

**GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

**BULLETIN**

**Fall 1989**

**Issue No. 5**

**Editors:** Professor Dr. Hartmut Lehmann and Dr. Kenneth F. Ledford, in conjunction with the Research Fellows of the Institute

**Address:** German Historical Institute  
1759 R Street, N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
Tel: (202) 387-3355  
FAX: (202) 483-3430

**Hours:** Monday - Friday 9:00 a.m. - 5:00. p.m.

**Library Hours:** Monday - Friday 10:00 a.m. - 5:00. p.m.

The next issue of the BULLETIN will appear in Spring 1990.

**GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

**BULLETIN**

**Fall 1989**

**Issue No. 5**

**Contents**

<b>I. Preface</b>	3
<b>II. Account of the Discussions at the Conferences Sponsored and Co-Sponsored by the German Historical Institute in 1989</b>	
A. A Framework for Democracy: Forty Years of Experience with the Grundgesetz of the Federal Republic of Germany	4
B. Genoa/Rapallo and the Reconstruction of Europe, 1922	8
C. Emigration and Settlement Patterns of German Communities in North America	12
D. Women in Postwar Germany: Culture, Society, and Politics	14
E. American Policy Toward Germany, 1949–1955	17
F. 1949–1989: The Federal Republic as History	25
<b>III. Institute News</b>	
A. Tours to Archives and Libraries in the Federal Republic of Germany and Courses at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel	34
B. The German Historical Institute in Washington Moves into a New Building	36

C. Reference Guide No. 2, "Guide to Inventories and Finding Aids of German Archives at the German Historical Institute"	36
D. GHI Library Report	36
E. New Staff Members	37
F. Scholarships	38
G. New Scholarship Recipients	39
H. Fall 1989 Lecture Series	41
I. Upcoming Conferences, 1990	41
J. Miscellaneous	42

## **I. Preface.**

In the course of the year 1989, the German Historical Institute has organized and co-sponsoreded a series of conferences covering a wide range of themes. Reports about the conferences form the content of this issue of our BULLETIN.

Despite the variety of themes, these conferences followed the same pattern: Each was organized by conveners from Germany and the United States; in each instance the German Historical Institute cooperated with at least one other institution; and finally participants from both Europe and North America took part in each single conference. In preparing and carrying through these conferences, we have attempted to give meaning to our mission, which is to support the exchange of ideas, to strengthen the ties, and to improve contacts between German and American scholars. As we were told from many sides, the conferences we were involved in were very successful. If that was so, the credit goes to the conveners and to the participants. It is my pleasure to thank them for their imagination and for the quality of their scholarly work.

Washington, D.C., November 1989

Hartmut Lehmann

## **II. Accounts of the Conferences Sponsored and Co-Sponsored by the German Historical Institute**

In view of its charge to promote and support the exchange of ideas between American and German historians and political scientists, the German Historical Institute in Washington has committed itself to the sponsorship of conferences which will bring together German and American scholars to discuss topics and issues within the Institute's mission. Beginning in Issue No. 4 of the BULLETIN, Spring 1989, brief reports have made the most important results of those conferences available to a wider audience. With Issue No. 5, the Institute hopes to establish a pattern of presenting brief conference reports on the year's conferences in each fall issue.

The following accounts are summaries of the main points raised during the various conferences of the year. Not every speaker could be included in these accounts, and remarks attributed to speakers are not direct quotations, unless they appear in quotation marks. Because the Institute will publish the formal conference papers of some of the conferences, the various presentations have been described only in summary fashion. The editor apologizes for any simplifications, omissions, or misunderstandings.

### **A. A Framework for Democracy: Forty Years of Experience with the Grundgesetz of the Federal Republic of Germany**

Philadelphia, April 6–9, 1989

This conference, marking the fortieth anniversary of the drafting of the Federal Republic's Basic Law, convened under the joint sponsorship of the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., the Center for West European Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, the Goethe House New York, and the German Marshall Fund. The conveners were Thomas Childers (University of Pennsylvania) and Peter Krüger (University of Marburg). More than fifty historians, political scientists, legal scholars, and jurists from the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Germany devoted three days to a thorough examination of the origins, context, content, and evolution of the *Grundgesetz*. The keynote address, held at Independence Hall in the room where—200 years ago—the first

United States Congress convened, was delivered by Ralf Dahrendorf (St. Antony's College, Oxford) who emphasized the flexibility of the *Grundgesetz* which, by facilitating evolutionary change, has permitted the development of a genuinely pluralistic political system in the Federal Republic. The opening ceremony ended with a reception at Old City Hall, given by the German Consul General in New York.

The working sessions of the conference took place at the University of Pennsylvania, where the Center for West European Studies generously provided all the necessary support. The first session, chaired by Thomas Childers (University of Pennsylvania), dealt with the historical context in which the *Grundgesetz* was drafted. Charles Maier (Harvard University) examined the international setting and the discussions between the occupying Western powers and the German zonal authorities, leading to what he described as "the constitution before the constitution" or "the presuppositions of the *Grundgesetz*." Wolfgang Benz (Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich) evaluated the impact of the German constitutional tradition (1848, 1871, 1918) as well as of the Weimar experience on the drafters of the *Grundgesetz*, while Erich Hahn (University of Western Ontario) stressed the influence of western models and, more directly, of the occupying powers on the political and constitutional reconstruction of West Germany. Finally, Volker Berghahn (Brown University) analyzed the economic conditions of the postwar era in terms of an "Economic Basic Law" which to a great extent guided and structured the deliberations in 1948–49. The discussion centered upon the question to what extent these various presuppositions limited the options of the founders and narrowed their room for maneuver.

The second session, chaired by Ellen Kennedy (University of Pennsylvania), took up major issues and controversies in the constitutional development of the Federal Republic. Donald Kommers (University of Notre Dame) compared civil liberties and constitutional jurisdiction in the United States and the Federal Republic and summarized the paper of Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenförde (*Bundesverfassungsgericht*, Karlsruhe), who was unable to attend the conference because of pressing court business in Germany. Kommers agreed with Böckenförde's conclusion that the solid legal protection of fundamental rights provided by the Federal Constitutional Court—which not only interprets the *Grundgesetz* but also creatively adapts its rules and principles to the changing needs of the society—represents one of the greatest achievements in the early history of the Federal Republic. Gebhard Ziller (Federal Ministry of Research and Technology) traced the constitutional background and subsequent development of federalism in the Bundesrepublik. Hotly debated at the

time of the adoption of the *Grundgesetz*, the federal principle is today firmly embodied in the constitutional system, guaranteeing at the same time cultural diversity and social stability.

While these papers dealt primarily with textual and structural aspects of the Basic Law, James Diehl (Indiana University) and Michael Stolleis (University of Frankfurt) addressed the implementation of its provisions. According to Stolleis, the proclamation of a "social state" or "welfare state" in Art. 20 of the Basic Law was just another step in a historical process that began with Bismarck's "*Sozialpolitik*" in the 1870s. He also demonstrated the opportunities and dangers that arise from the formulation of this relatively vague constitutional aim in a democratic system with a traditionally high participation of political parties and lobbies. Diehl considered in detail the social legislation passed in the first legislative period of the Bundestag (1949-1953) including such important acts as the Bundesversorgungsgesetz, the Heimkehrergesetz, and the Lastenausgleichsgesetz. These measures not only alleviated the sufferings of millions of people in the post-war crisis, but also did much to legitimate the new order and to immunize it against extremist solutions from both the right and the left.

A discussion of the *Grundgesetz* in the political life of the Federal Republic followed in the conference's third session, chaired by Peter Krüger (University of Marburg). Helmut Steinberger (University of Heidelberg) treated the foreign relations powers of the Basic Law as they have developed since 1949, and Marc Cioc (University of Massachusetts, now University of California, Santa Cruz) analyzed the controversial political and constitutional battle over the European Defense Community. In her paper "From Constitutional Legitimation to Party Crisis: Developments in the Post-1945 Party System", Michaela Richter (University of Pennsylvania) examined the importance of the West German party system for the Federal Republic's stability. Most of the participants accepted her thesis that this stability is threatened by recent changes in voting behavior and party identification.

The conference's fourth working session, chaired by Jane Caplan (Bryn Mawr College), turned to civil rights and social issues. David Large (Montana State University) gave a succinct overview of the considerable debate on the right of resistance from its origins in the immediate postwar period to the enshrinement of a resistance law in the *Grundgesetz* in 1968. He warned against seeing resistance, like the *Rechtsstaat*, in monumental and static terms, rather than recognizing the democratic order as something

that is never completed, but always in the process of becoming. Wilfried von Bredow (University of Marburg) dealt with new challenges to the stability and flexibility of the constitutional order of the Federal Republic since 1969, examining in particular new social movements and greater grass roots political participation. Finally, Robert Moeller (University of California, Irvine) took up the question of "Gender and *Grundgesetz*" by analyzing the constitutional debate concerning the legal rights of women and the central place of the family in society.

For its final session, chaired by Jürgen Heideking (German Historical Institute), the conference returned to the historic site of Old City Hall. John Kaminski (University of Wisconsin, Madison) reported on the ongoing projects to edit documentary materials relating to the drafting of the United States Constitution as an important effort to keep the American constitutional tradition alive in the minds of the people. Michael Stolleis informed the audience that a similar project concerning the sources of the *Grundgesetz*, led by Professor Hans-Peter Schneider, is currently under way in the legal faculty at the University of Hannover. Exemplifying the advantages of a comparative approach, Peter Krüger (University of Marburg) evaluated the influence of the United States Constitution on German constitutional development from the 1848 revolution to the drafting and consolidation of the Basic Law. For the future, he proposed to intensify not only contacts between American and German specialists but also common work on comparable problems. In this way both nations could profit from the unprecedented wealth of constitutional experience and knowledge accumulated over the past 200 years.

A concluding address to the conference was given by Hans Maier (University of Munich). He attributed the remarkable success of the Basic Law to its melting together of the elements of freedom, authority, and community into a binding order. This order rests on a broad consensus of the German people, and it is vigorously protected by the Constitutional Court, which symbolizes the sovereignty of law over politics in the Federal Republic. Maier's final observations concerned the complicated interplay between constitutional development and cultural change. He expressed the hope that the German people—having necessarily been turned away from authoritarian traditions by the Basic Law—may guard against the dangers of an excessive individualism, and that they continue to cherish the Basic Law as a "living constitution".

Thomas Childers/Jürgen Heideking

## **B. Genoa/Rapallo and the Reconstruction of Europe, 1922**

Washington, D.C., June 14–17, 1989

This research conference was jointly sponsored by the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., and the *Association Internationale d'Histoire Contemporaine de l'Europe*, an organization based in Strasbourg which promotes research on European international relations from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. Twenty-five specialists in the post-World War I era from ten countries gathered to discuss problems of the first major international effort to construct a new political and economic order for Europe.

Conference organizers were Carole Fink, Professor of History at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, who has published *The Genoa Conference: European Diplomacy 1921–22*, and Axel Frohn and Jürgen Heideking, both Research Fellows at the GHI-Washington and authors of *Der Rapallo-Mythos und die deutsch-amerikanischen Beziehungen* and *Die Pariser Botschafterkonferenz der alliierten Hauptmächte und die Probleme der europäischen Politik, 1920–31*, respectively.

Thanks to the kind hospitality of Dr. Jürgen Wickert, Director of the Washington office of the *Friedrich-Naumann-Stiftung*, all the working sessions took place in the Foundation's Theodor Heuss Room, a congenial setting, especially adorned with period documents and photographs, and just next door to the German Historical Institute's library, which featured an exhibit of international scholarship on Genoa and Rapallo.

The opening session focused on broad issues. Carole Fink's paper treated the origins and evolution of postwar revisionist sentiments among former enemies as well as neutrals, and showed how unsettled questions, such as Poland's eastern borders, the economic collapse of Austria, and the minorities question, intensified the forces of change. She described the "unfulfilled and unfulfillable" hopes raised by the Genoa conference which began as a major revisionist effort but soon turned to a "fine tuning" of the status quo and ended in failure. Peter Krüger (University of Marburg) presented new information from the records of the German Foreign Ministry about the negotiation of the Rapallo treaty and the role of councillor Albert Dufour-Feronce. Krüger's thesis that the Rapallo treaty was initiated by the proponents of a German "*Ostpolitik*" and had a disruptive influence on the Genoa conference as well as on European cooperation in general caused a lively discussion. Stephen Schuker (Brandeis University) stressed that in 1922 there was no realistic

"western" alternative to this political course, and several others doubted the importance of Rapallo for the final breakdown of the Genoa conference. As examples they pointed to the continuously strong influence of the "hardliners" in the French government and to the fact that Lloyd George was only temporarily alienated by the actions of the German delegation, so that British policy remained strongly pro-German even after Genoa.

In the afternoon the meeting turned to financial questions. Sally Marks (Providence, Rhode Island) presented a broad European perspective on the reparations issue in 1922. In his paper, "Rathenau, Stresemann and German-American Relations in 1922", Manfred Berg (University of Heidelberg, now *John F. Kennedy Institut für Amerikastudien*, Berlin) explained Stresemann's revisionist concept of German reintegration into the world economy which focused upon the financial ties between Germany and the United States. Stephen Schuker gave an acute analysis of America's preoccupation with the war-debt question. The United States chose a "business-like" approach to the problems of European reconstruction calling at the same time for disarmament, a cut in reparations payments, and the fulfillment of war-debt obligations. The ensuing debate centered upon the question whether a more conciliatory stance of the U.S. government in economic matters could have helped to break the European political deadlock in 1922.

The first day culminated with an address by Jacques Bariety (University of Paris-IV (Sorbonne)), president of the *Association Internationale d'Histoire Contemporaine de l'Europe*, on "The Financial Legacy of the Great War." Evoking the turbulence and controversies of the post-World War I era, Bariety called attention to the research that has been undertaken, and still needs to be done, and appealed especially for Soviet cooperation in opening essential archives; he also extolled the capacity of historians to deal meticulously and critically with complex economic and financial issues. Professor Bariety's discourse was followed by spirited statements calling for unfettered collaboration among European historians and for greater access to the documents.

The next morning was devoted to the "Russian question" in 1922. Alexander Fursenko (Institute of the History of the USSR, Leningrad) spoke on the "Oil Problem and Soviet-American Relations in 1922", noting his own efforts to gain access to important records of American private enterprises such as the Standard Oil Company and the difficulties that he encountered. Andrew Williams (University of Kent) investigated the official British policy toward the Soviet Union in the context of

economic aims as well as ideological and personal rivalries within the government. In particular, he noted the opposition of the conservative Foreign Office to Lloyd George's ambitious plans for European reconstruction. Anne Hogenhuis (European Institute of Public Administration, Maastricht, The Netherlands) detailed the elements of French financial and economic diplomacy toward Soviet Russia, largely conditioned by the desire to create a united front among Russia's prewar creditors. She also tried to explain the shifting position of Soviet negotiators at Genoa against the background of internal Russian developments. In his paper, Giorgio Petracchi (University of Florence) presented information on Italian political and commercial strategy toward Moscow. He distinguished the small business approach which favored recognition of the Soviet government and a small scale exchange of Italian manufactured goods for Russian raw materials from the aims of big business to recapture the Russian market and to penetrate the Soviet economy by means of large investments. The overall picture constructed by the papers as well as by the discussion was one of internal and external disunity among the Allies, which portended the unsuccessful outcome of the Genoa conference.

At the next session, attention focused upon the other participants at Genoa. In his contribution, Antoine Fleury (University of Geneva) described the aims and policies of Switzerland in particular and of the small neutral powers in general. Based on extensive archival research in the major East European capitals, Magda Adam (Institute of History, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest) gave a critical evaluation of the role of the Little Entente; and Frank Hadler (Institute of History, Academy of Sciences, Berlin, German Democratic Republic) reappraised the extremely active diplomacy of Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Benes. These contributions raised the question of the efficacy of small-power mediation in great power conflicts and the problems of the "successor states" after World War I.

The last day of the conference devoted itself to a general discussion based on a questionnaire circulated to all participants: What are the major sources available and still to be tapped? What are the major components (political, ideological, economic, financial, diplomatic, military, and social) of research on one particular country or problem? How do some of the larger historiographical questions, such as the problem of "restoration", the primacy of *Außen-* or *Innenpolitik*, and continuity versus discontinuity, relate to our common theme? What are the most useful means of practicing collaborative, comparative history?

In the closing session, participants presented exceptionally thorough reports on archival resources and finding aids for studying international history in 1922, including private, business, and government documents. The group also tackled several thorny questions, including the debt problem, treaty-revisionism, and the variety of structures of international peacekeeping in 1922. Several participants discussed the difficulty of democracies in responding promptly and coherently to their adversaries as well as their allies, as illustrated by painful delays together with precipitate decision-making. Using the Genoa conference as a model, considerable attention was devoted to the problem of gathering and interpreting public opinion in foreign affairs. The distorted "image of the other" was an important leitmotif at Genoa.

There was general agreement upon the value of international scholarly exchange, upon the necessity of a multinational perspective in studying twentieth-century international history, and upon the need to continue sharing resources. Regardless of specific national or scholarly orientation toward the events of 1922, the participants agreed upon the interdependence of political, economic, and social questions; upon the importance of evaluating and comparing the caliber as well as professed aims of the leadership in that year; upon the centrality of the "German problem" in the larger issues of European reconstruction; upon the significance of non-European influences (especially Japan, and the Near and Middle East); and upon the considerable human as well as material changes that overwhelmed Europe after 1914. Several elements of the Rapallo treaty remain mysterious and controversial, including its short- and long-term implications.

The Genoa conference, with its vast number of delegates, ambitious agenda, and indisputable links to today's political issues, provided a rich laboratory for a comparative study of European international relations.

Carole Fink / Axel Frohn / Jürgen Heideking

### **C. Emigration and Settlement Patterns of German Communities in North America**

New Harmony, Indiana, September 28–October 1, 1989

Conveners: Antonius Holtmann (University of Oldenburg); Jörg Nagler (German Historical Institute); Ruth Reichmann (Indiana University, Indianapolis).

Sponsored by the German-American Center of Indiana University, Indianapolis; the "*Forschungsstelle Niedersächsische Auswanderung in die USA*" at the University of Oldenburg, Germany; the Society for German-American Studies; the Indiana German Heritage Society; the German Studies Association; the National Historic Communal Societies Association; the Center for Communal Studies, University of Southern Indiana; and the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C.

In the past decades, research into the causes of European emigration to North America and into the problems and phases of assimilation of immigrants has been directed mainly toward the role of individuals. Researchers looked at individuals who decided to leave their home somewhere in Europe; they interpreted the motives of individuals who held such a high opinion of America that they decided to go there and nowhere else; they followed the routes of individuals who had to overcome the hardship of travel; they analyzed the problems of individuals, who, the researchers believed, had to struggle with all kinds of obstacles in the land of their choice and who disappeared, together with their cultural heritage, sooner or later into the melting-pot. Of course, scholars knew all along that much of the eighteenth and some of the nineteenth century emigration occurred in groups: groups with a leader, who decided when to leave and where to go; groups whose members stuck together during the trip; groups which settled in one place, in a suburb or a village. So far, however, not nearly enough is known about the special effects group emigration has had on settlement patterns and acculturation.

The main aim of the conference at New Harmony was to bring together those who have done, or are doing, research on Germans who emigrated in groups to the United States: historians, political scientists, and sociologists as well as students of literature, music, and culture. The conveners were able to assemble thirty scholars, about half from the United States and Canada, two from the Netherlands, and twelve from the Federal Republic of Germany. They discussed the theme in three

sessions which dealt respectively with settlements by religious groups, settlements by secular groups, and with the problems of the persistence of ethnic culture. The principal speakers at the conference were Günther Moltmann from the University of Hamburg, who gave an analysis of recent research on "Immigration and Settlements"; Donald Pitzer from the Center for Communal Studies at the University of Southern Indiana, who sketched the wider range of "German Communities in North America"; and Eberhard Reichmann from the Department of Germanic Studies at Indiana University in Bloomington, who described how the achievements of the founder of New Harmony, Johann Georg Rapp, are seen differently by the people at Iptingen in Württemberg where he came from and by the inhabitants of New Harmony which he established.

In evaluating the results of the conference, moderators and speakers agreed that much work remains to be done and that it is necessary to take a closer look at specific problems such as the role of churches or the economic and cultural role of special centers of concentration of German settlers. Needless to say, New Harmony, with its many beautifully restored early nineteenth-century buildings, formed a congenial setting for the meeting, which was attended by about 150–200 participants (archivists, librarians, teachers, local historians), mainly from Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, Kentucky, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania.

On one evening the conference participants were entertained by the Golden Raintree Singers and the Harmonist Chorale, who performed religious and secular songs from the Harmonist and Owenite tradition, thus commemorating 175 years of the founding of New Harmony. The day before and the day after the conference, speakers from overseas enjoyed tours to German settlements in Indiana. By bringing together American and European researchers who have been working on aspects of group emigration and group settlements, the conference promoted interest in German-American studies, provided an excellent opportunity to share research, and encouraged closer cooperation of those involved in the study of religious and secular settlements in the future.

Hartmut Lehmann

## **D. Women in Postwar Germany: Culture, Society, and Politics**

Raleigh, North Carolina, September 29–October 1, 1989

Between Friday, September 29, and Sunday, October 1, 1989, a conference on "Women in Postwar Germany: Culture, Society, and Politics" was held in Raleigh, North Carolina. The conference was chiefly organized by the Modern Language Department of North Carolina State University, with the co-sponsorship of the German Academic Exchange Service, New York, the North Carolina Humanities Council, North Carolina State University, and the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C.

In her keynote speech, Dr. Hanna Beate Schöpp-Schilling from the Federal Ministry for Youth, Family Affairs, Women, and Health (Bonn) characterized the achievements and problems of West German policy toward women's issues, occasionally referring to developments in the United States. She outlined two different kinds of approaches to the elimination of women's inequality: a special anti-discrimination law for women, and a case-by-case examination of the impact of existing and newly-passed laws upon women, an approach which takes into consideration the fact that women's real situation is different from that of men.

Claudia Koonz (Duke University) analyzed the gendered character of the *Historikerstreit*, arguing that this has been a purely male debate, which has neither paid any attention to the works which treat the history of women in the Nazi period nor incorporated controversies among women historians about the placement of National Socialism in German history and human experience.

As part of a panel on "Changing Places: Women at Work and in the Family", Christiane Lemke (University of North Carolina) and Hanna Schissler (German Historical Institute) gave talks comparing the situations in East and West Germany. Christiane Lemke showed how after 1945, the Soviet occupation and the East German government from the beginning reinforced gender equality in the labor force, but they did so without at the same time reducing women's responsibilities for their families, a prerequisite for true equality in the labor force. Reference was made to the *Trobadura* Beatrix in Irmtraud Morgner's novel. The *Trobadura* having heard of equal rights for men and women, travelled to the GDR, looking for paradise. Crossing the border, she was told: "You enter the German Democratic Republic, not Paradise." Playing on the metaphor, the

speakers and the audience speculated whether there was such a thing as paradise for women, and, if so, where it might be. Hanna Schissler gave a historical overview of women's situation in West Germany since the Second World War, arguing that the question of equal chances for both genders reveals most clearly the contradictions of modern industrialized societies which have not yet succeeded in resolving the historical gap of ascribed positions for women and men, and therefore constantly reproduce the inconsistencies of modern society. In the panel on literature (chaired by Sofus Simonson), the speakers presented thoughts on Christa Wolf's "*Kassandra*" (Larysa Mykyta), Günther Grass' "*Butt*", Eva Heller's "*Beim nächsten Mann wird alles besser*", and Svende Merian's "*Tod des Märchenprinzen*" (Sigfried Mews).

The panelists recast the title of the panel "What remains to be done to improve the condition of women in Germany?" to "What *has to be* done?" Dr. Monika Langkau-Herrmann (SPD) from the *Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung*, Marita Haibach, former *Staatssekretärin für Frauenangelegenheiten* in Hesse (Green Party), Dr. Antonia Wigbers (CDU), State Representative for Women's Issues in Lower Saxony from the *Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung*, and Dr. Inge Segall (FDP, member of the German *Bundestag* from the *Friedrich-Naumann-Stiftung* discussed issues in women's politics in West Germany. Herbert Kitschelt (Duke University), who chaired the panel, placed the Federal Republic into the European and American context. He outlined four fundamental positions in gender politics which can be traced historically: 1) Men and women are equal, but they live and act in separate spheres; applying different legal standards is only a consequence. (This is the conservative position). 2) In the liberal tradition, it is stressed that women and men should have equal opportunities for advancement in society. 3) Because of the long tradition of injustices, a *redistribution* of income, influence, power, and chances between women and men has to be implemented (the traditional socialist position). 4) A clearly feminist position would put weight upon the fact that it is not enough to bring women to men's standards in income, influence, and the decision-making process, but that these standards themselves should be changed, in order to achieve new human standards that are more appropriate for both women and men.

The panel discussion showed that women politicians, even if they started as experts in other fields such as economics and were previously opposed to any feminist approach in politics, would through time and experience become more aggressive with regard to women's issues. The discussion reflected the fact that the Federal Republic is a very contradictory place. On the one hand, there is the Green Party which has

made the issue of gender equality a matter of public debate, even for other political parties. On the other hand, participants in the lively discussion that involved the audience argued that one would rarely meet with as much male dominance on supervisory boards and committees as in the Federal Republic. In the United States, for years blacks, women, and other minority groups were excluded from positions of responsibility by the argument that no members of those groups were qualified to hold office. Such arguments cannot be made persuasively in Germany. Participants in the discussion cited examples both from politics and university life.

There was general agreement that this by no means should be interpreted merely as advancement in the United States and backwardness in the Federal Republic. Things are more complicated than that, and Hanna Beate Schöpp-Schilling even offered the opinion that while the Federal Republic looked to the U.S. in the 1970s as a model for "women's emancipation", things might have turned around in the 1980s, and the U.S. could learn from West Germany. While this might be true for politics, it surely does not obtain in universities, where the Federal Republic is remarkably backward in the advancement of women. Hanna Schissler referred to a speech delivered by the president of the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*, Hubert Markl, at the 1986 meeting of the *Deutsche Akademikerinnenbund*, entitled "*Männerwelt entmutigt Forscherinnen*", in which the numerical relationship of 96:4 male to female professors in West Germany was labelled an untenable and embarrassing situation, especially in comparison to other West European countries and the United States.

Dr. Segall pointed out that the German law which regulates discrimination against women in the workplace is a toothless tiger. She placed women in a global context, showing that world-wide, women possess only one percent of all property and earn only one-tenth of the money; but they do two-thirds of the labor and produce half of the food. Dr. Langkau-Herrmann strongly stressed that only measures such as quotas and affirmative action will be able to change the gendered power structure in West German society. Dr. Wigbers argued that the legal framework should be such that women have the opportunity to choose between work and family and that the reintegration of women into the labor force should be eased. The debate concentrated upon the question of quota regulation, and although some political parties oppose such regulations, the female representatives of these parties do not in principle reject the idea of some sort of legal regulation, for their experience over the years has shown them that mere abolition of discrimination cannot change things, that only active political regulation will be sufficient.

In the panel on women and education, the panelists outlined some of the reasons why it is so difficult to establish "women's studies" in the Federal Republic, and why there are so few female professors in West Germany. Hanna Beate Schöpp-Schilling, who had the latest figures, pointed out that there are at present only eighteen professorships in women's studies in West Germany—a deplorable number compared to the United States, where women's studies not only is well established but has also been much more successful in changing the paradigms of academic research.

By far the most moving contribution was made by the GDR novelist, Helga Schütz, in her talk on "Memories of Daily Life and Literature". Her description of everyday experiences of women gave a poignant impression of what it means not to have access to the goods and the information that women in Western countries take for granted.

Its stress upon the interdisciplinary approach, and its incorporation of history, political science, and literature made the conference a success. Erika Fairchild and Anthony LaVopa delivered concluding remarks. Christiane Lemke pointed out that comparing the impact of the women's movement on politics in the United States and in West Germany would make for a valuable (or worthwhile), interesting follow-up conference.

Hanna Schissler

## **E. American Policy Toward Germany, 1949–1955**

Marburg, September 26–28, 1989

On September 26–28, 1989, the German Historical Institute held its first conference in Germany. Convened by Hermann-Josef Rupieper (University of Marburg) and Jeffrey M. Diefendorf (University of New Hampshire), more than thirty German and American historians met at the University of Marburg to discuss problems of American policy toward Germany from the late 1940s to the mid-1950s. Attention focused upon the first period of the history of the Federal Republic, after Konrad Adenauer had been elected Federal Chancellor but while there was still another government residing on the *Petersberg*, a hill overlooking the newly and provisionally-established capital, Bonn: the Allied High Commission for Germany.

The conference met at a time of fundamental change in international relations. The customary frontiers of the Cold War are dissolving and so is the conceptual framework for the interpretation of post-World War II history. Arguing that the presumed end of the ideological struggle between capitalism and socialism might indicate a resolution of Hegel's dialectic contradictions in human history, Francis Fukuyama, deputy director of the State Department's policy planning staff, predicted in an article in the summer 1989 issue of *The National Interest* "not just the end of the Cold War, or the passing of a particular period of postwar history, but the end of history as such: that is the end of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government."

Historians at Marburg did not speculate about the future of humankind or history but presented the results of their current research into American policy toward Germany in an era in which the Cold War certainly did shape international relations. In six compact sessions, the participants discussed basic political issues including Germany's democratization, economic problems, defense matters, questions of industry and technology, and archival sources.

Erich J. Hahn (University of Western Ontario) analyzed U.S. policy toward a West German constitution from the London conference of the Council of Foreign Ministers in 1948 to the Washington meeting of the foreign ministers in 1949, and in particular General Clay's role in the process of the formulation and passage of the Basic Law. Michael Wala (University of Erlangen) described the Council on Foreign Relations both as a forum to test ideas and to discuss and build consensus on foreign policy issues and its recommendations for Germany's denazification, the revival of the German economy, and its strong support for Germany's inclusion in the European Recovery Program. Hermann-Josef Rupieper concluded the first session with an evaluation of the policies of the Truman and Eisenhower administrations toward the reunification of Germany. While in American eyes the integration of a reunified Germany (including the Federal Republic, the GDR, and Berlin, and excluding the Eastern territories under Soviet and Polish administration) with the West was deemed a maximum aim, U.S. policy from 1949 to 1952 gave priority to West Germany's stabilization and European integration. In a second phase from 1952 to 1955, after the Federal Republic's western orientation had been established, emphasis shifted from Germany's reunification to European security, and after the failure of the Geneva conference of foreign ministers, the issue receded to the background of U.S. policy.

The following session was devoted to economic problems. In his presentation, Gunther Mai (University of Marburg) summarized the effects of American policy toward Germany upon the process of European integration, 1945–1955, in four points: 1) the influence of the U.S. on the development of the institutional aspects of European integration tended to be negligible; 2) the preponderance of the German question determined American policy toward Europe in the beginning but proved to be a liability in the course of events; 3) American policy of European integration aimed at a possible disengagement in Europe without prejudicing U.S. leadership in the Atlantic Alliance; 4) European collective attempts to repudiate American hegemony contributed more to the long-term success of the integration movement than the collective defense against the Soviet menace. As to American support for the Schuman Plan, Mai and John Gillingham (University of Missouri) agreed that it was rather reluctant because the establishment of a single common authority to administer the heavy industries of France and Germany, as well as any other nation that might choose to join it, threatened to create a European super-cartel. In his assessment of French policy, Gillingham stressed that the Schuman/Monnet Plan was considerably more important for European integration than the Marshall Plan, and that Schuman's proposal did not constitute an about-face but a development of French policy toward Germany which had already changed at the beginning of 1948.

Returning to the Marshall Plan, Christoph Buchheim (*Institut für Zeitgeschichte*, Munich) explained what he called the "double relationship" between the European Recovery Program (ERP) and the West German currency reform. The ERP was a prerequisite for the success of the currency reform of June 1948, which again provided for an increase in German exports of capital goods to Western Europe. Insofar as these goods substituted for American products, Buchheim argued, they reduced the European dollar gap, and thus the currency reform contributed to the success of the Marshall Plan.

Germany's economic recovery not only required American credits but also the collaboration of Germany's industrialists. After blaming the Ruhr magnates during the early postwar years for helping to bring Hitler to power and for supporting the Nazi regime's expansionist policy and atrocities, the attitude changed with the political climate of the upcoming Cold War. The predominant pragmatic view was perhaps best expressed by the British control officer Sir Percy Mills. "They were not Nazis," he claimed, "they are businessmen." How this change affected the case of Alfred Krupp, one of the most prominent German industrialists, was set out by Werner Bühner (*Institut für Zeitgeschichte*, Munich). The case of

Alfried Krupp, who had been convicted of the abuse of slave labor and plundering occupied countries, came up again in a somewhat different context. On January 31, 1951, the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany announced his final decision regarding executive clemency for eighty-nine German war criminals held in Landsberg prison. For the most part, McCloy found grounds for clemency. The sentences of seventy-nine of those imprisoned were reduced, and thirty-two of the inmates were immediately released, among them Alfried Krupp. In his presentation on "John J. McCloy and the Landsberg Cases", Thomas Schwartz (Harvard University) addressed questions such as: Why did the U.S. High Commissioner initiate a new and comprehensive review of the Nuremberg sentences? Why did McCloy make the final decisions which he did? And what significance did the decisions have in the long run?

In the session on industry and technology, John Gimbel (Humboldt State University) and Raymond Stokes (Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute) discussed the topic of technology transfer. Gimbel focused upon the commercial-industrial exploitation program of the Commerce Department's Office of Technical Services (OTS) and the Field Information Agency, Technical (FIAT) in the early postwar years. Popular beliefs that the Americans took no reparations from Germany after the Second World War notwithstanding, he pointed out that the amount and value of American reparations removals from Germany in the form of scientific and technical know-how were by no means insignificant. In his paper on "Technology Transfer and the Emergence of the West German Petrochemical Industry, 1945–1955", Stokes too stressed the fact that immediately after the war the flow of (enforced) transfer was away from Germany and toward Allied and neutral countries, but that by the late 1940s unilateral transfer of technology stopped. During the final four years of Allied control, German chemical firms established more equal relationships with companies abroad. They offered their experience, research results, know-how, and patents to the highest bidder on the international market and used the proceeds to obtain technologies and feedstock supply agreements. On the positive side, both Gimbel and Stokes concluded, postwar investigations served as a conveyor-belt for future German-American industrial cooperation and business connections.

Another aspect of U.S. industrial policy was treated by Albert Diegmann (University of Aachen), who described the changes in American deconcentration policy toward the Ruhr coal mining industry: from the

concept of harsh punishment during the early occupation period (1945–1947), to a relaxation under the auspices of the Marshall Plan (1947–1949), ending up again in determined action against cartels and combines (1950–1951).

The fourth session was devoted to military questions and defense matters. James M. Diehl (Indiana University) examined U.S. policy toward German veterans from their designation as "Disarmed Enemy Forces" or "Surrendered Enemy Personnel" during the final stages of the war and in the early postwar years (in order to circumvent the formalized rules of treatment for "Prisoners of War" laid down in the Geneva convention of 1929) until the relaxation of Allied control measures following the creation of the Federal Republic. In contrast to the politics of the Weimar Republic, after the *Wehrmacht's* surrender in 1945 German veterans were denied political activity as veterans and forced by their difficult economic circumstances (abolition of war pensions) to form new economic and social ties - ties that worked to reintegrate them into society as individuals. Social reintegration therefore preceded activity in veterans' organizations, and this helped to foster policies that were pragmatic in nature when the latter were again permitted to operate.

Turning to the "European Defense Community" (EDC), David C. Large (Montana State University) characterized the EDC as a "grand illusion" for those who had chosen to believe in it. He examined the expectations for the EDC entertained by the two nations that became, after initial severe misgivings, its most ardent champions: the United States and the Federal Republic. In investigating these countries' official "conversion" to the project, he discussed the lingering doubts about the plan harbored by some of the converts as well as the continuing hostility toward it expressed by its opponents. Finally he tried to assess the significance of the EDC's failure within the broader context of West German rearmament.

Bruno Thoß (*Militärgeschichtliches Forschungsamt*, Freiburg) directed attention to the presence of U.S. troops in Europe and to the effect of plans to reduce their number upon German-American relations in the early and mid-1950s. Although President Eisenhower in early 1953 had stressed that American forces in Europe, which had been increased from one to five divisions in the wake of the Korean war, were a real physical deterrent to the Soviet Union and not merely a psychological one, he soon had to face the necessity of making American defense "more effective" and "less costly." His "New Look" concept therefore called for a reduction of troops and emphasized the importance of nuclear weapons. This

caused serious problems for the rearmament of the Federal Republic and anxieties on the part of the West German government about American isolationism and the continuing interest of the United States in Europe. After the foreign ministers failed even to touch upon disengagement plans at the Geneva conference in 1955, the stationing of U.S. troops in Europe gained the character of a "provisional institution in permanence." The consequences of the "New Look" and the strategy of massive retaliation with its heavy reliance on nuclear weapons for the Federal Republic were analyzed by Klaus A. Maier (*Militär-geschichtliches Forschungsamt*, Freiburg). Not only were West Germany's conventional forces diminished to secondary importance at a time when they had not even come into existence, but also the Federal Republic's territory had to be viewed as one of the main battlefields in a nuclear war.

In the session on American democratization policies in Germany, Rebecca Boehling (University of Maryland) evolved the thesis that the restraints placed upon grassroots political activity by both the U.S. Military Government and its appointed German officials in 1945 and 1946 inhibited not only the development of new and renewed political parties but also the potential for the democratic transformation of German society and the economic order. As examples she named the suppression of the *Antifa* movement by the military government's ban on political activities in the spring of 1945 and the collapse of the multi-party structure of the *Frankfurter Rundschau* in 1946. In her opinion, many Germans were all too willing to sacrifice the ideals of structural political and socio-economic democratization in return for U.S.-style capitalism—which most Americans equated with democracy—as long as it meant an end to the chaos, disorder, and shortages of the postwar period. Another "lost opportunity" was identified by Diethelm Prowe (Carleton College). Americans, he argued, reinforced a democratization in West Germany based upon a largely conservative restabilization with a considerable increase in power sharing. But they modified the form of this democratization by effectively blocking a second democratic system of corporatist-democratic institutions (e.g., chambers of industry and commerce) in the economy. West Germans ultimately adapted to a system, he continued, that has mixed much-weakened corporatist elements with the American concept of political democracy and unconstrained market economy.

Michael Fichter (Free University of Berlin) explained how the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany (HICOG) sought to insure that organized labor in Germany would fulfill what Americans regarded to be the role of trade unions in a democratic society. It was during the tenure

of John J. McCloy as High Commissioner (1949–1952) that basic (but not necessarily final) decisions were made on issues involving organized labor which were crucial to the future of the Federal Republic: codetermination, the Schuman Plan, decartelization, and rearmament. In the end, "selling the American way of life" to German labor was an element of policy but not an end in itself. Rather it was more of an ideal and a means to a more politically and strategically defined end. Of greater import to HICOG's concern for labor affairs and its attempts to influence the policy of the German trade unions was the goal of insuring that organized labor would contribute to the political stability and economic growth of the Federal Republic as well as to its integration into the Western Alliance.

Manfred Heinemann (University of Hannover) examined U.S. policies of "re-education" and "re-orientation" " as part of the re-emergence of cultural policies in West Germany, and Norbert Frei (*Institut für Zeitgeschichte*, Munich) discussed American concerns after the debate on nationalism in the Federal Republic in 1949, which the East Coast press feared might be a prelude to a "re-nazification" of Germany.

Turning back to an event that could be considered an example of a grassroots democratic development, James F. Tent (University of Alabama) described the unusual circumstances and intentions of the founding of the Free University of Berlin. It came into existence largely as a result of student initiative. When matters came to a head between Soviet-SED authorities who had assumed exclusive control over the old *Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität* in Berlin (later to be called *Humboldt-Universität*) and dissident students in April 1948, these students set in motion carefully prepared plans for the creation of a new university in the western sectors, "free" of ideological control, i.e., SED domination. The new university with its student representation at all levels was supposed to serve as a model of reform for other German universities, and with the help of returning émigré scholars, the Free University became a center for the social sciences. By admitting thousands of students who had been unable to begin studies at home, the Free University served—unofficially—as a kind of "State University" for the GDR. Despite its many reform features, the Free University ultimately failed in several of its purposes. After four years of chaos, the 1948 constitution was replaced by the 1969 University Law, which created a different institution of higher learning and effectively ended the experiment that had begun twenty years earlier.

When it came to rebuilding bombed cities, Berlin was a unique case too. Jeffry M. Diefendorf stated that from the time of the occupation

through active American involvement in programs sponsored by the Marshall Plan, the Americans pursued a relatively modest but consistent policy of encouraging modernism in town planning and housing construction. It was modest insofar as the American contribution to urban reconstruction was in fact much less (less than two percent of the investment in housing) than is commonly thought. American aid is part of the founding myth of West Germany, but most of that aid did not go to rebuilding destroyed cities—with the exception of West Berlin. Influenced by the ideas of Bauhaus-founder Walter Gropius and former Berlin town planner Martin Wagner, both by then professors at Harvard University, the Americans consistently urged the Germans to build modern, mass-produced, inexpensive housing units. American policy toward Germany's cities, he concluded, thus was a return of German thinking to Germany.

The final session of the conference focused on archives and sources. The presentations by Robert Wolfe (National Archives, Washington) and Josef Henke (*Bundesarchiv*, Koblenz) led to a productive exchange between archivists and historians. Among the vast amount of material reflecting American policy toward Germany (after 1949/51) in German archives, Henke mentioned the records of the Federal Chancellery and the *Auswärtiges Amt*, the records of the Berlin Senate and of Berlin *Bezirksverwaltungen* in the U.S. sector, the papers of Konrad Adenauer, Theodor Heuß, *Staatssekretäre* Hallstein, Globke, Lenz, and von Eckardt, and the Ministers President of the *Länder*, which are deposited in the *Bundesarchiv*, the *Staatsarchive*, and in the archives of political parties.

Robert Wolfe underscored that the records of the U.S. Federal Government deposited in the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) are a major source for the study of the history of the Federal Republic between 1949 and 1955. The largest pertinent series of these records (2,425 cubic feet), the Records of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany (HICOG), is not easily accessible to research. Substantial portions of that record group still await declassification or will remain security-classified indefinitely. Many HICOG records, particularly those of the *Land* level, were retained for use by U.S. diplomatic or consular missions which inherited remaining HICOG functions in Germany. Such records were retired to the U.S. with the Bonn, Frankfurt, Berlin, Munich, or Stuttgart post records at varying intervals, and some have not yet been received from the Department of State. Similarly, a large portion of the HICOG record group consists of Office of Military Government, U.S. (OMGUS) records retained in the files of HICOG agencies when they assumed responsibility for American diplomatic and

economic operations in Germany. While this assured continuity of actions then in progress, Wolfe pointed out, it now presents archival problems for both archivists and researchers.

The Marburg conference gave an impressive survey of research in progress into American policy toward Germany after World War II. It showed the degree to which historical interest has shifted to the early 1950s and gave an idea of how much research still has to be done. A vast quantity of material on the early history of the Federal Republic is available, but most outstanding is the series of HICOG records deposited in the National Archives. It will attract a growing number of researchers in the years to come.

Axel Frohn

## **F. 1949-1989: The Federal Republic as History**

Cambridge, Massachusetts, October 27–29, 1989

A colloquium entitled "1949–1989: The Federal Republic as History", met in Cambridge, Massachusetts, from October 27–29, 1989, under the joint sponsorship of the German Historical Institute in Washington and the Minda de Gunzberg Center for European Studies of Harvard University. In the midst of momentous change in German affairs, and on the eve of even more profound change, scholars took time, as Guido Goldman (Center for European Studies) stated in his opening remarks, to look to the past to understand the present and evaluate the experience of forty remarkable years. Hartmut Lehmann (German Historical Institute), in his greetings to those in attendance, noted that forty years, while an unusual number for commemorative celebration, was a period longer than that called the Reformation and almost as long as the life of the second German Empire, and thus the forty-year life of the Federal Republic is ripe for review and analysis. Finally, Charles Maier (Harvard University) enjoined all the participants to move beyond the trope of "order versus disorder" to the trope of "*Lernprozeß*", following Matthew Arnold's charge to "tell me what makes you interesting." Discussions began early in the mornings and lasted late into the evenings. The facilities of the new Center for European Studies provided an ideal meeting-place for the more than one-hundred participants from all over the United States and from Europe.

The opening session on Friday, October 27, treated the "Achievements and Limits of the Social Market Economy." Knut Borchardt (University of Munich) advanced two arguments why economic history should begin the conference: it conforms to the sequence of events in the beginning of the Federal Republic, and economic success was crucial to the identity and legitimacy of the new republic. Bonn is not Weimar because of a difference in economic performance, the best in German history. Borchardt interpreted the "social market economy" as primarily a polemical concept, which justified the protection of the state by limiting its interventions in the market to those at which it could succeed reliably.

Meinhard Miegel (*Institut für Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftspolitik*, Bonn) argued that the social market economy is a myth. Neither it nor its achievements or limits can be defined. The social market economy is really a mixed economy like that of other western capitalist economies, but a blend strongly shaped by the social and economic thinking of southwest Germany. What is particularly *German* about the social market economy is its higher regard for human resources, resulting in the social goal of reduction of the exploitation of human labor, which has led to the lowest work-week in the western world, and the emphasis upon a more equal distribution of wealth and income than the rest of the world, with the result that the Federal Republic has little manifest poverty.

Charles Sabel (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), while noting that the social market economy is the name given to politically domesticated capitalism in whatever form it takes at any specific time, concentrated his observations on the German labor unions. Generally admired by middle-of-the-road observers as a stabilizing influence in the German economy, the unions now find themselves endangered in their organizational basis by the successes of the German economy. While one great fear of the unions, loss of jobs through de-industrialization, does not appear to be happening, it remains difficult to recruit young workers into unions. The very nature of the work process, in which new project groups implement new technologies, makes the boundaries between labor and management, indeed the very boundaries of the factory, unclear and endangers the organizational framework of unions. If the process continues, the danger of conflict could increase.

Fritz Scharpf (*Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung*, Cologne) sought to explain the relatively poor ability of the Federal Republic's economic policy to translate economic growth into more employment. The economy of the Federal Republic has the largest proportion of industrial employment to total employment of all OECD countries. The

service sector is relatively smaller than all others, especially in the household and personal service sector (health, retail, entertainment). This sector of the economy cannot be automated or rationalized and is characterized by low labor productivity. There are two models of solutions: that of the United States, allowing for a *very* high wage differential and low tax burden, leading to the phenomenon of the working poor, and that of Sweden, which puts these service jobs into the public sector, for which citizens pay much higher taxes. Germany finds itself in the middle, unable to choose between the two.

The second session of the colloquium bore the title, "Pluralism or Fragmentation: Coping with Social Change". M. Rainer Lepsius (University of Heidelberg) stressed how the initial emphasis in the Federal Republic on aggregation and integration, as a device to avoid reference to the National Socialist past and to rebuild the economy, led to a high degree of social homogenization by the 1960s. In the 1960s, economic growth permitted the fulfillment of new social demands without a redistribution of wealth, allowing the social apparatus to remain regularized as it had emerged in the 1950s. Since the mid-1980s, Lepsius perceives a new tendency to deregularize the regularized structures, as unions are undercut and the national social apparatus is "overbridged" by European integration. A second tendency is disaggregation and pluralization, with a revival of ethnic rifts with non-Germans living in Germany and a higher degree of self-identification of Germans, seeing the Federal Republic as a positive point of reference.

Claus Offe (University of Bremen) delivered a history of the German social welfare system, arguing that its foundation on the basis of contributions rather than taxes, self-administration, connection to past employment, non-redistributive, de-politicized, and juridified rights have led to an extraordinary durability of the system. Little evidence of disorder can be found, for the consensus in Germany on the system is so broad as to make change a smooth path of piecemeal growth. Yet the system contains paradoxes, such as the clash between the collective interest in providing long-term security to employees to minimize conflict and individual interest in mobility, as well as the slant of the system in favor of retirees.

Ilona Ostner (University of Bremen) considered the reconstruction of normalcy in the Federal Republic and its impact upon women. Her analysis was that the Federal Republic had diversified women's life chances without changing the basic position of women. Diversification

of chances occurred, but only in traditional women's spheres. Social change in the Federal Republic has not been linear, but instead has affected different groups differently, *blocking* changes for women.

Wolfgang Zapf (*Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung*) began his analysis from the starting point of social homogeneity and traced new fragmentations, found less on the macro than the micro level of individual drop-outs and discrimination. New fragmentations include the third wave of immigration, the Turks, which has led to the creation of the first underclass, and the baby boom and bust which still results in dislocations. The whole of society is characterized by a pluralization of life-styles and the rising demand for individualism *together with* security.

The second day of the colloquium began with a panel on "The Basic Law and Its Impact". David Schoenbaum (University of Iowa) emphasized that the Basic Law created a playing field and rules of the game as no German constitution before had done, including suicide-prevention clauses to prevent a turn from democracy even if the people want it. It has survived one serious constitutional challenge in each decade of its existence: the rearmament debate of the 1950s, the constitutional emergency of the 1960s, and *Ostpolitik* in the 1970s. The next federal election could lead to the result that *no* majority can be formed, but no one fears for the survival of the republic, while any of these crises would have torn Weimar apart.

Dieter Grimm (*Bundesverfassungsgericht, Karlsruhe*) argued that the Basic Law is a successful constitution because it is not the object of political struggle. It stresses principle rather than procedure, creating fundamental rules that are unalterable, even by majority vote. *This* distinguishes it from the more formalist definition of democracy in the Weimar Constitution. While most of the Basic Law's special devices to save the Federal Republic from the fate of Weimar were of no importance, the Federal Constitutional Court is a novel and useful tool. Now disputes over constitutional interpretation are decided on a non-partisan basis. The court has defended the boundaries of individual rights, promoted the positive rather than the negative state, and tried to keep the political process open when parties wished to close it. It has even changed the rhetoric of political campaigns, as parties now attack the policies of opponents as "unconstitutional", a development that Grimm finds pernicious. The Court contributes to the ability of the Basic Law to fill the gap in German national identity through "constitutional patriotism".

Richard Buxbaum (University of California, Berkeley) recalled the model for the Federal Constitutional Court found in the United States Supreme Court. He criticized the definition of individual rights in the Basic Law, which is much more specific than in the U.S. Constitution, as having *overconstitutionalized* social conflicts that should be left to the arena of political debate and conflict.

Finally, Klaus von Beyme (University of Heidelberg) praised the role of the Basic Law, if unintentionally, in forcing various leftist groups to come together under one umbrella, the Green Party, because of the five percent rule. Thus the alienated left found a new home and found itself forced to adopt compromises and develop a coherent program beyond a single issue. In von Beyme's view, this is better than remaining in the extra-parliamentary opposition, contrary to what he had earlier believed.

The second panel of Saturday morning was "Living with Dissent: Intellectuals and Toleration." Joachim Fest (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*) questioned whether dissent existed at all in the Federal Republic. Because of Germany's historical tradition of striving for harmony, the lack of a political class, the lack of a geographic political center, among other reasons, it is easy to live with dissent because there is none. With the exception of the reaction to Ernst Nolte's contribution to the *Historikerstreit*, which Fest found to be oppressive, Fest finds Germany an intellectually dull place.

Jürgen Kocka (Free University of Berlin) disagreed, finding dissent alive and well. Since the 1960s, the Federal Republic has had *more* rather than less dissent than other western countries, although there is less dissent and more consensus in the Federal Republic than in earlier phases of German history. The political culture of the Federal Republic is still shaped by the shock of the 1930s and 1940s and the attempt to learn from those events; consensus and self-understanding are also stabilized by the mere existence of the German Democratic Republic. Limits to dissent exist. Germany lacks a market attitude toward ideas, which are dealt with rather in moral and absolute terms. Intellectual debates also miss popular bases for dissent, which may be contributing to the electoral support of the Republican party. Finally, multi-cultural pluralism is new and untested, especially in ethnic matters.

Peter Schneider (Dartmouth College) opined that he thought that he and Joachim Fest were talking about two different societies. He started from the proposition that there is *much* dissent in the Federal Republic. While the heroic times of great figures of dissent on fundamental issues,

such as Heinrich Böll, are past, dissent lives on. Problems lie in the structure of dissent. Since group dissent has replaced individual dissent, individuals must ensure that they express dissent *within* the dissenting groups; they must combat the enormous pressure for conformity within dissent.

Historians filled the panel that dealt with "Coming to Terms with the Past." Gordon Craig (Stanford University) examined the attempts in the Federal Republic to come to terms with the past in novels and in film, in the *Bundeswehr*, and finally among historians. In novels and film, the first phase involved ruthless criticism of all anti-democratic politics and war to the death on the world of their fathers; the second phase, beginning in the 1970s, involved the search for identity, for personal childhood memories. In the policy of the *Bundeswehr*, the first phase was self-referential, based on constitutional patriotism, with a break from past traditions; the second phase found the stress on the army as just another job inimical to military efficiency and sought to reestablish ties with older German military traditions. Among historians, the *Historikerstreit* typified the second phase, beginning with the attempt by neo-conservative historicism to reclaim German history from pluralists-and to create a German patriotism. While the dispute has been harsh, the historicization of the National Socialist past, as called for by Broszat and others, is very legitimate.

Wolfgang J. Mommsen (University of Düsseldorf) argued that the willingness to face the German past in a new way is a sign of a generational shift. A new generation of historians, after succeeding in supplanting traditionalist nationalist views of German history, had come to power when in the late 1970s a revival of interest of Germans in their own national past restored their public audience. The *Historikerstreit* came about when politicians began to exploit public interest in history, and while one can argue whether it was a success, it did create a new historical consciousness. It may simply reflect a return to normality.

Thomas Nipperdey (University of Munich) contended that the Germans had indeed become a people without a past and that the lack of a past had been a problem since 1945. The importance of economic growth in legitimizing state and system is connected with this lack of a past, as is what he described as the trendiness of German intellectual life. The conflict of coming to terms with the past is one of pluralism, conflicting party interpretations. The *Historikerstreit* is a response to the dominance of left interpretations for the last fifteen to twenty years, which has ignored and dismissed other interpretations of the past, such

as conservative and Catholic ones. Neo-historicism, Nipperdey argued, is more pluralistic than the liberal orthodoxy of critical history.

Heinrich August Winkler (University of Freiburg) asserted that the moral rejection of the Third Reich in the Federal Republic coexisted in the 1950s with an apologetic impulse for Germans as a whole and as individuals. The *Historikerstreit* in particular was an apologetic offensive linked to Bitburg in the spring of 1985, an offensive which failed because much of the public perceived it as morally and intellectually untenable. The German people, he argued, will come to grips with their past only when they cease to draw their identity from the *Kaiserreich*.

Sunday, October 29, began with the discussion of "A Divided Germany as History." Arnulf Baring (Free University of Berlin) noted that since 1949, West Germans have confined their concern with reunification to sermons on Sundays; on weekdays, they cared for their position in the western framework, for western integration. Ferment in the German Democratic Republic in 1989 has caused hopes to outstrip reality; progress in inter-German relations must continue step-by-step, and self-determination by the citizens of the GDR must be the means by which reform is accomplished. What the reaction in the west has revealed is both a stronger emotional tie to Germans in the east than many had thought *and* a change in the interpretation of German history such that the *Kaiserreich* no longer is the high point of German history, but rather an unhappy interlude.

Günther Gaus (Reinbeck) pointed out that for the first twenty years of the Federal Republic, the division of Germany was accepted, both as part of a general division of the world into east and west and as the price to pay for the National Socialist past. In 1969, policy shifted to formal acknowledgement of the status quo, *de facto* recognition of the division, and a pragmatic policy of step-by-step change to increase security for all. Circumstances seem to have changed in mid-1989, leading to the question of whether 1969-89 was an intermezzo before a new period only now beginning. Gaus stressed that it will be best to help the GDR participate in east bloc reforms without having to give up its identity or existence and blend into the west.

Peter Graf Kielmansegg (University of Mannheim) characterized the history of inter-German relations as a forty year period of learning to live with the division, of maintaining a reasonable balance between acceptance and non-acceptance. Great foreign policy struggles of the 1950s (European integration) and 1970s (*Ostpolitik*) were struggles between

these polarities. In the 1980s, it appeared that outright acceptance of the division, recognition of the GDR, was winning, until the events of summer 1989. Non-acceptance of the division *must* remain an element of any policy because the GDR has never been accepted as legitimate by its own citizens.

Peter Schneider delivered a comment that was critical of SPD *Ostpolitik* of the 1970s, arguing that it was a cabinet policy, contributing to a support of the SED regime by maintaining contacts with the east German government over the heads of east Germans. He emphasized the rhetorical question, can we still *avoid* reunification?

Karl Kaiser (*Forschungsinstitut der deutschen Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik e.V.*, Bonn), chair of the panel "Opting for the West: Past, Present, Future", introduced the discussion with the reflection that the question is not whether, but *how* the postwar order, structured around the division of Germany, is changing; can that postwar order provide a framework to accommodate the changes? Pierre Hassner (*Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques*, Paris) argued that the Federal Republic opted for the west in three ways: ideological, because it offered freedom; security, through NATO; and in national identity, that being a part of "the West" became part of West German national identity. None of these preclude closer ties with the GDR, especially now that changes in the east bloc, the fact that the east is moving toward the west, reduce the chance that closer ties with the GDR might mean compromise in ideology and security arrangements. Germany's neighbors are not all dead-set against reunification; 66% of French citizens responding to polls are not opposed. In predicting the future, however, observers cannot focus just on the state, for states are not the initiators of the changes in the east, but rather societies. States are caught between pressures from social change and the constraints of the international system, which begins to call the system, the two alliances, into question. The question becomes, what kind of association of two Germanies in what kind of integrated Europe?

Stanley Hoffmann (Harvard University, Center for European Studies) began his remarks from the assumption that the "German Question" was too important to be left to the Germans. But it is pointless for outsiders to oppose reunification fatuously, for not all Germanies must be the *Kaiserreich*. Yet nationalism is the greatest danger. The key focus will be the structure within which a reunification might take place, a European structure of integration to reduce the fears of Germany's western partners and of eastern Europeans.

Josef Joffe (*Süddeutsche Zeitung*), in looking at the future, expressed his fascination at the lack of enthusiasm, jubilation, among West Germans for the wave of East Germans coming to the west. Aggressive nationalism seems to have disappeared. The "German Question" remains one of freedom versus unity, but not that of the Federal Republic, but of the GDR, and freedom for the citizens of the GDR should be more important than unity.

Theo Sommer (*Die Zeit*) agreed with the previous speakers that the solution to the "German Question" cannot be separated from other European processes, specifically western European integration and eastern European liberation. Thus, the issue of German reunification should remain on the back burner until the future shape of Europe becomes clear. Once unification becomes possible, it might be superfluous.

The final session of the colloquium was a roundtable discussion "The First Forty Years and the Next", chaired by Hartmut Lehmann. Participants commented both upon the past and the future; this account will stress their focus upon the future. Guido Goldman warned that events in eastern Europe, specifically the DDR, might slow down enthusiasm in the Federal Republic for European integration, so that the opportunity of 1992 might be lost. Charles Maier emphasized that the economic, military, and political borders of a new Germany need not be the same, a lesson with deep roots in German history. Wolfgang J. Mommsen predicted no straight reunification of the two Germanies, but rather a social-democratic GDR in a federal relation with the Federal Republic in the context of a unified Europe. Werner Weidenfeld (University of Mainz) recalled that the Federal Republic had responded over time to many questions with a single key concept: European integration. This has been its great creative contribution; there is no reason to believe that it is about to turn away from it, and 1992 will bring it even more responsibility. Finally, Peter Katzenstein (Cornell University) stressed the strength of institutions of both state and market in the Federal Republic, which have undergone change only in small steps. These institutions will condition the future, but not determine it.

Kenneth F. Ledford

### **III. Institute News**

#### **A. Tours to archives and libraries in the Federal Republic of Germany.**

##### **Courses at the *Herzog August Bibliothek* in Wolfenbüttel.**

The German Historical Institute is very pleased to announce that the *Stiftung Volkswagenwerk* has awarded the Institute a grant in order to organize informational tours to archives and research libraries in the Federal Republic and to provide special courses for American historians of German history at the *Herzog August Bibliothek* in Wolfenbüttel.

##### *I. Tours to archives and research libraries*

It is the aim of the tours to archives and research libraries to provide to a new generation of American historians working in the field of German history a better acquaintance with the resources available in Germany.

Funding for the program has been approved for three years. If the program is successful, an extension can be applied for. The tours will last 10 days. Because not all important German archives and research libraries can be visited in this time-period, we plan to go to archives and libraries in Northern Germany in 1990, the corresponding institutions in Southern Germany in 1991, and to those located in the central area of the Federal Republic in 1992.

The 1990 tour will begin on Wednesday, June 6, and end on Friday, June 15; visits will include the archives at Münster, Bremen, Hamburg, Lübeck, Berlin, Hannover (and perhaps also Oldenburg, Celle, Braunschweig, Lüneburg, Stade). The number of participants is limited to 12. The Institute will cover round-trip airfare to Germany (economy; holiday-rates) as well as the costs of accommodation and main meals during the trip.

It is planned that the tour members will be introduced to the various facilities by local archivists and librarians. At each place there will be some free time for individual investigations.

If these selected participants wish, we may be able to arrange a group-flight from Washington on Monday, June 4, arriving in Frankfurt on June 5, and from there a transfer (via Koblenz-Bonn) to Münster.

## II. *Summer course at Wolfenbüttel*

The summer course at the *Herzog August Bibliothek* in Wolfenbüttel will last for 3 weeks. It will begin on Monday, June 18 and end on Friday, July 6. It is the aim of the course:

- a) to introduce American scholars of German history into German handwriting of the 16th to the 20th century;
- b) to give an introduction into the organization of archives and libraries in Germany (*Archivkunde; bibliographische Hilfsmittel zur älteren and neueren deutschen Geschichte*);
- c) to enable participants to do independent research in the rich holdings of the *Herzog August Bibliothek*;
- d) if participants are interested, to refresh their knowledge of early modern Latin.

The number of participants is limited to 12. The German Historical Institute will cover round-trip airfare (economy; holiday rates) as well as the costs of accommodation and one meal per day.

Participants who wish to take part in *both* programs will be given preference. If participants wish to arrange their own itinerary (for example, flying to Germany earlier and staying longer) they are welcome to do so, and they will be reimbursed by us for their flights (on the above-mentioned basis).

Applicants for both programs must already hold a bachelor's degree and should have a working knowledge of conversational and written German. Applications can be made by sending a letter of application, a current *curriculum vitae*, and two letters of recommendation to the Director of the German Historical Institute, 1759 R Street, N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20009, no later than February 15, 1990. Those chosen to participate will be informed no later than April 1, 1990.

## **B. The German Historical Institute Moves into a New Building**

In fulfillment of one of its long-term goals, the German Historical Institute in Washington has received its own building, the Woodbury-Blair Mansion, 1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009, purchased for its use by the *Stiftung Volkswagenwerk*. The new building will permit the Institute to expand its spectrum of support to scholars from Germany and the United States and the holdings and services of its library. Perhaps most importantly, the new building will house a lecture hall so that conferences sponsored by the Institute in Washington, as well as the Lecture Series and the Annual Lectures, will now be able to be held in our own rooms. Renovations are underway, and it is hoped that the Institute can move into the new building during the spring of 1990. The exact date of the move and of a ceremony dedicating and celebrating the new building will be announced in the spring.

## **C. Reference Guide No. 2**

The second in the Institute's series of Reference Guides, *Guide to Inventories and Finding Aids of German Archives at the German Historical Institute*, compiled by Dr. Axel Frohn and Anne Hope, is now available from the Institute free of charge. Materials listed in this Guide are in the Institute's library and available for use. Further Reference Guides are in preparation.

## **D. GHI Library Report**

### *New Technical Equipment*

The library now has a reader-printer for microfiche and microfilm. Because we have purchased the "National Inventory of Documentary Sources in the U.S. Federal Records" on microfiche, it is now possible to use this material and to make copies of it. We have also acquired an additional microfiche reader.

The collection of the library that until now has been cataloged with catalog cards is being converted to an on-line computer cataloging system. The six thousand titles now held by the library will be cataloged by the end of the year. We also intend to join the OCLC (On-Line

Computer Library Center) cataloging system, but we will maintain our own collection catalog as well. We also can provide printed copies of the results of search requests directed to our library.

In the new building, the library will be equipped with its own copying machine and eventually will have additional computer terminals for catalog searches.

Gaby Müller-Oelrichs

### **E. New Staff Members**

Two staff members have joined the Institute since March 1989.

Stig Förster, Senior Research Fellow, born in West Berlin, 1951: studied history and Germanic Studies at the University of Düsseldorf; *Dr. phil.*, Düsseldorf, 1982; Lecturer, Institut für Geschichte, Technische Hochschule Darmstadt, 1981–82; Research Fellow, German Historical Institute in London, 1982–87; *Habilitation* fellowship, Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, 1987–89.

Major publications: *Der doppelte Militarismus. Die deutsche Heeresrüstungspolitik zwischen Status-quo-Sicherung und Aggression, 1890–1913* (1985); *Präventiver Imperialismus und Pax Britannica. Die britische Expansionspolitik in Indien, 1793–1819* (forthcoming, 1990); as editor with Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Ronald Robinson, *Bismarck, Europe, and Africa. The Berlin Africa Conference 1884–1885 and the Onset of Partition* (1988). Articles on German military history, the history of Imperial Germany, East German historiography, imperialism, militarism, the Balkan Wars, British imperialism, and the British conquest of India.

Member of the Arbeitskreis Historische Friedensforschung, Prinz-Albert-Gesellschaft, Arbeitskreis Deutsche Englandforschung, German History Society (Great Britain), Arbeitskreis Außereuropaforschung, Verband der Historiker Deutschlands.

Married to Dr. Alice Förster, MRC Psych.

Kenneth F. Ledford, Research Fellow, born in Gulfport, Mississippi, U.S.A., 1953. Study of history and law at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, B.A. with honors 1975, J.D. with honors 1978; study of German, French, and English history at The Johns Hopkins University, M.A., 1984, Ph.D., 1988, dissertation title "A Social and Institutional History of the German Bar in Private Practice, 1878–1930"; Instructor, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, 1988–89; Visiting Assistant Professor, The Johns Hopkins University, Spring 1989; Professorial Lecturer, the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, Washington, D.C., 1988–

Publications: "Conflict within the Legal Profession: Simultaneous Admission and the German Bar 1903–1927", in Geoffrey Cocks and Konrad H. Jarausch , eds., *German Professions, 1800–1950* (forthcoming, 1990).

Papers on the nineteenth-century German *Bürgertum*, German liberalism, and the law.

Member of the German Studies Association, the Conference Group on Central European History, and the American Historical Association.

Married to the Rev. Susan W. Holderness, two children, Peter and Sarah.

## **F. Scholarships**

The Institute offers scholarships to doctoral students working on topics related to the Institute's general scope of interest. Applications should be sent to the Director, together with the following supporting information:

- curriculum vitae*;
- study plan, including research proposal, time frame, and locations in the United States where research is to be carried out; and
- letter of recommendation from the applicant's doctoral advisor.

Americans who apply for these scholarships should be working on German history topics for which they need to evaluate source material located in the United States. Those who wish to do research in Germany should apply to the Fulbright Commission, the *Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst*, or some similar foundation.

Copies of the *German-American Scholarship Guide for Historians and Social Scientists* are available from the German Historical Institute. The *Guide*, compiled by Jürgen Heideking, Anne Hope, and Ralf Stegner, includes information on some ninety-three scholarships, fifty-six of which provide funding for residents of the United States.

### **G. New Scholarship Recipients**

In 1989, the German Historical Institute expanded its scholarship program for the first time to include grants to candidates for doctoral degrees at American universities for research on German history topics in the United States. Recipients for 1990 are:

#### **Otto Burianek**

"The Politics of Rectification: Care of Displaced Persons in Munich, 1945–1951"

Doctoral Advisor: Professor Douglas Unfug, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia

#### **Aaron S. Fogelman**

"German Immigration and Settlement in Greater Pennsylvania"

Doctoral Advisors: Professors Kenneth Lockridge and John Shy, University of Michigan

#### **Detlev Heiden**

"Sozialisierungspolitik in Hessen, 1946–1954"

Doctoral Advisor: Professor Gunther Mai, Universität Marburg

### **Martin Meyer**

"Das Nachkriegsdeutschland im Spiegel amerikanischer Romane der Besatzungszeit, 1945–1955"

Doctoral Advisors: Professors M. Schulze and Reinhard Doerries,  
Gesamthochschule-Universität Kassel

### **Uta Nitschke**

"Berlin 1949–1955. Verhandlungen zur Statusfrage der Stadt" Doctoral Advisor:  
Professor Wolfgang Ribbe, Freie Universität Berlin

### **Kornelia Pfeiffer**

"Henry Morgenthau Jr. in der Administration Franklin D. Roosevelts"

Doctoral Advisor: Professor Gerhard Schulz, Universität Tübingen

### **Iris Pilling**

"Politische Theorie aus persönlicher Erfahrung. Hannah Arendts Jüdischsein als  
Grundlage für ihr Denken, Handeln, und Verstehen"

Doctoral Advisor: Professor Karl Otmar Frhr. von Aretin, Technische Hochschule  
Darmstadt

### **Karin Schulz**

"Vom Leben in der Fremde. Subjektive Eindrücke von jüdischen Auswanderern aus  
Osteuropa in die USA, 1881–1914"

Doctoral Advisor: Professor D. Kamper, Freie Universität Berlin/  
Auswanderermuseum Bremerhaven

### **Michael Siedenhans**

"Kriegervereine im Deutschen Kaiserreich 1871–1914 im internationalen  
Vergleich"

Doctoral Advisor: Professor Hans-Ulrich Wehler, Universität Bielefeld

## **Peter Zervakis**

"Die Bedeutung des 'Justice for Greece Committee' für die griechisch-amerikanischen Beziehungen zwischen 1945 und 1949"

Doctoral Advisor: Professor K.-D. Grothusen, Universität Hamburg

## **H. Fall 1989 Lecture Series**

September 14: Michael Geyer, University of Chicago, "After the Atlantic Divide: Toward Postmodern Histories of Germany in the United States and the Federal Republic".

October 12: Marion Kaplan, Queens College, New York, "Gender and Jewish History in Imperial Germany".

November 16: Thomas Childers, University of Pennsylvania, "The Political Mobilization of Women in the Weimar Republic".

November 30: Isabel V. Hull, Cornell University, "The Retreat of the State from the Regulation of Sexual Behavior in 18th Century Germany: Creating the Private Sphere".

December 7: Adelheid von Saldern, University of Hannover, "Ennobling Culture: 'Good Taste' and 'Good Morals' in Germany and the United States in the 1920s".

December 14: Thomas A. Brady, University of Oregon, "Between Town and Countryside: The Common People and the German Reformation".

The list of speakers for the Spring 1990 Lecture Series will be announced shortly.

## **I. Upcoming Conferences**

March 16–18, 1990, Paths of Continuity: Central European Historiography from the Twenties through the Fifties, Atlanta, Georgia, co-sponsored with Emory University.

April 20–22, 1990, Elections, Mass Politics, and Social Change in Germany, 1890–1939, Toronto, Ontario, co-sponsored with the University of Toronto.

May 3–5, 1990, Max Weber's "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism" Reconsidered, Washington, D.C.

September 13–16, 1990, German Influences on Education in the United States to 1917, Madison, Wisconsin, co-sponsored with the Max Kade Institute for German-American Studies at the University of Wisconsin.

September 25–30, 1990, The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. Conceptualizations and Problems in Research, Washington, D.C., cosponsored with the Society for Reformation Research and the *Verein für Reformationsgeschichte*.

## **J. Miscellaneous**

The Planning Committee for the 1989 International Conference on the *Grundgesetz*, sponsored by the German Society of Pennsylvania, the German American Lawyers Association, the John Peter Zenger Law Society, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, and the Villanova University School of Law is sponsoring an essay contest comparing the *Grundgesetz* of the Federal Republic of Germany with the United States Constitution. Any American law student or attorney who has not passed the German *Staatsexamen* and American graduate and undergraduate students are eligible. The prize is a roundtrip air ticket from the United States to West Germany on Lufthansa. Submissions should be sent in triplicate to the German Society Conference Committee, P.O. Box 2182, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103, by December 15, 1989.

The International Society for the Study of European Ideas announces a conference at the Catholic University of Leuven (Louvain), Belgium, on September 3–8, 1990 on the topic: "Comparative History of European Nationalism: Towards Europe 1992". Inquiries should be directed to Prof. Ezra Talmor, ISSEI Conference, Kibbutz Nachshonim, D.N. Mercatz 73 190, Israel, Telephone 972-3-9386445, FAX 972-3-9386500.

The Max Kade Institute for Austrian-German-Swiss Studies announces an international conference, "After Forty Contentious Years: The Two Germanies Since 1949", to be held at the University of Southern California, February 16–18, 1990. Inquiries should be directed to Cornelius Schnauber, Max Kade Institute USC, University Park, Los Angeles, California 90089-0351.