

## AMERICAN HISTORY IN GERMANY: THE VIEW OF THE PRACTITIONERS

Norbert Finzsch, Hans-Jürgen Grabbe, Detlef Junker, and  
Ursula Lehmkuhl interviewed by Astrid M. Eckert

In spring 2002, the *GHI Bulletin* featured an interview article with leading American scholars on the practice of German history in the United States. This article takes up the question in reverse and asks four leading German scholars of American history to share their thoughts on the state of their field in Germany. GHI Research Fellow Astrid M. Eckert interviewed Norbert Finzsch, Hans-Jürgen Grabbe, Detlef Junker, and Ursula Lehmkuhl separately last fall.

Norbert Finzsch teaches North American history at the University of Cologne, where he is the director of the Anglo-American Institute, the largest institute of this kind in Germany. He previously taught at the University of Hamburg (1992–2001) and the University of California at Berkeley (1999–2000). His interests in North American history are mainly focused on the social history of the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, gender history, and African-American history. His current research projects deal with the history of the Black Panther Party, African-American nationalism, and the development of biological warfare in eighteenth-century North America.

Hans-Jürgen Grabbe holds the chair for British and American Studies at the Martin-Luther-University Halle. Prior to his appointment in Halle, he taught American history at the University of Kassel and the University of Oldenburg. He is a former President of the German Association for American Studies (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Amerikastudien*, 1996–1999) and the founding director of the Center for USA Studies at Leucorea Foundation in Wittenberg (1995–1999). He currently serves as the German representative on the board of the European Association for American Studies. His interests focus on German-American relations and transatlantic migration. He is currently working on a general history of German-American relations from the seventeenth century to the present.

Detlef Junker is the Curt-Engelhorn Professor for American history at Heidelberg University and is currently establishing the Heidelberg Center for American Studies (*Heidelberger Amerikazentrum*). He is the founder of the Schurman Library for American History at Heidelberg's history department (1986) and from 1994 to 1999 he was the director of the German Historical Institute in Washington, D. C. His main fields of research are U.S. foreign policy, German-American relations, and, most

recently, U.S. identity and the politics of memory.<sup>1</sup> The translation of his handbook, *The United States and Germany in the Era of the Cold War, 1945–1990: A Handbook*,<sup>2</sup> is currently being completed. His next project is to write a history of American-German relations from 1871 to 1990.

Ursula Lehmkuhl is professor for North American history at the John F. Kennedy Institute for North American Studies at the Free University of Berlin. The Kennedy Institute is the largest interdisciplinary center for American Studies in Europe. She has previously taught at the universities of Erfurt, Bremen, Bochum, and Konstanz.<sup>3</sup> Her fields of interest in North American history are twentieth-century international history, American-Canadian relations, Anglo-American relations, and the cultural history of the Atlantic World in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Her current research project is entitled “Constructing Uncle Sam” and aims at explaining the rapid and thorough change in the Anglo-American relationship from hostility to friendship during the nineteenth century.

## 1. AND HOW DID YOU GET INVOLVED?— BIOGRAPHICAL REASONS FOR THE STUDY OF NORTH AMERICAN HISTORY

- *What drew you to studying and teaching North American history? Why did you turn to American instead of German (or any other European) history?*

**Finzsch:** When I grew up as a kid in Cologne during the 50s and 60s, the United States was very much the one nation I looked upon as our guiding nation, the big brother taking care of West Germany. I remember especially the day President Kennedy was shot. I was twelve years old, and it was a deeply felt shock. Only a couple of years later, when I was a teenager, America got entangled in the Vietnam War. In my perception, those were two contradicting developments, and therefore I didn't really understand what to make of the U.S. When I started with my studies in Cologne in 1970, the first seminar I took was on North American history in order to solve that riddle, in order to see what was the secret behind being a great democratic country on the one hand and an aggressor in South East Asia on the other. This contradiction has stuck with me ever since. So, in order to answer your question: I was drawn into the study and teaching of American history because I wanted to solve the riddle of American democracy. Of course, studying American history was also a way of not dealing with Germany's past in the twentieth century, especially if your father, like mine, was a professional soldier in the Nazi Army. He was a noncommissioned officer but he joined the Army in 1935

and stayed on until 1945. He was someone who was deeply influenced by the ways the Nazis perceived the world. I had discussions about Nazi history up to my neck with my parents every Sunday over dinner for at least ten years. I was sick and tired of German history.

**Grabbe:** I think it was already in high school that I wanted to become a historian. For family reasons—we had so many connections with the United States through relatives, etc.—my interests in the U.S. developed at a very early age. I still remember packages coming from America in the early 1950s, and because of this relationship I wanted to become an exchange student. I applied for an American Field Service (AFS) scholarship, which I received in 1965/66. I took an advance placement U.S. history course at my American high school in Park Ridge, Illinois, and since that time it was clear to me that I would focus on history, on modern history in general, but with a particular emphasis on the United States.

**Junker:** It basically goes back to my experiences at the end of the Second World War and in postwar Germany. Being born in 1939, my very first experience with the United States was the terror bombardment of Hamburg in 1943. I lived 15 kilometers from the city center. One of my deepest memories is this red sky over Hamburg. And I asked my mother: “What is this?”— “These are the American and the English bombers.” The second experience was a lot more benign, and I remember it quite vividly. We belonged to the British zone of occupation, but somehow, an American detachment passed through our small town Quickborn. And I am not kidding, it is almost archetypical, there was an American negro, as it was said at the time, a very friendly man. For the first time in my life I had white bread with cheese and butter. This was a miracle! I had never tasted such a thing. And, of course, in 1945 and 1946, we had one hot soup a day sponsored by the Hoover Foundation, the “Chocolate Soup.” In 1948, on June 20, my birthday, we had the currency reform. My father and I went to a restaurant somewhere, a public place, and received these 40 Deutsch Marks. I asked him: “From where did we get this?”— “I think from the Americans,” he said. Later, I became politicized during the debate on German rearmament. Thus, from the very beginning, there was a genuine interest in the United States prompted by personal experiences. During my study at the university, it did not surface yet. I studied German history, and my first book was on the German Center Party and Hitler,<sup>4</sup> the end of Weimar Republic—this was the thing to do at the time. The important crossroad of my life came in 1968. I became a *Wissenschaftlicher Assistent* (assistant professor) to the chair of Eberhard Jäckel in Stuttgart. I wanted to go back to journalism because I had been trained as a journalist. But Jäckel told me: “There is one option for you. If you would like to stay at the university, you had better make up your mind whether you would like to finish your *Habilitation*. You can either choose a different

century or different country [different from the dissertation]." And I said: "I choose the United States." So I applied for funding and received the Max Kade Fellowship. I crossed the Atlantic for the very first time on a ship called *Europa* and arrived in New York in August 1971. Since then I have lived in the U.S. for more than eight years. I became more and more interested in American history. My second book was on the *Unteilbarer Weltmarkt*.<sup>5</sup> Upon my return to Germany, I passed my *Habilitation* at the University of Stuttgart. My *venia legendi* was for *Neuere Geschichte und Theorie der Geschichtswissenschaften* (Modern History and Theory of History/Historiography). I got my first professorship at Heidelberg in 1974 with this specification. But I turned more and more to American history. After a while, I spent 60 or 70 percent of my teaching on American history, and increasingly, my scholarly activity turned to U.S. history, too.

**Lehmkuhl:** I was drawn into the study and teaching of North American history by my academic teachers and mentors, above all by Gustav Schmidt. Since during my high school years we had covered the period of the Third Reich, the Holocaust, and German reconstruction after the Second World War extensively, during my university education I focused on the history of Germany's neighbors, especially France, the social and cultural history of the European enlightenment, and the international settings that influenced German political and social developments during the Cold War. Historians such as Winfried Schulze, Hans-Ulrich Gumbrecht, and Jörn Rüsen influenced the way I work as a historian as well as my academic career. Eventually, Gustav Schmidt asked me to participate in a research project on the North Atlantic Triangle, which also became the research perspective of my doctoral dissertation on Canada and the Colombo Plan.<sup>6</sup> With this research project, I refocused my academic interests once again and got more and more attracted by political science theories in general and international relations in particular. It was again Gustav Schmidt who offered me a position as an "assistant professor" (*Wissenschaftlicher Assistent*) for international relations. As such I had to teach courses on American foreign policy, international organizations, European integration, regional and global conflicts, etc. I was very much intrigued by America's role in the postwar reconstruction process and the way Washington cooperated with other international actors, above all Great Britain. This became the subject of my second book, entitled *Pax Anglo-Americana*.<sup>7</sup> In this book, I reconstruct the structural power basis of the Anglo-American relationship in the 1950s. I passed my *Habilitation* at the University of Bochum in Political Science in 1997. A year later I was offered the position of Full Professor for North American history at the University of Erfurt. With the decision to take a position in a history department with a special emphasis on North American history, I refo-

cused my research and teaching again, this time on nineteenth and twentieth-century American and Canadian history exclusively.

- *How would you summarize your own “socialization” as a historian of American history? Did you receive the major impulses in the United States or in West Germany?*

**Finzsch:** I was not lucky enough to go to the United States at an early stage. I graduated from Cologne University in 1976, and I had never been to an English speaking country before. The first time I ever went to England—both England and the United States—was in 1977 after I had passed my M.A. in order to prepare my Ph.D. So you can say I received my major impulses within the Federal Republic.

**Grabbe:** I received my first and important impulses already in my American high school, as I have explained. However, I never studied at an American university. I received my professional training from the scholars at the overseas history division of the history department in Hamburg. Looking back after so many years, I still rate my academic teacher Günter Moltmann very highly. I always fought with him when he was still alive, yet looking back I see that his mode of practicing history greatly influenced me.

**Junker:** I received the major influences in Germany, exclusively. I didn't have a particular mentor in American history but became interested myself. It was a kind of self-teaching later in life. I acquainted myself with the literature on the specific topic, and I found out—this was in 1970/71—that the archival material for the years 1940/41 was just being opened at that time. That is why I went to the United States and worked on the origins of the Second World War. My *Doktorvater* was Michael Freund (Kiel), and my *Habilitationsvater*, so to speak, was Eberhard Jäckel (Stuttgart). He was very much interested in international relations, but he is not a U.S. historian.

**Lehmkuhl:** I never studied North American history proper but I got involved by serendipity. As I mentioned above, I was asked to work as a Research Assistant in a project on the North Atlantic Triangle which after some detours eventually drew me into North American history.

## 2. THE PAST, PRESENT & FUTURE OF AMERICAN HISTORY IN GERMANY

Anniversaries are a moment for taking stock. When the John F. Kennedy Institute celebrated its 25th anniversary in 1988, members of the Institute reflected upon “America Seen From the Outside—Topics, Models, and

Achievements in the Federal Republic of Germany.”<sup>8</sup> Similar questions are now being asked on the occasion of the upcoming 50th anniversary of the German Association for American Studies (*Deutsche Gesellschaft for Amerikastudien*, DGfA).

- *Looking back on the postwar practice of American history in Germany, what do you consider to be the major achievements of German historians doing American history? What are their contributions to the understanding of American history? Which books do you regard as the “landmarks” of German scholarship in American history?*

**Finzsch:** Let’s try to deal with one after the other. It would be much easier to point out the setbacks and the negative aspects in the study of American history by Germans than to name the highlights. Because, in my understanding, German historians doing American history have dealt far too much with history of German immigration. This has been a major point of interest for a lot of my colleagues over the last fifty years, especially if you look at the Hamburg school: Günther Moltmann and his students have done a lot of studies of German immigration. I think it did not help the development of American history in Germany that the majority of German historians dealt with German immigration. It would have been more helpful if German historians of the U.S. had dealt with things that had nothing to do with hyphenated “German-American” issues.

That leads me to the next part of the question. The best studies done so far in Germany are in early modern and colonial history. There are some original contributions to our understanding of American history in the eighteenth century. To name a few names, Hermann Wellenreuther in Göttingen is the first to come to mind. The first volume of his American history in the early modern period is an outstanding example of what German scholars can achieve in American history because that is something you would not find on the American market. It is written from a European perspective, it is written with a transatlantic perspective, and that makes it unique even in comparison to good handbooks that have been written by American authors.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, there are some remarkable studies of twentieth-century American history done by younger students of American history, like Olaf Stieglitz,<sup>10</sup> who have dealt with American problems proper—leaving out the German part. It is my understanding that recently there are more and more students who write their Ph.D. theses on original American topics. This is *not* supposed to mean that I disregard German-American history. There are some remarkable things done in this area, for instance, the collection of letters by Wolfgang Helbich in Bochum is an outstanding example of how German-American history should and could be done.<sup>11</sup> But most of German mi-

gration history focusing on nineteenth-century immigration is not helping us to develop a—how should I phrase this?—a critical mass of American historians in the Federal Republic.

**Grabbe:** I don't want to mention particular works because then I would have to exclude others and might perhaps hurt somebody's feelings. But I would like to single out Jürgen Heideking's life work. I think that in scope and quality this is an *oeuvre* that we have not had before nor perhaps since. Lately the field has become quite diversified, and more and more younger scholars return from the United States with an American Ph.D. and a much larger exposure to American history than those who were basically German-trained ever received. The field is expanding because of this phenomenon. The topics studied and researched are also becoming more and more diverse, almost as diverse as in the United States. It is very much a generational question.

When talking about contributions to the understanding of American history, it depends on whether you are talking about contributions to American history as they are perceived in the United States, or whether you are talking about the perception of American history here in Germany. I would say that the monographs written since the 1960s in Germany have received attention by specialists here and there. Of course, it makes a great difference whether these works were written in English or in German, and it even makes a difference—when they have been written in English—whether or not they were published by an American university press. Only the combination of English language and an American publisher leads to a wider exposure and recognition in the United States, and the other works are for the specialist.

**Junker:** It's a bundle of questions and not easy to answer. In general, I would say that German historians have contributed to the knowledge of American history *in Germany*. The impact on the general audience in the United States, on the American market, is very hard to assess. We all know that scholars of American history—even scholars who are working in the field of international relations—hardly take notice of books written in foreign languages. I was very naive when I began my career. In 1975, I published my *Habilitation, Der unteilbare Weltmarkt*, and discussed funding options for a translation with Inter Nationes. They said "No, we don't publish books on the United States, only on Germany." At that time I could not find the money that I needed for a good translation. In retrospect, I think I should have borrowed some money for a translator. But at that time I thought all sophisticated and learned American historians, especially historians of American foreign relations, would read German. This was, of course, a misperception. So, coming back to the point in question: Unless your book is published in English, they would not notice. German historians have published on all major subjects: the Ameri-

can Revolution, the American Constitution, topics in the nineteenth century, like immigration or the American Civil War, on American foreign policy in the twentieth century, and on American-German relations. On the same topics, there is an abundance of American scholarship as well. You are always part of a broader endeavour. And I really don't know what impact in general the German historians have had on the general public. I would say that even the American historians are partly marginalized as far as the overall shaping of the consciousness about their own past in the United States is concerned.

I can't think of any landmark book by a German in the sense that it really had a big impact on the general public in the U.S. There are some books that have been noted by colleagues in a certain field. That depends on the specific field. That is logical because we are part of an international scientific community. I have recently discovered that a collection of essays that I co-edited is selling surprisingly well: *1968: The World Transformed*.<sup>12</sup> The book is part of a series edited by the German Historical Institute. In general, the Institute publishes two very successful book series, one in German (Steiner Verlag Stuttgart) and one in English (Cambridge University Press). Of the latter, the series on Total War deserves attention.<sup>13</sup> But if "landmark" is meant to be a German book on the U.S. that has really shaped the American public—I don't know of any.

As to achievements, I note them in several fields: the American Revolution, the American Constitution (our colleagues Erich Angermann, Willi Paul Adams, Jürgen Heideking, Horst Dippel, and others), and recently, if you think about the two volumes published by Wellenreuther, in the prerevolutionary era as well. Then you have this range of scholars working on the nineteenth century (Willi Paul Adams, Hans-Jürgen Grabbe, Wolfgang Helbich, Jörg Nagler, and others). Once you get to the twentieth century, the amount of scholarship has grown significantly. I don't want to name everybody involved, but I would say the biggest contribution by German historians on the United States is in U.S. foreign policy, German-American relations, and what you might call the "Americanization of Europe" with a cultural approach. It is my impression that more than half of the productive historians are today engaged with the twentieth century, especially the younger scholars.

**Lehmkuhl:** These are difficult questions. To start with the achievements: I think it is uncontested that German scholars were very much involved in shaping the study of American history in the general field of German-American and European-American relations, especially immigration history or postwar diplomatic and cultural history. German and European scholars introduced a European perspective on American history because they used the European sources pertaining to their research subjects. Bringing in the "European" perspective especially enhanced re-

search on the history of the Cold War and on American-European political, social, and cultural relations.

With regard to specific contributions to the understanding of American history I would like to mention the research efforts in comparative history undertaken by German historians like Erich Angermann, Hartmut Lehmann, and not least the German-Historical Institute in Washington, whose publications have a strong comparative focus.

Thinking about "landmarks," the two volumes recently published by Hermann Wellenreuther come to mind.<sup>14</sup> These two books offer a synthesis of the history of the colonial period. With regard to their level of analysis, the interpretive density, and the specific "Atlantic" perspective, they are a "landmark." They are written in German for a German audience, but in my opinion they deserve a translation. Then, of course, Willi Paul Adams' dissertation, published in German in 1973 and in an English translation in 1980, was without doubt a "landmark" that has to be mentioned.<sup>15</sup>

- *The traditional topics of American history as practiced in Germany have often been chosen from the periods of intense German-American contact: German (voluntary or involuntary) migration to the United States; the American occupation of Germany after the Second World War; Westernization/Americanization. One could argue that these German-American topics have by now been thoroughly, even exhaustively studied. At the same time, the end of the Cold War has dissolved the peculiar political climate in which American Studies in Germany have thrived for decades. Against this backdrop, how would you respond to the thesis that the scholarly study of American history in Germany is in a state of crisis?*

**Finzsch:** I don't think so, because, as I said earlier, there is a young generation of students doing completely different things. For instance, there is one study under way on the history of cotton. Very interesting topic. As far as I know no one has ever written anything that you could compare to a history of cotton. We also need studies that provide an equivalent to the existing studies in German history on the development of the *Bürgertum* (bourgeoisie). Not much has been done in that area. I think American history could profit from the input of scholars like Jürgen Kocka and others who have dealt with *Bürgertumstudien* in Germany. And you could transfer this area to the United States and see how *Bürgertum* as a notion but also as a class developed during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. So far no one has really dealt with that.

**Grabbe:** I don't think it is. First of all I could answer as I would in a *Proseminar* "Introduction to Modern History": Every generation creates its own history. So, even areas that you would consider overstudied can take new research, and that research will come. Secondly, I would answer

that we still lack wider research on the nineteenth century. Books on the nineteenth century are really few and far between, and some have been published in the 1950s and 1960s. The nineteenth century is difficult because there was no German nation state prior to 1871. But even the 1871–1900 period has not been studied extensively. I see a serious gap in scholarship regarding comparative research on modernization and economic development in the United States and the German Empire, the Bismarck Empire. We have had some work on the Civil War but it has tended to focus on Germans in the Civil War. Prior to the 1860s, we ought to look at the *Länder*, at Prussia, and other important German states of that period—no work has been done on Bavaria, for instance. We have the diplomatic studies of Günther Moltmann, but they are of 1960s and 1970s vintage.<sup>16</sup> Our methodological approach has changed tremendously since that time. We now tend to integrate political, economic, social, and cultural history. And so I think that with this new awareness of state-of-the-art methodology, the nineteenth century is an interesting period. What holds for the nineteenth century is true for the eighteenth century, albeit to a lesser degree. The twentieth century, though, has been thoroughly studied. There, perhaps, we should move on to other topics. I would like to point out, however, that the focus on these particular periods that you have mentioned is understandable in a twentieth-century context where World War I led to World War II, and World War II led to the Cold War. I see a new situation since 1989, and I would combine this with the remark that I made before, that there is a new generation of historians who have no first-hand memory of the Cold War and therefore have no obsession with certain periods of German-American relations.

**Junker:** I don't believe it for a minute. On the contrary, the widening gap over the Atlantic and the widespread criticism of the U.S. in Germany and other parts of the world has increased the interest of German students in American history. I can see it in my current lecture course on German-American relations. I am desperately looking for a bigger lecture hall which I cannot find. No, no way, I don't think so, the opposite is true.

**Lehmkuhl:** I don't think so! On the contrary, since German historians are becoming more and more interested in international history, American history enters the field of German history in many respects. You find elements of U.S. history or references to U.S. history in the course offerings and research of scholars of German or European history. Topics stemming from North America are "intruding" on many historical sub-disciplines. To a certain extent this development is the historians' reaction to the globalization thesis. Especially the younger generation in the German history profession is trying to move away from an exclusively national approach by putting their research into an international or global

perspective. This trend towards international contextualization is especially prominent in historical sub-disciplines like media or film history, or environmental history. We are facing a move towards horizontal integration in the history profession. Various historical sub-disciplines on both sides of the Atlantic are converging because they are interested in the question how national, international, and global processes interact.

- *What are the themes of the twenty-first century? Where do you see the field going?*

**Finzsch:** Environmental history will be a very hot topic. I think Germans can contribute a lot to this area because—it may be a very arrogant way to put it—because I think ecological thinking is highly developed in Germany. In everyday life, people talk about ecological problems. Europe, as a densely populated area with, so-to-speak, less “nature” available for exploitation, is closer to the issue of ecological reform. And therefore I think with the changes in the climate that we are starting to feel in this country—more than I think anybody else in Europe—you cannot avoid looking at ecology as a scholarly problem, too. When did the exploitation of natural resources turn into something that was damaging the natural habitat of different species and of humans, for instance? The ecological consciousness influences the way history is written in this country.

In addition, postcolonial history will be important. And by postcolonial history I do not mean the history of the United States after the Early Republic. I mean postcolonial in the way Anne McClintock interprets postcolonialism;<sup>17</sup> to examine how race, class, gender—the three major categories of American social history—tend to be intertwined in mediated categories or a mediated category after the demise of European colonialism in the 1950s and 1960s; how far that tends to shape the way twentieth-century foreign and internal policies have developed; how instead of a formal domination by colonial powers, Third World countries are increasingly dominated by financial influence, and how that financial influence translates into a cultural domination of a specific postcolonial culture. It is the bringing together of race, class, gender, and culture into what you could label a “cultural history of late capitalism.” So I think—and that is something that is being done in Great Britain more than in the United States or Germany—in the long run American historians as well as German historians writing American history will have to adopt the postcolonial school of McClintock and others. In general, I am very optimistic concerning the future of the field. Once we get rid of the hyphenated “German-American” topics I think it will be great.

**Grabbe:** I would be hard pressed to mention a topic genuine to German interest in American history. In keeping with my earlier point

that a new generation of true generalists, well-versed in all aspects of American history, is coming to the fore: these scholars will follow the trends that arise in the United States. That has been the case for quite a while in the study of literature. I do not see a critical mass of scholars of the U.S. in Germany to generate a trend. Among American historians there has been a lot of talk about public diplomacy, for instance, bringing in aspects of culture or merging cultural history with diplomatic history. I think sooner or later scholars will come back—if I may say that somewhat boldly—to my understanding that political history is mainly about questions of life and death. Cultural predilections and perceptions do play a role, but I think this research has been overdone.

**Junker:** First of all, there will be a continuation of what you might call cultural history. It has been institutionalized, and it is very near to the heart of the younger generation. It took them some time to establish their own identity. Thus, this will go on. I don't expect a revival of social history, though, as it was in the 1960s and 1970s. But what will certainly come is—and this has to do with international developments, globalization, terrorism, war—a revived interest in international relations and diplomatic history because this interconnected and globalized world cries out for this approach. For example, one of the most classic topics is war and peace. If we don't respond to the basic problems of our times—and war and peace is one—we will marginalize ourselves. Economic history is becoming more and more important: the problems of the world economy, globalization, and this kind of thing. By the way, I have the feeling that because race, class, and gender dominate the field in the United States so strongly, the American historical profession is already marginalizing itself as far as the general public is concerned. And I already see a revival of diplomatic history, and diplomatic historians themselves are trying to reshape this field. This will be a great concern for scholars and for students as well. That's my present impression.

**Lehmkuhl:** I think at the moment the field is moving towards addressing new methodological and theoretical questions and research perspectives, like the cultural approach to diplomatic history or emotional history. One field of future research will be studies addressing problems of cultural transfer, ways and means of cultural adaptation, of exporting specific ideas from one culture to another. This perspective adds and complements to a certain extent the comparative approach and the research tradition focusing on *Beziehungsgeschichte*, the history of relations between cultures. The history of transfers between cultures takes into account the willingness of a society to adopt ideas from other cultures or societies. The point is not to show how a hegemonic power is influencing another one but how, in the process of interaction, both sides receive impulses. To a certain extent, this approach can be related to questions

addressed by American cultural studies, for example in the borderland concept, where you also have the perspective of amalgamation replacing previous hierarchical concepts.

Research addressing the question of “Americanization” will be influenced and is already influenced by transfer analysis. In Germany, the conceptualization of “Americanization” as cultural transfer can be traced back to the research project on Westernization initiated by Anselm Doering-Manteuffel in Tübingen.<sup>18</sup> He was trying to overcome the one-way street approach to the analysis of Americanization by asking how the sending society is also receiving elements from other cultures. He and his research team analyzed the numerous and multi-faceted interaction processes between Germany and the United States in the postwar period.

Then, interdisciplinarity will be crucial for defining the themes and research perspectives of the twenty-first century, and in this regard, German historians of American history will play a leading role. German historians—more than their American counterparts—try to integrate social-science approaches or approaches from literary and cultural studies into their framework of analysis. In the United States, historical research is still much more confined to the discipline and its methodology, except perhaps in sub-disciplines like media and film studies or in environmental history.

### 3. THE PECULIARITIES OF DOING AMERICAN HISTORY IN GERMANY

During the 1990s, the Organization of American Historians (OAH) and especially the editor of its *Journal of American History* (JAH), David Thelen, undertook major efforts to alert *American* Americanists to the study of American history abroad.<sup>19</sup> The JAH opened its pages to various non-American perspectives on American history and established a review policy that aimed at getting American reviewers for books written by foreign authors.<sup>20</sup> It sponsors foreign-language book and article prizes. It seems that, more than once, American historians of U.S. history were surprised to find books that were “completely up-to-date in their scholarship, asking the same questions and citing the same books and articles as similar essays published in the United States.”<sup>21</sup> They had thus come across a tendency among non-American Americanists to “go native” and make themselves indistinguishable from their American colleagues in their scholarly writings; a tendency proven by the effort to publish in English instead of one’s native language.

- *If the above observation is correct, why have German interpreters of American history? Why don’t we simply translate American authors?*

**Finzsch:** Well, the fact that you are trying to pass as an American, writing in English, doesn't mean you are losing your German perspective. I think you can try as hard as you wish, it will never be possible to do away with one's national culture even if Germans speak English fluently and have read all the American authors. It does not mean that they lose their background.

I am very grateful for the efforts undertaken by American scholars to internationalize American history. We will feel the impact of that policy only in the future, but I am sure it will have an impact on the development of the field in Germany. So, I think that is a very good and wise policy. I only wish we could do the same for German history because American history in Germany would benefit from the internationalization of German history as a whole. The efforts of the German Historical Institutes in that regard are not enough. The GHIs—I worked in one of them—lead a very, how would I phrase this?—they are islands, obvious islands, and people working there are privileged in many ways. The impact those institutes have on both the American and the German field are not reflected by the efforts taken by those institutes. The institutes do a lot more than what really trickles down to the level of everyday activity, both in the United States and Germany. Trying to rephrase it more critically, I'd say: The GHIs are a showcase, a very important showcase, but the impact they have could be greater.

**Grabbe:** Very good question, but first of all let us focus on the OAH. I have always been somewhat critical of their effort, not that it was made but how it was made. I deplore that the internationalization effort was not institutionalized, that the OAH did not approach, for instance, the German Historical Association or the German Association for American Studies. It was developed, rather, on a personal level. Americans chose Germans they thought could serve as a liaison to German scholarship. Generally speaking, the effort to make American scholars aware of research done abroad is a laudable one. It is also very difficult. Some years back and some time after the OAH initiative had been started, the *Journal of American History* printed a review that was supposedly about German textbooks on American history.<sup>22</sup> It reviewed the *Fischer Taschenbuch* by Willi Paul Adams, Angermann's *Geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten im 20. Jahrhundert* and Guggisberg's *Geschichte der USA*.<sup>23</sup> All of these books were described to an American audience as textbooks of American history. They were then compared to the American textbooks, and, of course, did not pass the test. The reviewer apparently did not know, or did not draw attention to the fact, that all of these books were geared towards a general audience, and that they were most likely not to be used in a university environment; that we and our students read the original American scholarship.

There is a strong feeling that I have: What is our purpose as Germans in this country dealing with American history? I think our main task is to explain developments in the United States to our own nation, to our own students, and to the German public, if it were to listen. But if it will not listen, then we must ask ourselves: have we written the right books? Should we leave the interpretation of all things American to foreign correspondents, to journalists, or to some outsiders who then use such books as a vehicle for their anti-American feelings? That ties in with the question whether we should publish in English or in German. That is a real dilemma for the reasons that I touched upon a moment ago. Only an article or a monograph written in English will receive scholarly recognition. On the other hand, that book will be lost for most potential readers in this country. Although English is the first language taught in most German schools, I do not think that the level of comprehension even among university students is such that they—excepting Americanists—are likely to cope with a big English reading load.

**Junker:** Now you might be surprised, but I have always found this whole question totally irrelevant. We are part of an international scientific community, and there are common standards of scholarship. If you study, for example, the origins of the Second World War, all historians, irrespective of where they live, struggle with the same problem of objectivity, causality, and value judgements. What could be a special German contribution to that? Perhaps, in this case, a better understanding of German history because Germans have more intimate knowledge of that. But that does not mean, on the other hand, that a “native” American historian with language skills who works hard to see the world from a German point of view might not be able to come up to the knowledge and erudition of a German scholar. So, the whole thing about a German or an American perspective is irrelevant, and if you see this, then it is not a *qualité de faute* but a *faute de qualité*. What I am really flabbergasted about is that there are old epistemological problems involved in this question that have been with us for 500 years since the beginning of modern times, and nobody seems to be aware of this. I think the question is irrelevant.

**Lehmkuhl:** I think this question needs to be answered from two perspectives, a historical one and an academic one. Looking at the development of German history departments during the twentieth century, one can identify a correlation between the democratization policies of the U.S. in the 1950s and the establishment of chairs in North American history. Most of these chairs were established after 1945. German history professors were meant to be cultural brokers, transmitting the message of democracy and liberalism to German academia as well as to a non-academic audience. The establishment of a German tradition of North American history was part of this re-education and democratization pro-

cess after World War II. Since German historians of North American history are one of the strongest segments in the European Association of American Studies and since German universities are very much involved in establishing exchange programs and partnerships with Central and East European universities, historians of North American history are, to a certain extent, still involved in re-education and democratization processes. Hence my first answer to the question whether we need German interpreters of American history is yes, we need non-American Americanists as cultural brokers.

From an academic point of view, we need German or non-American interpreters of American history for epistemological reasons. America is different, and we need people who are able to recognize and discern these differences, to analyze and interpret them. A mere translation of American authors would not help in coming to terms with the experience of alterity that Europeans almost always feel when they are confronted with the peculiarities of American history or the "American character." And this would be my second answer: We need the German or European 'view' to understand U.S. history in order to overcome or to avoid misunderstandings.

- *If national perspectives have not altogether vanished, how does American history as practiced in Germany differ from its cousin "made in the U.S.?" Is there a "typical" German take on American history?*

**Finzsch:** What's typical? If you teach a seminar on, let's say, the 1950s or the 1960s, and you have students taking your seminar, the underlying assumption that you have to work against all the time is that Americans in a way are bad, are inherently bad and therefore, anything they do in terms of politics is perceived under the rubric of anti-Americanism. So, first of all we cannot rely, as most of our American colleagues can, on a deep inside knowledge of American culture and on the assumption that American national history is inherently good. We have to work against a totally different notion of the United States. And as you know, anti-Americanism in this country is something that comes from both the political right and the political left. I think in the 1980s, the two wings of anti-Americanism came together and formed a new combination. You have to be aware of the fact that both your students and maybe you yourself come with cultural baggage that implies that Germans are the *Kulturnation* and that is *Kultur* with a capital K; and Americans lack that quality of *Kultur* with a capital K. And therefore, we start from very different points even if we read the same literature, even if we speak the language, even if we have all the connections with American colleagues that we need. We come from a very different angle and therefore I think

it is important to reflect that position every time you write on American history.

Let me give you an example: We presented a panel at the *Historikertag* this year on violence in the 1960s.<sup>24</sup> And we got nasty reactions from people by email. Americans wrote to us: "Why don't you sweep in front of your own door? Why do you have to talk about *American* violence or violence in America when you are the main perpetrators of violence in the twentieth century?" I think that's totally correct. It's a fact that you cannot dispute that a lot of the violence that happened during the twentieth century emanated from this country. So, when doing a panel like that, usually I try to reflect on why I am doing it, why I write about violence in the United States; whether this has something to do with well-hidden feelings of cultural superiority or whether there is a value in a reflection on American violence that transcends this perhaps hidden agenda. Same thing when I write on African-American history. Very often I am critical of African-American organizations like the Black Panthers. Well, I am a white, middle-aged, middle-class, German guy writing about a radical African-American organization in the 1960s, and of course, I have to, in a way, reflect on that position every time I am writing. I have to ask myself whether, when I deal with a given source or with books that are written by people like Huey P. Newton or others, my perspective is free of bias. And most of the time, it is not. There is always a bias, and you have to come to terms with that bias and try to deal with it.

**Grabbe:** There are large differences between the two. This has to do, I think, with a question that is often overlooked: the general organization of German universities. I belong to a department of British and American studies with four full professorships and one associate professorship; five scholars are expected to cover Great Britain, Ireland, the British Empire and its successor nations, the United States—language, literature, culture, history, the political system. So, in other words, you are a generalist because here in Germany you are responsible for just about everything in your field, and you cannot allow yourself the luxury to say: My field is the New Deal, or twentieth-century history. When I speak of "my field," I mean United States or American history, and I mean *all of it* from Columbus to the present. And I think it is this situation that prevents the development of an academic situation here that is in any way comparable to the United States, where American history departments have a specialist for every 20 to 30 years or so of American history. Because of that you need not discuss the matter further. It ties in with another question that you raised: what are the chances of young Ph.D.'s, and will we get more positions? Given Germany's financial situation, the structure of German universities, and the decision makers in the academic councils

and the ministries of culture, it is quite clear that our universities and our departments will not expand. We have seen new positions in American history created here and there—the number has not really been significant—and there still will be the need everywhere for an expert in ancient history, one or two in the Middle Ages, one in early modern history, two or three in modern history, and all that you can expect is that we see an advertisement: “Modern history with special emphasis on . . .” And even if it were more strongly phrased, those in the selection committee will ask very simple questions: If we hire someone who has written a dissertation on an internal American topic, and a *Habilitation* also strictly within a U.S.-American context, will that person help to carry our load of teaching, examining, advising diploma and M.A. theses, or not? In other words, among the available candidates, they will be more likely to choose someone who has a strong record in German history as well, and brings in American history as an extra. I think that those who have built their careers exclusively on American themes will have a hard time finding permanent positions.

**Lehmkuhl:** I am not sure whether there is really a “typical” German take or twist on American history, because most German historians of American history are “Americanized.” They have received their undergraduate or graduate education in the U.S., they are organized in American historical organizations like the OAH, AHA, or SHAFR, and they compare themselves with their American peers when it comes to research and teaching. Only a few of the German historians of American history regularly attend the conferences of the German *Historikerverband*. Even fewer participate actively in the biannual meetings of the German historians by preparing panels or papers. There exists, however, a very active group of historians in the German Association of American Studies (DGfA) who once in a while also invites a German historian who is not a member of the DGfA and whose research and teaching do not focus exclusively on American history. But these are rare occasions, and we need more of them. For the future of U.S. history in Germany, the interchange and communication with the professional organizations of German historians or historians in Germany may become crucial. We should try to get a voice in the *Historikerverband*. The interchange, especially with the younger generation of German historians, would help to establish new (German?) research perspectives on North American history, and it would also help the younger generation of German historians of North American history to find jobs in German history departments.

- *The Americanist Ron Robin from the University of Haifa came to the conclusion that “we who study the American past from abroad are professionally marginal. [. . .] With few exceptions, most [U. S.] scholars of*

*the American past would be hard pressed to name more than one book on American history written by an international scholar.”<sup>25</sup> What is your opinion on this rather pessimistic statement? Which books by German authors have made an impact on the study of North American History in the United States?*

**Finzsch:** Well, I think it is a pessimistic statement, yes. But I would turn the question around and ask: do you know any American historian who is studying medieval German history and has written a book on medieval Cologne in the twelfth century? Do you know any of them? No, you probably don't.

If you leave aside the specific problems of German historiography dealing with the period 1933 to 1950, there are a few books written by Germans that Americans know, especially if you look at the colonial period. There are some books that have been translated or have been written in English in the first place. Dirk Hoerder's book on crowds,<sup>26</sup> for instance, was written in English. Willi Paul Adams has published in English, and his books are well known in the field.<sup>27</sup> There are other examples of Germans who have been translated or at least are being reviewed, and that is a way of dealing with the reception of international scholars in the U.S. as well. A book doesn't necessarily have to be translated in order to be noticed by American colleagues. It may suffice that it has been reviewed, and then people who are able to read German or whatever the language may be tend to acknowledge that there is literature on that specific problem written by an international scholar. But I must subscribe to the statement by Ron Robin. I think most American historians would be hard pressed to name a book that was written by an international scholar even in their own field. The problem is the way publishers deal with translations. My own dissertation, which came out in 1980,<sup>28</sup> was supposed to have been translated by the University of California Press. UC Press made an offer, but my German publishing house wouldn't have it. They were trying to sell the few copies they had in German, and they thought that a translation would hinder them in the sales of the book abroad. So they flatly denied me the right to sign a contract with UC Press. I think that is very common, at least in the early days. Translations usually mean that you can forget about the German edition.

**Grabbe:** If you turned the question around for a moment, and asked German historians, generalists, who hold chairs in, say, *Zeitgeschichte*, or *Neuere Geschichte* to name the five most significant English-language books by American historians, I don't know what would come out of that. So, you really can't blame these American historians. If a book is published in Israel it will have a print run of 50–100 copies, perhaps. It may

not even make its way into American libraries. We have again arrived at the language question. Books in French, in Italian, in Spanish won't be noticed much. So, in a way, Ron Robin is right, but I find this inevitable. Perhaps we could differentiate between book-length studies—where the situation will remain difficult because it is difficult to find a publisher even in Germany now—and articles. When we look at articles we find that Germans, too, submit their work to American journals, and hence, are recognized. I could name a number of examples: the *William & Mary Quarterly*, the *Journal of American History*, the *American Historical Review*, and *Diplomatic History*, where German scholarship has been printed, and hence has been recognized.

I am the German representative on the Board of the European Association for American Studies. Therefore I can say—and I think it is safe for me to say—that when we deplore the German situation we should look at Italy, France, Spain, Greece, Romania. There are only a few scholars in those countries who could be described as specialists in American history. There is little impact that these people can have. I see an impact coming from Great Britain for reasons that I need not explain, and also from Germany. Here, over the past twenty years or so, a fairly significant pool of scholars has developed. It is often deplored that the number of practitioners is small, but when I include those writing their doctoral dissertations I see perhaps some 90 people whose primary interest is American history, and perhaps another 100 or so who take *some* professional interest in American history. That is miniscule when you compare it to the numbers of the United States, but I don't think it gets us very far to compare the situation in the two countries.

**Junker:** I basically agree with Ron Robin's statement. The best you can hope for in regard to the American academic community is that you have some impact on other scholars in your field by being cited and all that. Of course, the prerequisite is the English translation of your work. If you look through American books even on American foreign policy, the publishers don't like any foreign-language titles in the bibliography. I have hundreds of books on foreign policy, and hardly anyone nowadays mentions foreign-language titles because it does not sell. A very open question for me at the moment is: Will our massive Cold-War handbook become a landmark on the American market?<sup>29</sup> It brought together 146 contributions from 132 contributors from both sides of the Atlantic. This is a completely new conception, it has never been done to cover all these five fields (politics, security, economics, culture, society). People have often talked about it, asked for it, but it has never been done. I hope, of course, that it will become a landmark, but I am not quite sure.

**Lehmkuhl:** Again, a hard question. How to measure "impact?" We could look at the citation index or evaluation reports. Since I wasn't able

to do this for this interview, I can only guess. And my guess would be that German authors who use a comparative approach or write on topics that are not exclusively American had more of an impact on the study of North American history in the U.S. than German or European authors of books focusing on a niche in the history of North America. To give an example: I think that the book "1968—The World Transformed," edited by one American and two German historians has had such an impact.<sup>30</sup> This book is definitely well known on both sides of the Atlantic. It is used for teaching the history of the 1960s in the U.S. and in Germany alike.

I would also like to point out two book series that might have had an impact on the United States. One is the *Publications of the German Historical Institute* series with Cambridge UP. The other is the series that is published by the Academic Council of the City of Krefeld with Berg Publishers.<sup>31</sup> I think from the very first volume that Hartmut Lehmann published in cooperation with James Sheehan,<sup>32</sup> the GHI series tackled issues related to Germany/Europe on the one hand, and the United States on the other hand by pinpointing interdependencies, processes of cultural transfer, and other topics of special relevance to both sides of the Atlantic. The same holds true for the publications of the conference proceedings of the tri-annual "Krefeld Historical Symposia." These symposia are organized in a comparative way. Methodologically, this approach has to be traced back to Erich Angermann, who published widely on questions of comparative history, among other places in the *GHI Bulletin*.<sup>33</sup> Angermann underlined the need to find so called "skeleton topics" in German and American history that can be analyzed in comparative perspective, thereby bringing to the fore commonalities and differences. Topics such as German and American constitutional thought,<sup>34</sup> Germany and the U.S. in the era of World War I,<sup>35</sup> reconstruction and *Wiederaufbau* in Germany and the United States,<sup>36</sup> German and American nationalism,<sup>37</sup> the visions of the future in Germany and the United States,<sup>38</sup> and Atlantic communications<sup>39</sup> have been covered so far. Like the Cambridge series of the GHI, these books are published in English. Using English is and remains a prerequisite for communicating with our American colleagues.

- *Where do you see the German practitioner of American history vis-à-vis the German historical profession? How do you assess the role of American history and its German practitioners in the German historical profession? Is the historian of North America fully integrated with his/her fields of interest, or is s/he "the odd one out?"*

**Finzsch:** The odd one out, I'd say. They are still marginal to a large extent. Part of this problem has to do with a lack of critical mass. There are just not enough professorships in American history, which I think has to do with the Cold War in a way. You don't study your friends, you study

your enemies. Every major university in Germany did have at least one or two professors in Eastern European history, Russian history, or the history of the Soviet bloc. And that was the result of the Cold War, of course, whereas American history was notoriously lacking, as are French history, English history, or Italian history for that matter. History in Germany tends to be national history—still, until today. With, let's say, nine full professors doing American history—I think that's about the figure—it just cannot influence the field in a sufficient way. For every historian doing American history, there are 30 or 40 who do German history. And I don't know how we can change this. We just lost further positions in American history. So, if there is reason for pessimism, it has to do with the way positions are assigned in the field. Another issue is the openings that we can offer to younger students: How can we attract good, young historians in the field of American history if there are just not enough positions to be filled? That is the question. There is no critical mass. With nine full professorships it is not there, especially if the colleagues that hold the chairs in American history are relatively young. And it is foreseeable that for the next 10 or 15 years not much will be happening.

**Grabbe:** The overall number of positions in American history is not remarkable. It is, however, even less remarkable when you consider the academic hierarchies at German universities and take into account that many of those positions are "C3," or the equivalent of an American associate professorship. And when you take into account further that under the German system an associate cannot be promoted to full but will always remain in that position. The positions of power in German academic councils, *Fachbereichsrat*, *Fakultätsrat*, etc.—you may deplore it, it is simply a fact—are the "C4" positions. Most of our universities do not have a single one of those C4 positions reserved more or less for American history—even Tübingen doesn't, Bochum doesn't—it is just Berlin, Cologne, Erfurt, Hamburg, Heidelberg, and Halle-Wittenberg. How can these people make a difference within the *Historikerverband*? There is an initiative from within the membership of the *Historikerverband* of improving the recognition of non-European history. I haven't been present at their recent meetings but one of my associates has, and she reported to me that they didn't talk about American history at all, and they didn't even welcome American historians because these overseas historians were interested in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Their fear was that the inclusion of—from their perspective—the many historians of U.S. history would mean that their interests and their focus would be ignored. There has often been talk of whether German historians of the United States should form their own organization. I have always advised against it and thought that we should remain—problematic though that may be occasionally—in the pool of the German Association for American Studies, a

multidisciplinary association, because thereby—with about 800 members—we have much more clout in questions regarding the presentation and representation of the United States at German universities.

**Junker:** I think it depends. It differs from university to university. Here in Heidelberg we are completely integrated into the history department. My colleagues and I wanted it this way from the very beginning. A German student studying history here can either take a *Hauptseminar* (graduate course) on Hitler or on Roosevelt; he can study the French Revolution or the American Revolution. It is up to the professors to attract students to come to their seminars. I have heard complaints from other colleagues that they feel a bit marginalized but it really differs from university to university. Of course, the historians of the U.S. have complained for 30 or 40 years about the lack of chairs in American history. It is still true that you have four or five times as many professors of Eastern European history than of North American history. On the other hand, the situation has improved slightly. The few chairs we have seem to be here to stay. So, it is no longer marginal but compared to the big body of scholarship that goes into German history, the American past is nonetheless still a side-show at German universities.

**Lehmkuhl:** This question leads us back to the point already mentioned above: the way German historians of North American history organize themselves professionally. For many German historians of North American history, the DGfA—an interdisciplinary organization with a strong focus on literature and cultural studies—is the main academic forum. Historians present their findings to an interdisciplinary academic community that is exclusively interested in North America. Historians do not communicate their research findings to their “German” peers enough. This is perhaps one reason why we are marginalized to a certain extent. I would plea for a re-integration into the professional organizations of historians in Germany. We should try to use both the *Historikerverband* and the annual meetings of the DGfA as forums to present “German” research on North American history. Only continuing academic communication with the historical profession in Germany will help to overcome professional marginalization, which almost always has repercussions on job opportunities for young scholars specializing in a marginalized field.

#### 4. TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY IN GERMANY

- *From my personal observations at the John F. Kennedy Institute for North American Studies at the Free University of Berlin, and from remarks by colleagues teaching elsewhere, it seems that the history of the United*

*States remains a highly popular subject for German (under)graduates. Provided this observation is accurate, what, in your opinion, accounts for the popularity of American history in German universities? Why do German (under)graduates turn to the study of North American history?*

**Finzsch:** Less and less for political reasons, like in my own case, and more and more because of the products of popular culture. I can see this in connection with the seminars I teach. I try to teach seminars that offer topics for papers, term papers, etc., dealing with American popular culture. I always find far more applicants for those topics than, let's say, diplomatic history, political history, social history, or economic history of the United States. It is nowadays almost impossible to find someone for a paper on economic history of the U.S. No one is interested. Whereas if you offer something on hip-hop, you can be sure to have at least twenty people willing to write a paper on hip-hop. I am advising two people who are writing on the "Riot Grrrls" and on hip-hop in the United States. It has become very fashionable. Other things come to mind as well. You can easily find someone who's willing to tackle a problem of minstrel shows. Whereas if you give them the minutes of the Abolition Societies that are dealing with racism, no one is really interested. The impact of popular culture in Europe these days is just tremendous. You can see this from the choice of seminars and the choice of subjects picked for papers written for seminars.

**Grabbe:** It is not easy to find a satisfactory answer to this question. When you look at the *Mitteilungsblatt der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Amerikastudien* (Newsletter of the German Associations for American Studies) and take notice of the U.S. history courses listed at German universities, the number is fairly low. Where would you say is that interest that you observed—if you exclude Berlin, Cologne, Munich, and a few other universities? I see a genuine interest in Germany in American culture. (Let's not open this Pandora's box about culture; I don't want to make a distinction between popular culture and other forms of culture, let's simply say "culture.") You can make the observation when you leave the field of history and go into literature that whenever American literature is offered, students tend to flock to American literature classes more than to English literature classes. And I think one reason for this is the attempt at interdisciplinary study in American Studies. This is recognized by the British Embassy, by the way, and they are pushing British Studies with all their might. Concerning the attractiveness of American history, I think generalizations are difficult because it is not taught everywhere.

In my department, I advise about 70 percent of our M.A. and diploma theses which means it is a pretty heavy load. Since student enrollment at this school is not what it would be in Western Germany or in Berlin, I still

survive. However, this is in the context of a British and American Studies department. It would be different in a history department. I held a position as professor of North American history in the history department of Oldenburg University. There I acted as advisor on two M.A. theses on U.S. history over a two-year period. I only stayed for two years, so I don't know what would have happened in the long run. I am perhaps not the right person to answer this question. You should ask someone who is affiliated with a history department.

**Junker:** A lot of us have been influenced by the American style of teaching history. We have learned to become more effective and accessible teachers: witty, informal—you start with an ice-breaker and you end with a soul-shaker. I think this makes a difference. Second, German students are not stupid. They know that the U.S. is the only remaining superpower in the world. They know that the fate of the world, of Europe, and of Germany is being shaped by what the American administration does or does not do. And of course, they are affected by American popular culture. They have this intimate relationship with American pop culture, so there is a genuine interest irrespective of whether they criticize the U.S. or not. You either have the U.S. as a *Schreckbild* or as a *Vorbild*. They know this, so there is a genuine interest. And nowadays I even see an increase of interest in the United States. Very simple.

**Lehmkuhl:** First of all, a comment on your observation that American history is “highly popular”: Maybe it is highly popular at centers like the Kennedy Institute, but if you look at “normal” history departments you will find a maximum of 30 or 40 students in a *Hauptseminar* (graduate seminar) on North American history. Whereas you have 80 to 100 students in a *Hauptseminar* on the Holocaust or related topics. So, there is a difference. Maybe it is popular but I doubt whether it is really “highly” popular.

Why do German undergraduates turn to the study of North American history? To answer this question I have to refer to my own experience at the University of Erfurt. As you know, the history department in Erfurt is organized according to the study of world regions. North America is one out of six regions that are represented by chairs. Besides, there is Latin America, East and West Asia, and Central and Eastern Europe. Students have to choose two world regions as a focus of their history major. As it turned out, the combination of European and North American history is the most popular one. From the perspective of teaching, this trend correlates with what I said in the context of German research in North American history. German-American or European-American topics are important. Students want to learn something about common problems or differences in the history of Germany and the United States. In this respect, I would say that American history is popular. Students re-

alize that many developments in contemporary European history cannot be understood properly without putting them in the context of European-American relations or the context of the Atlantic World. This is why Erfurt also offers an interdisciplinary M.A. Program in Atlantic Studies, including course offerings in Political Science, History, Literature, Linguistics, and Media Studies. With this program, the University of Erfurt tries to react to students' desire to learn something about the nation that shaped European history during the nineteenth and, above all, the twentieth century more than any other. Students in Erfurt are eager to learn something about the Cold War. They ask for courses in diplomatic history, for information on Israeli-American relations, or the East-West conflict in general; students want to learn something about the way the U.S. shaped our international system.

- *Do you think that the teaching of American History is adequately represented in German History Departments? Is it a well-established subject in the curriculum or does it still figure as an odd subdiscipline ("Orchideenfach")?*

**Finzsch:** It is underrepresented stemming from the fact that there are so few colleagues in American history. It is also underrepresented because we still tend to see history as national history instead of seeing it as supranational or international history. Of course, you will always find someone who is writing on the impact of the relationship between Dulles and Adenauer but that is firmly focusing on German history proper, and John Foster Dulles only comes in when he has a personal relationship with Adenauer. He is not a subject per se.

**Grabbe:** I would certainly say that it is underrepresented. Is it an *Orchideenfach*? That isn't true either. I recently talked to Peter Lösche (University of Göttingen) who is a political scientist with a special interest in the United States. And he said, looking at his field, that there has been a trend over the last decade or so that he described thus: There is hardly a scholar in Germany focusing exclusively on the American political system. When you take this into account, you will find that all the political science departments in Germany in one way or another teach the American constitution, the American system of government, but they do it in a comparative perspective. And the same is true of a variety of other subjects: music, geography. There is a tremendous interest in anthropology, for instance. When you look at it that way, you are able to satisfy your interest in America at German universities because of this phenomenon. Scholars whom we as specialists don't necessarily think of and whom we may not even know are simply there. Every now and then my attention is drawn to this, particularly when I have to prepare a report on American Studies activities at the University of Halle for the *Mitteilungsblatt*

(newsletter) of the GAAS. The questionnaire on which it is based asks to list “courses on American Studies in departments other than your own.” And you find that there are courses of that type, and by people whom you have never heard about.

**Junker:** It really depends. At the schools that you mentioned where American history is represented by a chair, there, of course, it is no longer an *Orchideenfach*. It is a vital part of the curriculum. The problem is that there are so many universities that do not have American history at all. At those schools, American history is not an *Orchideenfach*, there is not even an *Orchidee*, there is simply nothing. This is the problem. Gerhard Weinberg always likes to cite the comparison with North Carolina.<sup>40</sup> And I think it still holds true. We have more professorships for German history in North Carolina than you have chairs on U.S. history in the whole of Germany—even united Germany.

**Lehmkuhl:** Compared to East European history, North American history in Germany is an *Orchideenfach*. There are only eight chairs in North American history in German history departments; another four are part of social science departments; and another three are integrated in cultural studies or literature departments. In comparison, we have about 26 or 27 chairs in East European history in German history departments. So there is a clear misfit between the political and cultural importance of the United States and North America and the institutionalization of North American history as an academic discipline. The same is true for the history curriculum. Since it is still predominantly shaped by the exigencies of teacher education, the prerogative or even monopoly of the state governments with regard to the examination of future high school teachers and the definition of what they have to learn is reflected in the history curriculum. This explains to a certain extent the dominance of German history and medieval or early modern *Landesgeschichte* in German history departments. We are facing a sort of *Deutungsmacht* of the States Ministries for Education. Via this soft power, a certain, I would say more traditional, way of doing history is perpetuated, which may be one reason why it is so hard to establish an American or any other non-European focus in German history departments. And it may also explain why positions in North American history are perceived to be redundant as soon as financial constraints make it necessary to reduce the number of professorships in German history departments.

## 5. THE GERMAN ACADEMIC JOB MARKET FOR PRACTITIONERS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

- *At the Historikertag in Halle in September 2002, data on the general job situation of German historians at the level of the Habilitation were pre-*

sented. As expected, the market especially in contemporary history is highly competitive. However, scholars of Eastern European history and non-European history still seem to be in a relatively better position than their colleagues in German history.<sup>41</sup> Are these results in sync with your own perceptions? What, in general, do you think about the job prospects for junior scholars on the academic market, i.e. those who wish to remain or become teachers and scholars of American history?

**Finzsch:** Well, if I look at the younger students of American history who are preparing a *Habilitation* right now, there are at least four at this institution. If you think of a major place like Erfurt or Berlin, I think there are at least as many as here in Cologne. And there are quite a number of *Privatdozenten* waiting for an opening. So, I am very pessimistic. I think that maybe not a whole generation but a substantial part of a scholarly generation will be sacrificed. They will not find a job in American history in Germany. As you probably know there are now a couple of younger colleagues who have found positions in the United States.

**Grabbe:** That is absolutely true but yet it is not as simple as that. When I sat on search committees as an assistant professor (*Wissenschaftlicher Assistent*) in Hamburg and we had openings in German history, the application numbers were far greater than the ones you have quoted from the *Historikertag*. 100 to 120 people, even when you took into account there were always those applying no matter what and whom you could discard right away, leaving still 50 more or less serious contenders. Nowadays the numbers are somewhat down but they are still fairly high. In our field, six to eight applicants is a fair number, and perhaps you could invite six people. Of those six perhaps four would deserve to be included in the short list of three. The ratio between applicants and successful candidates in our field is excellent. But the flipside of the coin is that a chance of being one of six contenders, and of making it to the short list of three comes once every two to three years at best. And that means that there are among the current *Privatdozenten* perhaps one or two who may not make it because of the age factor. All of our history departments currently have a fairly high age average but the way this is resolved is tragic for some because search committees will say: our age average is 55, or in some departments it is even 60. Will they consider someone who is 48 or 51, or will they choose someone who is 38 or 42? My observation is that they tend to go back 20 years. And by the way, the situation regarding positions in the history of Great Britain, France, or any other major foreign country is not dissimilar.

**Junker:** The situation is not bleak but extremely competitive. It is less competitive, though, than the job market for historians of contemporary German history. Statistically speaking, the historian of the American past

has a higher chance of finding a position than his or her colleagues studying twentieth-century Germany. The big problem from my perspective is the current economic crisis and the way the *Länder* in Germany will react to it; whether they will keep the existing chairs or not. This is a very open question. It is not necessary, but likely that we will run into an even deeper economic crisis that will lead to additional cuts by the government—then the situation might become desperate. But this is a worst-case scenario. Otherwise, I would say it is tough competition but you do have a fighting chance. You always take great risks if you start an academic career at a German university. Go back to Max Weber's *Wissenschaft als Beruf* where he adequately describes the hazards of an academic career. We still have the same hazards. Everybody should be aware that this academic career has an enormous amount of hazards. Even if you are a first-class historian—in the end, you need luck and connections as well.

**Lehmkuhl:** In certain respects, I think that the job prospects for junior scholars of German history are even worse. The job situation for junior scholars for American history is better insofar as the numerical relationship between positions at universities on the one hand and qualified junior scholars on the other is better than the respective figures in the field of German history. The latest numbers that were presented at *Historikertag* with regard to German history are frightening: there are 13 historians on the level of the *Habilitation* for one open position. In American history, it is less than half of this number. The figures are thus better for Americanists. However, you have to consider the fluctuation. At the moment the job market is very good for young scholars in American history. As you know we are undergoing a generational change. There are three schools right now in the process of hiring: Bochum, Tübingen, and Hamburg. Maybe next year Erfurt might be open again as well. If these positions are filled, however, then we will have a *Durststrecke* because the new jobholders will be relatively young. But then again, historians of American history always have the opportunity also to consider the American job market.

- *Do you as an academic teacher feel that you can encourage graduate students to try to make the study and teaching of American history their career?*

**Finzsch:** I don't! I don't! If they approach me about a Ph.D., I always tell them that it is a very risky business. I don't encourage them at all. I try to explain to them that there are very few positions that can be filled. And I always tell them to have at least a major publication in the area of German history. Within the old system that was easy. You would typically pass your Ph.D. in American history, and then the *Habilitation* would be in German history, or vice versa. That's how I dealt with the

problem myself. My second book was in German history;<sup>42</sup> it was not in American history. Now with the *Habilitation* gone, it will be difficult. You don't have that safety net anymore that you used to have with the *Habilitation*, firmly establishing another area of expertise and research. And therefore, even if I, as a rule, support the new junior professorships, and the abolition of the *Habilitation*, it is now a very risky business because it tends to locate younger scholars within a field that they cannot leave anymore once they have settled. But I am certain that the junior professorships will become firmly established. I am not fighting for one in American history here, though, because it is Cologne's policy not to have junior professorships. Partly because the Ministry for Education and Research in Düsseldorf sells junior professorships by packets of ten positions. You cannot just open one junior professorship in one area. You have to buy a package of ten junior professorships if you want to make them available. And that is something you cannot do, especially if you have a shortage of professorships to begin with. Not only in history but all over a place, like Cologne. It is the policy of University of Cologne not to apply for the junior professorships that are financed by the Ministry.

**Grabbe:** Career here is the word that we need to define. Should I encourage only those who will make it to the position of university professor? Günter Moltmann, my teacher, reminded me at the dissertation stage when I spoke of a possible career: "We do not have the career of a university professor." It might change now with the introduction of the junior professorship. But in the traditional system there may be a hiatus after your *Wissenschaftliche Assistentenzeit*, you may be forced to leave the university, or you may have this career that is called a *Drittmittelexistenz* where you jump from one research grant to the next. That is not fun. But no, I would always encourage students to study American history and to build careers by really opening up to what German society has to offer in the radio and television stations, the print media, new media, in public administration, in the ever increasing bureaucracies of the European Union, and so on and so forth. It would surely help to have more experts on the United States in this country, whatever they may do eventually.

**Junker:** I basically gave the answer already. I would not say "encourage" but I would say: "You still have a sporting chance." When I talk to younger scholars about this topic, I try to be as realistic as possible. Then they have to make their decision. I would not say that I "encourage" them, but I give them a realistic assessment of the possible future—though we don't know the future.

**Lehmkuhl:** Generally, I am very hesitant and selective in encouraging graduate students to pursue an academic career. I think that only a few are really qualified in the sense of being at the same time intelligent, innovative, communicative, good teachers, and having the stamina to

stand the pressure that exists in the academic world. I think for almost all young graduates it is better to look for alternative job opportunities like in organizations, private corporations, adult education, etc.

- *For professional or personal reasons, not all of the younger scholars trained in American history will find their place on the German or the North American academic job market. Where do you see alternative professional fields for these young people? Or put another way: what's American history good for in life?*

**Finzsch:** Especially in Hamburg where I taught before 2001, students of American history would traditionally become journalists. I think that is also true for Cologne. I don't really know but as a rule, one could probably say the following for American history: that a lot of the students of American history tend to become journalists. And the Ph.D. is something that looks nice on your door and your business card, and it helps promote your career within a TV station or an academic press. But basically I think American history should be studied as one of several fields, not just by itself. It should be combined with a deep knowledge of international affairs in order to allow people, talented young people, to become journalists, join the diplomatic service, or any other areas. To really ask students to concentrate on American history proper is not good advice at the moment.

**Junker:** For many things! Journalism, politics, publishing, public relations, political parties, adult education—what have you. There they compete with Ph.D. or M.A.s from other fields but I think they have as good a chance, even a better chance, to get a job here than the others, especially if they have lived and studied in the United States for some time.

**Lehmkuhl:** Students of North American history generally have a good knowledge of political, economic, and cultural developments in the United States. They very often have studied abroad and are fluent in English; they usually have established personal contacts in the United States. All this will enhance their job opportunities in political organizations, journalism, adult education, museums, even in private corporations in human resources. Private companies very often ask for people who have a broad general knowledge, international experiences, and who read and write English.<sup>43</sup>

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Detlef Junker, *The Manichean Trap: American Perceptions of the German Empire, 1871–1945*. With an introduction by Klaus Hildebrand and a comment by Paul W. Schroeder (Washington, D. C.: GHI, 1995, Occasional Papers, Nr. 12).

<sup>2</sup> *Die USA und Deutschland im Zeitalter des Kalten Krieges 1945–1990: Ein Handbuch*. Detlef Junker, ed., in cooperation with Philipp Gassert, Wilfried Mausbach, and David B. Morris, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: DVA, 2001).

<sup>3</sup> Further information on the programs in North American history represented by these scholars can be found at: [www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/histsem/anglo/](http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/histsem/anglo/)—[www.amerikanistik.uni-halle.de](http://www.amerikanistik.uni-halle.de)—[www.schurman.uni-hd.de](http://www.schurman.uni-hd.de)—[www.fu-berlin.de/jfki/geschichte/](http://www.fu-berlin.de/jfki/geschichte/)

<sup>4</sup> Detlef Junker, *Die Deutsche Zentrumspartei und Hitler 1932/33: Ein Beitrag zur Problematik des politischen Katholizismus in Deutschland* (Stuttgart: DVA, 1969).

<sup>5</sup> Detlef Junker, *Der unteilbare Weltmarkt: Das ökonomische Interesse in der Außenpolitik der USA 1933–1941* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1975).

<sup>6</sup> Ursula Lehmkuhl, *Kanadas Öffnung nach Asien: Der Colombo-Plan, das "New Commonwealth" und die Rekonstruktion des Sterlinggebietes, 1949–52* (Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer, 1990).

<sup>7</sup> Ursula Lehmkuhl, *Pax Anglo-Americana: Machtstrukturelle Grundlagen anglo-amerikanischer Asien- und Fernostpolitik in den 1950er Jahren* (München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1999).

<sup>8</sup> *America Seen From the Outside—Topics, Models, and Achievements in the Federal Republic of Germany*. Proceedings of a symposium held at the John F. Kennedy-Institut für Nordamerikastudien, December 1–4, 1988, ed. Brigitte Georgi-Findlay & Heinz Ickstadt (Berlin: JFKI, 1988).

<sup>9</sup> Hermann Wellenreuther, *Niedergang und Aufstieg. Die Geschichte Nordamerikas vom Beginn der Besiedlung bis zum Ausgang des 17. Jahrhunderts*, vol. I (Münster: Lit, 2000). Wellenreuther, *Ausbildung und Neubildung. Die Geschichte Nordamerikas vom Ausgang des 17. Jahrhunderts bis zum Ausbruch der Amerikanischen Revolution 1775*, vol. II (Münster: Lit, 2001). The books are the first two volumes of the series *The History of North America from an Atlantic Perspective from its Beginnings to the Present*, edited by Norbert Finzsch, Ursula Lehmkuhl, and Hermann Wellenreuther.

<sup>10</sup> Olaf Stieglitz, *"100 Percent American Boys": Disziplinierungsdiskurse und Ideologie im Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933–1942* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999).

<sup>11</sup> Wolfgang Helbich, ed., *Briefe aus Amerika. Deutsche Auswanderer schreiben aus der Neuen Welt, 1830–1930* (München: Beck, 1988).

<sup>12</sup> Carole Fink, Philipp Gassert, and Detlef Junker, eds., *1968: The World Transformed* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1998).

<sup>13</sup> The GHI's publications are listed at the end of the *Bulletin*. The latest book from the series on Total War is: Roger Chickering, Stig Foerster, eds., *The Shadows of Total War: Europe, East Asia, and the United States, 1919–1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002).

<sup>14</sup> See note 9.

<sup>15</sup> Willi Paul Adams, *First American Constitutions: Republican Ideology and the Making of the State Constitutions in the Revolutionary Era*, trans. by Rita Kimber and Robert Kimber (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).

<sup>16</sup> Günter Moltmann, *Atlantische Blockpolitik im 19. Jahrhundert: Die Vereinigten Staaten und der deutsche Liberalismus während der Revolution von 1848/49* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1973).

<sup>17</sup> Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995). See also Anne McClintock, Adamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat, eds., *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).

<sup>18</sup> Anselm Doering-Manteuffel, *Wie westlich sind die Deutschen? Amerikanisierung und Westernisierung im 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: V&R, 1999).

<sup>19</sup> See, for example, David Thelen, "The Practice of American History," in *JAH* 81:3 (1994): 933–960. The article analyzes a survey conducted among the readers of the *JAH* on the

practice of American history. It pays special attention to the responses from abroad. The same volume of JAH contains articles by practitioners of American History outside the United States, reflecting on their subject and their "external" perspective. See also the special issue of *Reviews in American History* 14: 4 (1986) devoted exclusively to "The View from Abroad," here especially Willi Paul Adams, "Personal Reflections on the Conditions of Scholarship in West Germany," 557–568; Donna Merwick, "Being There': Some Theoretical Aspects of Writing History at a Distance," 487–500.

<sup>20</sup> Thelen explains the review policy in the appendix to his article: "Of Audiences, Borderlands, and Comparisons: Towards the Internationalization of American History," in *JAH* 79 (1992): 432–462, here 451–453.

<sup>21</sup> James Henretta reviewing Jean Heffer and François Weil, eds., *Chantiers d'histoire américaine* (Paris: Belin, 1994), as quoted in François Weil, "Do American Historical Narratives Travel?" in Thomas Bender, ed., *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2001), 317–342, 331.

<sup>22</sup> Dirk Philipsen, "Test the West: American History through the Lens of German Survey Texts," in *Journal of American History* 82:2 (September 1995): 651–657.

<sup>23</sup> Willi Paul Adams et al., *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika*, Fischer Weltgeschichte, Bd. 30, (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1977, rev. ed. 1991); Erich Angermann, *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika seit 1917*, dtv-Weltgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts (München: dtv, 1966, 8th ed. 1987); Hans R. Guggisberg, *Geschichte der USA* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2nd revised and expanded edition, 1988).

<sup>24</sup> 44. Deutscher Historikertag, Halle a. d. Saale, 10.–13. September 2002. Panel 5.10: "Gewalt in den USA. Traditionen und Visionen in den 1960er und 1970er Jahren." See the report on the panel by Jürgen Martschukat under: <http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/> (Tagungsberichte, September 18, 2002).

<sup>25</sup> Ron Robin, "The Outsider as Marginal Scholar: Reflections on the Past, the Foreign and Comparative Studies in American History," in *American Studies International* 31:1 (April 1993): 117–125, quote 118.

<sup>26</sup> Dirk Hoerder, *Crowd Action in Revolutionary Massachusetts, 1765–1780* (New York: Academic Press, 1977).

<sup>27</sup> See note 15.

<sup>28</sup> Norbert Finzsch, *Die Goldgräber Kaliforniens. Arbeitsbedingungen, Lebensstandard und politisches System um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: V&R—Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, vol. 53, 1982).

<sup>29</sup> See note 2.

<sup>30</sup> See note 12.

<sup>31</sup> Further information at: <http://www.krefeld.de/kommunen/krefeld/fb17.nsf/pages/>

<sup>32</sup> Hartmut Lehmann, James J. Sheehan, eds., *An Interrupted Past: German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1991).

<sup>33</sup> Erich Angermann, *Challenges of Ambiguity: Doing Comparative History* (New York/Oxford: Berg Publishers, 1991).

<sup>34</sup> Hermann Wellenreuther, ed., *German and American Constitutional Thought* (The Krefeld Historical Symposia 1, New York, 1990). Hermann Wellenreuther, Claudia Schnurmann, eds., *Die Amerikanische Verfassung und Deutsch-Amerikanisches Verfassungsdenken. Ein Rückblick über 200 Jahre* (Krefelder Historische Symposia: Deutschland und Amerika 1, New York, 1991).

<sup>35</sup> Hans-Jürgen Schröder, ed., *Confrontation and Cooperation - Konfrontation und Kooperation—Germany and the United States in the Era of World War I. 1900–1924—Deutschland und die Vereinigten Staaten in der Ära des 1. Weltkrieges* (The Krefeld Historical Symposia 2, Providence/Oxford: Berg, 1993).

<sup>36</sup> Norbert Finzsch, Jürgen Martschukat, eds., *Different Restorations: Reconstruction and "Wiederaufbau" in the United States and Germany: 1865–1945–1989* (The Krefeld Historical Symposia: Germany and the USA 3, Providence RI, Oxford, 1996).

<sup>37</sup> Hartmut Lehmann, Hermann Wellenreuther, eds., *German and American Nationalism: A Comparative Perspective* (The Krefeld Historical Symposia 4, Oxford/New York, 1999).

<sup>38</sup> Norbert Finzsch, Hermann Wellenreuther, eds., *Visions of the Future in Germany and the United States* (The Krefeld Historical Symposia, Oxford/New York: Berg, 2001).

<sup>39</sup> Norbert Finzsch and Ursula Lehmkuhl, eds., *Atlantic Communications: Political, Social, and Cultural Perspectives on Media and Media Technology in American and German History from the 17th to the 20th Century* (Krefeld Symposium, May 2002; forthcoming).

<sup>40</sup> Gerhard L. Weinberg, "Wo bleibt amerikanische Geschichte an deutschen Universitäten?" in *Zeitschrift für Weltgeschichte* 2:2 (Fall 2001).

<sup>41</sup> "Das Verhältnis von Bewerbern auf die jährlich freiwerdenden Stellen in den nächsten ca. 5 Jahren beläuft sich im gesamten Fach auf etwa 1:8, wobei sich dieses Verhältnis in den jeweiligen Teilgebieten höchst unterschiedlich gestaltet. Der Konkurrenzdruck fällt in der Neueren Geschichte mit ca. 1:13 extrem aus, und auch in der Alten und Mittelalterlichen Geschichte sind die Verhältnisse mit ca. 1:7 bzw. 8 angespannt. [. . .] Relativ günstig scheinen die Berufungsaussichten in der außereuropäischen und der osteuropäischen Geschichte liegen (1:3 bzw. 4), wengleich hier angesichts der geringen Fallzahlen Vorsicht bei längerfristigen Vorhersagen geboten ist." Panel presentation entitled "Verband der Historiker und Historikerinnen Deutschlands: Situation des wissenschaftlichen Nachwuchses im Fach Geschichte: Erste Ergebnisse einer Erhebung 2002." (Historikertag Halle, 11. IX. 2002), presented by Prof. Dr. Sylvia Paletschek (Freiburg). The complete essay with illustrations and tables (46 pages total) is available at: [http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/daten/2002/lincke\\_paletschek\\_2002.pdf](http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/daten/2002/lincke_paletschek_2002.pdf)

<sup>42</sup> Norbert Finzsch, *Obrigkeiten und Unterschichten. Zur Geschichte der rheinischen Unterschichten gegen Ende des 18. und zu Beginn des Jahrhunderts.* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1990).