

GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

BULLETIN

SPRING 1993

ISSUE No. 12

Editors: Hartmut Lehmann, Manfred F. Boemeke, and Janine Micunek, in conjunction with the Research Fellows of the Institute.

Address: German Historical Institute
1607 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
Tel: (202) 387-3355
FAX: (202) 483-3430

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

Library Hours: Monday - Friday 10:00 a.m. - 6:00. p.m., and by appointment

© German Historical Institute, 1993

The BULLETIN appears twice a year and is available free upon request.

The next issue of the BULLETIN will appear in the fall of 1993

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

BULLETIN

Spring 1993

Issue No. 12

CONTENTS

I. Preface	
II. Accounts of Recent Conferences Sponsored or Co-Sponsored by the Institute	5
A. "Germany and the West in the 19th and 20th Centuries. Part 1: Transatlantic Relationships." Lübeck, November 18-21, 1992. Conveners: Michael Salewski and Hartmut Lehmann.	6
B. "Begriffsgeschichte." Washington, D.C., December 18, 1992. Conveners: Hartmut Lehmann and Melvin Richter.	7
C. "The Growth of Aggressive Nationalism: Foreigners and Anti-Foreigner Attitudes in Germany." Washington, D.C., February 5, 1993. Conveners: Hartmut Keil and Dietmar Schirmer.	8
III. Research in Progress at the Institute	
A. "'The Consent of the Governed': Studies in the History of Suffrage and Disfranchisement in the United States." (Manfred Berg)	11
B. "Exploitation by Integration: Intellectual Reparations or Scientific Transfer? The Use of German Technology and Scientists by the Allied Forces after 1945 in Electronics, Optics, and Precision Mechanics." (Matthias Judt)	13

C. "German Immigrants and African Americans in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America: A Study in Group Interaction." (Hartmut Keil)	16
D. "The Meaning of Political Institutions: Political Culture and Institutional Configurations in Germany and the United States." (Dietmar Schirmer)	19
E. "Emigration from Thuringia to the United States in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century." (Ulrike Skorsetz)	21
F. "A Social History of Household Trash in the United States." (Susan Strasser)	23
G. "The Edition of the Diaries of David Zeisberger." (Carola Wessel)	24
IV. Institute News	
A. Spring 1993 Lecture Series	26
B. Annual Lecture 1993	26
C. Third Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture	27
D. Conferences to be Sponsored or Co-Sponsored by the Institute in 1993	27
E. Scholarship Recipients for 1993	27
F. Announcement of Dissertation Scholarships	29
G. Library Report	29
H. Staff Changes	30
I. Exhibition: "Jewish Portraits"	30
V. Miscellaneous	
A. Fifteenth Annual Conference of the Historians of the German Society for American Studies. Tutzing, February 19-21, 1993.	31
B. National Archives II: A Communication from Don W. Wilson, Former Archivist of the United States	32
C. Announcement of GSA Annual Meeting	36

I. Preface

In the past few months, Dr. Manfred Berg and Dr. Ulrike Skorsetz have made considerable progress on updated versions of the Institute's Reference Guides No. 1 (*German-American Scholarship Guide for Historians and Social Scientists*) and No. 2 (*Guide to Inventories and Finding Aids of German Archives*), respectively. The new guides will include all relevant information regarding scholarships to the five new *Bundesländer* and the new states' archival holdings that are currently accessible.

It is our hope that both guides will serve to stimulate the interest of American historians in the forty-year history of the German Democratic Republic and in those aspects of German history for which the source material has been and still is housed in the archives of the former GDR.

The second, revised edition of both guides should be available some time this year. However, even before they appear in print, Drs. Skorsetz and Berg are prepared to answer specific questions that you may have. Please direct your inquiries to them at the Institute.

The twelfth issue of our Bulletin reports on the research projects of those fellows who have recently joined the staff as well as our other activities. Also included is a report by the former archivist of the United States, Don W. Wilson, on the new facilities of the National Archives in College Park, Maryland.

Washington, D.C.
March 1993

Hartmut Lehmann

II. Accounts of Recent Conferences Sponsored or Co-Sponsored by the Institute

A. "Germany and the West in the 19th and 20th Centuries. Part 1: Transatlantic Relationships." Lübeck, November 18-21, 1992. Conveners: Michael Salewski and Hartmut Lehmann.

This conference, which the Institute co-sponsored, was the annual convention of the Ranke Society. The Ranke Society is to be commended for taking up the topic of transatlantic relations at a time when historians are justifiably more concerned with the recent upheavals in central and eastern Europe, greater access to archival resources, and the new research agendas that these developments have inspired. The conference focused on the long history of Germany's relationship with the United States. Its purpose was to evaluate the effects of German emigration to the New World, the impact of American constitutional thought on Germany's liberal tradition, the close mutual scrutiny between the world wars, and the increasing interdependence that developed as a result of World War II. The conference's four sections dealt with political, security, constitutional, and emigration issues. Michael Bouteillier, mayor of Lübeck, gave the opening remarks.

The first session addressed topics central to the long history of political relations between Germany and the United States. Hermann Wellenreuther (Göttingen) was skeptical of the claim that the U.S. political system had served as an example for German liberal thought in the *Vormärz* period. His provocative interpretation was taken up in a later session in two papers that dealt explicitly with constitutional influences. Michael Dreyer (Cambridge, MA; Kiel) also questioned that the American Constitution served as a model for German constitutional thought in the nineteenth century; Jürgen Heideking (Tübingen) carried the debate into the twentieth century, analyzing respective influences of American constitutional thought on the Weimar Constitution and the Basic Law of the Federal Republic. Günter Moltmann (Hamburg) brought the political agenda back to fundamental issues with his analysis of the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine for Germany. Otto Pflanze (Bloomington, IN) elaborated on Bismarck's views of the

United States and the American perception of him. Detlef Junker (Heidelberg) took up the controversial issue of the mutual perceptions of Nazi Germany and the United States on the eve of World War II. Klaus Schwabe (Aachen) focused on the American view of the security problems that Germany created. The evening lecture was delivered by Gerhard Stoltenberg (Bonn), who surveyed NATO's changing role and new security challenges from the perspective of an experienced politician.

Security concerns were also central to the next morning's session, which included papers by Wolfram Hanrieder (Santa Barbara) on the post-World War II partnership between the two countries; Stefan Frölich (Bonn) on the German question in the context of American security policy after 1945; and Christian Tuschhoff (Berlin/Washington, DC) on the continuity and changes in German security policy during the same period.

The concluding panel addressed issues of emigration history. Jörg Nagler (Kiel) concentrated on the preeminent, political German emigrants during the *Vormärz* and after the failed revolution of 1848/49; Wolfgang Helbich (Bochum) recounted the expectations and desires of the mass of Germans emigrating to the United States in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; and Karl Holl's (Bremen) paper focused on exiles during the Nazi era.

Hartmut Keil

B. "Begriffsgeschichte." Washington, D.C., December 18, 1992.
Conveners: Hartmut Lehmann and Melvin Richter.

Just a few days before Reinhart Koselleck returned to Germany, after spending the fall semester teaching at Columbia University, we were able to bring together a group of distinguished scholars at the Institute to discuss with him the scholarly merits of *Begriffsgeschichte*. Koselleck, together with Otto Brunner and Werner Conze, developed that concept and launched the major project of *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* in German-speaking central Europe since the eighteenth century. After both Brunner and Conze passed away, it was Koselleck who guided the multi-volume work to completion.

We are grateful to Melvin Richter for having proposed to celebrate this event by arranging a one-day symposium on *Begriffsgeschichte*. Richter opened the program with an appreciation of *Geschichtliche*

Grundbegriffe as a "contemporary classic," as he phrased it, and James V. H. Melton discussed the origins of the history of concepts in the work of Otto Brunner during the late 1930s. Donald R. Kelley, Gabriel Motzkin, and John G. A. Pocock offered comments. Koselleck then responded to the remarks of both speakers and commentators.

The ensuing discussion between Koselleck and the American historians emphasized the contributions as well as some of the problems of *Begriffsgeschichte*. On the one hand, all the publications that *Begriffsgeschichte* has engendered (like the major work *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*) are perhaps among the most original historiographical achievements of German historians since the 1960s. Thus, the influence within the German profession of such scholars as Conze and Koselleck can hardly be overemphasized. On the other hand, *Begriffsgeschichte* seems a typically German concept. It is difficult to relate this kind of work to recent historical scholarship in the United States and perhaps even more difficult to translate it and incorporate it productively into the American historical discourse. All participants agreed, however, that it was a most productive exercise to examine the work of those who analyze the meaning of the key terms of ideas and concepts throughout history.

The papers and comments, as well as Koselleck's concluding statements, will be published in the Institute's series of Occasional Papers.

Hartmut Lehmann

C. "The Growth of Aggressive Nationalism: Foreigners and Anti-Foreigner Attitudes in Germany." Washington, D.C., February 5, 1993. Conveners: Hartmut Keil and Dietmar Schirmer.

As a contribution to the ongoing debate on contemporary right-wing extremism and anti-foreigner violence in Germany, this colloquium was a very atypical event in the series of GHI conferences: Its topic could not be contemplated retrospectively but was, and still is, in constant flux. Therefore, before we could find our own approach to the problem, we thought it was important to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of the current debate as well as on the question of what our genuine contribution to it as historians might be.

In observing the political and journalistic discourse on the topic, we realized that the common explanations for the frightening wave of

violence against foreigners and other forms of right-wing and neo-Nazi activism are inadequate. These theories link the problems exclusively to two causes: the increase in the number of migrants entering Germany, especially of Eastern European asylum seekers, and the effects of German unification. Explanations of this type, according to our hypothesis, are based mainly on a causal interpretation of temporal coincidence. It was the purpose of the conference to test this hypothesis and to develop more far-reaching insights.

Jürgen Fijalkowski, professor of political science at the Free University of Berlin, delivered the opening lecture on "Aggressive Nationalism, the Problem of Immigration Pressure, and Asylum Policy Disputes in Today's Germany." After giving an overview of the legal basis of the topic, he dealt with the current dispute over the German asylum and citizenship laws. He discussed in depth the causes of immigration pressures as well as possible solutions for combatting xenophobia and neo-Nazism in Germany and Europe.

The second half of the workshop introduced a cultural-historical perspective. Henry Friedlaender, professor of history in the Department of Judaic Studies at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York, offered "Some Remarks on the History of Xenophobia in Germany." He approached the problem by comparing the pluralism of the United States to Germany's questionable ability to cope with the condition of heterogeneity. His talk was guided by two questions, namely, the fragility of Germany's democracy and the "Germanness" of the current wave of violence.

Jeffrey Peck, professor of German at the Center for German and European Studies of Georgetown University, presented his contribution as a series of theses. He analyzed various German terms, such as *Ausländer*, *Heimat*, and *Deutscher*, and traditions, such as citizenship laws, that may lend insight into the German mentality and the tendency toward nationalistic aggressiveness.

After a break for lunch, Michael Lerner, editor of the magazine *Tikkun*, commented on the talks given in the morning session. He approached the problem of hatred of ethnic minorities by rooting it in its individual psychological sources.

Lerner's thesis was one of the main points in the extensive discussion following his comments. Participants raised the question of whether the search for the positive side of German history necessarily led to a revisionist treatment of its dark side, particularly the Holocaust. Other questions and remarks referred to the topics of German citizenship,

asylum laws, and concept of nation. What was lacking, however, was an accurate reconstruction of the process of revising German and Nazi history, which started in the early 1980s and is closely associated with the so-called *Historikerstreit*. This aspect could have offered an understanding of the West German background of the current debate.

The papers of this conference will be published in the Institute's Occasional Papers series.

Dietmar Schirmer

III. Research in Progress at the Institute

A. "'The Consent of the Governed': Studies in the History of Suffrage and Disfranchisement in the United States." (Manfred Berg)

The assertion of the Declaration of Independence that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" became one of the great promises of American democracy. This phenomenon contributed both to the early establishment of white male suffrage and to the subsequent emergence of the United States as a paradigm of modern democracies (Tocqueville). Thus, a critical inquiry into the history of suffrage may provide instructive insight into promise and reality in the development of American democracy.

Despite an immense bulk of literature, there is no overall narrative, let alone a synthesis, of the history of universal suffrage in the United States. Many disciplines deal with voting or suffrage, but there are few attempts to combine perspectives, approaches, and results. The history of universal suffrage itself can provide a such a synthesis, because it discusses the central political right that has been claimed at some time or another by all social, ethnic, and religious groups settling in America. The basic analytical categories that have shaped modern U.S. historiography—class, race, and gender—will also serve as guidelines for the study of voting rights.

The scope of this study will encompass the development of universal suffrage in its now widely accepted meaning: the right to participate in general, free, equal, immediate, and secret elections as both a voter and a candidate. To elaborate on its significance in the American context, the introduction will examine the changing interpretations of universal suffrage and representation in American political and constitutional theory and the relationship between franchise regulations, electoral systems, and participation. It will also attempt to establish a typology of disfranchisement.

In principle, the history of the United States from its colonial beginnings to the present will be the frame of reference. The study aims at investigating the major driving and inhibiting forces behind suffrage

extension, such as wars, both in their continuity over time and at their critical points of change. Other central issues will be the strategies of suffrage movements, the role of the federal government, the role of the judiciary, and the responses of political parties to the demand for franchise. By examining how the struggle for voting rights has shaped the American political system, the study intends to contribute to the historiography on democracy in the United States.

Assuming the Weberian paradigm that social science "aims at the interpretative understanding of social behavior in order to gain an explanation of its causes, its course, and its effects," the study will focus on general patterns as well as individual events. Theories and concepts of the social sciences (e.g. voting behavior) have to be employed, analyzed, and empirically tested. While the results of the quantitative "new political history" are important, the project does not include actual statistical work. The "classical" historical method of interpreting texts to reconstruct and comprehend meanings and motives of social action remains the central approach. Furthermore, no work that encompasses both the individual and the general aspects of a historical topic can be completely convincing without a comparative perspective. But, since voting rights in America have largely been under the jurisdiction of the states, a full-fledged international comparison is simply impossible.

There is a formidable amount of literature on suffrage from the viewpoints of various disciplines. Documents of legal and constitutional history, such as proceedings of state constitutional conventions, Supreme Court rulings, and so on, will be important sources. Printed and archival materials of governmental agencies, political organizations, and individuals also provide abundant documentation.

The following are my working hypotheses:

- Suffrage and elections have served different functions at different times. At least three ideal types of elections can be distinguished: elections as a ritual to ensure consensus within a community; elections as a device of partisan struggle; and elections as a competitive but peaceful way to settle conflicts and make decisions. The extension of universal suffrage is a key element in the development of Western pluralist democracies, since they are committed to the acknowledgment of conflicting interests and rules of procedure.

- The "Anglo-Saxon" model of evolutionary suffrage extension is largely a myth, at least in the American case. Generally, the ballot has been obtained only after difficult struggles and persistent efforts by

the disfranchised. A historical approach will have to focus on the particular events and circumstances, such as wars, that have contributed to the success of these demands.

- The modes of disfranchisement follow a three-stage pattern of development: legal disqualification, barriers to exercising the franchise, and vote dilution.

- Among the variety of motives for the denial of voting rights, racism has been the most important and most persistent reason for disfranchisement in U.S. history.

- Disfranchisement, including organizational barriers to voting (e.g. registration rules), has shaped participation and party competition on both the national and state levels for a longer time and to a greater extent than is usually assumed.

- Does suffrage matter? Have the hopes or misgivings associated with suffrage extension been justified? While a mixed balance is to be expected, a long-term historical assessment will presumably show that the struggle for the franchise has paid off.

In the Western legal tradition, suffrage is conceived as an individual right of citizens. However, voting itself serves to aggregate collective interests. In a fragmented and multiethnic society like that of America, the claim for group representation bears considerable centrifugal potential. While, in the past, disfranchisement was frequently intended to preserve social and political stability by excluding what were viewed as forces of disintegration, the United States is now in a period of transition, when preferential group representation is employed as a device of political integration.

B. "Exploitation by Integration: Intellectual Reparations or Scientific Transfer? The Use of German Technology and Scientists by the Allies after 1945 in Electronics, Optics, and Precision Mechanics." (Matthias Judt)

Since the end of the Cold War and the unification of Germany, research on the postwar period has been enlivened by new possibilities to analyze source materials that were inaccessible until 1989. In addition to carrying out new studies on the period, scholars have discussed and re-examined previous findings.

One area under examination is the nature of the reparations Germany paid after 1945 that contributed to the reconstruction of Europe. Most

recently, scholars have investigated the topic of "intellectual reparations"; that is, the German patents, technical documents, and research equipment, as well as human resources, that were confiscated by the Allies for their own benefit.

In my study, I will focus first on the unrelenting economic competition between and among countries, which is magnified during wartime. The war experience allows temporary (during the war) and final (after the war) victors to dictate the future of economic development in a defeated country. I will examine the basic conflict between Germany and the victors of the two world wars. Germany, as a defeated nation,

was subject to the economic regulations of the Versailles Treaty after World War I and to the several four-power agreements that led to its industrial disarmament after World War II.

There was also a conflict among the victors of World War II themselves regarding the use of German industrial and scientific assets for their own economic recovery. Their alliance was only necessary to win the war against Germany. Furthermore, the allies of common ideological ground (France, Great Britain, the United States) were not only competing amongst themselves but also with the Soviet Union to gain, in particular, the use of German scientists.

The second aspect of my research concerns the expectations of the German scientists and technicians who were involved in the field of reparations. It seems that, when confronted with the two possibilities of either taking part in simple reconstruction projects in Germany or continuing advanced research in their own fields (but under Allied control), the scientists and technicians preferred the latter. Undoubtedly, they wanted most of all to sign contracts with the Western Allies and, second, to be able to remain in Germany instead of having to emigrate. They did not exclude totally, however, the possibility of having to emigrate to the East. At least some of those who were forced to move to the Soviet Union had expected as much. By May 1945, the Soviet Union had already begun to invite German "specialists to join the community in the USSR." Members of this group, which included Gustav Hertz, had written letters to their colleagues in Germany describing the conditions and the terms of their stay in the Soviet Union. In East Germany, Soviet occupation authorities concentrated numbers of German scientists and technicians in various locations, usually in confiscated research facilities, from which many were then deported to the Soviet Union. The rest remained at institutions in East Germany, which were turned into Soviet-owned "scientific-technical

bureaus," or at Soviet corporations (*Sowjetische Aktiengesellschaften*, SAGs).

In addition, I will examine the policy of research control and prohibitions, specifically in the cases of electronics, optics, and precision mechanics. Because of the dual applicability of these fields, it was possible for the Allies to control the civilian use of their research results. The Allies were also able to isolate the German economies from selected scientific or industrial developments in the rest of the world for some time. In East Germany, this policy was continued through its integration into the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON).

When the GDR joined the COMECON, the so-called Socialist Economic Integration (*Sozialistische Ökonomische Integration*) resulted in a strong propaganda campaign to put into effect the various bilateral and multilateral agreements on economic cooperation among the COMECON countries. In contrast to West Germany, the loss of some of East Germany's traditional industrial output, due to the Allied controls and prohibitions, became permanent. As part of the Soviet bloc, the GDR was expected to participate in the "socialist industrialization," which entailed primarily the construction (in East Germany, the reconstruction after the dismantling) of heavy industries. The capital to finance the industrialization came from the profits made in other branches, such as the business machines industry.

Otherwise, East Germany profited from its integration with the Soviet bloc. This was especially true in the case of the optics industry, since East Germany had to supply the entire Eastern market with optical instruments and other products. The scientists and technicians who had worked previously in the armament industries were transferred into various civilian industries, such as optics, as part of the reorientation process.

I will begin my research with the year 1945, but will include some background discussion of the war period. It is somewhat difficult, however, to determine an exact point at which the study will end. Usually, examinations of the postwar period end with the formation of the two German states in 1949. This works well in the West German case, because of the termination of several economic restrictions during the implementation of the Marshall Plan and the integration in the Western defense system. But the policy of reparations out of production continued to be a factor in East Germany, which certainly promoted the development of the industries involved but also limited the growth of

the East German economy as a whole. For the most part, it influenced the development of science and research in East Germany, since the planning of research in the GDR was based mainly on its control during the postwar period. Also, the employment of East German scientists and technicians in Soviet-owned facilities was continued until the facilities became the property of East Germany. Although the relationship between East German authorities and the Soviet Military Administration (which reorganized itself as the High Commission) changed, the influence of Soviet authorities on East German economic policy remained constant. In other words, the exploitation by integration did not stop with the year 1949. Due to this difference between the two German states, it is necessary to give a more complete profile of the developments in East Germany in the 1950s.

C. "German Immigrants and African Americans in Mid-Nineteenth Century America: A Study in Group Interaction." (Hartmut Keil)

This study will take a close look at the traditional view of racial and ethnic relations in antebellum America. The relationship between immigrants and African Americans has been described as one dominated by racial antagonism, hatred, and violence, which often erupted into mob action, lynchings, and the murders of black Americans. The traditional explanation for this hostile record has been that these groups had a similar socio-economic status at the time and therefore competed for the same jobs in the labor market. Previous joint exploratory research by Jim Horton and myself has raised substantial doubt, however, as to the applicability of this model to the second largest group of immigrants who arrived before the Civil War, the Germans. Although German immigrants also subscribed to the ideology of nineteenth-century racism, they often expressed it differently and less confrontationally than, for instance, the Irish. Focusing on selected cities in the Northeast, the Midwest, and the South, this project will explore the following hypotheses:

1. German cultural and political traditions, the relative numerical strength of both groups in specific local settings, the near absence of direct occupational competition coupled with a difference in class status, and specific patterns of spatial proximity in the neighbor-

hoods molded social relations in ways that tended to alleviate racial tensions.

2. Racism, as practiced in the United States, was not automatically adopted by immigrants when they stepped ashore but was a gradual learning process and an integral part of, or even a precondition to, becoming integrated into American society. For the German immigrant community, it seems that this process took place at an accelerated pace in the decades following the Civil War.

Applying a comparative perspective, I will look at selected cities in the country's three major antebellum regions in order to find out if, and what kinds of, regional differences existed. Such regional distinctions can be analyzed by comparing typical population patterns and status hierarchies, specific local labor markets, differential degrees of openness of social systems, and access to political, civil, and legal rights. Was job competition an important factor in the cities along the Mississippi River, as Randall Miller has suggested? An analysis of local contexts is essential in order to trace concrete social relations between the African-American and German immigrant populations, and so is the special impact of German liberal democratic thought. Results will be compared with relevant findings on race relations between African Americans and the Irish.

The following cities will be included: Buffalo, Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis, Washington, D.C., Richmond, and New Orleans. A profile of each city's development, population, social and political composition, and industrial and commercial characteristics will serve as a backdrop to the following specific issues that will be addressed:

- a. Demographic, social, and occupational characteristics of the African-American and German population groups: The analysis will concentrate on patterns of migration and emigration; population growth; transiency, newness, and permanence of residency; family composition; level of occupational skill, employment/unemployment, and differential participation in sectors of the economy.
- b. Spatial proximity or distance: A detailed neighborhood analysis will be applied to find out what kind of contacts existed, if any, on the social level and in places of work. This aspect will concentrate on the wards where significant proportions of African Americans and German immigrants lived, or, in the absence of such wards, on those sections where representatives of both groups could be found. I will

look at the physical relationship between homes and work sites and the relationship between housing and household patterns, including the quality of houses, the amount and kind of property ownership, and neighboring household distributions in dwellings and streets. I will analyze the institutional infrastructures, such as the availability of semi-public spaces and institutions, the location of churches, saloons, gymnastic halls, gathering places, and other places of entertainment.

- c. Intermarriage patterns: Intermarriage has been taken as the best indicator of social acceptance of different religious, racial, and ethnic groups on the individual level. In an exploratory study of group relations in the city of Buffalo, Jim Horton and I found significant incidents of intermarriage and joint living arrangements in extended families. We need to know whether this was an exceptional case or if similar patterns can be observed in other cities as well.
- d. Incidents of racial violence: What were the occasions for such violence, and who participated in race riots? Were the New York draft riots of 1863 typical in that Germans tried to abstain from physical violence against blacks?
- e. Expressions of racism by public spokespersons and in publications of the German immigrant communities: During the 1850s, a new generation of German-language publications appeared in the United States, many of them founded by so-called forty-eighters, liberal democrats and socialists who had emigrated from Germany after the failed revolution of 1848. While their opposition to slavery and support of abolition have been well documented, racial views that were expressed in the German-language press and the relative impact of these papers, as compared with the traditional Democratic-oriented papers, in the communities where they were published still need to be gauged.
- f. Perceptions of German immigrants by the African-American community: Leaders of the black community expressed favorable views of German immigrants. There are indications that this bias was the result of close relationships with the radical German community, for example, in New York City and in Hoboken, New Jersey. How important were these personal and communicative networks for promoting cooperation in the cause of abolition? How widespread

was the support given by German intellectuals and artisans, and what was the connection between an ideological proclivity deriving from the European liberal tradition, basic humanistic principles, public and press opinion, and actual everyday practice?

It should be evident that this study must rely heavily on work by other scholars, such as community and neighborhood studies, histories of the respective cities, and monographs on race relations and race riots. Emphasis will be placed on reconstructing the work and everyday living situations of German immigrants as well as on the ways in which these aspects affected their perspectives on African Americans and the actual interaction between the two populations.

D. "The Meaning of Political Institutions: Political Culture and Institutional Configurations in Germany and the United States."
(Dietmar Schirmer)

Unlike Almond and Verba's behaviorist definition of the concept, I do not view political culture as an aggregation of individual political attitudes. Referring to recent works and theories in anthropology, ethnology, and the sociology of culture, I understand political culture as a more or less coherent structure of political assumptions, as a specific means to make sense of and give meaning to political events. From this perspective, one can interpret political institutions as the materialized form of a dominant political culture or, in other words, as the codified expression of the basic assumptions of political order and legitimacy within a society. Thus, the task of my research is to decode the assumptions of reasonable and justified political rule inscribed in the system of political institutions, that is, to analyze political institutions as signs and symbols. In this sense, the project aims to construct and evaluate political semiotics.

The subjects of my research are the legislative, executive, and judicial institutions in Germany and the United States on the federal level. With respect to the heuristic approach of the project, I have found it useful to introduce a comparative perspective and to deal with two institutional systems representing opposite poles, in terms of their history and structure, within the framework of Western democratic systems. By contrasting one of the oldest established democracies with one of the youngest; a single presidential system with one of the purest

parliamentary systems; and a self-confident, "innocent nation" with a country that has a deeply uncertain and fractional political identity, it seems possible to prove the analytical power of the concept of a semiotic approach to political institutions.

The institutional configurations of the American and German political systems will be examined with respect to the following dimensions:

- a. Modes of political representation. The question of adequate representation of the *demos* within the political process has turned out to be the main problem of political legitimacy in the modern age. It is obvious that the constitutional and practical answers to this question differ widely. Thus, I will look into the significance of areas of divergence between the American and German traditions, such as elections; outlets in the political arena for the great variety of social differences; divisions of legislative members based on gender, region, religion, or race; and governmental departments and the committee systems of the parliaments, which both reflect and formulate policies and issues regarded to be the most important. Furthermore, I intend to analyze the plenitude of symbols representing the values, norms, and cultural and political heritage that are shared—or, in the view of those in power, should be shared—by all or virtually all members of each political system.
- b. The nations' capitals: architecture and representation of the political order. Political systems always try to demonstrate their self-understanding in the architectural forms of their representative buildings—by interior and exterior design as well as topographical arrangement. For example, the District of Columbia is a perfect reflection of the American system: the particular situation of the White House and the Capitol on the perpendicular axes of the city signals the dualism of the executive and legislative powers that they represent. Similarly, the architectural symbolism in Berlin can easily be decoded: The neighboring *Schloß* and *Dom*, which represented the monarchy and the church as the two dominant powers of the Empire, occupied the most prominent position in the center of the old city, whereas the new, constitutionally weak *Reichstag* was erected on the opposite side of the Brandenburg city gate.
- c. The political encyclopedia. During the nineteenth century, which was shaped by the rise of the bourgeoisie as well as by broader access to education and a growing rate of literacy, encyclopedias

increasingly became a representative type of literature exhibiting an aura of truth and objective knowledge. This is also true of the political knowledge that encyclopedias impart: facts about the political system in general, particular institutions and offices, and basic values and norms. The encyclopedia implicitly provides the linkage between the political system and the public opinion that research on political culture tries to make explicit. Therefore, I will analyze such political key words as state, government, democracy, and freedom as defined in encyclopedias.

My project focuses on decoding the basic cultural patterns of cognitive, evaluative, and affective assumptions that mold political reality in the three dimensions under examination and will apply it to the entire political discourse.

The purpose of the project is to construct and evaluate an analytical concept integrating institutional theory and political culture, rather than to reconstruct the historical process. Therefore, I will look at three synchronic periods based on the significance of the expected results within a comparative framework that does not seek to be complete but exemplar. The time intervals chosen are the turn of the century (the Gilded Age and the German Empire), when the German and American political systems faced largely similar developments and demands; the 1930s (the New Deal and National Socialism), when their comparable political and social problems resulted in substantially different responses; and the cold war era, when the United States was rising as one of the two superpowers and the West German state was taking the shape of a Western representative democracy.

E. "Emigration from Thuringia to the United States in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century." (Ulrike Skorsetz)

Although the historical and social research in the former West Germany has led to extensive works on the various aspects of emigration from parts of West Germany to the United States and on the immigration experience of Germans in the New World, emigration from the eastern parts of Germany is only now being seriously investigated.

At the outset of my research on emigration from Thuringia, I visited the archives of various Thuringian principalities. I decided to concentrate on the districts of Saxony-Weimar, Saxony-Altenburg, and

Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, limiting my work to the second half of the nineteenth century. This time period stands out because a decree of 1848 by the Thuringian government officially allowed its subjects to emigrate, provided they were granted an emigration permit from the local authorities and announced their intentions in the local newspaper. I was able to use these permits and newspapers as sources for my project.

Initially, I tried to gather statistical data on the emigration from the districts under investigation. However, my main focus is not on the statistical elements but on the social backgrounds of those who emigrated. I chose the sample year 1852, since it marked the first high point of emigration from Thuringia. In fact, the figures for 1852 were never surpassed in the district of Saxony-Weimar.

Other aspects that I looked into included the legal and technical conditions of emigration as determined by the laws in the different districts; the existence of emigration agencies and societies; the availability of financial support for very poor emigrants; and restrictions on emigration.

For the main part of my study, my research in the United States over the next few years will concentrate on the fate of Thuringians in the New World. Where did they settle? To what extent was it possible to pursue the course of individual life after settlement in the United States? What economic and social positions did individuals or groups attain? Did the church help the Thuringian emigrants? If so, what sort of help did it give? Did the Thuringians retain their language, crafts, and customs (such as woodcarving, glassblowing, pottery, literature, papers, societies, etc.)? Did they maintain their ties with the Old Country? Did they write to family and friends and encourage others to follow them? How many of them returned home?

The greatest difficulty seems to be finding out exactly where the Thuringians settled. However, there are some leads: One group that emigrated from Saxony-Altenburg settled together in the vicinity of St. Louis and named its new town Altenburg. In addition, it is known that the Thuringian Emigration Society bought land in Pennsylvania and then sold it to fellow Thuringians.

In answering these and other questions, I have so far received a great deal of help from American colleagues and genealogical researchers. For instance, I have learned that some Thuringians settled in Wisconsin, New Hampshire, and Texas.

I would greatly appreciate any further information on this matter; I may be contacted at the Institute.

F. "A Social History of Household Trash in the United States." (Susan Strasser)

In this project, I am inquiring about the afterlives of objects of everyday life, studying disposal as part of the larger process that encompasses production, distribution, purchase, and use. As such, it involves—in addition to putting things in the garbage or taking them to the dump—a set of choices with both economic and social dimensions that has included reuse, recycling, remodeling, fixing, using leftovers, and giving things away.

My earlier work provides me with a distinctive perspective on this social and cultural history of household refuse. In *Never Done: A History of American Housework* (1982) and *Satisfaction Guaranteed: The Making of the American Mass Market* (1989), I explored complementary aspects of a fundamental transition in the American everyday experience. During the decades around the turn of the twentieth century, products manufactured, packaged, and advertised by large corporations replaced locally produced, often handmade and homemade goods. Along with new products that had never been made by hand, these objects transformed the ways in which people commonly fed, clothed, and sheltered themselves. *Never Done* studied housework as an economic activity, with an eye on technology, the labor process, and the broad scope of American capitalist development. *Satisfaction Guaranteed* examined the creation of markets for household products, concentrating on the new kinds of relationships between producers, middlemen, and consumers that were represented by the new products, their packaging, and their brand names. Like both of these books, my current project will focus on the interface between the private and the public, the economic (but not necessarily monetary) relationships of the household, and the domestic consequences of economic activity.

In the project's first stage, which culminated in my Annual Lecture at the Institute in the fall of 1991, I surveyed secondary literature in a number of fields and a smattering of primary sources, in the process discovering both the breadth of the subject and its novelty. I found in nineteenth-century America a highly developed recycling system—a producers' market in rags, paper, bottles, bones, metal, and grease for

which households had no further use. I also developed a theoretical and conceptual base that rested on the work of Mary Douglas, Michael Thompson, and Kevin Lynch.

Using these writers' focus on process, trash may be understood as part of the normal functioning of the household and the economy. The economic proposition is straightforward: the growth of markets in new products depends on the continuous disposal of old things. In the household, the creation of trash is part of the creation of living, and the sorting process that determines whether something is trash is part of the housework. As the production and distribution processes changed during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, so did disposal and Americans' relationships to waste. Like the other aspects of the cycle, disposal became more commercialized and more subject to the profit motive, economies of scale, and other dictates of capitalism. And it emerged as a public issue, a problem of poverty during the early years of the twentieth century, and a problem of affluence at its end.

Except for limiting my primary source investigations to the United States, I have deliberately kept my definition of this topic broad in scope; like my previous work, this project encompasses many potential monographs on which work has not yet been done. Moreover, there is no obvious research strategy; no single source or archive provides a basis for other research or a vantage point from which to examine other documents.

Instead, the current stage of this project requires further work on a wide range of specific topics, such as scavenging, electric garbage disposers, product packaging, leftovers, disposable products, yard waste, and the marketing of products, such as pet food, that have substituted purchased goods for waste products. I am, for the most part, using published sources at the Library of Congress, such as trade journals, women's magazines, domestic manuals, home economics textbooks, city directories, government documents, and the writings of reformers.

G. "The Edition of the Diaries of David Zeisberger." (Carola Wessel)

As part of the effort of the German Historical Institute to make German sources in American archives available to scholars, Professor Hermann Wellenreuther and I are currently producing an annotated edition of the diaries of David Zeisberger, a Moravian missionary who lived among

the Delaware Indians in Pennsylvania and Ohio in the eighteenth century. Written for the information of other Moravian congregations, these diaries are kept in the Moravian Archives in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Since they were written in old German script and are thus extremely difficult to read, these diaries have remained virtually inaccessible to American scholars, who might not have otherwise ignored such a valuable source of information.

In addition to the description of congregational life in a missionary town, which is of interest to theologians and church historians, the diaries offer many facts about the life of traditional Native Americans in the Upper Ohio Valley. They are therefore one of the few sources for anthropologists and ethnohistorians who study eighteenth-century indigenous cultures.

The most important information to historians is that on Lord Dunmore's War and the Revolutionary War. This particular edition is limited to Zeisberger's records of the years 1772–1781, when the missionaries and the Christian Indian congregation settled in the Upper Ohio Valley. Since they lived in close proximity to the Delaware capital of Goschachgunk (Newcomerstown), it was impossible for them to refrain from politics. With the American forces in Fort Pitt and the British in Detroit, the Upper Ohio Valley was an area of conflicting and competing interests. Both parties tried to convince the Delawares to fight on their side or at least to remain neutral. Zeisberger influenced the decisions of the Delawares, since he was present in their councils and interpreted and wrote letters for them.

In addition to detailed annotations, the edition will contain a comprehensive introduction covering the historical, theological, and anthropological background, as well as an extensive index.

Related to this editorial project is my dissertation on the Delawares during the Revolutionary War, for which I will consider the Zeisberger diaries as a main source. I intend to describe the life of the traditional Delawares and the Christianized Native Americans in the mission congregation and to analyze the degree to which their lives were changed by European influences. My focus will be the interaction of Native American tribes (mainly Delawares, Shawnees, and Minques) among themselves and with the British and Americans. Since there has been little information on the role of the Native Americans involved in the American Revolution, this research promises to provide new insights into their decision-making processes, politics, and diplomacy.

IV. Institute News

A. Spring 1993 Lecture Series

- Jan. 27: Peter Hayes, Northwestern University, "German Big Business and the Persecution of the Jews."
- Feb. 16: Christopher R. Browning, Pacific Lutheran University, "The Euphoria to Victory and the Path to Genocide: Hitler and the Final Solution."
- March 2: Doris Bergen, University of Vermont, "Christianity, Anti-Semitism, and the Quest for Manly Religion in the Third Reich."
- March 10: Atina Grossmann, Columbia University, "Sex Reform and Social Medicine from Weimar to National Socialism: The Problem of Continuity."
- March 25: Jay W. Baird, Miami University, Ohio, "Lyric Nazism: Heroic Imagery in the Literature of the Third Reich."
- April 22: Gerhard L. Weinberg, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, "German Plans for Victory, 1944–1945."
- June 2: Klemens von Klemperer, Smith College, "Beyond Luther? Dietrich Bonhoeffer and the Resistance against National Socialism."

B. Annual Lecture 1993

Stanley N. Katz, director of the ACLS and professor of history at Princeton University, will deliver the Institute's seventh Annual Lecture on November 15, 1993. The topic of the lecture will be announced at a later date.

C. Third Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture

Professor Ludger Kühnhardt of the University of Freiburg im Breisgau will give the Institute's third Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture on May 27, 1993. His topic will be "Ideals and Interests in Recent German Foreign Policy."

D. Conferences to Be Sponsored or Co-Sponsored by the Institute in 1993

In addition to those announced in Bulletin No. 11, the Institute has scheduled the following scholarly conferences for 1993:

"Allied Transfers of Technology from Germany after 1945 or 'Intellectual Reparations'." September 16-18, 1993, at the German Historical Institute.

"Medicine in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Germany: Ethics, Politics, and the Law." December 1-4, 1993, at the German Historical Institute. Co-sponsored by the Goethe-Institut, Washington, D.C.

E. Scholarship Recipients for 1993

The following scholars have received stipends from the Institute to carry out research on their dissertation topics in 1993:

Anjana Buckow, "The American Image of the GDR in the HICOG Files, 1949-1953/54." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. H.-J. Rupieper, University of Marburg.

Mathias Eberenz, "Vision and Reality in Chicago: The World's Columbian Exposition of 1893 as Cultural Symbol and Anticipation of the American Century." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. R. R. Doerries, University of Erlangen-Nürnberg.

Rudolf Herz, "Photography as a Medium of the Hitler Myth: The Life and Work of Heinrich Hoffman." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. Detlef Hoffmann, University of Oldenburg.

Solvejg Höppner, "Immigration and Settlement of Jews from Eastern Europe in Saxony, 1880-1933." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. Ulrich Heß, University of Leipzig.

Thomas Kohlmann, "German Emigré Architects and Designers in New York." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. Tilmann Buddensieg, University of Bonn.

Marion G. Müller, "Comparing Strategies of Political Imaging: Election Campaign Posters in Germany, France, and the United States." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. Peter Reichel, University of Hamburg.

Manfred Neumann, "Alamancilart (German Turks) and Chicanos: A Comparative Study of the Acculturation of Mexican Migrant Workers in the United States and Turkish Migrant Workers in West Germany." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. Dirk Hoerder, University of Bremen.

Eva Pietsch, "A Study of the Process of Class Development: The Organization of Ethnic Workers among the Amalgamated Clothing Workers in Baltimore, 1914-1938." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. Klaus Tenfelde, University of Bielefeld.

Ansgar Reiß, "Democracy without Enlightenment: The United States as Perceived by the German Revolutionary and Emigré Gustav Struve." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. Günther Lottes, University of Regensburg.

David J. Staley, "In Whose Image? Knowledge, Social Science and Democracy in Occupied Germany, 1943-1955." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. Alan Beyerchen, Ohio State University.

Manuela Thurner, "Free Black Women's Associational Activities in the Antebellum North, 1793-1860." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. Nancy F. Cott, Yale University.

Ulrike Weissenberger, "The War Powers Resolution: Aspects of a Democracy." Doctoral Advisor: Prof. Graf Kielmansegg, University of Mannheim.

F. Announcement of Dissertation Scholarships

The German Historical Institute offers scholarships to doctoral students working on topics related to the Institute's general scope of interest. Applications for scholarships to be taken up any time during 1994 should be sent to the Director no later than **May 31, 1993**, together with the following supporting information:

- curriculum vitae;
- detailed plan of study, including research proposal, anticipated time frame, and archives to be visited in the United States;
- two letters of recommendation, one of which should be from the applicant's doctoral advisor.

American applicants should be working on topics of German history for which they need to evaluate source material located in the United States.

Scholarships are awarded for three to twelve months; the average grant lasts six months.

G. Library Report

The library has recently acquired the updates for the National Inventory of Documentary Sources in the United States (NIDS), a collection of finding aids of archival holdings in the United States. The finding aids are on microfiche in four parts. Part 1 consists of the Federal Records; Parts 3 and 4 contain the collections of state archives; state, academic, and research libraries; historical societies; and other repositories. We do not carry Part 2, which includes the holdings of the Library of Congress Manuscript Division.

The index to the records, which was previously available either in book form or on microfiche, is now on CD-ROM. This facilitates the search and use of the material. The Institute has two microfiche readers, one of them with a printer, for consulting the finding aids.

H. Staff Changes

Dr. Hanna Schissler, research fellow, left the Institute in December 1992 to assume a position as visiting professor of history at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis.

Dr. Peter Becker of the Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte in Göttingen will join the Institute as a research fellow on June 1, 1993.

I. Exhibition: "Jewish Portraits"

The German Historical Institute, in cooperation with the Goethe-Institut Washington, D.C., recently presented an exhibit of "Jewish Portraits" by Herlinde Koelbl. This photo-documentary was an effort to capture the images of well-known German Jews who fled or were expelled from Nazi Germany and to document their individual reflections on Germany, anti-Semitism, and German-Jewish relations.

At the opening reception on February 4, 1993, Countess Ute Baudissin, director of the Goethe-Institut, and Minister Fritjof v. Nordenskjöld, deputy chief of mission of the Federal Republic of Germany, introduced the exhibit. Henry Friedlaender, professor of history in the Department of Judaic Studies at Brooklyn College, spoke on "Jewish Immigration after 1933." Hartmut Keil, deputy director of the German Historical Institute, commented on the address.

After closing on April 4, 1993, the exhibit went to the Goethe-Institut in St. Louis.

V. Miscellaneous

A. "War and Peace in the History of the United States." 15th Annual Conference of the Historians of the German Society for American Studies. Tutzing, February 19-21, 1993.

The conference, which was organized by Wolfgang Krieger, brought together more than seventy scholars in the wonderful setting of the Bavarian countryside. After greetings from Krieger and Klaus Grosch, Ernest R. May delivered the keynote address on "War and Peace in American History."

In the first session, "Fundamental Questions," Knud Krakau gave a paper on "War, Peace, and International Law: American Ambivalences," and Alfred Loesdau talked about a number of controversial matters related to war and peace in American historiography, especially after 1945.

The second session focused on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Mark Häberlein and Wolfgang J. Helbich discussed the role of German immigrants in the French and Indian War and the Civil War, respectively. Stig Förster spoke on the topic of industrialized people's wars, using the Civil War as an example. David Blight commented on the papers.

Jürgen Rohwer opened the third session, "The Twentieth Century," with a paper on changes in American strategic planning from 1890 to 1945. Jan Heitmann presented his research on "The Engagement of German Merchant Submarines in World War I" Michael Wala then reviewed the military connections between the United States and Weimar Germany. One of the highlights of the day was the slide show that accompanied Gert Raeithel's paper on American GIs and the Vietnamese civilian population. Following a break for dinner, there was a roundtable discussion on "The Internationalization of the *Journal of American History* and the OAH" moderated by Willi Paul Adams. David Thelen, editor of the *JAH*, was a "special participant" at the meeting.

The final session gave an overview of research in progress. Cornelia Wilhelm spoke about her project on loyalty problems of German-Americans between 1939 and 1945. Heike Bungert discussed the perception

of the Nationalkomitee Freies Deutschland and the Freie Deutsche Bewegung by the United States from 1943 to 1955. Burghard Jähncke presented his work on the German-American Mixed Claims Commission. Wolfgang Krieger concluded the conference with a paper on "The United States, the Nuclear Age, and What Next?"

Ulrike Skorsetz

B. National Archives II: A Communication from Don W. Wilson, Former Archivist of the United States

"Nothing endures but change," wrote Heraclitus some twenty-five centuries ago. All of us realize the wisdom that resides in these four words. Heraclitus might well have added that sometimes one must endure change itself. You and we, researchers and archivists, are facing a major change in how the National Archives serves its publics. This is because of the construction of a new main facility, commonly referred to as "Archives II."

Preparations for the relocation to this new facility, the move itself, and adjustments to the research environment of Archives II will affect all of us for the next several years. Like many changes, this one has its unpleasant aspects. I am reminded of the construction signs that read "Short-Term Inconvenience, Long-Term Improvement." That message may not be very comforting when we are heading down an unfamiliar detour or waiting in a long line of traffic for a paver to do its work. But temporary annoyances are necessary for progress, whether that is a new highway or a new archival facility. The result, the largest and most modern archives in the world, will be well worth what researchers and archivists must endure to get there. I would like to share my enthusiasm for Archives II with you and describe some of those temporary annoyances.

The National Archives and its users have for many years struggled with overcrowded and otherwise inadequate storage spaces, research rooms, offices, and public areas in a building that was erected almost sixty years ago. Despite our best efforts to keep up with growing needs, our holdings have been dispersed, working conditions for our staff members have been substandard, and our researchers have had to work under less than satisfactory conditions. The truth is that the National Archives has for years been unable to provide the kind of research environment for its increasing number of researchers that it *should* provide.

We who work for the National Archives feel this inadequacy as much as does the researcher who is squeezed into a research room or must wait awhile for a microfilm reader.

Years ago, the National Archives concluded that no solution to this situation could be achieved at its 7th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue location. We ultimately chose, therefore, to construct an entirely new facility adjacent to the campus of the University of Maryland at College Park. Archives II, begun in October 1989, is less than a year away from completion. The outer construction is finished, interior partitions are mostly in place, the mobile shelving (all 520 miles of it) is being put into position, and equipment and furniture are being installed. The first National Archives staff members will relocate in the fall of 1993, and the initial records to be moved will be close behind them.

Archives II will—for many scholarly researchers—largely replace the original National Archives Building in downtown Washington, D.C. With 1.7 million square feet on six floors, the National Archives will be able to consolidate the archival records and staff members that have been housed at numerous sites in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. Most of the civil records of the Federal Government (major exceptions are the records of Congress and the Supreme Court) and many military records will be transferred to Archives II. In addition, all nontextual and electronic records will be relocated there, along with conservation laboratories, research facilities, the Nixon Presidential Materials, and a large proportion of the archivists and other staff members of the National Archives. (Most family history records will remain in our existing building.)

Among the many features of Archives II are a number of particular interest to researchers. There will be only one security checkpoint for access to all of the research rooms, which are clustered together in one part of the building. These rooms, I should add, look out over a pleasant, wooded vista. The addition of Archives II will mean far more seats, microfilm readers, and copying equipment than we now have. Archivists will have commodious places for consultations with researchers. A totally new Archival Information System for reference use will be installed. Free parking for hundreds of researchers and visitors, as well as a full-service cafeteria, will be provided. Archives II will be linked by shuttle bus to the adjacent University of Maryland and to the nearest Metro station. From a long-term perspective, we can also rejoice in the fact that records will be maintained in optimal conditions, in stack areas as secure from fire, physical deterioration, and

other risks as we can make them. And, with the additional space in the new building, the National Archives will be able to accession more records, more quickly, so that our holdings will begin to increase rapidly again.

All in all, then, we at the National Archives look forward to a much happier state of affairs, for both researchers and the professionals who assist them. You will have a much-improved research environment. You will be able to do your research more efficiently. You will have more records available to you. And we can meet the standards that you—and we—expect the National Archives to meet. I am convinced we will achieve our goal of making Archives II the finest archival repository in the world.

One consequence of the relocation to Archives II, of course, is that records to be moved have to be temporarily unavailable as they are readied, physically transported, and then reopened at Archives II. It goes without saying that the job of transferring and rearranging 1.3 million cubic feet of records cannot be handled all at once! Careful planning will enable us to take records out of use for only a short time—probably no more than six or eight weeks. Researchers planning a trip to use records in the National Archives should, therefore, be aware of the fact that records may be temporarily unavailable. We are publicizing as widely as possible our schedule for the move so that potential researchers are informed about it. I suggest that you write to Donn Neal at the National Archives, asking to be put on the mailing list for the *Archives II Researcher Bulletin*. When we get closer to the actual move, we will announce the telephone number of a recorded message with the latest updates.

The move schedule calls for non-textual records (cartographic, motion picture, sound, videotape, still photography, and electronic records) to be transported first, between December 1993 and March 1994. Textual records will move, as complete record groups, in clusters that correspond to the major departments of the Federal Government. This portion of the move will extend through December 1995. (The attached chart lists when these clusters are expected to move.) Records in the National Archives have, in fact, already benefitted from the move, even though it is months away: our staff members have been working energetically to identify *all* the records the National Archives already holds; to rebox, preserve, and otherwise prepare records for transfer; and to design a new arrangement of records so that complementary holdings

can be brought together in the stacks. Naturally, all of this will benefit researchers, too.

Through various newsletters and the other means I have mentioned, researchers will be able to tell when the specific record groups within the clusters will be moving to Archives II. I am sure that researchers are as eager as we at the National Archives are to have this period of transition behind us. What keeps us going is the knowledge that a far better research and working environment awaits us in Archives II. Good planning, a little patience, and a growing sense of anticipation should get the National Archives through this relocation. We appreciate the understanding of researchers who approach our move in that same spirit, and we look forward to the time when we can welcome you to Archives II.

Don W. Wilson

TEXTUAL RECORDS MOVE BY CLUSTER

<u>Cluster</u>	<u>Timeframe</u>
Interior	Jan.-Sept. 94
Agriculture	Jan.-Oct. 94
Transportation	Jan.-July 94
Commerce	Feb.-Oct. 94
Energy	July-Sept. 94
Labor	Sept. 94.-Apr. 95
State/Foreign Relations	Sept. 94-Apr. 95
General Government	Oct. 94-Apr. 95
Justice	Nov. 94-May 95
Science	Dec. 94-Apr. 95
Treasury	Apr.-Dec.95
EOP/Presidential Agencies	Apr.-June 95
Health	Apr.-July 95
Modern Army	Apr. 95-Mar. 96
Education	June-Sept. 95
Air Force	July-Sept. 95
Housing	Sept.-Oct. 95
Defense	Oct. 95-Mar. 96

The move of classified records from the National Archives Building and WNRC to Archives II is planned for Sept. 94–Oct. 94. Nixon materials are planned to be moved from Pickett Street to Archives II between December 1993 and January 1994.

NONTEXTUAL RECORDS MOVE TO ARCHIVES II

<u>Records</u>	<u>Timeframe</u>
Cartographic	Dec. 93-Jan. 94
Motion Picture, Video	Jan.-Feb. 94
Still Photography	Feb.-Mar. 94
Electronic	Mar. 94

C. Announcement of GSA Annual Meeting

The German Studies Association will hold its seventeenth annual conference in Washington, D.C., October 7-10, 1993, at the Hyatt Regency Bethesda. Those interested in attending the conference or learning more about the program should contact the program director, Prof. Kees Gispén, Department of History, University of Mississippi, University, MS 38677 (tel.: 601-232-7148; fax: 601-232-7734; Bitnet: HSGISPEN-@UMSVM; INTERNET. HSGISPEN@VM.CC.OLEMISS.EDU.)