

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

BULLETIN

Fall 1990

Issue No. 7

Editors: Hartmut Lehmann and Kenneth F. Ledford, 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. - 5:00. p.m.

© German Historical Institute, 1990
MAC entire G R A P H I C S

The BULLETIN appears twice a year and is available free upon request.
ISSN 1048-9134

The next issue of the BULLETIN will appear in Spring 1991.

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

BULLETIN

Fall 1990

Issue No. 7

Contents

I. Preface	3
II. Accounts of the Discussions at the Conferences Sponsored and Co-Sponsored by the German Historical Institute in 1990.	5
A. "Paths of Continuity": Central European Historiography from the 1930s through the 1950s— Atlanta, March 1990	5
B. Elections, Mass Politics, and Social Change in Germany –1939: New Perspectives-Toronto, April 1990	10
C. Max Weber's "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism" Reconsidered—Washington, May 1990	12
D. Mutual Influences on Education: Germany and the United States. German Influences on Education in the United States to 1917—Madison, September 1990	14
E. The Reformation in Germany and Europe: Interpretations and Issues—Washington, September 1990	17

III. Institute News.	20
A. Research Fellowships for Visiting Scholars.	20
B. Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture.	20
C. Special Conference Report: New Research on Women in the Migration Process—Bremen, March 1990	20
D. Summer Program 1991.	24
E. Staff Changes.	26
F. Scholarships.	27
G. Fall Lecture Series..	27
H. Seminars on Special Aspects of German Unification.	28
I. Miscellaneous.	28

I. Preface.

Ever since the historians of the German Democratic Republic left the *Verband der Historiker Deutschlands* in the late 1950s, relations between historians from the Federal Republic of Germany and the GDR have been difficult. The number of contacts was small, and in the meetings that did occur the exchange of ideas was overshadowed by the ideological positions that the historians of the GDR were expected to represent, and which they very often seemed to represent with conviction. Moreover, until recently German historical institutes abroad had been put by the-SED on a so-called black list, which meant that historians from the GDR were not allowed to visit or have contact. At the same time, American history was almost totally ignored in universities and the academy of sciences in the GDR, and, characteristically enough, some historians at Jena and Leipzig who had begun to work in the field of American history in the past two decades were not included in the *SED-Reisekader* and thus were forced to study the history and culture of a country that they had never been able to visit.

Since November 9, 1989, these and other restrictions are a matter of the past. Since October 3, 1990, the mandate of the German Historical Institute in Washington also encompasses the task of supporting historians in the universities of the former GDR, just as we are to help those American historians who have a research interest in the history of the former GDR or who want to conduct research in the archives or libraries situated there, that is in the federal states of *Mecklenburg-Vorpommern*, *Sachsen-Anhalt*, *Thüringen*, *Sachsen*, and *Brandenburg*. Therefore, we are preparing a second edition of our *Guide to Inventories and Finding Aids of German Archives* (Reference Guide No. 2) in which the archives of the former GDR shall be included.

Furthermore, with the help of the Federal Ministry of Research and Technology, we have been able to invite three historians from the GDR, one senior colleague from Jena and two doctoral students from Leipzig, whose field is American history but who had never before been to America. Although they can be with us only for a few weeks, these visiting fellows are very important for us. We can engage with them in

discussions about matters that we were able to witness only from a distance; moreover, we hope that their visit marks the beginning of our contribution to the process of rebuilding the field of history in the universities of the former GDR.

This issue of our Bulletin focuses on the conferences carried through by the Institute in 1990, and contains, as always, various other important pieces of information.

Washington, D.C., October 1990

Hartmut Lehmann

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

- A. "Paths of Continuity: Central European Historiography from the 1930s through the 1950s". Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, March 16–18, 1990. Conveners: James Van Horn Melton and Hartmut Lehmann.

The academic proceedings of this conference began with Winfried Schulze's (Bochum) paper on "German Historiography from the Thirties to the Fifties." Schulze described in some detail a now famous meeting held under Werner Conze's auspices in Bad Ems in 1957. This meeting heralded the beginning of *Sozial-* or *Strukturgeschichte* in postwar Germany. Raising a central theme of the conference, Schulze questioned the origins of this development. He emphasized that from the 1920s on there had been a boom in *völkische* interpretations of German history, a trend opposed to dominant interpretations based on the primacy of the *Nationalstaat*. These *völkische* interpretations of German history stemmed largely from a renewed interest in *Ostforschung* during the Weimar period and were an attempt to study and preserve German culture and influence outside of the boundaries of the German nation-state. During the Nazi period, of course, *völkische* interpretations were the norm in the German historical profession. After 1945 there was little break in personnel among German historians, and as a result, *völkische* interpretations continued; a major aspect of the post-1945 period was, however, an attempt to de-nazify the concept of *Volkstum*. Schulze pointed to Freyer, Ipsen, and Brunner as the major conduits of *völkische* interpretations from the Weimar period to the post-1945 generation of historians led by Werner Conze. Thus the *Sozial-* or *Strukturgeschichte* proclaimed by Conze and the other historians gathered in Bad Ems in 1957 marked a continuity with prewar interpretations of German history.

In his comment, Georg Iggers (SUNY Buffalo) agreed with Schulze's views on two points: the continuity of conservative attitudes in the German historical profession, and that Conze's *Sozial-* or *Strukturgeschichte* did not represent a break with the past, but rather had its roots in the *völkische* ideas current in the Weimar and Nazi periods. Iggers then, however, argued that Schulze had told only part of the story. The emergence of social history in the 1950s cannot be explained without reference to the role of émigré intellectuals who returned to Germany after 1945. While relatively few refugee historians came back to Germany, émigrés in other fields—including Max Horkheimer, Otto Flechtheim, and Richard Löwenthal—did, and brought with them older German

traditions of critical analysis which had survived National Socialism in exile. While Schulze ended with events in the late 1950s, the beginning of the 1960s saw many developments in the field of social history. The Fischer Controversy, the republication of Eckart Kehr's works by Hans-Ulrich Wehler, a new interest in Weber, and the rediscovery of other streams of thought banished from Germany after 1933 all influenced a new generation of historians in the direction of social history; at the same time, these developments were ignored by Conze and Theodor Schieder. Thus while some of the impulses for social history came from Freyer and Ipsen via Conze, many others came from other traditions.

In the discussion, Schulze argued that Iggers's interpretation of the origins of the social history of the late 1950s and early 1960s has become the dominant historical interpretation. He wished to show that there were nonetheless impulses from the German historical profession of the 1920s and 1930s which were significant for the social history of the 1950s and 1960s. At this point, other conference participants joined the discussion, raising the issue of whether 1945 represented a break with German traditions of historiography (Lothar Gall, Frankfurt); arguing that between the 1930s and the 1950s there was a fundamental continuity of structural antimodernity in the German historical profession (Jörn Rüsen, Bochum); and asking why there was a period of silence between 1945 and 1959 (Charles Maier, Harvard).

In the next session Klaus Schwabe (Aachen), Lothar Gall, and Fritz Fellner (Salzburg) spoke on Gerhard Ritter, Franz Schnabel, and Heinrich Ritter von Srbik. Schwabe argued that Ritter did not change his approach to history after 1945, since he felt that he had already done so in the wake of Hitler's ascent to power. At that time Ritter had attempted to defend the autonomy of professional historians from Nazi intervention; he also became increasingly interested in the nature of value judgments in history. Between 1933 and 1945 Ritter wrote several historical studies which, Schwabe argued, could be read as anti-Nazi publications.

In his comment, Thomas Brady (Oregon) disagreed with Schwabe, arguing that Ritter's approach to history remained essentially unchanged from the 1920s through the 1950s; the new approaches which Schwabe saw in Ritter's work after 1933 were, at best, nuances.

In his paper on Franz Schnabel, Lothar Gall questioned the grouping of Schnabel with Ritter and Srbik in the conference program. Gall argued that Schnabel was a pillar of German revisionism: opposed to a purely political history, Schnabel argued for a broadly-based European structural history which would address the overarching themes of any given time period. Although Schnabel always remained something of an outsider in the German historical profession, he was influential because he offered a new methodological position: a, structurally analytical *Weltanschauung* from an idealistic perspective.

Hartmut Lehmann (German Historical Institute) agreed with Gall that Schnabel was one of the finest historians of the period under discussion. Schnabel, however, was not really an outsider after 1945, particularly since he had not compromised himself during the Nazi period. Lehmann then outlined some of Schnabel's positions prior to 1933. During the interwar period Schnabel publicized unpleasant truths about the First World War by giving an unvarnished account of the domestic war front, and by making no attempt to cover up the military defeat of 1918: By continuing to treat German history honestly, Schnabel maintained a degree of continuity in his historical work from the 1920s to the 1950s quite unique among his colleagues.

Participants then discussed why Schnabel did not take on more of a leadership role within the German historical profession after 1945. Schnabel's Catholicism (Schulze), his wariness of self-proclaimed leaders (Gall); and his reluctance to play the role of a *Machtmensch* (Fellner) were all reasons for why Schnabel did not occupy a dominant position in the postwar historical profession. The discussion ended with Gall remarking that Schnabel was limited in his potential influence after 1945 because he had become a more conservative historian.

Fritz Fellner then spoke on Heinrich Ritter von Srbik. He argued that Austrian historians found themselves in a situation very different from that of their German colleagues after 1945. The Austrian historians were thrown out of German historical traditions and, in fact, out of the German historical profession. Because Srbik had always attempted to integrate Austrian history into German history, there was no place for Srbik in Austria after 1945. In his comments on Fellner's paper, John Boyer (Chicago) raised a number of questions concerning Srbik. What did it mean for Srbik to be a German nationalist? What role did Catholicism and Christianity play in Srbik's life and work? Was Srbik a collaborator in the Third Reich?

In the ensuing discussion, James Melton (Emory) underscored the point that Srbik's books are unduly criticized because of their sharp anti-semitic tone and Srbik's relationship to the Third Reich. Srbik's works cannot simply be written off because of his pronounced anti-semitism, yet at the same time one cannot ignore the issue. A heated discussion ensued about whether there was a contradiction between Srbik's and Ritter's words and deeds vis-a-vis anti-semitism (Schwabe and Fellner arguing with Iggers). Because there are known cases in which these historians protected individual Jews, can Srbik and Ritter be somewhat excused for the compromises they made with the Third Reich?

Douglas Unfug (Emory) chaired the session on Hermann Aubin, Hans Freyer, and Otto Brunner. Marc Raeff (Columbia) described Aubin's program of *geschichtliche Landeskulturforschung* as a sort of *Heimatkunde*.

Aubin's main methodological tools included historical cartography and the investigation of languages. Aubin was interested in a total history, in the *Gesinnung* of a given area. In his *longue durée* approach, Aubin incorporated elements of structuralism similar to the *Annales* School, but because of Germany's history, Aubin stressed localism in his analyses. Aubin focused on the racial, ethnic, and cultural aspects of a given community, since these were the unifying factors of *Germanentum*. Nazi vocabulary seduced Aubin because it articulated his understanding of history.

Jerry Muller (Catholic University) spoke on Hans Freyer. He questioned whether there is a link between *Sozial-* and *Strukturgeschichte* and liberal/democratic traditions or political views. Muller described Freyer as a conduit of structural analysis from nineteenth-century historical traditions to the *Sozialgeschichte* of the 1930s to 1950s. In the postwar period Freyer was influential because he relayed the importance of sociology and social and economic structures for historical analysis. His pessimistic analysis of modernity was also influential after 1945.

In his talk on Otto Brunner, Melton emphasized that while social history is usually viewed as having leftist origins, other origins should also be examined. He then outlined why Brunner was important as a forerunner of Conze's *Sozial-* or *Strukturgeschichte*. Brunner had broken decisively with nineteenth-century historical traditions, particularly with the obsession with the nation-state. Brunner's ideas concerning "disjunctive" history, his interest in the peculiarities of Austrian historical development, and the boom in *Volksgeschichte* in the 1920s and 1930s led him to question the primacy of the state in historical analysis.

In his comment, Roger Chickering (Oregon) argued that the "missing man" or "uninvited guest" at this conference was Karl Lamprecht. Lamprecht's interest in "total history," "in a history which included demographic, social, economic, intellectual, and other histories; his intellectual debt to Roscher and Burkhardt; and his challenge to the primacy of the state in historical analysis all found resonance in the Bad Ems Group.

Steven Rowan (University of Missouri, St. Louis) commented on Melton's talk, remarking that Brunner has long been a "guilty pleasure" for many contemporary historians. Brunner's work resembled that of the *Annales* school, although in large part it is the non-progressive or anti-progressive elements of the *Annales* school found in Brunner's works. Finally, Rowan commented on the coherence of Brunner's vocabulary; cultural pessimism and nostalgia permeate his writings.

In the discussion, Iggers reminded the conference participants that three kinds of social history were being discussed simultaneously: first, the social history of the *Annales* school, of Lamprecht, and of the *völkische*

social history; second, the social history of Hans-Ulrich Wehler and Charles Tilly, an analytical tradition which has its roots in Marx, Weber, and positivism; and third, the new cultural history influenced by post-modernist anthropology. While the conference participants had been right in suggesting that social history in general had some roots in the first of these kinds of social history, Iggers questioned whether the speakers had not attributed a greater role to this social history than it merited. In a rejoinder, Melton argued that it was necessary to look at those roots of social history which have been ignored. Work has been done on Eckart Kehr's influence; should this not be complemented by an examination of the more conservative origins of social history? Raeff summed up this part of the discussion by saying that a feature of the whole tradition of social history is that it can be used by historians of different schools in many different ways.

Charles Maier opened the session of the conference on Werner Conze and Theodor Schieder, commenting that the conference had been, to date, a filio-pietistic exercise. Irmeline Veit-Brause (Deakin University) then spoke on Conze, arguing that continuity in the German historical profession was essential for Conze's identity with his profession. Given the interruptions in Conze's life and career, who are we to question his search for continuity?

Jörn Rüsen argued that the historicism so prevalent in Schieder's work was the only way he could approach what he perceived as the catastrophe of 1945. In essence, Schieder needed the continuity which historicism represented to explain the discontinuities of recent German history. Furthermore, Conze and Schieder never abandoned their earlier approaches to history; social history supplemented their historical methodologies. Rüsen ended his remarks with the comment that Schieder's neo-historicism will find renewed interest in the future German historical profession.

In his comments on Veit-Brause's paper, Peter Reill (University of California, Los Angeles) returned to the issue of continuity and discontinuity. There could be no break after 1945, because admitting such a break would have destroyed the profession. The *Volksgeschichte* of the 1920s and 1930s became the *Sozialgeschichte* of the 1950s; basically, there was just a name change. Thus, he wondered, was the earlier *Volksgeschichte* already the new social history? Reill then argued that Conze's *Sozialgeschichte* was rooted in the historicist tradition and that the "new" *Sozialgeschichte* did not include an epistemological critique of the "old" historicism.

Maier commented on Rüsen's paper on Schieder. He argued that the conference participants were dealing with historical fathers rather respectfully; one could, however, commit patricide. The historical fathers

in question were deeply conservative. To these historians, 1933 was not the tragedy, but rather 1945. It is important to get some distance from these historians. Maier then questioned whether Rüsen's view of Schieder's historicism as a strategy for survival after 1945 was really operational.

The final session of the conference was devoted to witnesses' accounts of the German historical profession after 1945. Felix Gilbert (Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton) gave a talk on "German Historical Scholarship after 1945," in which he recounted his impressions of the German historical profession in 1945, when he traveled around Germany as an American soldier. After Gilbert's remarks, Anneliese Thimme (Alberta), Hans-Günther Zmarzlik (Freiburg), and Fritz Fellner, on a panel titled "The Younger Generation after 1945," offered personal remembrances of their student days. In each of these historians' remarks, the leitmotiv was their disillusionment with how the standard bearers of the *Historikerzunft* treated German history after 1945.

In a short discussion in which some of the main themes of the conference were reiterated, Muller argued that the rise of Conze's and Schieder's *Sozialgeschichte* meant the exclusion of many kinds of questions because they could not be addressed in the framework of *Sozialgeschichte*: the role of the *Bildungsbürgertum*, the rise of National Socialism, and the Holocaust were topics simply not addressed by Conze and Schieder. Hartmut Lehmann and James Melton then closed the conference proceedings.

Catherine Epstein.

B. "Elections, Mass Politics, and Social Change in Germany, 1890–1933. New Perspectives." Regional Conference of the German History Society, organized in co-operation with the Goethe Institute, Toronto, and the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., Toronto, April 20-22, 1990. Conveners: James Retallack and Larry E. Jones.

If anyone believed that social history is on its way out and about to be replaced by a new emphasis on the narrative and the history of politics, he or she should have been in Toronto in late April. No, social history is alive and kicking, especially in North America and Great Britain. The British German History Society, which has long promoted the social historical approach to Germany's past, held one of its regional conferences in Ontario's thriving capital. James Retallack of the University of Toronto

provided an excellent organization, and the German Historical Institute in Washington was happy to co-sponsor an extremely useful gathering of experts.

Ever since the great debates of the 1960s and 1970s, there has been a wide-spread agreement that the analysis of elections, mass politics, and social change is crucial for an understanding of that extremely important period in Germany's history between 1890 and 1933. But since, for example, Hans-Jürgen Puhle, Hans-Ulrich Wehler, David Blackbourn, and Geoff Eley clashed over problems of German social history, the German *Sonderweg* in general, and political manipulation from above or self-mobilization from below, research in those fields has not stood still. This, if anything, became more than apparent during the conference at Toronto. In fact, research has gone much more into details and, at the same time spread out to previously rather neglected areas. For example, there is now a distinct emphasis on gender history, as well as a tendency to localized case studies. Many of the papers presented at the conference reflected these new developments. It is impossible to discuss all these papers here, but contributions such as Kathleen Canning's "Gender and the Culture of Work: Ideology and Identity in the World behind the Mill Gate, 1890–1914," Elizabeth Harvey's "Young Women, the Public Sphere and Party Politics in Weimar Germany," or Robert Hopwood's "Casting a Local Polity, Kulmbach, 1880–1900," were good examples of the general trend. *Alltagsgeschichte*, the history of daily life, still very controversial among German historians, was also on the agenda (David Crew), and Roger Chickering's "Political Mobilization and Associational Life: Some Thoughts on the National Socialist German Worker's Club (e.V.);" made an excellent example of combining this approach with standard social history. All this combined provided a more varied, sometimes controversial, and even revisionist (Richard Bessel) view of modern German history.

I have to admit, though, that I was less impressed by the way the papers were presented, or rather not presented. Rather than being read, the papers of each session were summarized and discussed by admittedly generally excellent commentators. However, I would have preferred to hear more from the authors themselves than just rather brief statements. Thus many interesting details of some papers were lost on the way. On the other hand, some of the general debates among the participants proved to be very interesting, not least because some people like Gerald Feldman, who did not present papers, found the opportunity to make valuable contributions. It is perhaps a pity that these lively debates will not be published when the papers appear in the Institute's series.

Certainly the conference seemed quite crowded, with twenty-five scheduled papers. But there were still some important gaps in the program which somewhat diminished the general success of the conference. It was for instance a pity that the "Bielefeld school" of German social historians was so underrepresented. Had Wehler, Kocka, or some other member of this "school" participated, the proceedings might have been even more interesting and the debates even more lively. Also, the overemphasis on social historical specialization sometimes led to strange results. Thus local developments in places like Kulmbach received more attention than central political issues such as tax reform or the Agadir crisis in Imperial Germany, the debate on Germany's war guilt in the Weimar period, and the impact of economic disaster after 1929, all of which had profound influences on elections and mass politics at the time. Under such circumstances, an all too radical separation of social history from other areas of modern historiography, particularly political history, remains problematical. The conference in Toronto was sometimes a good example of that.

But this is not meant to diminish the achievements of the conference, which provided an excellent picture of the latest trends in research on Germany's social history.

Stig Förster.

C. Max Weber's "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism" Reconsidered.
Washington, May 3–5, 1990. Conveners: Guenther Roth and Hartmut Lehmann.

In the past decades, research on Max Weber's famous essay, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, has developed in three distinct directions. Historians of 17th century history, and especially those involved in the history of countries in which Calvinism had taken root, used Weber's thesis in order to clarify whether, and if so how, ascetic Protestantism had indeed initiated and advanced the growth of capitalism. While some of them found proof which supported Weber's thesis, others claimed that they could refute it. At the same time, Weber's essay, published in 1904/05, was taken as a milestone in Weber's intellectual development which seemed to reveal how he had gained a new level of scholarly competence while recovering from the illness which had forced him to give up lecturing at the University of Heidelberg before the turn of the century. Moreover, for biographers of Weber, his essay served to exemplify his theoretical remarks on the use of ideal types in writing

history and on the significance of religious versus economic factors in history. Sociologists of religion, finally, used Weber's thesis on the relationship of ascetic Protestantism and the spirit of capitalism in order to gain arguments for constructing universally applicable laws of development which in turn could be used to strengthen the work ethic, and thus capitalism, in developing countries.

While the members of these three groups used the same text as a point of departure, in the past decades the way they interpreted the text, and some of their conclusions, drifted further and further apart. Moreover, for American scholars as compared to European students of Weber, as a result of the different history of Weber scholarship since 1920, his essay played a different role when they discussed its meaning and importance. Considering this, it seemed appropriate to assemble those Weber scholars who had occupied themselves particularly with the *Protestant Ethic* in recent years, in order to confront conflicting interpretations and probe the possibility of gaining common ground. With the generous financial assistance of the Fritz Thyssen Foundation, and with Guenther Roth (from Columbia University) and Hartmut Lehmann acting as conveners, a group of historians, sociologists, and historians of religion assembled in Washington from May 3–5, 1990.

The five papers of session I were devoted to an exploration of the "intellectual and cultural setting": Friedrich Wilhelm Graf (Augsburg) was able to show that many of the sources Weber had used, were not from the period 1880–1900 but from the 1830s–1850s; Hubert Treiber (Hannover) compared Nietzsche's notion of a monastery of the intellectual elite with Weber's ideal type of a sect; Thomas Nipperdey (Munich) analyzed Weber's place in the tradition of *Kulturprotestantismus*; Harvey S. Goldman (Columbia) explained relations between Weber's concept of the Protestant Ethic and *Bildungsbürgertum*; while Harry Liebersohn (Claremont) elaborated Weber's observations on national identity and national character.

After a public lecture in which Hans Rollmann described various aspects of Troeltsch's and Weber's trip to America in 1904, the three papers of session II threw light on the differences between, and the development from, the First to the Second version of the *Protestant Ethic*. Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer (Munich) explored the role of Weber's thesis in his studies on the economic ethics of world religions; Klaus Lichtblau (Kassel) interpreted Weber's concept of a "new ethic"; while Hartmut Lehmann compared Weber's view on the rise of capitalism with those of Sombart.

In session III, Philip Benedict (Brown) and James Henretta (Maryland) examined the role Weber's views had played in recent scholarship on European and colonial American Calvinism respectively, while Paul

Munch (Essen) discussed the way confessional prejudice had shaped research on the connection between Protestantism and economic progress.

In session IV, the most outspoken of Weber's current critics, Malcolm MacKinnon (Toronto) defended his views in a discussion with Kaspar von Greyerz (Kiel), Guy Oakes (Monmouth), and David Zaret (Indiana). In session V, finally, Guenther Roth (Columbia) and Gianfranco Poggi (Stanford) explained how differently Weber's thesis had influenced German and American sociology and historiography.

Of the various results of this scholarly enterprise, several deserve to be noted. Most speakers agreed that Weber's insights, his conceptualization of the historical meaning of the influence of the "Protestant Ethic" as well as his terminology were very much determined by the level of scholarship of his own time. In this sense, Weber's thesis is clearly "dated" and two generations after his death only of relative importance. At the same time many participants of the conference pointed out that Weber had articulated his thesis in a way which had stimulated research on the rise of capitalism in a most remarkable way and continued to do so, and that no one since him had had an influence on research which equalled his. While the conclusions drawn by historians and sociologists from reading this text of Weber may be different, the conference served to underline the lasting importance of his work.

Hartmut Lehmann.

D. "German Influences on Education in the United States to 1917". Madison, Wisconsin, September 12–15, 1990. Conveners: Jürgen Heideking and Jürgen Herbst.

Throughout the last three decades, the history of education has undergone a renaissance that has placed it at the center of some of the most active scholarship in social and intellectual history. As particularly the late Lawrence Cremin has shown so magnificently in his massive three volume opus on *American Education*, the history of education is no longer restricted to the history of the school. On both sides of the Atlantic, educational historians have come to claim large areas such as childhood and adolescence, family and gender, science and popular entertainment as legitimate targets of exploration, and their studies have enriched the body of the existing historical literature.

This development is also apparent in the growing list of journals and books devoted to educational history, and in the activities of the various national history of education societies and their international counterpart, the International Standing Conference for the History of Education.

As part of this larger movement, the Madison conference was jointly sponsored by the German Historical Institute, the Max Kade Institute for German-American Studies, and the School of Education of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Wisconsin, with its large German heritage and its cultivation of German academic ideals in university and state government, made the choice of place all but inevitable, and one of Madison's landmarks, the Meeting House of the Unitarian Society, designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, provided a good working atmosphere to contemplate the perceptions and probe the meaning of what is called the German influence on American education. The organizers achieved a balanced representation of geographic origins and interests of the participants. Half of the speakers came from Germany and half from the United States. They represented scholars in the fields of education, history, the history of science and of medicine, the classics, archeology, and linguistics. Their contributions ranged from the kindergarten to the university and professional schools, from charitable foundations to popular and religious education, from adult education to teacher training to individual teachers and scholars.

Three introductory lectures given by Jürgen Herbst (Wisconsin), Detlef Müller (Bochum), and Peter Lundgreen (Bielefeld) opened up a comparative perspective and set the tone for the following eight sessions: "American Views on German Education" (Konrad Jarausch, North Carolina; Karl-Ernst Jeismann, Münster; Gregory Wegner, Wisconsin-LaCrosse); "Schools and Churches in Two Societies" (Karl-Heinz Günther, East Berlin; Jochen-Christoph Kaiser, Münster; Derek S. Linton, Geneva, New York); "The Education of Women" (Ann Taylor Allen, Louisville, Kentucky; Gerald L. Gutek, Chicago; James C. Albisetti, Lexington, Kentucky); "German Schooling in America" (Dimitri Katsareas, Washington; Bettina Goldberg, Berlin; Anthony Gregg Roeber, Chicago); "Higher Education" (Thomas N. Bonner, Detroit; William M. Calder III, Urbana, Illinois; Sally Kohlstedt, Minneapolis); "Teacher Education" (Hans-Georg Herrlitz, Göttingen; Kathryn M. Olesko, Washington; Julian Jacobi, Bielefeld); "The Professor in Germany and the United States" (Ward W. Briggs, Jr., Columbia, South Carolina; Jörg Nagler, Washington, Bernhard vom Brocke, Marburg); "Religious Education" (Burchard Brentjes, Halle; Gary K. Pranger, Tulsa, Oklahoma; Manfred Jacobs, Münster).

Underlying all the papers and discussions was the question of how to define more precisely what we might legitimately consider to be German influences on American education in the various disciplines and fields of observation. In her paper, "German Science Seminars and Teacher Training in America," Kathryn M. Olesko tried to explain the concept of "influence" as an outside impulse that destabilizes the existing system and forces it to regain its balance on a higher level. In this sense, German influences helped to advance and shape the American system of education especially in the second half of the nineteenth century. Whereas earlier impulses seldom reached beyond German immigrant circles, the impact of German ideas and institutions during this period definitely contributed to the formation of a distinctively American educational culture. Two of the most well-documented examples are the establishment of graduate schools at American colleges and the professionalization of teacher education. The cultural transfer was promoted either by German immigrants and visiting professors or by American scholars who spent some time at German universities. Yet the dream of a "republic of letters," in which Germans and Americans would participate on equal terms, never came true. At the turn of the century, American academics had gained enough self-confidence to resist what they now began to perceive as attempts at "cultural hegemony" on the part of Imperial Germany. The tendency to regard the "Prussian model" as incompatible with the democratic and egalitarian ideals of American education could not be reversed by a formalized exchange of German and American professors that began in 1905 at the initiative of the German government and was patronized by Kaiser Wilhelm II. This episode ended abruptly with the outbreak of war in Europe; it constituted nevertheless an early example of *Kulturpolitik*, which in the course of this century became an integral part of the foreign relations of most nations.

The lively discussions in Madison made it clear that in the context of an immigrant culture such as that of the United States, the question of "influence" can ultimately be answered only in a comparative setting. German influences existed among others; and the conference proved that it is possible to detect, delimit, and describe them in detail. Against the background of the present crisis of the United States' educational system, the papers and debates also held out the promise of readjustment and reform by profiting from other peoples' experiences.

Two exhibitions—on German education in Wisconsin and on the American activities of the *Franckeschen Stiftungen* (Halle/Saale)—formed part of the conference. Social highlights were a reception at the Max Kade Institute and a dinner at the University Club. In 1992 this conference will be followed up at the University of Tübingen by a parallel effort to study American influences on German education, chiefly in the twentieth

century. On that occasion, a thorough reconsideration of the effects of post-World War II reeducation and cultural exchange programs in light of German reunification seems to be especially important and appropriate.

Jürgen Heideking/Jürgen Herbst.

E. "The Reformation in Germany and Europe: Interpretations and Issues."

Washington, D.C., September 25–30,1990. Conveners: Scott Hendrix, Heinz Schilling, Hartmut Lehmann.

From September 25–30, the Society for Reformation Research and the *Verein für Reformationsgeschichte* held their first joint congress in the form of a symposium, "The Reformation in Germany and Europe: Interpretations and Issues," co-sponsored and hosted by the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C. The multi-faceted program reflected the diverse memberships and research interests of both groups. Especially gratifying was the opportunity for several colleagues from the eastern part of Germany to participate freely for the first time in decades in a gathering of German and North American scholars of the Reformation. Conveners were Scott Hendrix for the Society, Heinz Schilling for the *Verein*, and Hartmut Lehmann for the Institute.

The richness of the program, which contained thirty-nine papers, numerous insightful comments, four public lectures, as well as many opportunities for informal discussion, prohibits detailed discussion of each paper on each panel. The first day's papers, however, set the stage for further discussion by addressing the question of the "Unity of the Reformation?" The very manner in which the issue was framed, as a question, indicated that the papers would reach little agreement. The principle point of agreement was that the Reformation, like many of its individual manifestations such as anti-clericalism, was protean. As Mark Edwards (Harvard Divinity School) stressed in his paper, "The Many Luthers of the Vernacular Press," both reader and popularizer ("representer") invested Luther's teachings (and those of other reformers or counter-reformers) with their own context. The dialectical relationship of reader and text, of individual and experience leads inexorably toward a diversity of experience and calls into question the usefulness of a concept such as the unity of the Reformation.

The second day of the symposium was devoted to the theologians, to the "Theology of the Reformation." Approaches as varied as an exegesis of Thomas Aquinas', Martin Bucer's, and John Calvin's commentaries on Romans 9 (David Steinmetz, Duke Divinity School); the "ring of faith"

image in art, stressing that God's promise will be fulfilled (Derk Visser, Ursinus College); the foreign policy considerations in the decision by south German free cities to "turn Lutheran" (James M. Kittelson, Ohio State); and the centrality of justification by faith alone to all reformers (Martin Brecht, Münster) and the *Schriftprinzip* to John Wycliff and others (Gustav Adolf Benrath, Mainz) all illustrate the manifold directions in which a focus on theology leads Reformation researchers.

The third day of the conference was devoted to "The Reformation and the Common People," and discussion revolved largely around the thesis of the *Gemeindereformation* expounded by Peter Blickle (Bern). Tom Scott (Liverpool) in particular advanced a critique from both ends; *within* the communes, reform strivings aimed more at *ecclesia* than *doctrina*, at reform of the secular behavior of the church rather than doctrine; moreover, *absence* of a full-fledged reform of doctrine does not necessarily mean a failure of the reform, but rather can mean that the clergy had been domesticated without a Reformation, and that thus the goals had been successfully achieved. Most agreed that the communal reformation was a salient strand in the tangle of motives for Reformation, perhaps even the most salient strand, but that it cannot be made to serve as the sole explanation for the phenomenon. New methodologies must bring new sensitivities, and a pre-Foucault view of the *Gemeinde* can overemphasize the constitutional to the neglect of the cultural-symbolic significance of Reformation.

Merry Wiesner-Hanks (Wisconsin-Milwaukee) and Grethe Jacobsen (Copenhagen) spoke on the ambivalent meaning of the "Reformation of the Women." More examples exist of attempts to impose reforms upon women than of women being given the opportunity to carry out their programs of reformation. Both adduced evidence that while men thought of women as a sex, women saw themselves as a gender, in a role imposed upon them by society.

Friday, September 28, saw the treatment of "The Cultural Significance of the Reformation." Topics as diverse as the impact of the Reformation upon the nobilities of Germany (H. C. Erik Midelfort, Virginia), the impact of Max Weber upon Reformation scholarship (Hartmut Lehmann, German Historical Institute), and popular religiosity in Lutheran almanacs (Robin Barnes, Davidson College) and Catholic testamentary requests for masses for the deceased (connecting changes with the price revolution of the 16th century) (Carlos M. N. Eire, Virginia) showed how far new methodologies and conceptualizations reach.

The symposium concluded on Saturday, September 29, with an examination of "The Reformation and Politics." The speakers stressed that the decision by a ruler to introduce the Reformation was inherently, even primarily, a political one, and the consequences varied according to

the political constellation at hand. Lutheran princes or cities in Germany had more room to maneuver than did Calvinists in France in how they approached the state and state authority. Even Calvin faced political struggles both within and without the structure of the church before he established his system in Geneva. Finally, the confessionalization of religion played an important role in the formation of the modern state-system over the course of the 17th century.

Throughout the conference, participants enjoyed the helpful assistance of the staff of the Institute and the sights and opportunities of Washington, D.C. Particular highlights were a visit to the Folger Shakespeare Library and a concert with works by Johann Sebastian Bach in the United Church of Washington on Friday evening.

Papers from the conference will be published by the Society and the *Verein* in a special number of their journal, *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*.

Kenneth F. Ledford.

II. Institute News.

A. Research Fellowships for Visiting Scholars.

As announced in Issue number 6 of the BULLETIN, the Volkswagen Foundation has awarded a grant jointly to the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C., and the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies of the Johns Hopkins University to support three research fellowships annually. The fellowships are open both to historians and political scientists, and recipients will spend up to one year as Fellows of both institutions while carrying out a research project in the field of postwar German history, especially the period 1945–55. Each year one fellowship will be granted to a "Junior" applicant, that is, someone who possesses a recently-conferred Ph.D. degree; one will go to an "Advanced" applicant, one who is working on a second substantial project, equivalent to a German *Habilitand/in*; and one will go to a "Senior" applicant, that is, one who has completed a second substantial research project, the equivalent to a German *Privatdozent/in* and above.

Applications for academic year 1991–92, during which fellowships must begin between April 1, 1991, and October 1, 1991, should be sent to the Director of the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., 1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009, *no later than* January 1, 1991, together with a current *curriculum vitae*, a list of publications, a project description (*no longer than* ten (10) typed, double-spaced pages), and a maximum of three letters of recommendation.

B. Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture.

Information as to the invitation for applications for the first Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture, announced in the Spring 1990 BULLETIN (Issue No. 6), will be forthcoming in the Spring 1991 BULLETIN (Issue No. 8).

C. Special Conference Report.

From time to time, one of the Research Fellows attends a conference whose subject is so timely, so closely related to the Institute's research focus, and whose participants so clearly should be made known to a wider audience that a special conference report is appropriate. In March 1990, Dr. Sibylle Quack attended the innovative conference in Bremen which she describes here.

New Research on Women in the Migration Process. Bremen, March 24–25, 1990.

On March 24–25, 1990, a conference dealing with new research projects on women in the migration to the United States, Europe, South America, and Africa was held at the Department of History of the University of Bremen. Initiators of the conference were Christiane Harzig and Monika Blaschke from the University of Bremen. Harzig heads and Blaschke participates in an international project on Swedish, Irish, Polish, and German women emigrants to Chicago, which is connected with the Labor Migration Project at the University of Bremen.

The invited speakers were mostly younger researchers from history departments of several German universities who discussed the results of their scholarly investigations into the acculturation process of women in different countries in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

As many speakers emphasized, this approach to immigration history is by far less common in German history departments than it is in the United States. While German research has addressed all kinds of economic, ethnic, and religious aspects of emigration and immigration, it has minimized migrant women's experiences by perpetuating stereotypes such as the tradition-keeping housewife and mother.

As Agnes Bretting (Hamburg) noted, there are several important studies which focus on immigrant women in different ethnic groups in America (e.g., Gabbaccia, Yans-McLaughlin, Diner) and in the labor market and in unions (Hareven, Dickinson), most of them written by American authors. But with the exception of Diner's book on Irish women, those studies do not deal much with the living conditions of women in their countries of origin. Bretting pointed out that autobiographical sources—besides church records, statistics, and demographical studies, which can provide objective data on the living conditions—could help to answer questions of the motives behind the decision to leave the home country as well as women's expectations and wishes as they came to America. Did German women migrants in the nineteenth century simply follow their husbands, fathers, or brothers, or did they make their own decisions? Why did they leave? Would a better approach be to measure their success in the new country against their wishes and dreams?

Taking as an example the diaries and letters of five women who had emigrated between 1836 and 1893 from Germany to the United States, to both rural and urban areas, Bretting showed how different personal backgrounds influenced the women's hopes and decisions and also their attitudes and thinking in their acculturation process in America.

Bretting then suggested that the most common motive for German women to emigrate was the search for an improved economic situation, which they believed could only be found in the United States. Their motive in leaving was not so much the wish to become more emancipated or to attain more personal freedom, but primarily the desire to change their economic status, Bretting argued, although there were of course exceptions, such as women like Franziska Anneke, whose life was then described in a lecture by Anette Bus (Bremen).

The observation that economic motives were decisive for women's emigration from Germany was certainly true in the cases of German *Dienstmädchen*, who emigrated as young unmarried women to the United States in the nineteenth century, although *Abenteuerlust* played a role as well. Silke Wehner (Münster) gave an insight into both their motives in leaving the homeland, and their process of acculturation in the United States. Wehner argued that for many women the position as *Dienstmädchen* was a transitional stage to becoming housewives and mothers. She pointed out how important this experience was for the acculturation of these mostly very young women: Living in with American families, they learned American customs very rapidly. They later on passed them on to their daughters, taking an active part in the acculturation process of the German-American family. Very early, daughters began to choose occupations in fields other than domestic service in much larger numbers than their mothers. Thus, Wehner criticized one-sided pictures of immigrant women as victims of migrations, clinging to tradition and unable to adapt to the new country. Her talk showed how important it is to analyze experiences of women in different life situations and not to generalize.

Irene Haeberle (Berlin) pointed out in her talk on *Frauenvereine* in the United States, 1870-1930, that it is necessary to focus on women as citizens even in a time when they had fewer civil rights than men. She showed how immigrant women from Germany organized their lives, taking part as active members of the ethnic communities through their own organizations. *Frauenvereine* were hardly mentioned in studies on German-American communities, which focused on male-dominated organizations. Haeberle also suggested that research on women's organizations could provide an approach to women in the public sphere, whereas recent studies of ethnic women's history research have mainly emphasized the private sphere of women.

How did the German-American press deal with women? Monika Blaschke (Bremen) analyzed women's pages and women's magazines, which began when Franziska Anneke founded her *Deutsche Frauenzeitung* (1852–1854), but reached their high point after 1900, when women more and more were addressed as consumers. From the women's

pages, it is not only possible to reconstruct problems of immigrant women's everyday life but also to point out the mechanisms of perpetuating traditional pictures of women. The magazine *Hausfrau*, for example, shaped the ideal of a German *Hausfrau*, who was supposed to keep German traditions alive in the family. At the same time, the *Hausfrau* gave immigrant women lots of practical advice about the life in America, thus becoming an important factor in their acculturation process.

Although Socialist newspapers like the *New Yorker Volkszeitung* had a more progressive approach in emphasizing *Berufsausbildung* for women, they nevertheless perpetuated stereotypes about women and "women's values." It was necessary, Blaschke concluded, to study the role of women's press in the process of acculturation of immigrant women from different social classes.

To find a German-American women's culture in Chicago before the turn of the century, Christiane Harzig (Bremen) examined the women's page of the *Illinois Staats-Zeitung* and the *Frauenzeitung* of the *Chicago Freie Presse* and other sources of the German-American community. She discovered lively elements of such a culture in neighborhoods, occupations, and in the German-American community. She stated that this *Frauenkultur* was very heterogeneous, different in social class, religion, region of origin, and women's life cycle. Harzig insists upon defining *Frauenkultur* not with traditional patterns but more by focusing on spheres of action which were shaped by women. She argued against ideas of a "female culture" which defined women as passive and emotional because of their gender.

In another section, the conference dealt with exile and emigration of women emigrants from National Socialist Germany. Sibylle Quack (Washington, D.C.) showed in her talk how gender roles in German Jewish families often changed after Hitler came to power, and how these gender relations were also typical for the families in emigration. Taking New York as an example, she pointed out the decisive role women played in the survival of German-Jewish emigrants and their families' reestablishment thus playing an important role in the acculturation process of German-Jewish immigrants. Christine Backhaus-Lautenschläger (Bremen) argued that emancipation of women emigrants from Nazi Germany had not taken place, although women had often carried the burden as the family's sole breadwinner in the first years of emigration. She assumed that women emigrants had no opportunity to work for their own aims and development because they were forced to work in low paying positions and could not continue in their own occupations.

Other talks focused on women migrants in different times and countries. Barbara Henkes (Groningen) gave a speech on German *Dienstmädchen* in the Netherlands after World War I; Rosa Lind Arndt-

Schug (Nürnberg) on German women immigrants in South Brazil in the 19th century; Sieglinde Gränzer (Bremen) on German women in the German colonies in Africa (1884–1914); and Andrea Koch-Kraft (Bremen) on women immigrants in Edmonton, Canada, after 1945. Britta Fees (Pulheim) spoke about prostitutes in San Francisco, 1848–1870, and Sarah Deutmoser (Hamburg) gave a talk on "*Mädchen and Frauenhandel*" at the turn of the century. A concluding discussion showed that it was necessary to confront images of immigrant women in the literature and in the contemporary sources in the receiving country with their experience in reality. The participants agreed that it was not enough to repeat stereotypes of women's life, but that research must question their active role in private and public spheres. Was, for example, education (*Bildungsinhalte*) mainly transferred by women? How did they pass on ethnic culture to their children and to the community? What role did they play in keeping ethnic identity in the new culture? How could "success" in their acculturation be measured? It was agreed that studies on those subjects could provide a new view and more complete results in the history of acculturation processes of both men and women migrants, and of their ethnic cultural communities.

The proceedings of the conference will be published as a collection of essays.

Sibylle Quack.

D. Summer Program for North American Graduate Students in German History 1991: Course at the *Herzog August Bibliothek* in Wolfenbüttel and tour to Archives in the Federal Republic of Germany, June 2–July 3, 1991.

The German Historical Institute is very pleased to announce that it will organize a second summer program for North American graduate students in German history in the summer of 1991. The summer program is made possible by a grant from the *Stiftung Volkswagenwerk*. The inaugural program took place from June 5–July 6, 1990, with twelve present or prospective graduate students from twelve different academic institutions participating. The 1991 summer program will begin on Sunday, June 2, 1991, and last until Wednesday, July 3, 1991, and will consist of two parts:

I. *Summer Course in Wolfenbüttel.*

The first part of the 1991 summer program is a three-week summer course at the *Herzog August Bibliothek* in Wolfenbüttel, lasting from Sunday, June 2, to Friday, June 21. The aim of the course is to:

- introduce young North American scholars of German history to German handwriting of the 16th to 20th centuries;
- give an introduction to the organization of research libraries and archives in Germany;
- enable participants to conduct independent research on their own projects in the rich holdings of the *Herzog August Bibliothek* (whose holdings are richest in the early modern period); and
- refresh their knowledge of bibliographical aids and early modern Latin, if participants are interested.

II. *Tour to archives.*

The second part of the summer program is a tour to archives in the central part of Germany, lasting from Sunday, June 23, to Wednesday, July 3. Its aim is to provide a new generation of North American historians working in the field of German history a better acquaintance with the resources available in Germany. Although the itinerary is not yet definitively set, the 1991 tour will concentrate upon archives in the central third of Germany, and it will visit archives from the *Bundesarchiv* in Koblenz and the *Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes* in Bonn in the west to archives in Leipzig and Dresden in the east. The precise schedule of archival visits will not be determined until spring. The manuscript divisions of research libraries may occasionally be included among the archives to be visited.

At each stop, staff archivists will introduce the program participants to the archive's facilities and holdings. Participants will be provided with orientation materials concerning *Archivkunde* and *Archivwesen* prior to departure, so that each archive will stress the particular nature of its holdings as compared to other German archives *and* the holdings there that could be of interest to each program participant. The object of the tour will be to acquaint participants with the system of organization of archives in Germany and the differences in holdings among the different kinds of archives (national, state, city, private). While at each stop there will be some time for each participant to pursue individual investigation, the purpose will be to acquaint the participant with how to cope with life in an archive. Individual research time will be very limited, and the tour is not to be mistaken for a grant to do research.

The number of participants is limited to 12. The German Historical Institute will pay round-trip airfare (economy; holiday rates) for each participant. During the archive tour portion of the program, participants will be housed in hotels in double rooms, and they will receive a *per diem* payment sufficient to cover main meals. During the course in Wolfenbüttel, they will be housed in hotel, pension, or dormitory, double or single, and will also receive a *per diem*.

Applicants who are available to participate in *both* parts of the program will be given preference. They must already hold a bachelor's degree and should have a working knowledge of conversational and written German. Although the program is intended primarily for graduate students studying German history, applications from others will be considered. It is suggested that the summer program is most helpful for graduate students of history at the end of their first or second years, before they have formally finalized their dissertation proposals. Applications can be made by sending a letter of application, a current *curriculum vitae*, a one page, double-spaced, typed description of dissertation or research interests, and two letters of recommendation to the Director of the German Historical Institute, 1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009, *no later than* January 15, 1991. Those chosen to participate will be informed no later than March 1, 1991.

E. Staff Changes.

Two new staff members have joined the Institute since April 1990:

Carola Wessel, Research Associate, born in Sulingen, 1964. Studied history, German literature, and cultural anthropology in Marburg and Göttingen. Magisterexamen, Göttingen, 1989. As part of the Institute's research project "Editions of German Sources in American Archives," she is preparing a critical edition of the diary of David Zeisberger, who lived in the Ohio Valley as a missionary among the Native Americans there from 1772–81.

Susanne White has joined the staff as Receptionist.

Three staff members have left the Institute since April:

Jürgen Heideking, Senior Research Fellow, has left to accept a call to a professorship in the field of American history in the *Seminar für Zeitgeschichte* at the University of Tübingen.

Catherine Epstein, Research Associate, has left to begin graduate studies in postwar German history in the Department of History at Harvard University.

Renate E. Solenberger, Receptionist, has left to pursue other interests.

F. Scholarships.

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

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

Applicants for scholarships to be taken up at any time during calendar year 1992 must send their letters of application, current *curriculum vitae*, and supporting letter(s) of reference to the Institute *no later than* June 15, 1991.

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

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

G. Fall 1990 Lecture Series.

- September 20: Vernon L. Lidtke, The Johns Hopkins University, "The Quest for an Iconography of Revolution: Politically Engaged Artists in the Weimar Republic."
- October 2: Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann, University College, Oxford, "The Liberal Power Monopoly in Imperial Germany's Cities."
- November 5: David Levering Lewis, Rutgers University, "W. E. B. DuBois in Germany."

- December 7: Renate Bridenthal, Brooklyn College, "Corporatism and Countrywomen: The German Federation of Agricultural Housewife's Associations."
- December 13: Richard Breitman, American University, "Hitler and Genghis Khan."

The list of speakers for the Spring 1991 Lecture Series will be announced shortly.

H. Seminars on Special Aspects of German Unification.

In light of the fast-paced events of the year from November 9, 1989, to October 3, 1990, the German Historical Institute is pleased to announce the following extraordinary seminars on *Special Aspects of German Unification*:

- October 22, 1990, 3:00-5:00 p.m.: Prof. Dr. Hartmut Zwahr, Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig: "Leipzig im Oktober 1989";
- November 2, 1990, 2:00-5:00 p.m.: Prof. Dr. Manfred Heinemann, University of Hannover: "The Universities of the Former German Democratic Republic in Transition," and Prof. Konrad H. Jarausch, University of North Carolina: "The Rush to Unity: Historical Reflections on the Process of German Unification";
- December 3, 1990, 3:00-5:00 p.m.: Prof. Dr. Peter Schäfer, University of Jena: "US-Geschichte an Universitäten in der ehemaligen DDR".

I. Miscellaneous.

The German Historical Institute and Cambridge University Press will celebrate the appearance of the first volume in the Institute's publication series with the Press, Hartmut Lehmann and James J. Sheehan, eds., *An Interrupted Past: German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933*, at the 105th Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association in New York, December 27–30, 1990. All friends of the Institute are invited to an informal gathering at the *Bierabend* in the Petit Trianon Room of the New York Hilton immediately after the conclusion of the business meeting of the Conference Group for Central European History, Saturday, December 29, 1990, at approximately 9:00 p.m.

In connection with the second Gustav Mahler Festival, the University of Kassel will host an international conference entitled *Wiener Moderne. Die Grundlegung des 20. Jahrhunderts* ("Viennese Modernity. Laying the Foundation for the Twentieth Century"), July 4–7, 1991. The goal of the conference is to discuss the broad and multi-faceted nature of the innovations of Viennese modernity in its entirety and to demonstrate how its perception of the world and of thought substantially shaped the twentieth century. Inquiries from those interested in attending should be directed to Dr. Jürgen Nautz, Universität-Gesamthochschule Kassel, Fachbereich 5 Gesellschaftswissenschaften, Nora-Platiel-Straße 1, D-3500 Kassel, Federal Republic of Germany.

The European Section of the Southern Historical Association invites additional Europeanists for membership. The Section affords its members a range of contacts and opportunities for sharing ideas and research within the context of the annual meetings of the SHA. Focusing upon the Middle Ages to the present, the Section offers the following privileges: Affiliate membership in the SHA for those who do not wish to hold full membership but wish to receive its annual program and special air and hotel convention rates; access to participation in the eight sessions arranged by the Section in conjunction with the SHA annual meeting; a semi-annual newsletter; access to published proceedings of selected papers and commentaries of each year's program; a business luncheon, at a nominal charge, where a keynote address is presented by a distinguished Europeanist. Anyone interested in joining the Section is invited to send a check in the amount of \$10.00 (\$5.00 for Section membership and \$5.00 for affiliate membership in SHA), payable to the European Section, to Robin M. Rudoff, Secretary-Treasurer, European History Section, SHA, Department of History, East Texas State University, Commerce, TX 75428.