

GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

BULLETIN

FALL 1991

ISSUE No. 9

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. - 5:00. p.m.

© German Historical Institute, 1991

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

The next issue of the BULLETIN will appear in Spring 1992.

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

BULLETIN

Fall 1991

Issue No. 9

Contents

I. Preface	5
II. Greetings Delivered at the Official Opening of the Institute's New Building	
A. Hartmut Lehmann, German Historical Institute	6
B. Hans-Ludwig Schreiber, Volkswagen Foundation	10
C. Samuel R. Gammon, American Historical Association	13
D. Heinz Riesenhuber, Federal Ministry of Research and Technology	14
III. Accounts of the Conferences Sponsored and Co-Sponsored by the Institute in 1991	
A. "Holocaust and <i>Shilumim</i> : The Policy of <i>Wiedergutmachung</i> in the Early 1950s." New York, March 1991.	18
B. "In and Out of the Ghetto: Jewish-Gentile Relations in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany." Los Angeles, May 1991.	23
C. "Chosen People Themes in Western Nationalist Movements, 1880–1920." Washington, D.C., June 1991.	25
D. "Continental European Migration and Transcontinental Migration to North America." Bremerhaven, August 1991.	27

E. "Political Philosophy. The Influence of German Emigrants on American and German Political Thought after World War II." Boulder, Colorado, September 1991. 30

F. "Women in the Emigration after 1933." Washington, D.C., November 1991. 33

IV. Institute News

A. Report of Summer Program 1991 40

I. Handwriting Course in Wolfenbüttel

II. Tour of German Archives

B. Announcement of Summer Program 1992 42

C. Fall 1991 Lecture Series 43

D. Scholarship Information 44

E. 1992 Conferences 44

F. Library Report 45

G. Staff Changes 45

H. White Rose Exhibition 46

I. Preface

The German Historical Institute celebrated the official opening of its new building at 1607 New Hampshire Avenue on October 2, 1991. To mark the occasion, greetings were delivered by *Bundesminister* Dr. Heinz Riesenhuber, head of the Federal Ministry of Research and Technology, the main source of support for the Institute; Professor Dr. Hans-Ludwig Schreiber, Chair of the Board of Trustees of the Volkswagen Foundation, which purchased and renovated the building; and Dr. Samuel R. Gammon, Executive Director of the American Historical Association. Professor Dr. Wolfgang J. Mommsen, the *Vorsitzender des Verbandes der Historiker Deutschlands*, presented the main address entitled "The Return to the Western Tradition: German Historiography since 1945." While the greetings appear in this issue of the *Bulletin*, along with brief accounts of the conferences that the Institute sponsored or co-sponsored in 1991, Professor Mommsen's lecture will be published as the fourth issue in our *Occasional Papers* series.

During the meeting of the Institute's Academic Advisory Council on November 1, 1991, the Council's Chair, Professor Dr. Erich Angermann, announced his resignation. On November 2, 1991, the Council elected Professor Dr. Rudolf Vierhaus as his successor. I would like on this occasion to express our sincere gratitude to Professor Angermann for his extremely important help and for the sacrifices he made in setting up the Institute. We wished that Professor Angermann's health would have permitted him to head the Institute's Academic Advisory Council much longer, but hope nevertheless that he will remain a member of this body for some time so that we may continue to profit from his experience, his expertise, and his scholarship. Let me also add that we are very grateful to Professor Vierhaus for accepting the task of leading the Institute's Academic Advisory Council. We look forward to working with him.

Hartmut Lehmann
Washington, D.C.
November 1991

II. Greetings Delivered at the Official Opening of the Institute's New Building

A. Hartmut Lehmann, Director, German Historical Institute

Four years after the German Historical Institute was established in Washington, D.C., the official opening of its new building today marks an important date in the Institute's young history. This is a time for looking back, for expressing gratitude, and for envisioning the next stage in our development.

For historians, it is certainly proper to begin by reflecting on the past. Starting with the conference "German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933," which I organized jointly with Jim Sheehan in 1988, the Institute has sponsored or co-sponsored no less than fourteen such events: six in Washington, six in other American cities, and two in Germany. Furthermore, we have organized more than fifty lectures and more than a dozen workshops and seminars. Our library, which specializes in recent publications on modern German history, has grown to over 10,000 volumes and has become a valuable instrument for research. The Institute has awarded scholarships to approximately fifty doctoral students. With the support of the Volkswagen Foundation and in cooperation with the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, we have just begun a post-doctoral research program in post-1945 German history. We have taken American doctoral students on tours of German archives and research institutions and have organized summer courses in paleography at the *Herzog-August-Bibliothek* in Wolfenbüttel, again with the financial assistance of the Volkswagen Foundation. Three members of the Institute's staff have been chosen for professorships, two in Germany and one in the United States, and two more are expecting appointments in the near future. American publishers have sought our opinion on the publication of new books written on German history, and faculties of American universities have requested our recommendations regarding the hiring and promotion of colleagues in this field as well. To conclude this survey, in the past four years we have published eight *Bulletins*, four *Reference Guides*, the first issue in our *Occasional Papers* series, four issues of the *Annual Lecture* series, and the first volume of our English book series with Cambridge University Press. Of the latter, four

volumes are in print, with another five in preparation, as are the first two volumes of our German book series and further issues of our *Reference Guides* and *Occasional Papers*. In the Institute's brief history, the Annual Lecture has been a special event, and this year we were able to establish the Alois Mertes Memorial Lecture with generous help from the *Stifterverband*.

One way for us to look at this growth is in terms of numbers. Another way is to express thanks to those who helped bring us where we are today. First and foremost, we are most grateful to the Ministry of Research and Technology of the Federal Republic of Germany, and to you, Minister Dr. Riesenhuber, for giving us the financial means to begin and continue our work, all without interfering in our scholarly activities. This is also the time to recognize the contribution of *Ministerialdirektor* Dr. Josef Rembser, Chair of the Institute's Board of Trustees. With your administrative experience, you gave us guidance.

Furthermore, we are very grateful to German foundations such as the Volkswagen Foundation, represented today by the Chair of its Board of Trustees, Professor Hans-Ludwig Schreiber. The Volkswagen Foundation deserves special praise because it not only supported some of our programs, as did the Fritz Thyssen Foundation and the Gerda Henkel Foundation, but it also acquired and speedily renovated this beautiful building. I am very glad to have you here with us today, Professor Schreiber. Please convey the expression of our sincere gratitude to *Generalsekretär* Möller. A sincere "Thank you" also has to go to Mr. Schönen of the WestLB.

Please allow me to say a word of thanks to the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany, especially to Ambassador Ruhfus, Minister Nordenskjöld, and Attachés Dr. Rusnak and Dr. Schroeter. Your support is very welcome and much appreciated.

Little would we have achieved, however, without the help of our American and German colleagues. I am very grateful to the Executive Director of the American Historical Association, Dr. Gammon, for agreeing to say a few words of greeting today. I am also most appreciative for the support we have received from our American colleagues, namely, Professor Gunther Barth of the University of California at Berkeley and Professor Mack Walker of The Johns Hopkins University, both of whom have served on the Institute's Academic Advisory Board. Many others responded when we asked them to speak, help organize an event, or simply give advice when we needed it. I am extremely pleased that our American colleagues have

now formed a circle of Friends of the German Historical Institute, which is led by the Conference Group, the American Historical Association, the German Studies Association, and the Society for German-American Studies. All friends of the Institute are welcome to join this organization.

The German historians are represented here today by the President of their professional organization, Professor Dr. Wolfgang J. Mommsen from Düsseldorf. Wolfgang, I am very grateful that you have agreed to speak to us today. I find your choice of topic interesting as well as appropriate. I should add that Wolfgang Mommsen was the much-acclaimed first Director of the German Historical Institute in London. We have learned a lot from your example, and if we have been successful, you may rightly also consider this your achievement. I should furthermore like to acknowledge the support given to the Institute by our other German colleagues on the Institute's Academic Advisory Board: besides Wolfgang Mommsen, we recognize Professors Angermann, Bracher, Holtfrerich, Kielmansegg, Nipperdey, and Vierhaus. They have sacrificed much of their time and we are greatly indebted to them.

Last but not least, I would like to add some words of thanks to the Institute's certainly deserving staff, first and foremost to my Deputy, Dr. Norbert Finzsch, to our Administrative Director, Dieter Schneider, and to our Librarian, Gaby Müller-Oelrichs. Together with your colleagues, you can be proud of what has been achieved in the last four years.

The Institute's history could also be described by the principles we have attempted to follow in our work. To name the most important ones:

First, we are committed to fostering cooperation with American colleagues and institutions, especially with American historians of German history, but also by aiding German historians of American history. Second, we are committed to comparative work within the field of transatlantic history. Third, through colloquia and conferences, we are committed to finding the right balance between research and an exchange of views on the results of recent research.

In the coming years we plan to concentrate our activities on two areas: nineteenth-century American history, with special emphasis on its cultural and social aspects, and twentieth-century German history in the context of international relations. As much as we have reason to celebrate today, we also have reason to ask for the continued help and

support of our friends and colleagues. We have traveled far in four years. Nevertheless much work lies ahead. Important questions are waiting to be answered, and many of the problems we have yet to encounter can only be solved through cooperative effort, as they have been in the past.

The German Historical Institute in Rome celebrated its one hundredth anniversary three years ago. In comparison, we are in our infancy. Therefore, it is my wish today that we continue to grow so that our future will bring an even more substantive contribution to research and the exchange of ideas between German and American historians.

From the onset of my work in Washington, it has been my wish to give due recognition to the most important role played by our colleagues who came to these shores under circumstances far more difficult than ours. I am speaking, of course, about the refugee historians, many of whom were very actively engaged in supporting the exchange of ideas between German and American historians long before the Institute was founded. It was those colleagues exiled after 1933 who, after 1945, paved the way for the Institute's work. We are deeply indebted to them.

In recognition of their achievements and sacrifices, and in commemoration of their dedication to the improvement of relations between German and American historians, the German Historical Institute's Academic Advisory Council, in its meeting on August 27, 1991, unanimously voted to name the Institute's reading room for Felix Gilbert.

Among the refugee historians, Felix Gilbert's role was unique in at least three ways. First, he was the only refugee historian who made an original, important contribution to our understanding of American history, thereby acknowledging the history of the country that had given refuge to him and to many of his colleagues. In this context, I refer to his work on early American foreign policy, published in 1961 under the title *To the Farewell Address*.

Second, Felix Gilbert, together with Hans Baron and Paul Otto Kristeller, literally established the field of Renaissance Studies in this country. On the basis of the insight provided by Jakob Burkhardt, Felix Gilbert opened up to his American colleagues a whole new area of research on European history and culture.

Third, in his capacity as a permanent member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, Felix Gilbert was the one who invited many representatives of a new generation of German historians to this country, thus providing them with a unique chance to grow.

From the beginning of the Institute's activities until his death on February 14 of this year, Felix Gilbert was most supportive of our work. It is a fitting tribute to him, and an honor to us, that the center of our research activities, the Institute's reading room, should bear his name.

B. Hans-Ludwig Schreiber, Chairman, Volkswagen Foundation

It is my pleasure to convey to you the good wishes of the Volkswagen Foundation's Board of Trustees at the official inauguration of this building. Even though the Historical Institute in Washington has been working for quite some time already—and obviously all staff members and guests seem to be satisfied—its formal inauguration is of special importance.

The eve of the first anniversary of German reunification is quite a remarkable date for a German Historical Institute; the third of October, a new German national holiday, will also be celebrated in Washington in close connection with the Fourth Annual German-American Day. The German Historical Institute in Washington will be a representative of the unified Germany and shall contribute to deepening the German-American relationship through an intensive exchange of ideas, joint research ventures, visiting professorships, and manifold lectures and conferences involving German and American historians.

The Volkswagen Foundation is pleased to put this building, which it owns, at the disposal of the German Historical Institute and the Goethe Institute, two representatives of German science and culture in Washington.

The Volkswagen Foundation was—thirty-nine years ago—not created by the *Volkswagenwerk*, the well-known automobile manufacturing firm in Wolfsburg. The ownership of this company had been disputed between the state of Lower Saxony and the German federal government since 1949, and the Foundation's capital stock of more than one billion German marks originated from the sale of company stock to the general public in 1961. The Foundation is not a governmental institution either, but a private one, although it was established by the Federal Republic of Germany and the state of Lower Saxony, which both acted as trustees. Its aim is to promote science and technology in research and education, and it does so independently.

The funds at the disposal of the Volkswagen Foundation for the promotion of science are derived from the proceeds of its capital, which amounts to approximately 2.8 billion German marks. According to German foundation law, a foundation is bound to substantially maintain its capital stock and to invest its money profitably. Part of the Volkswagen Foundation's funds is invested in real estate administered by the Foundation's subsidiaries.

This is where the German Historical Institute enters into the picture. But first let me begin with the German Historical Institute in London, which we assisted ten years ago in a similar project. The Volkswagen Foundation acquired a seventeenth-century manor house in the London university quarter, and after substantial restoration it was placed at the disposal of the German Historical Institute in London alongside other organizations in the academic field (the German Academic Exchange Service and the Anglo-German Foundation). Minister Dr. Riesenhuber also officially opened the London Institute in the name of the Federal Republic and—what is very important—by financing the Institute's budget, he secures the rent that the Institute owes to the Volkswagen Foundation.

With this background in mind, no one will be surprised that the Federal Ministry of Research and Technology asked the Foundation in 1988 to provide a building for the German Historical Institute in the United States (after it had been officially opened in November 1987) based on the London model, and to lease it on a long-term basis. Finally, this Woodbury Blair Mansion, where we are gathered together today, was chosen.

In many aspects this building was impressive. Built in 1910 for a prominent lawyer (Woodbury Blair) as his private residence, this mansion was in excellent condition, with only a few alterations to the interior and exterior. It was as elegant and representative as it had been when designed by the famous Washington architect Jules Henri de Sibour in the style of Beaux Arts Classicism with elements of the Second Renaissance Revival and Second Georgian Revival. For decades (until 1958) it was in the family's possession; thereafter it was converted for office use—still without any change to style and atmosphere—and was completely renovated in 1981. Last but not least, it is centrally located near downtown Washington and close to Capitol Hill, Georgetown, and the central business district.

Fiscal reasons made it necessary for the Foundation to establish an American subsidiary in Washington to buy and administer the real

estate on New Hampshire Avenue. The IVB Corporation, which was established in 1989 as a tax-exempt organization according to American law, acquired the property in the summer of that year and had it restored for the German Historical Institute. The total investment amounted to \$6.9 million (about DM 13.2 million). As in London, the Federal Ministry of Research and Technology will ensure that the legal entities of the Institutes—in London, the Anglo-German Group of Historians, and in Washington, the Foundation of the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C.—pay the rent to the Volkswagen Foundation.

However, the Volkswagen Foundation's involvement with the German Historical Institute is not only confined to providing and renting this beautiful historical building as a matter of investment. The Volkswagen Foundation has supported the Institute since its inception. After the Institute was officially opened in November 1987, Professor Lehmann, the founding director, asked the Foundation for support and applied for a "program of summer courses and visits of American historians of German history to work in archives/libraries in the Federal Republic of Germany," for which the Foundation's Board made a three-year grant in late 1988 with the possibility of prolongation for two more years if successful. So far the Foundation has spent a total of about one million marks on this program and on a fellowship program for visiting scholars in post-war German history, which was granted in 1990 and which is being conducted in cooperation with the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies in Washington.

Today there is a dual reason for the Foundation to be proud and grateful: Again it has been able to provide a place for science and culture abroad through an interesting and long-term investment abroad. And for the second time, a German Historical Institute has found a domicile in a beautiful historical building.

It is my hope that the work conducted in this house will be successful, that science and culture of our two countries will benefit from these activities, and that German-American friendship will be strengthened and prosper.

C. Samuel R. Gammon, Executive Director, American Historical Association

I am honored to appear on this important occasion as a representative of the American Historical Association at the official inaugural of this magnificent new headquarters.

The discipline of history in America is largely an outgrowth of the splendid German educational establishment of the nineteenth century. Our Association was founded in 1884 by two groups of historians: those who were gentlemen amateurs who wrote history as an avocation, and those who were younger, professional scholars trained in the first history seminar at The Johns Hopkins University, which was modeled after the admired German university seminars and which produced its first group of Ph.D.s in 1880. (The group included Woodrow Wilson, who later achieved a certain fame in another line of work, as well as John Franklin Jameson, who edited the *American Historical Review* for most of the time between its founding in 1895 and 1928.) Both groups of historians were truly German-trained rather than American, however, since most of the older gentlemen-scholars were themselves graduates of German universities.

In its second year, 1885, the American Historical Association began the practice of naming distinguished foreign historians as honorary members of the AHA. The first historian so honored was none other than Leopold von Ranke, whose letter of notification from our second president, George Bancroft, began with the greeting "Cher maître". I should note that von Ranke's papers are located in the George Arents Research Library, a division of the E. S. Bird Library of Syracuse University, which hosted a major conference a few years ago on the centenary of his death. The only requirements for honorary membership in the AHA are that the honoree must be a truly distinguished historian, and that he or she must have been especially helpful in assisting American historians who were studying in the honoree's country. The practice continues to this day; two of our more recent honorees are Fritz Fischer and Karl Bosl.

Historians in this country have observed with great interest the unification of the two German historical establishments over these past months. While we did have some real concerns at first, I must say that they have been alleviated, as we have watched the dedication and the care with which you have proceeded in this difficult and troubling task.

Let me close with an anecdote about the lessons of history. It is recorded that the great American historian Charles A. Beard, our president in 1933, was once approached by a popular periodical with the request that he write an article on "the lessons of history." Beard declined the honor—and the honorarium—with the statement that he knew only four lessons of history, all extremely brief. They were, he said:

Power corrupts ...
The mills of the Gods ...
The bee robs the flower it fertilizes, and
When the night is very dark, you can see the stars.

May I again extend the hearty best wishes of the American Historical Association to the German Historical Institute; may it flourish mightily and go on from strength to strength. Thank you very much.

D. Heinz Riesenhuber, *Bundesminister* for Research and Technology

It is a great honor for me to convey the greetings of the German government on the occasion of the official opening of the beautiful new building of the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C.—the greetings of the government of a unified Germany on the eve of the first anniversary of German reunification. I think that it is a very appropriate moment, just one year after German reunification, to celebrate in this Institute the long and fruitful tradition of scholarly and scientific cooperation between the United States and Germany.

First of all, let me thank those individuals and institutions that have contributed so much to the successful establishment of this Institute. Professor Lehmann has named some of them, and I would like to express my own gratitude for their excellent work and their unwavering support. The Volkswagen Foundation, in an exemplary spirit of initiative and cooperation, has provided this beautiful new home for the Institute, just as it did with 17 Bloomsbury Square for the German Historical Institute in London. In times of strained governmental budgets, we are fortunate indeed to be able to avail ourselves not only of the additional resources but also of the far greater flexibility of private foundations. The support of the WestLB has already been mentioned. I might simply add that it is, of course, always advantageous to have a large bank on one's side, with all its experience and expertise

in financial matters and its ability to conduct business occasionally in an unconventional way. I should also talk about the helpful role of the staff of the German Embassy in Washington D.C. But, then, it is not up to us to sing their praises. After all, they are merely performing their duty, so to speak. And if they are doing an excellent job, we greatly appreciate it but leave it to others to extol their virtues.

I am grateful to the various German organizations that were involved in the creation of this Institute. They not only helped to define its practical purpose but also contributed to imbuing it with such a congenial spirit. Above all, however, I have to thank the many American institutions—the American Historical Association, the Library of Congress, numerous archives—and the entire scholarly community of the United States. A special tribute has to go to the large number of American historians who so cordially welcomed their German colleagues and made it possible for this Institute to become a genuine place of German-American dialogue, a center for the crystallization of ideas, for an exchange of perspectives on the future based on our shared experiences of the past. Last but not least, I wish to acknowledge the important contributions of Professor Lehmann and the members of the Institute. From rather humble beginnings and with only a small staff, they built up this impressive research facility and ensured its smooth operation, acquired a remarkable body of knowledge and resources, and commenced a far-reaching and ongoing discourse with the larger academic community.

The establishment of the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C., is part of a long tradition of academic exchange, of cooperation in research, between Germany and the United States. For Germany, this exchange, this cooperation, was particularly important after World War II, when the country found its way back into the international scholarly community. In those years, it was crucial for us to have good friends. And it was a very moving experience to see that, in the years after the war, many scholars who had been driven out of the country in the 1930s returned to Germany, bringing with them a spirit of academic freedom and an international approach to research and teaching that had been lacking at pre-war German universities. One of the scholars who emigrated to the United States and later came back was the philosopher and sociologist Max Horkheimer. I still remember that one of the first lectures I attended at the University of Frankfurt in 1955 was Horkheimer's lecture on the "History of Freedom." At that time, not long

after the war, it was a unique privilege to hear a renowned thinker like Horkheimer discuss such a vital subject.

For several decades, the relationship that developed between German and American scholars and academic institutions proved to be extremely fruitful, reaching an ever-closer cooperation, while the underlying paradigm remained the same. However, during the past ten years or so, we have been aware of the fact that the links between the scholarly communities on both sides of the Atlantic were growing weaker, as the original programs established after the war were approaching old age, so to speak. Yet we also fully realize that in a world that is increasingly thinking and acting in global terms, we need this international scholarly dialogue more than ever. There are many problems that can only be solved jointly, problems that are far too great for any one nation to tackle on its own. To the extent that we understand this global interconnection and are willing to address the situation jointly, we have a chance to cope with the future.

These issues and their implications were very much on the mind of Helmut Kohl, and they assumed a high priority in his policies right from the beginning of his tenure as Chancellor in October 1982. He started several new initiatives for German-American cooperation, particularly in the humanities and social sciences. The first concrete result of this policy was the creation of this very Institute. It has been operating successfully now for several years, not only building up an extensive collection of research materials and not only organizing and sponsoring many scholarly conferences, but also involving the larger public in an ongoing dialogue through its lecture series. In a very short time, the Institute has achieved a position that is very important to us.

But the establishment of this Institute is only one of the new activities undertaken in the field of German-American scholarly cooperation. The Foreign Office, for example, has launched an initiative for the humanities and social sciences in the so-called Centers of Excellence that have been founded at several American universities. They have already made a substantial contribution by encouraging a number of cooperative programs in various academic fields. One of the most recent developments is the idea of establishing a German-American Academy of Science and Humanities. We have been discussing this possibility with eminent scholars on both sides of the Atlantic and have been deeply impressed by the interest, not to mention the enthusiasm, with which this idea has been greeted by both academic communities. But a venture of this kind cannot simply be a government-

tal initiative. Government can encourage and support research and scholarship, it can provide a framework and set the preconditions, but government cannot and must not define the goals and the contents of scientific inquiry; these have to be determined by the scholars themselves. It is in this spirit that I would like to see a future German-American Academy of Science and Humanities evolve: as one more link in the long chain of German-American cooperation and as a point of crystallization, which over time may be joined by others to help us cope with the problems of an increasingly complex world.

In this respect, this Institute, too, plays an important role. We have to understand the past, we have to be aware of the many difficulties we have overcome in order not to be discouraged by the complicated tasks ahead. We have to know that even the most challenging obstacles can be surmounted. Many problems that we are facing today seem to be simply overwhelming. But taking a good look back at the way in which we successfully dealt with the trying conditions during the years after 1945, during the years when we rebuilt our country, our society, our industry, we know that we will be able to deal with the demands of the future.

To a large extent, of course, it is up to the natural sciences and the engineering sciences to provide us with concrete answers. But we also need the advice and contributions of the humanities and social sciences. Although our world is largely structured by technology, we must not allow it to become a technocratic world. It must be a world in which human dignity prevails through our understanding of what human beings are and how they interact with each other. These phenomena cannot be explained by either the natural sciences or the humanities alone. They both have to listen to each other, to communicate with each other. We need their discussion. Only if the scholarly communities in the natural sciences and the humanities learn to speak the same language will it be possible to integrate the findings of these two different realms of inquiry into a comprehensive understanding of the future we are facing. This is the task ahead of us—a task that we can confront only if we transcend the old boundaries, the old limits, and open up a truly global, international, scholarly dialogue.

In this spirit, ladies and gentlemen, I wish the Institute a good and successful continuation of its work.

III. Accounts of the Conferences Sponsored and Co-Sponsored by the Institute in 1991

A. "Holocaust and *Shilumim*: The Policy of *Wiedergutmachung* in the Early 1950s."

Columbia University, March 15, 1991. Co-sponsored by the Goethe House, New York. Convener: Axel Frohn.

On March 15, 1991, the Goethe House and the German Historical Institute held a symposium on "Holocaust and *Shilumim*: The Policy of *Wiedergutmachung* in the Early 1950s" at the *Deutsches Haus* of Columbia University in New York. The larger program of which this symposium formed a part was first considered in the fall of 1989, when the demonstrations for reforms and democratization in East Germany had begun. The Berlin Wall was not yet crumbling, but the unification of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) no longer seemed a mere theoretical proposition.

The prospect of a united Germany caused considerable concern, especially among those who had suffered the last time Germany was united and who had fallen victim to the Third Reich. Would it be possible for Germany to re-embark on a course of extreme nationalism? For how long would a united, powerful Germany remember the lessons of the past?

The Goethe House, New York, decided to address some of these concerns, to review in its program the way in which Germany is dealing with the legacy of Nazism, to reflect upon the firmness of Germany's democratic roots, and particularly to consider German-Jewish relations after 1945. The German Historical Institute most willingly agreed to contribute to the scholarly part of the program and thus organized a symposium on one aspect of the general theme. Since many source materials on the early 1950s have most recently become accessible, and since the results of substantial research are now available, the Institute suggested to review the origins of *shilumim* and the Federal Republic's policy of *Wiedergutmachung*.

The term *shilumim* may require some explanation. In the Luxembourg Agreements of September 10, 1952, the Federal Republic of Germany consented to global payments to Israel. This was considered a kind of collective payment from the German people to the Jewish people insofar as the latter was represented by the State of Israel. Since mid-1951 the Israelis referred to these global payments with the Hebrew

word *shilumim* (recompense). The term was borrowed from the book of Isaiah (34:8) and indicates that these payments did not imply an expiation of guilt, nor did their acceptance connote a sign of forgiveness. The term embraces an element of vengeance, which at the same time can be a presupposition for bringing about peace (*shalom*). *Shilumim* is fundamentally different from the German word *Wiedergutmachung*, which etymologically means returning to former conditions and, in a broader sense, to a former state of co-existence. In connection with the Holocaust, *Wiedergutmachung*—though the most suitable word in German—sounds helplessly naive and out of place. The Jews and Israelis used a number of terms for their material claims from Germany, since it was still quite unclear at the time what exactly they were demanding. The problem of choosing the right expression was due to the fact that the Jewish claims were in a sense revolutionary, as Nahum Goldmann, the president of the Conference of Jewish Material Claims Against Germany (Claims Conference) later recalled, and as unique as the Holocaust itself. Finally the term *shilumim* was agreed upon.

In his introduction, **Axel Frohn** (German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C.) outlined the origins of West Germany's policy of *Wiedergutmachung* and *shilumim*. Compensation laws were effective in the *Länder* of the American Zone of Occupation since 1946, and in November 1947 the U.S. Office of Military Government for Germany issued the first restitution law. When the Federal Republic of Germany was founded, these laws became federal laws. They formed the basis for German payments to Jewish individuals who had been victims of Nazi persecution.

On March 12, 1951, out of ethical considerations as well as economic necessity, the Israeli government demanded German payments of 1.5 billion dollars for the integration of 500,000 Jewish refugees. Israel claimed one billion dollars (or two-thirds of the total amount) from the Federal Republic and 500 million dollars (or one-third) from the GDR. In the Luxembourg Agreements of September 1952, which were the result of German-Jewish negotiations in Wassenaar near The Hague, the federal government, which was very well aware of the overall political benefits, consented to global payments to Israel and the Claims Conference. Since the GDR never seriously responded to the Jewish demands, its one-third share of *shilumim* is part of the unfinished German-Jewish agenda, as **Saul Kagan**, the executive director of the Claims Conference, reminded us. Negotiations on this issue are

presently being conducted by the government of the united Germany and Jewish representatives.

In his lecture, "The United States and Wiedergutmachung: From Leadership to Disengagement," **Constantin Goschler** (Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich) examined not only the pre-history of the Luxembourg Agreement but also the context of the development of German Wiedergutmachung in the early 1950s. He concentrated particularly on the role of the U.S. Administration, the U.S. Office of Military Government, and, later, the U.S. High Commission for Germany, and addressed the critical question that has been debated since the beginning of the deliberations in Wassenaar: What was the American impact on the Luxembourg Agreements? Furthermore, what did this impact mean for long-term U.S. policy on German Wiedergutmachung? He also analyzed the attitude of the German federal government, especially Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's ambiguous position toward the Wassenaar negotiations.

At the time of the Israeli reparation claims in March 1951, Goschler concluded, the U.S. government was mainly interested in retreating from the direct responsibility for matters of Wiedergutmachung that it had previously exerted. Since the beginning of the 1950s, American foreign policy intended to impose a strong moral obligation on Germany but made no explicit demands. For Adenauer there were many reasons to enter into negotiations with Israel and Jewish organizations in other countries, such as personal convictions, pressure from inside and outside Germany, and, not least of all, political pragmatism. However, the important decision to make the Israeli reparations claim the basis for the Wassenaar talks was Adenauer's own and did not result from American or other foreign pressures. While the role of Adenauer's original motives has often been debated, with the focus largely on morality, it has never been resolved. Yet morality, as Goschler stated, is rarely a sufficient explanation for political decision making, and it certainly was not in Adenauer's case. Although the Luxembourg Agreements were not an *entre-billet* for the Federal Republic's integration into the West, a failure of the Wassenaar talks would have disturbed this process and was not in the interests of either West Germany or the United States.

Yeshayahu A. Jelinek (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev) chose a quotation by Gershon Avner as the point of departure for his presentation on "John J. McCloy, Jacob Blaustein, and the Shilumim: A Chapter in American Foreign Affairs." Avner, who served as Chief of the Western Europe Department in the Israeli Foreign Office in

1950–1951, stated in an interview in 1986 that, with regard to Jewish issues, "McCloy acted ... without much enthusiasm. He fulfilled the directives he had received from Washington. I would not call him anti-Jewish, this would be slightly too much, too sharp. ... You may call it 'adversity.'" Jelinek's research, however, led him to the opposite assessment. He argued that many of the U.S. policies toward German retribution payments to the State of Israel and the Jewish people were formulated in the residence of U.S. High Commissioner McCloy in Frankfurt, not in Washington, D.C., and he described McCloy as a statesman who demonstrated understanding and a sympathetic attitude toward the Jewish request. This understanding, he continued, could be ascribed to some degree to Jacob Blaustein, the president of the American Jewish Committee, who maintained friendly relations with the High Commissioner and intervened with him on various occasions on behalf of the Jewish shilumim claim. Significantly, in a crucial phase of the shilumim negotiations, Blaustein apparently contributed to McCloy's assuming "full responsibility for [the] ability of the German treasury to carry the financial burden of the settlement without recourse to additional American aid" and thus to overcoming a serious obstacle for the Truman administration's support of the Jewish claim. McCloy was not at all adverse to Jewish interests during his tenure as U.S. High Commissioner in Germany; in fact, Jelinek concluded, he was the best friend the Jews had in the Federal Republic.

In her comment, **Lily Gardner Feldman** (Tufts University) highlighted the central issues of both Goschler and Jelinek's lectures, namely, the significant role of the U.S. government in the development of Germany's policy of *Wiedergutmachung*, and pointed out the differences as to the character of the U.S. role, the timing of U.S. involvement, the importance of various American personalities, and the nature of the American motives. While Jelinek stressed that the United States played a key role of consistent, active guidance, Goschler argued that the U.S. government played a lesser role of passive support, intervening only when necessary. As Gardner Feldman observed, these two lines of analysis have implications for the explanation of Adenauer's motives in initiating the process of *Wiedergutmachung*. A passive American role would suggest that German self-initiative was motivated by moral, as well as political, considerations, whereas a more active American involvement would imply greater pragmatic reasoning on Adenauer's part.

In an overview of the ongoing German-Israeli-Jewish relationship, Gardner Feldman commented on the continuous influence of the U.S. government, which, for example, insisted on discussing the GDR's financial and moral obligations (vigorously pursuing the issue until German unification) and the similarities between the political situations of the early 1950s and today. While Germany, as in 1952, is fashioning a new identity for a changed world, once again within the context of preoccupation with its own internal reconstruction and constraints in financial largesse, Israel also faces similar challenges again: a hostile environment, severe economic pressures, and massive immigration. How Germany will ultimately respond, how it will balance its own needs with the requirements of others, she concluded, will reveal much about the new Germany's purpose and priorities.

Saul Kagan was "present at the creation" of the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany and responded to the scholarly presentations from the point of view of a participant in Jewish restitution efforts since their very beginning in the early postwar period. He recalled how the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization was established in New York, and how the U.S. government had accepted the position that one of the consequences of the *Endlösung* could not be that the successor state would inherit the assets of those who had perished. The successor organizations were the forerunners of what the Claims Conference later became: the trustee, in a sense, of a broad collective interest, acting on behalf of hundreds of thousands of survivors. The Claims Conference tried and continues to try to bring about measures of compensation for those who survived, but it also seeks a greater acceptance of the concept of responsibility. Kagan described how the Claims Conference had attempted to obtain some kind of response from the GDR since 1975, and how the U.S. government had persistently supported these attempts. But only in May 1990, after the first free election in the GDR had occurred, could deliberations begin. As a result, an explicit provision was finally incorporated into the unification agreement, which commits the federal government of the united Germany to enter into negotiations with the Claims Conference for additional measures to benefit those Nazi victims who received only minimal compensation or none at all. Kagan mentioned these developments in order to point out that the historical events presented in the lectures are of immediate relevance for today and tomorrow.

Kagan reminisced about the roles of General Clay and High Commissioner McCloy, Nahum Goldmann, and Jacob Blaustein, and

about the Israeli and Claims Conference delegations in Wassenaar. He mentioned the crucial role of the U.S. government, but stressed that the primary responsibility for seeing through what in German is termed *Wiedergutmachung* rests on Germany, the German people, and how the leadership of Germany will proceed in meeting its responsibility for a unique, tragic chapter of history.

The proceedings of this symposium have been published in the Institute's *Occasional Papers* series (No. 2) and are now available upon request.

Axel Frohn

B. "In and Out of the Ghetto: Jewish-Gentile Relations in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany." University of California, Los Angeles, May 9–11, 1991. Co-sponsored by the Center for Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). Conveners: John Brewer, R. Pochia Hsia, and Hartmut Lehmann.

During the 1920s and with renewed emphasis after 1945, much attention was paid to the history of Jews in Germany since the Enlightenment. It was a deep commitment for many historians to understand and explain the tragic path that led from the emancipation of the Jews to the Holocaust. For a long time, much less work was done on the history of Jews in Germany in earlier periods, particularly the period between the late Middle Ages and the Enlightenment. It was only in the past two decades that several historians set out to explore the various aspects of Jewish life in early modern Germany. As these historians had never met to discuss the results of their research, it was a challenge to bring them together.

From May 9 to May 11, 1991, thirty specialists in the fields of history, sociology, religious studies, linguistics, literature, and folklore came from the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Israel, and Germany to participate in the conference "In and Out of the Ghetto: Jewish-Gentile Relations in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany" at the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library of UCLA. The conference was jointly sponsored by the Center for Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Studies of UCLA, the Committee for Jewish Studies at UCLA, the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies of UCLA, the Department of History of UCLA, and the German Historical

Institute in Washington, D.C. Planned and organized by **John Brewer** (Center for Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century Studies, UCLA), **R. Po-chia Hsia** (Department of History, New York University), and **Hartmut Lehmann** (German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C.), the program consisted of six sessions. **Jacob Katz** (Hebrew University, Jerusalem) delivered the keynote lecture.

The speakers in the first session explored the topic "Jewish Cultural Identity and the Price of Exclusiveness: The Legacy of the Middle Ages." In this session, **Alfred Haverkamp** (University of Trier) presented new research on Jewish quarters in medieval German towns. **Christoph Daxelmüller** (University of Regensburg) discussed the relationship between Jewish popular culture and German popular culture primarily in the eighteenth century. **Otto Ulbricht** (University of Kiel) explained Jewish criminality and the punishment of Jews and further demonstrated how Jewish cultural identity in the Holy Roman Empire was shaped by external as well as internal factors.

Focusing on the social stratification of Jewish communities in central Europe, the speakers in the second session examined wealth, social and geographical mobility, and patterns of urban and rural settlement, thus contributing to our understanding of the social and economic structure of German Jewry from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries. While **Michael Toch** (University of Jerusalem) concentrated on problems of social stratification, **Stefi Jersch-Wenzel** (Historische Kommission, Berlin) described the Jewish professions. Unfortunately, **Natalie Zemon Davis** (Princeton University) was unable to present her paper on "German-Jewish Women."

The speakers in the third session discussed those places aside from the ghetto in which Jews and Gentiles established contacts and learned from each other. Examples of Jewish-Gentile contact and relations in the pre-emancipation period were related by **Paul Wexler** (Tel Aviv University), who analyzed the relationship between Rotwelsch and Yiddish; **Yacov Guggenheim** (Hebrew University, Jerusalem), who described the role of the "Schalantzjuden"; and **Robert Jütte** (Robert Bosch Foundation, Stuttgart), who explained the precarious relationship between Jewish physicians and their Christian patients.

The images, prejudices, and ideas by which German Jews were characterized in early modern discourse on religious, economic, and intellectual matters were themes of session four. **Amos Funkenstein** (UCLA) discussed the various ways in which Jews were dehumanized and diabolized by non-Jews since the twelfth century. R. Po-chia Hsia

argued that factual change in money-lending practices had no impact on the polemics against the "usurious Jew." **Miri Rubin** (Oxford University) commented on the desecration of the sacred Host that had been allegedly committed by Jews.

Patterns of authority and the limits of toleration were discussed in session five. **Rotraut Ries** (University of Münster) depicted the political and economic considerations that led German territorial princes to tolerate Jews. The same question was examined by **Friedrich Battenberg** (Darmstadt) regarding ecclesiastical territories. **Christopher R. Friedrichs** (University of British Columbia) followed suit for the imperial cities, devoting special attention to Frankfurt, Worms, and Hamburg.

In each session, a distinguished scholar served as commentator; included were **Theodore K. Rabb** (Princeton University), **Gershon D. Hundert** (McGill University), **Deborah Hertz** (State University of New York at Binghamton), **Carlo Ginzburg** (UCLA), and **Thomas A. Brady** (University of California, Berkeley). Their comments made clear that in the pre-emancipation period, Jews had close enough contact with Christians for intensive interaction, while at the same time they seemed far enough apart to inspire the imagination of Christians, with the result that strange and very often hostile images were produced. Such themes were further explored in the concluding session, which was devoted to the conference's overall theme, and in which **Jonathan Israel** (University College, London), **Richard H. Popkin** (UCLA), **Mack Walker** (Johns Hopkins University), and Hartmut Lehmann attempted to draw some more general conclusions. The complete collection of papers and the comments will be published in the Institute's series with Cambridge University Press.

Hartmut Lehmann

C. "Chosen People Themes in Western Nationalist Movements, 1880–1920."

Washington, D.C., June 13–16, 1991. Co-sponsored by the Divinity School of Harvard University with the support of the Gerda Henkel Foundation and the Lilly Endowment. Conveners: William R. Hutchison and Hartmut Lehmann.

Although the roles of economic, social, and political factors in modern nationalism have been studied extensively, the influence of religion, with very few exceptions, has been almost totally ignored. Furthermore,

while there are many case studies focusing on individual countries, comparative studies are rare. It therefore seemed very appropriate to explore in a comparative manner the place of religion within the emergence of modern forms of Western nationalism. It seemed necessary to examine in particular the use (or secularization) of biblical rhetoric or biblical symbolism in various examples of nationalistic expression, popular as well as official or formal. Even more specifically, it seemed rewarding to consider and compare ideas of national "chosenness," both those that depended on biblical precedents or stemmed from them, and others that may have denied or may not have displayed such lineage.

From June 13 to June 16, 1991, with the financial support of the Gerda Henkel Foundation and the Lilly Endowment, twenty scholars from nine countries (United States, Great Britain, Ireland, South Africa, Israel, Sweden, Switzerland, Germany, and Norway) assembled at the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C. Together they examined nine specific cases of the idea and meaning of "chosenness" in the United States, Great Britain, South Africa, Ireland, Sweden, Germany, and France, and the role chosenness played for Zionism as well as for African Americans. Some of the questions addressed by the speakers and commentators were the following: To what extent was the Old Testament covenant transferred and used as a model to describe a modern "chosen people" proceeding under a new (or continuing, or revised) covenant? Which social and political groups utilized and supported this chosen people rhetoric, and by what means was it propagated? If a concept of chosenness was not evident in a specific case or was unimportant, what kind of rhetoric was used, or was primary? In order to establish a more general background, certain issues such as the role and value systems of small groups versus those of large groups were examined, along with the coming to terms with change or impending change in modern society and the coming to terms with the causes and effects of secularization. There is no doubt that nationalistic movements provided a definite time frame that inspired hope in and gave stability to nations of people because they contained the idea of a golden past, that is, the idea of the present as crisis and, if overcome, the promise for a better future. The chosen people theme also may have masked de-christianization while creating the illusion of a new, unified political and belief system, when in fact secularization was progressing.

After introductory remarks by **William R. Hutchison** in the first session, **Conrad Cherry** (Indiana University) and **Knud Krakau** (Free

University, Berlin) commented on **James H. Moorhead's** (Princeton Theological Seminary) paper on the United States and on **Hartmut Lehmann's** study of the German case. In session two, **Hana Arie-Gaifman** (New York University), **Silke Lehmann** (Washington, D.C.), and **Ulrich Gäbler** (University of Basel) commented on papers by **Paul Mendes-Flohr** (Hebrew University, Jerusalem) about Jews and Zionism, **André DuToit** (University of Cape Town) on the Afrikaners, and **Albert J. Raboteau** (Princeton University) on African Americans. In session three, **Andrew Walls** (University of Edinburgh) presented the British case, **Alf Tergel** (Uppsala University) the Swedish case, and **Ulrich Gäbler** the Swiss case, while **Steve Mitchell** (Harvard University), **Reginald Ward** (University of Durham), and **Knut Aukrust** (University of Oslo) served as commentators. In session four, **Thomas Kselman** (University of Notre Dame) spoke on France and **C. C. O'Brien** (Dublin) on Ireland. **Caroline Ford** (Harvard University) and **Reinhard R. Doerries** (University of Erlangen) offered comments. The concluding session resulted in a most lively discussion in which we attempted to draw some general conclusions. The papers and comments will be published in the *Harvard Theological Studies*.

Hartmut Lehmann

D. "Continental European Migration and Transcontinental Migration to North America." Bremerhaven, August 15–18, 1991. Co-sponsored by the Labor Migration Project of the University of Bremen. Conveners: Dirk Hoerder and Jörg Nagler.

The European demographic shockwaves of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries caused tremendous changes in the respective national economies and hence affected the political, social, and cultural development of these societies. Only in the last two decades have migration historians begun to interconnect the various European migratory streams of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with transcontinental migration to North America and attempted to link their findings into a coherent theory and methodology. We are, however, still far away from an approach that would allow us to finally understand these complex processes of migration in a holistic way. One way to start is with a comparative approach in an attempt to analyze why various people migrated and under what circumstances, and what the images of their new destination were. It may then be possible to

identify the common denominators as well as the differences in the process of migration.

These were only some of the issues that the conference, held in Bremerhaven on August 15–18, 1991, attempted to address. Fifty-five speakers and discussants from six different countries participated. The conveners were **Dirk Hoerder** of the Labor Migration Project at the University of Bremen, and **Jörg Nagler** of the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C. As indicated in the title, the conference was dedicated to exploring a new concept of world migration systems and the various forms of acculturation within this process. The conference considered the cultures of origin as well as those of the recipient societies and led to some important findings through the comparative social history approach. Five major components structured the conference and subsequently led to the following sessions: "A Concept of Migration in the Atlantic Economies" (**Walter Nugent**, University of Notre Dame; **Leslie Page Moch**, University of Michigan-Flint; **Dirk Hoerder**, University of Bremen; **Samuel Baily**, Rutgers University); "Cultures of Origin: Influence on Migrant and Changes because of Outmigration" (**Kerby Miller**, University of Missouri; **Julianna Puskas**, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest; **Adam Walaszek**, Jagiellonian University/Pave, Cracow; **Marianna Knothe**, Jagiellonian University/Pave, Cracow); "Cultures of Origin: The Germanies" (**Rainer Mühle**, University of Rostock, **Uwe Reich**, Brandenburgische Landeshochschule; **Axel Lubinski**, University of Rostock); "German Internal Migration before 1914" (**James Jackson**, Point Loma College, San Diego; **Horst Roessler**, University of Bremen; **Karl M. Barfuß**, Hochschule Bremen; **Silvia Schraut**, University of Mannheim); "Women in the Process of Migration" (**Donna Gabaccia**, Mercy College, Dobbs Ferry, NY; **Suzanne Sinke**, University of Minnesota; **Deirdre Mageean**, University of Maine; **Joy Lintelman**, Concordia College, Moorhead, MN; **Sibylle Quack**, German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C.); "Processes of Acculturation in Europe and North America: Interethnic Comparisons" (**David C. Hammack**, Case Western Reserve University; **Nancy Green**, School for Advanced Studies in the Social Sciences, Paris; **Dorota Praszalowicz**, Jagiellonian University/Pave, Cracow; **Monika Blaschke**, University of Bremen).

In the first session of the conference, Walter Nugent, Leslie Page Moch, and Dirk Hoerder presented encompassing papers in which they established the conceptual and systematic framework for a world system of migration wherein migration in the Atlantic economies and the

regional European migrations are but one part of a complex, worldwide process. The individual papers that followed revealed new perspectives on and dimensions in the approach to understanding the changes that occur in both the culture of origin and the culture of arrival that are caused by migration. These findings included an often neglected aspect of migration history: the influence of return migrants on their home culture. Among others, Marianna Knothe addressed this issue in her presentation, "The Influence of Polish Return Migrants in Their Villages." Her research is based on an oral history project organized by the Jagiellonian University/Paweł in Cracow. Another relatively little-researched dimension of the migration process is the gender aspect; that is, the role of women and gender relations and the ways in which migration might have transformed certain traditional patterns.

The conceptualization of systems of migration has progressed considerably in the last decade, but the questions of how to integrate the findings of different social, economic, political, and cultural systems still remain to be answered. It should be mentioned in this context that this important issue of how to develop a coherent, methodologically sound system of migration will be further discussed at the next annual meeting of the Social Science History Association.

A public panel discussion chaired by **Klaus J. Bade** (University of Osnabrück) entitled "Refugees, 'Guestworkers' and 'Foreign Germans'. A Country of Immigration!" addressed the current situation of minorities and immigrants and their integration into German society. The pivotal political question of how Germany could deal with the expected massive influx of migrants from lesser-developed economies stimulated a lively discussion among the participants. By means of historical and theoretical references, it was possible to place this problem into a broader context, revealing a current conceptual lack of knowledge of how to cope with this problem. The participants agreed that there is much to learn by examining models of immigrants who are being integrated into a receiving society such as the United States.

The unusually extensive media coverage for an academic conference of this kind demonstrated the high degree of public interest in learning from historical migratory processes and their possible application to our present situation.

The papers presented at the conference will be published by the German Historical Institute and Cambridge University Press under the title: "Cultural Transfer: German Migrations in a Comparative Perspective."

Jörg Nagler

E. "Political Philosophy. The Influence of German Emigrants on American Political Thought after World War II: Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss." University of Colorado, Boulder, September 11–13, 1991. Conveners: Peter Graf Kielmansegg and Horst Mewes.

Panelists and papers presented:

Bonnie Honig, "In the Beginning All the World was America': Hannah Arendt and the Quest for Political Space."

Helmut Dubiel, "Hannah Arendt and the Theory of Democracy." Ernst Vollrath, "Hannah Arendt: A German-American Jewess Views the U.S.A.-and Looks back to Germany."

George Kateb, "Remarks on Arendt and Democracy."

Timothy Fuller, "Reflections on Leo Strauss and American Education." Jürgen Gebhardt, "Leo Strauss. The Quest for Truth in Times of Perplexity."

Alfons Söllner, "Leo Strauss. German Origins and American Impact." Robert B. Pippin, "The Modern World of Leo Strauss."

The conference treated a major theme in the German Historical Institute's work on the history of German emigration to the United States, that of the work and impact of German refugee scholars in the United States. It thus covered questions that had been previously raised at a conference organized by the Institute in December 1988 on the topic "German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States from 1933 to the 1970s," and at the same time enlarged the field of inquiry by adding to it the subject of political theory as an area of German scholarly influence in the United States. The proceedings focused on the work of the political philosophers Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss, who, although they differed strongly from one another, both had an important influence on contemporary political philosophy in the United States. Arendt publicized her thoughts on the pursuit of participatory freedom and on a great variety of questions concerning contemporary political

life and political action through lectures, articles, and books. She succeeded in finding an attentive audience. While she was a prolific writer, she did not pursue an academic career and had no students of her own. Strauss, on the other hand, developed fundamental principles of political and educational philosophy based on his reinterpretation of classical political philosophy. He worked at the New School of Social Research in New York and later at the University of Chicago and founded an academic school of philosophical thought with many students. Even among his followers there is considerable disagreement about the meaning of his work, which defies easy categorization, since it has developed new concepts of classical political rationalism chiefly through painstaking and unorthodox interpretations of classical philosophical texts.

The first day of the conference was devoted to a discussion of the work of Hannah Arendt. **Bonnie Honig** linked her analysis of Arendt's views on the relationship of politics to the public sphere of life with a discussion of the concept of political space in the history of the American West and called for the politicizing of all spheres of life. **Helmut Dubiel**, who spoke on Arendt's concept of public sphere and public freedom, mentioned the changing reception of Arendt's work in Germany in recent years, which paralleled the decline of Marxism. While his and Honig's presentations focused in part on a critical reading of Arendt's thoughts as presented in *On Revolution* and *The Human Condition* in light of contemporary politics, **Ernst Vollrath's** paper outlined how Arendt's distinction between the political and the social took up the German philosophical term of the societal and transformed it through the interpretation of totalitarianism. **George Kateb** discussed Strauss, Herbert Marcuse, and Arendt as the most influential German political thinkers in the U.S., thus pointing to the diverse schools of thought that were established separately from the Frankfurt School through the emigration of German political philosophers to the United States. In describing Arendt's relation to modern democracy and emphasizing her antimodern views, he warned against an oversimplified reading of her conception of politics. He suggested that her works should not be interpreted as a guide to the theory and practice of modern democracy, but that Arendt should be understood as the creator of what she herself called "thought trains."

Some of the issues raised in the discussion centered on the question of Martin Heidegger's and Carl Schmitt's influence on Arendt's thinking and on her books, *On Revolution* and *The Human Condition*.

Alfons Söllner criticized Honig's and Dubiel's papers for failing to reconstruct what Arendt actually said, and he argued that premodern or antimodern elements were present in her work. The critique of modernity in his view formed the common element in Arendt and Strauss' work. Kateb elaborated on his thoughts on antimodern elements in Arendt's ideas, which were then criticized by Dubiel. The exchange of opinions formed evidence not only of the different interpretations of Arendt as a democratic or antimodern thinker, but also of the current debate about the nature of American democracy, with Kateb and **Harvey Mansfield** taking issue with Honig's critique of political conservatism in Arendt's work.

Leo Strauss' work as a scholar and political philosopher was the subject of the second day of the conference. In his discussion of Strauss' role in and contribution to the defense of liberal education in the United States, **Timothy Fuller** pointed to the distinctive but recognizable voice on education that Strauss offered by recovering a lost understanding of education through the rejuvenation of the Great Books curriculum at the University of Chicago. By centering his remarks on Strauss' work *Natural Right and History*, Fuller arrived at a discussion of the concept of truth in Strauss' thought and described the Straussian refutation of historicism. He reviewed Strauss' critique of German philosophical thinking of the nineteenth century and his contribution to the development of American political philosophy. **Jürgen Gebhardt** placed Strauss in the academic tradition of what Fritz Ringer has portrayed as the "German Mandarins" and emphasized Strauss' success in infusing his vision of scholarship into the American academic community. He further outlined the rootedness of Strauss' scholarly work in his critique of neo-Kantianism and rationalism, which led to his turn to premodern rationalism and new understanding of the roles of the scholar and philosopher. Alfons Söllner described the development of Strauss' philosophical views, also linking Strauss' critique of the "modern project" with Ringer's concept of the German mandarins. He then argued that the contribution to the formation of a conservative school of American constitutional thinking forms part of a yet unwritten chapter on German emigration to the United States, which will need to explain how a scholar whose work must be viewed in the context of a conservative German academic tradition could be so successful in the United States. While Gebhardt and Söllner emphasized Strauss' role as a scholar rather than a philosopher, **Robert B. Pippin** criticized this notion and all previously made contentions regarding

Strauss' antimodern thinking by a philosophical reading of Strauss' writing. He presented Strauss as a conscious objector within modernity whose thinking ignored the traditions of freedom and independence, which he sees as important characteristics in nineteenth-century German philosophy.

Some of the questions posed in the discussion dealt with the notion of an inherent authoritarianism in Strauss' educational theories, as pointed out by Robert Pippin and **Simone Chambers**. In commenting on Pippin's and Söllner's papers, Mansfield suggested that a possible explanation for Strauss' lack of treatment of German philosophy in the nineteenth century can be seen in Strauss' critique of the then prevailing contempt toward Greek authors, particularly Xenophon, and also in the emerging concept of history. He further showed the importance of dialogue in Strauss' thinking, thus refuting claims as to notions of absolute truths and ideology in the Straussian method. **Hartmut Lehmann** suggested the concept of secularization to describe Strauss' intellectual development as a German emigrant to the United States and criticized the characterization of Strauss as a German mandarin, emphasizing the transformation of his work as a result of emigration.

The final discussion in the third day was chaired by **Peter Graf Kielmansegg**. It focused on the intellectual and cultural backgrounds of Arendt and Strauss, their Americanization, and their relationship to democracy. Among the questions examined was the achievement of Arendt's and Strauss' contributions in returning Germany to Western political thinking. Arendt's views on the history and philosophy of American republicanism and representation were debated, suggesting Arendt's importance as a political thinker rather than as a systematical theorist. The discussion will be presented in its entirety in the volume on the conference to be published by the German Historical Institute and Cambridge University Press.

Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt

F. "Women in the Emigration After 1933". Washington, D.C., November 25–27, 1991. Conveners: Sibylle Quack, Renate Bridenthal, and Marion Kaplan.

For years there has been a growing demand for historians of exile and emigration from Central Europe during the Nazi period to focus on the lives of men *and* women émigrés. To be sure, scholars have broadened

their view from concentration on the "Illustrious Immigrants" (Laura Fermi) to a consideration of the more "average" immigrants and to the professional and daily struggles of lesser-known refugees. Yet, while most of these studies implicitly deal with the lives and experiences of men, they include only hints of the decisive role played by women in the survival of their families. Researchers of exile literature were the only ones who, in exploring a number of female writers and poets among the refugees, offered a perspective on the work and biographies of women emigrés.

The purpose of the Washington conference, which was co-sponsored by the German Historical Institute, the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, and the Leo Baeck Institute, New York, was to take a new look at the social history of Jewish and non-Jewish emigration and immigration after 1933 by focussing on the lives of women emigres. Reports of eyewitnesses were included in the scholarly debate and contributed to very lively discussions in all sessions. The fruitful encounter between researchers from the United States and Europe—among them several children of German-Jewish immigrants and eyewitnesses of the acculturation process of that group—and members of the older generation created a unique atmosphere for a reconsideration of the results of historical research.

In her keynote speech, **Marion Kaplan** (New York) described the increasingly difficult lives of the Jewish population in Nazi Germany in the 1930s, focussing on the situation of women. She pointed out gender differences in the family and argued that Jewish women who tried to create an atmosphere of normality in a highly abnormal and threatening environment absorbed much of the stress on the family, and as a result it was they who pressed hardest for emigration. Although a gender analysis of the desire to emigrate shows the different expectations, priorities, and perceptions of women, it seems that more men than women were actually able to leave Germany. Kaplan offered a number of compelling reasons for this phenomenon, one of which was the fact that the employment situation within the struggling Jewish community was different for men and women. In addition, women very often did not leave Germany because they had to care for elderly parents or other relatives.

The first session was dedicated to the state of women emigrés in different countries. **Rita Thalmann** (Paris) delivered a paper on women emigrés in France, followed by an eyewitness report by **Elizabeth Marum Lunau** (New York) on her experiences in the Camp Gurs. The

situation of refugee women in England was then discussed in papers written by **Marion Berghahn** (Providence, RI) and **Susanne Miller** (Bonn), who contributed an eyewitness report on her exile in England. The papers described the difficult living conditions that the refugees faced and illustrated how women were able to adapt themselves to those hardships by being very active in building solidarity among the refugees and creating "an atmosphere of courage, dignity and fairness" (Susanne Miller) in the countries of emigration or exile. A common experience was that women were better able than men to cope with the situation.

In the following discussion, **Renate Bridenthal** (New York) raised the question of whether women, having played a more subordinate role, had less to lose and therefore fewer status problems than men. **Mitchell Ash** (Iowa) argued that the observed difference between men and women in coping with the situation had to do with whether or not they were professionals. **Atina Grossmann** (New York) suggested the need for a more critical investigation of women's ability to cope considering all they had lost. Refugee women lost not only work and professional opportunities but also the family and domestic life that they had been raised to expect. Relationships with their children also suffered, Grossmann pointed out, because many refugee women were either unable to have children, had children much later than they would have wanted, or had to neglect their children and send them away to boarding schools or to live with other families. **Robert Jacobs** (New York) suggested researching the falling birth curve among the refugees. He speculated whether this reflected a trend among German Jews prior to 1933, or whether it was due to the experiences during emigration and immigration.

As might have been expected, a great variety of experiences, feelings, and attitudes were described in the papers. For example, both eyewitness reports and scholarly papers demonstrated different attitudes toward exile or emigration and toward returning to Germany rather than staying in the country of immigration. Although the diverse experiences—almost "different worlds", as **Steven Lowenstein** (Los Angeles) put it—were strongly felt as a result of the emigration to different countries and cultures, some generalizations could be made: for example, the age of the refugee was found to be a crucial factor in her adaptation to the new country and also in her desire to stay there.

Six more papers dealt with the situation of women emigres in different countries: **Rachel Cohn** (Jerusalem), **Wilma Iggers** (Amherst, NY), and **Illo Heppner** (Indianapolis) gave eyewitness reports on their

experiences in Palestine, Canada, and Shanghai respectively; **Ursula Langkau-Alex** (Amsterdam), **David Kranzier** (New York), and **Katherine Morris** (Chapel Hill) delivered scholarly papers on women emigrés in the Netherlands, Shanghai, and Brazil. Gender played an important role in all countries when it came to work opportunities. Domestic work or other low-level jobs were available for women of emigration everywhere and shaped many women's experiences during the first years in the host country. Coming from a middle-class background, how did they cope with their declining social status?

The hypothesis that the patriarchal family as such was dysfunctional in a situation of deep transformation or turmoil was formulated by **Hanna Papanek** (Boston). Marion Kaplan stated that this was felt by both men and women, and that men also felt the burden even though women had shouldered much of it for them. Steven Lowenstein argued that one must take into account different stages for the refugee families: the period of crisis during the first years and the reconstruction period after the hard times were over.

Atina Grossmann pointed out that the category "women" alone did not provide the most helpful tool in analyzing women's experiences. Instead, she suggested, it was necessary to look at the age of the women, their place in the family, whether or not they had professions, whether or not they had children, etc. Did gender matter more for women than for men, and was women's identity as daughters or mothers more significant for them than it was for the men? Was there a gender specificity of the cultural encounter that took place? Did women perceive cultural differences differently because they had to deal with "menial" work in other people's households?

While many participants in the conference rejected any "labeling" of their experiences, suggestions were made to compare this group's immigration patterns with the immigration or migration of women from other nations and cultures (**Donna Gabaccia**, New York). Hanna Papanek argued that the characteristics of female labor force participation patterns should be analytically disentangled from those aspects specific to the context of German-Jewish exiles. She also stated that focussing on the particular German-Jewish experience alone made it harder to arrive at a generalized analysis.

The next sessions of the conference focussed on emigration to the United States. Papers on the changing gender roles in the refugee family (**Sibylle Quack**, Washington, D.C.), women's role in the German-Jewish immigrant community (Steven Lowenstein), *Selfhelp* (**Gabriele**

Schiff, New York), the *National Council of Jewish Women* (**Linda Kuzmack**, Washington, D.C.), and the *American Jewish Labor Committee* (**Jack Jacobs**, New York) showed individual and organizational efforts to help people overcome the hardships of emigration and immigration and rescue others from Nazi persecution. While women played an outstanding role in all aid organizations—whether they were created by the refugees themselves, like *Selfhelp*, or by Jewish immigrants who had come much earlier to America and whose organizations existed long before 1933—they did not assume a very visible, but rather a traditional, part in religious organizations. Rivalries and tensions between some of the organizations were also mentioned. Sibylle Quack reported that the *Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS)* and the *National Council of Jewish Women*, for instance, heavily debated the question of who would pick up refugees at the docks, and that *Selfhelp* was accused by the National Refugee Service of pushing down wages by creating too many employment opportunities for women in low-level jobs. **Frank Mecklenburg** (New York) remarked that the organizations mentioned in the papers were not really comparable because of their different sizes; however, they provided good examples of several strategies of women's activities.

One of the controversial points during following discussions was **Helmut Manner's** (Nashville, TN) statement that there was an extraordinarily high divorce rate among refugees. Other speakers pointed out that they found no evidence for this, but argued instead that couples would stay together rather than split up, even when relationships were sour. Marion Kaplan added that at that time there were still many arranged marriages among German Jews, and that expectations were therefore different. **Christel Wickert** (Berlin) felt that divorce was a taboo subject, not mentioned in conversations and interviews. Another subject not easy to research was suicide. Steven Lowenstein gave the opinion that the exact number of suicides cannot be found in the statistics because many had been covered up as accidents. From his work, however, he got the impression that more men than women refugees committed suicide.

The last sessions concentrated on papers about the occupations of women emigres. Atina Grossmann spoke on female refugees as physicians, Mitchell Ash on women psychologists and psychoanalysts, and **Joachim Wieler** (Erfurt) on social workers. **Sidney Weinberg** (New York) read an eyewitness report written by **Eva Neisser** (Vineland, NJ) on her life on a chicken farm. Frank Mecklenburg,

Catherine Epstein (Cambridge, MA), **Christel Wickert**, and **Guy Stern** (Detroit) delivered papers on women lawyers, women historians, Social Democratic women members of the *Reichstag*, and women writers. The papers explored emigré women's biographies and work, and described the impact of exile, emigration, and immigration on their career patterns. Many professional women had to change fields because their education and training in Germany could not easily be adjusted to occupations in the United States. This was, of course, true for refugee men as well, who also faced tremendous difficulties, as Marion Berghahn pointed out. In addition, both professional men and women were confronted with conservatism, anticommunism, and anti-Semitism in the host country. One must ask what role gender played in the ability to face those difficulties and adapt to the professional structures in the new country. One of the fields refugee women turned to was social work, even though it may not have been their first choice in Europe, as **Harriet Freidenreich** (Philadelphia) pointed out. Nevertheless, despite the tendency to change their professions, quite a few women refugees did succeed in their professional fields. Age was once again the most crucial factor in their ability to do so. It was also very important for their careers to find and create niches in their own or related academic fields where many of them became quite successful.

The question of how single women adapted in comparison to married women was raised and discussed. While Atina Grossmann assumed that it might have been even harder on single women because they lacked emotional support of a family structure and were more lonely, Sibylle Quack suggested that being single did not necessarily mean living alone. In many cases, sisters, mothers, fathers, and brothers lived together. In addition, she argued, single women were more mobile and could more easily apply for jobs in other parts of the country. This aspect needs to be investigated, as do many other phenomena discussed at this inspiring conference.

In his concluding lecture, **Peter Gay** (Hamden, CT) remarked that the findings of the conference provided historians with a far more solid basis for expanding the knowledge of refugee women, and also helped to outline a portrait of that group. Gay argued that to ask how deep the "shift from the first to the second sex" really went and how firm it proved to be remains a very important question in a time of rising awareness of what it meant to be a woman in history. In offering some suggestions for further research, Gay emphasized the need for more

work with interviews and subjective sources such as diaries, letters, and unpublished memoirs.

Dedicating his speech to the memory of his refugee mother, Gay shared some personal anecdotes with the conference participants. He noted that while the life history of each refugee is unique, and although historians must classify individual life histories, one should not forget to consider the influence of contingencies on the fate of the refugees.

The conference papers and eyewitness reports will be published by Cambridge University Press.

Sibylle Quack

IV Institute News

II. Tour of German Archives

A. Report of Summer Program 1991

This year's Summer Program took place from June 2 to July 3, 1991, and was made possible by a grant from the Volkswagen Foundation. The twelve participants were students of German history from various universities in the United States and Canada. The program consisted of two parts:

I. German Handwriting Course in Wolfenbüttel

The three-week summer course at the *Herzog-August-Bibliothek* in Wolfenbüttel lasted from Sunday, June 2, until Friday, June 21, 1991. In the morning members of the library's staff introduced the students to German handwriting from the Middle Ages to the twentieth century. Each participant received a copy of passages from documents and diaries and then took turns reading sentences and paragraphs. On occasion the students were asked to read additional texts as homework.

The *Herzog-August-Bibliothek* has rich holdings, especially in the early modern period. The participants were introduced to the organization of a German research library and to bibliographical aids. They were also able to conduct independent research on their own projects.

Another aspect of the program included lectures by German professors from Göttingen and Braunschweig on their specific fields. Professor Dr. E. Hinrichs spoke on "Historische Demographie anhand von Kirchenbüchern," Professor Dr. H. Wellenreuther on "Göttinger Stadtgeschichte," and Dr. H. Medick on "Die 'Fiktion des Faktischen' in der Darstellung der Geschichte am Beispiel der sogenannten Laichinger Hungerchronik."

In addition, the students were able to take part in various cultural events that had been organized for them by the *Herzog-August-Bibliothek*. The Summer Program proved to be an excellent opportunity for the students to get to know other American students of German history and to discuss their projects. A visit to the *Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv* in Wolfenbüttel served as a first introduction to German archives.

Carola Wessel

II. Tour of German Archives

The tour to selected German archives intended to give an introduction to the history and organization of German archival repositories and to prepare the participants for future research and teaching assignments in German history. The archives visited were selected as important examples of central archives, provincial archives, city archives, and non-state archives, as well as university and business archives. Each visit comprised a lecture given by the archivists about the specific history and holdings of each archive and a discussion of particular problems of archival work and research. In addition, the participants discussed their research topics as a group and were given an opportunity to examine selected archival records and finding aids pertaining to their own research interests. The visits to archives located in the former German Democratic Republic focused on the tasks facing these institutions in collecting and preserving the historical records of state institutions and political parties.

The following is a list of the archives visited:

Bundesarchiv Koblenz

Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes

Historisches Archiv der Stadt Köln

Historisches Archiv der Friedrich Krupp GmbH

Bundesarchiv Abteilungen Potsdam

Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz

Manuscript Division of the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz

Sächsisches Staatsarchiv Dresden

Stadtarchiv Dresden

Sächsisches Staatsarchiv Leipzig

Archiv der Universität Leipzig

Zentralstelle für deutsche Personen- und Familienstandsgeschichte, Leipzig

The next summer tour of German archives will visit archives located in southern Germany. Students interested in archival research in Germany and in the history and organization of German archives should write to the Institute for further information.

Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt

B. Announcement of Summer Program 1992

The German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C., is pleased to announce its 1992 Summer Program for North American graduate students of German history. The program is made possible by a grant from the Volkswagen Foundation. The 1992 program will begin on **Monday, June 1, 1992**, and last until **Wednesday, July 1, 1992**. It consists of two parts:

I. German Handwriting Course in Wolfenbüttel

The first part of the 1992 program is a three-week summer course at the *Herzog-August-Bibliothek* in Wolfenbüttel, lasting from **Monday, June 1 to Friday, June 19**. The purpose of the course is to

- introduce young North American scholars of German history to 16th-19th century German handwriting;
- provide an introduction to the organization of research libraries and archives in Germany;
- enable participants to conduct independent research on their own projects in the substantial holdings of the *Herzog-August-Bibliothek* (which are richest for the early modern period); and
- refresh participants' knowledge of biographical aids and early modern Latin, if they are interested.

II. Tour of German Archives

The second part of the Summer Program consists of a tour of archives and research libraries in southern Germany; it will last from **Sunday, June 21 to Wednesday, July 1**. Its purpose is to introduce North American students of German history to the organization of the various kinds of German archives (national, state, city, private). Although the exact itinerary has not yet been determined, the 1992 tour will include archives ranging from the *Bundesarchiv* in Koblenz to the *Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv* in Munich. At each archive, staff members will introduce their facilities and holdings. While participants may have some time for individual investigation, the tour should not be mistaken for a research grant.

The program is **limited to 12 participants**. The grant includes round-trip airfare to Germany (economy class, tourist rate), transportation within Germany, hotel accommodations (double occupancy), and

a *per diem* for main meals. In Wolfenbüttel, accommodations will be in hotels, pensions, or dormitories (single or double occupancy).

Applicants who are students of early modern German history and who wish to participate in both parts of the program will be given preference.

Applicants must hold a bachelor's degree and have a working knowledge of conversational and written German. A letter of application, a curriculum vitae, a one-page (double-spaced) description of the dissertation topic or research interest, and two letters of recommendation should be sent to the Director, German Historical Institute, 1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W, Washington, DC, 20009, **no later than January 15, 1992**. Successful applicants will be notified by March 1, 1992.

C. Fall 1991 Lecture Series

The following lectures were presented at the German Historical Institute during the fall season. All lectures held at the Institute are open to the public.

September 26: Gregg O. Kvistad, University of Denver, "The German State as Institution: Citizens Challenge Civil Servants."

October 11: Sir Michael Howard, Yale University, "The Franco-Prussian War, 1870–1871, in Historical Perspective."

October 21: Horst Dippel, University of Kassel, "1871 versus 1789: German Historians and the Ideological Foundations of Imperial Germany."

November 14: Marion E. Deshmukh, George Mason University, "Painting and Politics in Imperial Germany."

November 19: David W. Sabeau, Cornell University, "Flagging Texts: Ritual Gesture in Early Modern Bureaucratic Prose."

December 3: Arno J. Mayer, Princeton University, "Ideology and Contingency: Violence and Terror in the Epochs of the French and Russian Revolutions."

December 13: John Higham, The Johns Hopkins University, "The Future of American History."

D. Scholarship Information

The German Historical Institute offers scholarships to doctoral students working on topics related to the Institute's general scope of interest. Applications for 1993 should be sent to the Director no later than **June 15, 1992**, and should contain the following information:

- curriculum vitae;
- detailed plan of study, including research proposal, time frame needed to carry it out, and locations in the United States to be visited;
- letter of recommendation from the doctoral advisor.

Americans applying for these scholarships should be working on topics of German history for which they need to evaluate source material located in the United States.

E. 1992 Conferences

The Institute will sponsor the following scholarly conferences in 1992:

"On the Road to Total War: The American Civil War and the German Wars of Unification, 1861-1871." Washington, D.C., April 1-4, 1992.

"Culture and Politics in Germany in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries." Washington, D.C., May 1992 (during the German Arts Festival).

"The Prerogative of Confinement: Social, Cultural, Political, and Administrative Aspects of the History of Hospitals and Carceral and Penal Institutions in Western Europe and North America, 1500-1900." Washington, D.C., June 6-9, 1992.

"Mutual Influences on Education: Germany and the United States in the Twentieth Century." Tübingen, June 18-20, 1992.

"Peopling the New World. The Transfer of Ideas, Customs, and Social Institutions from Central Europe to the Middle Colonies in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries." Pennsylvania State University, October 28–31, 1992.

Conference participants are selected by invitation.

F. Library Report

In 1991 the library collection reached 10,000 volumes on German history and German-American relations. The library subscribes to 200 periodicals. Back-issues of periodicals have been given priority in the acquisition.

In addition to new releases, the library has tried to buy out-of-print books and was able to acquire a complete set of the volumes of the *Marx-Engels-Gesamtausgabe* (MEGA) that have been published so far.

We are happy to report that the library is frequented increasingly by students and researchers from the local universities. We have also been able to provide reference services to numerous telephone inquiries from institutions and private individuals.

G. Staff Changes

Anne Hope, Research Associate, will leave to pursue graduate studies in library sciences at Brigham Young University.

We welcome two new staff members to the Institute:

Christine Welter, Library Associate, born in Dahn (Rhineland-Palatinate), 1961. Studied German and English literature in Tübingen and at the University of Virginia. M.A., 1987; Staatsexamen, 1988. Assistant to the German/Dutch Specialist in the European Division of the Library of Congress, 1989; German Language and Culture Instructor at the Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, 1989–1991.

C. Petra Hauck, Receptionist, born in Frankfurt, 1957. Apprenticeship in retail management and buying, 1973–76, Frankfurt am Main. Completed Executive Training Program, Garfinckel's, 1986. Fragrance

and Cosmetics Department Manager, Garfinckel's, 1986–90; Branch Buyer, Garfinckel's, 1989–90; Manager, Pavo Real Gallery, Georgetown, 1990.

H. White Rose Exhibition

From October 28 until December 18, 1991, an exhibition on "The White Rose" is being shown at the German Historical Institute, 1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. This exhibition was a joint effort by the White Rose Foundation, the Goethe-Institut Washington, and the German Historical Institute. At the official opening of the exhibition on October 28, 1991, the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany in the United States, H. E. Dr. Jürgen Ruhfus delivered greetings, as did the Chairman of the White Rose Foundation, Franz J. Müller. Professor Peter Hoffmann, McGill University, Montreal, spoke on "The Second World War, German Society and Internal Resistance to Hitler." At a special seminar on October 29, 1991, witnesses of the time, including Freya Countess Moltke, were interviewed by Peter Hoffmann. On November 12, 1991, Dr. Sybil Milton, Resident Historian of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, gave a lecture on "The Limits of Resistance in Nazi-Germany." In addition, the Goethe-Institut showed the film "Weiße Rose" by M. Verhoeven and organized a seminar for teachers on the topic, while the German Historical Institute organized several guided tours through the exhibition for high school students of the Washington metropolitan area.