

servativer Vorstellungen einer Regierung ohne Parteien am Beginn der 1930er heran. Beide Studien verdeutlichen außerdem das Spannungsverhältnis zwischen Konservativen und der NSDAP. Renate Bridenthals umfassender Beitrag zeigt, wie der Reichsverband landwirtschaftlicher Hausfrauenvereine (RLHV) besonders während der Weimarer Republik sich zunehmend von der Frauenbewegung entfernte und an den Reichslandbund (RLB), der Nachfolgeorganisation des BdL, band. In diesem Kontext ist auch seine Einreihung in das antirepublikanische Lager zu sehen. Shelley Baranowski untersucht das Verhältnis der Großgrundbesitzer Pommerns zur NSDAP am Ende der Weimarer Republik. Die letzten beiden Aufsätze analysieren den konservativen Widerstand gegen Hitler. Theodore Hamerow stellt die Zusammenarbeit konservativer Kreise dar, die den Nationalsozialismus als Mittel eigener Interessen sah, Larry Eugene Jones erörtert die Staatsstreichpläne, die im Umkreis Papens geschmiedet wurden und denen die Ereignisse des 30. Juni 1934 ein Ende setzten.

Insgesamt handelt es sich um eine wertvolle Ergänzung zur Geschichte des deutschen Konservatismus. Vor allem die methodische Vielfalt dieser Aufsatzsammlung, die diesen nicht nur als politischen Faktor, sondern auch im Umfeld von kulturellem und sozialem Konservatismus sieht, macht diese Aufsatzsammlung interessant.

*Kiran Patel, Freiburg*

Lothar Dittmer, *Beamtenkonservatismus und Modernisierung. Untersuchungen zur Vorgeschichte der Konservativen Partei in Preußen 1810–1848/49*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1992, 453 S., kart., 158 DM.

Scholarship on early- and mid-nineteenth-century German conservatism is enjoying a marked renaissance, and this book – based on a University of Hamburg doctoral thesis (1989) – promises to make a huge impact, in three principal areas. First, it spans the gap between the two elements of life in Vormärz Germany that Thomas Nipperdey referred to as »Bürgerwelt« and »starker Staat«. To be sure, there is little social history here in the classic sense: the Bürgerwelt Dittmer examines is principally the world of bürgerliche Öffentlichkeit, bürgerliche Intelligenz. Moreover, because this is primarily a bürgerliche Beamtenwelt, it has virtually nothing to do with the complex social world of the Prussian Junkers so meticulously portrayed in Robert Berdahl's 1988 book, *The Politics of the Prussian Nobility* (which unfortunately is not addressed by Dittmer). Yet in common with Berdahl and Wolfgang Schwentker – author of another pathbreaking study of early conservatism – Dittmer successfully illustrates how the development of conservative ideology, propaganda, and associational life were all strongly influenced by those close to the throne. Of course, Prussia's capricious monarchs were anything but consistent in dispensing favour to the many personalities who stood »closer to the throne« (as David Barclay's forthcoming study of Friedrich Wilhelm IV will show). For all the steady stream of Denkschriften that bureaucrats sent to the king, one must also consider the verbal opinions, for instance from the Camarilla, that pushed the king in different directions. Although the Hochkonservativen are rarely encountered in Dittmer's study, this is probably all for the good, as they have received disproportionate attention in previous studies. The contribution of this book lies in another realm.

Dittmer – second – pushes early conservative journalism forcefully into the limelight. He argues, indeed, that in the 1830s, the editorial staffs of conservative newspapers and journals provided the only adequate vehicle for developing a conservative »program«. Before the appearance of political parties, they offered the most effective means to disseminate

conservative ideology to the »Funktionsträger« and »Meinungsmultiplikatoren« whom conservative officials imagined to be bulkwarks against liberal, democratic, and rationalist doctrines. The strength of Dittmer's argument is not his discussion of individual conservative organs or editors, as he breaks little new ground here. Instead, he illuminates in exhaustive detail how Prussian ministers, Regierungsräte, and other administrators believed that the conservative and semi-official press – not necessarily the same thing – could be used to communicate the government's political views to »the people«. In the Geheimes Staatsarchiv in Merseburg, Dittmer has combed the files of the three main »Zensurministerien« – the Außen-, Innen- and Kulturministerien – and produced a breathtakingly original account that illuminates almost every aspect of government policy towards the conservative press.

To be sure, one might argue that only one side of the equation is presented, leaving the reader in the dark as to the administration's view of the liberal press. Whereas important new information is brought to light, for instance, about the circulation of conservative journals, the subsidies granted to them by officials, or the personnel policies that led to fine gradations in the salaries paid to chief editors, correspondents, and common staffers, at no time is the relative strength of the conservative press considered fully. This leads to a conclusion that, while not wrong, is somewhat contradictory.

On the one hand, Dittmer argues that the *Öffentlichkeitspolitik* of Prussian officials was a »sinnvoll zusammengesetztes und wirkungsvolles Ganzes« (p. 320), that »die aus dem Kultusministerium gesteuerte Publizistik ihre Adressaten erreichte und von Angehörigen der Zeitungsredaktionen sowie wichtigen Meinungsmultiplikatoren gelesen wurde« (p. 319), and that the government-subsidized press »führte eine insgesamt erfolgreiche Auseinandersetzung mit liberalen und demokratischen Kräften. Sichertgestellt war vor allem, daß ganz unterschiedliche Bevölkerungsschichten angesprochen wurden.« (p. 408) On the other hand, Dittmer shows that conservative propaganda was most popular where its ideological and political content was least obvious – that is, in the rare cases where Prussian bureaucrats allowed conservative editors sufficient freedom to satisfy the public's thirst for up-to-the-minute news and entertainment. Thus, Dittmer's alternative but more correct conclusion is that the administration's conception of *Öffentlichkeitspolitik* was debilitated by »dilemmas«, »contradictions«, »dead-ends«, and unresolved paradoxes – so much so, in fact, that if it can be said to have succeeded at all, it did so according only to its own criteria. Those criteria in turn reflected the administration's wish to provide the public with both »Polemik« (because it sold copies and attacked the liberals directly) and »Überparteilichkeit« (because it accorded with the pre-constitutional ethos of the bureaucracy itself). Thus, post-1848 Prussian *Öffentlichkeitspolitik* was undermined by the same liabilities as in the Vormärz, »als ob die Revolution an der gouvernementalen Publizistik spurlos vorüber gegangen sei [. . .] Häufige Redakteurswechsel, abrupte Umstellungen innerhalb der Planung, Mißmanagement, eine geringe Attraktivität, geschäftlicher Mißerfolg, die Behinderung durch amtliche Stellen und nicht zuletzt der Zwang zur Rücksichtnahme zählen zu den ständigen Begleiterscheinungen des offiziellen Pressewesens.« (p. 414) This is the more realistic portrait of conservative journalism in the late 1830s: *not* effectively challenging the liberals for hegemony in the public sphere, *not* reaching the desired audience, and *not* reconciling the demands of »elite« and »popular« politics, but merely making liberal ascendancy in the press slightly less than complete.

Third, Dittmer surveys the many threads that in 1848 came together to permit the founding of the first true conservative party in German history. In some ways, despite the book's title, this is the least developed of the three principal themes. Indeed, the main argument seems to be interrupted when, in the second half of the book, Dittmer discusses at length the personnel policies of the Kultusministerium. There is also a disquieting tendency when discussing the gradual emergence of a conservative *Vereinswesen* to suggest

that the proportion of officials found (for instance) in charitable organizations or in the Frankfurt parliament proves that what Dittmer somewhat loosely labels »Reform- bzw. Beamtenkonservativen« were decisive in showing the way toward formation of a conservative party. The linkage here remains tenuous because the author has focused not so much on the political views of Prussian officials as a whole – how could he? – but on only a handful of officials at the apex of three ministries. Nevertheless, these reservations aside, Dittmer's analysis of the Prussian conservative party's »pre-history« is always nuanced and thought-provoking.

This book, in sum, shakes many assumptions about the worlds of conservative journalism and Prussian politics. It shows beyond doubt that conservative forces in the Prussian administration were compelled – by Hardenberg's reforming policies, by the upheavals of 1848, and by many smaller crises in between – to supplement a »negative« (i.e., censorial) stance toward the challenge of liberal Öffentlichkeit with a »positive« (or at least proactive) response: as Dittmer documents, this policy demanded substantial sums of money and considerable (though often reluctant) patronage from the king. More surprising still is evidence that Prussian officials, far from resting on complacent assumptions about the effectiveness of Metternich's Karlsbad decrees, agonized over ways to communicate their own political *and* corporate ethos to the reading public. Dittmer's study also breaks down the notion that the Prussian bureaucracy was either a monolith or uniformly reactionary; this argument fits well into the general revisionist trend in this direction advanced for earlier and later periods by Barbara Vogel, Tibor Süle, and Gary Bonham. Lastly, this book offers a corrective to older views that treated the interrelated aspects of »modernization« – in the economy, in social relations, in administrative structures, in political representation, and (not least) in periodical publishing – as if they changed Germany in a merely cumulative way rather than reciprocally and exponentially. With admirable clarity of style, truly pathbreaking work in the archives, and fruitful engagement with previous scholarship, Dittmer has produced a book that no student of pre-1848 German politics can afford to ignore.

*James Retallack, Toronto*

Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für Deutsche Geschichte, Bd. 20: Sozialgeschichte der Juden in Deutschland. Festschrift zum 75. Geburtstag von Jacob Toury, hrsg. im Auftrag des Instituts für Deutsche Geschichte der Universität Tel Aviv von Shulamit Volkov und Frank Stern, Bleicher Verlag, Gerlingen 1991, 494 S., pbk., 78 DM.

Die Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Juden hat erst relativ spät eine angemessene wissenschaftliche Aufmerksamkeit gefunden. Die jüdische Geschichtswissenschaft, die sich im Laufe des 19. Jahrhunderts als Teil einer umfassenden »Wissenschaft des Judentums« entwickelt und vorwiegend an Rabbinerlehranstalten institutionell etabliert hatte, blieb im wesentlichen auf die Religions-, Bildungs- und Ideengeschichte konzentriert. Sozial- und wirtschaftsgeschichtliche Fragestellungen fanden erst Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts gewisse Berücksichtigung – so z. B. in der »Zeitschrift für Demographie und Statistik der Juden« oder der 1929 gegründeten »Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland«. Nach der Katastrophe gab es zunächst keine Weiterführung dieser älteren jüdischen Sozialgeschichte. In der Historiographie der aus Deutschland vertriebenen, der Vernichtung entronnenen Juden stand lange Zeit – so Shulamit Volkov in ihrem Einleitungssay – das Bemühen im Vordergrund, »Größe und Bedeutung des deutschen Judentums herauszuarbeiten und das Ausmaß seines Verlustes zu betonen.« (S. 14) Entsprechend wurden der Bei-