



Volume 3. From Vormärz to Prussian Dominance, 1815-1866

1. Government and Administration

The proper nature of government and administration was the subject of considerable intellectual controversy and political conflict in Germany during the half-century between 1815 and 1866. Three major issues are particularly helpful in illustrating the nature of government and administration and the controversies over them. The first issue, perhaps the most important, was the way in which Central Europe should be organized – as a confederation of sovereign states or as one German nation-state? The second issue was the role of popular participation in the government of the different German states and any potential united German nation-state. Should that government be authoritarian and absolutist in character or parliamentary and constitutional in nature? The third issue was what contemporaries called the emancipation of the Jews. Here, the question was not just whether members of this minority group were equal citizens, but involved the very nature of citizenship and the government.

A. Confederation or Nation-State?

Following the destruction of the old Holy Roman Empire by the armies of the First French Republic and Napoleon between 1793 and 1806, the reorganization of the governments of Central Europe became a major item on the political and diplomatic agenda. The famous Congress of Vienna, the international peace conference of 1814-15 ending the Napoleonic Wars, created its own distinct solution in the form of the German Confederation, a league of independent and sovereign German states. Although this German Confederation lasted fifty-one years (the longest governmental arrangement in Central Europe until the very end of the twentieth century, when the Federal Republic of Germany celebrated its 51st birthday in 2000), it remained a deeply disputed institution. In particular, there were persistent demands for its transformation into or replacement by a single, united German nation-state. The choice between confederation or nation-state was, of course, about the nationalist idea that one nation should live under one government but, as the following documents show, it was also about the place of

the German lands in a wider Europe, and about the goals and purposes of government in Germany.

The first group of documents contains excerpts from the German Federal Act of 1815, establishing the German Confederation, the Vienna Final Act of 1820, which supplemented this initial document, and three of the more important decisions of the Confederation: the Press Law of 1819 and the Six Articles and the Ten Articles of June-July 1832. All of these documents established the Confederation as a league of sovereign states, independent from each other and from the other European powers. They also, though, set down binding rules on these sovereign states, requiring them, for instance, to treat Catholics and Protestants equally, to have some form of representative institutions, but also to suppress freedom of the press and political activism.

The next three documents demonstrate nationalist opposition to the Confederation. Ernst Moritz Arndt (1769-1860), historian, author, and journalist, was a prominent opponent of Napoleon's rule in Germany and one of the intellectuals who first formulated modern German nationalism. His poem of 1813, "The German's Fatherland," was written in the wake of the defeat of Napoleon's armies and the collapse of Napoleonic rule in Central Europe; it would be set to music and sung countless times by German nationalists in the nineteenth century. The poem put forth a very different principle for the government of Germany than what was being decided by the diplomats in Vienna at the time of its composition. Note the way that Arndt established language and culture as the basis for a German nation-state, but also note how he proposed hatred of the French as another basis of that nation-state. Arndt condemned the German princes who had collaborated with Napoleon and whose sovereign rule was to be guaranteed by the German Confederation.

Johann August Wirth (1789-1848), journalist and political activist, was also a proponent of a united German nation-state. His speech, given before the 30,000 participants of the Hambach Festival of May 1832, a mass oppositional political demonstration, called, as Arndt's poem did, for a German nation-state and denounced Germany's princes and their confederation. While Arndt's German nationalism was based on national hatreds, Wirth imagined a German nationalism that would cooperate with other nationalist movements in opposing authoritarian rule throughout Europe.

As with the two previous documents, the article "Germany's Unification" from the *Düsseldorfer Zeitung* of September 3, 1843, criticized the existing German Confederation, but its call for a united German nation-state emphasized other, more economic, issues that would become increasingly important to nationalists as the nineteenth century proceeded.

The first actual attempts to create a German nation-state, as opposed to writing poems about it, occurred during the revolution of 1848-49. A crucial problem that emerged during these efforts, and helped ensure their failure, was whether a German nation-state should include the German-speaking inhabitants of the Austrian Empire. These individuals had always been regarded as part of Germany (as can be seen from the three previous documents); the royal dynasty of the Habsburgs, who ruled Austria, had been the head of the old Holy Roman Empire and presided over the German Confederation. Some 80 percent of the Habsburgs' subjects were not Germans, though, but Magyars, Poles, Italians, Romanians, and members of different Slavic nationalities. Were the whole Austrian Empire to be part of a united German realm, then that realm would not be a German nation-state; were only the Germans of the Austrian Empire to be part of a united Germany, then the Austrian Empire would cease to exist.

One solution, first tried in 1849, was the creation of a "small Germany," a united German nation-state excluding the Germans of the Austrian Empire. With the exclusion of Austria, such a small Germany would have been dominated by the other Central European Great Power, the Kingdom of Prussia. The National Association, founded in 1859, pressed for such a little Germany. Its founding document, the Eisenach Declaration of August 1859, and the group's declaration on a German constitution of September 1860, both implied that a small German nation-state was only possible if the Kingdom of Prussia was led by a liberal, reforming government.

The "Greater Germans," the proponents of a German nation-state including the Germans of the Austrian Empire, organized their own society in 1862, the Reform Association, to press for their version of a united Germany. Comparing their founding declaration with that of the competing National Association, we can see that the "Greater Germans" had a more favorable opinion of the German Confederation.

An important impetus for the Greater Germans was religious and confessional conflict. A large majority of the inhabitants of the Austrian Empire were Roman Catholics and Austria had always

been the Catholic Great Power in Central Europe, opposed to predominantly Protestant Prussia. Were Austria's Catholics excluded from a united, small German nation-state (as they would be in 1866), then Catholics would be a permanent minority in Germany. The September 1862 declaration of the *Katholikentag*, the yearly assembly of Roman Catholic clubs, organizations, and societies from across Central Europe, clearly demonstrates how Germany's Catholics linked the question of a small German versus a greater German nation-state with threats faced by the Catholic Church across all of Europe.

The government of the Austrian Empire instituted a diplomatic initiative in the early 1860s to gather support among the governments and people of the many German states for its position against both the Kingdom of Prussia and the small German nationalist movement. Part of this diplomatic initiative was the July 1863 proposal for the reform of the German Confederation. For all its evocation of German nationalism, the proposal shows the considerable difficulties the government of the multinational Austrian Empire had with the idea of a German nation-state.

The final document in this section is the famous "Blood and Iron" speech of Prussia's Prime Minister, Otto von Bismarck, which he delivered at a meeting of the budget commission of the Prussian parliament on September 30, 1862. At the time, the parliament, dominated by its liberal majority, was refusing to pass the Prussian government's military budget. In condemning the actions of the parliament's liberals, many of whom were affiliated with the National Association, Bismarck made it clear that he favored the creation of a small German state, dominated by Prussia, although not a liberal and reformed Prussia, as the National Association advocated. In effect, he was calling less for a small Germany than for the creation of a greater Prussia, which is what would happen following the war of 1866.

B. Authoritarian or Parliamentary/Constitutional Rule?

Another hotly contested issue of the period was the nature of governmental power. Should the executive – that is, the German monarchs – be able to rule in an authoritarian fashion, or should their power be limited by a constitution, explicitly listing the powers of an elected legislature and guaranteeing the right to public discussion of political affairs?

A prominent proponent – and practitioner – of authoritarian (or, as contemporaries would have said, absolutist) rule was the Austrian chancellor, Clemens Prince von Metternich (1773-1859).

In his letter of June 17, 1819, to his personal secretary and, as we might say today, political operative, Friedrich Gentz, Metternich denounced the enemies of absolutist rule, whom he identified as trouble-making intellectuals. Metternich was particularly hostile to both freedom of the press and constitutional government, arguing that while they might be acceptable in England or France, they were impossible in the German states. In his political testament, written in 1820, he expanded the argument made in his letter to Gentz, asserting that the common people accepted authoritarian rule, while opposition to it came from the middle class and from anti-clerical free-thinkers, and he called on monarchs across Europe to join together in taking action to preserve their rule.

Metternich's proposals were easier said than done, and even authoritarian governments, resolutely rejecting constitutions and elected legislatures, still found it necessary to cultivate public opinion. This letter of June 7, 1844, from the Prussian Minister of Educational and Religious Affairs, Karl Friedrich von Eichhorn to the Prussian Minister of the Interior, Adolf-Heinrich Count von Arnim, noted, as did Metternich, the anti-governmental activity of trouble-making intellectuals in Prussia's Rhine Province. To compete with them, Eichhorn sought funds to subsidize a newspaper that would offer a conservative, pro-governmental voice and seek to win over public opinion.

The *Staats-Lexikon* was a twelve-volume encyclopedia of political concepts that first appeared in the 1830s. Its editors and authors were proponents of political liberalism and a constitutional form of government. In the excerpts from the entry "Constitution," Carl von Rotteck (1775-1840), Professor of Law at the University of Freiburg, one of the editors of the *Staats-Lexikon*, and a liberal leader in the Grand Duchy of Baden, carefully noted the difference between absolutist and constitutional government, and argued that all of Europe was faced with a choice between these two ways of governing.

David Hansemann (1790-1864) was a wool wholesaler and financier in the city of Aachen and a leader of the liberal opposition to the authoritarian rule of the king of Prussia. In this letter to the Prussian Minister of the Interior, Ernst von Bodenschwingh, written on March 1, 1848, just after a revolution had chased the king of France from his throne and a republic had been proclaimed in Paris, and a few weeks before the revolutionary events of 1848 reached the German states, Hansemann painted a drastic picture of the results of over three decades of absolutist rule.

Most supporters in Germany of a constitutional government assumed that such a government would be a constitutional monarchy. A king or other prince would be the head of state, deriving his powers from a constitution, powers that would still be substantial, if certainly less than those of an absolute monarch. Advocacy of a republican form of government was most common during the revolution of 1848. Carl Schurz (1829-1906) was, in 1848-49, a student at the University of Bonn and a democratic and republican political activist. (Following the defeat of the revolution, he fled to the United States, where he was active in the anti-slavery cause and the new Republican Party, served as a Union general in the Civil War and was appointed Secretary of the Interior under President Hayes.) In his memoirs, written at the beginning of the twentieth century, he explained the course of events that turned him from a constitutional monarchist into a republican.

Constitutional government became increasingly the norm in Central Europe following the 1848 revolution, and even very conservative figures found such a form of government acceptable. In this 1853 speech in the parliament of the Kingdom of Prussia, Friedrich Julius Stahl (1802-61), conservative political theorist and Professor of Law at the University of Berlin, explained why he opposed a motion to abolish the Prussian constitution, instituted during the revolution of 1848. Stahl, whose ideas had a considerable influence on Bismarck, argued in his speech that a constitution would, if anything, increase the power and authority of the Prussian king, rather than weaken it, as defenders of authoritarian government in the first half of the nineteenth century had feared.

C. Emancipation of the Jews

Since Jews were a very small minority of Germany's population, around 1-1.5 percent (and even regionally rarely exceeded 5 percent), it might be surprising to see the question of their citizenship rights as a central issue of government and politics in the 1815-66 period, or for this collection of sources to rank this question alongside that of national unity or constitutional government. The emancipation of the Jews was a major political issue because the debates over it revealed profoundly different opinions about the nature of citizenship and the relationship of citizens to their government.

A useful introduction to the debate about equal rights for the Jews is an 1822 memorandum from the Ministry of State of the Duchy of Nassau, a small state in the western part of Germany,

on the question of Jewish population's rights to residence and marriage. The authors of the memorandum point out that the question itself emerged as a result of the profound political changes of the three previous decades. In the German old regime, the pre-1789 Holy Roman Empire, society and government were corporate in nature; that is, different social or religious groups had different obligations and privileges and no one group was equal to any other. In those circumstances, the idea of a religious minority with its own distinct burdens and way of life was part of the broader scope of things. Following the upheavals of the French Revolution, though, this model of government and society was replaced with one of common citizenship, which made the position of the Jews distinctive. The bureaucrats writing this memorandum noted that efforts had been made to reduce the social and economic distinctiveness of the Jewish population, in order to make its occupational structure similar to that of the other inhabitants of the Duchy. They expressed skepticism not just about the success of these efforts, but their usefulness and validity.

The second document, dated January 25, 1820, thus from about the same time, was a report of the Prussian District Government of Koblenz, an area just to the northwest of the Duchy of Nassau, about the conditions of the Jews in their district, and whether the Prussian government's edict of 1812, offering the Jews more civic rights, should be applied to the territories acquired by Prussia in 1815. The report contrasted the legal condition in the areas on the west bank of the Rhine River, where laws created by the French Revolution were in effect, with those on the east bank of the river, which were still largely from the old regime. The author of the report, opposed to granting the Jews expanded civic rights, described the Jewish population of the area in hate-filled and bigoted ways in order to justify this opinion. This very hostile account of the Jews was designed to show that they did not fit the criteria for citizenship, implying that requirements for citizenship included confessing a certain religion, following certain customs, and practicing particular occupations.

From the time of the revolutions of 1830 onward, the question of Jewish emancipation was subject to increasing debate. The following two documents show in particularly explicit form the different and opposed conceptions of the nature of state and citizenship informing this debate. The first of the two documents contains excerpts from the pamphlet *The Jewish National Distinctiveness*, published in 1831 by H.E.G. Paulus (1761-1851), Professor of Theology at the University of Heidelberg from 1811 to 1834. A rationalist theologian whose commentary on the Gospels had created an enormous stir when he denied the resurrection of Jesus, Paulus was

also politically active and frequently commented on public events. Opposing the proposal then before the parliament of the Grand Duchy of Baden for the emancipation of the Grand Duchy's Jews, Paulus asserted that Germany's Jews, by following their religious laws, were making themselves into a distinct and foreign nationality, different from other Germans. Therefore, they could only be protected subjects of the state, not equal citizens. The only way for Jews to become equal citizens, according to Paulus, was to change their laws and customs. In addition to making their religion more like Christianity, Jews would have to cease being commercial middlemen and peddlers, occupations he denounced as harmful to the public good. For Paulus, religion and nationality were integrally connected; Jews would have to demonstrate that they met standards – religious, moral, and occupational – set by Christians to become citizens of a German state.

The next document contains excerpts from a pamphlet written in response to Paulus, *Defense of the Civic Equality of the Jews against the Proposals of Herr Dr. H.C.G. Paulus*. The author was Gabriel Riesser (1806-1863), the most forthright proponent of Jewish emancipation among Germany's Jews. A Hamburg native trained in law, Riesser would have a distinguished political career: he was vice president of the Frankfurt National Assembly and, in 1859, was named as a justice on the Hamburg Court of Appeals, the first Jew in Germany to be appointed as a judge. Riesser's response to Paulus's arguments was less to defend Jewish religious rituals or to debate Jewish occupational structure than to argue that these were not the issue. In regard to Paulus's attacks on Jewish commercial activity, Riesser responded that middlemen were a normal part of commercial life, peddlers' activities were beneficial to consumers, and attacks on Jewish businessmen were largely the work of their competitors who, by limiting competition, would just harm consumers. Responding to Paulus's contention that Jews, by obeying their religious laws, set themselves outside the circle of citizenship, Riesser asserted that obeying Jewish religious law was a matter of religious conviction and individual conscience and not a precondition for citizenship, which was the obligation on the part of all citizens to obey the laws laid down by the government. Jews, Riesser pointed out, had fought in the wars of liberation against France and served in the armies of the German states, thus demonstrating that they were part of the German nation. By defining nationality, citizenship, and the role of the state very differently from Paulus, Riesser arrived at diametrically opposed conclusions about the emancipation of the Jews.

In 1846, the parliament of the Duchy of Nassau debated a motion calling on the government to grant the Jews equal rights with other citizens of the Duchy. Similar debates would be held in parliamentary bodies of other German states at this time, including Baden, Bavaria and Prussia, and in the German National Assembly during the revolution of 1848. In the course of this debate, excerpts from which are reproduced here, both proponents and opponents of the emancipation of the Jews expressed their views on the nature of citizenship and whether the Jews fulfilled the criteria necessary to be citizens.

2. Parties and Organizations

In the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century Germans recognized the existence of political parties, but had ambivalent feelings about them. The first document in this section, an excerpt from the entry "Parties" in the *Staats-Lexikon*, demonstrates this ambivalence. The author began by discussing the theories of a journalist, Friedrich Rohmer, who noted that his contemporaries in the 1840s divided the parties on a left-to-right political spectrum, naming radicals, liberals, moderates (or "juste milieu," as he said, referring to the moderates in France), and conservatives. However, the author ultimately condemned this way of thinking, preferring to describe politics in terms of special, particular interests and the general or public interest. The only legitimate parties, he asserted, were those that represented the public interest; other parties, or those representing special, particular interests, were illegitimate. The author of this excerpt had left-wing political sympathies, but the suspicion of political parties as representing illegitimate, special interests rather than the general, public interest was widespread among Germans of all political views.

Turning to the individual parties, or perhaps more precisely, to political tendencies, we can start on the right with the conservatives. The speech "What is the Revolution?," given in 1852 by the conservative political theorist Friedrich Julius Stahl, explained what conservatives opposed and, from this opposition, what conservatives espoused. In this speech we can see the important role that opposing ideas and demands of the French Revolution of 1789 played for German conservatives, and also the great importance of revealed Christian religion for conservative principles. Also of interest is Stahl's sharp denunciation of nationalism as a form of godless idolatry. Since, in the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries, nationalism has often been closely connected to conservative politics, it is always a shock to find that German (and other European) conservatives of the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century were so strongly

opposed to nationalism. When, in 1866, Otto von Bismarck, the eminently conservative Prussian Prime Minister, preceded to take up part of the nationalist political program, conservatives across Germany were horrified by his actions and saw them as a betrayal of their political principles.

At the beginning of October 1847, liberal parliamentary deputies and politicians from several states of southern Germany met in the town of Heppenheim to hammer out a common political program. Their declaration, the "Heppenheim Program" of October 10, 1847, offers a good account of liberal political thought on the eve of the revolution of 1848. Central for these liberals was the call for the creation of a united German nation-state, but they were also interested in the expansion of basic civil liberties and the rule of law, and an end to feudalism and seigneurialism. As the newspaper account of their meeting suggests, they were aware of economic issues affecting the lower classes, such as the burden of taxation, and declining standards of living, but could not reach agreement on what to do about them.

The program of the German Progressive Party, the liberal party in the Kingdom of Prussia, founded in 1861, demonstrates the demands of liberal political parties toward the end of this period. Nationalism and German national unity remained a central issue for liberals; the preservation of the rule of law and the creation of a strong and independent judiciary had become increasingly important themes. Another major item was expanding the powers of the elected House of Deputies of the Prussian Parliament against the executive branch of the Prussian government and the noble-dominated House of Lords. The burdens of taxation and questions of economic policy were also addressed, but, as in the Heppenheim program, only vaguely. Finally, we can see an emphasis on public education and the separation of church and state.

The democrats, as the more radical element in German politics of the time was often known, were at their most active and effective during the revolution of 1848-49. Gustav von Struve (1805-70) was a prominent democratic political activist in the Grand Duchy of Baden. Invited to participate in the so-called pre-parliament, the March-April 1848 meetings of liberal and democratic activists that would prepare the calling of a German National Assembly, he offered a motion encapsulating the democratic political program. Some aspects of Struve's motion reveal similarities with liberal ideas: national unity, civil liberties and the rule of law, separation of church and state, an end to feudalism and seigneurialism, but they were expressed in more

vigorous and angry language. Other aspects, characteristic of the democrats, included vehement hostility to the nobility and the advocacy of a republican form of government. The program also called for social reform and measures to combat poverty, issues the liberals were more reluctant to touch. One should also note that this democratic and radical political program was hostile to government bureaucracy and called strongly for the reduction of taxes, ideas that in more recent times are associated with conservatives.

It was only towards the end of the 1815-66 period that a specifically socialist political tendency developed out of the broader radical and democratic movement. If there is any one individual who could be called the founder of a socialist or social-democratic party in Germany it would be the author and political agitator Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-64). In his famous "Open Letter" of 1863, he called for the creation of a socialist labor party. Such a party would not just be socialist, it would also take up the liberal demand for constitutional and parliamentary government and the radical demand for a democratic suffrage because, in Lassalle's opinion, the existing liberal and democratic parties had failed to do so. The labor party would thus become, in effect, the heir to their aspirations.

One of the distinctive aspects of the German political system between 1871 and 1933 was the existence of a specifically Roman Catholic political party in addition to socialist, radical, liberal, and conservative parties. This party enjoyed the strong support of Germany's Catholic population. Before 1866, though, it was unclear if such a party would come into existence. There were certainly church-going, devout Catholics involved in politics; there were Catholic associations and societies active in public life, but the question of whether these societies should be the basis of a Catholic political party, and whether devout Catholics should be politically active in it, was unresolved. During the revolution of 1848, Germany's Catholics formed Pius Associations (named after Pope Pius IX); the general assembly of the Pius Associations of the Rhineland and Westphalia, held in Cologne from April 17-20, 1849, included a revealing debate about whether these associations should just deal with religious questions or should make their opinions known on all political questions – in effect, form a Catholic political party. The chief participants in the debate, Franz Xaver Dieringer (1811-76), Professor of Theology at the University of Bonn, the Cologne attorney Hermann von Fürth (1815-88), Franz Joseph Buß (1803-78), Professor of Law at the University of Freiburg, and Ignaz Döllinger (1799-1890), Professor of Theology at the University of Munich, were all prominent Catholic political activists. Their arguments centered on the question of whether a Catholic political party

would be good for the Church, but also whether Catholics could best make their influence felt in public life by forming their own party or by working through other, existing political parties.

3. Military and War

The most prominent military thinker of early nineteenth-century Germany (and one still appreciated today) was the Prussian Major General Carl von Clausewitz (1780-1831). His treatise *On War*, which drew on his own experiences in the Napoleonic Wars, as well as his detailed study of military history, was composed during the 1820s, but first published after his death. The book is still cited by military strategists, and most people have heard of its celebrated phrase: "War is the continuation of politics by other means." The selections here, however, emphasize the nature of warfare as it was understood in the early nineteenth century.

Clausewitz noted the increasing domination of infantry over the other branches of the armed forces, and he also noted the difficulties in making effective use of it: lengthy marches fatigued and disorganized an army; defensive operations were more likely to be successful than offensive ones. At the same time, he suggested that, since the late seventeenth century, warfare was becoming ever larger in scale and ever more focused on broader objectives and a total victory. Strategy thus called for aggressive operations to bring about total victory, but military tactics suggested such operations would be less likely to succeed.

A resolution of this dilemma would come from Helmuth von Moltke (1800-91), the first chief of the Prussian General Staff. In his memorandum of 1861, Moltke noted that improvements in military technology – particularly the rifling of gun barrels and artillery pieces and the introduction of breech-loading rifles – would greatly increase armies' firepower. Rifles and cannons could be effective at much greater ranges, and infantrymen could use their "needle guns," the breech-loading rifle that had been adopted by the Prussian army, to achieve a much greater rate of fire. In these circumstances, firepower would dominate the battlefield, making impossible frontal attacks, Napoleonic-era style bayonet charges on flat terrain. After withering infantry and artillery fire had weakened the adversary, deep formations, with extensive reserves, would launch decisive flanking and encircling attacks, taking advantage of topographical features in their advance.

How were the troops to get to the battlefield in the first place, avoiding the difficulties of the lengthy marches that Clausewitz had pointed out? Moltke's answer was that they would reach

the theater of operations by rail. In his memorandum of April 1866, on the possibility of a war between Prussia and Austria, Moltke noted that although Prussia was well outnumbered by Austria and its allies among the German states, by making effective use of the rails the Prussian army could bring more men to the front in Saxony and Bohemia than the Austrians, which is exactly what happened when war broke out two months later.

Moltke's new tactics would prove so successful because Prussia alone adopted them. The Austrian Empire, Prussia's main diplomatic and military rival among the states of the German Confederation, continued to employ the Napoleonic-era battlefield bayonet charges, to mobilize its troops slowly and cautiously, largely on foot, and to rely more on fortresses than on railroads. Prince Kraft zu Hohenlohe-Ingelfingen (1827-92) had a long military career, ending as a general of the Prussian artillery. In 1854, as a young officer, he was the Prussian military attaché in Vienna. His impressions of the Austrian army, as set down in his posthumously published memoirs, show an incompetently led and poorly trained armed force, incapable of coming to grips with advances in military thinking or technology.

4. Economy and Labor

The 1815-66 period saw the growing implementation of a free market economy in the German states and the abolition of barriers to market freedom, such as seigniorial rights in agriculture, the guild system in the crafts, and protective tariffs in international trade. These changes, however, were hard fought, and opponents of different aspects of the free market economy put up a vigorous fight against economic liberalization.

Great Britain was the great model for nineteenth-century advocates of the free market economy, and the leading spokesman for free trade in Germany in the 1815-66 period was an Englishman, John Prince-Smith (1809-74), who moved to the Prussian town of Elbing in 1831 to teach English and eventually became a Prussian subject. Prince-Smith was one of the founders of the Congress of German Economists, a debating and lobbying group that vigorously promoted free trade. Following are excerpts from Prince-Smith's 1843 and 1845 essays on free trade and protectionism, in which he argued the virtues of free trade and the importance of government non-interference in the economy. Prince-Smith was careful to connect his endorsement of the free market both to the heroes of Prussia's early nineteenth-century reform era (the Prussian reformers were, in fact, supporters of a free market economy), but also to link

it to the first building of railroads and the development of factory industry in Central Europe during the 1840s. Also included in this section is an excerpt from a later essay from 1863 on the nature of the market, in which Prince-Smith discussed a quite different aspect of economic development, arguing that a free market would increase economic growth and improve the condition of the working class.

The introduction of a free market economy in nineteenth-century Germany involved two different and distinct kinds of freedom, and advocates of one were not always supporters of the other. One was freedom of trade and commerce (*Handelsfreiheit*), which involved ending tariffs, import prohibitions, and other limitations on goods flowing from one state to another. The other freedom was freedom of occupation (*Gewerbefreiheit*), the freedom to practice any trade or craft, and closely connected with it, the freedom to take one's residence where one wished. The chief enemy of freedom of occupation was the guilds, whose members were determined to restrict the number of people who could practice crafts and to regulate very closely the practice of such crafts. Germany's city-states, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck, were strongholds of the guilds. The economy of these cities was largely dependent on international trade, and their governments were strong proponents of freedom of commerce, but they were also generally opposed to freedom of occupation. [Karl] Victor Böhmert (1829-1918) was an economist and business journalist, and was active in the Congress of German Economists; in the late 1850s, he was also editor of the *Handelsblatt*, a commercial newspaper in Bremen. (Böhmert would later be named professor at the Dresden Institute of Technology and director of the Saxon State Bureau of Statistics.) In his 1858 book on freedom of occupation, excerpts from which are reproduced here, he confronted Bremen's supporters of the guild system. Böhmert quoted guild proponents who asserted that guilds reinforced the middle class, prevented the growth of an impoverished proletariat, and improved the moral qualities of life among craftsmen and workers. He argued that exactly the opposite was the case, that freedom of occupation would encourage these worthwhile conditions, while the regulations of the guild system would prevent them.

Particularly in the first half of the nineteenth century, repeated economic crises and evidence of growing impoverishment of large portions of the population made the ideas of economic deregulation unpopular. The economist Friedrich Bülow (1805-59), Professor of Governmental Administration (*Staatswissenschaft*) at the University of Leipzig, asserted in 1834 that contemporary understandings of the growth of poverty in Germany during the first half of the

nineteenth century ignored the impact of markets on standards of living. He argued for free market solutions in agriculture, trade, and poor relief as means to resolve Germany's economic difficulties.

Even supporters of the free market had their doubts. This excerpt on freedom of occupation, taken from the entry "Trade and Manufacturing" in Rotteck and Welcker's *Staats-Lexikon*, vigorously denounced guilds and called for the establishment of freedom of occupation. Yet the author could not help noting that a free market in labor seemed to lead to the domination of large capitalists over small businesses. Rejecting any form of government intervention, he felt that the solution to this problem was to be found in voluntary associations, cooperatives, and educational efforts – ideas that were widely popular among German supporters of a free market economy, as can be seen from Böhmert's essay on freedom of occupation excerpted above.

One of the most prominent critics of free trade was the journalist and economist Friedrich List (1789-1846). In his most famous work, *The National System of Political Economy* (1841), excerpted here, List criticized Adam Smith and his successors. List argued that free trade between nations favored economically and industrially more advanced countries, such as Great Britain, and was harmful to industrially less advanced countries, such as Germany. These countries should introduce protective tariffs on manufactured goods to help their manufacturing capability develop. More broadly, List argued for a specifically national view of economic development and for the importance of policies aimed at improving the skills of a labor force as a means of economic development. List's ideas were very influential in nineteenth-century Germany, and his works are read with interest in East Asia today.

While supporting protectionism in international trade, Friedrich List believed in free trade among the German states and in freedom of occupation and residence within them. However, in the years 1815-66, there were many critics of freedom of occupation and residence, and many supporters of the guilds. One of their major arguments was that the introduction of such freedoms was really an act of bureaucratic oppression, imposed on an unwilling population by authoritarian government officials. The folklorist and conservative journalist Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl (1823-97) articulated this idea with verve and clarity in his very influential book *Civil Society* (1851).

The emergent socialist movement, as one might expect, was no friend of the free market. In this excerpt from Ferdinand Lassalle's 1863 "Open Letter," the socialist leader explained his "iron law of wages," according to which the workings of the free labor market invariably and irresistibly reduced workers' wages to a subsistence minimum.

The period 1815-66 saw the development of a specifically Roman Catholic social and economic doctrine in Germany. More than any other, the man who articulated this doctrine was the Bishop of Mainz, Wilhelm Emmanuel von Ketteler (1811-77). Ketteler took up both the conservative criticism of freedom of occupation and Lassalle's "iron law of wages," vigorously condemning the free market economy and the political liberals who endorsed it. Yet, unlike other Catholic or conservative critics of the free market, he had his doubts about the guild system, noting the benefits to consumers from economic competition, and he rejected the idea of government economic intervention. Ketteler felt that the Catholic Church could best help solve the social question by offering charity, getting the workers to lead a moral and religious life, and encouraging wealthy and devout Catholics to provide the funds to found producers' cooperatives.

5. Nature and Environment

It would not be unfair to say that environmentalism in the modern sense or a feeling that industrial and technological developments were threatening nature did not exist in Germany between 1815 and 1866. Industrialization and urbanization were just getting started in these years. There were certainly instances of gaseous or liquid discharges from early factories causing damage in their vicinity and angering or annoying their neighbors. Early governmental regulations on such emissions and legal doctrines that treated them as a public nuisance, rather like the sort that might emerge from an overflowing cesspool, were not very effective instruments for dealing with such still relatively uncommon developments. As the following documents show, contemporaries were quite unsure what to make of – and do about – these new trends.

In 1816, a chemical factory was founded in the Westphalian city of Iserlohn. Complaints from neighbors and government measures against it had begun as early as 1830, but, as the following documents show, somehow nothing ever seemed to be done about it. The factory was finally closed down in 1853.

In 1862, a group of Ulm residents presented a petition to the Bavarian Ministry of the Interior, complaining about the pollution stemming from the increased use of coal as a fuel in larger production facilities. Asked to comment, the Bavarian government's Central Office for Trade and Industry admitted the validity of the petitioners' complaints, but could not suggest any effective way to deal with the situation, and rather implied that the citizens of Ulm would just have to get used to it.

At this time, Germany's physicians were just beginning to become aware of the potential health hazards of industrial pollution. The following selection is an excerpt from a clinical report and autopsy published in the medical journal *Deutsche Klinik* in 1860 by Professor Ludwig Traube (1818-1876), a physician at Charité, the hospital associated with the University of Berlin. It shows German medical science starting to develop an understanding of black lung as a specific disease associated with the breathing of coal dust, and as different from the many other respiratory system diseases (influenza, pneumonia, bronchitis, tuberculosis) that were common at the time.

6. Gender, Family and Generation

Dominant and widely accepted ideas about family and gender in this period were set down in two entries in the *Staats-Lexikon*. In the first, "Family, Family Law," the author asserted that marriage was the moral and legal basis of the family. Marriages were a union of two people, based on their mutual love and affection, into one united personality, under the control of the husband. Marriage was also a property relationship, where, once again, the husband was in charge of family property, but in which the wife retained certain rights to her property. Finally, families were hierarchies in which the parents had authority over their minor children and the head of household had authority over servants, who were perceived as members of the family.

The second article, "Relations between the sexes," deals with purported differences between men and women and the political consequences of these differences. Taking up a common contemporary theme, the author asserted that men and women were different by nature. The former were active, vigorous, and rational, their lives oriented primarily outward; the latter were passive, accepting, and emotional, their lives oriented inward toward the family and the household. As a result, the author maintained, only men should have the right of active political

participation. He rejected the ideas of conservatives, who believed that poor men should have no more rights than women, and well as the ideas of feminists, who felt that women should have equal political rights with men. At the same time, the author felt that women could participate in public life to a certain extent, using their female qualities of empathy and caring to form associations, to petition the government, and to be spectators at meetings of parliamentary bodies.

One might wonder about the extent to which these ideas about family and gender corresponded to actual circumstances. Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl had his doubts, noting that the ideal of separate spheres – men at work in public, women at home with the family – was seen primarily in the life of the upper classes, while among the common people men's and women's common activities intersected much more.

Then as today, big cities included groups of residents whose private lives differed strongly from the dominant ideals. In his 1846 book *Berlin*, author Ernst Dronke (1822-91) described two examples of urban phenomena. One example was the commercialization of marriage in the form of marriage brokers, who brought together individuals primarily on the basis of their property, thus making a mockery of the idea of marriage as a union of two people based on mutual love and affection. The other example was the lives of Bohemian intellectuals, who supported the emancipation of women, lived together without being married, and generally rejected the assertion that marriage was the moral and religious basis of family life.

Early German feminists criticized dominant ideals of marriage to some extent. In the *Women's Newspaper* (of which she was editor), the author and political activist Louise Otto (1819-95) denounced the way that marriage in rural areas was based entirely on property, with no attention given to mutual love and affection (which the authors of the *Staats-Lexikon*, one might remember, also saw as necessary to marriage).

Women's political activism was most often seen in Central Europe during the revolution of 1848. The three following examples show that their activism was more in conformity with the gender ideals expressed in the *Staats-Lexikon* than in opposition to them.

In the appeal of the married women and maidens of Württemberg to Germany's soldiers, women used their place in the home and family, and their status as primarily loving and emotional creatures, to encourage men to take political action.

Louise Otto's statement of principles, published in the first issue of her *Women's Newspaper* (April 21, 1849), shows the careful distance she kept from "emancipated" feminists who denied any differences between men and women.

Women in Vienna were particularly active during the 1848 revolution. The following documents introduce the statutes of the city's Democratic Women's Association, a brief retrospective report from 1850 on its activities, and the petition that the association sent to the Austrian Constituent Assembly. Only women could be active and voting members of the group, and married and unmarried women had equal membership rights. These statutes were a bit of a challenge to the ideas about gender introduced in the *Staats-Lexikon* articles. The group's activities, though, generally followed the lines laid down as appropriate for women.

Women's political activism in Germany was suppressed after the failure of the 1848 revolution and only revived in the 1860s. 1865 saw the founding of the first national women's group, the General German Women's Association. Its statutes and the 1869 report of its presiding officer, Louise Otto, show that the group's efforts were primarily directed toward improving women's education and their chances for employment. The idea of women in the workplace, particularly women from the educated middle class, was a challenge to the gender ideals expressed in the *Staats-Lexikon*, which placed women's activities in the home and family.

1866 saw the formation in Berlin of the Association for the Encouragement of Employment Qualifications among Members of the Female Sex, or the Lette Association, as it was commonly known. As this 1890 retrospective on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the group's founding makes clear, it was neither a feminist nor an oppositional organization. Its founder, Professor Lette, was a man, a member of the social reform group the Association for the Welfare of the Working Classes; his society was endorsed and financially supported by members of the Prussian royal family. Nonetheless, the group's purpose – to provide education and job-training to young women from the middle class and to enable them to support themselves without having to be married – was also a step away from the gender ideals so prevalent in the period.

All of these forms of women's activity were far from finding universal support and endorsement. Political conservatives, in particular, were quite opposed to the idea of women having any role in public life. In this excerpt, Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl takes up the dominant ideas about differences between men and women and uses them to attack not just "emancipated" women, such as the author Louise Aston, but all forms of women's activity outside the home.

7. Region, City, Countryside

Riehl was a keen, if at times tendentious, observer of Germany's regions and its rural and urban areas. In this selection from *Land and People* (1851), he argues that Germany could be divided into three regions, each characterized by a distinctive relationship between city and country. The student should be aware that Riehl's very acute observations were laden with politically loaded value judgments, above all his assumption that people who live in the city and in the country should be very different.

A second excerpt from Riehl's *Civil Society* (1851) addresses the continuing presence, among Germany's rural population in the middle of the nineteenth century, of regional identities dating back to Germany's old regime: before the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Eras and the Congress of Vienna had drastically transformed the territories of the German states.

When Germans think of a region as being provincial, they often think of the Palatinate (Pfalz), in the extreme southwestern corner of Central Europe, on the west bank of the Rhine River. In 1857, the novelist and journalist August Becker (1826-91) wrote a celebrated traveler's guide to the Palatinate, which began with a general description of the region and its inhabitants. Becker's version of what makes a region includes natural features, such as climate and topography, historical experiences, folkloric customs, and social practices. He also noted the importance of the relationship of the region to its ruling state (the Kingdom of Bavaria, in this case) and to the idea of a German nation-state. Becker's political sympathies were with the liberals, and the student might compare his ideas about what makes a region with those of his conservative contemporary Riehl.

The years 1815-66 were not a period of rapid urbanization in Germany; it was only after c. 1850 that the population of cities and towns began to grow at a faster rate than the population as a whole. There was no one dominant urban center in the German states, of the sort that Paris,

London, Madrid, Lisbon, Amsterdam, Copenhagen, or Stockholm were in other European countries. The most rapidly growing of Germany's large cities was the Prussian capital Berlin. The writer and socialist Ernst Dronke's 1846 book about the capital city created a sensation and led to his arrest by the Prussian authorities. The excerpts presented here paint a picture of life in the metropolis: fast-paced, immoral, diverse, and anonymous. As a socialist, Dronke also describes Berlin as a city of expanding capitalism and working-class misery. A closer look at his description of the workers, though, finds a long list of pre-industrial crafts and master artisans dependent on merchant capitalists, but very few factory workers. The Berlin Dronke describes here seems closer to a pre-industrial eighteenth-century European city than to later nineteenth- and early twentieth-century industrial centers of the sort that Berlin itself would become.

8. Religion

The first two-thirds of the nineteenth century was a period of growing secularization in Germany, particularly among the educated Protestant middle class. In contrast to the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, this secularization did not take the form of opposition to Christian revealed religion; rather, it emerged from within Christianity itself. A prime document of this development is the 1835 book *The Life of Jesus*, by the Protestant theologian David Friedrich Strauss (1808-74). Applying the methods of the "higher criticism" devised by German Protestant theologians to develop a better understanding of the Bible, Strauss concluded that Gospel accounts of the miracles and of the death and resurrection of Jesus were later, mythical interpolations to the life-story of a mortal figure. Even more, he asserted that the ideals of Jesus's teaching would be more appropriately expressed in a secular humanism than in Protestant doctrine. The book cost Strauss his position at the University of Tübingen. His appointment as Professor of Protestant Theology at the University of Zurich in 1839 was thwarted by a mob of angry devout Protestants, but the ideas he expressed continued to exert an influence throughout the nineteenth century.

If the years 1815-66 were a period of growing secularization, they were also, paradoxically, a period of religious revival. Among the Roman Catholics of Central Europe, there developed a growing belief in the validity of religious practices and beliefs rejected by the Enlightened eighteenth century: veneration of the Virgin Mary, saying the rosary, pilgrimages and processions, and divine intervention in human affairs in the form of miracles. The great pilgrimage to the Holy Shroud of Trier was an early example of this form of piety. Perhaps a half

million pilgrims went to the Trier cathedral that year to see the shroud (the seamless garment worn by Christ before his crucifixion, in the Gospel according to St. John) publicly exhibited. Jacob Marx (1803-76), Professor at the Trier Theological Seminary, described the pilgrimage in terms of a revival of Catholic piety.

Many of Germany's Protestants were also experiencing a religious revival at this time, which contemporaries called the Awakening. The Awakened, who strongly rejected the rationalist ideas of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment as well as their nineteenth-century continuation in the doctrines of the philosopher G.W.F. Hegel and his followers (such as David Strauss), were born-again Christians who experienced a personal relationship to Jesus and placed Biblical revelation above human reason. As a group, they were very active in founding organizations and societies for charitable and pious purposes. Missionary societies to bring the Gospel to "heathens" and Jews were a favorite project of Awakened German Protestants. This account of the founding of missionary societies in Elberfeld and Barmen – two industrial cities in western Germany where the Awakening was very influential – shows both the theological and intellectual context of the Awakening. Its first adherents, often few in number and gathering in conventicles, saw themselves as part of an international Protestant movement of religious revival and rejected both eighteenth-century Protestant rationalism and the ideas of the French Revolution.

One of the leading Awakened theologians in Germany was Friedrich August Tholuck (1799-1877). Tholuck was Professor of Theology at the University of Halle from 1825 until his death; he was a prolific scholar and an active preacher, fighting for an Awakened Protestantism and battling religious rationalists from the pulpit, at faculty meetings, in the lecture hall, and in both scholarly studies and polemical essays. Following are excerpts from two sermons he delivered at the university chapel in Halle to students of Protestant theology. The first, "What is human reason worth?," from the early 1840s, opposes the efforts of rationalists like David Friedrich Strauss to criticize Biblical texts by asserting that human reason is only valuable if it is exercised under the guidance of divine inspiration, as laid down in revelation. The second, "When is greater civic freedom fortunate for a people?," given during the revolution of 1848, is sharply critical of the revolution, and of calls for freedom, democracy, and civic rights. It shows the strongly conservative political orientation of most devout German Protestants of the era.

Between the growth of a secular humanism, on the one hand, and a religious revivalism on the other, it became more difficult in the years 1815-66 to find a religious middle ground, one that sought to reconcile revealed religion with developments in science and critical humanistic scholarship. Adherents of all religions in Germany tried to do this, although efforts in this direction were less common among Catholics than among Jews and Protestants. One prominent example of such an attempt was the founding at a conference in the Thuringian city of Eisenach in 1865 of the Protestant Association (*Protestantenverein*). Daniel Schenkel (1813-1885), Professor of Theology at the University of Heidelberg, a center of religious rationalism in Germany, was one of the co-founders of the group. The following excerpts from a pamphlet he wrote to justify the organization's existence outline some of the major arguments used to carve out a place between rationalist humanism and religious revivalism. Schenkel's distinction between religion and church, his definition of Protestantism in terms of freedom of conscience and individual spiritual inquiry, produced a very different picture of religion than did Tholuck's, which was based on Biblical revelation. Schenkel's linking of Protestantism to the German nation and to demands for critical thinking on the part of the educated German middle class suggested a religion aligned with liberalism and nationalism, once again different from Tholuck's views on religion and politics. The slogan of the Protestant Association, its call for "the renewal of the Protestant Church in the spirit of evangelical freedom" and "in harmony with the overall cultural development of our time," would suggest a way to reconcile Protestant religion with the new trends in science and scholarship, while retaining the ideals of the Reformation.

9. Literature, Art, Music

During the first half of the nineteenth century, two cultural styles prevailed in Central Europe: Classicism and Romanticism. The former emphasized finished craftsmanship, elegance, and proportion in art; its adherents were cosmopolitan and looked to classical antiquity, particularly ancient Greece, for their cultural models. The latter emphasized passion, longing, the unfinished, and the incomplete; its supporters tended to be nationalists, and they found their cultural models, above all, in the Gothic art of the Middle Ages.

The leading advocate and representative of the Classical style in early nineteenth-century Germany was the poet, playwright, and novelist Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832). During the final years of his life, Goethe engaged in a series of thoughtful discussions with Johann Peter Eckermann, a young protégé. Eckermann recorded their conversations and

published them after Goethe's death. The first document in this section is taken from *Conversations with Eckermann*; in it, Goethe reasserts the validity of his own aesthetic ideas and denounces the competing ideas of the Romantics.

Above all, it was the author and literary critic Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829) who most clearly articulated the ideals of Romanticism. Included next are excerpts from three of his works. First come passages from *Athenaeum Fragments* (1798). It was here that Schlegel introduced the term Romantic poetry, which he described as being characterized by incompleteness and a longing for the infinite. Then come excerpts from *Fundamentals of Gothic Architecture* and *Appeal to Painters of the Present Day* (both from 1803-04). In these texts, Schlegel points to two key sources of the Romantic longing for the undefined and the infinite: Gothic art and wild, unspoiled nature.

It is important to note that Romanticism and Classicism were broad cultural styles whose impact on people's lives extended well beyond the narrowly artistic. The next document consists of two parts: first comes a letter of consolation that Austrian Chancellor Clemens Prince von Metternich sent to Prussian King Frederick William IV upon the death of the latter's father, King Frederick William III. Metternich's letter is followed by Frederick William IV's reply. Whereas Metternich was an avid adherent of the Classical style, Frederick William IV was an ardent lover of Romanticism: the contrast between their two styles is informative.

In the 1830s, a group of Central European authors started to criticize the Romantic cultural style. They accused its adherents of using aesthetic theories to mask and apologize for political, social, and economic oppression. In 1835, authorities in the German Confederation formally banned the writings of these authors, known collectively as "Young Germany." The group's most famous representative, the poet and literary critic Heinrich Heine (1796-1856), was already living in exile in Paris at the time. In *The Romantic School*, which was published the following year, Heine told his French audience why "Young Germany" was critical of the Romantics, but he also praised their aspirations.

Already implicit in the writings of "Young Germany" was the call for a more realistic art – an art that strove to portray life as it actually was, not as it should be according to various ideals. Berthold Auerbach (1812-82) and Gustav Freytag (1816-95) were two of the leading Realist novelists of the mid-nineteenth century. In the preface to *Village Tales* (1844), a collection of

short stories, Auerbach wrote that his intention had been to write a realistic, not an idealized, account of peasant life in southwest Germany. In an 1853 review of various novels published in his literary journal *Die Grenzboten* (*The Border Messengers*), Freytag presented a program for a realist literature.

10. Elite and Popular Culture

The brothers Jacob (1785-1863) and Wilhelm Grimm (1786-1859) were linguists and folklorists who devoted their lives to the collection and preservation of popular culture. Among their works, individually and together, were collections of proverbs, mythology, and an enormous multi-volume dictionary of the German language, which was started by them but completed decades later by other scholars. The brothers Grimm are, of course, best known for their collection of fairy tales. The first item in this section is the preface to the second edition of their collection, which appeared in 1819. In this preface, the Grimms describe the characteristics of popular culture, sharply distinguishing it from elite, literary, and scholarly culture. Popular culture was traditional, largely unchanged across the ages, and was, indeed, a key to the original character of a nation. It was orally transmitted by the simple, almost childish, common people, especially the peasants. With the progress of education, urban life, and high culture – written, complex, changing, and the product of the educated classes – popular culture was in danger of being forgotten. The job of scholarly critics, such as the Grimm brothers themselves, was not to criticize popular culture, or even to investigate it more carefully (some of the stories they described as authentic German folk tales actually derived from seventeenth-century French writers), but to gather it, to keep it from being forgotten, and to celebrate it, rather in the fashion of the Romantics' enthusiasm for nature and the Middle Ages.

The brothers Grimm thus drew a clear distinction between elite culture and popular culture, each having their separate characteristics and each their distinct validity. In this excerpt from his famous book *Berlin* (1846), author Ernst Dronke describes popular and elite theater. Dronke found the two all too similar, and was clearly dismayed by this. Moreover, he was disappointed that elite theater lacked the cultural and artistic excellence he felt it ought to have.

In *Civil Society* (1851), Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl expressed his doubts about whether educated, middle-class authors knew enough about peasant life and peasant culture to write realistic fiction about it.

11. Science and Education

In the first half of the nineteenth century, there were strong elements in German intellectual life, stemming from the cultural tradition of classicism and the philosophical one of idealism, arguing in favor of the unity of all systematic knowledge. Probably the most prominent proponent of such ideas was the philosopher G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831). His 1817 *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, an excerpt from which is provided here, was a sort of brief account of the unity of such knowledge. Hegel's convoluted prose is notoriously difficult to understand, but the student might want to note Hegel's argument that philosophy – because it addresses the creation and definition of concepts – is the master branch of knowledge. Hegel developed basic ideas of physics and biology from philosophical concepts and was not afraid to criticize Isaac Newton's theories of physics on the basis of his philosophy.

Hegel included what we would now call the humanities and social sciences in his unity of all knowledge. In the following excerpt from his lectures on the philosophy of world history, delivered during the 1820s when he was a professor at the University of Berlin, Hegel explains that the meaning of human history is the progress of the philosophical concept of freedom.

Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1858) was a naturalist and explorer, whose celebrated expedition to South America, lasting from 1799 to 1804, generated a lifetime of scholarly studies of botany and natural history. Toward the end of his life, between 1845 and 1858, Humboldt wrote the multi-volume work *Cosmos*, in which he attempted to articulate the unity of all scientific and scholarly knowledge, demonstrating its links to human passions and desires, and to practical engineering and economics as well.

Humboldt's attempt to articulate the unity of knowledge was one of the last examples of such a classicist and idealist effort. As early as the 1820s a quite different attitude was appearing – one that would become dominant among German scholars and scientists after the middle of the nineteenth century. In an 1862 speech given upon his appointment as pro-rector at the University of Heidelberg, the physicist Hermann von Helmholtz (1821-94), formulator of the law of the conservation of energy, explicitly rejected Hegel's ideal of a philosophical unity of knowledge. Rather, he drew clear conceptual and epistemological distinctions between the natural and physical sciences on the one hand, and the humanities and social sciences on the other.

It was not just German scientists who criticized the idealist conception of the unity of knowledge, but scholars in the humanities as well. The historian Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886) emphatically rejected Hegel's approach to human history as demonstrating the development and progress of philosophical concepts. Rather, as can be seen from the excerpts reproduced here – the introduction to his 1825 book *The History of the Latin and Teutonic Nations*, his notes from the 1830s on history and philosophy, and his 1854 lectures on world history, Ranke stressed the importance of precisely understanding historical events on the basis of an intensive and critical study of published and unpublished primary sources. Ranke did not deny that there were general themes that could become apparent from the study of history, but he believed that such themes emerged from the historian's empirical analysis rather than philosophical presuppositions. Ranke was also skeptical of the idea that history was the story of any form of progress, conceptual or otherwise.

While scholars argued about the meaning of advanced forms of knowledge, a quite different controversy was in progress concerning elementary education. One tendency in this controversy was represented by Friedrich August Ludwig von der Marwitz (1777-1837), a noble landlord in the province of Brandenburg in the Kingdom of Prussia, who was the model of a nineteenth-century reactionary. When, in the first decade of the nineteenth century, the Prussian government set about freeing the serfs, Marwitz opposed this so vigorously that the frustrated Prussian Chancellor von Hardenberg had him imprisoned in a fortress. In his 1836 memorandum on crime and moral decay, Marwitz set out, in slightly exaggerated form, a nineteenth-century conservative belief about elementary public education for the lower classes. Such education, Marwitz thought, should consist primarily of teaching children of the common people the basics of religion and morality. Further instruction, whether in the three R's, or more advanced subjects, would just ruin the common people morally and economically.

Friedrich Adolph Diesterweg (1790-1866) was a secondary school teacher and a prominent proponent of a progressive pedagogy in which pupils would learn a wide variety of topics by independent investigation. A prolific author, rather the hero of many of Germany's schoolteachers (and still widely esteemed today), Diesterweg served as director of the teachers' college in Berlin from 1832 until 1847, at which point he was dismissed due to conservative political pressure. Diesterweg's 1856 essay "An Educator's Little Book of Crabs," gets its comic-sounding title from the fact that crabs scuttle backwards, and thus were a nineteenth-century epithet for reactionaries, people who wanted to move society and politics back into the past. In

this essay, Diesterweg denounced the enemies of progressive pedagogy: supporters of rote learning and memorization, proponents of religion as the primary subject of instruction in the public schools, adherents of the subordination of schoolteachers to the clergy and, more generally, those who wished to keep schoolteachers in a low social status.

Jonathan Sperber