
Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte
Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris
(Institut historique allemand)
Band 6 (1978)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.1978.0.49275

Rechtshinweis

Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

Manfred RAUH, *Die Parlamentarisierung des Deutschen Reiches*, Düsseldorf (Droste) 1977, 533 p. (Beiträge des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, Bd. 60).

This very important book marks a further escalation of the already lively historiographical controversy concerning the character of imperial Germany. It is the sequel to Dr. Rauh's earlier monograph published in the same series, »Föderalismus und Parlamentarismus im Wilhelminischen Reich« (1973), which brought his story up to about the end of the Bülow era. But his new volume does more than simply round out the subject by advancing it to a chronological terminus in November 1918. The emphasis has been quite noticeably shifted in such a way that the somewhat muted implications of the author's previous work have now been openly and vigorously stated. The more assertive tone results in part from a deliberate change of targets. Whereas the fire of Dr. Rauh's first study was directed mainly against the massive four-volume constitutional history of Ernst Rudolf Huber, »Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1789« (1957–69), now his heavy artillery has been drawn up to face the self-proclaimed »critical school« led by Hans-Ulrich Wehler. Dr. Rauh's text and footnotes fairly bristle with pejorative remarks that are bound to rankle with his latest antagonists. Obviously he is itching for a fight, and it should be interesting to see how he fares with such formidable opposition: a list that includes, besides Wehler, such names as Boldt, Witt, Saul, Puhle, Berghahn, Kocka, Fischer, Heckart, Albrecht, Feldman, Sauer, and others.

Dr. Rauh is persuaded that Huber and Wehler, strange bedfellows indeed, share one fatal misconception. They both stress that the autocratic and essentially antiparliamentary character of the Second Reich was rigidly fixed from the time of its inauguration and was thereafter incapable of organic evolution. To the contrary, Rauh is at pains to demonstrate, a steady process took place after 1890 in which the weight of political authority was increasingly transferred from the Bundesrat to the Reichstag. This development had important consequences, most basic among them the progressive dissolution of Prussia's hegemony over Germany's federal system of government. This »quiet parliamentarization« brought the Reich inexorably closer to democracy, a metamorphosis hastened by the World War and finally realized, albeit under instable and unfortunate circumstances, in the form of the Weimar Republic.

Although such a brief gloss cannot possibly do justice to the nearly one thousand pages of Rauh's two volumes, this scenario should be sufficiently clear to suggest how he arrives at generalizations that are antithetical to those popularized by the »critical school.« Rauh takes seriously German parliamentary life that has often been dismissed by others as merely a fraudulent *Scheinkonstitutionalismus*. He also insists on the interaction of foreign and domestic affairs and thus rejects the slogan of *Primat der Innenpolitik* repeatedly advocated by Wehler et al. He argues, more over, that the political integration of the SPD and the emergence of the liberal Erzberger wing of the Center Party were symptomatic of a »crypto-parliamentary« trend. Hence Rauh concludes that the insurrections of 1918 were harmful (*ein belastendes Moment*) for the intro-

duction of genuine democracy; in 1918 Germany experienced at best a superfluous revolution. He does not hide his skepticism about the revolutionary councils (*Räte*) as the potential basis for a more democratic system, thus putting himself again at odds with numerous scholars who have in recent years adopted a more generous view of them.

These are substantive judgments. They can be and doubtless will be debated as historians attempt to digest some of the huge morsels that Dr. Rauh has offered them. But beyond the identifiable issues, he also raises a number of methodological objections to the »critical school« that will prevent his work from going down easily. Any rapid listing of his more serious charges against other historians would include at least the following: harboring predetermined opinions, selection of evidence to suit prejudice, simultaneous disregard of contrary evidence, narrowness of interpretation, predilection for striking phrases rather than for thorough documentation, exaggeration, reductionism, and retrospective *Besserwisserei*. These are grave and hurtful imputations made with cutting specificity. Those who have been struck by them are certain to retaliate, and Dr. Rauh had best prepare to defend himself against the predictable counterattack.

Well conceived as it is, Rauh's work is far from invulnerable; and it is consequently not difficult to discern a few of the weaknesses that his detractors are likely to exploit. For someone who is quick to criticize others for their excesses, first of all, he is conspicuously given to the same foible. For instance, in the two decades after Bismarck's dismissal from office, he argues, the internal balance of power in Germany was »completely transformed« (*total verwandelt*). Such hyperbole is likewise apparent in his discussion of »quiet parliamentarization« in 1917–1918 which was, he contends, »solely« (*nur*) the culmination of an extended democratic development. Might not common sense dictate a less categorical view? Are we seriously expected to believe that the military defeat and discredit of the imperial leadership in the final days of the war were only incidental to the creation of the Weimar Republic? And is it far fetched to suppose that, had Ludendorff's final offensive succeeded in the spring and summer of 1918, the inexorability of parliamentary democracy might have been thrown into serious question? In Dr. Rauh's leadpipe certainty about an evolutionary process that was »not to be deterred« (*nicht zu verhindern*), there is more than a hint of fatalism. In this regard he seems guilty of the elementary historical fallacy of assuming what came to be also had to be.

Yet at the same time Rauh is capable of indulging in counterfactual speculation. He wonders about the missed opportunity in 1918 to leave intact some form of monarchy in Germany and thereby to provide a continuity sorely lacked by the Weimar Republic. Fully aware that such a notion will surely provoke the mirth if not the wrath of the »critical school,« and not of them alone, Rauh hastens to add that this possibility is not mentioned out of any political motive but with the »scientific« intent of explaining why the troubled beginnings of the Republic only served to weaken its parliamentary system. In this rather strained attempt to make a complete separation of politics from *Wissenschaft* so as to maintain the purity of the latter, one may detect a somewhat

quaint Weberian notion of the historian's craft that hardly seems fit to elicit universal assent.

Finally, R. may be found lacking in conceptual clarity on precisely the point that is most fundamental to his thesis. In his long and illuminating discussion of the changes that occurred in imperial Germany's ruling system over a span of several decades, he lapses into occasional confusion about whether he is describing the progress of parliamentarization or of bureaucratization. A distinction between *Reichsleitung* and *Reichsverwaltung* is not always sustained. Most of us in this century have found occasion to observe that there is a crucial difference between being democratically governed and efficiently administered. When assessing a major historical analysis of modern Germany, of all places, it is more than a quibble to inquire whether this issue does not deserve more thoughtful consideration than Dr. Rauh devotes to it. Still, the magnitude of his effort should in no way be diminished by the suspicion that he may not have had the final word. Partly because of his remarkable efforts, the controversy to which he has addressed himself appears destined to continue.

Allan MITCHELL, San Diego

Gilbert BADIA, Rosa Luxemburg. Journaliste, Polémiste, Revolutionnaire, Paris (Éditions Sociales) 1975, 8°, 931 S.

Rosa Luxemburg (1850–1919) war sicherlich die bedeutendste Persönlichkeit des linken Flügels der SPD in den letzten Jahren vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg sowie des Spartakusbundes bzw. der KPD im Kriege und in der deutschen Revolution 1918/1919. Mit ihrer und Karl Liebknechts Ermordung am 15. Januar 1919 begannen die Schreckenstaten der Gegenrevolution gegen führende Repräsentanten der ersten deutschen Republik, die dann in der Ermordung von Kurt Eisner, Hugo Haase, Matthias Erzberger, Walter Rathenau und so vieler anderer weniger bekannter Persönlichkeiten ihre Fortsetzung fanden.

Das Leben und Wirken Rosa Luxemburgs ist in den letzten Jahren eingehend erforscht worden,¹ ihre längeren wissenschaftlichen wie auch ihre kürzeren journalistischen Arbeiten sind leicht zugänglich,² eine Edition ihrer Briefe wird vorbereitet.³

¹ Vgl. Peter NETTL, Rosa Luxemburg, Köln–Berlin 1967 und Annelies LASCHITZA/Günter RADZUN, Rosa Luxemburg. Ihr Wirken in der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Berlin-DDR 1971.

² Rosa LUXEMBURG, Gesammelte Werke, Bd. 1 (in 2 Halbbänden)–5, Berlin-DDR 1970–1975 und Rosa LUXEMBURG, Politische Schriften 3 Bde., Frankfurt a. M. 1966–1968.

³ Im Dietz-Verlag, Berlin-DDR. In den Jahren 1968 bis 1971 wurden ihre – polnisch geschriebenen – Briefe an Leo Jogiches von Feliks TYCH in Warschau herausgegeben: RÓZA LUKSEMBURG, Listy do Leona Jogichesa–Tyszki. Von den drei Bänden erschien 1971 eine einbändige Auswahl-Edition in deutscher Sprache, die aber wegen der schlechten Übersetzung der Briefe nur mit großer Vorsicht benutzt werden kann. Eine kleine wertvolle Sammlung ihrer Briefe (»Briefe an Freunde«), die von Luise Kautsky zusammengestellt und von Benedikt KAUTSKY zuerst 1950 herausgegeben wurde, erschien 1976 (Wien, Europa-Verlag) in zweiter Auflage.