

JÜRGEN KUNOW / THOMAS OTTEN / JAN BEMMAN (eds), *Archäologie und Bodendenkmalpflege in der Rheinprovinz 1920–1945*. Materialien zur Bodendenkmalpflege im Rheinland volume 24. LVR-Amt für Bodendenkmalpflege im Rheinland, Bonn 2013. € 58.00. ISBN 978-3-9811909-7-7. 448 pages, c. 200 figures in b/w and colour.

The volume reviewed here presents 26 articles held at the conference “Archäologie und Bodendenkmalpflege in der Rheinprovinz 1920–1945: Personen – Institutionen – Netzwerke” (Archaeology and Archaeological Heritage Management in the Rhine Province 1920–1945: Actors – Institutions – Networks), which took place from 14th to 16th May 2012 in the Forum Vogelsang in Schleiden (North Rhine-Westphalia). It regards itself as a contribution to the critical reflection on the history of archaeology in the first half of the 20th century – with the regional approach opening a new perspective.

As is well-known, the number of studies on the history of archaeology in Germany remarkably increased since the 1990s and the quality as well as the aim of these studies have changed compared to the traditional intradisciplinary research history. So a number of studies, particularly on archaeology under the Nazi-regime, have been published in the last two decades, which have revised the long maintained legend of science being abused and instrumentalised by politics while the archaeologists themselves – apart from a few exceptional cases – where upright and objective. Initial points were the two conferences in Berlin in 1998 (A. LEUBE / M. HEGEWISCH [eds], *Prähistorie und Nationalsozialismus. Die mittel- und osteuropäische Ur- und Frühgeschichtsforschung in den Jahren 1933–1945. Studien zur Wissenschafts- und Universitätsgeschichte 2* [Heidelberg 2002]) and in Freiburg in 1999 (H. STEUER [ed.], *Eine hervorragend nationale Wissenschaft. Deutsche Prähistoriker zwischen 1900 und 1995. RGA Ergbd. 29* [Berlin, New York 2001]). It could be shown that many archaeologists actively put themselves into the service of political ideology and propaganda. Thus the perception of this period of archaeology's history is much more sophisticated today.

While most of these studies examine the history of single institutions and protagonists or the structures on a national level, the proceedings under review focus on a single province. Considering the federal structure of Germany – especially on the cultural sector – this seems a comprehensible step. Consciously not only the period from 1933 to 1945 is considered, but also the time of the Weimar Republic. This approach provides for the fact that many of the developments and ideas have their roots already in the early 20th century and that the institutions were gradually converted to National Socialist bodies (p. 20). In form of an outlook some of the papers also follow up the development after 1945, showing the persistence of networks and ideas.

Altogether the conference and its proceedings aim to give new impulses for the history of archaeology or even to be a model for comparable studies in other regions (*ibid.*). Following the preface of Jürgen Kunow, the Rhine Province is especially appropriate for such an exemplarily study due to its economic power, its geopolitical location on the western border of Germany and its committed protagonists in the provincial administration (p. 9). On this basis the provincial museums in Trier and especially in Bonn became exemplary institutions for other German states and provinces. Subdivided into six main sections, the articles investigate the various protagonists and institutions of archaeological research and heritage service on a broad basis. Additionally, the external political and cultural-political conditions in the considered period are examined.

The four articles in the introductory chapter describe the political and cultural-political conditions under which archaeology and archaeological heritage service was practiced in the Rhine Province during the considered period.

As Georg Mölich in his paper on the cultural policy in the Rhine Province is able to show, there was a continuity concerning the idea of “Heimat” (or “Heimatgedanke”) from the time after WW I until the 1930s and 1940s. The political support of this idea was not an invention of the Nazis but gained a new dynamic when Hans-Joachim Apffelstaedt became head of the Cultural Department of the Rhine Province in 1933. With Apffelstaedt and Heinz Haake, governor of the Rhine Province, Mölich introduces two of the main protagonists of regional cultural policy. He depicts how Haake and Apffelstaedt sustained against efforts for a national centralisation and control and instead managed to establish a comparatively autonomous cultural policy with an individual profile. On the other hand they managed to centralise and control the cultural sector in the Rhine Province itself.

In a biographical article Heidi Gansohr-Meinel examines the role of Apffelstaedt in more detail. As head of the Cultural Department from 1933 to 1944, he was one of the most influential and dedicated protagonists of cultural policy in the Rhine Province and one of the primary patrons of prehistoric archaeology. Personally responsible for the sector of archaeology and archaeological heritage management, Apffelstaedt actively influenced the development in this field, inter alia through the installation of new positions and their staffing as well as through tactical networking.

Having thus defined the general conditions on a regional level, the four articles of the next section are concerned with the institutions most important for German archaeology in the Third Reich. While studies on the SS-Ahnenerbe and Amt Rosenberg already were published in the 1970s (R. BOLLMUS, *Das Amt Rosenberg und seine Gegner. Studien zum Machtkampf im nationalsozialistischen System* [Stuttgart 1970]; M. H. KATER, *Das „Ahnenerbe“ der SS 1935–1945. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturpolitik des Dritten Reiches* [Stuttgart 1974]), and based on this, their role and their struggle for predominance in archaeology often had been analysed in studies on the history of archaeology, an in-depth examination of the role of the Reich Ministry of Science, Education and Culture (Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung, abbreviated Reichserziehungsministerium [REM]) was a desideratum until recently. On the basis of her detailed study (A. C. NAGEL, *Hitlers Bildungsreformer. Das Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung 1934–1945* [Frankfurt a. M. 2012]), Anne C. Nagel in her paper highlights the long neglected role of the REM under its minister Alfred Rust. The aim of this ministry was a centralisation and the overcoming of the federal structures in the cultural sector. Amongst others, it was responsible for the archaeological heritage management and furthermore it essentially participated in the institutionalisation and professionalisation of prehistoric archaeology through the establishment of university chairs and departments. Based on the survey of Nagel, the concrete role and influence of the REM on the archaeological research and heritage management has to be the subject of future studies.

While the articles on the REM by Nagel and the SS-Ahnenerbe by Achim Leube give an outline of the developments on a nationwide basis, Günter Schöbel’s paper on the Amt Rosenberg focuses on the Rhine Province. Schöbel reveals how in the Rhine Province the Ahnenerbe prevailed over the Amt Rosenberg in the struggle for competence. Not least this was owed to the intervention of Apffelstaedt.

With the excavations at the hillfort Erdenburg near Bensberg (today Bergisch-Gladbach), Angelika Mecking presents a concrete example for the alliance between archaeology and politics. Conducted by Werner Buttler and Hans Schleif, it was the first excavation under the patronage of the SS. Mecking can show how this site was used by politics for propaganda – and how this was actively supported by several archaeologists. Patron of the excavation was Heinrich Himmler, who on the occasion of a visit explicitly characterised it as a means of National Socialist propaganda.

Even though the excavation methods were up-to-date, the participating archaeologists followed this argumentation.

The eight articles in the next main chapter are concerned with the antiquarian societies and the museums. Here different levels of activity and parties in the competition for responsibilities are examined: private initiatives vs. state engagement as well as local museums vs. the provincial museums.

Stefan Kraus describes the shift from an archaeological heritage management mainly supported by the privately financed and conducted antiquarian societies towards a heritage management in the responsibility of the state. He demonstrates how in consequence of the Prussian law on excavations from 1914 and its regulatory statutes from 1920 a struggle for competence and for the ownership of excavated artefacts started between the provincial museums in Bonn and Trier on the one hand and the antiquarian societies and museums of local history (Heimatmuseen) on the other. After 1933 the centralisation could be enforced and with the foundation of an independent State Office in 1938 the archaeological heritage service finally passed into the responsibility of the state. This process was significantly advanced by Apffelstaedt and the director of the Provincial Museum (Landesmuseum) in Bonn, Franz Oelmann. Subsequently local opposition against the centralisation settled in the internal debate in archaeology.

With the example of the two provincial museums, the importance and influence of Apffelstaedt gets obvious one more time. Jürgen Merten in his paper on the museum in Trier characterises Apffelstaedt as a “key figure” (p. 198) for the archaeology in the Rhine Province. So he can show how Apffelstaedt actively affected the museum’s work and its agenda by reorganising the allocation of duties and by a subtle staffing policy. The number of personnel was remarkably augmented and especially academically educated prehistorians were recruited. All in all the financial means considerably increased and the status of prehistoric and medieval archaeology was enhanced, even though the archaeology of the Roman period remained a main field of interest. An essential aim of the new politics was a “drastic reorganisation” (“durchgreifende Neugestaltung”) of the two provincial museums from “a scholarly museum to a popular museum” (“vom Gelehrten-Museum zum Volksmuseum”; translated from the original quotation, p. 188). While the newly arranged permanent exhibition in Bonn was opened in 1935 and 1936 (see B. BOURESH, *Die Neuordnung des Rheinischen Landesmuseums Bonn 1930–1939. Zur nationalsozialistischen Kulturpolitik der Rheinprovinz* [Bonn 1996]), the far-reaching plans to a great ‘palace museum’ in Trier couldn’t be realised after the out-break of WW II.

Beside the two provincial museums, also the greater local museums in Köln, Duisburg and Krefeld are investigated. Especially the museum in Duisburg, discussed in the paper of Volker Herrmann, should be mentioned in this context. Rudolf Stampfuß, director from 1930 until 1938, was the most prominent representative of the Amt Rosenberg in the Rhineland and so the museum is an example not only for the struggle between local and provincial museums, but also for the internal struggle in archaeology.

The exhibitions are discussed only marginally. Concerning two special exhibitions in the museum in Krefeld, it is stated that the museum managed to keep them as far as possible free from propaganda. This worked, according to the paper’s author Christoph Reichmann, because one of the rooms was arranged by the party political institutions and served as an ideological link.

The two contributions to the next main chapter focus on the state archaeological heritage service. In his study on the working area of Bonn, Jürgen Kunow can distinctly show how politics directly influenced the archaeological heritage management by a deliberate staffing (with archaeologists who were in accordance with the party line) and a good financial strength. But beyond this,

Apffelstaedt also affected the content and object of research, when in 1936 he himself elaborated a “great excavation plan” that was aimed at the solution of the “great ‘völkisch’ central problems of Rhenish prehistory” (p. 270). In addition, he named 14 (later 21) excavation sites and the concurrent beginning of these excavations was accompanied by a great media campaign. By means of these efforts, the Rhine Province should achieve a leading role in German prehistory. Even though the scientific results were rather marginal, the initiative finally resulted in the establishment of a heritage management of high quality that covered the whole Rhine Province as well as all archaeological epochs (with a focus on prehistoric and medieval archaeology). But already in 1939, the excavation sector nearly completely came to a halt and only rescue excavations in connection with war building activities were conducted.

The next section, comprising three papers, examines the universities and the newly founded chairs in Köln (in 1930) and Bonn (in 1938). They exemplarily show the professionalisation of prehistory in the first half of the 20th century, which was especially advanced in the Third Reich. Here the authors once more can show the influence of the provincial administration, e. g. the foundation of the Institute for Pre- and Protohistory in Bonn as well as the appointment of Kurt Tackenberg as professor was significantly supported by Haake and Apffelstaedt, as Jan Bemmann reveals. Furthermore, the new institute was provided with strong financial resources and excellent technical equipment. The institute in Köln (see the papers by Martina Schäfer and Michael Schwab) was also enhanced during this period and received a very well and modern equipped laboratory for diverse scientific analyses, so that its director Walter Stokar von Neuforn in 1938 could call it one of the best equipped institutes of this kind in all Germany (p. 320).

The five papers of the last section are concerned with the subject of Westforschung and archaeology in the occupied western countries. In her paper Uta Halle discusses how several archaeologists strove for linking archaeology to the politically motivated Westforschung and its “scientific think tank” (p. 389), the Western German Research Community (Westdeutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft). But these efforts only were successful after the German remilitarisation of the Rhineland in 1936. After the break-out of WW II, research concepts were extended to the occupied western countries. Especially archaeologists of the Rhine Province masterminded the organisation and staffing of archaeological research. This primarily was done on the archaeologist’s initiative; there were no concrete instructions by the politics.

Turning to archaeology in the occupied western countries, the topic is widened geographically. This extended perspective completes the conference topic, as Hubert Fehr shows, because of the geographical proximity and manifold staffing interdependences; for example, Eduard Neuffer from the museum in Bonn became head of the ‘Archäologischer Kunstschutz’, a department of the army (Militärischer Kunstschutz des Heeres) in the occupied countries. It was responsible for the recording of the inventory of the museums and private collections, the rescue of known and newly discovered archaeological monuments and the support of German archaeologists during research travels. And not at least, concerning the layout of research questions, there was a great similarity to the Westforschung. Research especially aimed to prove a cultural imprint of these regions by the Germanic people. While the provincial administration of the Rhine Province highly supported archaeology, Fehr can determine only little interest in this topic by the political authorities of the military administration in the occupied countries, for which economic interests were predominant (p. 405). Regarding the post-war period there can be asserted various continuities of scientific concepts that emerged from the Westforschung. Fehr ascribes this to the persistence of the scientific networks well in the 1950s and 1960s.

Framed by studies on the political and cultural-political conditions as well as the general history of German archaeology, a comprehensive and multifaceted picture of the development in the

Rhine Province is drawn, which considers a great variety of acting people and institutions. On the one hand, the struggle for power between the SS-Ahnenerbe and the Amt Rosenberg and thereby the efforts for a nationwide centralisation of archaeological work are demonstrated – provided in favour of the Ahnenerbe by high-ranking politicians of the provincial administration. On the other hand, the struggle between lay archaeology and professional archaeology respectively between local and regional competences is described.

Hans-Joachim Apffelstaedt arises as one of the central figures of the Rhenish archaeology, the head of the cultural department, who was very dedicated in this field and with the great excavation plan directly aimed to influence research contents. Otherwise, archaeologists took advantage of this engagement by political representatives and institutions. Many of the far-reaching plans couldn't be realised or came to a halt after the out-break of the war.

Corresponding to the character of an anthology, the various papers set different priorities and archival sources are used in different quantity and analysed in different profundity. Occasionally a more detailed discussion and evaluation of the presented facts is desirable. Nonetheless, it is the merit of the editors to present this deliberate anthology and the wish of the editors for comparable studies on other regions can only be emphatically supported.

D-01109 Dresden
Zur Wetterwarte 7
E-Mail: Frauke.Kreienbrink@lfa.sachsen.de

Frauke Kreienbrink
Landesamt für Archäologie

WOLFGANG DÖPCKE, Pré-História e nacional-socialismo na Alemanha. Um ensaio biográfico sobre o arqueólogo Karl Hermann Jacob-Friesen. Estudos Germânicos, volume 1. Peter Lang, Oxford, Bern, Berlin 2014. € 56.70. ISBN 978-3-0343-1744-3. XVII + 206 pages, 2 b/w illustrations.

“Objector or collaborator: what was the true face of the archaeologist during the National Socialist dictatorship?” (p. 6). Starting from this question, Wolfgang Döpcke conceives and structures *Pre-history and National Socialism in Germany. A biographical account of the archaeologist Karl Hermann Jacob-Friesen*, whose thinking and work we follow and contextualise in space and time. An exercise completed after we immerse ourselves in “*Dramatis personae*, German institutions and terminology” (such as Himmler and Reinert) (pp. IX–XV); subsequently to be informed about the goals, methodology and methods adopted in the book (pp. 1–14); entangling ourselves in historiographical perspectives on National Socialism and prehistory, alongside with the understanding of the ‘völkisch’ thinking (chapters I–III and VII), and throughout a drama occasioned by the cravings for polycratic power led, among others, by the Amt Rosenberg and the SS-Ahnenerbe (chapters IV–VI).

Subscribing to a recurring theme of the literature published by different specialists in the last 20 years, i. e. the connection between archaeology, ideology and politics, Döpcke in his biography trans-contextualises other inherent matters, while dissecting the intended symbiosis between notions such as race, culture, language and people, in a highly valued communion essential to the ideological construction of totalitarian regimes. Döpcke does so by taking the example of a prominent critic of the Kossinna school in the Weimar Republic and a supporter of museums as “schools for educating adults” and “mediators between the sciences and the public” (p. 60); at least, this was Jacob-Friesen position until the assertion of National Socialism. From here, attitudes will have changed, modified or adapted themselves to the new circumstances of the current regime.