Leaving the Walls or Anomalous Activity: The Catholic and Jewish Rural Bourgeoisie in Germany

JACOB BORUT AND ODED HEILBRONNER

In imperial Germany, Catholics and Jews were two religious minorities in the midst of an intolerant majority society. Although there were considerable differences in size (Catholics were about 35 percent of the German population and Jews about 1 percent), their positions as minorities vis-à-vis the Protestant majority had clear similarities. While they were officially free to integrate themselves into the Protestant society surrounding them, they were nevertheless targets of religious persecution and of social and cultural discrimination. They were perceived by wide sectors of the German society as "a state within a state," "a knife in the nation's back," and as a group of "betrayers" of the German national policy. Even Germans who did not use such expressions, considered these minorities "marginal groups" inasmuch as their religious principles or their cultural heritages seemed outdated and unimportant and thus easily cast off in the name of assimilation.

Among the Catholics and the Jews it was largely the bourgeoisie who aspired to become integrated into the majority society and on occasion who were able to realize these hopes. Members of the bourgeois class demonstrated a willingness to part with their religious communities' characteristic traditional modes of behavior and welcomed the modernization process which Germany underwent from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. The Protestant bourgeoisie, unlike other German social strata, was also relatively more open and willing to accept the members of religious minorities. The Catholic and Jewish bourgeoisie thus found themselves in a kind of intermediate position between the bourgeoisie of the majority and the members of the religious communities into which they had been born.

This bourgeoisie's cultural, economic, and political modes of behavior indicates the extent of its integration into the majority society on the one hand and their fidelity to the traditional values of their religious communities on the other. Although a wealth of studies have been written on Catholics and Jews dur-

Financial support for this research was kindly provided by the Leo Baeck Institut in Jerusalem, the Center of German History at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Minerva Foundation, and the DAAD. We are grateful to Olaf Blaschke, and especially to Till van Rahden, for reading the manuscript and providing useful advice. The responsibility for any mistake lies only on the authors.

0010-4175/98/3355–2364 $9.50

ing this period, only few have applied research methods characteristic of modern scholarship on the bourgeoisie and German society to study the Catholic and Jewish bourgeoisie. Moreover, there is no comparative study about what distinguishes and what unites the members of these two religious minorities, Jewish and Catholic.

Until the last decade, the view of historical scholarship about Germany's Catholics and Jews during this period maintained[1] that most Catholics (mainly in western Germany) jealously guarded their uniqueness, refused to intermix with the majority, and remained a close-knit and distinct minority within the majority society, a unique Catholic milieu.[2] The Jews were regarded as the opposite—a minority society that aspired with all its might to integrate into the majority, most of its members opposing any manifestation of isolation or independence. They were viewed as considering themselves to be first and foremost loyal citizens of the German Reich and only afterwards Jews. Modern scholarship on German Jews depicts them as people who consciously and willingly rejected the Catholic model of preserving an independent and distinct identity and a network of collective institutions that served to maintain separation from the majority society.[3] Instead, the Jews preferred integration into the liberal bourgeoisie and into its social and cultural institutions. Thus, it is not possible to speak of a Jewish milieu in Germany: The Jews belonged, both ideologically and practically, to the bourgeois milieu.[4]

A more detailed investigation reveals, however, that both the Jewish and Catholic communities were complex and multi-faceted, not monolithic entities with members who all acted in identical ways. We are primarily interested in identifying groups whose behavior was anomalous and even the reverse of the conventional wisdom about the society to which it was affiliated religiously. One such group that has received little attention in social studies about German society, Catholics, and Jews is the rural bourgeoisie (the *Dorfbürgertum*). Members of the Jewish and Catholic rural bourgeoisie developed their own ways of integrating in ways that did not match the typical modes of behavior of their respective minority culture. Apart from being intermediaries between

[1] This view is summed up in Till van Rahden, "Weder mileu noch Konfession. Die situative Ethnizitaet der deutschen Juden im Kaiserreich in vergleichender Perspektive," Olaf Blaschke, Frank-Michael Kühlemann, eds. *Religion im Kaiserreich* (Gütersloh, 1995), 415–40. This collection is one of the first attempts at a comparative research of religious minorities in the Second Reich. See pages 43–56.

[2] See for example the collection of essays in W. Schieder, ed., *Religion und Gesellschaft im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1993); On various aspects of the Catholic milieu, see in Blaschke, Kühlemann, *Religion in Kaiserreich*, Part ii.

[3] See Peter Pulzer, *Jews and the German State* (Oxford, 1992), 98.

[4] This subject is widely discussed by Jacob Katz in his various studies, and see his article "German Culture and the Jews," in Yehuda Reinharz, Walter Shazberg, eds., *The Jewish Response to German Culture* (Hanover, New Hampshire, 1985), 85–99. About the inapplicability of that concept for the German Jews, see van Rahden, *Weder Milieu*, 42–43, and Andrea Hopp, "Von der Einheit der 'heiligen Gemeinde': zur Vielfalt der ethnisch-religiösen Minderheit. Die jüdische Gemeinde in Frankfurt am Main," in Blaschke, Kühlemann, *Religion*, 439.

the bourgeoisie of the majority and the members of their own religious communities, they were also intermediaries between the urban and the rural societies.[5] It is of vital importance to analyze these groups because neither Catholic nor Jewish society, nor their relationship to the German state and German society, can be investigated only through general descriptions. Instead, we emphasize the complexity and variety of these societies and the fact that their members faced different options of integrating into German society—not all of them chose the same path.

This essay compares the Catholic and Jewish bourgeoisie in several rural areas in southern and western Germany, analyzing their modes of behavior as intermediary groups between the bourgeoisie of the majority society and the traditional modes of behavior of their respective coreligionists, as well as between city and village norms, and delineates the similarities and differences between the Jews and the Catholics. In doing so, the study will offer one more contribution to the study of the German *Bürgertum*—a subject that is today at the focus of the historiography of nineteenth-century German society,[6] and of the study of Catholics and Jews in Germany[7]—and will endeavor to make a pioneering contribution to the comparative study of minority groups in imperial Germany. We also aspire to open up the European rural bourgeoisie to examination through the research methods of social and new cultural history, which up until now has been done only partially and sporadically. We will do this by summing up the critical differences between the two groups under discussion and by relating the evidence to larger implications concerning other European rural societies.

This attempt at a comparative study is preliminary. The distinctive groups under study in this essay are not entirely identical. Geographically, the Catholic rural bourgeoisie was concentrated in southern Germany, while their Jewish counterparts also lived in the Rhineland and Westphalia. In terms of the time span, the developments described here regarding the Jews from the end of the 19th century to the Weimar period were spread over a longer period of time than were the developments among the Catholics in the second half of the nineteenth

[5] On the difference between the urban and the rural societies, see Thomas Nipperdey, *Deutsche Geschichte 1866–1918. Erster Band: Arbeitswelt und Bürgergeist* (München, 1988), *passim.*

[6] The literature is too substantial to note in full. Key texts include: Jürgen Kocka, ed., *Bürger und Bürgerlichkeit im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1987); *idem,* ed., *Bürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert. Deutschland in europäischen Vergleich,* 3 vols. (München, 1988); *idem* and Allan Mitchell, eds., *Bourgeois Society in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford, 1992); Gall, Lothar, ed., *Stadt und Bürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert* (München, 1990–93); *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert,* 4 vols. (Stuttgart, 1986–1993); David Blackbourn and Richard J. Evans, eds., *The German Bourgeoisie* (London, 1992); see also the ten monographs (up to now) in the *Bürgertum* series of Vandenhöck and Ruprecht *Verlag* of Göttingen.

[7] For a survey of new studies about the Catholic society, see Margaret L. Anderson, "Piety and Politics: Recent Works on German Catholicism," *Journal of Modern History,* 4 (1991), 681–716; for German Jewry, see Trude Maurer, *Die Entwicklung der jüdischen Minderheit in Deutschland* (Tübingen, 1992); Keith Pickus, "German Jewish Identity in the Kaiserreich: Observations and Methodological Considerations," *Jewish History,* 9:2 (1995), 79–91.

century. We are aware of some problems which are raised from our study: the unequalled periods which we have chosen here and the fact that both groups emerged from our study in a kind of static position which did not change during the period from the second half of the nineteenth century to 1920s. Still, our goal has not been to compare two entirely identical communities, but to locate distinctive groups that may present angles that historical study has not addressed so far. This will allow the creation of an extensive basis for comparison which includes all their complexity and variety and which will make it possible to contribute in the future to further studies on the subject of German Jews and Catholics.

I. COMPARING THE LEVELS OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL MODERNIZATION

Germany underwent a process of industrial and social development that was more rapid and intensive than that in other European countries.[8] The extent to which the country's Catholics and Jews participated in the economic and social modernization processes may be summarized concisely. Considerable variations notwithstanding, the Jews were ahead of the majority of German society in modernizing, and the processes involved in this modernization encompassed a larger portion of the Jewish than of the Christian population, both Protestant and Catholic. Catholics, in contrast, were late in responding to these processes, with only a small minority taking part in these industrial developments.[9] This is reflected in accepted indexes such as the level of urbanization and the rate of migration from country to city, the level of education, and the decline in the birth rate. The rate of development was not uniform among either the Catholics or the Jews,[10] but is true as a general rule about these regions and socio-economic groups.

The data known to us on Jewish society in imperial Germany point to a socio-religious group of a unique social character. A similar conclusion, but from the opposite direction, may be reached about Catholics. If the Jews represent an inverted socio-economic pyramid (the majority belonged to the bourgeoisie and only a minority to the lower class) relative to the structure of European societies of that period, then the Catholics represent a pyramid appropriate to the socio-economic patterns of European societies in general and to that of Germany in particular. Most of them were small-scale farmers,

[8] Hans-W. Hahn, *Verlauf und Charakter der deutschen industriellen Revolution* (München, 1997).

[9] A. Liedhegener, "Marktgesellschaft und Milieu. Katholiken und katholische Regionen in der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung des Deutschen Reichs 1895–1914," *Historisches Jahrbuch,* II:113 (1993), 283–354.

[10] *Ibid.;* Hans Maier, "Zur Sozioligie des deutschen Katholizismus 1803–1950," in Dieter Albrecht, ed., *Politik und Konfession. Festschrift für Konrad Repgen* (Berlin, 1983), 159–172; Steven Lowenstein, "The Pace of Modernisation of German Jewry in the Nineteenth Century," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* [henceforth: LBIY] 21 (1976), 41–56; Shulamit Volkov, *Die Juden in Deutschland 1780–1918* (München, 1994).

craftsmen, and traders, with those who resided in cities being mainly industrial laborers. Yet, in comparison with their proportion in the population, both Catholics and Jews constituted an exceptional socio-religious group in the pyramid. Among the Catholics (who constituted 36 percent of the population), 75 percent worked in the agrarian and industrial sectors. Among the Jews, (who were about 1 percent of the population), some 27 percent were employed in these sectors.[11]

These figures reveal that Jews and Catholics, as minority groups in German society, had socio-economic profiles that often represented opposite poles and did not match those of the majority society. Yet for both groups the surrounding society was a model to be identified with. This is especially true of the Catholic working and bourgeois classes and of the Jewish bourgeoisie. It is our intention to examine these processes of identification within the bourgeoisie of both societies. We will do so through a survey of modes of political behavior, the culture of association, the culture of leisure, and the attitudes towards religion in the two groups.

2. POLITICAL CULTURE

The Catholic Bourgeoisie

The secularization processes that some members of the Catholic bourgeoisie underwent indicate their desire to integrate into German Protestant society. These were characterized by full or partial detachment from the Catholic Church, which included a decline of the deference towards local priests, enrolling one's children in *Simultanschule* (in areas where such schools existed), and especially non-attendance of important Church ceremonies (in the case of the Old Catholics, this even reached total abandonment of the church).[12] The *Zentrumsstreit* (the Center Catholic Party controversy) at the turn of the century was an example of this process. It involved Catholic groups, especially members of the bourgeoisie in the Rhineland, who advocated "leaving the tower," integrating into the majority society, and adopting the majority's modern forms of behavior.[13]

The force of the secularization process differed regionally. There were also differences between different settlements in accordance with size of the local Catholic and Protestant communities or their proximity to nearby Protestant settlements. As a rule, the more a region was backwards and distant from the center of "the rhythm of bourgeois life" (the big cities), the more extreme was the local rural bourgeoisie's presentation of its vision. This could be seen es-

[11] *Statistik des Deutschen Reiches*, bd. 211 (1907).

[12] Olaf Blaschke, "Der Altkatholizismus 1879 bis 1945. Nationalismus, Antisemitismus und Nationalsozialismus," *Historische Zeitschrift*, 261 (1995), 51–99.

[13] Thomas Mergel, *Zwischen Klasse und Konfession. Katholisches Bürgertum im Rheinland 1790–1914* (Göttingen, 1994); Josef Mooser, *Katholik und Bürger? Rolle und Bedeutung des Bürgertums auf den Deutschen Katholikentagen 1871–1913* (Habilitationschrift, Bielefeld, 1986).

pecially in extreme anti-clerical behavior and the more explicit expression of a desire to be like the Protestant bourgeoisie.[14] Political modes of behavior among German Catholics were characterized by support of the Catholic Center Party (*Zentrum*). But this support diminished over time: While the party received almost 90 percent of the Catholic vote during the years of the *kulturkampf*, it garnered only 60 percent of the Catholic vote on the eve of World War I.[15] Various groups, such as the Catholic bourgeoisie, nobles, and Catholic workers groups, especially in the Ruhr region, gave some support to other parties.[16] Nevertheless, apart from the bourgeoisie, most Catholics—especially in rural areas—supported the Zentrum.

South Germany is the exception. Liberal parties and peasants movements received exceptional support in comparison with Catholic areas in the west or east of Germany. In South Baden, Swabia, and the Catholic cities of Bavaria, the bourgeoisie lent its support to the National Liberal Party (*Nationalliberale Partei*), and when, in some regions, this party endorsed the anti-clerical Bavarian Farmers Party (*Bayerische Bauernbund*), the Bavarian bourgeoisie did the same.[17] The Zentrum's identification with the Church made it difficult for the bourgeoisie to support it, at least until the end of the nineteenth century.[18] In the anti-clerical south, the National Liberal party was identified as the party of the German nation, the party that had established the Reich, so it was only natural for the Catholic bourgeoisie, which so much wanted to become integrated into the German nation, to lend its support to this party.[19]

The Jewish Bourgeoisie

A unique feature of Jews in Catholic regions of western Germany is their widespread support for the Zentrum, at a time when most German Jews—including rural Jews—supported the liberal parties.[20] Scholarship assumes that the Jewish supporters of the Zentrum were Orthodox, especially members of break-

[14] Oded Heilbronner, "Wohin verschwand das katholische Bürgertum? Der Ort des katholischen Bürgertums in der neueren deutschen Historiographie," *Zeitschrift fur Religions -und Geistesgeschichte*, 47:4 (1995), 320–37; *idem*, "In Search of the Catholic (Rural) Bourgeoisie: The Peculiarities of the South German Bürgertum," *Central European History*, 2:29 (1996).

[15] Karl Rohe, *Wahlen und Wählertraditionen in Deutschland* (Frankfurt, 1991).

[16] Jonathan Sperber, "The Catholic Electorate in Imperial Germany," a paper presented at the 109th annual meeting of the American Historical Association (Chicago, 5–8 January 1995).

[17] Dietrich Thraenhardt, *Wahlen und politische Strukturen in Bayern* (Düsseldorf, 1973).

[18] Mergel, *Zwischen Klasse*, 271–81.

[19] J. Schmidt, *Bayern und das Zollparlament: Politik und Wirtschaft in der letzten Jahren wor der Reichsgründung* (München, 1973); Ch. Stache, *Bürgerlicher Liberalismus und katholischer Konservativismus in Bayern 1867–1871* (Frankfurt, 1981); G. Zang, ed., *Provinzialisierung einer Region Zur Entstehung der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft in der Provinz* (Konstanz, 1978).

[20] The electoral behavior of German Jews was discussed by Jakob Touri, *Die politischen Orientierungen der Juden in Deutschland* (Tübingen, 1966); Pulzer, *Jews and the German State*. Stanley Suval, *Electoral Politics in Wilhelmine Germany* (Chapel Hill, 1985), 107–10, repeats the existing viewpoints. About the Weimar period, see Martin Liepach, *Das Wahlverhalten der jüdischen Bevölkerung: zur politischen Orientierung der Juden in der Weimarer Republik* (Tübingen, 1996).

away orthodox groups,[21] but this turns out not necessarily to be the case. Jewish—including liberal Jewish—support for the Zentrum was evident in Catholic cities like Köln. At the end of the nineteenth century, the Kölner Zentrum set aside one of its seats on the city council for one of the leaders of the Jewish community at a time when that Jewish community was controlled by political and religious liberals.

In Catholic villages and towns of the Rhineland and Westphalia, there was broad Jewish support for the Zentrum, and these Jews, as we will soon see, were not strictly orthodox but observed parts of the tradition and so integrated into the village social life (which was religiously conservative). With such social integration came support for the Zentrum, and the Jews never felt that their Judaism was an obstacle to their affiliation with the party.

An outspokenly liberal Jew in Lechenich (Rhineland) was described by local inhabitants as having two distinctive traits: He voted for the DDP [the Weimar liberal party] and ate pork both at home and in public.[22] He, however, was considered unusual—his Jewish neighbors acted differently in both respects. We have evidence of Jewish support for the Zentrum in other villages and small towns,[23] although this was not exclusive; and Jews did vote for other parties as well. The almost total support for the left-liberals, typical of urban and rural Jews in other parts of Germany until the late stages of the Weimar republic,[24] was not found among Rhineland and Westfalian Jewish rural bourgeois. Industrialist Emil Schüler of Lippstadt in Westfalia, one of the leading businessmen and cousin of the famous playwright, Else Lasker-Schüler, was a leading member of the local Zentrum. His funeral was attended by the *Bürgermeister* and the leaders of the party chapter, who laid in its name a wreath on his grave.[25] Jewish identification, or sensitivity, to local po-

[21] On the Jewish position toward the Zentrum, see Toury, *Die politischen,* 246–54; Pulzer, *Jews and the German State,* 141–2. For the Weimar period see Liepach, *Das Wahlverbalten, passim.,* and especially his discussion of "local factors" that led to uncommon cases of Jewish support for the Zentrum: pp. 167–70, 303–4.

[22] Heidi and Cornelius Bormann, *Heimat an der Erft, Die Landjuden in den Synagogengemeinden Gymnich, Friesheim und Lechenich* (Erfstadt, 1994), 37.

[23] Interview with Rachel Rehberger; 3.9.1995; Franz Piacenza, *Jüdisches Leben in der Rheinprovinz: Die Synagogengemeinde Zell-Mosell* (Manuscript, Bullay/Mosell, 1996), 27. I thank Mr. Piacenza for his manuscript. We require more micro-studies that will make it possible to analyze the voting patterns of the Jewish village bourgeoisie.

[24] On the support given by rural Jews to the DDP, see Martin Liepach, "Die politische Oriemtierung der 'Landjuden' in Baden am Ende der Weimarer Republik 1928–1930," *Historical Social Research,* 22:1 (1997), 88–106; "The Voting Patterns of Jewish 'Landjuden' in Hesse," in Peter Pulzer, ed., *Jews in Weimar Germany* (Tübingen, 1998).

[25] On Schueler, see Eduard Muehle, "Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Minderheit,"in *Lippstadt. Beiträge zur Stadtgeschichte,* Band 2 (Lippstadt, 1985), 545–7; *Leben und Leiden der jüdischen Minderheit in Lippstadt. Dokumentation zur Ausstellung der Stadt Lippstadt (Lippstädter Spuren* (Sonderband, 1991), 156. The obituary published by the Zentrum upon his death is mentioned also in Margaret Lavinia Anderson, "Interdenominationalism, Clericalism, Pluralism: The 'Zentrumsstreit' and the Dilemma of Catholicism in Wilhelmine Germany," *Central European History,* 21 (1988), 350–78, at 350–1.

litical culture was manifested in other ways. For example, Jews in Catholic villages, unlike most German Jews, seem to have avoided celebrating the *Sedantag*, just like their Catholic neighbors.[26]

Nevertheless, the village Jews were and remained loyal patriots of the German Reich. They were not ultramontanes like the rural population around them: They treated the bishops and priests with respect but did not see them as the source of authority. The source of authority for them was the official government and enthusiastically identified with the state and its symbols. One of the manifestations of this was the enlistment of young Jewish men in the army. Not a few Jews, from the villages in particular, volunteered for the special forces that went, at the end of the century, to fight rebellions overseas; and some died there. During World War I this voluntary enlistment reached record highs. The village Jewish communities were left with very few men (which led to the paralysis of community life during this period), and there was almost no community that did not lose some of its sons. Of course, this patriotic enthusiasm swept all Germans, but it is important to note that in the Jewish case, there was a prospect of fighting against other Jews in the French army, but it did not bother German Jews.

In summary, we have two groups that voted the opposite of what was conventional in their milieu or religious group and therefore also opposite from each other. While the Catholic village bourgeoisie voted for the liberals rather than the Zentrum, many—perhaps most—of the Jews in the villages of the Catholic regions of the Rhineland and Westphalia voted for the Zentrum and not the liberals, for whom German Jews generally voted. The political identification of the Catholic village bourgeoisie stretched beyond the boundaries of their place of residence. They did not identify with Catholic village society nor the Catholic milieu in general but, rather, the German bourgeoisie as a whole. The Jews, on the other hand, were in a middle position, feeling patriotism for the Reich on the one hand and identification with the village and small town society in which they lived on the other.

The new studies that address the subject of the milieu have distinguished between several of its levels, among them are the micromilieu, found on the local level and determined by geographical proximity and personal relations, and the macromilieu, which is nationwide.[27] In the Jewish context, their identification was split. On the local level they identified with the Catholic micromilieu, with which they were in direct contact on a daily basis. On the level of the macromilieu, however, they identified not with the Catholics but with the bour-

[26] On the *Sedantag*, see Fritz Schellack, "Sedanfeieren und Kaisergeburte," in P. Düding, P. Friedemann, and P. Muench, eds., *Öffentliche Festkultur* (Reinbeck, 1988), 278–98; Ute Schneider, *Politische Festkultur. Im 19. Jahrhundert. Die Rheinprovinz von der französischen Zeit bis zum Ende des Ersten Weltkrieges (1806–1918)* (Essen, 1995), 238–63. On the negative feelings towards those celebrations among the Catholic country population, see *ibid.*, 241–2, 245, 250. Jewish papers carry many reports of celebrations of the Sedantag in various Jewish communities, but not from rural communities in Rhineland and Westphalia.

[27] See Blaschke, Kühlemann, "Einleitung," in *Religion*, 47–51, and the sources cited by them.

geoisie. This discrepancy, along with the complexity of their identifications as both Jews and Germans, created a situation in which the Jews of the villages had to set priorities and to decide between the conflicting demands of the different components of their identities. This was even more complicated, given their consciousness of belonging to an unloved minority and their reluctance to enter into conflict with their environment. In the specific context of their political lives, the Jews had to choose between the Zentrum favored by their neighbors in the Catholic micromilieu and the liberal parties supported by the bourgeois macromilieu and hated by most members of the village Catholic micromilieu.

It turns out that a large number of the Jews in the Rhineland and Westphalia preferred to identify with their neighbors and support the Center Party. There are no testimonies of similar voting by Jews in the villages of Wurtemburg or Baden, so apparently these Jews supported the liberal parties.[28] In southern Germany, liberalism in the villages was stronger, and Jews found it easier to identify with the liberal parties than did the Jews of the Rhineland and Westphalia. In these latter regions, since the great majority of the bourgeoisie supported the Zentrum, where there was a bourgeois micromilieu, it also identified politically with the Zentrum. It would seem that the support of the Zentrum by the Jews in these areas was in part a result of fear of a hostile response. Instead, it was largely an outgrowth of identification with the dominant values in the Catholic areas (as will be seen in the section on attitudes to religion). These complex relations with the environment illustrate in this case the difference between the Jews and the Catholic village bourgeoisie, which had no fears of the local micromilieu and openly identified with the bourgeois macromilieu.

3. THE PUBLIC SPHERE: THE BOURGEOIS CULTURE OF ASSOCIATION (*BÜRGERLICHE VEREINSWESEN*)

The Catholic bourgeoisie did not deny being Catholic. In the south, for example, it was possible to hear the claim made that "*Wir sind Katholisch, Gut Katholisch, aber nicht Ultramontan!*"[29] This was their motto in their battle with the priest over cultural hegemony, over their right to send their children to the local (Catholic) gymnasium, read the liberal press and bourgeois literature, dress as they pleased, and vote as they saw fit. The Catholic bourgeoisie imitated the cultural behavior of the Protestant bourgeoisie. The Catholics, especially in the cities like Cologne, Aachen, Münster, and the cities of southern Germany, such as Munich, and in villages and small towns in southern Germany, enthusiastically adopted the bourgeois lifestyle.[30] The imitation of modes of bourgeois cultural behavior typified the Catholic bourgeoisie, which felt a certain ambivalence towards the Church's authority. This found expression in sev-

[28] See, *Die politische*, by Liepach.
[29] *Der Schwarzwalder*, 23.2.1865.
[30] Heilbronner, "In Search"; Zang, *Provinzialisierung.*

eral areas: housing style, the belief in *Bildung* as a key to molding the personality and as an entry ticket into bourgeois society, the study of foreign and classical languages, having a family modeled on the Protestant bourgeois family, the belief in progress, and also, especially, establishing and becoming active in the bourgeois associations (*Vereine*).[31]

In our opinion, a central tool for examining the extent to which both the Catholic and the Jewish bourgeoisie integrated into Protestant society is the bourgeois Verein, a core element of the bourgeois public sphere from the mid-nineteenth century onward. Examining the extent of Catholic and Jewish activity in Catholic and Jewish associations, or alternatively in the bourgeois associations, will enable us to identify to what extent the Catholic and Jewish bourgeoisie adhered to their own religious groups and to what extent they tried to become integrated into the majority society by becoming active in the Vereine, according to the bourgeois Protestant model. The Vereine constituted "the public conscience of the burghers, the defenders of their values and traditions, the initiators and institutional base for a revitalized and reconstructed political community. In short, the cultural clubs were the Paladins of the Burgertum."[32]

A distinction is generally made between Vereine with cultural and social purposes (*Musikvereine, Männergesangvereine, Turnvereine, Schützenvereine, Museumgesellschaft, Kriegervereine* and *Militürvereine,* and Vereine for political and economic activities.[33] In our essay we would like to consider Vereine accessible to all citizens of the community regardless of religion or class—a feature more likely in the case of Vereine, whose purpose was cultural, social, or recreational, rather than professional, economic, political, or religious goals. This definition excludes Vereine connected to political Catholicism, the Catholic Church, to Jewish organizations, and to the working class.

The Bourgeois Catholic Vereine

After the middle of the nineteenth century, members of the middle class in rural areas had introduced the associational life into the countryside, copying only in part the urban model of the Vereine. Usually established at the initiative of local notables, a new model of Verein was created in the countryside. They in-

[31] For more studies on these bourgeois institutons, see Blackbourn, Evans, *The German bourgeoisie;* Kocka, *Bourgeois Society.*

[32] Robert Hopwood, "Paladins of the Bürgertum: Cultural Clubs and Politics in Small German Towns 1918–1925," *Historical Papers* (Toronto: Canadian Historical Association, 1974), 213–235.

[33] Ch. K. Hezinger, "Gemeinde und Verein," *Rheinisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde,* 22 (1978), 181–202; D. Jauch, "Die Wandlung des Vereinsleben in ländlichen Gemeinden Südwestdeutschland," *Zeitschrift für Agrargeschichte und Agrarsoziologie,* 28 (1980), 48–77; Renate Pflaum, "Die Verein als Produkt und Gegengewicht sozialer Differenzierung," in Gerhard Wurzbacher, ed., *Das Dorf im Spannungsfeld Industrieller Entwicklung* (Stuttgart, 1961), 151–82; Hans Siewert, "Verein und Kommunalpolitik," *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie,* 29 (1977); *idem,* "Der Verein. Zur lokalpolitischen und sozialen Funktion der Vereine in der Gemeinde," in Hans Wehling, ed., *Dorfpolitik* (Opladen, 1978), 65–83; *idem,* "Zur Thematisierung des Vereinswesen in der deutschen Soziologie," in Otto Dann, ed., *Vereinswesen und bürgerliche Gesellschaft in Deutschland* (München, 1984).

directly filled the following functions: They defended and supported the local social structure, were both a means of social control and a vehicle for the expression and communication of opinions, contributed to the creation of positions of power for people interested in local offices, and contributed to the shaping of the individual by providing various forms of education (music, sport, reading, animal husbandry). The Vereine were a way of expressing psychological identification with the community and, most important, were agents of integration, vehicles of social mobility and motivators of the democratization of community life. Cultural events, celebrations, rehearsals, and bourgeois ceremonies of various kinds were a means to create a sense of social and community involvement and to give every citizen the opportunity to participate in associational activities, regardless of age, origin, or class. It allowed anyone to achieve a position within an association and to advance in its hierarchy.[34]

The Vereine had the potential for exerting local political and economic influence because of its daily social activity and the fact that political activities and political parties are, in small places, entirely different from those in big cities. The Vereine could influence political decision making in rural areas and small towns because many of their members and leaders held important local positions. Despite this, many of the Vereine prevented their members from engaging in politics in the framework of the association. The cultural Vereine also served as a catalyst for economic development and growth in the places where they existed. The functions they served testify to their importance. Among the cultural Vereine, those that engaged in group activities (song and sports) were the pillars of the rural bourgeoisie. They had great prestige, and their leaders served in senior positions in the socioi-economic life of the village or town.[35]

In Catholic southern Germany, bourgeois Vereine (along with ultramontane and class-based Catholic Vereine) began to flourish in the second half of the nineteenth century. Their activities and goals were similar to those in Protestant areas. Usually, the Verein was headed by a respected member of the community—the proprietor of the local tavern (where the Verein generally met), the mayor, a doctor, a veterinarian, a teacher, or the owner of a factory; generally most of them opposed the local priest. The *Stammtisch* served as the center of Verein activity; women could not join. There were flags, standards, anthems, and a large number of symbols that characterized their activities, along the lines of the Protestant model. The language used at meetings (after the mandatory reports on the state of the treasury and membership) and at events was full of nationalist, almost *völkisch* pathos, in which the German *Vaterland* and landscape played a central role.[36] In constant competition with parallel socialist and

[34] See note 22.

[35] Pflaum, "Der Verein"; Jauch, "Die Wandlung"; Ernst Wallner, "Die rezeption stadtbürgerlichen Vereinswesens durch die Bevölkerung auf dem Lande," In G. Wiegelmann, eds., *Kultureller Wandel im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1973), ch. 11.

[36] Paul Nolte, *Gemeindebürgertum und Liberalismus in Baden, 1800–1850* (Göttingen, 1994); Staatsarchiv Freiburg [henceforth: StaaF], BZ Neustadt, P.261,Nr.381-Jahresbericht Bezirksamt

Church Vereine, the Catholic bourgeois Vereine excluded socialists, Ultramontans, and other *Reichsfeinde.* Since many of the leaders of the bourgeois Vereine held important positions in village and town life, they pursued a discriminatory policy against the rival—Catholic class-based and ultramontan—Vereine. As a general rule, most of the (male) rural Catholic bourgeoisie used the Vereine to consolidate their cultural hegemony.[37]

The Jews and Bourgeois Vereine

The development of Jewish Vereine and Jews participation in bourgeois vereine reflected Jewish aspirations to become integrated into the surrounding society but also their reactions to the obstacles that stood in their way.

In traditional Jewish communities, there were Jewish associations and organizations dedicated to specific goals such as charity, study, professional advancement.[38] Such organizations were essentially religious and, as the traditional Jewish world disintegrated, declined and were replaced by associations of a new type that were characteristic of the Enlightenment period: Their goal was not to observe religious precepts but to disseminate secular learning and to achieve rationalist goals.[39] In Western Europe, many of the old organizations disappeared entirely. Those that survived were largely devoted to various forms of charity (but even these were now seen as humanitarian rather than religious organizations) because charity continued to be applied largely on a confessional basis. Furthermore, as the modern welfare state developed, its authorities supported Jewish charitable activities because that relieved municipal welfare institutions from having to provide assistance to needy Jews.[40]

Alongside the charitable societies, burial societies also continued to operate in many communities. Another organization found in many communities was the synagogue choir association (*Chorverein*), a kind of religious social club

---

Neustadt 1884.BZ Villingen 1985/110–2025, Triberg; Kurt Blessing, *Die Familie Blessing und das Orchestrion: Entstehund und Entwicklung der Orchestrion-Industrie in Unterkirnach im Schwarzwald, Neustadt a.d.* (Aisch, 1983), 15. For Bavaria, see for example, C. Eckert, "Das Vereinsleben der Stadt Füssen," in *Alt-Füssen, 1980–1983: Zur Erinnerung an das 25jährigen Bestehen des Verschönerungsvereins Kempten 1883–1908* (Kempten, 1908).

[37] StaaF, BZ Neustadt, 1974/31–910; Lesegesellschaft Löffingen 1854, BZ Schönau 186–Verschönerungsverein, Schonau 1895. BZ Villingen 1985/110–1636, Vereine in Schönwald, Turnverein–19.9.1894; Protokollbuch–Turnverein Schonach-1883.

[38] "Hevrah, Havurah," *Encyclopoedia Judaica*, vol. 8 (Jerusalem, 1971), col. 440–442; See also "Das Vereinswesen," *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums* [henceforth: AZJ] 51, 15, 14.4.1887, pp. 227–8; Isaak Hirsch, "Über jüdische Vereinigungen," *Der Israelit* [henceforth: Isr.] 30, 32/3 25.4. (1989), pp. 577.

[39] *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, "Hevrah, Havurah"; Jacob Katz, *Tradition and Crisis: Jewish Society at the End of the Middle Ages* (Jerusalem, 1978), 301–2; Henry Wassermann, *Jews, Bürgertum and "Bürgerliche Gesellschaft" in a Liberal Area in Germany* (Ph.D. Disser., Department of Jewish History, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1980), 75–80; David Sorkin, *The Transformation of German Jewry 1780–1840* (Oxford, 1987), 114–23.

[40] See, for example, about Hamburg: Helga Krohn, *Die Juden in Hamburg. Die Politische, Soziale und Kulturelle Entwicklungen einer Jüdischen Grosstadtgemeinde nach der Emanzipation 1848–1918* (Hamburg, 1974), 50.

that devleoped in the wake of the reform of the prayer service. In sum, in post-Emancipation Germany, there was still a network of Jewish organizations, the vast majority of them charitable societies. Such organizations could be found in almost all Jewish communities, large and small. In 1909, there were 3,010 charitable organizations in 1,014 communities.[41] In the big cities, the number of these organizations declined in the twentieth century, especially during the Weimar period, the result of a trend towards centralization and modernization of such activity that led to the unification of many societies into large umbrella organizations run and financially supported by these communities. In the communities in which there had been only one or two charitable societies, these remained active. In practical terms, however, the great majority of Jews conducted most of their lives outside the framework of Jewish organizations. Thus, such groups had few members, and their activity was not particularly intensive. There is direct evidence that the directors of an important charitable association in Berlin were required to participate in "no more than six" meetings per year.[42] Jewish women's societies were, in contrast, more active.[43]

Most Jews centered their activities around bourgeois German Vereine. From the late nineteenth century, a striking contrast developed between urban and rural or small town Jews. In the cities, Jews encountered considerable exclusion in local social institutions. Certain types of associations—primarily those of a professional character (associations of merchants, doctors, or lawyers) and progressive associations—were entirely open; and in all large cities we find Jews holding the most senior positions in them. In contrast, their ability to become involved in other associations, especially those close to the political right wing, was very limited. Student organizations, elitist social organizations and many veterans' associations (Kriegervereine) avoided accepting Jewish members. Other social organizations that did accept Jews made them feel discriminated against and isolated.

As a result, a trend began in the 1880s of establishing Jewish Vereine in those areas in which Jews were discriminated against. In 1886, the first Jewish student society was established. In 1887, Jews who felt unwelcome at Freemason and Odd Fellows lodges established the first German branches of the Jewish-American B'nai B'rith order. Despite initial opposition to such organizations, they spread. In the 1890s this trend turned into a wide process which led to the

[41] "Die jüdische Wohltätigkeit und Wohlfahrtstpflege in Deutschland," *Zeitschrift für Demographie und Statistik der Juden*, 5, 3, March 1909, p. 45. Lists of the Vereine in the various communities appear in the yearly editions of the *Handbuch der jüdische Gemeindeverwaltung*, published by the Deutsch-Israelitische Gemeindebund. See also Sorkin, *The Transformation*, 121–2, who views those societies as a Jewish "subculture."

[42] Aaron Hirsch Heymann, *Lebenserinnerungen* (hrsg. von Heinrich Löwe) (Berlin, 1909), 310.

[43] On the move from Jewish societies to bourgeois societies in a small town, see K. Tohermes, and J. Grafen, *Leben und Untergang der Synagogengemeinde Dinslaken* (1988), 52–53, 58–59, and see there also on women's societies. On the Jewish women's societies and the level of their activity, see Marion Kaplan, *The Making of the Jewish Middle Class* (Oxford, 1991), 192–211.

creation of an entire network of specifically Jewish organizations devoted to a wide variety of goals. In practice, they constituted a partial subculture (*Teilkultur*), centered on large national organizations that identified themselves as specifically Jewish, such as the *Centralverein Deutscher Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubnes* and the *Verband der Vereine für Jüdische Geschichte und Literatur.*

In the villages, the trend was the reverse. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, a process of migration to the larger cities began which severely reduced the Jewish population in the villages and led to the dissolution of many small communities. In many others, the activities of the Jewish organizations ceased, simply because there were not enough local Jews to keep them running. Instead, the remaining Jews became increasingly involved in the non-Jewish local societies, a trend that reached its peak during the decade preceding World War I.

The Jews of rural western and southern Germany belonged to most of the local Vereine, with the exception of the Church associations.[44] Jews were active members of most of these: gymnastic societies, singing societies, shooting societies, and even military and veterans' societies. The latter were right-wing groups that Jews who lived in the cities could get into only with difficulty. In the case of some of the rural Vereine, among them the Schützenvereine, the Turnvereine, and the *Männergesangvereine*, which had high social standing, Jews were often among the founders and in many reached senior leadership positions. This was also true for the various sports societies spreading through the area, especially during the Weimar period (although these organizations were not of high social standing). Local organizations in which Jews were especially active were those tied to the bourgeoisie and its professional and social makeup: *Museumgesellschaft, Theatervereine*, and *Handelsvereine*. To these should be added the medical societies (*Sanitätskollon*) and societies in support of the Red Cross, as well as volunteer fire brigades (*Freiwillige Feuerwehr*).

Despite this, there were limits on the Jewish minority's ability to integrate into the system of local associations. In every society that has minorities, there is a limit to how far the minorities may advance, an invisible boundary beyond which the minority cannot step over. This boundary is not at the same level for ever member of the minority, nor does it remain static through time. Our findings indicate that within the Vereine, the boundary was lower for rich and socially prominent Jews, since they could get into more prestigious societies than their co-religionists. Furthermore, the boundary was higher during the Weimar

[44] On the Rhineprovince and Westphalia, see Jacob Borut, "*'Bin Ich auch ein Israelit, ehre Ich doch den Bischof mit'*. Village and Small Town Jews within the Social Spheres of Western German Communities during the Weimar Period," in Peter Pulzer, ed., *Jews in Weimar Germany* (Tübingen, 1998). On Wurtemberg, see Utz Jeggle, *Judendörfer in Würtemberg* (Tübingen, 1969), 247–50, 253–4; Steven Lowenstein, "Decline and Survival of Rural Jewish Communities," paper presented at the conference, "Circles of Community" (Bloomington, Indiana, 17 March 1996), p. 7, and also p. 19 n. 21. We thank Professor Lowenstein for providing us with the manuscript of his paper.

years than it had been before World War I: Jews found it harder to join or reach senior positions in certain kinds of associations. These boundaries become more apparent when we examine what positions the Jews could reach within the Vereine. And we should, for that matter, remember that Jews had played a prominent role in introducing the Vereine into towns and villages, had participated in founding and organizing them, and had provided vital financial support.[45]

Jews did reach high positions in local Vereine, where they served as treasurers, secretaries, and board members. They were especially prominent in merchant and trade societies. The boundary is apparent, however, when one tries to find Jews serving as chairmen of Vereine, even of those they had themselves founded.[46] A Jewish chariman—for example, Karl Dannenbaum, *Vorsteher* of the *Ladeninhaberverein* of Rheda in Westphalia[47]—was rare indeed. Still, village Jews accepted those boundaries and were not resentful of them. They felt "at home" (*zu hause*) in their communities, wanted to belong to the local social system, and bore no grudges against it, even when its codes discriminated against them.

In this section we have argued that the Catholic village bourgeoisie created its own network of organizations, which it shaped according to its values and views—values and views that were, once again, different from, and even in conflict with, the values of traditional Catholic village society. In fact, they created a bourgeois micromilieu for themselves on the local level, between the milieu of the Old Catholics (*Alt Katholiken*) and the milieu of the ultramontane characterized by the hegemony of the Church and the Center Party. The Jews, in contrast, abandoned their system of traditional societies and tried to integrate into the system of bourgeois societies in their places of residence. In the cities, however, when many Jews felt, for various reasons, that this attempt was not fully succeeding, they began to establish a system of alternative organizations, a Jewish partial system or Teilkultur. (Although, apart from a small Zionist minority, they did not give up their hope and desire to integrate but claimed that their Jewish organizations did not contradict, and even helped, their integration). In the villages, the Jews successfully integrated into the system of local organizations. In other words, they became integrated into the local bourgeois micromilieu in places where this existed. Nevertheless, even though they belonged to the bourgeoisie, they did not challenge the values of traditional society. Quite the opposite—they treated them with great respect. Although there were social restrictions that prevented them from becoming fully integrated, the

[45] See note 4, and also Jeggle, *Judendörfer*, 248.

[46] For example: Siegfried Hony, an industrialist in Wissen, near Betzdorf, founded in 1925 a *Sportsverein* called Siegfried. This Verein was considered Jewish by the Nazis, who disbanded it when they came to power. But Hony himself held in the Verein the role of *Sportsobmann*—he was not its chairman. Günter Heuzeroth, "Jüdisch-Deutsche Bürger unserer Heimat," Teil III, *Heimat-Jahrbuch des Kreises Altenkirchen*, 19 (1977), 124.

[47] *Israelitisches Familienblatt* 33, 38, 24 September 1931.

Jews accepted these limitations, so that even here, in an area where there was ostensibly the potential for conflict between the Jews and their immediate surroundings, this conflict was avoided, and the Jews kept up their good relations with their neighbors of all classes.

4. THE PRIVATE SPHERE: READING AND CULTURAL HABITS

The Catholic Bourgeoisie

Next to the Vereine, the most important network establishing and maintaining bourgeois hegemony and which expressed its visions, language, and aspirations, were the local newspapers and magazines. In order to underline their importance, let us first survey the reading habits of Catholic non-bourgeois society, where religious reading predominated. The Badensee folklorist, E. Meyer, surveyed, in 1894, the reading habits in Catholic (and Protestant) rural areas in Baden. The books he found in the homes of most Catholic families centered on religious themes: the apparition of the Virgin Mary in Lourdes, local saints and religious customs, as well as ultramontane novels.[48] In the local priest library of the village of Schoenwald for example, the most popular Catholic authors were Alban Stolz, novelist Christoph V. Schmidt, and Konrad Kuemmel.[49] On the other hand, the liberal-bourgeois press had a wide readership throughout southern Germany. In both regions, newspapers affiliated with the Church and political Catholicism were established only towards the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. In contrast, the local bourgeois press was established in southern Baden during the 1860s (such as *Der Schwarzwälder* and *Der Hochwächter*) and even before (*Donaueschinger Wochenblatt* in 1793). In Bavarian Schwabia, the bourgeois *Kemptner Zeitung* was established as early as 1783 and the *Memminger Zeitung* in 1862. The local bourgeois papers were read by most of the local inhabitants, including farmers and people from the lower classes,[50] although their content was more important than their distribution. In numerous articles and, more important, the family and Heimat romances that appeared every weekend, the local bourgeoisie demonstrated its hegemony by imbuing the local community with a vision of the "new bourgeois world." Some weekend stories (*Feuilleton*) were written by local notables; others were repreinted from national newspapers. In

[48] Elard Meyer, *Badisches Volksleben im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Strasbourg, 1990), 351–6.
[49] Erzbischöflisches Archiv Freiburg, Pfarrarchiv Schönwald, Kirchenvisitationen, 6.5 1908.
[50] In 1907 the bourgeois *Donaueschinger Tagblatt* sold 3,200 copies, while the newly established Catholic *Donaubote* sold only 2,000 copies. The *Hochwächter* sold 1,500 copies, but the new, though still weekly, Catholic *Echo vom Hochfirst* sold 800; For the Allgäu and the bourgeois-Catholic newspapers, see Hans Zech, *Geschichte der bayerischen Allgau bis 1900 erschienen Zeitungen* (Ph.D. thesis, München, 1949), 45–68; For the early twentieth century, see *Triberger Bote*, 12.10.1931; ErzAF, Dekanat Kinzigtal, 22.10.1930, 6.4.1932; *Handbuch der Deutschen Tagespresse*, vol. IV (1932, Baden, Bayern).

these romances and local folklore (*Heimat*) stories, the rural bourgeoisie tried to express their belief in technology, their patronage relations with the working class, their attitude towards gender, and most significantly (and popularly), their feelings about the home and its moral function. Most of these stories took place in rural middle-class homes described as bourgeois temples which contained, for example, a piano, a garden, servants, and cuckoo clocks—the most popular furnishing in local bourgeois houses in south Baden. Here, the symbolic was an important tool in creating the ongoing process of bourgeois micromilieu.[51]

Local newspaper advertisements offered the local Bürgertum their cultural and material accouterments, such as mahogany furniture, wallpaper, carpets, curtains, bookshelves, napkins, tablecloths, silver plate. In numerous personal columns, local notables wrote on gastronomy, reviewed books, concerts, and the theater, even offered tips for piano players and suggested evening reading. Trains were also the subject of stories and were a powerful symbolic element in the bourgeois vision: "Whoever supports the idea of the *Hollentalbahn* [the local Black Forest train] belongs to the progressive camp, to the intelligent people. Those against it: to Rome, to the uneducated elements of society."[52] It was through such symbolic instruments that the local bürgertum validated its existence, its ambition, and its *weltanschaung.* In constructing the public and private spheres, the (rural) south German bourgeoisie (based on male hegemony) created the basis for a class culture by defining a common identity distinct from that of other social groups. Crucial to that identity was gentility (for example, in dress, manners, and taste), anti-clerical activity, cultural and political activity, evening reading, and the symbolic world created in the local newspapers and publications. Hence, cultural properties based partly on economic activity created a cultural experience. These experiences created cultural groups: the Catholic rural bourgeoisie.

The Jews

Rural Jews constituted an unmistakable bourgeois element in their villages, conducting a bourgeois lifestyle and constituting a central factor in importing bourgeois habits into the village. The Jews were better acquainted with city life than Christian villagers, both because most of them engaged in commerce and were more mobile than the average villager and because after the middle of the nineteenth century Jews migrated to the cities at a much faster rate than other rural Germans, so that most village Jews had relatives in a city. Furthermore,

[51] *Donaueschinger Wochenblatt,* 3.6.1857; *Der Schwarzwälder* 7.3.1857; *Kemptner Zeitung* 28.10.1881; *Tag- und Anzeigeblatt für Kempten u. das Allgau,* 18.6.1903.

[52] I was looking for advertisements in the back pages of the above-mentioned newspapers. The herald of bourgeois culture in the Allgäu was the *Tag u. Anzeigeblatt.* See Zech, *Geschichte,* 62–68. The *Hollentalbahn* quotation is taken from the *Hochwächter,* 12.3.1872.

Jews read bourgeois newspapers and through them learned about the bourgeois way of life. The *Gartenlaube* was especially popular among Jewish families in the countryside.[53]

The Jews were among the first to build houses in the city style and to use furniture and implements as symbols that characterized urban bourgeois life (such as sofas, pianos, and china closets). In addition to pianos, they often owned other musical instruments as well. The Jews, male and female, dressed according to bourgeois fashions; and the females were among the first to use makeup. The Jews were also among the first in their villages to use modern inventions such as the radio, the telephone, and the automobile. In the town of Horb, in the Black Forest region of Württemberg, there were at the turn of the century 30 telephones, 24 of them owned by Jews.[54] In the cities, Jews also conducted their leisure lives according to bourgeois patterns and were to a large extent mixed with Christian bourgeois society, at concerts, in museums, and at the theater. German Jewry did not want and did not try to create its own cultural frameworks but rather enthusiastically participated in the German cultural system, although the Jewry's participation in this process of integration and its sharing of the same values and symbols of the German non-Jewish bourgeois then created new Jewish bourgeois symbols and cultural properties.[55] On the level of personal friendship, most Jews were restricted to the company of other Jews; few Christians visited Jewish homes or invited Jews to their homes. Yet even here, among the Jews in their private homes, their lives followed the bourgeois patterns of home entertainment: discussions of bourgeois cultural affairs, group readings of classical texts, piano playing, card games, and so on. Jews also liked to sit in coffee houses—the fashionable bourgeois ones, of course.

In the villages, even though many Jews were part of the local bourgeoisie, the possibilities for bourgeois-style leisure activity were limited. It was hard to find a fashionable bourgeois coffee house in the villages. Most Jewish men in the villages of western Germany, like village men in most other areas, spent a great part of their leisure time in the tavern. The evidence is that they were integrated into local society, and many of them belonged to the *Stammtische*, most of whose members were Christian. Village women had no place in the tavern, so they spent their few free hours making visits and in the activities of small social groupings—*Kränzchen*—or in women's associations. Here, too, Jewish women participated in village social activity: Personal relations between Jews

[53] See, for example, *Auszug aus den Erinnerungen von Hermann Oppenheim* (Leo Baeck Institute Archives, New York) ME 483, p. 5.

[54] The first study to describe the bourgeois characteristics of Jewish village life was Jeggle, *Judendörfer.* The numerous local studies written so far, as well as the work of Monika Richarz, the leading researcher on the rural Jews of southewestern Germany, confirm this view. About southwestern Germany see also Lowenstein, "Decline and Survival," 9–10, and the sources cited in notes 32 and 33.

[55] The one exception to this was the community of Eastern European Jews during the Weimar period, which established Yiddish theater organizations and cultural groups.

and Christians were closer in the villages than in the cities.[56] Despite these close relations, there was a clear boundary in personal friendships beyond which Jews were not allowed. However, as previously noted, village Jews accepted these social boundaries without complaint and felt at home in their communities.

Some leisure time was spent at home, and here bourgeois patterns were notable, especially in the area of reading. As noted, the Jews read bourgeois newspapers, and the literature they read was also largely typical of the bourgeois bildung aspiration, including classical literature (among the more educated) and modern literature.

In summary, the Jews behaved as bourgeoisie in their private sphere; but unlike the Catholics, the Jews had little in common with most of their neighbors, non-bourgeois Catholic villagers. Yet, in their public social lives and leisure activities (with the exception of the specific case of the Vereine, which we have addressed separately), the Jews accepted the norms of their immediate surroundings. In fact, given the circumstances of village life, they really had no other choice.

5. ATTITUDES TO RELIGION

The Catholic Bourgeoisie

Pietistic elements played an important role in (but not only in) southern German Catholic rural society. Religion, controlled by the priest, was even used for political purposes. Customs, superstitions, saints, prayer ceremonies, and seasonal rituals served as a social control and for the socialization process of the villagers' lower classes. It was against these "backward" practices that the village Catholic bourgeoisie directed its criticism.

Anti-ultramontanism was the foundation of Catholic bourgeois behavior. We have already cited their motto, "Wir sind Katholisch, gut Katholisch, aber nicht Ultramontanen," in their ongoing battle with the priest and his flock. This struggle generally was about questions like their right to send their children to gymnasiums, reading literature the priests considered immoral, dress, and of course everyday politics. Their attitude towards their religion was affected by their desire "to get out of the ghetto" and was expressed in the form of protest. They believed in the capitalist economic order and in secular culture, but they did not neglect their basic Catholic obligations, such as participation in Christmas and Easter services, receiving the host on Easter, baptizing their children, and regularly attending Sunday services. This did not imply that they recognized the priest's socio-cultural authority but rather a view that his authority was limited to the church. Outside the church, the bourgeoisie claimed, they had a right to act as they pleased. Their contacts with priests were entirely formal. On many occasions they participated in ceremonies because of "what the neighbors would

[56] See Marion Kaplan, *The Making*, 127–9.

say" or out of fear of being ostracized or suffering socio-economic sanctions. In this they differed from the Old Catholics, who were mostly bourgeois. The Old Catholics, who established their own church, did not recognize the (Roman) Catholic church and believed they were the keepers of the true Catholic religion. The village bourgeoisie fought the priest largely over their right to observe the principles of the bourgeois *Tugend*, which was based on classical education, the importance of the family, and the separation of the public and private spheres. The Church had no right to interfere with their private lives, they believed, just as they did not interfere with church ceremony. The separation of church and state was important to them and was expressed in their anti-clerical "religion of the bourgeoisie." In the rural areas of southern Germany there was a gentler version of the extreme Old Catholics who advocated a bourgeois religion.[57]

The Jews

Religious life was another area in which there was a notable difference between village Jews and the Jewish urban bourgeoisie. It is an example of the complexity of the process of Jewish integration into general society. Especially in the twentieth century, village Jews integrated into Catholic village society by observing Jewish ceremonies and remaining loyal to Jewish religious customs. Since Catholic village society encouraged respect for religion and its rituals, Jews living in this society preserved religious frameworks and observances—and in fact preserved precisely those observances that were parallel to the ones kept by their Catholic neighbors.

Rural Jewry was always perceived to be more traditional than urban Jewry. Many of the books and memoirs written about village Jews describe them as observant "by nature," the same image that emerges from conversations with Jews who grew up in the cities. The villages are portrayed as a stronghold of traditional Judaism shielded from the sweeping winds of modernism. Village Jews, say their urban coreligionists, observed the religion's precepts out of inertia and habit, without being great scholars or experts in Jewish law.[58] In fact, the picture is much more complex; and there was no unity of religious observance among the Jews of the villages.

Religious observance among village Jews declined during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and even more so during and after World War I. A study of religious observance among rural Jews in the Rhineland and in Westphalia during the Weimar period, in which the observance of religious precepts was low relative to previous periods, showed that observance was preserved largely in three areas: first, those observances having to do with "rites of pas-

[57] On these two terms and the differences between them, see H. Kleger and A. Muller, eds., *Religion des Bürgers: Zivilreligion in Amerika und Europa* (München, 1986), 13.

[58] This view is presented by numerous books and articles about rural Jewry. See for example Hermann Schwabb, *Jewish Rural Communities in Germany* (London, n.d. [1956?]). The subject is treated more carefully by Werner Cahnmann, "Village and Small-Town Jews in Germany," in *idem., German Jewry. Its History and Sociology* (Oxford, 1973), 53–55.

sage"—ceremonies symbolizing transitional stages in the life cycle—circumcision, bar mitzvah, marriage, and death (ritual washing of the body and funeral rites); second, public prayer at special times, the most important of these being the high holidays, Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur; and, third, those precepts linked to the home and to family life, such as the dietary laws and Sabbath and holiday meals, an area that was largely under the control of the women.[59]

Village Jews differed in these areas from the urban Jewish bourgeoisie, especially during the Weimar period. With regard to rites of passage, it is known that there was a high rate of intermarriage among urban Jews and that the bar mitzvah, replaced by many Jews with "confirmation," was in many cases abandoned altogether. Many urban Jews preferred to have their bodies cremated, an act forbidden by Jewish law. In the area of public prayer, there was also a large difference between village and urban Jews. In the cities, most Jews did not attend synagogue even on the high Jewish holidays,[60] whereas their counterparts in the villages not only attended but also made financial sacrifices to do so. In places where there was no *minyan*, or prayer quorum, Jewish men, called *Minyanleute* were paid to come on holidays from other areas to make up the quorum. The village Jews were also prepared to pay good money to bring in a good *vorbeter* to lead the services.

The third group of observances, those connected to the Jewish home, show that Marion Kaplan's claim that women in the imperial period were more traditional than men[61] may well also be true of village women during the Weimar period. Confirmation of this may be found in local studies that indicate a higher (though not fully orthodox) level of religious observance among women than among men.[62]

The first two aspects of observances, rites of passage and public prayer, would seem to have something in common, a connection with the religious and social norms of the villages. The Jews were part of the village social community, in which religion and religious ceremonies played a central role in shaping social norms, self-identity, and social life in general. This is especially true of the Catholic villages in the Rhineland and Westphalia. Local public opinion did not look kindly on those who were indifferent to religion. Just as Catholics were expected to fulfill their religious obligations, so were Jews.

The two sets of observances that most Jews kept were parallel to the precepts that most of the Christians in the village observed. Most Germans observed rites of passage as religious ceremonies, and in the villages the number of these re-

[59] Borut, "Religiöses Leben der Landjuden in West-Deutschland während der Weimarer Republik," in Reinhard Rürup and Monika Richarz, eds., *Jüdisches Leben auf dem Lande* (Tübingen, 1997), 130–48; "'Bin Ich doch ein Israelit," 113–29.

[60] See *Gemeindeblatt der jüdischen Gemeinde zu Berlin*, 19 Jg. Nr. 6, Juni 1929, S. 292–93.

[61] Marion Kaplan, *The Making*, especially ch. 2.

[62] See Borut, "Religious life," 104–5.

ligious ceremonies was proportionally higher than in the cities.[63] Although church attendance declined, sometimes steeply, in the cities, it remained high in the villages, especially the Catholic ones. In Catholic villages, Sunday church attendance was still considered an obligation, *Sonntagspflicht*, as late as the 1970s.[64] In such circumstances, the Jews could also feel that they had to observe their rites of passage according to religious tradition and that they had to fulfill their own Sabbath obligation. This was part of their world view as residents of the village. In small towns where there was less social pressure, Sabbath prayer services were not held on a regular basis. From Jewish memoirs we learn that for many people, the most important part of the service was the conversation after it, the *Schwaetz*, when Jewish men stood in the synagogue yard and chatted. We thus learn that many Jews viewed the services not so much as a religious observance but as a social obligation that they fulfilled against the background of a local society and Jewish tradition, in which both social and religious obligations were intermingled. Village Jews, especially in Catholic villages, considered themselves part of the local village community to the point of taking part in Catholic ceremonies. There are numerous reports of Jews decorating their homes on Catholic holidays and celebrations, and in a few cases Jews even took part in Catholic holiday parades.[65] Their position can be summed up in a banner prepared by Jews on some occasions of visits from senior Catholic religious officials: "*Bin ich auch ein Israelit, ehre ich doch den Bischof mit*" (Een though I am a Jew, I respect the bishop, too).[66]

All in all, it is clear that, in contrast with the Jewish urban bourgeoisie, who distanced themselves from religion and some of whom were anti-clerical, the Jewish rural bourgeoisie had a completely different attitude towards religion, both Jewish and Catholic. There were even extreme cases of fondness for the Church. We know of cases of teenage Jewish girls (but not boys) who went with their Christian friends to church ceremonies. In the village of Kroev, the local priest even berated a Jewish girl for not attending a particular ceremony—her attendance at others having been so frequent that he thought she was Christian. These church visits were made with parental knowledge.[67] In the village of Gey, near Düren in the Rhineland, a wealthy Jew, whose eldest son had been born sick and

[63] See the information on the Aachen area presented in G. Plum, *Gesellschaftsstruktur und politischer Beweusstsein in einer katholischen Region 1928–1933* (Stuttgart, 1972), 217, n. 88, 229, n. 4, 282, ap. 9.

[64] G. Golde, *Catholics and Protestants. Agricultural Modernization in Two German Villages* (New York, 1975), 171.

[65] See, for example, Manfred van Rey, *Leben und Sterben unserer jüdischen Mitbürger in Künigswinter* (Königswinter, 1985), 89.

[66] Elisabeth Haas-Reck, "Juden in Kobern," in *Kobern-Gondorf-von der Vergangenheit zur Gegenwart* (Kobern-Gondorf, 1980), 267; Günter Heuzeroth, "Jüdisch-deutsche Bürger unserer Heimat," Teil III, *Heimat-Jahrbuch des Kreises Altenkirchen*, 19 (1977), S. 128 (Betzdorf); Wolf Stegemann and S. Johanna Eichmann, *Juden in Dorsten und in der Herrlichkeit Lembeck* (Dorsten, 1989), 260. (Wulfen).

[67] Hubert Gessinger, *Die Juden von Zeltingen-Rachtig*, 27. The father's reaction, quoted there, indicates his full agreement with his daughter's social behavior.

had died in babyhood, celebrated the birth of a second, healthy son by donating 100 marks to the synagogue and another 100 marks to the local church.[68]

We can thus see that in their religious lives the Jews also identified very much with the surrounding local community and with the dominant values of the place. In this case we may say that the religious values of the local society constituted a kind of social control that helped the Jews preserve their own Jewish religious values. Unlike the Catholic village bourgeoisie, which was prepared to enter into conflict with the Church and its supporters, the Jews of the villages avoided conflict with their Catholic neighbors and accepted the prevailing values of the villages.

6. SUMMARY

The Catholic Rural Bourgeoie

The Catholic village bourgeoisie in southern Germany considerably identified with Protestant culture. They considered themselves Germans first and Catholics only afterwards and even than as Catholics who were not ultramontanists. This conception was reflected in cultural activities and voting patterns. As opposed to the Jewish village bourgeoisie, the Catholic bourgeoisie generally enjoyed cultural hegemony, even if they had an ongoing struggle with the Church for that hegemony. This group was thus not marginal and did not consider itself as such. Its members felt like pioneers, helping to free their entire micromilieu from its backwardness and its isolation from the majority society. However, our examination shows that their adaptation of Protestant and urban cultural norms was not unqualified. They did reserve a place for local, rural values and acted as intermediates between their vicinity and what they saw as the "wide world."

Our model of Catholic bourgeoisie society in rural Germany is composed of highly specific patterns of political-economic behaviours and mentalities. Chief among these are support for groups backing national-bourgeois issues, an anticlerical bias, an allegiance to progress, an affirmation of the Capitalistic economic order, a partial or complete rupture with the Catholic Church, and the adoption of socio-cultural patterns typical of the Protestant bourgeoisie. The rupture with the Catholic Church is a highly important point. We regard this as a vital condition to the creation of a bourgeois formation wielding cultural hegemony. There is no doubt that while many Catholics remained in one Catholic milieu or another and were supportive of the Center Party, they were exceedingly close to the Catholic bourgeoisie presented above in respect to economic ideology (liberalism) and attitudes concerning secular cultural manners. Such was the case, for example, in the cities of Cologne, Aachen, Bonn, Boppard, or Mainz. Yet how did they regard the Catholic Church and the Center Party?

[68] H. Köller, "Über die Juden in Gey im 20. Jahrhundert," *Dürener Geschichtsblätter,* 75 (1986), 67.

Thomas Mergel has recently suggested the model of the "*Catholic Spagat.*" This Spagat forced many Catholics during the Kulturkampf to choose one of three different world views: first, the pro-liberal and radically anti-ultramontane; second, the pro-liberal within the walls of the ultramontane ghetto; and, third, the Liberal bourgeois, but without entirely abandoning Catholicism.[69]

Our Catholic example improves our understanding of the reasons why class or religion were so important to the style of daily life in one area but less so in another. Our study is based on the assumption that cultural variables establish and mold the infrastructure of local society. The Old Catholic Church is a good example of such a mixture of religion and daily life. However, not all the members of the bourgeoise in South Germany belonged to the group of Old Catholics—indeed, most did not. Such being the case, how did they express their rupture with the Catholic Church?

A majority did not express irreconcilable alienation. The model of the Old Catholics—Catholics publicly throwing down the gauntlet to Church authority—was not followed by other groups. The Old Catholics upheld "Bourgeois Religion" (*Burgerliche Religion*). They believed in private Christian piety, salvation in the personal sphere, and complete detachment from the Roman-Catholic Church and its agencies. We can call them the pragmatic faithful. The more moderate religious model was "the Religion of the Bourgeoisie" (*Religion des Burgers*).[70] They saw themselves as an enlightened bourgeoisie, loyal to the state. Their goal was to separate the state from religion and to preserve the liberal relations between the state and its politic. From a cultural perspective they expressed a belief, among others, in anti-clerical activity (and in this differed radically from the Rheinland—who were not Old Catholics—bourgeoisie). Although they staunchly upheld the most elemental Church requirements, such as participating in important rites of Christmas and Easter, they saw themselves as part of the humanist-liberal civilization and regarded their link with the church and the priest in purely formal terms. We may suppose that participation in such rites was less a matter of religious conviction for many of the Catholic bourgeoisie than a worry over "what will the neighbours say?" or possible adverse social and economic sanctions if they did not observe those rites. Such social groups could, of course, be found in large Catholic cities of Germany no less than in that region in the South of Germany.

The Jewish Rural Bourgeoisie

The Jews of the villages and towns of western Germany constructed a complex self-image. Whereas modern research on German Jewish identity concentrates

[69] Mergel, *Zwischen Klasse und Konfession; idem*, "Ultramontanism, Liberalism, Moderation: Political Mentalities and Political Behavior of the German Catholic Bürgertum, 1848–1914," *Central European History*, 29:2 (1996), 151–75.

[70] H. Kleger and A. Müller, eds., *Religion des Bürgers. Zivilreligion in Amerika und Europa* (München 1986), 13.

on the aspects of Deutschtum and Judentum, little or no attention was given to the aspect of local identity below the national level.[71] Those Jews described in this essay openly considered themselves not only as Jews and loyal Germans but also as members of the local community[72] or members of a micromilieu who identify with its norms and social attitudes. This tendency was evident in a number of areas, such as local associational life, habits of entertainment and leisure, and religious life. Unlike the Catholic village bourgeoisie, Jews belonging to the local economic and cultural elites did not seek to educate or advance the members of the surrounding Catholic society and did not publicly display a feeling that they were superior to others (even though they had enemies who accused them of feeling this way). Their lack of confidence, their sense of belonging to a minority in a marginal position, shaped their attitudes and made them accept a significant part of the local norms. They did not try, as did the Catholic bourgeoisie, to change those norms.

When the Jewish community declined and when more and more of its members moved to the cities or to the United States, Jewish public opinion lost its ability to exert social control. The public opinion of the village's Christian inhabitants, however, remained a very efficient tool of social regulation; and local norms assumed a decisive role in shaping public Jewish conduct, including public religious life. Thus, the forms of Jewish religious life in small communities were determined not only by Jewish value systems but also by Christian ones. By merging parts of their own tradition with Christian values, the village Jews could feel themselves to be simultaneously good Jews and good Germans and loyal members of their communities. This combination of feelings and identity systems—the German homeland, Judaism (in the special way in which it was perceived), and the local community—characterized the urban Jewish bourgeoisie as well. In the cities, however, it led to entirely different value systems, social habits, and religious behavior. The differences between these groups reveal the complexity of German Jewry and show that Jews, like Catholics, cannot be portrayed according to a unitary stereotype based on a specific distinction or even a fundamental opposition between these two minorities. Not all of German Jewry copied the Protestant model: Some Jews found other ways of leaving the ghetto walls and integrating into the majority society. The Jews who lived among pious Catholics looked for a way to integrate according to Catholic modes of behavior that characterized their environment, yet to remain loyal to the German Reich. They wished to integrate not only into their immediate surroundings but also into the Reich as a whole, an integration that was, in the end, denied them.

[71] For an excellent study on that subject in a specific area, although it does not refer to Jews, see Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials, The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley, 1990).

[72] On identification with the local community as a driving social force in the local level, see John Theibault, "Community and Herrschaft in the Seventeenth Century German Village," *Journal of Modern History,* 64:1 (March 1992), 1–21.

A COMPARATIVE DISCUSSION

In this study we have examined two groups that may be termed "minorities within a minority": the bourgeois minority among the Catholic rural society and the Jewish minority in Catholic villages. These are two social groups that scholarship has tended to ignore, perhaps because they have not been identified as cultural groups that are "anomalous" in the context of the accepted image of Jewish and Catholic village society and because the recent studies of European bourgeoisie have tended to concentrate on the urban bourgeoisie. In short, we have tried to show that even on the level of the micromilieu there are many cultural variations.

The conditions for the two groups under discussion were close to the reverse of scholarly consensus. The Catholic rural bourgeoisie strove to assimilate into the dominant Protestant society by accepting its values and joining its organizations. Yet, in spite of their anti-clerical stand, they did not go to the Old Catholic extreme of irreconcilable alienation towards the church and its public rites. The Jewish rural bourgeoisie, on the other hand, had shunned some of the dominant norms and organizations of Protestant Germany: They voted in large numbers for the Zentrum, a party avoided, indeed, vehemently denounced by Protestants; and the Jewish rural bourgeoisie avoided both the anti-clericalism and secularism that were typical of urban, bourgeois Protestant culture and tended to be shared by the urban Jewish middle class. However, while seeking accommodation with the surrounding Catholic milieu, the Jewish rural bourgeoisie did not assimilate these norms completely. In their private family lives and their consumption habits, they emulated Protestant-bourgeois norms and retained a different, more positive and affirming attitude toward the state and the central government.

Both groups shared a value identification that went beyond their immediate environment, the local Catholic micromilieu, and extended to the bourgeois macromilieu. The Catholics and Jews responded to the dilemma of their double identity in different ways: While the Catholic bourgeoisie did not hesitate to enter into conflict with the local sources of religious authority, the priests and their immediate environment, rural Jews sought to integrate into their Catholic environment, respected its values, and in some cases (political identification and religious life) even awarded these values a dominant position in their lives.

That difference in confidence and self assertion had several grounds. The most obvious one is the difference in quantity. Although both Catholics and Jews were minorities in the sense that they constituted less than a majority, less than 50 percent, of the population, Catholics were about 35 percent of the German population, but Jews were just 1 percent. Moreover, Catholics were a local and regional majority, generally making up over 90 percent of the populations of towns and villages in the areas examined. By contrast, Jews formed only a few percent of the population in these areas.

We should also note that the Jews and Catholic rural bourgeoise, while both being a middle class living in small towns and villages, had quite different economic positions. Jews were typically agricultural middlemen (cattle dealers, farm product wholesalers, property brokers, money lenders and the like, sometimes performing all those roles together), who were dependent on the other inhabitants of the rural world for their living. Large parts of the Catholic rural bourgeoise, on the other hand, earned its living outside of rural society: as industrialists, owners of tourist hotels, professionals who owed their credentials to the state (or worked for it). Thus, the two groups generally had positions which allowed for quite different attitudes towards the surrounding society, with the Catholic rural bourgeoise having the best chance to be more independent and self-assertive than their Jewish counterparts.

CONCLUSION: THE EUROPEAN RURAL BOURGEOISIE — A COMPARATIVE DIMENSION

Our discussion here of the German rural bourgeoisie displays the variety of possible patterns of reaction to the challenge of modernity which rural societies in some other European countries also faced. Although a rural bourgeoisie is largely considered to be the extension of urban society into the countryside, acting like the transmission belt carrying the norms of modernity from town to village,[73] that sector of society reacted to modernity in more complex ways. True, the members of that sector were more mobile than most country dwellers had more access—spiritually as well as physically—to the growing towns and to urban society and its evolving norms, which we call modern. Yet, they addressed what they saw or read in a critical manner. They made their choices without forsaking their self-identity as dwellers of the countryside. Some members of the local rural bourgeoisie had seen rural society as backward and tried to advance it in the right direction without opening a rupture with its leading institutions (mainly the church), taking care to stay within the invisible social boundaries dictated by the worry about "what will the neighbors say"—no matter how backward those neighbors were considered. The bourgeois who took this path still felt that they were members of the local society and not urbans in exile. As a result, they had not, in fact, assimilated the whole range of urban, modernistic attitudes, although they did make some selections, tacitly choosing to ignore such norms or deeds that would lead to an open conflict with their rural surroundings. The rural bourgeois in our study made more complex choices, adopting some urban norms and attitudes in certain fields of life while retaining more traditionalistic attitudes in others. In spite of the view of the rural bourgeois as pioneers of modernism in the countryside—a view shared by many of the rural bourgeoisie and by many researchers who wrote about them—village

[73] G. E. Mingay, *Land and Society in England 1750–1980* (London, 1994), 185. The various articles in Wolfgang Jacobeit *et al.*, eds., *Idylle oder Aufbruch: Das Dorf im bürgerliche 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1990), Wallner, *Die Rezeption.*

norms and social control played a major role in their choices. Rather than a transmission belt, members of the rural middle class were middlemen in the literal sense of the word.

A discussion of the rural bourgeoisie should also take into account developments in other European countries, Britain for example. A promising direction for the (German) case study here emerges from L. Davidoff and C. Hall's *Family Fortunes*, which gives another dimension to the rural bourgeoisie.[74] This is a pioneering attempt to study the middle classes of rural Essex (as well as urban Birmingham) according to the central European Bürgertum definitions and cultural methods used in this essay. According to Davidoff and Hall, middle-class consciousness came to be organized around the concept of a separate private sphere for men and women. This private sphere distanced the middle-class bourgeoisie from the aristocracy and the lower class. Issues like anti-clerical activity, non-conformist religion, women's rights, clubs and family structures were negotiated within the families, voluntary associations, and local societies, as was also evident in the discussion here of the German Jewish and Catholic rural bourgeoisie. The struggle to define rural bourgeois identities took place mainly at home. Here was a refuge from the traditional rural class conflict. Home (and family) became "the hallmark of the middle class," the central institution of the middle class moral code."[75] Middle class farmers, manufactures, merchants and professionals critical of many aspects of aristocratic privilege and power, sought to translate their increasing economic weight into a moral and cultural authority.[76] Their public sphere, characterised by voluntary associations and private sphere (home), together with their belief in their ability to control the lower class, were the basis of their claim to moral and cultural authority. Here, too, the similarities to our rural bourgeoisie are evident. This study concentrates mainly on gender relations which were identical in town and village and in general deals with the aspects of conctructing a middle-class identity[77] that distinguished its holders from local aristocrats, artisans, and agrarian sectors. Unlike our study, it pays little attention to differences between urban and rural middle class. Still, it does point to the complexities both within provincial society and within the middle class itself and to the creation of a distinctive provincial class with a separate identity and values. Together, both studies are trying to shift the traditional attention from the middle-class metropolis to the creation of the provincial bourgeoisie as a real social formation.

[74] Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes, Men and Woman of the English Middle Class 1780–1850* (London, 1988).

[75] *Ibid*, 25.

[76] *Ibid*, 30.

[77] Of course there are distinctions between the term "middle class" used by Davidoff and Hall and that of bourgeoisie used in this essay, but they hold no relevance for the discussion under point.