

# CITY, MUSEUMS FOR THE PEOPLE, AND NEW MEDIA (1900-1933/1934)

ADELHEID VON SALDERN  
*University of Hanover*

The article deals with the educational intentions of and the discourses on popularization of museums by the new media. The use of radio by museums as a means of attracting more people will be reconstructed from the turn of the century to the Nationalist Socialist period. Looking at the Hamburg, the article demonstrates how the city *Heimat* museum, the Museum of Hamburg History, and its director, Professor Otto Lauffer, cooperated with the Hamburg radio station Norag and one of its program directors, Dr. Kurt Stapelfeldt. The cooperation of the two men was based on similar ideas of *Volk*, *Stamm*, and *Heimat* and demonstrates the use of the most modern media at the time for the popularization of a conservative, attractively prepared concept. Although there was a bias for the rural past, their *Heimat* concept was not anti-urban per se. Instead, they wanted the cities to search their identities in the peculiarities of the old rural culture of their region. Lauffer and Stapelfeldt considered their work apolitical; in fact, their concept was directed against the modern republican and democratic political culture of the Weimer Republic, and therefore it belonged to the pre-story of the Third Reich.

**Keywords:** *museums; Heimat; Germany; new media*

**By the turn of the twentieth century**, one of the significant issues in the history of museums was whether museums were supposed to be open to the public and, if so, for how long and how to fulfill this task. This debate coincided with changes in German society, in particular the emergence of a “mass” society under a semiautocratic regime, the Reich. New demands for the popularization of patriotism challenged the role of museums during World War I. The Weimar Republic split opinions about the task of museums for or against the spirit of democracy and pluralism. This article deals firstly with the educational intentions of and the discourses on the popularization of museums. Secondly, the use of the new media by museums as a means of attracting more people will be reconstructed from the turn of the century to the National Socialist (Nazi) period.

Connected with the issue of the popularization of museums is another topic of this article: the foundation of city museums, or *Heimat* museums. This type of museum focused on a concept of *Volk*, *Stamm*, and *Heimat* (people, tribe, and homeland), which bound modern and antimodern components together. “Modern” was the interest in people, and “antimodern” the references to

antipluralism by the idea of a genuine, eternally effective common root of the people of a region, the *Stamm*, which was considered essential for *Heimat*.

Looking at Hamburg in particular, the article also demonstrates how the city *Heimat* museum, the Museum of Hamburg History, and its director, Professor Otto Lauffer, cooperated with the Hamburg radio station Norag and one of its program directors, Dr. Kurt Stapelfeldt. The cooperation of the two men, hitherto neglected in the literature, was based on similar ideas of *Volk*, *Stamm*, and *Heimat* and demonstrates the use of the most modern media at the time for the propagation of a fundamentally antiquated concept, which when attractively packaged could take on the trappings of modernity.

The relevance of this *Heimat* concept for the German history of the early twentieth century lies in its character as a basic counterconcept to a democratic and pluralistic view of society. In a society that had undergone rapid modernization and industrialization, people's search for a permanent space in which they could feel at home clashed with the burghers' increasing insecurity about maintaining their local power and cultural dominance. In this situation, the idea of emphasizing people's roots in preindustrial times, combined with the idea of an organic society in which every individual in the cities and the countryside had his or her stable roots and place, was conceptualized as an ethnically "clean" model.<sup>1</sup>

Usually, people who promoted these ideas were not convinced supporters of the Weimar Republic. Instead, they wanted a new reich based on *Volk* and *Stamm*. The revival of *Heimat* in the 1920s paved one of the ways to 1933, because the Nazis could easily use the conservative version of the *Volk* concept and the *Heimat* movement for their racist purposes.<sup>2</sup> It was wholly contrary to a Weimar society that represented the modern world of arts and city life, the focus of so many brilliant books on Weimar culture. The two sides of the coin demonstrate the tensions within Weimar society.

### MUSEUMS FOR THE PUBLIC

Museums in nineteenth-century Germany had three roots: first, in the former collections of the royal seats; second, in the collections in schools and universities; and third, in the collections of private citizens and associations. An example of a civic association is the art association, the *Kunstverein* in Hamburg (1817), which was first opened to the public in 1850. Well-to-do citizens donated their private collections of paintings and other cultural objects to this and similar organizations. The donations were labeled, exhibited, and intended to give prestige to the donors.<sup>3</sup> In Hamburg and other cities, art became a public affair, and the cities, with their burghers, were proud of their contribution. Associations of art initiated museums, such as the Hamburg Kunsthalle.<sup>4</sup>

The burghers' pride, however, was challenged from four sides. Firstly, during the last third of the nineteenth century, the state and the local authorities became more and more involved in museum provision, partly as owners, partly as financial supporters. This change was based on the establishment of bureaucracies by local authorities, who had to manage the increasing problems of modernizing cities. The new bureaucrats also developed a pride in their cities, which was not always identical with that of the well-to-do burghers. Secondly, the economic position of many wealthy burghers was radically weakened by their financing of World War I and by the hyperinflation of 1922-1923. As a result, many of the former private sponsors lost their fortunes and with them their influence on city cultural life. The third challenge stemmed from the growing political self-consciousness of Social Democrats and the trade unions, especially after 1890. They wanted the city to be "their city" also. Their political campaigns centered on the neglect of workers' basic needs, especially their housing and the low wages paid by employers (including those who often were honored as art donors),<sup>5</sup> and on the undemocratic voting system that applied at both local and state (*Stadtstaat*) level in Hamburg. In fact, Hamburg, with 1 million inhabitants in 1905, was one of the few German states to stiffen the election laws in 1906. As one of the centers of the working-class movement, the Social Democrat Party (SPD), the political dominance of the bourgeoisie was regarded as endangered by the party. Thus, a stricter local/state voting system was supported to maintain its power. As a consequence, the SPD and the unions organized a general strike with, as its focal point, a demonstration in front of the city hall that attracted 100,000 participants; but it was all in vain.<sup>6</sup> Although such problems did not directly touch the museums, which with the promotion of art represented the "chocolate" side of the city,<sup>7</sup> it served to poison the atmosphere.

The fourth challenge can be seen in the art education movement (*Kunsterziehungsbewegung*) and in the German Arts and Crafts movement (*Kunstgewerbebewegung*) at the end of the nineteenth century, which were supposed to address the lower strata of the population and to open museums to ordinary people. In other words, the position of museums as important civic places of so-called high culture only for well-educated people was questioned. At the beginning of the twentieth century, art became increasingly a public affair, and with this a new conception of museums arose. Through the work of, above all, Alfred Lichtwark (Hamburg), Georg Kerschensteiner (Munich), Fritz Wichert (Mannheim), Gustav Pauli (Bremen), and later Wilhem Peßler (Hanover) and Adolf Reichwein (Halle), museums became part of the broader move to educate and elevate people's understanding and cultural awareness.<sup>8</sup> The art education movement had many facets and included cultural liberals and cultural conservatives—including *Heimat* supporters—alike. The Hamburg Kunsthalle director, Lichtwark, a convinced opponent of the Social Democrats, a strong nationalist and Hamburg patriot, and a friend of modern art,

was eager to present art—that is, high and classical culture, for example Dürer’s paintings—to the people to elevate their artistic taste.<sup>9</sup> He believed in the creation and definition of a national culture through which “all members became equal members of the national community.”<sup>10</sup> Although his ideal of the new German was a cross between a teacher (*Oberlehrer*) and an officer,<sup>11</sup> he also pursued economic goals. “Educating the population to appreciate artistic products of good quality would spur industrial reforms aimed at producing high-quality goods for the domestic market.”<sup>12</sup> Lichtwark belonged to the group of reformers who wanted to combine national patriotism with emotions for local *Heimat*. His organic society “grew out of the soil of its landscape and the values of its past”.<sup>13</sup> Thus, he searched for local traditions and supported the establishment of local museums.<sup>14</sup> The spirit of local identity was supposed to become a counterpole to Berlin and its tendency toward the centralization of politics and culture. Therefore, “the art and culture of Hamburg and its surrounding countryside became increasingly central to its institutional organization and educational mission.”<sup>15</sup> To this end, Lichtwark started three new collections that dealt solely with Hamburg painters and Hamburg paintings.<sup>16</sup>

This kind of popularization was realized in a time-specific, patriarchal manner: male authorities defined what was to be highly appreciated as classic art and what was not. Every step of popularization was, however, a difficult task, especially because, for example in Hamburg, the workers’ movement was not interested in these museums.<sup>17</sup> Although hotly debated, special guided tours for workers were organized. Moreover, Lichtwark was also eager to offer lectures in his Hamburg Kunsthalle, and teachers were urged to cooperate. Lectures were supposed to help people, especially the young, to understand art.<sup>18</sup> By contrast, most of the museum directors, above all Hugo von Tschudi, director of the Berlin National Gallery, and Wilhelm von Bode, director of the Berlin Nationalmuseum, only supported attempts to address broader strata of middle-class people but not the workers.<sup>19</sup>

### NEW CHALLENGES FOR MUSEUMS AFTER WORLD WAR I

After World War I and the Revolution of 1918-1919, efforts were made in many cities to go a step further: from the popularization to the democratization of museums. One of the most radical of these reformers was Wilhelm R. Valentiner, with his idea of a republican *Volksmuseum*. Valentiner had worked at the Metropolitan Museum in New York before returning to Germany during the war. After 1918, he was one of the few museum experts who supported the Revolution.<sup>20</sup> As a member of the revolutionary workers’ council of art (*Arbeiterrat für Kunst*), he wanted, first, to reorganize the entire sphere of museums in Germany according to systematic principles; and, second, he

avored a new mode of exhibiting paintings by putting them into furnished period rooms to give an impression of the whole spirit of the time. Finally, he wanted museums with artefacts from the real life of people, not confined to the products of bourgeois high culture. He also pleaded not only for longer opening hours, including Sundays, but also for using the museum as a forum.<sup>21</sup> Valentiner's concept was, however, strongly criticized and had no chance of realization.

All the attempts at popularizing the art museums, however, had limited success among workers. To be sure, the Hamburg Kunsthalle, for example, increased its popularity and had around 200,000 visits in 1920.<sup>22</sup> But after that year, rather than growth, public interest in art and art museums showed every sign of decreasing.<sup>23</sup> People had wider opportunities for recreation, especially sports and commercial culture such as movies. It was in response to this that directors of art museums turned to consider new means of popularization. Many cultural conservative reformers no longer considered references to conventional bourgeois art sufficient to create social cohesion.<sup>24</sup> In fact, conventional bourgeois art was losing its hegemony. First, avant-garde art—except New Objectivity—evoked uncertainty about artistic values and norms.<sup>25</sup> Second, the growing separate socialist workers' cultural movement was regarded as “cultural socialism” and therefore a danger in the eyes of cultural conservative reformers. Third, an adoption of a republican-democratic concept of culture lay beyond the *Weltsicht*, or worldview, of cultural conservatives,<sup>26</sup> because many museum officials retained a Wilhelminian antidemocratic spirit and favored authoritarian ideas and a conservative view of national patriotism.

In the face of all the cultural and political challenges after World War I, cultural conservatives “discovered” the *Volk* and *Volkskunst*. To be sure, leftist and modern artists in Germany and other countries also “discovered” the real or alleged inspiration of *Volkskunst* during the 1920s and 1930s,<sup>27</sup> but the conservative-*völkisch* interpretation and contextualization of these terms had the greatest political-cultural effect. The conservatives' references to the *Volk* and to the “*Volk* community” (*Volksgemeinschaft*) were seen as the answer to the challenges of modernity and the so-called mass society. In this context, new so-called *Heimat* museums, or museums of city history or museums for *Volkskunst*, were founded. Although museums of this kind were built in such cities as Hanover and Hamburg in the prewar era,<sup>28</sup> the breakthrough for this kind of museum only came after the war.

#### NEW IMPULSES: THE FOUNDING OF *HEIMAT* MUSEUMS

During World War I, the *Heimat* movement received many impulses from patriotism and the concept of a regional *Heimat* front. The war witnessed the

first great simultaneous feeling of mass experience, presented in newspapers on a national level, which were read by the majority of people. The war, defined as a war of defense, was a matter of national unity, and, as a consequence, the nation was to be presented as the highest point of reference. Because the nation was an abstract phenomenon, regional *Heimat* was supposed to make it concrete. Region and nation were to be seen as identical. While soldiers defended *Heimat*, people left in the *Heimat* had to support the military front by individual efforts to strengthen the economy, by eliminating every inner conflict, and by emotionalizing the soldiers' tasks.<sup>29</sup> Above all, young people were to be educated in a regional-national love of *Heimat*. Love of *Heimat* and knowledge of *Heimat* were seen as appropriate means of educating people in the new spirit. *Heimat* associations and *Heimat* museums flourished.<sup>30</sup> As a consequence, many museums established war collections, and *Heimat* museums were enlarged into regional-national war museums to encourage patriotism in the spirit of German imperialism and cultural-racist chauvinism. Besides the new national-patriotic dimension of many *Heimat* museums, the individual and the family became integral parts of the *Heimat* museums, for example by collecting war letters or by establishing memorials to fallen soldiers.

After the war, the "shame of Versailles" was to be balanced by gaining "fresh hope" through pronounced references to *Heimat*.<sup>31</sup> The *Heimat* movement saw its task as the regeneration of regional *Heimat* and national spirit.<sup>32</sup> Therefore, the *Heimat* movement grew after the war and reached its peak in the late 1920s and early 1930s.<sup>33</sup> One of the largest city and *Heimat* museums was the Rheinisches und Historisches Museum in Cologne, later named the Haus der Rheinischen Heimat, which was founded after the city's 1,000-year jubilee in 1925.<sup>34</sup> In general, *Heimat* museums were designed to be embedded in the culture of a town or a region, and they endeavored to popularize a specific kind of history. Such *Heimat* museums were characterized by their dense networks, formed by teachers, clerks, physicians, and local officials. As yet, however, *Heimat* museums, as institutions often unstable and unprofessionally led, lacked a clear political program for the collection and display of items.<sup>35</sup>

The visitors to the ordinary *Heimat* museums were researchers, teachers who were alone or with their pupils, inhabitants going sightseeing with their visitors, and, finally, people who were fascinated by the exhibitions per se:<sup>36</sup> old household contents, old clothing, old equipment, and so on. The museum in Hamm, a city with a population of 50,000, had 10,000 museum visits in only one year.<sup>37</sup> The Museum of Hamburg History also gained some popularity, especially by its lectures on *Volkskunde* and *Heimat* culture that attracted teachers and students alike.<sup>38</sup> In the context of the *Heimat* movement, a collectors' movement arose in the 1920s. With the authorities' support, they looked for old items of every kind and collected the variations of fairy tales and traditional songs.<sup>39</sup> The old costumes (*Trachten*) of a region were important items



for collection.<sup>40</sup> According to the ideas of cultural conservatism, which underlay most *Heimat* museums, people were to know about their own past (which was, of course, a constructed one) to feel unified as a *Volk* community.

Although the local- and regional-oriented concept of *Heimat* museums dominated, there was also a nationally oriented concept of *Heimat*, not least due to the experiences of war.<sup>41</sup> An example of the national idea was given by the general director of the state museums in Berlin, Wilhelm Waetzoldt, whose endeavors were described in an article published in 1932: Waetzoldt was eager to renew the state collection of the German *Volkskunde* and to open a German *Volksmuseum*, in other words a *Heimat* museum on a national basis, exhibiting all the traditional items of German *Volk* history.<sup>42</sup>

### THE CONCEPT OF *HEIMAT* MUSEUMS AND ITS PROPAGATOR, OTTO LAUFFER

In the liberal period of the mid-nineteenth century, scientific knowledge was to be popularized, and these efforts were informed by the idea of enlightenment. But knowledge of the social conditions of the working class and of social conflicts were usually ignored in exhibitions. Around 1900, only a few exhibitions, for example that on home work (*Heimarbeit*) in Frankfurt, were organized. Instead, *Heimat* and *Volkskultur* as an emotionalized concept became dominant.<sup>43</sup> *Heimat* was sanitized by excluding all evidence of social conflicts, and, to that extent, history was distorted. It was seen as a source of national renovation and therefore a means against widespread cultural pessimism. This corresponded with an increasingly nationalist orientation with respect to art politics,<sup>44</sup> to museums for civic history, to the art trade museums (*Kunstgewerbemuseum*), and to ethnological museums, called *Volkskunde* museums.<sup>45</sup> In fact, museums once founded in the spirit of enlightenment were changed into museums as places of counterenlightenment.<sup>46</sup> While the liberals had followed an idea of social integration often combined with aggressive nationalism,<sup>47</sup> the conservatives were inspired by the ideology of a classless "Volk community." The novelty of the *Heimat* museum was seen in its attempts to encourage love of the *Heimat*<sup>48</sup> and of its *Stamm*. The idea of the *Heimat* museum was to create a *Heimat* also for the allegedly nonrooted urban people, especially those who lived in big cities.<sup>49</sup> Therefore, people were to learn about the culture and history of their region. Moreover, *Heimat* and its regional *Stamm* were to be bound to love of the fatherland (*Vaterland*) and the nation.<sup>50</sup>

The Museum for Hamburg History, opened in 1908 and reestablished in 1922, addressed Hamburg's past, its *Volk*, and its *Heimat* in an idealistic-organic way and attempted to inspire people with love of their *Heimat* and *Vaterland* alike.<sup>51</sup> Its conservative and nationalist director, Professor Otto

Lauffer, wanted his museum to foster people's ethics and education.<sup>52</sup> His museum collections referred to not only the city of Hamburg but also the entire Lower Elbe region, combined with agrarian romanticism. The past was thus presented as a harmonious, organic, and classless society.<sup>53</sup>

Lauffer was not an isolated figure. Rather, he was part of a network fostered by Karl Weinhold, who founded the Berlin association of *Volkskunde* (Berliner Verein für Volkskunde), drawing together the many scholars of *Volkskunde* in other German regions. It was Otto Lauffer who helped create the idea of the entity of Low Germany (including its cities), rejecting the idea of a culturally "closed" unity of Lower Saxony.<sup>54</sup> Lauffer was an influential professor for German *Altertums-* und *Volkskunde* at Hamburg University, built after World War I, and was rector of the university for some years.<sup>55</sup> He was among those scholars who were committed to establishing *Volkskunde* as a separate discipline at the university level and had great influence in this field across Germany.<sup>56</sup> He was eager to establish a local branch of the right-wing nationalist academy for scientific research and care of Germanism (Akademie zur wissenschaftlichen Erforschung und Pflege des Deutschtums, or Deutsche Akademie for short) with the support of the university and entrepreneurs.<sup>57</sup> In his eyes, history was not to be written as political history and a history of state affairs, but as the history of its *Volk*, the German *Volk*.<sup>58</sup>

According to the *völkisch* thought of the conservatives and the Nazis, references to the regional *Stamm* were bound up with the (Aryan) German idea. After 1933, Lauffer published, taught, and kept his position as director of the Hamburg museum. In his publications, he used the terms *Blut* and *Boden*, (which he called excellent catchwords) and the term *Rasse* (race) as German *Volk* characteristics.<sup>59</sup> There was no need for him to change his opinion on *Volk* after 1933 because his ideas were, by and large, easily compatible with those of the Nazis. The connection to Nazi ideals was close, because Lauffer wanted to emphasize not only the various German *Stämme*, such as the Lower Germans, but also the German *Volk* character as an entity to differentiate Germany from other nations, as the Nazis demanded.<sup>60</sup> He also legitimized the idea of *Führer*.<sup>61</sup> Already in 1920, he had sought to maintain German peculiarities "pure and genuine" (*rein und unverfälscht*)<sup>62</sup> and saw overforeignization as a great problem.<sup>63</sup> In one of his books, he considered the Jewish items of religious ritual strange (*fremdartig*), recognizing that their production was combined with German skill (*Kunstfertigkeit*). By 1932, Lauffer was eager to overcome the latent tensions between regional *Heimat* ideas and German patriotic feelings.<sup>64</sup> Under the Third Reich, he remained a reputable scholar and museum director without becoming overly involved in Nazi politics. As an opponent of the Nazis' superficial exploitation of old *Volk* symbols for their political-ideological purposes,<sup>65</sup> he was able to maintain his reputation after 1945.



### POPULARIZATION OF THE MUSEUMS BY USING THE NEW MEDIA

From the start of the art education movement, the new media were supposed to help increase the popularity of museums. Photos were used from the turn of the century onward.

It was no accident that Hamburg was one of the first cities to have amateur photography clubs and that the first international exhibition of amateur photography was held in the city in 1893.<sup>66</sup> Lichtwark opened a museum for photography.<sup>67</sup> Moreover, slide lectures were very popular; for example, one with the title "Who Knows Berlin?" was shown to trade unionists as well as to military personnel.<sup>68</sup> The Halberstädter *Heimat* museum had a 2,000-slide collection that could be used for lectures.<sup>69</sup> With respect to films, the directors of the museums were at first reluctant to use this media. But the prewar hygiene exhibitions proved excellent in pioneering the employment of films in this area. Then, in the 1920s and during the National Socialist period, films served to inform and familiarize people with special objects in museums or to educate them directly inside the museum, above all in the German Museum in Munich, founded in 1925.<sup>70</sup> In Hanover, the culturally progressive director Alexander Dörner, known as for his strong commitment to art experiments, for example by integrating the avant-garde into his Provincial Museum (Provinzialmuseum), also mounted educational experiments by presenting films inside his institution.<sup>71</sup>

Besides films, the use of modern methods of advertising, including the use of the gramophone, increased during the Weimar period.<sup>72</sup> Information was often combined with advertising. First of all, museums and exhibitions had to be made known to the public by information in the press or by distributing special leaflets.<sup>73</sup> This information policy was supposed to be different from the American method of museum advertising, which basically made no distinction between museum and commercial advertisements.<sup>74</sup>

Under the National Socialist regime, information, advertising, and racist Nazi propaganda were effectively bound together. Many directors of museums hoped for a new wave of popularization after Hitler came to power. Instead of museums for men of letters (*Gelehrtenmuseum*), museums would be for the people (*Volksmuseum*). Thus, the number of guides was increased after 1933, and the Deutsche Arbeitsfront was eager to cooperate with the art museums. The suborganization of the Deutsche Arbeitsfront, the Kraft durch Freude, organized reasonably priced trips to the main cities in Germany, in which a guided museum tour was included. By participating in such trips, many people entered the world of museums for the first time. While Lichtwark and other prewar liberal reformers tried to attract people to go to the museums, the directors of the National Socialist period were advised to display part of their exhibitions on commercial, industrial premises (as so-called *Werkausstellungen*).

For example, in the Siemens plant, there was an exhibition of masterpieces of old German art. Moreover, once a year, museum entrance was completely free, and many people made use of this opportunity. In short, during the Nazi period, the popularization of art and other kinds of museums was strongly and successfully fostered—at the same time that the museums were being “cleansed” of modern art and Jews were being treated as outcasts.<sup>75</sup>

The new media served as propagator for museum treasures. The public relations office (Außenamt) for the Berlin state museums, founded in 1930, widened its competence and organized regular information for the press. Museum films were made that no longer concentrated only on information about a museum but became historical documentary films by using objects from various museums. Such films carried colorful titles, for example, *The Lüneburg Silver Treasure (Der Lüneburger Silberschatz)*, *The Secrets of the Mummies (Die Geheimnisse der Mumien)*, and *On the Tracks of the Hanseatic League (Auf den Spuren der Hanse)*.<sup>76</sup> By 1938, the same effect was being achieved by using television, which, although it could only be watched in some public television rooms in Berlin, regularly showed treasures of museums by presenting one art item a month.

Among all the modern media, radio, which began in Germany in 1924, was especially important in representing museum interests. Its importance increased the more that museum directors noticed a general decrease in public interest in museums during the late 1920s. Wilhelm Waetzoldt was one of the directors who tried to analyze this decline and to find new ways of awakening public interest. He proposed so-called museum lectures on radio, which were not intended to replace a visit to a museum but rather were to prepare for and complement it. The radio station Berlin Funkstunde first broadcast such lectures in 1928. In the same year, Waetzoldt enthusiastically advanced the use of radio for advertising exhibition objects.<sup>77</sup> Besides the press and films, the use of radio as a promoter of museums was enhanced after 1933.<sup>78</sup> Radio broadcasts were mounted on museums and their exhibitions as well as their new purchases of art and other cultural objects.<sup>79</sup> The head of the public relations office (Außenamt) of the Berlin museums, Niels von Holst, organized these museum broadcasts.<sup>80</sup> The Berlin model was emulated by other radio stations, such as ones in Cologne and Breslau. Although this kind of fifteen-minute broadcast was not very popular, radio announcements about exhibitions and the like were more successful than comparable information in the press,<sup>81</sup> presumably because radio as a relatively new medium was attractive in itself. Radio broadcasting in the *Reichssender Berlin* and the *Deutschlandsender* is said to have become more successful when von Holst organized a dialogue immediately after the news: the hope was that listeners could be made curious about museums before they noticed that the report dealt “only” with museums.<sup>82</sup> It should be noted that this was done in a traditionally gendered manner: a woman asked the questions and was answered by a man.

Radio broadcasting, greatly influenced by the Weimar state, was, however, more than a propagator and advertiser of museums and their treasures. Radio policy makers shared the same view as museum directors: museums and radio were primarily to promote the education of people, their participation in so-called high culture, and the elevation of their taste in art. For them, the medium was seen as a cultural factor per se. Although the great majority of the listeners, who were primarily found in big cities,<sup>83</sup> preferred light music and entertainment,<sup>84</sup> radio saw itself as having the same tasks as museums. Unlike films, however, radio faced the problem that broadcasting was only a matter of listening and not of watching. Therefore, radio policy makers, such as Karlheinz Bodensiek, argued that oral contributions on radio had to be descriptive (*bildhaft*) and graphic (*anschaulich*), so that radio could also—like a museum—offer the “impression of a genuine picture (*Uranschauung*).” The most severe problem was how to offer art via the radio, because the picture in a museum impressed the observer directly and this could not be replaced by radio voices. Nevertheless, in 1932-1933, an art broadcast (*Kunstfunk*) commenced that described and interpreted pictures that had appeared before in radio journals.<sup>85</sup>

#### THE HAMBURG NORAG RADIO AS AN EXAMPLE

Norag in Hamburg, one of the nine radio stations in Germany, started its program in May 1924.<sup>86</sup> It had two substations at Bremen and Hanover. Nearly 6 million people lived in the Norag broadcasting area, which comprised the Prussian provinces of Hanover and Schleswig-Holstein as well as the states (*Länder*) of Brunswick, Oldenburg, and Mecklenburg and the old Hanseatic cities of Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck. In March 1925, there were about 124,000 (and in 1932, 650,000) people (households) who paid their monthly radio fee.<sup>87</sup> Only the radio station in Berlin had more, with about 265,000 listeners in 1925. By the mid-1920s, Norag’s daily program lasted up to thirteen hours. The program director was the thirty-six-year-old Hans Bodenstedt, who had been a newspaper journalist and publicist.<sup>88</sup> Besides private capital, the state governments (also *Länder*) held shares in local radio companies, although the formal borders of the states were not identical with the range of the radio stations. Despite the strong federal components of the German radio system, the Reich dominated it from the beginning in December 1923 by several ways and means.<sup>89</sup> In July 1932, a new Reich radio law was passed under the Reich Chancellor Franz von Papen, known as Hitler’s backer (*Steigbügelhalter*).<sup>90</sup> The Reich appointed state commissioners who were empowered to control the radio programs of all regional stations more intensively than before. In sum, radio was already brought into line (*gleichgeschaltet*) before Hitler came to power.<sup>91</sup>

Norag was a model radio station with respect to the idea of *Stammeskultur* as the basis for a radio program, especially with respect to literature and the German version of ethnology (*Volkskunde*).<sup>92</sup> Norag supported the Low German language by using it in *Heimat*-related broadcasts and by broadcasting Low German plays and amateur performances. In contrast to the museums, radio broadcasts penetrated homes; the Norag program producers knew that the intruder should “not be a stranger,” and thus dialect was deliberately used.<sup>93</sup> *Heimat* item collectors, authors who wrote in dialect, and researchers of *Heimat* culture were connected with radio broadcasting in various ways. Moreover, radio broadcasting sought to assist the efforts of *Heimat* collectors by awakening people’s interests in *Heimat* topics.<sup>94</sup> From the commencement of Norag in 1924, a Low German theater broadcast, *Funkbühne*, was founded. During the first two years of its existence, Norag broadcast seventy Low German plays, comedies, musicals (*Singspiele*), and folk plays (*Volksstücke*), while from 1926 to 1927 the *Funkbühne* received a stable regular broadcast time.<sup>95</sup> Within three years, Norag broadcast 250 *Heimat* evenings, 250 *Heimat* lectures, and 100 *Heimat* programs for young people.<sup>96</sup> Certainly, the *Heimat* radio program should be seen in the context of diversified radio programming, which included many other types of broadcasts. There is, however, no doubt that there were determined attempts to foster the indigenous culture of the region. The efforts to create a kind of virtual *Heimat* museum over the airwaves increased during the Nazi period. In 1937, *Reichssender Hamburg*, the successor of Norag, produced 1,298 *Heimat* broadcasts, so that 78 percent of all broadcasts in the area of current affairs (*Zeitgeschehen*) were regionally specific.<sup>97</sup> Through special activities in which the public participated, including the popular *Volkssenderaktionen* in 1935 and 1936, the regional radio stations helped to find old objects to enrich the collections of the *Heimat* museums.

One of the greatest supporters of presenting radio as a virtual *Heimat* museum was Dr. Kurt Stapelfeldt, who regarded the promotion of the *Heimat* movement as “one of the most responsible tasks of radio broadcasting.”<sup>98</sup> Stapelfeldt, who had studied philology and political science (*Staatswissenschaft*), had worked for the Hamburg press, the Bismarck-supporting *Hamburger Nachrichten*, before he joined Norag. At the age of twenty-five, he took over the financial department of Norag and was the “second man” there. In 1929-1930, he became a member of the Norag board of directors. Together with his twenty-six-year-old friend and fellow philologist, Dr. Hans Böttcher, he conceptualized a great deal of the Norag program. Both were members of Quickborn, an association that promoted Low German language and culture. Böttcher was responsible for—among other things—the Low German theater broadcast (*Niederdeutsche Funkbühne*). For both men, their understanding of the media was firstly determined by press journalism, but they quickly learned the “laws” of the new media, for example, short lectures, and music as transmitter or as illustration. Bodenstedt, Stapelfeldt, and

Böttcher were sympathizers of the right-wing German national party of the people (the German National Folk Party, or DNVP). It was striking that they began their work at Norag with a systematically developed concept, which combined political-ideological aims with interests in the region, variously called *Heimat* movement, *Heimat* culture, and care of *Heimat* (*Heimatspflege*). Stapelfeldt was fascinated by the fact that radio could reach many more people by broadcasts than could *Heimat* evenings organized by associations, museums, and so on. He argued that 40 to 50 percent of the radio audience would listen to such programs. Therefore, radio was supposed to take over the task of awakening *Heimat* consciousness. He had reason to be convinced that listening to radio evoked people's interests in theater performances<sup>99</sup> or museum visits. Stapelfeldt had good connections to the Hamburg educators and organized a school radio program (*Schulfunk*). He had also connections to the new Hamburg University.

Together with Hamburg University, Norag founded in 1924 an adult education center (*Volkshochschule*) linked to the radio, the Hans Bredow School for Volkswissenschaften, which was devoted, among other subjects, to the people's health care (*Volksgesundheitspflege*), to agriculture, and to languages, above all Low German.<sup>100</sup> In 1931, the Hans Bredow School accounted for 2.8 percent of the Norag program. Although not high, this percentage shows that such matters were a consistent and stable element in Norag's output. Well-known experts, such as the professors Conrad Borchling (Hamburg),<sup>101</sup> Otto Mensing (Kiel), and Otto Lauffer (Hamburg), held lectures on Low German literature and history,<sup>102</sup> which, if included under the categories of "current lectures" (*Aktuelle Vorträge*) or "general lectures," made up 8 percent of the program.<sup>103</sup> The school became the scientific foundation on which the Norag Low German program could be established. Furthermore, the Hans Bredow School was the backbone of and the mediator between the Museum for Hamburg history and Norag, due to Lauffer's double director position in the Museum and the School of Low German (*Schule des Niederdeutschen*). Together with Stapelfeldt, Lauffer was also a member of the board of trustees (*Kuratorium*) of the School for Low German.<sup>104</sup>

In this context, Lauffer regularly delivered broadcast lectures, for example, "What Is Low German?" and "Low German *Volksart*," and a series of lectures on *German Life in the Workshop*.<sup>105</sup> Up to 1931, the school had one broadcast a week. His commitment to Norag was, as he expressed it once, one of the best means of popularizing directly the idea of *Volkskunde* and *Heimat* museums.<sup>106</sup> The School of Low German also organized trips to the surrounding areas of Hamburg. Norag inspired such folklore (*volkskundliche*) trips and was said to address all strata of the population, achieving a much wider reach than the new adult education center (*Volkshochschule*). Lauffer himself guided many tours. Every excursion was introduced by a broadcast lecture. The excursions were supposed to improve the relationship between the rural people and the urbanites. The inspiration behind such trips was the idea of a common *Stamm*.<sup>107</sup> The

Hamburg Norag radio station even experimented with broadcasts conceptualized as museum tours, in which the radio audience was guided around a museum while its objects were described and explained. The production of such broadcasts was seen as a difficult task, whereby an appropriate selection of the guide was regarded as especially important.<sup>108</sup>

Stapelfeldt had the same concept of *Heimat* as Lauffer.<sup>109</sup> Both were interested not only in the rural but also in the modern urban world.<sup>110</sup> It was more than a symbolic act when, in 1924, Stapelfeldt welcomed the arrival of an American zeppelin in Hamburg in a Norag broadcast.<sup>111</sup> But both had a special view of the city: it was to be bound to its rural hinterland.<sup>112</sup> This type of broadcast was entitled *City Pictures (Städtebilder)* and was broadcast not only in Hamburg but also in the affiliated subbroadcasts (*Nebensender*) in Hanover, Bremen, and Kiel. For example, from January 1925 to April 1926, the writer Kurt Siemers presented fifty “North German city pictures” (*Norddeutsche Städtebilder*), and until his death in 1932 his lectures on Norag proved quite popular.<sup>113</sup> In summary, in supporting *Heimat* history, radio broadcasting was not explicitly anti-urban. Instead, the focus and goal were the promotion of the indigenous culture of city and region, which was considered both rural *and* urban, with local and global interests. This mode of integrating urban society into a regional indigenous entity was exactly how Berlin was written of in the radio journal *Rufer und Hörer* in 1934-1935. The author, Werner Brink, wanted to convince radio politicians to see Berlin in *Heimat* broadcasts not as a metropolis but “as a term for a region (*Landschaftsbezirk*), and *Volkstum*” characterized by its dialect, the *Berlinerische*.<sup>114</sup>

### SUMMARY

The Hamburg example demonstrates the common interests between the concepts of the *Heimat* museum and the “virtual radio museum.” Certainly, the degree of common interests between both was extremely strong in Hamburg, but comparable tendencies can also be found in other regions, especially in radio stations at the German borderlands, in which German culture was supposed to be strengthened via regional *Heimat* culture.

In the *Heimat* museums and in the radio stations alike, the proponents of this particular approach to culture considered their work to be apolitical, although it was anything but, being latently directed against the spirit of the Weimar republican state.<sup>115</sup> *Heimat*-oriented politics attracted conservative parts of the middle classes, especially educated and well-to-do burghers.<sup>116</sup> Although there was a bias in favor of the rural past, the *Heimat* ideals of its two protagonists, Lauffer and Stapelfeldt, were not anti-urban but sought to integrate the cities into the concept of a region with common roots, the *Stamm*. This concept, which was the basis for the cooperation between these two men,



implicitly excluded modern transregional and transnational mobilization and migration as well as “strange” (*fremde*) cultures, such as the “East Jewish” or Polish cultures. These “silent” political implications were never overtly discussed, because the supporters of *Heimat* museums interpreted their activities as politically neutral. The idea of *Heimat* emerged within the context of an antidemocratic conservative *Weltsicht*, in which the preindustrial period was uncritically idealized and emotionalized.<sup>117</sup>

In the history of the *Heimat* museums, the year 1933 did not mean a caesura *per se*.<sup>118</sup> But the overall context and the rules of definitions and discussions radically changed: first, the Nazis defined the *Stamm* concept of *Heimat* and *Volk*, as it had been common for the majority of the supporters of *Heimat* museums to do before 1933, in a radically racist spirit. This became the new state doctrine. Second, by their dictatorship, they suppressed all the other interpretations, strivings, and sources of opposition, which had influenced the pluralistic political culture of the Weimar Republic.

As this article has shown, the history of museums in Germany, especially the *Heimat* museums in the early twentieth century, is ambiguous and is therefore not suited to serve as a story of identification today. The activities in the sphere of museums were too idealistic and destructive with respect to the principles of a modern pluralistic-democratic society.

As is known, the recourse to *Heimat* by a museum or a radio station could and can be connected to different concepts. This can be shown if one looks at the Federal Republic. Since the 1970s, museums of local history and radio stations alike have rediscovered the city and the region as a manifold historical source of former people’s everyday lives and of the multifaceted cultures of the past. The democratic grassroots movement, especially the History Workshop Movement, of the 1970s and early 1980s demanded a critical discussion of the conventional exhibitions of local history objects and pushed the *Heimat* museums, in particular in big cities, to change their old-fashioned profile. The discussions also led to a modern interpretation of *Heimat* as a city or region with which inhabitants of different cultural heritages are familiar. In this democratic-pluralistic way, regional ties have been accepted as a necessity for maintaining many people’s mental equilibrium against the increasing trend of globalization.

## NOTES

1. This concept could be integrated in many concepts and disciplines: for example, *Volkskunst*, folk studies (*Volkskunde*), folk history (*Volksgeschichte*), eugenics, racism, and folk pedagogy (*Volkspädagogik*).

2. One of the best introductions is Hermann Bausinger, “Zwischen Grün und Braun. Volkstumsideologie und Heimatpflege nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg,” in *Religions- und Geistesgeschichte der Weimarer Republik*, ed. Hubert Cancik (Düsseldorf, 1982), 215-29.

3. The Germanisches Nationalmuseum erected in Nuremberg in the 1850s, a model for many smaller museums in the subsequent decades, was also based on burghers’ activities. Ingrid Edeler, *Zur Typologie des*

*Kulturhistorischen Museen, Freilichtmuseen und kulturhistorische Räume* (Frankfurt am Main, 1988), 36-39. For an example from the early twentieth century, see Ines Katenhusen, *Kunst und Politik. Hannovers Auseinandersetzungen mit der Moderne in der Weimarer Republik* (Hanover, 1998), 264, with respect to the Kestner Gesellschaft in Hanover. I am grateful to her for criticism and good hints.

4. For more, see Walther Grasskamp, "Die Einbürgerung der Kunst. Kooperative Kunstförderung im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Sammler, Stifter und Museen. Kunstförderung in Deutschland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Ekkehard Mai and Peter Paret (Cologne, 1993), 104-13, here 109.

5. For some, but not all, arguments, see Thomas Adam, "Die Kommunalisierung von Kunst und Kultur als Grundkonsens der deutschen Gesellschaft ab dem ausgehenden 19. Jahrhundert. Das Beispiel Leipzig," *Die Alte Stadt*, no. 2 (1999): 79-99. With respect to the living conditions of Hamburg workers, see Arno Herzig, Dieter Langewiesche, and Arnold Sywottek, *Arbeiter in Hamburg* (Hamburg, 1983); and for the cholera epidemic, see Richard J. Evans, *Tod in Hamburg* (Oxford, 1987).

6. From that point (up to 1919), there were two classes divided by income: males who earned more than 2,500 marks a year were in the first class, while the other males formed the second. The first class elected forty-eight representatives, and the second class twenty-four, although the second class had twice as many voters as the first. Johannes Schult, *Geschichte der Hamburger Arbeiter 1890-1919* (Hanover, 1967), 75. Women could not vote until 1919.

7. See, in general, Adelheid von Saldern, *Häuserleben. Städtisches Arbeiterwohnen vom Kaiserreich bis heute* (Bonn, 1995).

8. Of course, this was not the earliest example of this, when we consider the foundation of the Germanische Nationalmuseum in the 1850s and the many attempts at popularizing science through museums and exhibitions.

9. The tendency to conceptualize museums as museums for all citizens was, however, not ubiquitous. First, the conventional culture of collecting everything still existed at the time. Second, ancient culture was so highly valued that the main museum, the new Pergamon museum in Berlin, received a lot of money, while other projects, for example in the area of preservation, were neglected. Hermann Schmitz, *Revolution der Gesinnung. Preußische Kulturpolitik und Volksgemeinschaft seit dem 9. November 1918* (Neubabelsberg, 1931), 144-47.

10. Jennifer Louise Jenkins, *Provincial Modernity: Culture, Politics and Local Identity in Hamburg, 1885-1914*, UMI Microform 973332107 (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1997), 179.

11. In Gerhard Kratzsch, "'Der Kunstwart' und die bürgerlich-soziale Bewegung," in *Ideengeschichte und Kunstwissenschaft. Philosophie und bildende Kunst im Kaiserreich*, ed. Ekkehard Mai, Stephan Waetzoldt, and Gerd Wolandt (Berlin, 1993), 371-96, here 387.

12. Jenkins, *Provincial Modernity*, 195. Lichtwark praised the English Arts and Crafts movement.

13. *Ibid.*, 207.

14. *Ibid.*, 182.

15. *Ibid.*, 204-5.

16. For more, see *ibid.*, 205.

17. It should be mentioned that there were also attempts to identify museum work more with scientific methods and research.

18. Helen Meller, *European Cities 1890-1930s: History, Culture and the Built Environment* (Chichester, UK, 2001) 165. The culturally liberal Lichtwark was open toward French impressionists.

19. Alexis Joachimides, *Die Museumsreformbewegung in Deutschland und die Entstehung des modernen Museums 1880-1940* (Dresden, 2001), 112.

20. *Ibid.*, 191-93.

21. Birgit-Katharine Seemann, *Stadt, Bürgertum und Kultur. Kulturelle Entwicklung und Kulturpolitik in Hamburg von 1839 bis 1933 am Beispiel des Museumswesens* (Hamburg, 1997), 231-36.

22. Meller, *European Cities*, 168.

23. Wilhelm Waetzoldt, "Museum und Rundfunk," *Der Kunstwanderer. Zeitschrift für alte und neue Kunst, Kunstmarkt und Sammelwesen* 9 (1928): 185-86. Waetzoldt noted the increasing interest in the body, on one hand, and in psychology, on the other.

24. In general, see Georg Bollenbeck, *Tradition, Avantgarde, Reaktion. Deutsche Kontroversen um die kulturelle Moderne 1880-1945* (Frankfurt am Main, 1999).

25. See Vernon L. Lidtke, "Museen und die Zeitgenössische Kunst in der Weimarer Republik," in Mai and Paret, *Sammler*, 215-38, here 234. An exception was museum director Alexander Dorner of Hanover, who also collected abstract art.

26. Seemann, *Stadt*, 211. The reform-oriented and publicly oriented Gustav Pauli, director of the Hamburg Kunsthalle, and more enthusiastically Max Sauerlandt, director of the Museum for Art and Trade, collected modern art. Pauli was more reluctant to purchase modern art than Sauerlandt. Seemann, *Stadt*, 256. While Pauli retired in 1933 at the age of sixty-seven, Sauerlandt's collection of modern art was requested in 1933—not at least as a consequence of a burgher's demand. See Seemann, *Stadt*, 295. It was the scenery painter Heinz Daniel.
27. Konrad Köstlin, "'Volkskünste'. Ästhetische Progammatik in Lebentwürfen der zwanziger Jahre." in *Volkskunst*, ed. Herbert Nikitsch and Bernhard Tschofen (Wien, 1997), 39-54.
28. Andreas Urban, *Von der Gesinnungsbildung zur Erlebnisorientierung. Geschichtsvermittlung in einem kommunalen historischen Museum im 20. Jahrhundert* (Schwalbach, Germany 1999).
29. Compare, for example, Jürgen Dittmar, "Volksunterhaltungsabende im Dienste der Weltkriegspropaganda," in Günther Noll, ed., *Musikalische Volkskultur und die politische Macht* (Essen, 1994), 281-300, esp. 282, 297.
30. Werner Hartung, *Konservative Zivilisationskritik und regionale Identität. Am Beispiel der niedersächsischen Heimatbewegung 1895 bis 1919* (Hanover, 1991), 277.
31. For Hanover, see Urban, *Von der Gesinnungsbildung*, 28.
32. Hartung, *Konservative Zivilisationskritik*, 304.
33. Unfortunately, there is no information available on how many museums existed before and after 1933. Martin Roth, *Heimatmuseum. Zur Geschichte einer deutschen Institution* (Berlin, 1990), 95-96.
34. Max Tauch, "Zur Entwicklung der Historischen Museen in Deutschland unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Geschichtsmuseen im Rheinland", in *Geschichtsmuseum und Geschichtsunterricht*, ed. Dieter Riesenberger and Max Tauch (Düsseldorf, 1980), 55-66, here 59.
35. Hartung, *Konservative Zivilisationskritik*, 305.
36. After 1933, Nazi politicians did not approve of this group because it was regarded as only looking to the past. Otto, "Schlesische Heimatmuseen vom Besucher aus gesehen," *Schlesische Monatshefte*, no. 9 (1937); cited in Roth, *Heimatmuseum*, 225. The reports deal with Silesian museums.
37. Gerhard Kaldewei, "Aspekte historischer Museumspädagogik: Zur Kooperation von Museum und Schule 1903-1943," *Museumskunde* no. 1 (1983): 17-27, here 26.
38. Seemann, *Stadt*, 267-68.
39. Collectors in Germany could point to similar movements in northern European states.
40. There was a "German costumes" (*Trachten*) show in Nuremberg in 1922, which was interpreted as a show of various regional traditions (presented by mostly urbanites) but also had an nationalistic impetus of greater Germany, including for example Tirol. Armin Griebel, "Trachtenvereine und Politfolklore. Zur Situation in Nürnberg 1919 bis 1933," *Jahrbuch für Volkskunde* 14 (1991): 79-100.
41. For the genesis of this link, see Alon Confino, *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory 1871-1918* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1999). With respect to the Weimar era, see Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley, Calif., 1990).
42. Wilhelm Waetzoldt, "Für ein deutsches Volksmuseum," *Berliner Börsen-Zeitung*, August 7, 1932. In some ways, the idea of *Heimat* was also supported by the so-called reform pedagogy of the 1920s. Focusing on an education based on perception and experience, the reform pedagogy could be easily connected to the *Heimat* museum movement. The movement also impressed and influenced the representatives of museums in other countries. Roth, *Heimatmuseum*, 144.
43. Andreas Kuntz, *Das Museum als Volksbildungsstätte. Museumskonzeptionen in der deutschen Volksbildungsbewegung 1871-1918*, 2nd ed. (Marburg, Germany, 1980), 33, 36.
44. See Joe Segal, "The World of Art as a Mirror of National Identity: Public Debates on Art and Culture in Germany during World War I," *European Review of History—Revue européenne d'histoire* 4 (1997): 1-17. The article deals mainly with the prewar years.
45. Seemann, *Stadt*, 152; and Kuntz, *Das Museum*, 60. The Berlin Volkskunde Museum (founded by Rudolf Virchow in 1888) was also interested in collecting items on old regional customs. *Ibid.*, 76.
46. Kuntz, *Das Museum*, 69.
47. Roth, *Heimatmuseum*, 61.
48. Kuntz, *Das Museum*, 68.
49. Hermann Schmitz, *Revolution der Gesinnung. Preußische Kulturpolitik und Volksgemeinschaft seit dem 9. November 1918* (Neubabelsberg, Germany, 1931), 152.
50. Kuntz, *Das Museum*, 77, 79.
51. Seemann, *Stadt*, 161, 241, 244.
52. *Ibid.*, 261.

53. *Ibid.*, 272-73.

54. Thus, it is not surprising that the *Heimat* association of Lower Saxony voiced some criticism against the Norag program concept. Although it was satisfied that Norag supported regional culture, it stressed that Lower Saxony differed from Low Germany. Otto Lauffer, *Land und Leute in Niederdeutschland* (Berlin, 1934), 28-30; and Otto Lauffer, *Dorf und Stadt in Niederdeutschland* (Berlin, 1934). Lower Saxony was interpreted as the region extending from the Netherlands to Harz and Elbe. Hartung, *Konservative Zivilisationskritik*, 311. On radio, see Kurt Voß, "Niedersachsen und der Rundfunk," *Niedersachsen* 36 (December 1931): 529-31; and Kurt Voß, "Niederdeutsche Kultur im Norddeutschen Rundfunk," *Niedersachsen* 38 (May 1933): 264.

55. See Eckart Krause, Ludwig Huber, and Holger Fischer, eds., *Hochschulalltag im "Dritten Reich"*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1991). *Alturtumsforschung* means the research of old relicts and objects of German culture.

56. See Lauffer's papers, Staats-und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, box 39, here correspondence.

57. *Ibid.*

58. This was a new approach to history in general and dominated social history until the 1960s. More recently published work has focused on the contribution of this group of historians to Nazi ideology and to Nazi politics. See, for example, Karen Schönwälder, *Geschichtswissenschaft im Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt am Main, 1992); and Willi Oberkrome, *Volksgeschichte. Methodische Innovation und völkische Ideologisierung in der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft 1918-1945* (Göttingen, Germany, 1993).

59. See, for example, Otto Lauffer, *Niederdeutsche Landschaft und Niederdeutsches Volkstum* (Hamburg, 1938), 3, 5, 36.

60. See Lauffer's review of Martin Kaehler, ed., *Der deutsche Volkscharakter. Eine Wesenskunde der deutschen Volksstämme und Volksschläge*, *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 9, no. 1 (1938): 90-92.

61. Manuscript in Lauffer's papers, box 1.

62. Otto Lauffer, *Deutsche Sitte* (Leipzig, 1920), 47.

63. Manuscript in Lauffer's papers, box 1.

64. Otto Lauffer, *Heimat und Vaterland*, speech given at the celebration of the Reich foundation [of 1871], January 18, 1932, Hamburg, in Lauffer's papers, box 36.

65. See some articles in James R. Dow and Hannjost Lixfeld, eds., *The Nazification of an Academic Discipline* (Bloomington, 1994), 2, 22, 27, 97, 108-9, 209, 210.

66. Jenkins, *Provincial Modernity*, 189.

67. Henrike Junge, "Alfred Lichtwark und die 'Gymnastik der Sammeltätigkeit,'" in Mai and Paret, *Sammler*, 202-14, here 206.

68. Schmitz, *Revolution der Gesinnung*, 153.

69. Lauffer's papers, box 36a.

70. Besides documentary films, gramophone records were also used as museum guides. Roth, *Heimatmuseum*, 223.

71. Monika Flacke-Knoch, *Museumskonzeptionen in der Weimarer Republik. Die Tätigkeit Alexander Dorners im Provinzialmuseum* (Hanover, 1985), 87-99.

72. Seemann, *Stadt*, 288-89.

73. Hans-Joachim Klein and Monika Bachmayer with Helga Schatz, *Museum und Öffentlichkeit. Fakten und Daten—Motive und Barrieren* (Berlin, 1981), 35.

74. Roth, *Heimatmuseum*, 226.

75. See, for example, Fritz Traugott Schulz, "Die Notwendigkeit der Umgestaltung unserer Museen," *Museumskunde*, no. 5 (1933): 147-51. Compare Roth, *Heimatmuseum*, 226, 229; and Joachimides, *Museumsreformbewegung*, 225-39. The Nazis favored the so-called Atelier room simulation.

76. Roth, *Heimatmuseum*, 222. The Lüneburg silver treasure received a gold medal at the Paris World Exhibition in 1937. Up to 1938, thirteen museum films were made. Roth, *Heimatmuseum*, 222. See also Berliner Museen, *Berichte aus den preußischen Kunstsammlungen* 2, no. 2 (1937): 51.

77. Wilhelm Waetzoldt, "Museum und Rundfunk," *Der Kunstwanderer. Zeitschrift für alte und neue Kunst, für kunstmarkt und Sammelwesen*, no. 9 (1928): 185-86.

78. Berliner Museen, *Berichte aus den preußischen Kunstsammlungen*, no. 3 (1934): 62.

79. A list of the broadcasts can be found in *ibid.*, no. 3 (1935): 69; no. 4: 90; no. 1 (1936): 17; no. 4: 82; and no. 2 (1937): 50.

80. Roth, *Heimatmuseum*, 229. For more information and for lists of the radio broadcasts about museums, see Berliner Museen, for example (1936) and (1937).

81. Roth, *Heimatmuseum*, 230.

82. Niels von Holst, "Wie werben Museen?" *Museumskunde* (1939): 1-8, here 3.

83. In villages, radios were at first bought by pastors, teachers, and some officials, and then later by shopkeepers and artisans, and finally by farmers. This was the pattern of diffusion across the Norag region but is also valid for other regions. First session of the program board of the North German Radio, February 9, 1933, Staatsarchiv Hamburg, St.Pr IzII Bb1.

84. Such were the findings of listener questionnaires, which, it must be admitted, did not reach the standard of modern empirical methods. See Hansjörg Bessler, *Hörer- und Zuschauerforschung* (Munich, 1980), 21-29.

85. Karlheinz Bodensiek, "Bildende Kunst und Hörsendung," *Rufer und Hörer* 2, no. 6 (1932-1933): 251-256.

86. There was also a long-wave radio station called Deutsche Welle.

87. Ulrich Heitger, "Auf der Suche nach einem Programm. Die Norddeutsche Rundfunk AG 1924-1932," in *Der NDR. Zwischen Programm und Politik*, ed. Wolfram Köhler (Hanover, 1991), 9-44, here 37.

88. Materialien zur Rundfunkgeschichte. Zur Programmgeschichte des Weimarer Rundfunks, ed., *Deutsches Rundfunkarchiv*, vol. 2 (Frankfurt am Main, 1986), 28.

89. Its influence was primarily guaranteed by the central holding company, Reich Radio Company (*Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft*), whose biggest shareholder was the Reich Post Office. Reich Radio Company, an umbrella organization headed by radio commissioner (*Rundfunkkommissar*) Hans Bredow (1926-1933), held more than half of the share capital in each of the nine regional broadcasting companies and therefore could supervise the stations. Second, the Reich Interior Ministry—in an arrangement with the states—was responsible for the appointment of three of five members of the supervisory committees (*Überwachungsausschüsse*), which had to be attached to every regional broadcasting station. And the Reich was to be consulted before the state government appointed up to twelve members of the less influential radio cultural advisory boards (*Kulturbeiräte*). Third, all the news for radio was steered by the *Dradag Zentrale Nachrichtenagentur*, a private company controlled by the Interior Ministry that could use it as a means of influencing regional broadcasting. Fourth, the Reich Post Ministry was the owner of all technical equipment and was authorized to charge fees for its distribution to the regional stations.

90. Under the influence of the German National Folk Party (DNVP), von Papen and his assistant, Erich Scholz, expanded the Reich's power so far that the regional radio stations were completely directed by the Reich and its Reich Radio Company. Private capital owners, who represented a minority of the shareholders of the regional radio companies, were forced to sell their shares, and thus the regional radio companies became publicly owned corporations. The Reich held 51 percent of the capital, and the states 49 percent. For more, see Konrad Dussel, *Hörfunk in Deutschland. Politik, Programm, Publikum (1923-1960)* (Potsdam, Germany, 2002); and Winfried B. Lerg, *Rundfunkpolitik in der Weimarer Republik* (Munich, 1980). For a more general overview, see Konrad Dussel, *Deutsche Rundfunkgeschichte. Eine Einführung* (Konstanz, Germany, 1999).

91. Stapelfeldt's further career was fostered by the new radio law in 1932. Under the banner of conservative and reactionary policy, radio was centralized by law, which meant that the existing regional radio stations were completely directed by the influence of the Reich and its Reich Radio Company (*Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft*). As a consequence, Stapelfeldt became the head of the programming department of the central radio organization in Germany, the *Reichsrundfunkgesellschaft*, not at least because he was a German conservative nationalist. Nevertheless, he had to leave his position under the Nazi dictatorship.

92. Mario Krammer, "Rundfunk als politischer Erzieher," *Funk*, no. 8 (1924): 137.

93. "Nordischer Rundfunk. Zur Psychologie des Noraghörers. Eine Programmbegründung," *Rundfunk Jahrbuch* (1931): 93-117, here 98.

94. Stapelfeldt reported that the newspapers maintained they did not have enough space to support such endeavors. Kurt Stapelfeldt, "Der Rundfunk als Träger und Erhalter der Heimatkultur," *Rundfunk Jahrbuch* (1929): 233-43, here 240.

95. For information, although totally uncritical, see Heitger, "Auf der Suche," 32.

96. Other regional radio stations also broadcast such programs. Stapelfeldt, "Der Rundfunk," 243. Among the other stations were WERAG (Cologne), the Frankfurt station, and the Silesian and Bavarian radio stations. Leo Flamm, *Westfalen und der Westdeutsche Rundfunk* (Stuttgart, 1993), 87; August Soppe, *Rundfunk in Frankfurt am Main 1923-1926: Zur Organisations-, Programm- und Rezeptionsgeschichte eines neuen Mediums* (Munich, 1993), 418; Heinz Pohle, *Der Rundfunk als Instrument der Politik. Zur Geschichte des deutschen Rundfunks von 1923/38* (Hamburg, 1955), 72; Renate Schumacher, "Radio als Medium und Faktor des aktuellen Geschehens," in *Programmgeschichte des Hörfunks in der Weimarer*



*Republik*, vol. 1, ed. Joachim-Felix Leonhard (Munich, 1997), 423-622, here 614; and Wolf Bierbach, *Rundfunk zwischen Kommerz und Politik. Der Westdeutsche Rundfunk in der Weimarer Zeit* (Frankfurt am Main, 1986), 190. For more details, see Teresia Wittenbrink, "Rundfunk und literarische Tradition," in Leonhard, *Programmgeschichte* 2:996-1097, here 2:1025-27.

97. Wolfgang Schütte, *Regionalität und Föderalismus im Rundfunk. Die geschichtliche Entwicklung in Deutschland 1923-1945* (Frankfurt am Main, 1971), 168.

98. Stapelfeldt, "Der Rundfunk," 234.

99. *Ibid.*, 239.

100. "Hamburger Bericht," *Der Deutsche Rundfunk*, no. 25 (1925): 1578-79; and no. 44: 2851.

101. Borchling was supervisor of Stapelfeldt's dissertation. Thanks to Horst O. Halefeldt, Deutsches Rundfunkarchiv Frankfurt, for this information.

102. *Deutscher Rundfunk*, no. 41 (1925): 2622.

103. Heitger, "Auf der Suche," 36.

104. See Stapelfeldt's letter to Lauffer, March 13, 1933, Lauffer's papers, box 39.

105. Richard Wossidlo (1859-1939), a conservative writer, collector, scholar of *Volkskunde* in Mecklenburg, and supporter of *Heimat* museums and associations, also broadcast many lectures on the radio on old costumes and mores. Heike Müns, "Musikalische Volkskultur und die politische Macht am Beispiel Mecklenburg," in Noll, *Musikalische Volkskultur*, 70-89, here 71.

106. Lauffer's paper, box 36. For this information, I would like to thank Horst O. Halefeldt, Deutsches Rundfunkarchiv Frankfurt.

107. "Volkskundliche Spaziergänge der Norag-Hörer," *Deutscher Rundfunk*, no. 24 (1925): 1520.

108. Minutes of the tenth session of the Norag Cultural Advisory Board, October 1929, in Staatsarchiv Hamburg, St.Pr. I t II B 61.

109. Cited in Teresia Wittenbrink, "Zeitgenössische Schriftsteller im Rundfunk," in Leonhard, *Programmgeschichte* 2:1098-195, here 2:1126-27. Halefeldt mentions these problematic radio policies only briefly. Horst O. Halefeldt, "Ein Sender für acht Länder. Die Norag. Regionaler Rundfunk in der Weimarer Republik," *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 41 (2001): 145-70, here 158-59.

110. "Nordischer Rundfunk," 96-97. As one of the so-called neoconservatives, Stapelfeldt was also fascinated by modern technology. Schumacher, "Radio als Medium," 473, 592; "Nordischer Rundfunk," 97, 116; and minutes of the tenth session of Norag Cultural Board, October 1929, in Staatsarchiv Hamburg, St.Pr. I t II B 61.

111. *Der Deutsche Rundfunk*, no. 40 (1924): 2292.

112. On Stapelfeldt, see Wittenbrink, "Rundfunk," 1025-27.

113. Heitger, "Auf der Suche," 32.

114. Werner Brink, "Heimat vor dem Mikrophon," *Rufer und Hörer* 4, nos. 6/7 (1934-1935): 268-71. For general remarks on this connection, see Ferdinand Eckhardt, "Der Rundfunk als Mittler einer wahren Volkskunst," *Rufer und Hörer* 3, no. 7 (1933): 299-303.

115. Seemann, *Stadt*, 300.

116. For Westphalia, see Karl Ditt, "Eine 'Symbiose von Erde und Menschentum'. Zur kulturpolitischen Konstruktion von Raumbewusstsein in Westfalen im 20. Jahrhundert," in *Das Erbe der Provinz. Heimatkultur und Geschichtspolitik nach 1945*, ed. Habbo Knoch (Göttingen, Germany, 2001), 29-49, here 43.

117. Heinz Reif, Sigrid Heinze, and Andreas Ludwig, "Schwierigkeiten mit Tradition. Zur kulturellen Praxis städtischer Heimatmuseen," in *Labor, Schaubühne, Identitätsfabrik*, ed. Gottfried Korff and Martin Roth (Frankfurt am Main, 1990) 231-50, here 231-37. Recent empirical local research has concluded that the conservative tendencies, including the attitudes of many museum officials, were stronger than the liberal-progressive ones. Seemann, *Stadt*, 242.

118. Seemann, *Stadt*, 277. There was also an interest in collecting and exhibiting items of race, such as skulls, especially in the Hamburg Museum for Ethnology (Seemann, *Stadt*, 277-88), whereby the Nordic race was regarded as superior.

Adelheid von Saldern is professor of modern history, University of Hanover (retired April 2004). Her recent research is in urban studies, media, and cultural history. Results from a Volkswagen Foundation-supported project include "Inszenierte



Einigkeit" (2003) and "Inszenierter Stolz" (Stuttgart, 2005). These investigate various self-representations of cities under the Nazi regime, the GDR, and the Federal Republic of Germany. English versions of several articles were published by University of Michigan Press in 2002 as *The Challenge of Modernity*.