

Cambridge University Press

0521534429 - Transatlantic Images and Perceptions: Germany and America since 1776

Edited by David E. Barclay and Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

DAVID E. BARCLAY AND ELISABETH GLASER-SCHMIDT

Ere Babylon was dust,
The Magus Zoroaster, my dead child,
Met his own image walking in the garden.

– Percy Bysshe Shelley, *Prometheus Unbound*

Like Shelley's Magus Zoroaster, European travelers to the United States may have met their own image, if not that of the Other. The same was true for Americans who visited the old continent or expressed their private thoughts about it. Do images and perceptions of another country consist of accurate observations that mirror the reality of the perceived object? Or do those perceptions reflect the subject's own psyche, prejudices, intentions, and actions? These are the major questions that inform this book. The last century of German and American relations has witnessed a close relationship emerging from the great antagonism between the two powers during the era of the world wars. The deep mutual fascination that has developed from this changing relationship finds its antecedents in the German immigration that started in the late seventeenth century and became a mass movement in the middle of the nineteenth. Interest in the other country's constitutional development and its federal system figures as another point of engagement. The history of German-American relations offers rich material for the study of German and American mutual images and group perceptions. Exploring them will in turn allow us to map patterns of communication that have powerfully shaped the evolution of German-American relations in general. The analysis of German and American mutual images thus constitutes an important chapter in the burgeoning history of transnational perceptions. In surveying the formation of individual and group perceptions on both

Cambridge University Press

0521534429 - Transatlantic Images and Perceptions: Germany and America since 1776

Edited by David E. Barclay and Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt

Excerpt

[More information](#)

sides of the Atlantic, the authors of this book use the tools of historical analysis to understand the processes by which perceptions of the other are generated and expressed. These processes have parallels in private relations or within the views that social, religious, gender, or ethnic groups form of each other within each society. Consequently, when we examine the images that Germans and Americans have conceived of each other, we do so within a general perceptual framework that has drawn the attention of psychologists and social scientists as well as students of literature and ethnology. The term “perceptions” originally comprises mental observations and mental images or, used in a neurobiological and psychological context, the process of converting a sensory experience into a symbolic representation.¹ As employed in this book, it also refers to the formation of group opinions and stereotypes that result from image formation of the other, the distant country, the enemy, the rival. It is thus used synonymously with the term “images,” which likewise refers both to a visual representation of a mental observation and verbally expressed conceptions about an object. Historians have chiefly concentrated their efforts on presenting the expressions of perceptions and on analyzing intentions, social circumstances, and other motivations that influence such perceptions. Individuals communicate their perceptions through verbal or visual images as well as reenactments. This book concentrates on the historical analysis of written representations and some visual depictions, which are the main expressions of perceptions accessible to historical scrutiny. Moreover, it focuses primarily on perceptions of the present rather than the past of the other country, though it also includes references to traditional and persistent ethnic and cultural images.² The chapters in the book present historically rooted case studies that may contribute to a better understanding of how image formation takes place. They should serve as material witnesses to the ongoing development of a new theory of mutual perceptions and image formation in history and its neighboring disciplines.

Research about image formation and perceptions faces similar challenges to those that confronted European and Arabian mapmakers in the age of discovery. Before the Islamic scholar al-Idrisi sent a world map to Roger of Sicily in 1154, European and Arabian mapmakers explored the

1 George Goldenberg, Ivo Podreka, and Margarete Steiner, “The Cerebral Localization of Visual Imagery: Evidence from Emission Computerized Tomography of Cerebral Blood Flow,” in Peter J. Hampson, David F. Marks, and John T. E. Richardson, eds., *Imagery: Current Developments* (New York, 1990), 307–33.

2 See Hermann Wellenreuther’s chapter in this book.

same problem without communicating with each other. As a result, information about Asia's geography was poor and failed to advance until Jesuit missionaries used Chinese maps in the sixteenth century to prepare a more accurate atlas. Similarly, until quite recently, research on perceptions has been segregated into separate avenues of psychological, literary, social science, and historical inquiry, with little communication among the different fields. Still, some common problems have emerged. Thus, a great deal of social science research on perceptions has tended to focus on the differences between perception and object reality. Psychologists have enhanced that approach. Psychoanalysis and social psychology have added substantially to our knowledge by adumbrating the emotional foundations of individual and group images. In his study of dream interpretation, as well as through his analytical work with patients, Sigmund Freud sketched out a comprehensive theory concerning the operation of the unconscious. Through those pioneering achievements, Freud pointed to the limitations that the individual faces in correctly perceiving his or her own fears and desires. In his later work, Freud applied his empirical knowledge of individual psychology to a theoretical exploration of the emotional foundations of society. In *Totem and Taboo*, as well as in *The Future of an Illusion*, he showed the irrational roots of human thought as they were embodied in society's religious illusions. *Civilization and Its Discontents* broadened the theme to include the flight from *Unbehagen* (uneasiness) in modern culture. That work interpreted the flight into human pleasures – such as work, religion, and love – as an escape mechanism to shelter society from the inevitable dreads of aging, death, and aggression.³ Freud underscored the emotional background behind society's perception of cultural values and implicitly provided major insights into the affective roots of image formation.

Subsequent psychoanalysts who ventured to explain links between individual image formation and mass opinion have presented a significant body of empirical evidence about perceptual processes in group behavior. Otto F. Kernberg, an American psychologist who has sought to provide a link between Freud's approach and that of the object relations school, described early individual defense operations in group processes.⁴

3 Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Work of Sigmund Freud* (London, 1953–), 4 and 5:58–648; Peter Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Time* (New York, 1988), 127–9, 525–53, and passim; Philip Pomper, *The Structure of the Mind in History: Five Major Figures in Psychohistory* (New York, 1985), 49–80.

4 Otto F. Kernberg, *Internal World and External Reality: Object Relations Theory Applied* (New York, 1980), 217; see also Diane Mackie and David L. Hamilton, *Affect, Cognition, and Stereotyping: Interactive Processes in Group Perception* (San Diego, 1993).

Heinz Kohut, founder of the school of self-psychology, widened the focus of research on group perceptions by calling attention to the role of individual leaders or national elites in mobilizing transferences – in other words, articulating unconscious feelings in ways that parallel the process of projection in analysis.⁵ The chapters in this book on German immigrants' perceptions of the United States and of American painters' representations of Nazi Germany present clues about the crystallization of group perceptions of cultural identity as well as leadership ideals.⁶ Those contributions offer historical evidence that allow us to apply psychoanalytical and other theories of image formation to larger groups.

Misperceptions form a prominent theme in political science investigations into the enemy stereotypes held by high-level American decision makers.⁷ Here again, research conducted during the last thirty years emphasizes the difference between reality and perception. Gestalt psychology provides the most frequently used theoretical framework for the interpretation of the perceptual process; it hypothesizes that individual perceptions are inextricably related to the social reality and the actions of individuals that flow from that reality. This theory thus offers insights for the psychological and sociological explorations of the roots of misperceptions. Herrmann has formulated an agenda for further political science research that includes perceptions of threat and perceptions of cultural differences, two aspects addressed in several contributions in this book.⁸ Despite an already large literature, both themes constitute a fruitful field for additional inquiry.⁹ Social science research relating to perceptions has largely focused on stereotypes, that is to say, simplified findings and generalized statements of characteristics attributed to others and not shared by the social group of the perceiving individual. A series of essays

5 Heinz Kohut, *Self-Psychology and the Humanities: Reflections on a New Psychoanalytical Approach*, ed. Charles Strozier (New York, 1985), 82–4.

6 See the chapters in this book by Marion F. Deshmukh and Wolfgang Helbich; on visual images, see also Nicholas Natanson, *The Black Image in the New Deal: The Politics of FSA Photography* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1992).

7 See, e.g., Ole Holsti, "Cognitive Dynamics and Images of the Enemy: Dulles and Russia," in David J. Finlay et al., eds., *Enemies in Politics* (Chicago, 1967), 25–96.

8 Richard K. Herrmann, "Perceptions and Foreign Policy Analysis," in Donald A. Sylvan and Steve Chan, eds., *Foreign Policy Decision Making: Perception, Cognition, and Artificial Intelligence* (New York, 1984), 25–52.

9 Daniel Katz and Richard Braly, "Racial Stereotyping of One Hundred College Students," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 28 (1933): 280–90; Joshua A. Fishman, "An Examination of the Process and Function of Social Stereotyping," *Journal of Social Psychology* 43 (1956): 27–64; William Buchanan and Hadley Cantrill, *How Nations See Each Other: A Study in Public Opinion* (Urbana, Ill., 1953); Ole R. Holsti, "The Belief System and National Images: A Case Study," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 6 (1962): 244–52.

Cambridge University Press

0521534429 - Transatlantic Images and Perceptions: Germany and America since 1776

Edited by David E. Barclay and Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt

Excerpt

[More information](#)

edited by Willi Paul Adams and Knud Krakau has applied some of the resulting findings to related issues in American history and American foreign policy, and has clearly demonstrated the potency of the interdisciplinary approach.¹⁰

Historical research on ethnic or national stereotypes invariably confronts the question of how closely these stereotypes conform to reality. Social psychology offers some pertinent clues. Otto Klineberg has pointed out that the amount of veracity in a stereotype can often exceed the amount of error.¹¹ Klineberg's empirical studies suggest that stereotypes can have a positive function in that they provide a proximate reflection of some characteristics of the other. Nevertheless, Klineberg's thesis, while tantalizing, seems difficult to test. It serves mainly to remind us that relationships between objective reality and subjective perception are exceedingly complicated and cannot be sorted into simple boxes of truth and fiction.

Historical research concerning images of other nations that are separated by a large geographic distance from the perceiving individual or group has mainly tended to focus on the social and political processes of group and national image formation and on the resistance of those images to reality testing.¹² Indeed, historians are particularly inclined to emphasize the pernicious and sometimes fateful consequences of misperceptions. On the one hand, the methodological constraints of their discipline limit their ability to evaluate the reality content of stereotypes. On the other hand, historians – like social psychologists and sociologists – often find it easier to document the comic and tragic effects of stereotyping than to

10 Knud Krakau and Willi Paul Adams, eds., *Deutschland und Amerika: Perzeption und historische Realität* (Berlin, 1985); Hubertus-Carl Duijker and Nico H. Frijda, *National Character and National Stereotypes: A Trend Report* (Amsterdam, 1960); Sander Gilman, *Difference and Pathology: Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race, and Madness* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1985); Jean Pirotte et al., *Stéréotypes et préjugés raciaux aux XIX et XX siècles: Sources et méthodes pour une approche historique* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982).

11 Otto Klineberg, *Tensions Affecting International Understanding* (New York, 1950); see also Knud Krakau, "Einführende Überlegungen zur Entstehung und Wirkung von Bildern, die sich Nationen von sich und anderen machen," in Adams and Krakau, eds., *Deutschland und Amerika*, 9–18.

12 See, e.g., Peter Berg, *Deutschland und Amerika, 1918–1929: Über das deutsche Amerikabild der zwanziger Jahre* (Lübeck, 1963), 8 and passim; Charles W. Brooks, *America in France's Hopes and Fears, 1890–1920* (New York, 1987), 4–7, and passim; David Strauss, *Menace in the West: The Rise of French Anti-Americanism in Modern Times* (Westport, Conn., 1978); Christine Totten, *Deutschland – Soll und Haben: Amerikas Deutschlandbild* (Munich, 1964); Konrad H. Jarausch, "Huns, Krauts or Good Germans? The German Image in America, 1800–1980," in James F. Harris, ed., *German-American Interrelations: Heritage and Challenge* (Tübingen, 1983), 149–59; Detlef Junker, "Hitler's Perception of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the United States of America, 1933–1945," in Cornelius A. van Minnen and John F. Sears, eds., *FDR and His Contemporaries: Foreign Perceptions of an American President* (New York, 1992), 145–56.

disentangle the complicated and layered strands of accurate perceptions and misperceptions that fuse into images over time.¹³

Recent research in social psychology has emphasized the experiential factor in the genesis of stereotypes and images of the other. For example, Vamik Volkan, a psychiatrist interested in political psychology, has dealt in his work with group images of enemies and allies. Volkan's findings about affective needs for enemies, based on observations of the externalization process in groups, seem especially apposite for historical research in the fields of ethnicity and nationalism. As Volkan has stated, targets of externalization develop in each social group with a certain amount of causality; the targets are chosen as a consequence of long historical processes.¹⁴ The reality content of stereotypes thus becomes a point of departure for further inquiry. Although Volkan comes from a different tradition and does not refer to Klineberg, his argument echoes the latter's findings about the historical foundations of stereotypes. That theme is discussed in the chapters here that deal with American diplomatic and popular perceptions of Germany during the two postwar periods.

Those of us who seek to investigate the history of perception, as well as the social function and externalization of images, must consider a variety of contingencies. Peter Gay wisely reminds us that the historian is never forced into a narrow choice between an emphasis on "objective," external realities as shapers of human experience or an emphasis on the ego's distorted apprehension of the external world.¹⁵ The historical evidence presented in this book underlines the wide array of possible motives for the expression of human experience. These observations parallel recent findings in neurobiology that dispute previously accepted assumptions about the dominance of the right hemisphere of the brain for image formation. Thus, we are bound to reject global generalizations about the emotional or cognitive composition of mental images. Imagery, in the infelicitous diction that currently prevails, thus concerns a wide array of brain functions, and the underlying neurological process seems to be shaped by individual differences.¹⁶ Because brain-scanning techniques that

13 See the chapters by Peter Krüger, Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt, Beverly Crawford and James Martel, and Hans-Jürgen Schröder in this book.

14 Vamik Volkan, *The Need to Have Enemies and Allies: From Clinical Practice to International Relationships* (Northvale, N.J., 1988), 90–5; for a historical statement about America's need for enemies, see Detlef Junker, *The Manichean Trap: American Perceptions of the German Empire, 1871–1945*, German Historical Institute, Occasional Paper, no. 12 (Washington, D.C., 1995).

15 Peter Gay, *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud: Education of the Senses* (New York, 1984), 226–7.

16 Goldenberg, Podreka, and Steiner, "Cerebral Localization"; see also Stephen Kosslyn, Michael H. Van Kleeck, and Kris Kirby, "A Neurologically Plausible Model of Individual Differences in

help us to localize verbal and nonverbal neurological functions remain in an early stage of research, definite conclusions about the cognitive process of image formation and its relevance for historical study appear premature. Likewise, historical research about the emotional, cognitive, and social processes underlying image formation, while abstaining from reductionist fervor, must take into account all possible contingencies concerning how human minds interact with the external world to shape individual perceptions and group attitudes.

The materials presented in this book, though different in their analytical presuppositions and thematic focus, underscore the notion that historical research about perceptions should avoid deterministic concepts about the effects of psychological and cultural factors upon perceptions. To be sure, psychological inquiry into the makeup of idle thoughts, which lie at the juncture between individual image formation and verbal representation, suggests that cultural value systems determine the contours of seemingly free associations.¹⁷ Those findings lend empirical support to the hypothesis that underlies the contributions in this book: that individual and group perceptions are culturally constructed. Correspondingly, psychoanalytical research has led to cognate findings about the influence of emotional factors on image formation that now are widely accepted in the historical discipline.

Historians of perception, whether they study across cultures or look intraculturally at social, sexual, or ethnic groups, face three distinct challenges. The nature of our discipline imposes an obvious constraint on the researcher. Even a description of the past that is based on years of painstaking research, as well as prudent perusal of the available scholarly literature, will generate a reconstruction that remains partially rooted in the researcher's own perceptions.¹⁸ Mindful of the methodological pitfalls in our own discipline and of the difficulties in attaining objectivity, we seek not to stray too far from our evidentiary base. In short, we explore past individual and group perceptions by describing

Visual Mental Imagery," in Hampson, Marks, and Richardson, eds., *Imagery*, 39–77; see also the contributions in Richard Davis and Kenneth Hugdahl, eds., *Brain Asymmetry* (Cambridge and London, 1995).

17 Susan Aylwin, "Imagery and Affect: Big Questions, Little Answers," in Hampson, Marks, and Richardson, eds., *Imagery*, 247–67.

18 See, e.g., Reinhard Koselleck, "Representation, Event, and Structure," in Koselleck, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time* (Cambridge, Mass., 1985), 105–15; see also the recent discussions of "objectivity" in history, esp. Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge, 1988); for a recent assessment of Ranke's concept of objectivity, see Lothar Gall, "Ranke und das Objektivitätsproblem," in Norbert Finzsch and Hermann Wellenreuther, eds., *Liberalitas: Festschrift für Erich Angermann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 1992), 37–44.

Cambridge University Press

0521534429 - Transatlantic Images and Perceptions: Germany and America since 1776

Edited by David E. Barclay and Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt

Excerpt

[More information](#)

and analyzing image representations where concrete documentation is available to us.

The historical task of image research therefore depends on the availability of that documentation, such as diaries and letters that may reflect the personal experience underlying the formation of perceptions. Up to a generation or so ago, historical research tended to focus on well-known individuals and their writings. The progenitor of transatlantic perceptions research, even before the field had a name, was Alexis de Tocqueville, and his writings remain a continued object of study and analysis. Although American researchers have largely focused on Tocqueville's social and political ideas, their French and German counterparts have shown more interest in his image of America. Thus, Otto Vossler, a German historian of ideas, has proposed to reconstruct the life experience that influenced Tocqueville's assessment of American and French societies.¹⁹ Historical research during the last twenty years, following this model, has expanded the field of inquiry by examining and contextualizing the written documentation left by less prominent individuals. The results have provided substantial and often original insights into modes of thought, cultural values, and mentalities.²⁰ The contributions in this book reflect those findings by enlarging our field of scrutiny to embrace immigrant letters, popular travel books, and movies.

The ultimate challenge to historians studying the reality content of national images is to distinguish among many shades of gray. Although, as Klineberg and Peter Gay remind us, cultural assumptions, projections, and a host of other neurotic phenomena distort the accuracy of perceptions, we should not overlook the extent to which a core reality underlies them.²¹ No doubt we must bear in mind the extent to which individual images and experiences are culturally and effectively constructed. Yet

19 Otto Vossler, *Alexis de Tocqueville: Freiheit und Gleichheit* (Frankfurt/Main, 1973), 9–12; see also Bernhard Fabian, *Alexis de Tocquevilles Amerikabild* (Heidelberg, 1957); Françoise Mélonio, *Tocqueville et les Français* (Paris, 1993); Jon Elster, *Psychologie politique* (Paris, 1990); André Jardin, *Tocqueville: A Biography*, trans. Lydia Davis with Robert Hemenway (New York, 1988); Larry Siedentop, *Tocqueville* (New York, 1994); Alan S. Kahan, *Aristocratic Liberalism: The Social and Political Thought of Jacob Burckhardt, John Stuart Mill, and Alexis de Tocqueville* (New York, 1992); Bruce J. Smith, *Politics and Remembrance: Republican Themes in Machiavelli, Burke, and Tocqueville* (Princeton, N.J., 1985); James T. Schleifer, *The Making of Tocqueville's Democracy in America* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1980).

20 See, e.g., C. Vann Woodward and Elisabeth Muhlenfeld, eds., *The Private Mary Chesnut: The Unpublished Civil War Diaries* (New York, 1984); Robert C. Bray and Paul E. Bushnell, eds., *Diary of a Common Soldier in the American Revolution, 1775–1783: An Annotated Edition of the Military Journal of Jeremiah Greenman* (De Kalb, Ill., 1978); Laurel T. Ulrich, *Good Wives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England, 1650–1750* (New York, 1990); Laurel T. Ulrich, ed., *A Midwife's Tale* (New York, 1990).

21 Klineberg, *Tensions*; Gay, *Education of the Senses*, 11–13.

Cambridge University Press

0521534429 - Transatlantic Images and Perceptions: Germany and America since 1776

Edited by David E. Barclay and Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt

Excerpt

[More information](#)

cultural historians and social psychologists who lean toward broader notions of a constructed society and psyche go further and claim that emotions themselves are socially constructed.²² “All theory is gray, my friend,” Goethe once remarked, “but green is the everlasting tree of life.” However, there exists no convincing evidence to support that claim. The historical research presented in this book, though mindful of social, cultural, and emotional experiences that shape individual and group images, assumes that perceptions remain rooted in a subsoil of reality. They may indeed be partly constructed, but those constructs constitute an additional ingredient of the complex historical and experiential reality that we seek to reconstruct. The analyses of historical images elaborated in this book take account of the well-known constraints in perceiving external reality by grounding their findings in the evidence.²³ The task of historical analysis is to distinguish carefully between misunderstandings that result from partial vision, ignorance, or lack of mobility, and misperceptions that emanate from a desire to construct a larger fiction or myth for ulterior purposes.²⁴ Thus, we try to reconstruct individual and group perceptions by collecting and conflating multiple sources of singular experiences and by practicing historical craftsmanship, once elegantly defined by Erich Angermann as a “work of art conveying insight not otherwise obtainable.”²⁵

Perceptions across the Atlantic constitute a special field for historical analysis of image formation as well as a recurrent leitmotif in the history of European–American contacts.²⁶ Individual travels starting in the seventeenth century, mass immigration across the Atlantic beginning in the 1830s, and detailed diplomatic reports commencing in the early twentieth century created transatlantic perceptions on a multiplicity of levels and for a variety of purposes. The United States from its earliest colonial begin-

22 The constructionist claim is spelled out in Rom Harré, ed., *The Social Construction of Emotions* (New York, 1986); a critique is offered by Ralf Nüse, Norbert Groeben, Burkhard Freitag, and Margrit Schreiber, *Über die Erfindungen des Radikalen Konstruktivismus* (Weinheim, 1991).

23 Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Studierzimmer*; see also the chapters by Krüger and Glaser-Schmidt in this book; see also the recent contribution by Ido Oren, “The Subjectivity of the ‘Democratic’ Peace: Changing U.S. Perceptions of Imperial Germany,” *International Security* 20, no. 2 (Fall 1995): 147–84; for an example of useful projection of social criticism on distant cultures, see Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu, *The Persian Letters* (New York, 1961).

24 For an example, see Peter Gay, “A Special View: Freud’s America,” in Frank Trommler and Joseph McVeigh, eds., *America and the Germans: An Assessment of a Three-Hundred-Year History*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1985), 2:303–13.

25 Erich Angermann, *Challenges of Ambiguity: Doing Comparative History* (New York, 1991), 18–19.

26 Antony Pagden, *European Encounters with the New World from Renaissance to Romanticism* (New Haven, Conn., 1993); Jerry M. Williams and Robert E. Lewis, *Early Images of the Americas: Transfer and Invention* (Tucson, Ariz., 1993); Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, trans. Richard Howard (New York, 1984).

nings had constituted a prominent destination for European emigrants and, as a result, defined itself as what Europe was not.²⁷ The ensuing mass emigration, combined with an enduring interest in America's democratic institutions, resulted in a lasting German fascination with the other continent. First-time travelers and traders, ever conscious of the rigors and the expense of the journey to the New World, took special pains to report their impressions because they knew that they might never see America again. Likewise, they thought that they should report frequently to their European brethren who might not otherwise have access to anything more substantial than superficial newspaper reports about the new land.²⁸ The Civil War in the United States and German unification in 1871 sparkedled mutual curiosity in the two countries' parallel constitutional development.²⁹ America's steadily increasing involvement in European conflicts, beginning with the dynastic struggles of the seventeenth century and culminating in its interventions in the great wars of 1914 and 1939 and in the subsequent Cold War, increased interest in mutual explorations of the other. From the late 1960s onward, mutual relations became more ambivalent as anti-Americanism in Germany and elsewhere brought back old misperceptions mixed with new concerns about the war in Vietnam and America's role as a nuclear hegemon.³⁰

This book concentrates on political, social, and cultural perceptions at the level of the group. Individual views constitute the component parts of group images, yet they aggregate to something more; accordingly, these chapters rightly emphasize the larger social context. So, for example,

27 Daniel Boorstin, *America and the Image of Europe* (New York, 1960).

28 For a magisterial documentation of German immigrants' images, see Walter D. Kamphoefner, Wolfgang Helbich, and Ulrike Sommer, eds., *News from the Land of Freedom: German Immigrants Write Home* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991); see also Helbich's and Kamphoefner's chapters in this book.

29 Angermann, *Challenges of Ambiguity*; Peter Krüger, "Die Beurteilung der Reichsgründung von 1871 in den USA," in Finzsch and Wellenreuther, eds., *Liberalitas*, 263–84. See also Detlef Junker's chapter in this book; and, by the same author, "Roosevelt and the National Socialist Threat to the United States," in Trommler and McVeigh, eds., *America and the Germans*, 2:30–44.

30 Frank Trommler, "The Rise and Fall of Americanism in Germany," in Trommler and McVeigh, eds., *America and the Germans*, 2:332–43. See also H. Stuart Hughes, *The Sea Change, 1930–1965* (New York, 1975), 148–53; for a description of Max Horkheimer's steadfastly critical image of the United States, see *The Authoritarian Personality*. For historical antecedents of German anti-Americanism in the 1960s, see Klaus Schwabe, "Anti-Americanism Within the German Right, 1917–1933," *Amerikastudien/American Studies* 21 (1976): 89–107; for more recent developments, see Paul Hollander, *Anti-Americanism: Critiques at Home and Abroad* (New York, 1992); Thomas P. Thornton, *Anti-Americanism: Origins and Context* (Newbury Park, Calif., 1988); Rob Kroos, Maarten van Rossem, and Marcus Cunliffe, *Anti-Americanism in Europe* (Amsterdam, 1986); Peter Lösche, "Amerikanische Deutschlandbilder und die deutsche Vereinigung," in Günter Trautmann, ed., *Die hässlichen Deutschen: Die Deutschen aus der Sicht ihrer Nachbarn* (Darmstadt, 1991); Hans-Georg Betz, *Post-Modern Politics in Germany: The Politics of Resentment* (New York, 1991); and the chapters by Konrad H. Jarausch and Frank Trommler in this book.