Introduction

In 1945, the sketch artist Heinrich Schröder walked through the streets of his native Cologne, surveying the destroyed local landscape and drawing in his sketchbook. The air wars levelled most of his hometown, with only 5 percent of the population remaining.[1] All twelve of the city's famous Romanesque churches lay in ruins, with corpses strewn throughout the streets. Schröder left out images of the dead but drew several of the church ruins and the city bridges, which retreating Nazi forces had blown up after reporting that they were abandoning the "rubble pile Cologne."[2] The Cologne Cathedral, which surprisingly suffered only minor damage, was left towering above the silent ruins. Schröder and other Cologners who walked through the ruins expressed a sense of shock. Their accounts centred on lost local communities, former personal existences, and once familiar places of Heimat. As the introduction to Schröder's book of sketches noted, the ruins of Cologne appeared as a "desert-like absence of Heimat." The account, however, was not simply about conveying a sense of suffering. Underneath the ruins of their hometown, the work concluded, slumbered the "seeds of new life."[3]

Within months of the war's end, hundreds of thousands of Cologners flooded back into the rubble city, baffling experts. Local discourses were filled with discussion about how deep desires for Heimat drove them back. Many described local Heimat as about leaving behind war and embracing peace, healing torn communities, and repairing ruptured lives. By 1946, the city administration reported how a "wild growing" revival of "Heimat" and local culture had gripped the city as Cologners sought sources of "new life."[4] Many citizens, local newspapers, and local publications similarly

---

[1] Gerhard Brunn, "Evakuierung und Rückkehr," in *"Wir haben schwere Zeiten hinter uns." Die Kölner Region zwischen Krieg und Nachkriegszeit*, ed., Jost Dülffer (Cologne, 1996), 129.

[2] Werner Schäfke, *Köln nach 1945* (Rheinbach, 2007), 8.

[3] Heinz Fries, "Geleitwort," in Heinrich Schröder, *Colonia Deleta* (Cologne, 1947), 5–10.

[4] Statistischen Amt der Stadt Köln, *Verwaltungsbericht, 1945/47* (Cologne, 1947), 50.

remarked on the revival of local Heimat culture. Cologners spearheaded a local cultural renaissance, founded numerous Heimat societies and publications, revived local traditions, observed special localist events, wrote dialect poetry about Heimat, and held "Heimat evenings" to get through daily life in the ruins.

Discussions about democracy could also be found throughout these discourses. Many democratically engaged localists wrote about how they believed Heimat should be about rejecting nationalism, facilitating participation, and promoting more federalist ideas of Germanness. New language about local identities also emerged relatively soon after the war. Many Cologners began to harness select local pasts to argue for "Cologne democracy" as a local value and to define their region as a "world-open bridge" to the West. Such new language hardly made Cologners into reformed democrats, though it illustrates the role of locality and region in some of the earliest attempts to identify with a vaguely conceived idea of democracy.

The significance of these developments is not simply that they took place in Cologne, but rather how they reflected similar patterns in other regions. Far to the north in the Hanseatic cities, many noted how local sentiment reached fresh heights and how local Heimat was about finding new lives. Democratically minded groups further developed discourses about Hanseatic "democracy," and "world-openness," while reframing ideas about their cities as "gates to the world" to interpret them as being about international reconciliation. Seven hundred kilometres to the Southwest, we find analogous reports of how "Heimat values" had become "all the more valuable than they ever were in peaceful times."[5] Regionalists discussed how they could realize new lives in the "small circle" of Heimat, while democratically minded regionalists argued that they should harness regional values of "democracy" and see their region as a bridge to France and Switzerland.

These accounts clearly conflict with narratives of Heimat as tainted after 1945. But they are also at odds with arguments that Heimat was always an anti-democratic, anti-western, or nationalist force.[6] While exclusionary,

---

[5] Otto Feger, *Konstanz. Aus der Vergangenheit einer alten Stadt* (Konstanz, 1947), 11.
[6] For works that have seen Heimat as largely anti-democratic in the early post-war years, see Willi Oberkrome, *Deutsche Heimat. Nationale Konzeptionen und regionale Praxis von Naturschutz, Landschaftsgestaltung und Kulturpolitik in Westfalen-Lippe und Thüringen (1900–1960)* (Paderborn, 2004); Petra Behrens, *Regionale Identität und Regionalkultur in Demokratie und Diktatur. Heimatpropaganda, regionalkulturelle Aktivitäten und die Konstruktion der Region Eichsfeld zwischen 1918 und 1961* (Baden-Baden, 2014); Habbo Knoch, ed., *Das Erbe der Provinz. Heimatkultur und*

anti-democratic, or nationalist strains of thinking about Heimat could easily be found in the post-war years, this book explores long overlooked attempts to conceive of Heimat in more democratic, open, and inclusive modes.

By probing the history of the Heimat idea in West Germany after 1945, this book also sheds light on other important debates in post-war German history. Reflection on Heimat was often about confronting dissonant biographies, repairing shattered communities, and pursuing new post-war lives – all issues which have loomed large in studies of early post-war history. For many, reflection on Heimat was also a starting point for thinking about democracy, federalism, European unification, and alternative ideas about nation. The role of Heimat in thinking through these issues provokes intriguing questions. Why did local Heimat have such deep emotional appeal and why did so many describe it as a site of new life? What impact did desires for Heimat have on democratization? Everyday West Germans often emphasized the importance of local communities in beginning anew. But what functions did they believe local communities should serve?

In focusing on Heimat, this book particularly engages with debates about West German democratization. It explores how local worlds offered flexible resources which many West Germans used to identificationally adjust to new political realities at a time when power structures and future expectations were shifting at a dizzying pace. Narratives of local democracy became surprisingly widespread by the end of the 1940s. This study does not question the many shortcomings of early West German democracy, nor does it suggest that democratization was anything but a long and arduous process. Instead, it argues for more attention to the role of identity in the process and shows the presence of unexpectedly early attempts to identify with the search for democracy and western rapprochement on a local level. The book further explores how such identifications existed alongside ongoing failures in democratic mentalities and practices.

A study of Heimat in West Germany would be incomplete without also considering the millions of expellees from the former eastern regions for

Geschichtspolitik nach 1945 (Göttingen, 2001). For only a few works that view Heimat as trans-historically regressive, see Thomas Ebermann, *Linke Heimatliebe. Eine Entwurzelung* (Hamburg, 2019); Peter Blickle, *Heimat: A Critical Theory of the German Idea of Homeland* (Rochester, 2002); Florentine Stryelczyk, *Un-Heimliche Heimat. Reibungsflächen zwischen Kultur und Nation* (Munich, 1999); Paul Parin, *Heimat, eine Plombe* (Hamburg, 1996); Werner Hartung, *Konservative Zivilisationskritik und regionale Identität* (Hanover, 1991); Horst Glaser, "Heimat unterm bösen Blick," in *Heimat-Tradition-Geschichtsbewußtsein*, ed., Klaus Weigelt (Mainz, 1986), 93–109.

whom return was impossible. While much has been written about their history, scholars have yet to ask how expellees and West Germans viewed the Heimat concept through the lens of their differing post-war fates. The impact of expellee-society rhetoric on broader appraisals of the concept also deserves more explicit attention. This study breaks new ground by probing public debates about the Heimat concept amongst both expellee and West German interlocutors.

If we are to finally dispense with the stubborn misconception of Heimat as tainted immediately after 1945 – and this book very much argues that we should – it begs the question of when certain groups began to argue that Heimat was irredeemably reactionary and should be struck from the public lexicon. The prolific repetition of the 1945 legend itself reflects the lack of a history of efforts to do away with the word "Heimat" and seemingly the phenomena it described.[7] This book is the first to probe exactly when, amongst whom, and in what context such efforts first emerged. It traces their emergence to a surprisingly narrow time window and explains why they emerged during the Second Berlin Crisis in the early 1960s and proliferated after the construction of the Berlin Wall. This study uses a subsequent examination of the "anti-Heimat movement" of the 1960s as a springboard to offer a re-reading of the "Heimat Renaissance" of the 1970s and 1980s when many on the political left argued for re-engagement with Heimat.

Stepping back from the specific context of post-war German history, this study's findings also speak to broader interdisciplinary debates about home and place attachment. In the English-language scholarship, humanistic geographers were among the first to put the topic on the map. Writing at the same time West Germans were speaking of a Heimat Renaissance, such scholars reacted against a technocratic way of seeing place and explored home as a site of meaning, protection, and field of care – though other scholars rightly noted that home could also be a site of oppression.[8] Not unlike debates over Heimat, scholars in the English-speaking world have continued to disagree about whether local attachments and local

---

[7] Though not tracing the genesis of such efforts, the closest work can be found in studies of anti-Heimat films. see Daniel Schacht, *Fluchtpunkt Provinz. Der neue Heimatfilm zwischen 1968 und 1972* (Münster, 1991); Johannes von Moltke, *No Place Like Home: Locations of Heimat in German Cinema* (Berkeley, 2005), 203–226.

[8] See, amongst others, Yi-Fu Tuan, *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes and Values* (New York, 1974); Eduard Relph, *Place and Placelessness* (London, 1976); Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis, 1977); Anne Buttimer, ed., *The Human Experience of Space and Place* (London, 1980); Paul Adams et al., eds., *Textures of Place: Exploring Humanist Geographies* (Minneapolis, 2001).

identities can be shaped in inclusive and democratic ways or are intrinsic-
ally reactionary forces which should be transcended.[9] These debates, as
John Tomaney has noted, have often centred on more abstract forms of
analysis.[10] Taking a more empirical approach, this study contributes to
these debates and challenges narratives about local attachments and iden-
tities as inevitably reactionary.

Between Trope, Places of Experience, and Future Visions

Studies of "Heimat" have inevitably faced the task of defining the concept
and staking out a position on whether it refers to an aberrant German
phenomenon. Most studies have offered at least a perfunctory definition,
though some have dispensed with the task altogether to avoid adding to
the "graveyard" of definitions.[11] The importance of definition, however, is
often underestimated, with overly narrow assumptions about its meaning
informing preconceptions about which sources and fields of investigation
are assumed to be representative. While some scholars have probed think-
ing about Heimat as specific sites of home, others have approached it as a
generic, idyllic, and rural trope in the mode of what the sociologist
Hermann Bausinger has referred to as "Heimat from the rack."[12] Some
have denied that Heimat has ever referred to any real places at all, insisting
that it is an imagined utopia or an empty signifier which was only about
imagining nation.[13] Such definitions, however, have tended to isolate a
fragmentary strand of discourse about Heimat and take it as representative

---

[9] For overview works on the politics of home, see Alison Blunt and Robyn Dowling, *Home* (London, 2006); Jan Duyvendak, *The Politics of Home: Belonging and Nostalgia in Western Europe and the United States* (Basingstoke, 2011). For a review of earlier works on "home," see Shelley Matt, "Understanding Home: A Critical Review of the Literature," *Sociological Review* 52, 1 (2004): 62–89. For arguments on local attachments as essentially reactionary, see Ash Amin, "Regions Unbound: Towards a New Politics of Place," *Geografiska Annaler B* 86, 1 (2004): 33–44; Roberto Dainotto, *Place in Literature: Regions, Cultures, Communities* (Ithaca, 2000); Mary Douglas, "The Idea of Home: A Kind of Space," *Social Research* 58, 1 (1991): 287–307. On debates about whether creating an open idea of home requires rejecting specific local and historically rooted identities, see Doreen Massey, "A Global Sense of Place," *Marxism Today* 38 (1991): 24–29; Doreen Massey, "Places and Their Pasts," *History Workshop Journal* 39 (1995): 182–193; John Tomaney, "Parochialism – A Defence," *Progress in Human Geography* 37, 5 (2013): 658–672; John Tomaney, "Region and Place II: Belonging," *Progress in Human Geography* 39, 4 (2015): 507–516.

[10] Tomaney, "Parochialism," 661.   [11] Korfkamp, *Heimat*, 12.

[12] Hermann Bausinger, "Heimat in einer offenen Gesellschaft," in *Heimat*, eds., Cremer and Klein, 83–86.

[13] Alon Confino, *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany and National Memory, 1871–1918* (Chapel Hill, 1997). On Heimat and utopia, see Ernst Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*, vol. 3 (Berlin, 1959), 484–489.

of the whole. Seemingly complicating the search for a definition, studies of the concept have invariably noted the dizzying array of sensual referents which individuals associate with Heimat – whether it be the sound of a familiar dialect or the sight of a familiar church tower.

There is a good argument for a broad descriptive definition which can accommodate how the concept has been used in diverse and contested ways throughout its history. This study, in turn, views Heimat as a concept which is broadly about place attachments and the diverse functions they serve. This dovetails with the definitions of scholars who have viewed Heimat as a place of experience, personal geography, a "satisfaction space," "near space," or an "internal relationship" to an experienced environment.[14] Thinking about the concept historically encompassed reflection on real place attachments, future visions of them, and sometimes visions of a more ideal place of home as elsewhere. Many who evoked the concept in modern history described Heimat as a site of orientation, identity, and security, and a landscape of personal memory. Given its saturation with sites of personal memory, it should not surprise us that the sights, smells, or sounds that trigger memories of Heimat would be diverse and subjective.[15] Most importantly, Heimat represented for many a geography where their personal relationships were most dense and could be most easily kept intact.[16] Those who lost Heimat often described it as first and foremost about a loss of people.

This study, in short, rejects notions that Heimat was never anything more than an empty signifier, generic trope, or strategy of imagining nation. Its connection to the phenomenon of place attachment, moreover, is what makes study of Heimat relevant beyond German-speaking Europe. This is not to say that Heimat did not play a role in shaping ideas of nation or that generic Heimat tropes did not exist. Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, German-speaking Europe was also unique in

[14] Ina-Maria Greverus, *Auf der Suche nach Heimat* (Munich, 1979); Hermann Bausinger, "Heimat und Identität," in *Heimat. Sehnsucht nach Identität*, ed., Elisabeth Moosmann (Berlin, 1980), 13–28; Beate Mitzscherlich, *Heimat ist etwas was ich mache. Eine Psychologische Untersuchung zum individuellen Prozess der Beheimatung* (Pfaffenweiler, 1997); Wilfried Belschner et al., eds., *Wem gehört die Heimat? Beiträge der politischen Psychologie zu einem umstrittenen Phänomen* (Opladen, 1995). On Heimat as about locally situated social ties, see Heiner Treinen, "Symbolische Ortsbezogenheit: Eine soziologische Untersuchung zum Heimatproblem," *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 17 (1965): 73–97, 254–297.

[15] On Heimat as an "association generator," see Gunter Gebhard et al., "Heimatdenken," in *Heimat. Konturen und Konjunkturen eines umstrittenen Konzepts*, eds., Gunter Gebhard et al. (Bielefeld, 2007), 9.

[16] For similar arguments about "home," see Michael Fox, *Home: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, 2016), 111–117.

terms of the volume and vitality of public discourses on local place attachments which took place through discussion of Heimat. The long history of regional fragmentation in Central Europe certainly played a role here and informed a more robust federalist tradition of thinking about place. Claims that Heimat feeling was uniquely German can also be found in several sources, while English-language scholarship has pointed to the lack of a direct translation of the term. In focusing on sources that emphasize Heimat's Germanness, however, scholars have tended to ignore frequent use of the word in ways which assumed or even explicitly argued that the Heimat phenomenon transcended national borders.[17]

It would be problematic to assume that the phenomena Heimat has historically described were uniquely German. Notions of its aberrant Germanness have too often underpinned assumptions that eliminating the word is tantamount to transcending place attachments altogether. It goes without saying that the functions of local geographies as sites of orientation, personal biography, identity, collective memory, or dense social bonds were not unique to Germany, Austria, or Switzerland. Proliferating interdisciplinary studies on place attachment offer ample examples elsewhere.[18] The difficulty of translating "Heimat" also does not make the term as unique as it may first appear. Most terms for home and place attachment in different languages reveal difficulties in finding direct translations with the same connotations and associations.[19] This can also be seen in the geographic scales of terms for home in different languages which, as the Swedish philologist Stefan Brink has pointed out, have demonstrated great diversity and have changed over time.[20] The term "home," for example, deviates from "Heimat" in its ability to refer to the smaller scale of the domestic abode, while it demonstrates convergences in how it can be extended to other geographies by referring to "hometown," "feeling at home" in local places, or by referring to a

---

[17] See discussions on Heimat as a "human metaphor" throughout this book.

[18] See Jeff Smith, ed., *Explorations in Place Attachment* (London, 2017); Jennifer Cross, "Processes of Place Attachment," *Symbolic Interaction* 38, 4 (2015): 493–520. Scannell and Gifford, "Place Attachment," 1–10; Setha Low and Irwin Altman, "Place Attachment: A Conceptual Inquiry," in *Place Attachment*, eds., Irwin Altman and Setha Low (New York, 1992), 1–12.

[19] "Heimat? Ein Heft über Alles was Dazugehört," *SPK-Magazin* 1 (2016). For a linguistic study of Heimat, see Andrea Bastian, *Der Heimat-Begriff. Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung im verschiedenen Funktionsbereichen der deutschen Sprache* (Tübingen, 1995).

[20] Stefan Brink, "Home: The Term and Concept from a Linguistic and Settlement-Historical Viewpoint," in *The Home: Words, Interpretations, Meanings and Environments*, ed., David Benjamin (Aldershot, 1995), 17.

"homeland."[21] The term "*Memeklet*" in Turkish demonstrates similarities with Heimat in its emotional reference to feeling at home in local places but is less likely to be used in reference to the region.[22] The term "*rodina*" in Russian, which is often used as the closest translation for Heimat, similarly refers to a place of familiarity, personal experience, and emotional attachment. The term differs in the extent to which it is projected onto the nation, though not onto the state, politics, or a sense of nationalist obligation conveyed by the German term "*Vaterland*" – a function taken on by other Russian terms.[23] In Hebrew, "*moledet*" is typically the term offered for both home and Heimat. While it appears throughout the Bible to refer to local places of home, in modern history it has also been extended to refer to the state of Israel.[24] Terms for home and place attachment, in short, reveal tremendous diversity and there is not a universal standard from which the German language deviates.

Thinking about home and Heimat has always involved contested conceptualizations about how places of personal experience should relate to larger geographic scales.[25] Differing ideas about the appropriate scalar relationships of Heimat were often tied to differing political viewpoints. Amongst post-war democratic and pro-European federalists, for example, Heimat was described as about moderating national sentiment and supporting European unification. This diverged from the nationalist view that local Heimat sentiments should bolster and strengthen a sense of Germanness. For the rare separatist, Heimat meant rejecting the nation altogether – an act which some also described as harmonizing with European unification. Others argued that Heimat should be conceived as strictly local and private to realign the boundaries between the private and the political in the wake of National Socialism. It is not enough, therefore, to simply establish the multi-scalar nature of thinking about home and Heimat. The contested and variant perceptions of how these relationships should work proved crucial.

---

[21] This former function is taken on by the word "*Zuhause.*" On the geographic elasticity of the English term, see David Sopher, "The Landscape of Home," in *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes*, ed., D. W. Meinig (Oxford, 1979), 136.

[22] Muhterem Aras and Hermann Bausinger, *Heimat. Kann die weg?* (Tübingen, 2019), 29.

[23] Anna Wierzbicka, *Understanding Cultures through Their Keywords* (Oxford, 1997), 191–195; Natalia Donig, "Die Erfindung der 'sowjetischen Heimat'," in *"Heimat als Erfahrung und Entwurf*, eds., Natalia Donig et al. (Berlin, 2009), 61–86.

[24] David Ohana, *Birth-Throes of the Israeli Homeland: The Concept of Moledet* (London, 2020).

[25] On the multi-scalar nature of home, see Blunt and Dowling, *Home*; David Morley, *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity* (London, 2000). On the multi-scalar aspects of "*domov*" (home) in the Czech case, see Aviezer Tucker, "In Search of Home," *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 11, 2 (1994), 181–187.

Regarding the question of Heimat's "Germanness," this study steers a middle path which both recognizes how unique historical experiences and ideas about place in German-speaking Europe have influenced the concept, while also acknowledging its connections to what the anthropologist Nigel Rapport has referred to as the universal human capacity for creating places of home.[26] Rather than positing a singular "German" understanding across time and space, I instead approach discussions of Heimat as parts of an evolving and contested discourse over the meaning of place attachments and their relation to diverse political and social issues. Definitions of the concept, however, are not simply assumed to be descriptive of spatial practices.[27] Quite often they represented active efforts to shape them. Whether it was the pro-European federalist who argued that Heimat was about decentring the nation, the East German propagandist who insisted it was about funnelling local sentiments into a new state identity, or the well-intended denizen who argued that Heimat feeling should generate empathy for the displaced, each conceptualization can be read as an effort to shape practices of homemaking and perceptions of Heimat's relationship to broader geographies and matters of concern.

This study also rejects notions that Heimat has only ever described utopian visions of place. Visions of more ideal places of home often played a role in thinking about Heimat and in some instances could become utopian in nature. Taking them as representative of the whole, however, proves problematic. If anything, visions of Heimat in the early post-war years proved more mundane than utopian. The problem of viewing Heimat as simply a utopia that never existed becomes even more apparent in thinking through the loss of Heimat. In a utopian model, such loss would cease to mean much of anything beyond the loss of a dream.

The temporalities of Heimat were ultimately more complex. In addition to visions of future places, Heimat also had deep connections to memory and the past.[28] Individual history in a place provided the basis for orientation, a sense of personal biography, and locally situated human relationships. Denizens also evoked more distant pasts in shaping local identities.

---

[26] Nigel Rapport, "Home-Making as Human Capacity and Individual Practice," in *Home*, eds., Bahun and Petric, 17–37.

[27] As Reinhart Koselleck argued, language should not be conflated with the practices they sought to conceptualize or facilitate. Reinhart Koselleck, *Begriffsgeschichten. Studien zur Semantik und Pragmatik der politischen und sozialen Sprache* (Frankfurt, 2010), 15, 32–33.

[28] Friederike Eigler and Jens Kugele, eds., *Heimat: At the Intersection of Memory and Space* (Berlin, 2012). On "home" as similarly involving a contested interplay between memory and future visions, see Matt, "Understanding Home," 69; Sopher, "The Landscape of Home," in *Landscapes*, ed., Meinig, 136.

While the proper temporal orientations of Heimat sometimes became an explicit subject of debate, it was not a matter of progressive ideas of Heimat being oriented towards the future and conservative ones towards the past. The post-war years particularly demonstrated how evocation of historical memory could be used to accommodate change.

Heimat's Diverse Histories

While this book focuses on the West German case after 1945, a brief look at the concept's longer history is needed to put this work in perspective. Studies of Heimat have particularly focused on questions about the concept's modernity and its relationship to politics and nation-building. While the word proliferated throughout the nineteenth century, it was used in the early modern period to refer to a legal right of abode, while religious discourses drew on the idea of one's true "Heimat" being with God in the afterlife – a conceptual manoeuvre which admonished seeking home in the mortal realm.[29] By the end of the eighteenth century, religious discourses made more space for earthly Heimat, while literary figures in the age of sensibility and romanticism infused the concept with emotional depth. Though the romantics drew on aestheticized ideas of Heimat, they did not advance a significant nationalist Heimat discourse, which only emerged in a notable way in the latter half of the nineteenth century.[30]

During the nineteenth century, turbulent modernization, industrialization, national unification, urbanization, and mass uprootedness all brought discussion of the concept to the fore. The "Heimat movement" – as the flowering of regional cultural societies is called – came into its own in the late nineteenth century. Celia Applegate's work has particularly demonstrated how engagement with Heimat in the period played a role in bridging between realms of personal experience and the abstract nation.[31]

---

[29] For an excellent study on this, see Anja Oesterhelt, *Geschichte der Heimat. Zur Genese ihrer Semantik in Literatur, Religion, Recht und Wissenschaft* (Berlin, 2021). Such religious ideas, however, are not indicative of a deviant German semantic history and were part of a broader Christian tradition, with comparable ideas conveyed through terms like "eternal home" or "demeure éternelle."

[30] Ibid. It is problematic, however, to read romantic flourishes about finding Heimat in "art" without accounting for poetic licence and how they drew on the language of place in constructing metaphor. Assumptions about such sources as reflecting transcendence of place should be avoided. See also, Susanne Scharnowski, *Heimat. Geschichte eines Missverständnisses* (Darmstadt, 2019), 18–33.

[31] Celia Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley, 1990). Also see Siegfried Weichlein, *Nation und Region. Integrationsprozesse im Bismarckreich* (Düsseldorf, 2004); Abigail Green, *Fatherlands: State-Building and Nationhood in Nineteenth-Century Germany*