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the importance attached to a close, intensified and open cooperation, between Germany and the United States in one of the most essential fields of thought.

There is a history between our two countries which links us. It is the history which we celebrated recently at the Tricentennial of German Immigration and which President Theodore Roosevelt referred to in his letter of October 12, 1906 to the University of Berlin, when he wrote about the historic and unshakable friendship between the two nations; the history, which President Reagan recalled at Hambach Castle, where, as he said, "so much that is good and worthy of our two nations began".

There is another part of German history which is extremely hard to face. It places high demands on this German Historical Institute in the United States of America. "A truthful relation to the past, a sense of responsibility to the dangers and opportunities of our time and a continuing spiritual effort in dealing with the gifts of our culture—in this area lies the position and the tasks of the German people" and may I add to President von Weizsaecker's thought—specifically of this German Historical Institute.

My profound respect and gratitude at this hour go to those historians—and many of them are amongst us today—who had to flee Germany during its darkest period. They have kept alive the best tradition of German learning and knowledge abroad, while it was suppressed in Germany itself. They formed the bridge from a German humanistic history to a new beginning on the basis of shared values. If there is a continuity of German thought which we can be proud of, we owe it to them. Their support for this Historical Institute gives me hope that its work will bring new and important impulses not only for German and American historians but also for a "successor generation" on both sides of the Atlantic, which tends to neglect or sometimes misinterpret the past. "Whoever closes his eyes to the past becomes blind to the present"—may this Institute raise our awareness and thus contribute to a deeper, more sincere understanding of each other.

In this spirit I wish the German Historical Institute much success on this opening day.

Robert Forster,
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore; Council of the American Historical Association.

The American Historical Association welcomes with immense gratification the founding of a German Historical Institute here in Wash-
ington, D.C. Our national association of historians, the AHA, has encouraged the teaching and writing of history since its founding one hundred and three years ago. For that reason alone the creation of an institute furthering the study of German history would be greeted with pleasure. But there are special reasons in this instance for enthusiasm. German scholarship played a very central role in the professionalization of historical research in this country a century ago. Our indebtedness to our German colleagues is great; the founding of this Institute renews and perpetuates a longstanding academic alliance.

John Higham has written that historians in the United States have passed through three distinct phases of their craft—a Puritan phase, a patrician phase, and a professional one. We entered the third phase as recently as the 1870s. This was the decade when Johns Hopkins University launched the first graduate program in history and when Harvard University transformed its program in history to include graduate training. By 1882 the USA had produced sixteen PhDs in history. In 1884 we founded the American Historical Association. These modest milestones marked the decline of the free-lance historian and the rise of the teacher and research specialist, gradually evolving the professional attributes we associate with one Max Weber—specialization, certification, ranking, and institutionalization—enforced by our peers.

Two American scholars stand out in this initial phase of our professionalization as historians—Herbert Baxter Adams and John Franklin Jameson. Both of these men were deeply influenced by historical scholarship and training in Germany in the last quarter of the 19th century. Herbert Baxter Adams had received his doctoral degree at the University of Heidelberg; his Doktorvater was Johann Bluntschli. As director of historical studies at Johns Hopkins and then as secretary of the American Historical Association in the 1880s and 1890s, Adams probably did more than any other historian to Germanize American historical scholarship. By Germanize Adams meant even more than meticulous thoroughness in the selection and use of the sources, the development of the tools of research from languages to paleography, and judicious generalizations. Adams believed in the historian as the conscience of a country or as the guardian of a culture. He dedicated much of his professional career to promoting history with the public powers, appealing especially to the US Congress. But in this Adams met with little success. Unlike most European governments, ours was unwilling to spend public funds for historical research or even to preserve historical materials. President Theodore Roosevelt, an amateur historian himself, had little sympathy for what he called "the conscientious, industrious, painstaking little pedants." Yet Adams persisted and met with greater success at the state level.
John Franklin Jameson was too poor to go to Germany for his graduate work, but his dedication to German historical training was equally strong. Earning his PhD at Johns Hopkins in 1882, Jameson became President of the AHA at only forty-eight. Unlike Adams, Jameson abhorred the scholar-promoter, and devoted much of his long career to making sources available to historians. His great ideal was the Monuntenta Germaniae Historica and he published an annual bibliography of Writings on American History from 1903 to 1928 and, like Adams, persistently petitioned Congress to centralize the management of the nation's archives. He lived to see the creation of the National Archives in 1934.

In 1987, as we commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Jameson's death, it is hard to realize that before the professionalization of history in the U.S.A., we had little sense of "scientific history," of the importance of immersion in the sources, of selectivity and accuracy in their use, and of balance and judiciousness in their deployment in historical writing. What scholarly maturity we have gained since those fledgling days a century ago, we owe in no small part to the example of our German colleagues. And they continue to serve us today as we celebrate the founding of a German Historical Institute in our nation's capital.

Konrad H. Jarausch,
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Executive Secretary of the Conference Group for Central European History.

The significance of this ceremony for the scholarly community in Germany and the US might best be illustrated by a short anecdote. Over ten years ago I chatted with one of the leading German specialists in American history in some faceless convention hotel about the difficulties of our mutual work: While he was trying to explain America to Germans, I was struggling to make sense of Germany for Americans. While he was sometimes laboring before uninterested or even anti-American youths, I was fighting profound ignorance and occasionally anti-German prejudice. While he often felt his scholarship ignored by tongue-tied American colleagues, I sometimes thought my own research insufficiently appreciated by continental Ordinarien. In short, striving for the same aim of increasing academic understanding between Germans and Americans, we faced exactly the same difficulties, only mirror-reversed. Repeated dozens of times by other colleagues, this ironic realization has inspired the creation of