President Bush made this statement in regard to the Vietnam War, but it might equally serve as an epigraph for the "historikerstreit," the historian's dispute, that erupted in Germany in 1986. The memory in question is the Holocaust, and more generally the Nazi period, and the dispute concerns how both scholars and the general public can come to terms with these aspects of Germany's past.

The historian's dispute is a complex and ill-defined subject, but at the risk of great oversimplification, its outlines are as follows: Conservative scholars such as Ernst Nolte and Michael Sturmer argue that the time has come to put the Holocaust and the entire Nazi period in a new perspective. Nolte suggests that the Holocaust must be compared to other cases of genocide, and in particular it must be linked to Soviet atrocities, which triggered a German reaction. "Auschwitz," Nolte writes, "is not primarily a result of traditional anti-semitism . . . It was the fear-bourne reaction to the acts of annihilation that took place during the Russian Revolution." Sturmer is concerned that an obsessive focus on the Nazi past, especially by left-wing scholars, has robbed Germans of their historical consciousness and national identity. The leading voice in the liberal opposition to these new perspectives is the philosopher Jurgen Habermas. Habermas argues that Holte and Sturmer are in fact seeking to recreate a chauvinistic German nationalism that will undermine the democratic gains of the post-war period.

*Forever in the Shadow of Hitler?* includes 42 original documents of the Historikerstreit, plus five additional notes. The authors include Nolte, Sturmer, and Habermas, as well as Christian Meier, Klaus Hildebrand, Joachim Fest, Eberhard Jackel, and others. The documents are drawn from newspapers and magazines, as well as texts of speeches given in various contexts.

The historian's dispute raises a number of fundamental questions about history in general and German history in particular. It has forced historians to look anew at the Nazi period, and to consider questions of the origins and the uniqueness of the Holocaust. The intense debate also opens fresh perspectives on post-war Germany, suggesting new ways of thinking about politics and culture and the politics of culture in the Federal Republic. And, not the least important, the Historikerstreit raises crucial (but often ignored) questions about the nature of historical knowledge, the role of comparisons in historical thinking, and the relationships between ideology and scholarship.

The Historikerstreit is therefore an excellent tool for encouraging critical thinking about the nature and meaning of history. But the collection translated by James Knowlton and Truett Cates, while a valuable source of documents, poses several problems as a textbook. There is no introduction, and the only notes are those in the original articles. Furthermore, the contributors are not identified in any way. Thus, students will have no context within which to understand the articles, unless extensive class time is devoted to presenting background material. The articles are arranged in chronological order; while this does allow the reader to see the evolution of the debate, it also makes it more difficult to see connections and overall patterns.

*Forever in the Shadow of Hitler?* needs to be read in conjunction with an analysis of the Historikerstreit such as Charles S. Maier's excellent *The Unmasterable Past* (Cambridge:
Harvard University Press, 1988). Maier's book provides both context and concepts for understanding the documents in Knowlton and Cates. The two together would be good choices for courses on post-war Germany or on the philosophy and methods of history. While neither is suitable for lower-level or survey courses, they should prove valuable reference works for instructors in modern German history and for serious students seeking insights into the current state of historical thinking in Germany.

William B. Breuer, the author of seventeen books on World War II, is a veteran of the first assault waves to land in Normandy on June 6, 1944. His Hoodwinking Hitler is a popular account of the espionage activities surrounding D-Day, and especially the Allied efforts to deceive the Nazi high command about the timing and location of the invasion.

Breuer is an enthusiastic writer with a good ear for colorful anecdotes, and Hoodwinking Hitler is highly readable. But this is familiar ground, covered by many other writers, and Breuer has little new to add. There is no effort at analysis and no attempt to place the events described in any larger context. Hoodwinking Hitler would make a good gift for the World War II "buff" but has little or no use in the classroom or on course reading lists.
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It is commonplace to mark the late eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century as a momentous epoch in the north Atlantic world. Profound demographic, intellectual, and political changes, accompanied by the onset of the Industrial Revolution, engendered the most fundamental socio-economic changes since the development of agriculture more than ten thousand years earlier. In a variety of ways the old order would persevere for decades, in some instances even two or three generations. But traditional society was henceforth on the defensive, fighting a losing battle to maintain accustomed ideological, political, and economic structures. Of course the impact of the changes on the traditional tableaux was complex and varied: For example, elites often invested in new economic enterprises while attempting to maintain their place in the traditional ideological and political foundations of the "old order;" laborers were glad to proclaim their emancipation from the "eternal" deferential society, as they struggled against capitalist enterprise to preserve the "moral economy" of a pre-industrial society.

Pat Hudson's Industrial Revolution examines the present-day historiographical controversies associated with these and many other developments during the extraordinary epoch. Limiting his work to Britain, and then almost exclusively to England from the 1760s to the 1830s, Hudson argues that, although far from complete, England experienced a definitive break from traditional society.

Hudson's "Industrial Revolution" is broadly defined, much in the way American scholars often apply the term "modernization" to explain the interrelated economic, social, political, and ideological phenomena of the era. He argues that the industrial revolution can be understood only in the context of an integration of "social and economic conditions" originating in a deep-rooted historical process unique to Western Europe, and particularly England, that "gathered a particular momentum in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries."


Throughout this work, the reader is treated to lucid discussion of differing scholarly interpretations of the above issues, as well as numerous subsidiary themes within each of those