

strongest supporter of the democratic republic, heavy industry was its most dangerous opponent. At least some leaders of the Ruhr industry went even beyond the limits of legality in this opposition: in 1926, the Prussian police detected a conspiracy of industrialists aiming at the violent overthrow of the republican government.<sup>1</sup> When the majority of the Ruhr industrialists turned to the Nazi party during the depression, they did not establish any new goals or revamp their relationship to labor: they merely changed weapons.

Heavy industry, of course, had its internal dissensions. Stinnes, at times, was more moderate than some of the others, and the same was even more consistently true of Paul Silverberg, the king of lignite and electric power. On the other hand, Paul Reusch and, of course, Fritz Thyssen belonged to the intransigents. But German heavy industry was a sufficiently coherent sociological entity to achieve essential unity of action—most of the time. It should be noted, however, that only producers of coal and steel belonged to this sociological group. Independent machine manufacturers (especially those of machine tools) played an entirely different political role: they were the most progressive wing of German industry, and their influence within the Union of German Employers' Associations (*Vereinigung deutscher Arbeitgeberverbände*) prevented for a number of years the breakdown of the machinery for the control of industrial warfare. Heavy industry belonged only nominally to the *Vereinigung*: it had its own agency for handling labor matters, the Northwest Employers' Group.

I am aware that Mr. Hallgarten's remark about political collaboration between heavy industry and organized labor represents merely a brief passage in his interesting and informative article. But if this *obiter dictum* had to be accepted, the course of political and economic events in the Weimar Republic would become unintelligible. Therefore I think it necessary to register dissent.

CARL LANDAUER, *Berkeley, California*

#### COMMENTS ON MR. LANDAUER'S LETTER

I appreciate Mr. Landauer's interesting remarks and do not see any basic difference between his interpretation of this particular problem and the one I would give. The expression "political co-operation"—I nowhere employed the term "collaboration"—which I used in one instance with reference to the relationship between heavy industry and trade unions was neither meant to deny the involuntary character of this co-operation (the co-operation resulted from Germany's defeat in the First World War) nor the existence of the cleavages and fights between the two elements in question, inherent in all such relations. By using the term "political" I meant that the  *motive* for, not the nature of, the co-operation was political. Besides, the passage quoted by Mr. Landauer is contained in part I of my article which, as stated in footnote 1, is only a summary of the nonprinted first half of my manuscript. Thus, my opinion on this particular point might have

<sup>1</sup> See the memoirs of the prime minister of Prussia at the time: Otto Braun, *Von Weimar zu Hitler* (Hamburg: Hammonia, 1949), p. 99.

become slightly blurred through abridgment. In the original, there is a lengthy passage running along the line of Mr. Landauer's thoughts.

There is still one specific point in Mr. Landauer's letter, however, which I believe calls for comment; that is, his remark that my timetable concerning that co-operation should be reversed. The facts are that this co-operation started in October 1918, a few weeks before the German Revolution of November 8 which led to a series of street fights and to the assassination of Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg on January 15, 1919. During this period, the co-operation was temporarily offset by the industrialists' backing the Fascist forerunner Stadler. Resumed in full after these events, it lasted, in an organizational form, until March 1924, and in the form of collective bargaining to the end of the Republic. Thus, using the yardstick of time, I think I would be fully justified in saying that there was more co-operation *after* than *before* the street fights—but I did not even say that. There is no question that the co-operation of October–November 1918 which resulted from panic on both sides was more intense than that of the later period, but I did not deny this nor would I. In concluding, it gives me pleasure to see that, with the exception of this minor question which I hope is herewith cleared up, Mr. Landauer finds my article interesting and informative.

GEORGE W. F. HALLGARTEN, *Washington, D.C.*