The Kingdom of Württemberg and the Making of Germany, 1815-1871.

Bodie Alexander Ashton School of History and Politics Discipline of History The University of Adelaide

Submitted for the postgraduate qualification of Doctor of Philosophy (History)

May 2014

For Kevin and Ric; and for June, Malcolm and Kristian.

Contents

Abstract	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
List of Abbreviations	xi
Notes	xiii
Introduction	15
Chapter 1 States and Nation in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century	35
Chapter 2 Stuttgart and Vienna before 1848	67
Chapter 3 The Kingdom of Württemberg and Early Kleindeutschland	93
Chapter 4 Independence and South German Particularism, 1815-1848	123
Chapter 5 The Years of Prophecy and Change, 1848-1849	159
Chapter 6 Counterrevolution, Reaction and Reappraisals, 1850-1859	181
Chapter 7 Six Years of Autumn: 1860-1866	207
Chapter 8 The Unification of Germany, 1866-1871	251
Conclusion	295
Bibliography	305

ABSTRACT

_

THE TRADITIONAL DISCOURSE of the German unification maintains that it was the German great powers - Austria and Prussia - that controlled German destiny, yet for much of this period Germany was divided into some thirty-eight states, each of which possessed their own institutions and traditions. In explaining the formation of Germany, the orthodox view holds that these so-called *Mittel*- and *Kleinstaaten* existed largely at the whim of either Vienna or Berlin, and their policies, in turn, were dictated or shaped by these two power centres. According to this reading of German history, a bipolar sociopolitical structure existed, whereby the *Mittelstaaten* would declare their allegiances to either the Habsburg or Hohenzollern crowns.

The present work rejects this model of German history, through the use of the case study of the southwestern Kingdom of Württemberg. It demonstrates that Württemberg's state government was dynamic and fully in control of its own policy-making throughout most of the nineteenth century. While it did often align itself with Vienna, it did so for pragmatic reasons of self interest; sometimes, it would forsake that alignment in favour of ties with Prussia, or its neighbouring *Mittelstaaten*, or even France, if it felt that such ties were in the state's best interests. Keenly involved in the national question, successive governments and monarchs in Stuttgart manoeuvred the country so as to gain the greatest advantage. These manoeuvres included decades-long attempts by Stuttgart, in conjunction with state ministers in Munich, Karlsruhe, Darmstadt, and sometimes Dresden, Kassel, and Hanover, to unite the smaller German states to form a southern 'bloc' (the so-called 'Third Germany') against the aspirations of Austrian or Prussian hegemony in the German hinterland.

This thesis demonstrates that the shape of German unification was not inevitable, and was in fact to a great extent driven by the particularist desires of the *Mittelstaaten*, rather than the great powers. The eventual *Reichsgründung* of January 1871 was merely the final step in a long series of negotiations, diplomatic manoeuvres, and subterfuge, with Württemberg playing a vital, regional role.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

_

THIS THESIS WAS undertaken at the University of Adelaide, and I wish to acknowledge the assistance of the staff and academics in the School of History and Politics of that institution. I would like to single out the late Associate Professor Fredric S. Zuckermann, who was my principal supervisor when I began, and was always the source of greatest academic inspiration, throughout my undergraduate as well as my postgraduate years. Ric is deeply missed by all of us. I cannot express enough thanks for the support of my complete supervisory panel of Professor Robin Prior and Doctor Gareth Pritchard; sitting in an ancient chair, drinking coffee and chatting with Robin about any manner of subjects (both related to the thesis and otherwise) has been one of the most memorable experiences of this candidature, and any student would be lucky to have either of these excellent historians as a supervisor. The support of a succession of postgraduate coordinators and heads of discipline (including, but not limited to, Tom Buchanan, Lisa Mansfield, Claire Walker, Rob Foster, and Vesna Drapac), not to mention the School manager, Greta Larsen, is also greatly appreciated. I would also like to thank the staff at the Barr Smith Library, particularly Margaret Hosking, Maria Albanese and Margaret Galbraith, for their almost superhuman efforts to supply me with hard-to-find books and resources, and for somehow keeping me out of trouble with my overdue loans.

The archival research would have been heavily curtailed if it wasn't for the financial assistance that came from two grants: one, supplied by the Bupa Group in conjunction with the University of Adelaide's Development and Alumni department, and another, which was awarded by the (surprisingly unisex) Australian Federation of University Women (South Australia). Once in Germany, research was conducted at several archives. The assistance provided by many of the archival staff was prodigious. In particular, I would like to give my greatest thanks to the following: Dr. Gerhard Keiper of the *Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts*, Dr. Ulrich Kober of the *Geheime Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz*, Franz Göttlicher from the *Bundesarchiv* (all in Berlin); Dr. Thomas Fritz, Judith Bolsinger, Anja Stefanidis, Johannes Renz, Irene Kremser, and *Archivdirektorin* Dr. Nicole Bickhoff, all from the *Hauptstaatsarchiv* Stuttgart; Dr. Klaus-Dieter Rack of the *Hessisches Staatsarchiv* Darmstadt; and Karla Rommel of the *Stadtarchiv* Esslingen.

I can only express my profoundest gratitude to all my family, particularly my parents, who have given an enormous amount of time, effort and support. This work would never have been possible without them, and I owe them a debt I can never repay. In Germany, I was accompanied by my wonderful travelling companions, Kristian Ashton, Courtney Jameson and Ralph Edele. I have also benefitted from some truly extraordinary friends and colleagues who have willingly become a veritable army of proofreaders. In particularly, I'd like to single out the efforts of Kylie Galbraith, Daniel Ashdown, Hilary Jane Locke, Thomas A. Mackay, William Prescott, Justin Madden, Matilda Handsley-Davis and Kyrie Fuss. Each of these is a fine historian in his or her own right, and I dearly hope I have the opportunity to return the favour one day. Needless to say, any errors in this document are produced in spite of their best efforts. As any Ph.D. student knows, writing can be a fairly itinerant process, and I would like to offer my thanks in particular to Daniel Freer and Ian Callahan, who always provided a great and comfortable writing environment away from my office (whether they realised that that's what they were doing or not!)

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Tosca, Miranda, Phoebe, Tomsk and Holunderle, all of whom decided at various points during the thesis-writing process that I'd *far* prefer to tickle their tummies than type another few thousand words.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

_

BArch. Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, Berlin

fl. Gulden or Florin; Württemberg unit of currency

FO Foreign Office, London

GStAPK. Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin

GlaB. Generallandesarchiv Baden, Karlsruhe

Hes.StAD. Hessisches Staatsarchiv Darmstadt, Darmstadt

PAdAA. Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts, Berlin

StadtAE. Stadtarchiv Esslingen, Esslingen

WVLG. Württembergische Vierteljahrshefte für Landesgeschichte

(en. Württemberg Quarterly Journal of State History)

ZWLG. Zeitschrift für Württembergische Landesgeschichte

(en. Journal of Württemberg State History)

DECLARATION

_

I CERTIFY THAT this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution in my name and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Notes

_

GERMAN IS A logical and relatively easy language to learn, speak, and write. It is, however, not as easy to integrate it into an English-language thesis. Adjectives change their suffixes depending on what grammatical case the sentence takes. For example, the newspaper *Schwäbischer Merkur* could, in fact, be written as *Schwäbischen Merkur* or *Schwäbischem Merkur*, depending on whether it appears as the subject, direct object, or indirect object in a sentence. If preceded by its definite article (*der*), it would also be written as *der Schwäbische Merkur*. This, naturally, can become confusing, since the bulk of this text is written in English. For the ease of reading, this thesis will display such titles, regardless of what position they appear in a sentence or whether they are preceded by a definite article, as though they are in nominative case without article. Hence, *Schwäbischer Merkur*, *Württembergisches Heer*, or *Schwäbische Kronik*.

Where possible, footnote references and index entries include the noble rank held by many of the prominent figures in the story of the German unification. So, for example, Karl von Varnbüler will be referred to as a baron (*Freiherr*). In a very few cases, however, some ranks change over the course of the years studied. Otto von Bismarck, for instance, was at various points a count (*Graf*), a duke (*Herzog*), and a non-hereditary prince (*Fürst*). For ease of reference, instead of constantly altering Bismarck's title, he is referred to throughout this work as a count, as this is the rank he held throughout the majority of his time in power that is pertinent to this work (1865-1871). Similarly, while his surname was technically "Bismarck-Schönhausen", the Prussian chancellor is almost universally known as "Bismarck"; this is also reflected in footnotes. Kings, regents, princes, and dukes are listed under dynastic surnames. Hence, Grand Duke Leopold of Baden is listed under "Zähringen", while the Prussian kings appear under the name "Hohenzollern."

This work also uses a number of contemporary newspaper sources. In many cases, presumably depending on the copy editor or journalists working on a given day, title formats and other details often altered on an issue-by-issue basis. Thus, the Württemberg newspaper whose title translates as "State Gazette" appears within the same year, month or week, as Staats-Anzeiger für Württemberg, Staatsanzeiger für Württemberg, or, simply, Staats-Anzeiger or Staatsanzeiger. Sometimes, the issue number is listed along with the date. Other times, it is not. For the purposes of clarity, this work will commonly refer to this particular paper as the Staats-Anzeiger für Württemberg, regardless of the titular flourish of that particular issue. Otherwise, details will be provided when they are available. Therefore, if the masthead included an issue number, that will be listed in the footnotes. If the issue number was absent, it will similarly be absent from the footnotes. Otherwise, spellings appear as they do in the original source. Hence, the German word 'defence' (Verteidigung in modern German spelling) may be rendered in the archaic Vertheidigung, just as Rat (advice, or council) may appear as Rath.