

Aus: Rainer Hudemann unter Mitarbeit von Marcus Hahn, Gerhild Krebs und Johannes Großmann (Hg.), *Stätten grenzüberschreitender Erinnerung – Spuren der Vernetzung des Saar-Lor-Lux-Raumes im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Lieux de la mémoire transfrontalière – Traces et réseaux dans l'espace Sarre-Lor-Lux aux 19e et 20e siècles, Saarbrücken 2002, 3., technisch überarbeitete Auflage 2009. Publiziert als CD-ROM sowie im Internet unter www.memotransfront.uni-saarland.de.*

Rainer Hudemann (translation: Andrea Caspari, Princeton)

Saar-Lor-Lux: Linkages in a European Core Region

1. Foundations for linkages in a region rich in conflict

The Saar-Lor-Lux region has for several decades asserted the claim to be a pioneer in terms of cross-border linkages in Europe. This is precisely because borders here have, over the last two centuries, repeatedly functioned as particularly sharp lines of demarcation. The fact that these borders were shifted again and again was the cause of conflicts that were all the more acute. At the same time, however, through the years they also gave rise to diverse processes of cultural layering and the creation of linkages, some of which illustrate more general regional interactions in Europe.

The term “Saar-Lor-Lux” was only coined at the end of the 1960s. Given the wars and occupations in this border region over the course of the last two centuries, many observers considered the term a politically generated, artificial construct. This term has since become a slogan that has proved to be a useful and innovative political tool. This is evident also in the expansion of its use and the current inclusion in the term of, variously, Westphalia, Northern Alsace, Wallonia, the Trier Region or the entire Federal State of the Rhine Palatinate, depending on the political context. In accordance with the framework of the EU's Interreg projects, the context within which this presentation evolved, we will concentrate on the core composed of the Lorraine region, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, and the Federal State of the Saarland, with occasional forays into neighbouring regions.

Yet the key phrase “Saar-Lor-Lux” is not an artificial creation that describes a new state of affairs. One does not even need to go back as far as medieval “Lotharingia” with its central position at the heart of Europe as proof of this. Since the French Revolution, conflict and co-operation have given rise to a great variety of new cross-border structures. These are the object of our enquiry. Some of these are today firmly established in the general consciousness, many are not. Within this area, perceptions are very varied – national, regional and interregional structures are also superimposed within the different and sometimes contradictory perspectives and expressions of memory.

Such are the traces explored here. The thread being followed in this research is the architectural objects – topographical, tangible, visible traces which reflect cooperation and contrasts, neighbourliness, friendship and tensions. These include traces which are closely tied to the recollection of suffering as well as to the recollection of achievements. Above all, however, these are traces whose cross-border dimension is less apparent without an in-depth knowledge of the historical background. It is precisely these traces which are today frequently buried in the depths of “collective memory”. This is why, in choosing objects for study, an emphasis has been put on these. Even though the structures of the regions which together constitute the Saar-Lor-Lux triangle have historically developed in very different ways, they can be used to demonstrate basic arrangements for processes of cross-border demarcation and linkage.

1.1 Shifting borders in the German-French border region

Many sites of cross-border memory have actually grown out of contacts and conflicts across borders, while others are the result of the multiple shifting of borders that occurred in the region. In the course of the Coalition Wars after 1792, the left bank of the Rhine was initially occupied by French Revolutionary troops and annexed in the Peace of Lunéville in 1801. In the peace treaties of 1814 and 1815, the Saar region – Saarbrücken only in 1815 – went to Bavaria and Prussia. The annexation of Alsace Lorraine by the German Reich followed in 1871, and the return of both regions to France in 1918. At the same time, the Saargebiet (Saar Territory) was created, which in turn came under the international mandate of the

League of Nations, with a predominant French role, until 1935. In that year, the first Saar referendum restored the Saar – rebaptised as the Saarland – to Germany, which had meanwhile become the Third Reich. A new French occupation followed in 1945, which was changed to an economic union with a limited and unclearly defined political autonomy in 1947. The second Saar referendum, in 1955, laid the basis for the final political and economic reintegration of the Saar to the Federal Republic in 1957/59.

1.2 Luxembourg: a sovereign state amidst European linkages

In the nation state of Luxembourg, the context for cross-border influences is different from that of Lorraine or the Saar; these influences are less well known and will therefore be described here in somewhat greater detail.

In the 19th century, the century of the formation of nation states in Europe, the process of nation building became a central part of Luxembourg's position as the interface of Europe: the adoption, whether deliberate or not, of other countries' models became a significant part of what finally became valued in the country itself as an expression of its own identity in the 20th century. These interwoven layers of influences are still in evidence today at various levels, from the education system to the judicial system and from the external morphology and inner structure of the cities to economic ties; their greater or lesser capacity to have this impact depends on the country's specific development patterns.

The old aristocratic ruling class had largely died out in Luxembourg in the 18th century, or had moved the core of their professional and private lives to other countries. These patterns of behaviour, even though they resembled those which were typical of the aristocracy at the beginning of modern times, were already a manifestation of the country's diverse ties, which then became international ones in the 19th century. Thus, the formation of the elites in the newly developing nation state also proceeded under different conditions than those in many other countries in Europe. The conflict or even partial cooperation between the rising middle class and the old elites, which was in some countries a dynamic element in the process of nation-building, played a different and less fundamental role in Luxembourg. There, the bourgeoisie had to develop in a more independent fashion.

Because it had been under foreign rule for centuries, especially that of the Habsburg Netherlands under Spain and then Austria, it could only make reference to its own specific traditions to a limited degree. There were few of those conflicts, such as the wars of liberation against Napoleon in Germany or the struggle against Habsburg in Italy, which acted as catalysts of national consciousness; towards the end of the Ancien Regime, the Luxembourg aristocracy still counted among the Habsburg crown's most loyal supporters despite its strong differences with the crown which had continued throughout the whole 18th century. Conflicts with rulers who were perceived at the time or retrospectively as foreign took a different and distinctive form.

Especially complex, multi-layered forms of influences developed from this in the 19th century, influences which, for the most part, did not become genuinely "foreign" until the period of the formation of the nation state between 1815 and 1839:

- the old traditions of a France-oriented culture among the upper class until the 18th century;
- the traditions of the Spanish and then, after 1714, Austrian Netherlands, after the French occupation of 1684–1698 and the rule of Philip of Anjou from 1700–1711, as well as the Bavarian interlude from 1711–1714;
- the revival and reinforcement of French influence, with lasting and long-term structural effects, accompanying the revolutionary annexation in 1795 and under the influence of Napoleonic institutions in the Département des Forêts until 1814 – Institutions which were in some cases identical to those introduced in what was to become Belgium;
- the renewed ties to the Netherlands of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, newly created in the Vienna Congress of 1815 with a personal link to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and which at the same

time, as a member of the German Confederation, was strongly influenced by the processes underlying the formation of the nascent German nation state;

- the beginning of independence, in a kind of limited sovereignty, with the partition, along the linguistic border, of the Province of Luxembourg between Belgium and the Netherlands, after the Belgian Revolution of 1830 – an autonomy as the personal Grand Duchy of the House of Orange-Nassau, which was however only implemented in 1839, and which, in retrospect, can be considered the year of the beginning of the nation state;
- the economic upswing following the entry to the Customs Union in 1842, the political neutralization of the country after Napoleon III's 1867 attempt – foiled by Prussia – to buy Luxembourg, and the German Reich's taking control of the management of the William-Luxembourg railroad in 1871.

The influences and cultural transfers which resulted from this complex layering of traditions had effects which worked in entirely contradictory ways. Thus, William I of Orange-Nassau's inadequate implementation of the special rights for Luxembourg that had been agreed in 1815, intensified rather than reduced the centuries-old tensions with the Netherlands, but at the same time further consolidated close ties with Belgium. Joining the Customs Union, and the political as well as economic importance of the Reich in Europe after 1871 increased German influence. However, at the same time – and the Prussian and German envoys often complained about this – as an expression of a counter-reaction the new, rising elites, soon followed by large parts of the German-speaking middle and lower classes, turned increasingly towards French culture. This was not an act of political identification, rather an element of "self-assertion" by Luxembourgers. Conscious orientations, like those expressed by the architecture of the Bourbon Plateau, played a role as much as did, for example, the cross-border migrations of servants or artisans.

The reorientation to the Luxembourgish language, which had gained in importance alongside French and German in the second half of the century, represented the growing efforts for the independent development of the new nation at the interface of these diverse spheres of influence. In this process, influences were consciously or subconsciously embraced or rejected, in order to integrate elements of the cultures and traditions of the many countries with which Luxembourg had had political and institutional ties, into what was regarded as a particular, eclectic Luxembourg identity. In this way, in contrast to many other nation states, the search for a connection between the most varied influences became a key element of the process of nation building in Luxembourg.

The First World War, and even more so the Second World War with its *de facto* annexation of Luxembourg by the Third Reich, its incorporation into the Gau Moselland and persecution by the German SS apparatus, led to a more permanent orientation of the country to France than to Germany. Hinzert, the special SS camp near Hermeskeil in the Hunsrueck in which the majority of Luxembourg Resistance fighters were interned, has become a symbol of this resistance. Luxembourg had the highest proportion of Resistance fighters per capita among the occupied countries in Europe. Numerous sites such as the Villa Pauly, Gestapo headquarters in the city of Luxembourg, today bear witness to these experiences.

Nevertheless, several figures eminent in 20th century European domains of economy, culture and politics have embodied the country's position as mediator, which had evolved before the advent of the nation state with its complex web of interactions and effects. One of these, in the interwar period, was Emile Mayrisch, the Director of ARBED, with his ideas of creating cross-border economic cartels and his impressive role as cultural mediator in the German-French Studies Committee, which was moreover largely based on his analysis of the economic interests of the participating countries. Some of his ideas were taken up again after the Second World War by Robert Schuman, who, as French foreign minister, linked the representation of French interests in modernisation with the initiative for a functional, partial European integration in the European Coal and Steel Community. In the 1950s, another important role in European integration was played by Luxembourg's prime minister Joseph Bech. These public figures, who realistically assess nation states' future cross-border perspectives, are an expression of the culture of their country of origin, in which they are not dissimilar from a number of other Lothringians, like Robert Schuman, born near Metz.

1.3 Interregional and international superimpositions

Thus, Lorraine, the Saar region and Luxembourg reflect diverse forms of interactions, the creation of linkages, and cultural layering, derived from cross-border relationships and the shifting of borders. The lines of contact and confrontation which can be observed often mirror national differences. However, the more research on these processes of interference progresses, the clearer it becomes that it is precisely the most complex, and therefore the most interesting, processes that cannot be satisfactorily explained by national categories. One of the key characteristics of the processes of superimposition seems to be that, over the course of years or decades, new, independent forms develop. This can be clearly observed in the example of Luxembourg.

This is even more striking in the Alsace than it is in Lorraine. It provides a great deal of rich and relevant material for the systematic analysis of this phenomenon. It is specifically because of the tension that often exists between border regions and their respective central governments that a reversion to the regional heritage acquires a special political significance and – in often paradoxical ways – sometimes even entails adopting traditions of the “other” side in order to affirm these regions’ own identity. The “droit local” exemplifies this in many ways. In Alsace as in Lorraine this is a combination of German and French elements, for example in church laws, social security legislation or in building regulations. In Luxembourg, it appears that especially the French, Belgian and German influences, themselves sometimes a product of assimilations, which were taken up and blended with each other, in turn became key elements in the building of the nation state. In the case of the urban development of Strasbourg after 1871, which we will not describe in greater detail here, the indigenous population for a long time fought the “Prussian”-seeming new city, even though it was, for its part, not so different from the contemporaneous redevelopment of cities in France, along the lines of Baron Haussmann’s Paris. In Strasbourg at the turn of the century, ideas and arguments were used which had been developed by the movement to protect German patrimony, and which adopted ideas about “aesthetic urban development” – a school of thought developed in Vienna which will be expanded upon under the rubric of “urban development”. To put it another way: the indigenous population of Alsace used German ideas to fight against German ideas and against the “Haussmannisation” under the German government during annexation. The fact that the alternative ideas were derived from German debates was soon forgotten – the ideas became part of the regional heritage. This is evident to this day if you venture into the streets of the Neustadt of Strasbourg. The complexity of the processes of cultural layering is by no means limited to the region we are focusing on here. Rather, we can suppose that we will find similar patterns in other European border regions; the structure of the cities in the Eupen-Malmedy region seems to be a further example of this.

Some cross-border linkages are specific to the Saar-Lor-Lux area, while others reflect an interplay of forces typical in Europe in the 19th and 20th centuries. Thus, the many buildings in this border region which adopted “Historicism” – a style drawing on numerous European architectural traditions – were only following a trend that was already widespread throughout Europe at the end of the 19th century. That said, it was this tendency that strengthened linkages especially in this area. This historicist style assumed different forms that dominate architecture in many respects – up to the buildings which, like the Meder-Haus in Esch-sur-Alzette, specifically attempt to go beyond this Historicism. Certain features of the train stations in Metz and Strasbourg display strong historicist elements, even if in Metz, Romanesque is dominant. Compared with this, the excessive Historicism of the ARBED administrative building, visible also in numerous other buildings in the same residential area on Luxembourg’s Bourbon Plateau, really stands out. This is a fusion of 19th century, European-wide Historicism with the specific characteristics of its border location. Thus, the combination of different stylistic tendencies is not in any way random, as will be demonstrated.

Certain regional patterns can also reflect international influences directly, which can be seen in the modest example of the renovation of the old Hennesbau Mill in the town of Feulen in Luxembourg. Transformed into a cultural center, it is part of the German Bauhaus tradition which Mies Van der Rohe continued to develop in the United States. Ieoh Ming Pei’s Museum of Modern Art in the old fortifications

of Luxembourg combines international design principles with elements that are typical of the region, which have themselves been forged by French, Spanish and Austrian foreign rule since the 17th century.

Likewise, the architecture of the Kirchberg plateau in Luxembourg, as a site at the confluence of cross-border influences which reflects the global trends of the second half of the 20th century, symbolises not the Saar-Lor-Lux area, but Europe. The fact that these public and private European institutions chose to establish themselves in such large numbers in Luxembourg has very much to do with its centuries-old position at the crossroads of Western and Central European influences, which predestined it to become a site and symbol of European cooperation. As such, Kirchberg itself also belongs at the heart of our project's problematic, as an emblem of the international function of this border area.

1.4 Networks and interregional identity

The term "identity", whether regional or local, is seldom used in this exploration. Yet this notion is useful as a tool, insofar as the German and French border regions repeatedly attempted to assert their autonomy in the context of the tensions which set them against their respective national centres. Regional traditions could provide the basis of or reinforcement for this assertion of autonomy. The term is useful also insofar as patterns of behaviour that were subconscious but significant in terms of social history and the development of patterns of thought very soon crossed the region's borders to give rise to shared characteristics, as the example of the structure of workers' migratory movements at the height of industrialisation illustrates.

However, the term is used here only sparingly. Especially when used as a slogan, it threatens to distort the varied and contradictory interpretations of shared or similar experiences in a region, and thereby to conceal rather than reveal the many layers of interferences and processes of demarcation. One of our main objectives is precisely to bring to light this profusion of relationships in all their variety and complexity. In Luxembourg, the diversity of influences has itself actually become an element of identity – but of national identity. Crossing borders, the patterns that remain, in the context of the tensions that set the regions against the national spheres, are different. The examples presented in this study aim to heighten awareness of the problem and to refine the perception of this diversity. In the present stage of our study, we do not wish to go beyond the objectives which we have set ourselves and which consist of delivering partial results for a systematic analysis. These results often raise as many questions as they provisionally answer. From this perspective, the project we present here continues to have the character of a work in progress. It provides us with building blocks for research on regional identity, without aspiring to give a conclusive answer to the question about its origin and development.

The concept of linkages, or "Vernetzungen" in German, proves to be more viable. Our presentation brings to light a multitude of forms of these linkages. These linkages are important components in the development of an identity, a cross-border sense of belonging, while at the same time they testify to an actual belonging together in many domains, even though these may be little noticed.

2. Patterns of interpretation

2.1 "Cross-border memory"

In contrast to usage in scholarly discussions about "lieux de mémoire" in recent years, "places of memory" are understood here in the original, literal sense of sites. The notion of "places" as conceived by Pierre Nora and which Étienne François and Hagen Schulze developed in their huge project "German places of memory", describes all levels of collective memory: from sites, monuments and symbols, to people, gestures, novels, and significant historical events. By contrast, our foray into a core region of Europe is concerned with material, physically identifiable sites of architecture and landscape which manifested and still manifest the imprint of cross border structures and experiences. German allows one to differentiate between the notion of "Stätten" (sites, as material sites) as distinct from the notion of "Orte" (places, a more generic term), which has acquired a somewhat different meaning among historians;

French, which has only one term, does not allow one to make such a fine distinction. “Sites” could be a useful term.

Thus, the scope of this project is at the same time more modest, and more ambitious. More modest in the sense that certain strata of collective memory are left to one side, or simply skimmed over, whereas they constitute an essential part of “places of memory” as understood by Nora. But at the same time more ambitious, because it is a question of breaking away from the national dimension and discovering the visible material traces left by the complex experiences of a representative border region. Even the projects which, prompted by Nora’s research, followed in other countries – like Denmark, the Netherlands, Austria, or in fact Germany – take as their starting point concepts of the nation state, or of national culture, with all the difficulties of definition this entails due to the eventful history of the Continent. Getting beyond these is at the heart of our undertaking and the criteria for selecting the chosen places. The fact that these places are continuously, or at least frequently, in a relationship with the national authorities which is marked by tension is certainly an integral part of this larger dimension.

Memory, in the sense of this project, does not only mean that memory which is present now in the heart of the population and is sometimes consciously recollected for the purposes of commemoration. On the contrary: This presentation aims to improve our ability to discern the variety of ways in which cross border linkages – that is, the conflicts, cooperation, areas of contact and overlap – were and remain visible in the external appearances of places and landscapes. The aim is to contribute to an awareness of the cultural, economic, social and political interconnections in a European core region. Nora correctly indicated that “lieux de mémoire” emerge as “milieux de mémoire” disappear. The tension between still active memory and a new activation of potential memory is also at the heart of our enterprise.

Sites of memory as such and as we understand them, are therefore to be found on three levels:

- Sites where an occurrence took place which was typical of the border area, mostly in specific eras.
- Sites which were consciously intended to epitomise the interactions and contrasts characteristic of their border location, mostly through their architecture.
- Sites on which activities typical of the border location were practiced or which, because of their border location, especially influenced the development of these activities, without this being part of their “programme” and their purpose.

Put another way: Sites here are understood not only as active, living memory but also as testimonies which can, but do not necessarily, become a catalyst for active commemoration. Forgetting is an integral part of the whole complex of memory. Forgetting can reflect the transformation of modes of memory. Deliberate forgetting, especially in an area with such a history of conflict, can also be a tool for differentiating oneself from the other, and as such can truly represent the many levels of tension between partners or groups, whatever their composition.

In many places, memory and recollection can only be activated when one knows how to “decode” these places. It is rare to be able to understand the cross-border references of the outer appearances of the cities or the workers’ housing estates in the border area as readily as one can grasp this significance in the case of a war memorial; at least doing so assumes a knowledge of the relatively complex contexts of urban development or the history of housing in Europe. The examples presented here should prompt us to discover these traces and heighten our ability to perceive the many, often hidden dimensions of the external appearances in the region.

It is only seemingly that war memorials disclose their meaning “spontaneously” – as is also the case with many other memorials. This has been widely researched in recent years within a national framework, as well as in a comparative German-French one by Charlotte Tacke. In cross border areas, however, additional dimensions must be taken into account. It seems obvious that war memorials make reference to cross border conflicts. Yet their meaning can be complicated, especially in a border area. The poignancy of the inscription “Aux enfants de...” on war memorials in so many places in Lorraine is

revealed not on the monument itself, but only when we know that the dead fought on opposing sides and that therefore their memory cannot be jointly evoked with the collective term “Morts pour la patrie”. The wrathful “German” warrior at the main train station in Metz can be interpreted as “German” aggressor or “French” defender. If one knows this Roland statue’s history since 1908, one can go beyond this and see it as an expression of the interplay of the different, overlapping interpretations and experiences and the shifts of powers in the region. Ambivalence rests even in apparently simple and “easy to read” monuments everywhere; for their part, these are a direct expression of the multilayered nature of existence in this so often fought-over country, which has, at the same time, kept evolving in a role as mediator. Freddy Raphael, in a somewhat different context, coined the term “*mémoire plurielle de l’Alsace*”: He hit the mark in terms of our problematic.

Memory is subject to constant change. Objects and places can hold very different meanings at different times, and also at the same time in the eyes of different groups, especially national groups. The ideological interpretations of the form of German and Lorraine farm buildings after 1918 developed in ways that were radically opposed to each other. The Metz railway station remained a symbol of German annexation between 1871 and 1918 for most long-time inhabitants of Metz for almost a century; whereas for many “*Alt Deutsche*”, Germans from inside the Reich who had established themselves in these territories before the First World War, this centre of regional modernisation symbolised a historical affinity, rich in traditions, with Lorraine. In the historicisation encouraged by the French in their maintenance of monuments since about 1980, it became transformed into a symbol of the reciprocity of French-German influences. It was precisely when they were lived as antagonistic, that certain patterns of memory, including the refusal to remember, carried heavy emotional baggage.

2.2 The search for categories of sites of memory

In collecting material for this project, the first step was to identify places that reflected cross-border situations. The nine chapters of this presentation are not organised along theoretical lines, but around functional categories linked to the former or present use or purpose of sites which can be traced today, on the ground in everyday life.

By way of introduction, however, we will try to identify elements of a typology to apply to the variety of objects being studied.

As this project seeks to free itself from the national context within which most studies of “*lieux de mémoire*” have been situated until now, we are entering new territory; many of the terms and categories of the intensive scholarly discussions of recent years have no traction here, as their questions are posed within different frames of reference.

Among the categories proposed by younger researchers, the classification of places of memory (“*Erinnerungsorte*”) suggested by Aleida Assmann proves useful for our purposes. We will explore its feasibility and heuristic usefulness for our enquiry. As we do not, for the most part, share Assmann’s framework for enquiry, we will extrapolate and deviate somewhat from her definitions in the interests of terminologies adapted to our specific topic; our aim is not to adopt her system entirely but to structure our material with its help.

- Generational places are those which could and can anchor the individual memory of a family over long periods, encompassing several generations; these are rare in our research. On the contrary, cross-border memories or fragments of memory are more likely to be related to migrations, to voluntary or forced moves, or even to expulsion or evacuation as was the case in 1871, 1919 and several times during the Second World War. If we extend Assmann’s definition of a place of family life, in the economic domain this would for example apply to the old glass-making tradition of the Raspiller family, which was obliged to move many times for economic reasons. This applies also to the diversification of the location of enterprises, in which an enterprise’s headquarters did not necessarily stay in one place over the long term, and in the context of which the memory transmitted from generation to generation was sometimes anchored in different places or in several places at the

same time. The reasons for this were mostly the growth of a business or a reaching for new opportunities, for example in Stumm's move from the Hunsrück to the Saar. The shifting of borders, such as that which occurred between Germany and France in 1871, and the de facto annexations as in 1940 could also entail a change of nation while in the same place. The industrial dynasty of Wendel was especially marked by this phenomenon. By contrast, a generational memory can be found in the same place among workers' families to the extent that, over several generations, many of them found work in the same enterprise – this is only a “cross-border” memory where borders have been shifted; as a rule, it is tied to working life in one place.

- Sacred places, which are described here under the rubric of sacred architecture, have for a long time belonged to sites in which national borders play a relatively small role. This has not always been the case, as is evident in the 1933 pilgrimage to the Holy Coat of Trier (“Heilig Rock”), orchestrated as a national gathering place on the eve of the 1935 Saar referendum. But it has often been the case if one considers less politicized pilgrimages, or observes what could be called the multipurpose development of a site such as Oranna/Berus from a medieval pilgrimage destination, to the nationalistic Hindenburg Tower of the inter-war period, and to a monument to Europe in the post-war period.
- Places of commemoration (“Gedenkorte”) are, it seems initially, closest to the framework of our enquiry. While generational places embody a continuity of life and experience in one place, these are, by contrast, the expression of the rupture of a tradition, which has turned to stone as a relic or newly created memorial in this place and which does not live on of itself, according to Assmann. It has to be brought to life by language, by story-telling and by explaining past experiences. Thus, places of commemoration capture only a part, and a small part at that, of the traces of cross-border memory as understood in our enquiry. In another sense, however, a reference back to these traditions can bring to light structures which people are not conscious of in the present, and thereby make them real for the first time, or strengthen them. Assmann distinguishes between graves in which the dead remain present, and places of recollection (“Gedächtnisorte”) in which former actions are absent. Graves belong to our sites. Regarding the patterns/systematisation of cross border linkages, the distinction between graves and places of recollection is however less productive. We will therefore include graves among the places of recollection.
- Places of commemoration become ruins when they are removed from their proper environment and remain as relics without context “in a world become foreign”, as Aleida Assman says. In this view, whether a place is assessed as a ruin or as a commemorative site is in the eye of the beholder. The “Neue Bremm” Gestapo camp was for decades a forgotten – or “to be forgotten” – “ruin” in the collective consciousness of the Saar, whereas it was a place of commemoration for the former prisoners, their families and friends and the representatives of the victims. Factory buildings which are in a state of collapse such as the glass works of Fenne are well on their way to becoming ruins, but perhaps they will, by dint of a little information, become part of the consciousness of tradition.
- There is no lack of traumatic places in this region – and therefore of sites in which, in the view of many, memory should not be revived. Again, this can lead to different perceptions, depending on the group. Places can be centres of memory for some and not play any role at all for others. This happened in the case of the “Neue Bremm” Gestapo camp between the end of the war and the late 1970s, and it remains very difficult to find a “valid” shape for this as a place of commemoration. The victims naturally deal with such a trauma in a completely different way than the perpetrators – although we are using terms here which do not do justice to the complexity of the reality of the camps under National Socialism. There are numerous sites of National Socialist domination and terror in Lorraine and Luxemburg, from the Gestapo headquarters in the Villa Pauly in Luxemburg to the special SS camp in the Fort Queleu fortress in Metz. And yet the difficulties in dealing with the heritage of this region, which was so influenced by shifting borders, are not limited to the National Socialist period. Even now, the former Meisenthal glass works in the Pays de Bitche and the Art

Nouveau of the École de Nancy reflect the trauma of the reintegration of Lorraine in 1918: it was only in 1999, in a centenary exhibition showcasing this center of French Art Nouveau, that it was possible to show that a significant part of the work of one of the most important Art Nouveau artists in Nancy, Émile Gallé, had been produced in the then “German” Meisenthal. For one hundred years, there had been silence about this. Only then could an active memory, re-fashioned by French-German cooperation, be carried into the old sites of production in the Pays de Bitche. Thus, trauma hides also itself – or becomes apparent – in places in which it is not obvious that one would expect it. The dominant memory of the National Socialist era can conceal other traumas which continue to smoulder under the surface and resurface as topical decades later, albeit in circumstances that have fundamentally changed.

Assmann’s categories – somewhat expanded – allow us to systematise numerous problems associated with our selection of objects. However, some places which are characterised by these cross-border linkages and contrasts go beyond these categories. The concept of traces allows us to pin-point further categories which partly overlap with the above named categories, but which also open new perspectives.

- Traces of cross-linkage encompass many objects which might at first glance seem far removed from categories of conscious recollection. These are especially evident, for example, in the wide field of urban development and architectural concepts as well as workers’ housing estates.
- Traces of the crossing of borders are distinct from traces of cross-linkage in that they reflect an active desire to cross the border and are subject to a process of control.

The types of classification suggested here relate to the objects of this presentation because, depending on the era, the framing of the questions, and the observer’s perspective, different categories can apply to the same objects. Here, once more, the variety and complexity of this area which we want to demonstrate becomes manifest.

2.3 Factors that play a role in cross-border linkages

The variety of patterns of remembering and forgetting derives from the complexity of the configurations of cross-border linkages, whose foundations are summarised by theme and outlined here:

1. National patterns: It is not only national categories that dominate “collective memory” and the processes of the creation of linkages in an area so full of conflict and so marked by national boundaries as the Saar-Lor-Lux region, even though other patterns often develop in a dialectical relationship to the national dimension. This is all the more surprising, as it is precisely here that one would expect national conflicts to amplify the importance of national influences.

2. Patterns in border areas: The confrontation with national models and norms varied, depending on the phase and the region. It led to demarcations and delimitations, but equally to processes of transference, cultural layering, linkages, interconnections and appropriations. These could be conscious, or so subconscious that the originally national context of its components was initially suppressed and later forgotten.

3. The formation of nation states: In Luxemburg, the embracing of diverse influences from neighbouring countries was characteristic of the specific form of the building of this nation state in the 19th and early 20th century. Inversely, the country tried to consolidate its identity by an ostentatious differentiation from these influences. Therefore, the creation of the nation state itself points to transnational influences and the complexity of their structures.

4. Regional consciousness of traditions: Compared to Luxemburg, the completely different development of the German-French border area during the period of the formation of the nation states in the 19th century also resulted in different processes of demarcation and overlaying of cultural influences. Especially in the Alsace, and more modestly in Lorraine, the reference to patterns of regional traditions became the core of processes of transference, adaptation and appropriation, in the interests of their own

development amidst the large nations. Inversely, processes of transfer could foster and develop additional elements for a regional consciousness.

5. Political power: Political domination was an important factor which should not, however, be overestimated. The transmitting and interweaving of national models within the border area was often not derived from decisions made by the rulers, but proceeded via subtler mechanisms – and this gave and gives them some of their more lasting effectiveness.

6. Discrepancies in modernisation: Some modern management and development patterns advanced more rapidly in the German Empire, with its high population pressure and pressure to industrialise, than in France and Luxemburg. In Alsace-Lorraine between 1871 and 1918 these were often adopted despite, rather than because of, the conditions of annexation, which one would have expected to provoke a defensive reaction. In Luxemburg, they strengthened the importance of transference in the nation building process. These discrepancies between areas in terms of their modernisation are among the most effective elements of transferences.

7. Communication structures: On the one hand, these are clearly a function of paths of communication in the sense of streets, trains, canals, and bridges, but there are also more complex forms. Gradually, at the end of the 19th century, circuits of communication evolved in large, medium and small cities that were composed of specialists and prominent people who increasingly discussed and made decisions on the basis of professional criteria rather than national considerations. Although it would be hard to pin them down topographically, these came to function as a sort of transmission belt for the effects of discrepancies in modernisation. This was also the context in which dissenting views in terms of national politics, anti-modernistic attitudes, or other motivations could be channeled and new, shared, identity-forming energies could be released.

8. Bourgeois society: The emergence of the bourgeoisie and its norms and aspirations was closely linked to the effectiveness of urban and technical modernisation, which could be used as a means of social control and of maintaining order in relation to the “classes dangereuses” (dangerous classes). Even though, in some respects, such socio-historical developments followed different paths and in different phases in individual countries, in everyday life throughout the region and beyond borders they contributed to a reduction in the weight of political and national directives.

9. Mediators between nations: Cross-border cooperation that had crystallised around personal and topographical points in turn became – even beyond the border area – a kind of transmission belt for the diffusion of norms, models and strategies for action, which had originally evolved and been appropriated within one national context, but then became those of the national context on the other side of the border. There were limits on such functions of the border region, however, depending on the antagonisms at the national level – which affected communication structures far more profoundly than subconscious processes of cultural layering – and depending on the tenacity of national systems.

10. Conflict and linkages: The diverse patterns of cultural layering which evolved in the last two centuries in the Saar-Lor-Lux region, show a remarkable persistence. Many of them emerged from times and situations of conflict. It is precisely these, however, which produce a wealth of deep structures which, over the long term, develop into lasting cross-border linkages of varying intensity. In different contexts, regions which have also experienced complex cultural layering can thus also take on a role as mediator between countries.

The significant factors outlined here do not, as a rule, correspond to individual sites of recollection. Rather, sites often represent several factors, at the same time or at different times. A typology of influential factors such as this therefore applies to the entire stock of sites presented here.

3. Structure of the publication

Gerhild Krebs (translation: Andrea Caspari, Princeton)

3.1 A map of memory

The present publication attempts to put together, by way of examples, an inventory of buildings of the Greater Region, insofar as they represent sites of cross-border memory. Included are places of memory dating from 1800 until the present day, which have changed because they, and the memory embedded in them, were altered for the purposes of the nation state, whether through new construction, conversion, demolition or change of use. Thus we are seeking to design a concept which, though geographically modest, is complex in terms of its contents – that is, a map of memory of this multilingual border region which has had several nation states and constitutions over the course of 200 years.

Although we have made suggestions as to the structuring of scientific terminology, we wish to avoid prejudging the content, and at the same time wish to suggest a second level of interpretation. Therefore we undertook to present a thematic layout of the buildings according to functional criteria and the buildings' socio-economic position in the topographical landscape.

The following are portrayed in nine chapters:

- Political culture and the culture of workers and associations
- Development of villages
- Memorials and monuments
- Commercial and industrial architecture
- Infrastructure and transportation architecture
- Cultural and leisure architecture
- Military and border architecture
- Religious buildings
- Development of cities

In a few cases, objects were included under several rubrics at the same time, for example the *Église Sainte-Barbe* in Crusnes which can be counted both as a religious building and as an impressive specimen of industrial architecture. Added to this are articles with background information which refer to individual or different sites of memory. These can be found directly through their own designated menu point.

The selection also includes contemporary buildings, which are oriented to the future under the rubric of German-French friendship, and which symbolize or help create a European future. The processing of wartime experiences in the Saar-Lor-Lux area is, on the one hand, expressed in sites of commemoration, but has also, above all, led to a constructive reinterpretation. The European Academy at Otzenhausen or the European Monument at Berus are examples of this new orientation after 1945, as is, most recently, the Saarbrücken-Forbach Eurozone, a European pilot project which is the Continent's first cross-border commercial zone.

Taking the period of about 1800 to today does not, of course, mean that only those architectural objects which have lasted throughout this time frame will be considered. Buildings will be presented which already existed or were constructed during this time, and which underwent one or several modifications, changes of use or demolition. The period under observation varied in the different articles, tending more often to encompass earlier periods, without going into these in as much detail.

The buildings themselves were selected only on the basis of their relevance for cross-border relations. Questions about respective builders played a secondary role. The objects are public buildings as well as, albeit to a lesser degree, private ones.

The objects reflect both deliberate and unintentional processes. Under the heading of deliberate processes, which we find in identical or similar form in other European regions, we include the decisions by the state, the military or enterprises to play a role – in their own or other countries – which had a cross-border dimension or which could influence the relationship with the other country. As a rule, these are characterized by serialisation, strict functionality and standardisation of architectural details, found in a high degree in the barracks and bunkers and to a lesser extent in the train stations of the Reichsland period in Alsace Lorraine, and in the different types of public workers' housing estates. These were often associated with industrial production methods and standardisation of individual building components, as for example in the National Socialist reconstruction plan in the "Westmark". In many of the objects presented, deliberate and unintentional processes were frequently intermeshed in a variety of ways.

Cases that were, first of all, considered relevant for this publication were ones where the construction of a building was a direct precondition for and/or a result of cross-border action, for example the case of the Saar Coal Canal, which came into existence because of cross-border agreements between France and Prussia and also had cross-border trade on the waterways as its goal. Certain kinds of damages as well as the demolition of buildings also fall under the heading of transformations buildings have been subjected to. Despite original intentions, an important domain had to be excluded from this project as there is not at present sufficient research on this topic: the destruction of synagogues and other Jewish cultural buildings perpetrated by Germans between 1940–1944 in Lorraine and Luxemburg could not be included here. One of the desiderata of cross-border research is to evaluate these buildings, damage to them, or their complete destruction, and their possible rebuilding as places of recollection.

Special attention was paid to buildings which underwent a change of use, temporarily or permanently, due to institutions or citizens of the neighbouring country. In such cases of what was sometimes a history of multiple changes of use, the aim was to determine the symbolic meaning of such transformations. There are several impressive examples of this in Metz, as well as the former Prussian mining headquarters in Saarbrücken.

Large scale changes in the landscape, which also encompassed numerous individual buildings, were equally included in our study. This is why the fortification systems of the Maginot Line and the Siegfried Line are featured in the chapter on military and border architecture, alongside train, bridge, street and canal constructions in the chapter on infrastructure. The incorporation of a group of objects such as railroads and station buildings in the chapter on infrastructure is based on the primary economic importance of these buildings and not on their military function, which is also important, but not determining.

The owners and administrators of buildings often changed in the course of a few decades because of the shifting of borders. This raises the question about the reciprocal influences of these buildings with successive owners and administrators in a single location; this dimension in turn leads to the consideration of whole ensembles and symbolic urban or rural landscapes, for example in the cases of Spicheren, Metz, Luxembourg, Bitche or Saarlouis.

The term ensemble as used here does not derive from concepts of historical preservation, but refers in a wider sense to a group of buildings of different ages in a single location or in the immediate vicinity, from the perspective of their respective historical function and their relationship to each other. The ensembles can also include buildings in different locations as long as these demonstrate a corresponding internal relationship to each other. Such an ensemble can be found in the article about Michel Ney in the Saarland; this text considers buildings in Saarlouis, Ensdorf and Saarbrücken to demonstrate the changing interpretations of memory by way of the example of this Saar-French general of the Napoleonic era. Such ensembles, which transcend time and borders, bring into a relationship several buildings that were built at different times and which had a different function to each other, and which would not necessarily be regarded as part of ensembles in terms of the concepts of historical preservation.

Rainer Hudemann (translation: Andrea Caspari, Princeton)

3.2 How to use this presentation

This internet guide presents an overview of the cross-border region and does not claim to be an exhaustive guide, even though it contains numerous historical details about the objects cited. In particular, this is not an art history guide – there are exemplary other publications in that domain, from the “Dehio” to the Dumont guidebooks. By contrast, the main object is to find those details which can help us to discover and understand the interplay of cross-border influences and interactions in the 19th and 20th centuries. The focus of our work is that information which is significant in this respect. For further in-depth information, also with different frames of reference, there are suggestions for further reading – necessarily limited in number given the nature of the medium – in the individual contributions or in the introductory passages; most of the works cited themselves have links to other, more specialized publications.

This presentation likewise does not claim to be exhaustive as regards the selected objects. They are far too numerous. This would also have been impossible with the limited means at our disposal. The guiding principle was to consider a wide spectrum of traces of cross-border memory in all their variety and to highlight characteristic examples, in order to sensitize the reader to these connections in the approximately 800 objects discussed in about 200 contributions. The authors hope that this will enable the readers to independently deepen their understanding by way of further examples. There are references to other objects which could not be described here in greater detail.

3.3 The team

Particular thanks go to all the authors for their contributions to this project, which were made under difficult working conditions – not least due to the structure of the European Union’s Interreg II Programme – and, for the first edition of this publication in 2002, often to tight deadlines. For all concerned, the work entailed an adjustment to new problematics as well as to unfamiliar ways of presenting material, oriented to the specific forms of an internet presentation. Ultimately each author chose his or her own style, despite general guidelines for all contributions. The editor and editorial staff did not try to iron out these differences in personal emphasis, although they made efforts to ensure that certain basic information was provided. Corrections, changes and additions by the editorial staff were agreed with the respective writers. Responsibility for the content of the individual contributions and sections as well as how they are evaluated remains with the respective authors.

Much in the contributions stems from the individual research of the authors or the team. However, we also owe much to the work of others. At this point we would like to give particular thanks to those researchers who, through their earlier work mentioned here, largely made this present undertaking possible. Some of them, as well as key institutions of the cross-border region, helped the Interreg team directly with materials and suggestions. Others will find traces of their work here indirectly in the works cited. It would have been impossible for the Saarbrücken team, working with limited means and under time pressure, to develop such a “guide to traces and tracks”, had it not been able to build on this earlier research.

The project was originally based on a larger research project which until 1997 was sponsored primarily by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation) at the University of Saarland’s Historical Institute – research on urban history in the German/French/Luxemburg border region in the 19th and 20th century, undertaken under the direction of the editor-in-chief, Rainer Hudemann. Professor Dr. Christoph Cornelissen, Dr. Stefan Leiner †, Annette Maas M.A. and Dr. Rolf Wittenbrock, research colleagues at the University of Saarland at the time, were particularly involved in this project; traces of joint discussions and conclusions can be found in diverse forms throughout the present publication.

The project is also based on a regular teaching and research collaboration, which has been progressively built up since the middle of the 1980s, between the chairs of the departments of recent and contemporary history at the University of Metz (Prof. Dr. Alfred Wahl and, since 1999, Prof. Dr. Sylvain Schirmann), the

University of Nancy II (Prof. Dr. François Roth), the Centre Universitaire of Luxemburg (Prof. Dr. Jean-Paul Lehnens) and the University of Saarland (Prof. Dr. Rainer Hudemann).

These chairs joined forces in 1996 in an Interreg II application for a project on “Historical Interconnections and Cultural Identity in the Saar-Lor-Lux Region. City and Urban Culture in the 19th and 20th Century” (“Historische Vernetzung und kulturelle Identität des Saar-Lor-Lux-Raumes. Stadt und städtische Kultur im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert – Liens historiques et identité culturelle dans l’espace Saar-Lor-Lux. Villes et culture urbaine aux XIXe et XXe siècles”). The present project is one of the results of this Interreg II work. In Interreg II, it was anticipated that there would be collaboration between Saarland and Lorraine, but not between Saarland and Luxemburg. Nevertheless, we carried out the work with all four of these universities, and actively defended this decision in relation to the relevant institutions. In 1999, for Interreg III, this Saarland/Luxemburg cooperation was officially accepted, not least due to the previous work carried out together. Apparently memory really can create the future...

The Interreg Project had interconnection (“Vernetzung”, “Interconnexion”) as its goal, in two senses of the word. On the one hand, its aim was to establish and extend contacts between future multipliers of cross-border work in the Saar-Lor-Lux region. For this purpose, regular one or two-day joint colloquia with 30–40 participants each were held. The foundations Elisabeth Selbert Akademie, affiliated with the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, the Union Stiftung in Saarbrücken, as well as the Parliament of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg supported us especially for a session in the Münsbach Castle, where the idea of this survey of sites of cross-border memory was conceived. One part of this collaborative work is manifest in publications, for example a volume on the associations of Lorraine in 2000, as well as, in 2001, a volume of a sample of students’ qualifying papers, taken from the joint colloquia, on the theme of “Lorraine and Saar since 1871 – Cross-border Perspectives” (“Lorraine et Sarre depuis 1871 – Perspectives transfrontalières. Lothringen und Saarland seit 1871 – Grenzüberschreitende Perspektiven”).

This internet survey of sites of cross-border memory, the last part of the project, was undertaken in the spring of 2000 and largely completed in its first version in the early summer of 2001. The work of moving from the conceptual framework to the selection of individual objects to be presented was undertaken throughout 2000 primarily by Gerhild Krebs, the principal full-time research associate, building on preparatory work by Anne Hahn. Gerhild Krebs also wrote a substantial part of articles, either as a draft or final text, especially the parts pertaining to the Saarland. The compilation of objects and majority of writing for Luxemburg was undertaken by Roger Seimetz, to whom thanks are due. Picture research for Luxemburg was largely the work of Karin Maaß; for Saarland Wilfried Busemann and Gerhild Krebs made significant contributions. Raimund Zimmermann photographed the majority of objects – working on the content with Gerhild Krebs and Karin Maaß – as well as being responsible for the reproduction of older prints and working on graphic design for the computerisation with Marcus Hahn, Heike Kempf and Alexander König. Rainer Hudemann completed the photographs for the three regions. Martina Müller (now: Martina Saar) helped to produce the manuscript. Marcus Hahn, research associate, designed and implemented the production of the project on the internet. Together with editor-in-chief Rainer Hudemann and with student assistant Heike Kempf, he took on the extensive work of coordination and final editing. As the Interreg Programme could not be extended beyond 31 December 2000, the completion of the work was made possible by the University of Saarland and through a contribution of the Saarland Landtag for the exploration of French sources regarding the cross-border questions. Marcus Hahn also took on the incorporation of map materials and route suggestions for the 2004 second edition of the online publication.

In 2008/2009 the electronic presentation of the data was completely revised and adapted to take into account the new possibilities in information technology. Johannes Großmann was particularly responsible for the overall technical concept, the layout, the implementation of the new menu structure and the internal links between individual contributions. There was an editorial revision at the same time. The emphasis was on adjusting the typography and standardising the bibliographic references. The contents of the contributions were only reworked where there was outdated data or where there were clear errors.

Working with Johannes Großmann, student assistant Michael Hackbarth took over the editorial task of ensuring coherence and transferring the texts into HTML and PDF formats.

We thank those European Union bodies which are responsible for the Interreg, especially Interreg II Programme's Interregional Monitoring Committee, for supporting the entire project "Cultural Interconnections in the Saar-Lor-Lux Region in the 19th and 20th Century". The EU provided half the funding, with the Lorraine region and the Saarland, as well as the Universities of Saarland, Metz and Nancy II providing the other half. Our special thanks go to Dr. Gregor Halmes, "spiritual guide" at that time at the Saarland Ministry of Economic Affairs, who always sought to resolve problems with appropriate solutions in what were often administratively complex situations.

We need to express our deep gratitude to numerous people and institutions, whom we will name separately – insofar as they have not already been thanked by the individual authors – for their valuable direct support in the form of advice, written and picture materials, and photo reproduction rights. The Saarland Regional Archives and the Saar Historical Museum helped us with particularly extensive materials from their picture archives. The copyrights to the images are cited individually in the respective texts.

Unfortunately, the financial means at the disposal of the Interreg II Programme were not sufficient to be able to present the project in the two languages, as had originally been planned. Therefore, the articles have been published in their authors' native language. Roger Seimetz chose to publish his articles in German.

The paragraph devoted to Luxemburg (1.2) is based on an article by Rainer Hudemann, *The Intersection of Cultures. Urban Development and the Creation of the Nation State of Luxemburg in the 19th and early 20th Century*, in: Kurt-Ulrich Jäschke (dir.), *Grenzen erkennen – Begrenzungen überwinden*, Sigmaringen 1999, p. 385–397.

Further reading

On the debate concerning the "places of memory":

Assmann, Aleida, *Arbeit am nationalen Gedächtnis. Eine kurze Geschichte der deutschen Bildungsidee*, Frankfurt/Main 1993.

Idem, *Erinnerung als Erregung*, in: Lepenies, Wolf (dir.), *Wissenschaftskolleg Jahrbuch 1998/99*, Berlin 2000, p. 200–223.

Idem, *Erinnerungsräume. Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*, Munich 1999.

Berding, Helmut/Heller, Klaus/Speitkamp, Winfried (dir.), *Krieg und Erinnerung. Fallstudien zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Göttingen 2000.

François, Étienne/Schulze, Hagen (dir.), *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte*, 3 vol., Munich 2001.

Martini, Wolfram (dir.), *Achitektur der Erinnerung*, Göttingen 2000.

Nora, Pierre (dir.), *Les lieux de mémoire*, 7 vol., Paris 1988–1992; some passages have been translated into German: Nora, Pierre, *Zwischen Geschichte und Gedächtnis*, Berlin 1990.

Raphael, Freddy/Herberich-Marx, Geneviève, *Mémoire plurielle de l'Alsace. Grandeurs et servitudes d'un pays des marges*, Strasbourg 1991.

Rouso, Henry, *La hantise du passé*, Paris 1998.

Tacke, Charlotte, *Denkmal im sozialen Raum. Nationale Symbole in Deutschland und Frankreich im 19. Jahrhundert*, Göttingen 1995.

On the case of Luxembourg:

Calmès, Albert et Christian, Histoire contemporaine du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg, 13 vol., the volumes 1–10 have been published, Luxembourg 1939–95; German translation of vol. 12: Calmes, Christian, Gründung und Werden eines Landes: 1815 bis heute, Luxembourg 1989.

Hudemann-Simon, Calixte, La noblesse luxembourgeoise au XVIIIe siècle, Paris et Luxembourg 1995.

Poidevin, Raymond/Trausch, Gilbert (dir.), Les relations franco-luxembourgeoises de Louis XIV à Robert Schuman, Metz 1978.

Trausch, Gilbert, Histoire du Luxembourg, Paris 1994.

Idem, Luxemburg als Dritter zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich, in: Les tiers dans les relations franco-allemandes. Dritte in den deutsch-französischen Beziehungen, edited on behalf of the Comité franco-allemand des historiens by Christian Baechler et Klaus-Jürgen Müller, Munich 1996, p. 105–118.

Idem, Der Einfluß Deutschlands in Luxemburg um 1900, in: Pflug, Günther/Eckert, Brita/Friesenhahn, Heinz (dir.), Bibliothek-Buch-Geschichte, Frankfurt/Main 1977, p. 492–508.

On the case of Lorraine:

Baudin, François, Histoire économique et sociale de la Lorraine, 3 vol., Nancy/Metz 1992–1997.

Bonnet, Serge, Sociologie politique et religieuse de la Lorraine, Paris 1972.

Desmars, Bernard/Wahl, Alfred (dir.), Les associations en Lorraine. De 1871 à nos jours, Metz 2000.

Parisse, Michel et al., Histoire de la Lorraine, Toulouse 1978; in German: Lothringen – Geschichte eines Grenzlandes, translated by Hans-Walter Herrmann, Saarbrücken 1984.

Roth, François, La Lorraine annexée. Étude sur la Présidence de Lorraine dans l'Empire allemand 1870–1918, Nancy 1976.

Roth, François, Histoire de la Lorraine, vol. 1: De la Révolution à la Grande Guerre, Metz 1992, vol. 2: Le vingtième siècle: 1914–1994, Metz 1994.

Wahl, Alfred, L'option et l'émigration des Alsaciens-Lorrains (1871–1872), Paris 1974.

On the case of Saarland:

Van Dülmen, Richard/Hannig, Jürgen/Linsmayer, Ludwig (dir.), Erinnerungsarbeit: Die Saar '33–'35. Katalog der Ausstellung zur 50jährigen Wiederkehr der Saarabstimmung vom 13. Januar 1935, Saarbrücken 1985.

Hoppstädter, Kurt/Herrmann, Hans-Walter (dir.), Geschichtliche Landeskunde des Saarlandes, vol. 1: Vom Faustkeil zum Förderturm, Saarbrücken 1960, vol. 2: Von der fränkischen Landnahme bis zur französischen Revolution, Saarbrücken 1977.

Hudemann, Rainer/Jellonnek, Burkhard/Rauls, Bernd (dir.), with the collaboration of Marcus Hahn, Grenz-Fall. Das Saarland zwischen Frankreich und Deutschland 1945–1960, St. Ingbert 1997.

Hudemann, Rainer/Poidevin, Raymond, with the collaboration of Annette Maas (dir.), Die Saar 1945–1955. Ein Problem der europäischen Geschichte. La Sarre 1945–1955. Un problème de l'histoire européenne, Munich 1992, 2nd edition 1995.

Linsmayer, Ludwig, Politische Kultur im Saargebiet 1920–1932. Symbolische Politik, verhinderte Demokratisierung, nationalisiertes Kulturleben in einer abgetrennten Region, St. Ingbert 1992.

Mallmann, Klaus-Michael/Paul, Gerhard/Schock, Ralph/Klimmt, Reinhard, Richtig daheim waren wir nie. Entdeckungsreisen ins Saarrevier 1815–1955, 3rd edition, Bonn 1995.

von Zur Mühlen, Patrick, "Schlagt Hitler an der Saar!". Abstimmungskampf, Emigration und Widerstand im Saargebiet 1933–1935, 2nd edition, Bonn 1981.

Paul, Gerhard, "Deutsche Mutter – heim zu Dir!". Warum es mißlang, Hitler an der Saar zu schlagen. Der Saarkampf 1933–1935, Cologne 1984.

Zenner, Maria, Parteien und Politik im Saargebiet unter dem Völkerbundsregime 1920–1935, Saarbrücken 1966.

On the Saar-Lor-Lux region:

Brücher, Wolfgang/Franke, Peter Robert (dir.), Probleme von Grenzregionen: Das Beispiel Saar-Lor-Lux-Raum. Beiträge zum Forschungsschwerpunkt der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität des Saarlandes, Saarbrücken 1987.

Hudemann, Rainer/Wittenbrock, Rolf (dir.), Stadtentwicklung im deutsch-französisch-luxemburgischen Grenzraum (19. u. 20. Jh.). Développement urbain dans la région frontalière France-Allemagne-Luxembourg (XIXe et XXe siècles), Saarbrücken 1991.

Kugler, Lieselotte (dir.), Grenzenlos. Lebenswelten in der deutsch-französischen Region an Saar und Mosel seit 1840. Katalog zur Ausstellung, Saarbrücken 1998.

Soutou, Georges-Henri, L'Or et le sang. Les buts de guerre économiques de la Première Guerre mondiale, Paris 1989.

On borders and cross-border linkages:

Demarolle, Jeanne-Marie (dir.), Frontières (?) en Europe occidentale et médiane de l'Antiquité à l'an 2000, Metz 2001; comprises amongst other articles: Roth, François, La frontière franco-allemande de la Moselle au Rhin 1918–1939, p. 127–138; Brunn, Denis, Les entreprises allemandes en Moselle dans la première moitié des années 1930, p. 431–445.

Haubrichs, Wolfgang/Schneider, Reinhard (dir.), Grenzen und Grenzregionen. Frontières et régions frontalières. Borders and Border Regions, Saarbrücken 1994; comprises: François Roth, La frontière franco-allemande 1871–1918, p. 131–145.

Überfill, François, La société strasbourgeoise entre France et Allemagne (1871–1924). La société strasbourgeoise à travers les mariages entre Allemands et Alsaciens à l'époque du Reichsland, Le sort des couples mixtes après 1918, Strasbourg 2001.