Sisko Haikala

DENOUNCING THE ENLIGHTENMENT BY MEANS OF A CONSPIRACY THESIS

Göchhausen's Enthüllung der Weltbürgerrepublik

I

Ernst August Anton von Göchhausen's initially anonymous *Enthüllung der Weltbürgerrepublik* (*Exposure of the Cosmopolitan Republic*, 1786), with its theses on a "cosmopolitan conspiracy" which threatened the established political and religious order, is a noteworthy illustration of the rise of conspiracy thinking in the political culture of the late Enlightenment. Conspiracy theories generally emerge in times of crisis when scapegoats and monocausal explanations for problems and disasters at hand are searched for. They belong to irrational elements in the history of thought and do not seem to fit into the picture of the 'Age of Reason'. However, signs of a crisis within the Enlightenment and illustrations of a growing awareness of the existence of such a crisis were visible in late eighteenth-century Europe well before the outbreak of the French Revolution. This crisis followed from conflicts between traditional and novel norms and

from disappointment at progress in the Enlightenment which was sometimes seen as excessively slow, sometimes as excessively fast, sometimes as going astray. Divisions among the Enlighteners into various radical and moderate groups emerged, and a considerable rise in Counter-Enlightenment thought occurred. Such developments were reflections of accelerating processes of politicization. Unlike stereotypical interpretations of the German Enlightenment as an essentially non-political movement suggest, an ideological polarization and a connected rivalry for dominance of public opinion was also taking place within German public discourse well before the beginning of the French Revolution.¹

Background for the rise of conspiracy theses is also provided by the extraordinary coexistence of the public and the secret within the Enlightenment. While Enlightenment culture appreciated the principle of publicity, it also had a special interest in secrecy and secret societies. This interest in secrecy could be seen in the exceptional popularity of Freemasonry. Yet Freemasonry was also drifting into a crisis, as esoteric and irrational trends gained increasing support in the movement. The Masonic crisis provided a starting point for a public campaign against secret societies which began in the 1780s. This debate has long been considered a sign of politicization and also of the rise of conservative political thought in Germany (Valjavec 1951, 271-302).

The *Enthüllung*, the content, intentions and discursive connections of which are discussed in more detail in what follows, is an interesting contribution both to the debate on secret societies and to the great question of the time on “what is Enlightenment?” Göchhausen belonged to the critics of the Enlightenment, and his *Enthüllung* was one of the first publications to start a debate on what the character of the proper, the false and the dangerous type of Enlightenment was. The debate would continue in public for several decades to come. Like a number of other conservatives, he characterised himself as an advocate of the ‘true’ Enlightenment. Yet his political thinking contained such deeply traditionalist and reactionary views that his place among Counter-Enlightenment thinkers can hardly be questioned. A number of his contemporaries shared the view of him being an obscurantist, a most passionate enemy of the Enlightenment.²

Göchhausen's political thought has not been widely studied thus far, and his main work has not been analyzed from all relevant perspectives.³ Scholars have paid attention to Göchhausen mainly because his conspiracy theory evidently shares some features with counter-revolutionary conspiracy theories which flourished after 1789. In conspiracy myths which emerged during the French Revolution, Enlighteners and secret societies of the Enlightenment were accused of the outbreak of the Revolution. The threat of the expansion of the revolution was claimed to be present everywhere. The later effects of these conspiracy theses have been seen as considerable. It is obvious that the theses already provided a basic model for anti-modernist conspiracy theories which were to reoccur in new versions with changing scapegoats throughout the nineteenth century. Their latest major renaissance occurred together with National Socialist propaganda against an alleged universal Jewish conspiracy (Rogalla von Bieberstein 1976).

In Germany, the major organs of this counter-revolutionary propaganda included the *Eudämonia* (1795-98), an ultra-conservative periodical. Göchhausen himself belonged to the founders of the paper. It was due to the Eudämonists that paranoid suggestions of the German Illuminati as promoters of the French Revolution, as founders of the Jacobin ideology and as an underground organisation advocating a universal revolution began to occur in international discourse (cf. Braubach 1927, Epstein 1966, 555-46). Through their correspondence, the editors of the *Eudämonia* are known to have had an influence on the contents of the ex-Jesuit Augustin Barruel's famous *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme* (1797/8) (Schaeper-Wimmer 1985, 181-2; 384-401; Rogalla von Bieberstein 1976, 97; Haaser 1997, 312).

The Illuminati order, founded by Professor Adam Weishaupt in 1776 with the purpose of promoting the victory of the Enlightenment, reason and morality among its members and in the whole of society, was abolished and forbidden as an anti-state organisation in Bavaria in 1784-5 as a consequence of a campaign of reports and libels. According to recent studies on the Illuminati, however, this suspected secret society did not promote any political revolution or concrete political reforms. Instead, the Illuminati were an elitist and esoteric-utopian para-Masonic organisation, the activities of which

declined throughout the Empire within a few years after they had been made objects of persecution in Bavaria. Repeated claims in conspiracy myths about the revolutionary character of the Illuminati were primarily based on two features of the thought and action of their leaders. Firstly, in their thoughts concerning the philosophy of history, the Illuminati held radically utopian views on the disappearance of the princes, nations and churches from the earth. Secondly, the society aimed at promoting the Enlightened cause by supporting the advancement of its members to positions of influence in court and government. In Bavaria, these efforts to gain places led to some concrete results as well.⁴

As Göchhausen's theory presented the Freemasons and Enlighteners as members of a cosmopolitan conspiracy threatening society, Göchhausen can be regarded as one of the "founding fathers" of the tradition of anti-modernist conspiracy theses. His *Enthüllung* has with good reason been considered a major illustration of the fact that it is simplistic to see the rise of the conspiracy myths as mere reactions to the French Revolution. It is not clear, however, whether the *Enthüllung* really was a predecessor of the conspiracy hysteria advocated by the *Eudämonia* in the 1790s as far as the defamation of the Illuminati is concerned. Interpretations of some eighteenth-century readers and a narrow point of view in research emphasizing continuity also explain a deep-rooted tendency among scholars to see the *Enthüllung* as a part of the persecution of the Illuminati. However, this interpretation appears as questionable and deserves critical attention. The contents of the book and Göchhausen's later statements need to be taken into serious consideration (see Ch.V).

In this article, Göchhausen's conspiracy construction will be discussed in the context of the contemporary discourse of the 1780s, as it is obvious that the prevalent approach emphasizing continuity has produced a one-sided and slightly too modern a conception of Göchhausen's conspiracy theory and its propagandistic meanings. Scholars have either ignored or paid only secondary attention to certain essential differences between the conspiracy theories of the *Enthüllung* and those of the editors of the *Eudämonia* in the 1790s. One of the most interesting differences is that Enlighteners and Freemasons were by no means the only scapegoats in Göchhausen's theory of a cosmopolitan conspiracy. A major role was also played by ex-

Jesuits, members of the Society of Jesus, which had been abolished in 1773. With only a few exceptions, the ex-Jesuits belonged to the Counter-Enlightenment forces in Germany.⁵ Göchhausen's suggestions about a common front between Jesuits and Enlighteners against society were amazing to many contemporaries. In later historical research, in particular, they have tended either to puzzle scholars or to give rise to comments in which Göchhausen's theory appears absurd (cf. esp. Epstein 1966, 98-100.).

All conspiracy theories are, of course, absurd if taken as descriptions of reality. Due to irrational elements, which are always a natural part of conspiracy thinking, Göchhausen's construction of conspiracy cannot completely be made an object of rational analysis. It is impossible to fully understand the strange logic with which Göchhausen was able to connect facts, prejudices and mere beliefs in his theory. Yet through contextualization and text analysis, a modern scholar can attempt to reveal the propagandistic purpose of the book and to make the process of writing it slightly more understandable. The structure and meanings of the ambiguous conspiracy theory presented in the *Enthüllung* cannot be understood if separated from contemporary discourse to which the text was originally intended to contribute.

Göchhausen took a stand, firstly and most importantly, on a controversy concerning theses of a Crypto-Catholic threat in Protestant Germany. According to these suggestions, which were distributed in public from the mid-1780s onwards, ex-Jesuits and Catholic emissaries were, in secret, successfully converting subjects of Protestant countries and plotting in a number of ways to destroy Protestantism. Above all, they were claimed to have achieved, without ordinary members being aware of this, anonymous leadership in secret societies such as the Gold- und Rosenkreuzer and the Scottish Freemasonry. They were argued to be cunningly making use of growing religious tolerance and distributing religious mysticism, beliefs in wonders and other *Schwärmereis* in order to gradually destroy true Protestantism and to bring the Protestants finally back to the Church of the Pope. Quite surprisingly, the advocates of this imaginary propaganda were neither Protestant enthusiasts nor Orthodox Lutherans but very well-known Enlighteners from Berlin: Johann Erich Biester and Friedrich Gedike, editors of the *Berlinische Monatsschrift*, and Friedrich Nicolai, famous author and publisher.⁶ The conspiracy

theses of this group of Berliners became a major sensation of the time and gave rise to a long-lasting and widespread public debate. Yet studies on the Enlightenment have failed to pay this debate the attention it deserves. A primary reason for this negligence seems to have been a traditionally established yet increasingly criticized understanding of the Enlightenment as an over-rationalized phenomenon. Scholars have tended to categorise the frequently occurring features of irrationality, traditionality, esotericism and occultism within Enlightened thought as irrelevant curiosities or as signs of early Romanticism. For long, it was a common custom to choose such elements of the Enlightenment as objects of research which were in line with the traditional understanding of the Enlightenment as a rational and modernizing movement. In analyses of Göchhausen's conspiracy theory as well, attention paid to the debate on Crypto-Catholicism has been negligent.⁷ Due to this failing in previous research, the debate on Crypto-Catholicism will be considered as a major context in the following analysis of the *Enthüllung*.

II

At the time of the publication of the *Enthüllung*, Ernst August Anton von Göchhausen (1740-1824) was *Geheimer Kammerrat* in Eisenach in the Duchy of Saxony-Weimar.⁸ Göchhausen had a modest noble background and he had made a career as an officer. In 1769 he retired from the Prussian army with the rank of lieutenant. His move to a career in the civil service obviously did not improve his economic status sufficiently, as it has been suggested that a need for extra earnings made him into an author. Between 1776 and 1796, he published a number of anonymous pamphlets and articles. Distinct features in all of these writings include the ethos of an officer, the loyalty of a civil servant towards authority, and a willingness to appear as a mere honest man in the character of the uneducated *Biedermann* (Albrecht 1997, 156). Furthermore, ever since his youth, Göchhausen had been deeply religious and considered himself an Orthodox Lutheran. As early as the 1770s, he seems to have rejected the alleged irreligion of the Enlightenment

and its neological and partly deistical trends. Such trends were advocated by Friedrich Nicolai in Berlin and his theological associates all over Germany in Nicolai's *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*, one of the most notable organs of the Enlightenment.⁹ His lack of university education and his introvert nature explain the fact that Göchhausen had few contacts with the circles of the learned and the authors of the time. Therefore, even contemporaries knew little about the background and intentions of his literary activities. For the very same reason, his contemporaries were unable to identify many of his anonymous writings as having been written by Göchhausen. The *Enthüllung* was an exception, however. Even though Göchhausen publicly admitted his authorship only in 1799, contemporary correspondence demonstrates that Göchhausen's authorship became a well-known fact within the republic of letters soon after the publication of the book.¹⁰

Information on Göchhausen's connections to Freemasonry, the dangers of which were so eagerly demonstrated in the *Enthüllung*, are based on his own accounts. In the early 1760s, when living in Halle, Göchhausen had joined the Scottish masons belonging to the Rosaic system, and he finally became a member of the *Strikte Observanz* (Göchhausen 1799, 295-297), the greatest Masonic organisation of the high degrees on the European continent in 1760-80. Baron Karl Gottfried von Hund und Altengrotkau imported it from France in the early 1740s and developed it further in Germany. One of the secrets of the hierarchical order was the myth of Unknown Superiors who managed it. Another secret was a belief in a Templar legend according to which the organisation was a successor of the Order of Templars which had been destroyed in the beginning of the fourteenth century. In addition to more or less Enlightened elements, the ideas of the organisation had been affected by ambiguous new religiosity, mysticism, belief in wonders and promises of hidden knowledge. This eclectic combination of ideas made the Strict Observance an easy target for frequent charlatans who took the role of its unknown superiors or possessors of occult knowledge. A growing uncertainty about the origin and leaders of the order, scandals caused by cheats and the emergence of competing systems all contributed to a deep crisis within the Strict Observance after the death of Hund. This crisis finally led to the

rejection of the Templar legend and to the abolition of the organisation at the international Masonic congress in Wilhelmsbad in 1782. In the long run, the decisions of the congress contributed to the victory of more rational trends within Freemasonry. Yet, throughout the 1780s, there were disagreements about the inheritance of the Strict Observance, and destructive conflicts between irrational and rational Freemasonry occurred.¹¹ According to Göchhausen, he never rose above the lower degrees of the Strict Observance. The crises of the organisation destroyed his Masonic ideals and caused him to reject the Masonic labor after the congress of Wilhelmsbad. His disappointment in Freemasonry was, according to him, one of the reasons why he decided to write the *Enthüllung* (Göchhausen 1799, 298-9).

In the 1790s, Göchhausen's contemporaries regarded him as one of the anonymous editors of the *Eudämonia*. In the 1930s, Gustav Krüger made an archival finding which seemed to confirm this interpretation. Krüger's finding demonstrated that Göchhausen indeed belonged to the group of ultra-conservative authors who wished to produce propaganda against revolutionary ideas by founding a periodical of their own. In 1794, they had taken concrete action to start a paper and contacted princes in order to gain subsidies for its publication (Krüger 1931, esp. 486, 479-81). Later research has shown, however, that Göchhausen's relationship to the *Eudämonia* was not so unproblematic. The letters found by Krüger already reveal that Göchhausen and the other founders of the periodical disagreed about princely influence on the content of the paper. As no article in the *Eudämonia* has been identified with certainty as the work of Göchhausen, and as one of his letters from 1797 suggests that he had nothing to do with the periodical, it seems quite possible that he did not belong to the editors or contributors of the paper at all (Höfer 1970, 135, 150 n. 109; Albrecht 1997, 191 n. 95, 192 n. 98). Therefore, Göchhausen's reactionary conspiracy theses and the theses expressed in the *Eudämonia* cannot be considered identical. His pamphlets and political satire demonstrate that he belonged to the advocates of reactionary conspiracy theses and ultra-conservatives also in the 1790s. Yet Göchenhausen's writings do not provide more detailed information on the development of his political thought. Fur-

thermore, in the mid-1790s, he seems to have lost his belief in the utility of political propaganda, and rejected publicity.¹²

III

The *Enthüllung* (EH) can be considered a *roman à clef* in which the author pretends to be describing reality through fiction. The book is supposed to be based on the correspondence of a late relative of its editor. It is argued that, before his death, the relative, an officer and a well-informed Mason, had urged the editor to make his papers public so that both the authorities and the audience would be warned about a threatening danger (EH 449-51). The main theme of the book focuses on the life of Wilhelm, a well-educated man with a proper Lutheran background. As a young lieutenant, with a character not unlike that of Göchhausen himself, Wilhelm becomes enthusiastically interested in the ideas of Freemasonry and, in spite of warnings from his father, joins a lodge of the *Strikte Observanz*. Before long, however, he starts to ask questions about the objectives of the unknown leaders and about the fundamental secrets of the organisation. Long discussions with the master of the lodge finally reveal to Wilhelm the horrid truth: The entire Masonic movement with its enlightened ideals appears as a mere construction aimed at covering what is going on behind the scenes. It is designed to hide a "cosmopolitan" political conspiracy which runs the organisation. After hearing this revelation, Wilhelm resigned his membership in the Freemasons. The rest of the book consists of long letters from a friend and tutor of Wilhelm, *Kriegsrat* 'v. N', including accounts of religion, society and the origin and character of political power, all based on biblical references. Furthermore, the latter part of the book provides statements on the existing trends in Freemasonry, the Rosi-crucians and the Illuminati.

The genre of the *Enthüllung* was hardly surprising to contemporaries, as the use of fiction by anonymous writers was no exception among publications providing revelations on secret societies. Such secrecy was by no means always a result of fear of intervention by the censors. Neither were the authors necessarily afraid of fierce public criticism nor revenge from Masonic brothers. It was rather a way of provoking interest among the public and promoting sales to suggest

that the author possessed authentic and dangerous information gained from the inner circle (Agethen 1984, 130-2). Göchhausen knew this strategy well, as can be seen in his confession from 1798. Göchhausen then admitted that he had adopted the character of an experienced Mason in order to make his message appear urgent in the eyes of the public (Göchhausen 1799, 229-300). This untrue statement had been made possible by the cover of anonymity. The choice of a fictional genre created a favourable position for the author. He could fail to provide evidence for his statements, and yet the genre enabled him to freely declare the truth. Göchhausen made use of his chosen strategy as early as in 1787 when endeavouring to refute fierce criticism the book had provoked. In his anonymous *Aufschluß and Verteidigung der Enthüllung des Systems der Weltbürgerrepublik*, he emphasized the fact that not all the arguments of a “philosophical novel” were intended to be taken as literal truths (Aufschluß 1787, 46-8).

Even though contemporaries generally had no major difficulties in distinguishing between fact and fiction in literature exposing Masonic secrets, the *Enthüllung* was at first received with considerable amazement and uncertainty about the real purpose of the book.¹³ It appears quite evident to the reader that the master of the lodge is the villain of the book, whereas Wilhelm’s father, *Kriegsrat* N and the increasingly informed hero of the book were advocates of the right values. The problem with the *Enthüllung* was that its conspiracy construction was ambiguous, containing either intentional or unintentional obscurity.

A detailed reading of the *Enthüllung* reveals a presentation of two intertwined conspiracies. Firstly, the book provides a broad description of a Masonic conspiracy advocating the Enlightenment. Secondly, it depicts a “cosmopolitan-Jesuitical” conspiracy. In his first revelations on the secrets of Freemasonry, the master interprets the history of mankind for the young adept in conspiratorial terms. He tells how, at all times, there have been small groups of wise thinkers, “cosmopolitans”, in action and how these groups have aimed at the liberation of mankind by fighting against prejudices and by promoting the cause of human rights and human perfection. Even though despotic rulers and the clergy had made it necessary for these groups to work in secret, they had actively contributed to all the revolutions and progressive turns of mankind. It was only with the growth of Enlightened

thought and the protection provided by Freemasonry that the work of the cosmopolitans was about to reach its goals (EH 211-220).

At its early stage, the description of the lodge master seems to be based on an idea of “the conspiracy of the good” that had been able to direct the course of history as a type of secular providence. Such ideas were commonplace in a number of Masonic legends. Yet Wilhelm finds it hard to approve of the revelation that Freemasonry hides an inner circle which appears to be a proponent of an ultra-radical Enlightenment and an enemy of Christianity. The master argues that the major obstacles to human liberty included the religion, princes, and states with their national conflicts of interests (EH, 234-6). He holds the utopian ideal of a community of cosmopolitans, the only professed religion of which was “the religion of reason” (deism). Such a community would no longer have priests, princes, estates, armies or states. It would allow its citizens broad rights, and would be governed by “philosopher kings” who had been initiated into the conspiracy (EH 228-38, 245-7). In the course of the description, it becomes increasingly evident that the cosmopolitan Enlightenment is revolutionary “universal republicanism”, the methods of which are based on the unscrupulous manipulation of human minds.

By emphasizing the ethically questionable features of the cosmopolitan conspiracy, Göchhausen gives his readers hints of a final surprising, though not necessarily convincing, revelation. The readers are told that the preceding description of an enlightened conspiracy hidden within Freemasonry did not however contain the entire truth. The master goes on to argue that a further conspiracy exists. This conspiracy reaches for goals quite different from the Enlightenment and the emancipation of humankind. The real secret leaders of this conspiracy were in Rome. “Cosmopolitanism” was in fact “Jesuitism”, as the master states (EH 276):

Jesuiten sind Weltbürger der ersten Klasse, Freymaurer der Letzten. Jesuitism können sie gestrost für Kosmopolitism annehmen.

Göchhausen made ambiguous use of the term “Jesuitism”. First of all he insists that the terms ‘Jesuits’ and ‘Jesuitism’ are kept separate (EH 265, 431). The synonyms of Jesuitism included both “cosmopolitanism” and “universalism”. In the *Aufschluß* (1787,14), he gave

a further definition, according to which “Jesuitism is nothing else but practical atheism” advocating arbitrary government, the suppression of human understanding and the status of an infallible authority. In a sense Jesuitism was a general concept for Göchhausen, referring to Jesuiticality that was not restricted to the organisation founded by Loyola. It was rather based on evil human nature inclined to cunning and unscrupulous greed for power.

However, it would be a mistake to assume that Göchhausen did not refer at all to the Society of Jesus when writing about Jesuitism. Jesuitism was not mere “republican and deistical principles” of the late eighteenth century.¹⁴ Göchhausen did not always systematically use the abstract concept of Jesuitism which could have made the conspiracy construction of the *Enthüllung* slightly more logical. Göchhausen merely used the concept for the purpose of showing how Jesuiticality in the meaning of cunning and greed for power could occur anywhere and among all human groups, including the Enlighteners. Yet Göchhausen’s theory also concerns the real ex-Jesuits and sees them as the major collaborators of the cosmopolitan conspiracy.¹⁴ Even though the *Enthüllung* never clearly states who exactly the cosmopolitan superiors in Rome are, the reader can draw no other conclusion than that the unknown superiors of the conspiracy must have been persons holding leading positions in the Catholic Church or in the former Society of Jesus.

IV

Göchhausen’s theory of a Jesuitical-cosmopolitan conspiracy was basically a Counter-Enlightenment version of the Jesuit theories of the Berlin Enlighteners in Berlin. Göchhausen referred frequently for the writings of the Berliners and expressed his support to most of their claims about continuous activities among the Jesuits after 1773. He considered it self-evident that secret Catholic missionary work was continuing in Protestant countries. He also believed that ex-Jesuits had entered secret societies and were distributing superstition and irrationalism with evil intentions in mind. Even when he goes much further than the Berliners, he only sharpens their claims

about Jesuitical greed for power and the tendency of the Jesuits to appear with thousands of different masks, including that of an advocate of religious tolerance and the Enlightenment.¹⁶ Göchhausen's seeming support for the conspiracy arguments of the Berliners was so extensive that the *Berlinische Monatsschrift* (VIII 1986, 563) considered it necessary to warn the public about the book and to emphasize the fact that its author belonged to a hostile group of writers.

In Göchhausen's exaggerations, the Jesuits, after the dissolution of the organisation in 1773, were not at all an order promoting spiritual goals (EH 268-71). The conversion of Europe back to Catholicism, which, according to the Berlin Enlighteners, was a major goal of the Crypto-Catholic conspiracy, appeared a mere half-way target. In Göchhausen's view, the Jesuitical-cosmopolitan conspiracy aimed at nothing less than gaining universal political power. The only way Göchhausen troubled to prove his thesis was to provide obscure references to history, as seen in the master's words to Wilhelm (EH, 271):

Machen Sie nicht eine Albernheit! legen Sie den theologischen Confessionsbegrif von Kirche ab. Dencken Sie sich bey der Kirche allzeit Rom; bey Rom den Sitz der Cäsarn, und die Universalmonarchie, bey Catholicism, Cosmopolitism; bey Jesuiten Cosmopoliten, und bey Freymaurerey Jesuiterrey. Das ist der rechte Schlüssel.

The most important point in which Göchhausen rejects the Jesuit theories of the Berliners and starts to use their theories against them and the entire Enlightenment concerns the double strategy of the conspiracy. Göchhausen argued that in order to gain power the conspiracy promotes both superstition and irreligion. In Catholic countries, it concentrates on the propagation of ignorance and superstition. But as this strategy was unlikely to be successful in the more developed Protestant countries, the conspiracy had had to adopt the Enlightenment as its major instrument. Its strategy in the Protestant countries was to provoke the Enlightenment to utter irreligion and radicalism without the promoters of the Enlightenment themselves realising what the plot was all about. Göchhausen attempts to demonstrate the simultaneous use of contradictory strategies as logical by a thought construction that occurred in nearly the same form in other conspiracy theories as well. In the late nineteenth century, the

construction occurred in the *Protocols of the Elders in Zion* when the actions of the members of a Jewish conspiracy in the world of the *goyim* were described. According to the construction, the purpose of the conspiracy was to cause complete anarchy, mental and material distress, in which people would start to look for leaders and order. Such anarchy would open up an easy way for cunning men, who wish to gain hegemony in the world, to subordinate mankind to their rule.¹⁷(EH, 263-4, 272-3)

Unlike the Berlin Enlighteners, who attempted to prove their conspiracy theories empirically by referring to known facts and sources of varying relevance, Göchhausen did not point to any concrete examples of the actions of the cosmopolitan conspirators or to their influence on the course of events. The rhetoric he employs is mainly based on creating visions. The *Enthüllung* constructs horrifying images of a vile abuse of people. “The evil” can gain influence anywhere. One of the areas which the conspiracy has turned into its instrument was publicity, as the master reveals to Wilhelm (EH, 249):

Im Reich der Wissenschaften und der Litteratur geben wir Ton an, folglich haben wir die besten Köpfe jedes Volcks, jeder Confession, (auch der Ihrigen, mein lieber lutherscher Bruder,) in unserer Gewalt, ohne daß sie es wissen...

Göchhausen's book also reflects his opposition to modernity, his rejection of commercialization, monetary economy and development in industries. It is the “cosmopolitan spirit” which is to be blamed for the economic change and the corruption of manners as well (EH 286-7):

Er [=the spirit of cosmopolitanism] spannt alle Hirne zu Industrie, und Speculation in jedem Sinn; er nährt und lenckt, unbemerckt [...] den Nervenfressenden Luxus; er hebt Fabriken und raffinirten Handlungsgeist; zeddelt Jalousien unter den handelnden Völckern an; alle trachten nach Uebergewicht; die Staatsschulden vermehren sich vom Jahr zu Jahr, und Köpfe und Herzen gerathen in ewigen Wirbeln.

Göchhausen's intention, when constructing a conspiracy theory based on cooperation between two completely opposite groups, the Jesuits and Enlightenmenters, was to counter the political and

propagandistic goals which the theses on Crypto-Catholicism, developed by the Enlighteners of Berlin, were designed to promote.

In the theses of the Berliners, the Jesuits and Crypto-Catholics appeared as visible enemies to Protestants, and the entire debate tended to reactivate old confessional prejudices and animosities. However, the Jesuit-hunt was not initially intended to defend the inherited religion but the Enlightenment which was felt to be threatened. The concepts of Protestantism and Catholicism, when used by the Berliners, were secularised to a high degree. They saw "Protestantism" not merely as a right to religious liberty. Protestantism also entailed a liberty of political conscience and freedom of speech, of independent rational and critical thinking, and of a liberal way of thinking.¹⁸ "Catholicism", as understood by the Berliners, was a counter-concept which did not merely refer to the Catholic Church and its doctrines but also to a number of patterns of thinking criticized by the Enlighteners, including subjection to authorities, traditionalism, irrationality and superstition. A central intention of the Berliners, when accusing someone of concealed Catholicism and when repeatedly suggesting that people could serve as instruments of Jesuitical plotting without knowing it, was to make the religious and political ways of thinking among opponents of the Enlightenment, who were gaining increasing support in Protestant Germany, appear suspect (Haikala 1996,62-3).

Starting from the same premises as the Berliners, Göchhausen's intention was to demonstrate that they were mistaken when supposing that the Jesuits only had influence in ideologies opposed to the Enlightenment. No matter how unconvincing a compilation in many respects, Göchhausen's conspiracy theory demonstrated a fundamental weakness in the argumentation of the Berliners. Starting from the premises of the Berliners, it was completely possible and even logical to draw the conclusion that the Jesuits, due to their abilities in plotting, could use even the Enlightenment as an instrument. Referring to the Berliners, Göchhausen stated that he considered it ridiculous that the Protestant "Abderites" and "guard of Zion" were warning people about Crypto-Catholicism and making a noise about the missionary work of some secret emissaries or the dangers of theological "superstition" while not realising that the Enlightenment was also having undesired consequences and that they were themselves being used as

instruments of “Rome” (EH 272-3, 282-3). His purpose was to demonstrate the “Jesuitical” character of the Enlighteners and to show that the hidden threat of the Enlightenment to Protestantism was much greater than those anti-Enlightenment phenomena which the Berliners claimed were serving the Catholic cause. Göchhausen’s claim that the cosmopolitan Jesuits were attempting to gain purely secular universal dominance played a central role in his endeavour to denounce the Enlightenment as a political threat to the state.

Göchhausen’s construction is so imaginary and lacks evidence to such an extent that there is reason to wonder whether the theory was meant to be taken seriously at all. Göchhausen’s way of supporting some of the arguments of the Berliners yet using the same arguments against their original advocates appeared so comical that a contemporary pamphleteer, who pretended to be the author of the *Enthüllung*, ironically argued that the book was a mere libel. According to this pamphleteer, the purpose of the book was to turn the logic of the Jesuit-hunters into parody and to illustrate how, following their theories, anyone could be demonstrated to be a participant in Crypto-Catholic plotting.¹⁹

Göchhausen’s intentions were, however, far from humourous. No particular fact gives reason to suppose that he did not honestly believe in the existence of the trends which he summarised in his conspiracy theory. According to his own understanding, he had based his conclusions on generally known and recognized facts. This understanding can be seen in his insistence, “daß es hier gar nicht aufs glauben noch nie erhörter oder gesagter, sondern nur allein aufs anordnen und zusammenstellen der allebekanntesten Dinge, und aufs entwickeln derselben, aufs herausheben ihrer innern Wahrheit, ankommt.” (EH, 454). It is, of course, impossible to reveal what different types of sources and hearsay Göchhausen had used for the construction of his conspiracy theory. It is noteworthy, however, that, both in the *Enthüllung* and the *Aufschluß*, he mentioned a number of sources and authors which enable us to draw conclusions about the connections of the *Enthüllung* to contemporary discourse. Some of Göchhausen’s literary references concern literature which warned the public of religious and political dangers linked to the radical Enlightenment. Yet they also show that Göchhausen’s beliefs in the activities of the Jesuits did not originate merely from the *Berlinische*

Monatschrift's and Nicolai's writings on the threat of Crypto-Catholicism but also from earlier debates among the Freemasons. Confusion among the Masons of the high degrees and uncertainty about the real objectives of the order and about its leaders had given rise to suspicions within the organisation. Some Freemasons suspected that Jesuits had indeed secretly entered their organisation. Such suspicions were fomented by ancient anti-Jesuitical prejudices which had become widely known as a result of a long-lasting campaign against the Society of Jesus in Catholic countries. They gained further force from some potentially Catholic and quasi-monastic features inherent in the legends, rituals and hierarchical organisation of the Templar Masonry. The question of the possible influence of Jesuits within the leadership of the Strict Observance had already been debated in the Masonic congress of Wilhelmsbad, to the protocols of which Göchhausen had referred in the introduction of the *Enthüllung*.²⁰

V

A longish research tradition from Rossberg to Albrecht places Göchhausen's *Enthüllung* in the context of the persecution of the Illuminati which started in the mid-1780s. Its description of a cosmopolitan conspiracy has been seen as an attack against the Illuminati.²¹ However, Göchhausen does not give any direct hints supporting such an interpretation. Indeed, he has rather constructed his work in a way that supports the opposite conclusion. Scholars reading Göchhausen have not usually paid attention to the fact that, in the end of his work, Göchhausen briefly takes a stand not only on the Strict Observance and the Rosicrucians but also on the Illuminati.²² His description of the Illuminati is surprisingly moderate given the fact that he was well aware that this Enlightenment organisation had been banned. Göchhausen's text shows that he knew the Electoral mandate published in Munich on 16 August 1785 in which the Illuminati had been presented as a political threat because of their members having so successfully gained high positions in the courts of law and within the administration of the state.²³ In the *Enthüllung*, Göchhausen sees the goals of the organisation as double-edged. However, it is noteworthy

that he draws a clear distinction between the Illuminati and what he has described as a Jesuitical-cosmopolitan secret society. The Illuminati appear merely as one of those several German Masonic and para-Masonic organisations which may have become instruments of secret plotting by the ex-Jesuits and Jesuitism in general without their members being aware of what was going on. Göchhausen's conspiracy suspicions are much more cautious in relation to the Illuminati than to other Masonic organisations. His caution is due to the fact that the Illuminati were known to consider the Jesuits as their main opponents and that the Jesuits were generally held responsible for the persecution of the Illuminati in Bavaria. Still in his *Aufschluß* (154, cf. 158), published in early 1787, Göchhausen, referring to the lack of information, avoided taking a distinct stand on the supposed dangerousness of the organisation. Neither do his later works provide any detailed information on his conception of the Illuminati as an ideology or as an organisation, even though they do demonstrate that he held a negative view of the order. As early as in the late 1780s, Göchhausen published satires mocking the Illuminati.²⁴ In the 1790s, a number of his writings supported conspiracy propaganda attacking the Illuminati (Albrecht 1997, 174).

The prevalent interpretation among scholars of the *Enthüllung* as presenting the Illuminati and cosmopolitans as identical has been based on its publication in the middle of persecutions of the Illuminati and on contemporary beliefs in the parallel nature of the Illuminati and the secret society of master X. Such speculations gained further force from the Bavarian authorities who, in 1787, published authentic yet intentionally selected documents recently confiscated from the Illuminati to prove how dangerous the organisation was to the established political order (Agethen 1984, 83). It was only the publication of these documents that, for the first time, revealed to the general public and even to many of the Illuminati themselves certain detailed information on the programme and goals of the organisation. It turned the question of the Illuminati into a major sensation all over Germany. The documents included Weishaupt's famous and frequently misinterpreted speech to the new members of the degree of *Illuminates dirigentes* held in 1782. In his speech, Weishaupt introduced his well-known utopian philosophy according to which princes and nations were due to disappear in the course of history as a con-

sequence of moral progress. This disappearance would take place without violence being necessary.²⁵ Many have seen Weishaupt's views as nearly identical to the views of the master in the *Enthüllung* which depicted an ideal society lacking priests, princes, estates and armies.

The parallel character of the master's thoughts and Weishaupt's speech made the *Enthüllung* particularly useful for ultra-conservative propaganda after the outbreak of the French Revolution. It was their propaganda about conspirators with Illuminati and Jacobin connections which created the established interpretation according to which Göchhausen had revealed "the disgusting system of the Illuminati" – as the *Eudämonia* (II 1796, 20) put it – well before the Bavarian authorities came out with their documents on the Illuminati.²⁶ Importantly, however, the views presented in the *Eudämonia* were not necessarily the views of Göchhausen. The question of how Göchhausen – who is not known to have ever joined the Illuminati²⁷ – could have received such information on the activities and secrets of the organisation before 1787, remains unanswered. It is only known that such confidential information was not accessible even to the brothers of the lower degrees and that some of the revelations seem to have come as a shocking surprise even to many leading Illuminati outside Bavaria (cf. Agethen 1984, 11).

The reactions of J.J.C. Bode (1787/1994, 201-202), one of the leading Illuminati, have been considered most convincing evidence for the interpretation which links the *Enthüllung* to the persecution of the Illuminati. In his journal notes dating from the time of his journey to Paris in 1787 (during which, the writers of the *Eudämonia* claimed, the Illuminati imported their revolutionary ideas to France!), Bode considered the *Enthüllung* an attack against the Illuminati organisation. He explained the attack as having resulted from Göchhausen's antipathy towards Adolf von Knigge, a leading Illuminati, as a person. Bode had seen the emergence of this antipathy with his own eyes during a meeting in Eisenach in 1782. Furthermore, he claimed that Knigge's papers contained some written documents by Göchhausen in which this hatred was expressed. Bode assumed that the animosity had started as Knigge had attempted to recruit Göchhausen to the Illuminati order. According to Bode, this supposed recruitment had been done employing unskilful methods, including Knigge's suggestion that he was himself one of the un-

known leaders of the organisation. Some historians have suggested that Knigge had then revealed to Göchhausen some further secrets of the inner circle of the Illuminati, but such a hypothesis is not entirely supported by Bode's description. Bode argued that Göchhausen, without knowing the Illuminati and merely out of personal animosity, had condemned the entire organisation. Due to the broad character of the Illuminati order, however, contemporaries could have a number of potential private sources of information on the affairs of the Illuminati.²⁷ It has been pointed out that Göchhausen could also have borrowed ideas for his book from Bavarian anti-illuminati publications in which the order had been accused of a conspiracy against the state and religion well before 1787.²⁹

An important counter-argument against this Illuminati interpretation of Göchhausen's work can be found in a letter written by Göchhausen in Eisenach dated 12 July 1798 and published by the *Taschenbuch für Freimaurer* in 1799 (p. 293-306). Only from the late 1980s onwards has this document received serious attention from scholars. The obvious purpose of Göchhausen's letter was to counter previous accusations of his obscurantism and to distance himself from the militant propaganda of the *Eudämonia*. He was asking the interpreters of his book to end their constant attacks against his person. According to Göchhausen, these unfounded attacks had followed from an excessive attention to his book and from numerous misinterpretations of it. Above all, he denied having meant the Illuminati with his references to cosmopolitans:

“Einige Ausleger waren gar so schlau, in meinen Weltbürgern die *Illuminaten* zu finden. Lieber Gott! als ich die Enthüllung schrieb (im Jahre 1785) wußte ich noch kein Wort von *Illuminaten*...” (p.303).

Furthermore, he denied all claims that he had been in profession of some particular inner circle information on the Illuminati or some other secret societies at the time of writing the book in 1785. Although the text of the *Enthüllung* shows that Göchhausen was exaggerating when claiming that he had heard no word of the Illuminati by the time of writing, his principal argument about the irrelevance of the Illuminati to the contents of the book is not necessarily untrue. Neither do we have any particular reason to doubt his argu-

ment that the *Enthüllung* was a “result of abstraction”, in other words, a product of contemplations and conclusions following from reading and hearing. In fact, Göchhausen had already put forward the same argument in the *Enthüllung* itself.

No sufficient evidence exists thus far to support the assumption that Göchhausen was referring to the Illuminati when writing about the cosmopolitans. Indeed, the helpfulness of the entire hypotheses on the secret intention of the book is questionable. The meanings of the *Enthüllung* can well be understood without such a hypothesis. The reader of the book should pay attention to Göchhausen’s explicit statements and hints contained in the text itself.

VI

The conspiracy construction in the *Enthüllung* provides the framework and starting point for Göchhausen’s fierce criticism of the Enlightenment and for his objective to prove that the “new” Enlightenment was an ideology opposed to both Christianity and the state.

One of the dimensions of criticism against the Enlightenment in Göchhausen’s book is the condemnation of Freemasonry. Although Göchhausen did not wish to condemn the majority of the Freemasons who had good intentions, he pointed out that Masonic lodges, as supranational organisations lacking state control, were in constant danger of being taken over by cunning men and being turned into sources of “political and moral plague” (EH xii). As far as the ideology of Freemasonry was concerned, he saw cosmopolitanism and religious tolerance, both generally shared ideals among the advocates of the Enlightenment, as giving rise to danger. Unlike most Enlighteners, who understood cosmopolitanism as the love of humanity and the will to promote the welfare of mankind as a whole, Göchhausen saw cosmopolitanism as the opposite of patriotism and, therefore, as a threat to the state: “Du bist Staatsbürger oder du bist Rebell. Kein Drittes giebt es nicht” (EH 177).³⁰ Religious tolerance, as advocated by the Freemasons, appeared to Göchhausen as a source of opposition to Christianity, of deism and of religious indifference (EH 176-7; 185, 189-90, 199).

Göchhausen's understanding of the Enlightenment builds on stereotypes which were commonplace in religiously motivated late eighteenth-century anti-Enlightenment thought. He criticized the Enlightenment for its intellectualism, for its sinful promotion of reason as the highest authority and for its aspirations to play down imagination, heart and feelings, which he saw as aspirations rejecting human nature (cf. EH 257-8, 307). On the basis of the Bible, Göchhausen condemns the anthropological optimism and individualism of the Enlightenment and denounces its secular efforts to distinguish between religion and morality (EH 315-6). In his view, *falsche Aufklärung* is connected to deism which, in turn, is likely to lead to moral relativism tending to disintegrate society. He finds deists among any thinkers expressing doubts with relation to revealed religion, no matter whether naturalists or Neologians (EH 260-1; cf. 377). For Göchhausen himself, the scriptures were the only source of all intellectual and moral truth. He was actively calling for a return from a religion of reason to Luther's *Bibelreligion* (EH 359ff.).

Göchhausen's patriarchal and monistic political theory, with which he opposed the Enlightened ideals of liberty, equality and natural law, was biblical as well. The Old Testament provided him with the legitimation for monarchical power and the authority of the sovereign. According to Göchhausen, the monarch was "lebendiger Abdruck des Gottes" and "Stellvertreter des Unsichtbaren" (EH 322-34; 351-8; the citations p. 303). In accordance with traditionalist Lutheran cesaropapistical thought, he considered it necessary that spiritual and political power were united in the person of the monarch, the highest bishop and protector of the church (cf. EH 341-2). He defended biblical monarchy with a religious fervour, arguing that Christianity and Orthodox Lutheranism in particular were an essential condition for the preservation of society and the monarchy (EH 357-8; 377-8 et passim.). Such a dedication to monarchical power gave rise to accusations of an awkward flattery of princes and poor knowledge of theology (ALZ 1786, II, 402).

The common interests of religion and monarchy became visible in Göchhausen's criticism of the freedom of printing, for instance. Like most anti-Enlightenment thinkers, Göchhausen considered the liberty of the press had been corrupted to a dangerous licentiousness of the press. He dared to criticize princes for making conces-

sions to the Enlightenment and allowing authors to publicly attack religion and the political order. In Göchhausen's view, the princes underestimated the dangers of free publishing (EH 248-51). Even mere criticism of religion was dangerous to the rulers, as the persuasion of public opinion against the church and religion was the first and essential step in the plans of the advocates of the Enlightenment to destroy the authority of rulers in the eyes of their subjects. The same way of thinking was central to Barruel and to the conspiracy propaganda of the writers of the *Eudämonia*.³¹ In the *Enthüllung*, it occurred in the master's statement on the strategy of the cosmopolitan conspirators (EH 248):

“Wir machen vorerst sie Pfaffen verdächtig, lächerlich... Ist Pfaffenkredit dahin, so ist es auch um den Aberglauben, geoffenbarte Religion genannt, die an Pfaffenexistenz und Einfluß gebunden ist, geschehen. Sind Fürsten, die auf ihre Würde halten, in den Augen des Volcks nichts als Despoten, Fürsten aber und ihre Trabanten, der Adel, überhaupt nichts weiter, als – Menschen, so ist – ihr Nimbus dahin!”

With his *Enthüllung*, Göchhausen was evidently trying to gain the attention of not only the general public but also the princes. He wished that the princes would take concrete measures against Freemasons and other secret societies. He also wished that they would set restrictions on free printing (EH 387-9; 440).

With all its religious fervour, irrational contents and aspirations to denounce the advocates of the Enlightenment as enemies of religion and the state, the *Enthüllung* represented an extreme reaction against the Enlightenment. However, the fact that Göchhausen's conspiracy theory was primarily a reaction to a Crypto-Catholic threat propagated by the advocates of the Enlightenment suggests that the tendency to conspiracy thinking, and to denouncing opponents in a rude manner, was a rather general phenomenon in the political culture of the period. Still in the 1780s, both Protestant advocates of the Enlightenment and the “obscurantists” could claim that Catholic and Jesuit plotting were the cause of the problems they were experiencing. This early modern way of thinking illustrates that contemporary political thought was still closely linked to religious prejudices and traditionalist models of identifying political problems. In

Germany, the preservation of this confessional tradition as an essential part of political argumentation had been promoted by the development of a bicultural realm after the Reformation. In this bicultural realm, the contrasts between Protestant and Catholic Germany survived and were reflected in considerable differences in the progress of the Enlightenment. Yet both Göchhausen's and his opponents' declaration that religion was in danger – when approached through the study of propaganda and the history of concepts – can be considered a sign of secularization typical of the transition to modernity. After all, both were writing secular political polemic by using religious language for the purpose.

TRANSLATED BY PASI IHALAINEN

Notes

- 1 For politicization of the German Enlightenment, see e.g. Valjavec 1951; Vierhaus 1967; Aufklärung als Politisierung 1987; Klippel 1990; Stuke 1972, 278-80.
- 2 See esp. Obscuranten-Almanach 1798, 178-85.
- 3 There is no monography on Göchhausen. Höfer (1970) and Albrecht (1997) have written two important articles on his production and career.
- 4 For recent studies on the Illuminati, see esp. Dülmen 1975; Agethen 1984 and 1987; Neugebauer-Wölk 1995, 25-59; Neugebauer-Wölk 1996; Reinalter (Hg) 1998; Mulsow 1999.
- 5 For contrasts of the enlightened thinkers and Jesuits, see van Dülmen 1969; Müller 1993.
- 6 For more details about the debate on Crypto-Catholicism, see Haikala 1996.
- 7 A significant exception to this trend is Voges (1987, 133-36). He recognises the principal value of Berliners' thesis for the book. As a literary historian his focus is quite different to that in this article.
- 8 We do not know so many details about Göchhausen's life. This is based on the works of Höfer (1970), and Albrecht (1997).
- 9 Albrecht 1997, 157; cf. Göchhausen 1776, 204, 35-37. On the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*, see: Schneider 1995, 8, 138-9.
- 10 See e.g. K.G. Reinhold to Friedrich Nicolai 26 January 1787, published in: Reinhold 1983, 184.

- 11 On the history of Strict Observance and the crises of the Freemasonry, see e.g. Le Forestier 1970, esp. livre 1 (83-270), 3 (553-706); Hammermayer 1980; Schüttler 1996.
- 12 The proof of the change of his opinion was the pamphlet *Ohnmasgebliche Vorschläge zum allgemeinen literarischen Frieden* (1796), wherein he tried to persuade authors and journalists to leave all political campaigns to princes and give up anonymous publishing. Of course, these opinions could not be supported by the publishers of Eudämonia; see Albrecht 1997, 179-80, 182.
- 13 One clear indication was that the notable review journal of the Enlightenment, *Allgemeine Literaturzeitung*, published two reviews of the book. In the first (ALZ 1786 II Nr. 143, 524-8) an anonymous contributor gave the book at a very high rating. Therefore, the editors decided it necessary to publish later another and larger review, in which the content of the book was totally crushed due to the anti-Enlightenment hostility contained in the text (ALZ 1786 IV Nr. 282, 385-392; Nr 284, 401-03).
- 14 Graßl (1968, 266) has expressed this kind of interpretation.
- 15 This is said very clearly: EH 268-71, 275-6; 370-1.
- 16 Cf. EH 291-93, 407-8; xi; Aufschluß 52-6, 125, 160, 235.
- 17 EH, 263-4; 272-3; cf. Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion, 10. Protocol. There are also other similarities to *Enthüllung*, for example in the thesis concerning the question of how to win the public opinion over and what kind of economic changes were going on; see *ibid.* 5., 6. and 24. protocols.
- 18 See, for example, Biester's notes in: BM VII 1786, 63-4, and Nicolai, Beschreibung einer Reise. Bd.7, Anhang, 101.
- 19 Vollendeter Aufschluß des Jesuitismus 1787, 149-51. The contemporaries seem to have been aware the pamphlet was not written by Göchhausen (see e.g. reviews in: ALZ 1786 III, 473-78; Neueste Religionsbegebenheiten 1787 St.9, 697). – Even recently Luckert (1993, 278, 279-80) was misled by this pamphlet into assuming *Enthüllung* was a satire.
- 20 EH xf.; Aufschluß 211-271; 278-9. For the increase of Jesuit suspicion in Freemasons' own circles, see Voges 1987, 130-1; Taute 1909, 35, 68-71, 85; Hammermayer 1980, 25.
- 21 Rossberg 1942, 38; Koselleck 1973, 113-4; Graßl 1968, 226-7; Epstein 1966, 98; Rogalla von Bieberstein 1976, 85-6; Schüttler in: Bode 1787/1994, 201 notes 556, 557, 558, p. 203 note 562; Albrecht 1997, 158-9.
- 22 For example Albrecht has no doubt when he comments on the notes in the letter dated 20 February 1786, written by G.J. Göschen, the publisher, to F.J. Bertuch. For Albrecht the notes on the Illuminati are further evidence that *Enthüllung* was a delicate attack against them. He does not pay

attention to the possibility that Göschel merely commented on the words Göchhausen explicitly stated in *Enthüllung* on the potential influence of the Jesuits on the Illuminati order: 'Diese Freyheit des Denkens und die Freyheit seine Gedanken andern ehrlichen Menschen mitzuthemen um sich zu beruhigen und zu unterrichten scheint mir durch die Ent.d.W. [=Enthüllung der Weltbürgerrepublik. SH] zu verdächtig gemacht zu werden. Auch scheint mir der Verfaßer noch zu allgemein zu reden. Ich halte einige Menschen für Illuminaten die wirklich nichts anders unter Aufklärung suchen als Glückseligkeit der Menschen und Befreyung von Aberglauben und Vorurtheilen. Diese redlichen Menschen werden den Credit verlieren. Ich glaube daß diese Männer, welche ich für Illuminaten halte, die eifrigsten Kämpfer gegen Jesuiterey sind...' (Albrecht 1997, 184-5 note 17).

- 23 EH 428; The Edict of Munich is published in: Dülmen 1975, 390-1.
- 24 Albrecht 1997, 165-8, 174, 185 note 19. – The Illuminati and Weishaupt are subjects of a sharp attack for example in his satire *Thorheit steckt an..* (1788). It describes sadly unsuccessful attempts by the Enlighteners to carry cosmopolitan ideas to a country village.
- 25 Weishaupt, *Andere an die neu aufzunehmenden Illuminates dirigentes* in 1782, quoted in Dülmen 1975, 166-194, see esp. 179.
- 26 See also *Nachrichten* 1795, 4. Beleg, 12-14.
- 27 Dülmen does not even mention Göchhausen as a possible member of the order, but Hermann Schüttler (1991, 63) referring to Bode's diary, has put him on the list of Illuminati as an uncertain member. In no way does the diary provide evidence that Göchhausen really joined the Illuminati (see the next paragraph in the text).
- 28 Obviously, Koselleck (1973, 209, note 24) is the first to express this hypothesis. Anyway, cf. Bode 1787/1994, 202: "von Göchhausen spricht sehr keck über die *Illuminaten* sein Verdammungsurtheil und er kennt sie wahrhaftig nicht. Er würde das aber vermuthlich nicht thun, wenn sich Philo [=Knigge.SH] nicht als einer ihrer unbekannten Obern bey ihn gerirt und sich ein wenig andringlich um von Göchhausen beworben hätte."
- 29 Grassl 1968, 226-7; Schüttler in: Bode 1787/1994, 159; Albrecht 1997, t. All of them assume the pamphlet *Ueber Freymaurerey* composed by J.M. Babo and printed in 1784 would have been a sufficient source of information for Göchhausen's book. The pamphlet denounced the Illuminati as enemies of the state: Babo 1784, esp. 30-50.
- 30 As yet in German usage the rare term 'Staatsbürger' (citizen) could take distance to term 'Untertan' (subject). Naturally, Göchhausen did not use the term 'Staatsbürger' in any emancipated meaning. He only employed

the term in order to contrast the word 'Weltbürger' with 'Staatsbürger'. On these concepts see: Riedel 1972, 683-6, 689-92 and Koselleck 1975, 52-8; 660-2.

31 Cf. Barruel esp. II 1798, 32-35 and I 1798, xxi-xxii; Eudämonia V 1797, 522-3.

Bibliography

Sources

Allgemeine Litteraturzeitung (= ALZ) 1786. Bd. II-IV. Jena 1786.

[Babo, Joseph Marius] Ueber Freymaurer. Erste Warnung. Sammt zwey Beilagen. s.l. 1784

Barruel, Augustin (1798-99): *Memoirs pour servir à l'histoire du Jacobinisme*. Tome 1-5. Hambourg.

Berlinische Monatsschrift. Hrsg. von F. Gedike und J.E. Biester. Berlin 1783-96.

Bode, Johann Joachim Christoph (1787/1994): *Journal von einer Reise von Weimar nach Frankreich im Jahr 1787*. Hrsg. sowie mit einer Einleitung, Anmerkungen, einem Register und einem dokumentarischen Anhang versehen von Hermann Schüttler. München.

Eudämonia oder deutsches Volksglück. Ein Journal für Freunde von Wahrheit und Recht. Bd.I-VI. Leipzig, Frankfurt/M, Nürnberg 1795-98.

[Göchhausen, Ernst August Anton von]: *Aufschluß und Vertheidigung der Enthüllung des Systems der Weltbürger-Republik*. Nebst einer Bitte an die Leser. Rom [Leipzig] 1787.

[Ernst A. A. von Göchhausen]: *Enthüllung des Systems der Weltbürger-Republik*. In Briefen aus der Verlassenschaft eines Freymaurers. Rom [Leipzig] 1786.

[Ernst, A. A. von Göchhausen]: *Thorheit steckt an, wie der Schnupfen. Oder die Weltbauern zu Tollmanhausen*. Ein deutsches Originalstück fürs Liebhaber-Theater zu.... Deutschland [Frankfurt] 1788.

[Göchhausen, Ernst A. A.] (1776): *Das Werther-Fieber, ein unvollendetes Familienstück*. Nieder-Deutschland [Leipzig].

Göchhausen, Ernst August Anton (1799): Schreiben an den Herausgeber des Taschenbuchs für Freimaurer. Eisennach 12.7.1798 In *Taschenbuch für Freimaurer*. Bd.2. Cöthen 1799, pp. 293-306.

[anon] *Nachrichten von einem großen aber unsichtbaren Bunde gegen die christliche Religion und die monarchischen Staaten*. 2. Aufl. s.l. 1795.

Die neuesten Religionsbegebenheiten mit unpartheyischen Anmerkungen. Jg. 1787. Gießen 1787.

- Nicolai, Friedrich: *Beschreibung einer Reise durch Deutschland und die Schweiz im Jahre 1781*. Berlin und Stettin, 12 Bde, 1783-1796.
- Obscuranten-Almanach auf das Jahr 1798*. Paris [Altona].
- Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion. Die Grundlagen des modernen Antisemitismus – eine Fälschung*. Text und Kommentar. Hrsg. v. J.L. Simmons. Göttingen 1998.
- Reinhold, Karl Georg: *Korrespondenz*. Bd.1: 1773-1788. Hrsg. v. Reinhard Lauth. Stuttgart 1983.
- [anon] *Vollendeter Aufschluß des Jesuitismus und des wahren Geheimnisses der Freimaurer*. Ans Licht gestellt von dem Herausgeber der Enthüllung der Weltbürger-Republik aus den Papieren seines verstorbenen Veters. Rom 1787.

Literature

- Agethen, Manfred (1984): *Geheimbund und Utopie. Illuminaten, Freimaurer und deutsche Spätaufklärung*. München 1984.
- Agethen, Manfred (1987): *Aufklärungsgesellschaften, Freimaurer, geheime Gesellschaften*. Ein Forschungsbericht (1976-86). *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung*. Bd. 14 (1987), pp. 444-7.
- Albrecht, Wolfgang (1997): In Biedermannsposen polemisch eifernd wider die "Epidemie der Aufklärungswuth". Ernst August Anton von Göchhausens Beiträge zur norddeutsch-protestantischen Gegenauflärung. In *Von "Obscuranten" und "Eudämonisten": gegenauflärerische, konservative und antirevolutionäre Publizisten im späten 18. Jahrhundert*. Hrsg. von Christoph Weiß in Zusammenarbeit mit Wolfgang Albrecht. St. Ingbert 1997, pp. 155-192.
- Aufklärung als Politisierung - Politisierung der Aufklärung*. Eds. Hans Erich Bödeker and Ulrich Hermann. Hamburg 1987.
- Braubach, Max (1927): Die "Eudämonia" (1795-98). Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Publizistik im Zeitalter der Aufklärung und der Revolution. *Historisches Jahrbuch* 47 (1927), pp. 309-339.
- van Dülmen, Richard (1969): Antijesuitismus und katholische Aufklärung in Deutschland. *Historisches Jahrbuch* 1969/1, pp. 52-80.
- van Dülmen, Richard (1975): *Der Geheimbund der Illuminaten. Darstellung, Analyse, Dokumentation*. Bad-Cannstatt.
- Epstein, Klaus (1966): *The Genesis of German Conservatism*. Princeton.
- Graßl, Hans (1968): *Aufbruch zur Romantik. Bayerns Beitrag zur deutschen Geistesgeschichte 1765-1785*. München 1968.
- Haaser, Rolf (1997): "als wenn ich ein Erzaufklärer wäre...". Der Gießener Regierungsdirektor und reaktionär-konservative Publizist Ludwig Adolf

- Christian von Grolman. In *Von "Obscuranten" und "Eudämonisten": gegenaufklärerische, konservative und antirevolutionäre Publizisten im späten 18. Jahrhundert.* Hrsg. von Christoph Weiß in Zusammenarbeit mit Wolfgang Albrecht. St. Ingbert 1997, pp. 305-365.
- Haikala, Sisko (1996): "Jesuitenriecherei" und Kryptokatholizismus-propaganda - eine Verschwörungsthese der Spätaufklärung. In *Finnland und Deutschland: Forschungen zur Geschichte der beiden Länder und ihre Beziehungen.* Protokollband des Dritten Deutsch-Finnischen Historikerkongresses auf Schloß Spyker (Rügen) vom 15. bis 19. September 1993. Eds. Manfred Menger and Dörte Putensen, Hamburg 1996, pp. 54-65.
- Hammermayer, Ludwig (1980): *Der Wilhelmsbader Freimaurer-Konvent von 1782. Eine Höhe- und Wendepunkt in der Geschichte der deutschen und europäischen Geheimgesellschaften.* Heidelberg.
- Höfer, Gottfried (1970): Ernst August von Göchhausen. *Jahrbuch der Sammlung Kippenberg.* N.F. Bd.2. Düsseldorf 1970, pp. 110-150.
- Klippel, Diethelm (1990): The True Concept of Liberty. Political Theory in Germany in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century. In *The Transformation of Political Culture. England and Germany in the Late Eighteenth Century.* Ed. by Eckhart Hellmuth. Oxford 1990, pp. 447-466.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (1973): *Kritik und Krise. Eine Studie zur Pathogenese der bürgerlichen Welt.* Freiburg, München.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (1975): *Preussen zwischen Reform und Revolution. Allgemeines Landrecht, Verwaltung und soziale Bewegung von 1791 bis 1848.* 2. berichtigte Aufl. München.
- Krüger, Gustav (1931): Die Eudämonisten. Ein Beitrag zur Publizistik des ausgehenden 18. Jahrhunderts. *Historische Zeitschrift* 143 (1931), pp. 467-500.
- Le Forestier, René (1970): *La Franc-Maçonnerie templière et occultiste aux XVIIIe et XIXe siècles.* Publié par Antoine Faivre. Paris.
- Luckert, Steven (1993): *Jesuits, Freemasons, Illuminati, and Jacobins: Conspiracy theories, secret societies, and politics in late eighteenth-century Germany.* Dissertation State University of New York at Binghamton, 1993. Ann Arbor, Michigan 1997.
- Müller, Winfried (1993): Der Jesuitenorden und die Aufklärung im süddeutsch-österreichischen Raum. In *Katholische Aufklärung – Aufklärung im katholischen Deutschland.* Ed. H. Klueting Hamburg 1993, pp. 225-245.
- Mulsow, Martin (1999): Vernünftige Metempsychosis. Über Monadenlehre, Esoterik und geheime Aufklärungsgesellschaften im 18. Jahrhundert. In *Aufklärung und Esoterik.* Hrsg. von Monika Neugebauer-Wölk unter Mitarbeit von Holger Zaunstöck. Hamburg 1999. pp. 211-273.

- Neugebauer-Wölk, Monica (1995): *Esoterische Bünde und bürgerliche Gesellschaft. Entwicklungslinien zur modernen Welt im Geheimbundwesen des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Göttingen.
- Neugebauer-Wölk, Monica (1996): Die utopische Struktur gesellschaftlicher Zielprojektionen im Illuminatenbund. In *Die Politisierung des Utopischen im 18. Jahrhundert: vom utopischen Systementwurf zum Zeitalter der Revolution*. Eds. Monika Neugebauer-Wölk and Richard Saage. Tübingen 1996 pp. 169-97.
- Reinalter Helmut (Ed.)(1997): *Der Illuminatenorden (1776-1785/87). Ein politischer Geheimbund der Aufklärungszeit*. Frankfurt/M.
- Riedel, Manfred: "Bürger, Staatsbürger, Bürgertum". In *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*. Eds. O.Brunner, W. Conze, R. Koselleck. Bd.1. Stuttgart 1972, pp. 672-725.
- Rogalla von Bieberstein, Johannes (1976): *Die These von der Verschwörung 1776-1945. Philosophen, Juden, Liberale und Sozialisten als Verschwörer gegen die Sozialordnung*. Bern.
- Rossberg, Adolf (1942): *Freimaurerei und Politik im Zeitalter der Französischen Revolution*. Berlin.
- Schaeper-Wimmer, Sylva (1985): *Augustin Barruel. S.J. (1741-1820). Studien zu Biographie und Werk*. Frankfurt/M.
- Schneider, Ute (1995): *Friedrich Nicolais Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek als Integrationsmedium der Gelehrtenrepublik*. Wiesbaden.
- Schüttler, Hermann (1991): *Die Mitglieder des Illuminatenordens 1776-1787/93*. München.
- Schüttler, Hermann (1996): Zum Verhältnis von Ideologie, Organisation und Auswanderungsplänen im System der Strikten Observanz. In *Die Politisierung des Utopischen im 18. Jahrhundert: vom utopischen Systementwurf zum Zeitalter der Revolution*. Eds. Monika Neugebauer-Wölk and Richard Saage. Tübingen 1996, pp. 143-68.
- Stuke, Horst (1972): "Aufklärung". In *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*. Eds. O.Brunner, W. Conze, R. Koselleck. Bd.1. Stuttgart 1972, pp. 243-342.
- Taute, Reinhold [1909]: *Der Wilhelmsbader Konvent und der Zusammenbruch der Strikten Observanz*. Nach Originalakten und zuverlässigen Quellen dargestellt. Berlin.
- Valjavec, Fritz (1951): *Die Entstehung der politischen Strömungen in Deutschland 1770-1815*. München.
- Vierhaus, Rudolf (1967) Politisches Bewußtsein in Deutschland vor 1789. In *Der Staat*. Bd. 6 (1967), pp. 175-196.
- Voges, Michael (1987): *Aufklärung und Geheimnis. Untersuchung zur Vermittlung von Literatur- und Sozialgeschichte am Beispiel der Aneignung des Geheimbundmaterials im Roman des späten 18. Jahrhunderts*. Tübingen.