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This dissertation explores how the postfascist countries of East Germany, West Germany, and Italy taught about the Second World War and the Holocaust in their educational systems and specifically explores the representations of these events in textbooks. Postwar textbooks were initially reluctant to discuss mass murder, but a discourse eventually developed in all three countries’ textbooks that was largely influenced by the needs of rebuilding postwar nations. While West German textbooks and their treatments of the Holocaust have been highly studied, the East German and Italian cases have thus far suffered from a paucity of scholarship. Using process-, product-, and reception-oriented methods, this three-country comparative project deals not only with the actual textbook products, but also with the processes by which these textbooks were developed, the educational structures that supported their production, as well as their reception among student and the public. The East-West German comparison permits us to evaluate how governmental ideology affected educational reform, while the comparison between both German states and Italy allows one to consider how the ambiguities of perpetrator status helped determine educational policies.

This dissertation dates the first instances of increased attention to Holocaust education to the late 1950s. This finding challenges scholarly narratives that argue that the 1961 Eichmann Trial and/or the 1968 student movements were central to focusing public attention on Holocaust memory and Holocaust education. This is an important distinction because it suggests that this
new attention to education about Nazi crimes in secondary schools in the late 1950s could have had a causative influence on the increased attention that the Nazi/fascist past received during the student revolts in the West. Overall, this project examines larger questions of how textbooks both contributed to and reflected the processes of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* [coming to terms with the past] and building postwar national identities. It investigates how these countries approached the process of nation-rebuilding, both incorporating and sometimes selectively ignoring the painful legacies of the fascist attempts at racial empire-building. Most broadly, it illuminates how post-dictatorial states democratize and rebuild.
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INTRODUCTION

In her memoir, West German writer Sabine Reichel (b. 1946) described her history class with teacher Fräulein Lange. Reichel recalled that Lange became visibly uncomfortable as the class moved towards the year 1933 in the history book, asking the class, “We are now getting to a dark chapter in German history. I’m sure you all know what I mean?” Reichel recollected of this 1960 history textbook, “There was an extra chapter, about three-quarters of a page long. It was entitled ‘The Extermination of the Jews,’ and I had read it in my room at home many times…Six million Jews were killed in concentration camps, and as I read about Auschwitz and the gas chambers a wave of feelings—fearful fascination mingled with disgust—rushed over me.” Despite the fact that they often read sections of the textbook out loud, Reichel remembered that her class never read or discussed this one. Reichel was left with many questions as to how this horror could have happened:

On page 219 of my history book, Germany was described as a nation living happily under National Socialism …Yet only fourteen pages later the same Volk is depicted in the midst of an entirely different world, miraculously denazified and retrained. . . How did they do it?

---


2 Sabine Reichel, What Did You Do in the War, Daddy?: Growing up German (New York: Hill and Wang, 1989), 105.

3 Ibid., 105-06, 10-11.
My dissertation deals with many of the same questions: How did the postfascist states of East Germany, West Germany, and the Republic of Italy restructure their educational systems? How did these countries choose to teach “a dark chapter” in history textbooks and how did these attempts vary over time? How did students and other citizens respond to these efforts? Essentially, how was history “made” or constructed and how was this constructed history perceived?

Using these questions, I conduct a sustained transnational comparison of countries with similar fascist legacies and roles as aggressors in the Second World War. This project illuminates larger questions of how textbooks both contributed to and reflected the processes of Vergangenheitsbewältigung [coming to terms with the past]. It also investigates how these countries approached the process of nation-rebuilding, both incorporating and sometimes selectively ignoring the painful legacies of the fascist attempts at racial empire-building.

Despite conventional wisdom that these countries refused to deal with the past at all in the immediate postwar period, limited discussion of wartime atrocities in textbooks from the earliest postwar years challenges this perception of silence. Yet this discussion was highly partisan and framed in a way that was useful to the new postwar states’ national identities and ideologies. It took a considerable amount of time before the Holocaust was truly recognized in all three countries and national complicity was acknowledged. This acknowledgement proceeded at different speeds in the different countries, influenced by local circumstances, but there were certain common transnational trends.

The Comparative Approach
With this project, I challenge national boundaries within scholarship. Traditionally, East German, West German, and Italian schoolbooks have been analyzed in isolation. But by considering them together, I am able to advance new arguments that change the way we think about Holocaust memory and education in these three post-fascist states. My findings challenge previous scholarships’ claims of a stagnant ideological East German textbook narrative. By comparing East German textbooks to contemporaneous West German and Italian ones, it becomes clear that during certain periods East Germany was in the vanguard of Holocaust education. I suggest new answers as to why West Germany was more successful than the other post-fascist perpetrator states in introducing its children to a more self-critical textbook narrative about national complicity. I contend that for various reasons, West Germany was subject to the most international scrutiny—far more than East Germany and Italy. Additionally, various groups, including German Jewish community organizations and worldwide Jewish organizations, successfully pushed for changes in the West German educational materials. These factors made the West German state unable to maintain a narrative that blamed an “external other” for Nazi-era crimes, thus resulting in the eventual development of the more self-critical narrative.

Each leg of the comparative triangle offers new analytical insights. The comparison between both German states and Italy allows one to consider how the ambiguities of perpetrator status helped determine educational policies. The East-West German comparison permits us to evaluate how governmental ideology affected educational reform.

---

Conditions of Textbook Production

Governmental structures and ideological underpinnings affected the processes by which textbooks were produced in these three countries. The postwar Italian school system was centralized in name, but the Italian format allowed for a great deal of local variation. In Italy, the Federal Ministry of Public Education set the basic curricular guidelines, but authors wrote the textbooks. Local school committees composed of teachers, parents, and students chose which textbooks were selected for each school and even each class. From speaking with those involved in Italian education, it is clear that, even today, there is little homogeneity in Italian instructional practices. For example, although the Italian Ministry of Public Education has several times since the institution of the *Il Giorno della Memoria* [Day of Memory] in 2000 provided guidelines to educators as to how to teach the Holocaust, these guidelines are not binding on either educators or textbook writers.

In the “welfare dictatorship” of East Germany, the entire country used only one textbook, printed by the state-controlled central publishing house *Volk und Wissen Volkseigener Verlag* [People and Knowledge People’s Publishing House, often called *Volk und Wissen Verlag*]. *Volk und Wissen Verlag* printed only a few unique editions of its middle-school contemporary history

---


textbook over the course of East Germany’s existence, although, it did also sometimes reprint translated Soviet textbooks, especially in the early years.\(^8\)

The West German system, in contrast, was federalized and allowed for both regional and local variation. The *Kultusministerkonferenz* [Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs or KMK], a committee composed of representatives from each West German state, issued curricular and textbook guidelines. Each West German state then issued its own recommendations, influenced by those of the KMK. Teachers and academics created textbook manuscripts, which were then submitted to the more than 80 West German textbook publishers.\(^9\) Each individual West German state had to approve a textbook before it could be used in that states’ classrooms. Teachers were allowed to pick which textbooks they wished to use in their own classroom from the state-approved list.\(^10\) As a result, between 20-30 textbooks dealing with National Socialism were on the market in West Germany at a time; somewhere between 150 and 180 textbooks dealing with National Socialism were published between the formation of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) in 1949 until reunification in 1990.\(^11\)

School history textbooks, which were governmentally approved, are important artifacts of how postfascist governments wanted the national past to be presented. For children who had participated in fascist-youth organizations and had real-life experiences with the dictatorship, textbooks were a means of reeducation. For the next cohort of youth, those who had not been

---

\(^8\) The actual number of unique editions varies based on how you define “contemporary history.” Additionally, for a period of time in the early 1960s, the National Socialist period was divided between the 9th and 10th grade books. Rodden, xxiii, 2-3. For a full list of the East German textbooks considered in this dissertation, see the bibliography.


\(^10\) Ibid., 6-7.

\(^11\) von Borries, "The Third Reich in German History Textbooks since 1945," 46.
raised in a fascist or Nazi system, the textbooks served as authoritative sources on the past, as there was little else about the Holocaust in the surrounding culture. As subsequent cohorts passed through the school system, through the 1970s and 1980s, a greater variety of educational media became available, such as films, museums, concentration camp educational centers and witnesses who were invited to speak with students about the past. Yet textbooks still retained their preeminence, because they, for the most part, contained the material on which students were tested.\textsuperscript{12} Textbooks narratives were not only influenced by governments, but also by authors, teachers, students, parents, and occupation forces. Furthermore, textbooks stood at the crossroads of historiography and public memory. They were influenced by both historiography and public memory, and influenced them both, at various times, in turn.

In many ways, the textbooks mirrored broader discourses on Holocaust memory, but this dissertation also challenges some conventional assumptions, especially those concerning post-war silence and the idea that the Eichmann trial and/or the student uprisings of 1968 revolutionized Holocaust education. By considering underutilized sources (the textbooks), we can develop a more nuanced understanding of how postfascist states dealt with the “dark chapters” of their past.

**Historiographical Background**

This project, with its interdisciplinary reach, addresses issues within various fields—bystander studies, Holocaust studies, reeducation and comparative occupation studies, textbook

\textsuperscript{12} That is not to say that the official textbook narrative was the only one to which students were exposed; history was also transmitted to German children in family contexts, as well. Harald Welzer, "Collateral Damage of History Education: National Socialism and the Holocaust in German Family Memory," *Social Research* 75, no. 1 (2008), http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/docview/209670550/fulltextPDF?accountid=14244.
analysis research, modern German history and modern Italian history. Below, I will briefly sketch out some of these issues and explain how my project fits within them.

**Bystanders: Shall We Revise the Traditional View?**

Bystanders are typically defined by inaction. The term “bystander” first appeared in the context of the Holocaust in the discussions surrounding discussing the newly premiered Rolf Hochhuth play *Der Stellvertreter*, performed in English as *The Deputy*, which harshly criticized Pope Pius XII for his failure to condemn the Nazis and protest the deportation of the Roman Jews.13 Although Hochhuth’s play was not a work of history, per se, it set off a great debate over the role of the Church in the Holocaust. Pope Pius XII was, thus, the “first” Holocaust bystander. Evaluations of Pope Pius XII and the Catholic Church serve as an instructive case study for examining the development of the “bystander” concept over time.

Hochhuth’s play coincided with several historical books addressing the same concept, including Gunter Lewy’s *The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany* (1964), Saul Friedländer’s *Pope Pius XII and the Third Reich* (1964), and Carlo Falconi’s *The Silence of Pius XII* (1965). These historians were limited by their inability to access the Vatican archives, but as a whole criticized the Pope for his silence and “passivity” in the face of the deportations of the Jews of

---

Europe. More recent works on the Pope as bystander include Susan Zuccotti’s *Under His Very Windows* (2000), David Kertzer’s *The Pope and Mussolini* (2014), and Renato Moro’s *Il mito dell’Italia cattolica: nazione, religione e cattolicesimo negli anni del fascismo* [The Myth of Catholic Italy. Nation, Religion, and Catholicism in the Years of Fascism]. These works, drawing on new sources that have become available to scholars and the public, have been more harsh in their historical assessment of the Popes activities and have increasingly focused less on the Vatican and the Popes as silent passive bystanders and increasingly as collaborators, gaining something by actively complying or cooperating with the fascist powers of Mussolini and Hitler.

The move from representing bystander passive inaction to a discussion of bystander complicity and collaboration has been reflected in theoretical debates about how to define who was a bystander. The term “bystander” has developed into a very broad term. As Donald Bloxham and Tony Kushner observed, “The term has become a somewhat loosely defined catch-all for those who are ‘neither perpetrator nor victim.’ This has led to a confusing amalgamation of two distinct groups, argued David Cesarani and Paul A. Levine—a first group,

---


16 Bloxham and Kushner cited the foreword, written by Carol Rittner and John K. Roth, to Victoria Barnett’s *Bystanders: Conscience and Complicity during the Holocaust*. In the forward, Rittner and Roth wrote, “What we do know is that bystanders were neither perpetrators nor victims. They were ordinary people who simply went about their daily lives in the midst of a ghastly dictatorship.” Carol Rittner and John K. Roth, ‘Forward’, in Victoria Barnett, *Bystanders: Conscience and Complicity During the Holocaust, Contributions to the Study of Religion* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1999), x. Donald Bloxham and Tony Kushner, *The Holocaust: Critical Historical Approaches* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 177.
composed of “ordinary Germans” and those living under German occupation during the war, and a second group, composed of individuals and governments physically removed from the sites of atrocities, such as neutral states and the Western Allies. Cesarani and Levine have advocated for the “restor[ation] of the distinction between radically different kinds of ‘bystander’” This call for the divorce of these two categories of bystander coincided with, and was likely prompted by, an increasing historiography elision between the categories of bystander and perpetrator.

The question of how bystanders relate to perpetrators or rescuers has been another source of great historiographical debate. Some, most famously Raul Hilberg in *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders*, have described these categories as separate and distinct. But even Hilberg noted that people moved between categories over the course of the war. Other scholars have more explicitly represented perpetrators, bystanders, and rescuers/resisters on a continuum. For example, Victoria Barnett in *Bystanders: Conscience and Complicity During the Holocaust* wrote, “Some individuals who began as bystanders later became actively involved in the genocide. A minority of people moved in the opposite direction, and became rescuers or members of resistance groups.”

More recent scholarship has shown that people did not only move on the perpetrator-bystander-resister spectrum over the course of the war; sometimes they simultaneously held several positions. In *Neighbors: The Destruction of the Jewish Community in Jedwabne, Poland* (2001), Jan Gross demonstrated that it was not the Nazis that killed the Jews of Jedwabne, but
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17 Cesarani and Levine, "Introduction," in 'Bystanders' to the Holocaust, 1.

18 Ibid., 3.


their Polish neighbors. Gross called into question the idea of the passive bystander and demonstrated that the boundary between them was “fuzzy;” one could be a bystander and a perpetrator at the same time.\textsuperscript{21} Jan Grabowski, in his 2013 study of Polish-Jewish relations during the Holocaust in Dabrowa Tarnowska, demonstrated that there was a whole “rescue spectrum” among Poles who hid their Jewish neighbors. Some Poles might rescue Jews for a time, but then might extort money from their guests, give them up to the Germans, even kill them themselves.\textsuperscript{22} They could simultaneously hold the positions of rescuers and persecutors.

This empirical scholarship has prompted shifts in theoretical writings, as well. Donald Bloxham and Tony Kushner, as well as Tom Lawson have similarly remarked that those in occupied territories could simultaneously hold the roles of perpetrator, victim, and bystander, with Bloxham and Kushner particularly referencing Jedwabne as an example. As a result, some studies, like Lawson’s and Bloxham and Kushner’s have shied away from this elision of roles, and thus have preferred to focus their bystanders on the Western democracies or the Vatican, where there is less of a chance of a bystander turning into a perpetrator or holding those roles simultaneously.\textsuperscript{23} However, those working on “bystanders” in German-occupied territories or in collaborator states do not have such a luxury. The continuum model, with its inherent ambivalence, is, therefore, particularly important when dealing with these figures.

\textit{Bystanders: The Italian Case}

\textsuperscript{21} Jan T. Gross, \textit{Neighbors, the Destruction of the Jewish Community in Jedwabne, Poland} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 12, \texttt{http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9781400843251}

\textsuperscript{22} Jan Grabowski, \textit{Hunt for the Jews: Betrayal and Murder in German-Occupied Poland} (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 77, 150, 52.

The use of the word “bystander” with reference to those in collaborator-occupied nations (ex. Fascist Italy), did not come into wide parlance until the late 1980s and 1990s. That does not mean, however, that these issues were not discussed in Holocaust or Second World War historiography before these decades. Often issues of passivity and complicity were debated using the terms “collaborator,” “rescuers,” and “innocents,” instead.

Italy embraced fascism far earlier than Germany had, with Benito Mussolini coming to power in 1922. Mussolini increasingly aligned Italy with Nazi Germany over the course of the 1930s. Italy created antisemitic legislation in June 1938 and entered the Second World War in June 1940, partially in an attempt to expand its own territory.\(^{24}\) Fascist Italy created concentration camps for Jews and other individuals in both its occupied territories and on the peninsula from 1940-1943.\(^{25}\) However, upon the invasion of the Allies into the south of Italy in 1943, Mussolini was overthrown and a new government set up in its place under Marshal Badoglio, which subsequently surrendered in September 1943 to the Allies. As a result, Germany invaded the northern portion of the peninsula and helped Mussolini set up an Italian Social Republic (RSI). From 1943 to 1945, for the first time, Jews in Italy were rounded up \textit{en masse} and deported to concentration camps and death camps in the German Reich.\(^{26}\) This legacy of


semi-independent government and German occupation make evaluating complicity in fascist Italy a difficult task.

Renzo De Felice was the first prominent historian to give sustained consideration to the topic of the Italian Jews under Italian fascism. *The Jews in Fascist Italy. A History*, published as *Storia degli ebrei italiani sotto il fascismo*, first appeared in 1961 and has been revised and republished several times over the last fifty-five years. De Felice described Mussolini as unsupportive of state antisemitism until 1937.\(^{27}\) When antisemitism experienced a resurgence in Italy in the 1930s, it was in response to Nazi pressure, which was “decisive but not direct.” De Felice condemned attempts “to attribute Nazis direct responsibility for Italian racist campaigns.” Yet, De Felice proffered another way to avoid responsibility, by concentrating responsibility for antisemitism among a small number of fascists. He wrote, “Only a small number of unsavory characters (who were often paid) wound up being in favor of the racial policies.” In any case, De Felice purported that Italian racial policies were “less personally oppressive” than other countries’ antisemitic laws and were aimed far more at expulsion than at extermination. While De Felice is correct that there was no Italian anti-Jewish extermination policy before 1943, scholars such as Valeria Galimi, for example, have sounded a note of caution about some of De Felice’s conclusions and have noted that “many social groups….demonstrated real zeal in excluding Jews from public life.”\(^{28}\)

---

27 The dissertation author has chosen to use “antisemitic” and “antisemitism” rather than “anti-Semitic” and “anti-Semitism.” However, she has not changed the terms if they appear in a quoted source. For example, American newspaper coverage in the 1960s used the term “anti-Semitism.” Renzo De Felice, *The Jews in Fascist Italy: A History*, trans. Robert L. Miller (New York: Enigma Books, 2001; repr., 3), 219.

De Felice proceeded from the belief that not only did Italians refuse to embrace antisemitism, but also that they actively resisted it. He emphasized partisan struggle during the years of the Italian Social Republic, as well as Jewish Italians’ role in it. The high survival rate of Italian Jews was attributed to a “wave of solidarity, which was truly national and saw the overwhelming majority of Italians helping their Jewish compatriots and anyone else seeking refuge from Nazi barbarism in Italy, every way they could.” 29

It was not until the mid-1990s that this view of Italians as a nation of passive bystanders, even active resisters, began to be challenged. 30 Notable scholarship on the persecution of the Italian Jews came out the Fondazione Centro di Documentazione Ebraica Contemporanea [The Foundation, Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation or CDEC] in Milan in the 1990s, including Liliana Picciotto Fargion’s 1991 Il libro della memoria: gli ebrei deportati dall’Italia, 1943-1945 [The Book of Memory: The Jews Deported from Italy, 1943-1945] and also Michele Sarfatti’s 1994 Mussolini contro gli ebrei: cronaca dell’elaborazione delle leggi del 1938 [Mussolini Against the Jews: Chronicle of the Elaboration of the Laws of 1938]. 31 In his monograph, Sarfatti took on the idea that the Italian antisemitic laws were adopted under Nazi pressure. Sarfatti placed the blame squarely on Mussolini and aimed to investigate his role in establishing these laws. 32 Sarfatti argued that before Kristallnacht in Germany in November


32 Sarfatti, Mussolini contro gli ebrei (1994).
1938, the Italian racial laws (created in September of that year), were actually more severe than their German counterparts.\textsuperscript{33} Notable work on the Italian racial laws has also been presented in the 2019 edited volume, \textit{Vietato studiare, vietato insegnare} [Forbidden to Study, Forbidden to Teach]. In this work, Vincenzia Iossa and Manuele Gianfrancesco collected official bulletins of the Ministry of Education related to the anti-Jewish laws in Italy, in an attempt to illustrate the connections between “the fascist regime, the racism of the state, and scholastic norms.”\textsuperscript{34}

While Sarfatti’s 1994 book took an in-depth look at the development of one set of laws, his 2006 \textit{The Jews in Mussolini’s Italy: From Equality to Persecution} had a far broader scope, considering the years 1922 to 1945. In \textit{The Jews in Mussolini’s Italy}, Sarfatti evaluated, among other things, the actions of the Italian government and the Italian period during the Italian Social Republic period. Sarfatti pointed out that the “hunt” for the Jews in northern Italy was carried out both by German soldiers and by the police forces of the Republic of Salò. The Italian authorities even turned Jews that had been arrested over to German control at transit camps of Fossoli di Carpi and Bolzano-Gries. From there, these Jews were deported to Auschwitz; only six percent of whom survived.\textsuperscript{35} That said, research has also uncovered evidence that Italian officials blocked the deportation of Jews from their occupied territories during the pre-1943 period out of a desire for prestige and sovereignty over their occupied territories and the contentious Italo-German relationship.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 124-26.
\textsuperscript{34}Vincenza Iossa and Manuele Gianfrancesco, eds., \textit{Vietato studiare, vietato insegnare: il ministero dell'educazione nazionale e l'attuazione delle norme antiebraiche 1938-1943} (Palombi, 2019), 32.
\textsuperscript{36} Rodogno, \textit{Fascism's European Empire} (2006), 362-401.
Sarfatti also discussed Jewish rescue by non-Jewish Italians and concluded that all Italians cannot be characterized as “good” or “bad” because “a clear-cut confrontation was taking place during those months between ‘bad’ Italians—the persecutors, the informants, the acquiescent, the indifferent—and the ‘good’ Italians—the active rescuers, the charitable, the sympathizers, the just.”

Thus, Sarfatti emphasized that not all of the population were sympathetic to the Jews and even those who were may have acquiesced or been indifferent; their silence was not a neutral act. Alexis Herr further investigated this idea in her 2014 dissertation and subsequent monograph on the Italian concentration and transit camp Fossoli di Carpi. Herr, who described her dissertation as “an investigation of gentile silence and the ambiguity of the bystander category in Italy during the Holocaust,” argued that those “bystanders” simply living out their lives during the war, could also possess “perpetrator” qualities, if they contributed to the Fossoli camp’s operations—driving prisoners to the trains for deportation, for example. The role of non-Jewish Italians in the rounding up and deportation of their neighbors has also been explored in Italian-language regional studies published in the mid-2000s, such as Ebrei in Toscana tra occupazione tedesca e RSI: Persecuzione, depredazione, deportazione (1943-1945) [Jews in Tuscany between the German Occupation and the RSI: Persecution, Depredation, Deportation (1943-1945)], edited by Enzo Collotti, and Amedeo Osti Guerrazi’s Caino a Roma: I complici romani della Shoah. [Cain in Rome: The Complicit Romans in the Holocaust].

---

37 Ibid., 209.
39 All quotes are from the 2014 dissertation version. Herr, "Fossoli di Carpi," 4-5.
The most recent work of note is Simon Levis Sullam’s *The Italian Executioners* (2018). Although it offers little additional in primary research and focuses primarily on the 1943-1945 period, it provides an effective summary of the recent Italian-language scholarship for English-language audiences.\(^1\) Levis Sullam compared the Italians assisting in the process of the deportation and extermination of the Italian Jews to the “desk perpetrators” of Raul Hilberg’s work.\(^2\) Levis Sullam argued that “although the final acts of extermination were not carried out on Italian soil or by Italian hands, there is no doubt that Italians, working both at the center and on the periphery of the reborn Fascist State, also took the initiative in the process.” Italians had created internment camps for Jews long before the German occupation and the Italian Social Republic. When the deportations began in 1943, Italian officials proffered lists of Jews living in Italian cities; these documents were used by German and Italian policemen alike to conduct arrests. Italian informers identified and turned in Italian Jews and non-Jewish Italians also benefitted from arrested and deported Jews’ property. Italians administered the day to day operation of the Fossoli concentration camp and Italian train operators drove the deportation trains to the border. These individuals were therefore responsible for the genocide.\(^3\)

In the case of Fascist Italy, the term “bystander” has little meaning. Given the messy combination of independent government (which later became semiautonomous as the RSI), German occupation, and somewhat willing collaboration with Nazi officials, it is difficult to

---


characterize any level of participation in local or national government, or indeed any silence, as passive. This is becoming increasingly clear as scholars gain access to new sources and no longer have to base their analyses solely on captured Nazi documents, documents of the “clear perpetrators.” Although Fascist Italy was not the primary engine behind the Holocaust, some members of the Italian government supported and implemented policies that facilitated its execution. The Italian government and state can be characterized as a “co-perpetrator;” thus my project treats it as such, as it tried, like the German states in the postwar era to pull its country back from the brink of disaster and to educate its students in a new way of being.  

Postwar Educational Reconstruction: The Process

Postwar educational reconstruction is a well-established research subject; however, far more attention has been given to West German educational reconstruction than to East German or Italian postwar reeducation projects. When moving from the least to the most studied, one begins with Italy. Postwar education reform in Italy has received little consideration in English-language literature, with the notable exception of Steven F. White’s monograph Progressive Renaissance. White’s Progressive Renaissance stressed the relatively collaborative nature of the reeducation process in Italy—with both occupiers and occupied working together to determine what would be the new educational “normal”. However, both White and Christina Allemann-Ghionda, who has written a chapter on John Dewey’s influence on the restructuring of Italian

44 Robert Gordon has also noted that Italy can be considered a “coperpetrator” in Robert S. C. Gordon, "Which Holocaust? Primo Levi and the Field of Holocaust Memory in Post-War Italy," Italian Studies 61, no. 1 (2006/03/01 2006): 90, http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/007516306X96700.

education, have argued that the progressive elements introduced to the Italian school system by
the Allies in the immediate postwar era were subsequently “reinterpreted” or even eliminated as
the more conservative forces of Christian Democracy (DC) came to power and the Cold War
began in earnest.46 Other scholars, such as Luigi Cajani and Anna Ascenzi, have mentioned
postwar reforms in the context of articles or broader works, but only briefly.47

The field, however, has been marked recently by a number of newer Italian-language
studies on the defascistization of reeducation from different angles.48 Fabio Targhetta’s 2018
article “Tra selva normative e schedature di massa: i procedimenti di epurazione degli insegnanti
di scuola secondaria” [Between Tangled up Regulations and Mass rRgistration: The
Defascistization Process of Secondary School Teachers] considered in the issue in the city of
Padua, drawing from local Italian sources.49 Tommaso Dell’Era’s 2003 article in *Ventunesimo
secolo* looked at the ministerial politics of the Ministry of Public Education between 1943 and
1948, but did not consider overmuch the ministry’s attitude towards textbooks.50 Piergiovanni
Genovesi’s 2009 study *Il manuale di storia in Italia: dal fascismo alla repubblica* [The History
Textbook in Italy: From Fascism to the Republic] paid special attention to the defascistization of
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46 Cristina Alleman-Ghionda, “Dewey in Postwar-Italy: The Case of Re-Education,” in *Dewey and European
Education: General Problems and Case Studies*, ed. Jürgen Oelkers and Heinz Rhyn (Dordrecht: Springer

47 For examples, please see: Cajani, “Italian History Textbooks on the Brink of the Twenty-First Century,” in *School
History Textbooks across Cultures*; Anna Ascenzi, *Education and the Metamorphoses of Citizenship in
Contemporary Italy* (Macerata: EUM, 2009).

48 Many thanks to the anonymous reviewers of my article in the *Journal of Educational Media, Memory, and Society*
fors pointing me towards this literature.

49 Fabio Targhetta, "Tra selva normativa e schedature di massa: i procedimenti di epurazione degli insegnanti di

50 Tommaso Dell’Era, "Tra educazione nazionale e pubblica istruzione: le politiche ministeriali dell'istruzione
school textbooks in Italy, but did not place the process in the context of broader Allied efforts.51 These are all valuable studies, but overall the role of textbooks in the process of defascistization and the transnational connections to other Allied postwar reeducation programs remain under-researched.

The restructuring of the East German school system has received more scholarly attention. Early works such as Norman Naimark’s 1995 *The Russians in Germany*, emphasized the totalitarian nature of the Sovietization of the East German zone. However, this understanding of the ruling *Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands* (Socialist Unity Party of Germany, SED) and East German society as subservient to the Soviets and their top-down shaping of education and culture has not been shared by later historians.52 Benita Blessing, in *The Antifascist Classroom: Denazification in Soviet-Occupied Germany, 1945–1949* (2006), for example, argued that the Soviet occupation of Germany was a time of school reform that drew upon the legacy of indigenous German progressive reforms. She looked at the development of the “new school” [*neue Schule*] in the Soviet occupied zones of Germany from 1945 to 1949. Blessing asserted that this “new school” had a hybrid character; it combined Soviet antifascist democratization with the legacy of indigenous German debates about educational reform from the latter half of the 19th century. Blessing stressed that educational policy was not just administered by the Soviets from above; East Germans had more autonomy in creating the new state than previously thought.53 Charles Lansing’s 2010 study *From Nazism to Communism: German Schoolteachers under Two Dictatorships* also explored the continuities between the East
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German school system and earlier educational models. Lansing argued that both National Socialist and East German communist policies failed to truly change the physical and ideological make-up of the teacher corps. Lansing wrote, “The men and women charged in the postwar era with educating a new ‘antifascist’ generation were, to a surprising degree, the same individuals who had dutifully worked to Nazify Germany’s pupils in the Third Reich.”

There has also been a number of German-language studies (primarily dissertations, which are not widely available) published since the end of the Cold War. This flurry of post-1989 analysis has not been matched in the English-speaking world. Thus, in general, scholarship has increasingly highlighted both the continuities between the previous school system and the new East German one, as well as the structural barriers inhibiting total Sovietization of East German schools.

Given this, the West German and East German postwar school systems may have been more similar than previously thought.

Scholarship on the denazification and reconstruction of West German education has been, by far, the most popular and prolific. Earlier work in this field, such as James Tent’s 1982 Mission on the Rhine: Reeducation and Denazification in American-Occupied Germany and Saul B. Robinsohn and J. Casper Kulhmann’s 1967 article “Two Decades of Non-Reform in West German Education” in Comparative Education Review, stressed the failure of the

---

54 Charles B. Lansing, From Nazism to Communism: German Schoolteachers under Two Dictatorships (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).


democratization of West German education and labeled the immediate post-war rebuilding of the school system as a time of “restoration.” However, more recent studies, such as Beate Rosenzweig’s *Erziehung zur Demokratie?: amerikanische Besatzungs- und Schulreformpolitik in Deutschland und Japan* [Upbringing for Democracy?: American Occupation and School Reform Politics in Germany and Japan] and Brian Puaca’s *Learning Democracy: Education Reform in West Germany, 1945-1965* have noted grassroots transformations in the school system and have challenged this more traditional narrative. Most work has primarily focused on the American-occupied areas of Germany, although there has been some recent scholarship on the British zone, such as David Phillip’s 2018 *Educating the Germans: People and Policy in the British Zone of Germany, 1945-1949*. The French zone is almost entirely ignored in the literature.

Surprisingly little comparative work has emerged. There have been a few comparative works on the two German states, for example Andrew Haeberlin’s PhD dissertation “Towards a Post-Nazi Education: Administrators Rebuild the German School System 1945-1949,” Karl-Heinz Füssl’s monograph *Die Umerziehung der Deutschen: Jugend und Schule unter den

---


Siegermächten des zweiten Weltkriegs 1945-1955 [The Reeducation of the Germans: Youth and School under the Victorious Powers of the Second World War, 1945-1955], and Arthur Hearnden’s *Education in the Two Germanies.* In his comparison, Haeberlin focused on the roles of educational middle administrators as intermediaries between occupation leaders and the German public. Karl-Heinz Füssl’s work looked at youth organizations and school policy in the American and Soviet occupied zones, but his study was somewhat unbalanced. For example, Füssl also only discussed school policy in the Soviet occupation zone, but not in those areas controlled by the Western Allies. Arthur Hearnden’s analysis, published in both German and English, considered all four occupying powers’ policies towards reeducation, but only in one chapter of a much larger work book. Aside from the few comparative studies on the various occupied zones of Germany, there have also been some scholarly comparisons between West Germany and Japan. For example, both Beate Rosenzweig’s and Masako Shibata’s monographs argued that Japan embraced more wholesale educational reform (at least outwardly), while West Germany retained more of its previous educational structures and presented greater opposition to American educational imports.

---


62 Haeberlin, "Towards a Post-Nazi Education: Administrators Rebuild the German School System 1945-1949."


Despite the fact that some of the same individuals were involved in reeducation projects in both the American-occupied zone of Germany and Italy, there appears to be currently little comparative scholarship on this topic. Furthermore, the bounty of work on postwar reconstruction has provided little understanding as to how postwar textbooks contributed to students’ reorientation and how they were used by postwar occupation officials and education ministries. This dissertation attempts to investigate this issue.

Textbook Research: The Product

Scholarship on the actual textbooks themselves has largely taken place outside of the discipline of history—in a sphere populated by pedagogues, social scientists, and linguists. Despite the different character of its scholarly practitioners, textbook analysis work has followed a similar pattern to the postwar reconstruction literature—a paucity of work on Italy, some more work on East Germany and a much greater focus on the West German case. Italian textbooks’ portrayals of the Second World War and the Holocaust have been particularly ignored in the English-language scholarship, with the exception of Luigi Cajani’s, Anna Ascenzi’s, Milena Santerini’s, and Antonio Gioia’s translated works. But these studies and other Italian-languages ones have either been relatively brief in their treatment of textbook representations of Holocaust
complicity and resistance or have been limited temporally in their focus. Italy has also been mostly left out of comparative textbook analyses.

Analysis of East German schoolbooks has also been relatively sparse. John Rodden’s work is perhaps the best known, but it fails to consider change over time and has an overbearing Cold Warrior tone, which detracts from his conclusions. Others, including Gregory Wegner and Michael Bröning, have also contributed to this field, but overall, most historians and pedagogues prefer to focus on the West German case, perhaps because the East German case is often seen as relatively stagnant. Many historians have considered West German textbooks and their historical coverage of World War II and the Holocaust. Recent studies have depicted West


German textbooks as increasingly explicit in introducing young readers to a critical approach with regards to national involvement in the Holocaust.\(^6\)

While thus far, our overview of product-oriented analysis has focused on contemporary scholarly work, it should be noted that there was an interesting body of work created between the late 1950s and 1970s by West Germans and Italians as the inadequacies of the earlier generation of middle school textbooks began to become increasingly apparent. In the West German case, this body of literature does not seem to have been published, but was instead produced internally in the late 1950s and early 1960s for the KMK’s use when drafting new guidelines on how to teach the National Socialist period. These files contain reviews of West German textbooks and critiques of their handling of the Nazi past.\(^7\) In Italy, this literature was published, but does not seem to have been widely circulated. A few Italian product-orientated analyses came out of scholarly discussions in the early 1970s, for example the proceedings of the national conference held in 1970 Ferrara, which were published as *Libri di testo e resistenza* [Textbooks and Resistance]. *La storia dannosa: indagine sui libri di storia adottati nelle scuole medie* [Harmful History: Investigation of History Books Adopted in Middle Schools], published in 1972, draws
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\(^7\)See, for example: Folder B 304/1949 2 von 2, *Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (hereafter referred to as KMK), *Bundesarchiv Koblenz*, Koblenz, Germany (hereafter referred to as BA Koblenz)
on this conference in its analysis, as well. These 1960s and 1970s studies are useful on two levels. They provide the historian with product-oriented studies on which to draw and they also allow the historian to discern the concerns which were prevalent at the time of the studies’ publications.

Commemorative Culture and Holocaust Education: The Reception

Studies on the impact of Holocaust education and public commemorative culture tend to focus on contemporary populations and events and thus often tend not to be very historical in nature. One such example is social psychologist Harald Welzer’s study from the early 2000s on the differences between private German memory culture and the official narrative that one is taught in school. Welzer concluded that education about the Holocaust, rather than prompting young Germans to reflect on the older generations’ possible guilt, had convinced them that their grandparents had all been resisters during the Third Reich and had never been antisemitic. Welzer concluded, “Whoever was guilty of the Holocaust, whoever committed the crimes in the extermination camps, the forced labor system, and the camps—one thing is clear to all German citizens: Grandpa wasn't it!”

There are few, if any, studies on how Holocaust education was historically received in either Germany or Italy. However, occasionally some historians incorporate student reactions into their discussion of postwar educational reconstruction, such as in Puaca’s use of reflections of Berlin Student Parliament participants when evaluating the democratizing effects of student

---
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governments in West Germany and Blessing’s use of pupil essays when looking at East German “new schools.” Some memoirs and autobiographical writings reflect on their Holocaust education and school time experiences and there has also been some general literature on the transformation of political and memory culture, including a comparative volume Erinnerungskulturen: Deutschland, Italien, und Japan seit 1945 [Memory Cultures: Germany, Italy, and Japan since 1945]. Erinnerungskulturen, an edited volume, did include two contributions on the representation of the Second World War in textbooks: an essay by Luigi Cajani on textbook depictions in the Italy and one by Susan Petersen on Japanese schoolbooks, but there were no comparative essays and the German case was not considered. Thus, we do not really know what role the textbooks played in this transformation. My project attempts to elucidate this link.


Methodology and Theory

Textbook Analysis Methodology

In a paper for a 1990 educational workshop held in Braunschweig, Peter Weinbrenner set out three categories of schoolbook research: process-oriented, product-oriented, and reception-oriented research.\(^{75}\) As my own project is an integrated history involving all three of these categories, I will briefly give an overview of each and the scholarly methods utilized in each category of study.

Process-oriented textbook research focuses on the context and process by which textbooks are created. As Weinbrenner explained, “This is geared to the life cycle of schoolbooks” and involves the following fields: “1. Development; 2. Approval; 3. Marketing; 4. Introduction; 5. Application; 6. Disposal or destruction.”\(^{76}\) An example of process-oriented research is Puaca’s *Learning Democracy*, which looked at the variety of reforms pioneered in the first two decades of West German education, including textbook revisions promoted by American-established Educational Service Centers.\(^{77}\) A second example would be my article “American and British Efforts to Democratize Schoolbooks in Occupied Italy and Germany from 1943 to 1949,” which examined and compared the textbook revision processes in Allied-occupied Italy and Germany.\(^{78}\) John Rodden’s *Repainting the Little Red Schoolhouse* also stands as an example of this process-oriented research; it considered the structures and processes of


\(^{76}\) Ibid.


\(^{78}\) Weiner, "American and British Efforts to Democratize Schoolbooks in Occupied Italy and Germany from 1943 to 1949."
education and re-education in the East German school system. Indeed, although Rodden’s subsequent book Textbook Reds engaged far more in product-oriented analysis, Repainting the Little Red Schoolhouse barely mentioned textbooks and focused far more on the cultural milieu that influenced East German educational directives.79

The vast majority of the scholarly work that has emerged has been product-oriented research, with a focus on the actual schoolbooks. Comparative textbook analyses, like Peter Carrier’s global mapping project of Holocaust textbooks and curricula and my article “Tendentious Texts: Holocaust Representations and Nation-Building in East German, Italian, and West German Schoolbooks, 1949-1989,” usually fall into this category.80 Product-oriented analyses are typically conducted by two types of scholars: historians and professors of education/pedagogy. Most historians (as well as some pedagogues)—including Bodo von Borries, Walter Renn, Falk Pingel, Waclaw Sobanski and Brian M. Puaca—have conducted their analysis through close readings of their selected texts.81 Another qualitative methodological possibility is presented by Antonio Gioia, who presented a catalogue of selected textbook extracts on various themes.82 Some education scholars, however, have utilized more quantitative approaches...
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81 von Borries, "The Third Reich in German History Textbooks since 1945."; Renn, "Federal Republic of Germany: Germans, Jews and Genocide," in The Treatment of the Holocaust in Textbooks: The Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, the United States of America; Pingel, "From Evasion to a Crucial Tool of Moral and Political Education: Teaching National Socialism and the Holocaust in Germany," in What Shall We Tell the Children?: International Perspectives on School History Textbooks; Puaca, "Mastering the Past?" in As the Witnesses Fall Silent; Waclaw Sobanski, School Textbooks in the German Federal Republic (Warsaw: Zachodnia Agencja Prasowa, 1962).

82Gioia, Guerra, fascismo, resistenza (2012).
methods, using statistical analysis to survey a large number of textbooks. For example, Patricia Bromley and Susan Garnett Russell analyzed the treatment of the Holocaust in 465 textbooks published since 1970 from 69 countries using a statistical model to answer the question of whether or not these selected countries discussed the Holocaust in the context of human rights’ violations (as a opposed to as a unique historical event).83 A further division between historians and pedagogues can be observed in their use of historical context in textbook analysis. While some historians—like Brian Puaca—have focused on analyzing the textbooks in the historical context of their production, many scholars—like Jason Nicholls, John Rodden as well as Patricia Bromley and Susan Garnett Russell, have not taken this approach.84 This has largely given product-oriented research an ahistorical quality.

Product-oriented analysis also remains largely undertheorized. Many analyses, particularly those written by historians, as opposed to by education scholars, appear without any reference to their theoretical underpinnings. In 1990, Weinbrenner noted that “to date no detailed and universally recognized ‘theory of the schoolbook’” exists.85 Despite the number of textbook analyses that have emerged since Weinbrenner penned these words, this still appears to be the case. That said, education theorist Michael Apple presents some interesting ideas with regards to the connection between textbooks and power, which are applicable to this project. Apple’s


85History and Social Studies - Methodologies of Textbook Analysis (1992), 22.
theoretical writings are adamant that textbooks and the curricula are not neutral entities. They are “at once the results of political, economic, and cultural activities, battles and compromise. They are conceived, designed, and authored by real people with real interests. They are published within the political and economic constraints of markets, resources, and power.”86 What is presented as “fact” depends on who and what has power, which often leads to the exclusion of the historical experiences of less powerful minority groups.87 According to Apple, an American liberal combatting what he perceives as the invasion of conservative thought into school curricula, textbooks “participate in creating what a society has recognized as legitimate and truthful.”88 That said, Apple acknowledged that textbooks are not “totally reliable defenders of the existing ideological, political, and economic order” because “there are progressive elements within curricula and texts,” largely arising from the new more liberal middle class, who are often the authors of these texts. As a result, textbook production can become an ideological battle ground.89 Applying Apple’s theory to postwar Europe, textbook representations of the Holocaust and the Second World War often reflected the memory politics of the ruling political parties, and changed as a result of electoral or regime shifts.

Those engaged in reception-oriented textbook research tend to be scholars in the fields of education and sociology. Their research considers public reaction to textbooks, as well as how textbooks influence teacher-student relations in the classroom. An example of this type of analysis would be Debora Hinderliter Ortloff’s, “They Think It Is Funny to Call Us Nazis”:


87 Ibid., 170, 75.

88 Ibid., 172.

89 Ibid., 162.
Holocaust Education and Multicultural Education in a Diverse Germany,” which appeared in the 2015 edited volume As the Witnesses Fall Silent: 21st Century Holocaust Education in Curriculum, Policy, and Practice. In her study, Ortloff considered both social studies textbooks and interviews that she conducted with 58 teachers. The teacher interviews, in particular, were used to measure reception—how teachers connected Holocaust education to contemporary issues of xenophobia in their classrooms. Ortloff conducted initial “in-vivo coding” of both textbooks and teacher interviews manually and using the qualitative research software NVIVO.90

Reception Theory and Memory Studies

Since the historical scope of my research, in many cases, precludes the possibility of teacher interviews, I measure reception by considering memoirs and other autobiographical writings. Use of these sources requires a knowledge of reception theory, as well as some familiarity with memory studies and the theory behind life-writing.

Reception theory (or reader-response theory) emerged out of the Konstanz School in Germany and emphasized the importance of reception of a text and the active role of the reader. For the members of the Konstanz school, dominated by Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser, the text was not autonomous and was not of paramount importance; more important was the reader, whose interpretation of the text was shaped not just by the text’s words, but by his or her own life experiences.91 In the case of this project, the stories that students may have heard from


parents and grandparents about the war and the Holocaust—exchanged through what Aleida Assmann terms “three generational memory”—would affect how they received textbook depictions of these events. But generational memory is not the only thing at play. The concept of collective memory is also important when considering how students, many generations after the Second World War, experience the textbooks. Collective memory, unlike generational memory or individual memory, is bolstered by “symbolic supports” and external symbols, such as monuments, images, commemorative ceremonies, or textbooks. These symbols make the memory real and allow students to partake in it, even if their families were not in Germany or Italy at the time of the Second World War and they have no personal connection with this “dark chapter” of the recent past. Students brought these preconceptions to the table when they interacted with these textbooks.

How, exactly, can one discover how these historical students experienced these textbooks? While I utilize some contemporaneous documents (evaluations of the textbooks, usage statistics, student essays), the vast majority of the sources available to me to answer this question are memoirs and autobiographical writing, written years after the authors were in school. This means that the sources are “self-reflexive, contrasting a prior self with the later persona and thereby providing clues to individual and collective learning processes.” This also means that the sources have been often shaped by the collective memory or narratives of society. As popularized by Maurice Halbwachs, collective memory means that the retrieval of one’s


93 Ibid., 21.

memories is not an individual process. The individual is dependent on societal frameworks in order to establish coherent recollections and memories. As a result, the past is not “preserved, but is reconstructed on the basis of the present.” Assmann reflected, “Memories do not exist as a closed system; they are already affected, strengthened, inflected, modified, and polarized by other memories and by impulses to forget within the context of a given social reality.” Thus memoirs, unlike the contemporary interviews utilized by Ortloff, allow the subject time to reflect and revise their “memory” of events based on what society at a later date messages is important. This does not, in any way, negate the usefulness of these sources, but it is important to consider when conducting reception-oriented analysis.

Methods, Sources, and Structure

My project involves an integrated comparison of history textbooks and history education in Italy, East Germany, and West Germany. By the terms “integrated comparison” or “integrated history,” I mean that my project compares how educational systems and curricula developed in the three subject countries, the three postfascist states’ history textbooks, as well as how these textbooks and curricula were received; it combines process-oriented, product-oriented, and reception-oriented analyses. This contributes to a fuller understanding of how these textbooks came about and how they affected the society around them. It also allows me to answer the question of how the educational system reflected the states’ narratives about the past, as well as

---


why and how the textbooks that carried these narratives mattered in the lives of students and the surrounding communities.

Process-oriented textbook research focuses on the context and process by which textbooks are created. As Weinbrenner explained, “This is geared to the life cycle of schoolbooks,” from schoolbooks’ development to their use to their demise.97 I have chosen to interpret process-oriented research more broadly than Weinbrenner and to expand its meaning to include the processes of curriculum development, which shapes the form that textbooks will take. The process-oriented analysis in my dissertation traces the production backstory of history textbooks from the postwar rebuilding of the school systems through the end of the Cold War in my three subject states. Primary source documents for this portion of the dissertation include: papers of the occupying forces and military governments; documents of the postwar ministries/departments of education in East Germany, West Germany, and Italy; interviews with authors and editors; curricular guidance documents produced by all three states; as well as correspondence related to the revision of textbooks.

The process-oriented research for this dissertation required the most travel and involved trips to the National Archives of the United States and the United Kingdom to investigate the textbook revision processes promoted by the American and British occupying authorities, as well as extensive work in the national archives of Italy and Germany to collect documents from the educational oversight bodies in the Republic of Italy, East Germany, and West Germany (located in the national/federal archives in Rome, Berlin, and Koblenz, respectively). Some papers of the Soviet occupying authorities were also located at the Federal Archive in Berlin. I also consulted the files of the East German pedagogical institutes: the Deutsches Pädagogische Zentralinstitut.
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[German Pedagogical Central Institute, DPZI] and its successor the Akademie der Pädagogische Wissenschaft der DDR [Academy of Pedagogical Science of the GDR, APW], which are located at the Library for Research on Educational History [BBF] in Berlin. These trips to national archives were supplemented by a short stay at the University of Chicago Special Collections to access the private papers of American occupation official Thomas Vernor Smith, who plays a large role in Chapters 1 and 2 of this dissertation. I also conducted a large amount of research at the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research [GEI], which holds curricular documents for various countries throughout the world.

In Italy, due to the loose structure of the Italian educational system, as well as different national archival practices, textual records were much less available than in Germany. This, while frustrating, led me to various individuals involved in the Italian educational world, who graciously and generously agreed to be interviewed and to provide material to help supplement my work in this area. These include: the textbook author Carlo Cartiglia, author of prolific series of middle school history books published by Loescher from the 1980s to present day; the textbook editor Luciano Marisaldi, who has worked on Paolo Paolucci’s history books, which have been published by Zanichelli from the 1960s onwards; several officials from the Ministry of Education, University and Research (MIUR), including Vincenzia Iossa, who was involved in the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research in the late 1990s; as well as a Holocaust educators from Rimini, Laura Fontana and Maria Rosina Di Dedda. Maddelena Giordani from Zanichelli also worked with me for months to facilitate my access to the Zanichelli library and to set up my interview with textbook editor Luciano Marisaldi.
That said, it must be acknowledged that there is a certain asymmetry of sources between the Italian and German cases. Furthermore, although an attempt has been made to work with issues and textbook series that were relevant and used across the entire Italian peninsula, there were and continue to be regional differences between the various Italian regions and particularly between the northern and southern portions of the peninsula. Most of the interviews were conducted and textbook source collected in the central and northern portions of the country for practical reasons (institutional support etc.)

There were also limitations on the availability of process-oriented textual records for the most recent years of this project. The Central Archive of the State in Rome does not tend to hold files created after the early 1980s. Files in the Federal Archives in Berlin and Federal Archives in Koblenz are by law under a thirty-year embargo. Happily, the files created between 1988 and 1989 became available as I finished my research stay in Germany, making me one of the first historians to extensively work with them, adding a certain richness to Chapter 6, but unfortunately anything curated in these archives that was created after 1989 was largely obscured from view. For the most recent years in this project (dealt with primarily in the Epilogue), I focused in a more concentrated manner on my second level of analysis—product-oriented analysis.

My dissertation project focuses primarily on middle school history textbooks published during the years 1943-2000. In order to ensure that these books are representative of the larger marketplace, I selected book series that were put forth by major publishing houses and which had long print runs, on which to do case study analysis. I then supplemented these case study
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98 I have chosen to focus on middle-school textbooks since most studies have concentrated on high school books and because I, myself, have experience as a middle school teacher. Furthermore, while many students in the Italian and German systems did not continue in school through grade 12, most made it through grade 8 or 9.
analyses with the use of the textual analysis software Voyant Tools, in order to consider a much larger corpus of books. Voyant Tools allows me to isolate patterns of words and phrases that occur repeatedly throughout the textbooks and compare how frequently these words and phrases occur from edition to edition or from textbook to textbook. Voyant Tools also creates interactive interpretive tools—such as frequency graphs and cirrus visualizations—to better understand texts. The vast majority of the textbooks in this dissertation have been collected from the library at the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research in Braunschweig, my frequent host over the course of this project, and also from the Universities of Macerata and Torino in Italy.

The third level of my analysis focuses on the public response to and reception of these textbooks and educational policies—reception-oriented analysis. Reception-oriented analysis considers public reaction to textbooks, as well as how textbooks influence teacher-student relations in the classroom. While, ideally, my study would consider process, production, and reception in equal parts, reception is the most intangible of the three modes of analysis and the sources are few and far between. In order to get a sense of how these textbooks were received, I consult memoirs and autobiographical writings, most of which are currently published. The memoirs that I consider represent both Jewish and non-Jewish perspectives on growing up in postwar perpetrator states. I supplement the memoirs with observational reports of teachers using the textbooks, teacher reviews of the textbooks, public opinion polling (available primarily for


West Germany), usage statistics (available primarily for West Germany and Italy), some personal interviews, and also student essays (for example, the published essays of the 1980-1 West German President’s Prize contest). I make no claims that these sources are representative of the general population as a whole and there are certainly more reception-oriented sources available for West Germany than for the other two subject countries; however, I hope that they will, however, provide a sense and a flavor for how various individuals, shaped by their personal backgrounds, experienced education around the Second World War and the Holocaust.

This dissertation is divided into three chronological parts. Each part is divided up into two thematic chapters. The chapters of Part I: Postwar Rebuilding (1943-1949) investigate the individuals who laid the groundwork for the first postwar textbooks and the initial factors that determined how these states dealt with the immediate past. One cannot understand how postwar textbooks presented fascism, the Holocaust, and resistance efforts, without considering how the textbooks transitioned from instruments of fascist indoctrination to tools in an effort to create democratic attitudes and teach students about wartime complicity. Thus, Part I traces and compares postwar rebuilding of the school systems (and, in particular, history education) in Italy and Germany under occupation. It considers the roles of and the relationships between the occupiers and the occupied during this process.

Part II: The First Textbooks (1949-1967) explores history education in the period before 1968. Its two thematic chapters consider depictions of Holocaust and anti-fascist resisters in the textbooks, respectively. Part II investigates the contention that there was a “silent” period in the textbooks before 1968 and rebuts it. It argues that the 1950s and 1960s were periods of vital change and growth in all three states’ contexts and were witness to early discussions of Nazi crimes and complicity. Yet, this limited reckoning of the past was coupled with a resistance
narrative, which served to rebuild the state and show that not all Italians and Germans were at fault.

Part III: The Holocaust Boom (1968-1989) attempts to answer the questions of how textbook depictions of the Second World War reflected and/or influenced the student movements of 1968, as well as the growing prominence of the Holocaust in the media and in mainstream society in the 1970s and 1980s. It concludes that the seismic memory shifts of the 1968-1989 period did not fully permeate the textbook, which followed by then largely well-established narratives. Larger educational changes, however, could be observed in the new textbook structures and other types of educational media available to educators. The dissertation concludes with an epilogue, which briefly considers the post-Cold War transition and how textbooks and textbook depictions of the Holocaust and Second World War shifted with the fall of the Soviet Union and the Berlin Wall.

The Importance of Textbooks in National Life

School textbooks and what students learn in school continue to be contested ground in many countries into the present day. Most recently, a January 2020 New York Times article by Dana Goldstein illustrated how popular social studies textbooks used in California and Texas offer very different historical interpretations of immigration and gun rights issues.101 School textbooks matter because they present information that youth take as “truth.” This dissertation explores how narratives around a shameful past, a “dark chapter in history” were presented in a variety of countries over time. It contributes to a richer understanding of nation-rebuilding and national identity in the three postfascist states of East Germany, West Germany, and Italy. More

broadly, this dissertation adds to more general understanding of how post-dictatorial states
democratize and rebuild, as well as providing greater insight into how to democratize youth, an
issue especially pertinent today with the growth of right-wing ethno-nationalism.
PART I: POSTWAR REBUILDING, 1943 TO 1949

And I have faith that…the school will have to contribute to the production, beginning from childhood, of new generations; from it, a new rebirth of our country will spring forth.
- Guido De Ruggiero

As seen in the above quote by Guido De Ruggiero, Italian Minister of Public Education from June 1944 to December 1944, education was perceived as a powerful tool in the remaking of postwar Europe. The logic went: fascist thinking, disseminated through the school system, had poisoned the minds of Germans and Italians. Thus, properly democratic education was the only way of undoing this damage and ensuring a peaceful postwar Europe.

The first step in presenting students with an understanding of fascism and fascist crimes was eliminating fascist dogma and racialized thinking from the textbooks. This was a largely “negative” mission, as the occupiers described it. Only then once the textbooks were “‘pure’—purged of Fascist poison and clear of race criticism and derogation of democracy”—could students be introduced to the dangerous effects and violent consequences of the National Socialist and Italian fascist regimes.

During the last years of the Second World War and the occupation time period, there seems to have been little, if any, discussion in the textbooks about the specific crimes of the
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Nazis and the Italian fascists, or the persecution and annihilation of the Jews of Europe. This was for a number of reasons. First, many of these textbooks were written and published as the war was ongoing or in the immediate aftermath. Textbook creation is a lengthy process, and often a palimpsestic one, with new material laid over the old. With little time or material to create entirely new non-propagandistic sections on the tumultuous events of the 1930s and 1940s and also little hindsight or reflection, the textbooks of the immediate postwar often ended their historical coverage with the First World War. It was only in the early 1950s that most textbooks began truly to address the fascist regimes of the 1930s and 1940s and the violence that they inflicted upon the peoples of Europe.

Second, the specifically Jewish dimension of suffering was not yet common knowledge, nor a focus of most historiography. This is not to say that there was no discussion of the Holocaust at all. As depicted in Laura Jockusch’s *Collect and Record: Jewish Holocaust Documentation in Early Postwar Europe*, as well as David Cesarani and Eric Sunquist’s edited volume *After the Holocaust: Challenging the Myth of Silence*, there were immediate postwar documentation projects. Amateur historians collected victim testimony in the tradition of *Khurbn Forshung* [destruction research] and Jewish survivors wrote down their experiences—largely in Yiddish. These efforts, however, were mostly ignored by the established historical academy, and even these early Jewish historical works or testimonies did not especially address the Jewish aspect of the Final Solution, preferring instead to focus on patriotism or Leftist leanings. Thus, it is not surprising that the specific dimension of Jewish suffering was not discussed in these late 1940s textbooks.
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Part I of this dissertation, is composed of two chapters—the first focusing primarily on Italy and the second primarily on Germany— that will trace and compare postwar rebuilding of the school systems under occupation and the textbook revision that went along with this process. Part I will begin chronologically in 1943, with the first invasion of an Axis country, and will end in 1949, with the formation of the two German postwar states. Part I seeks to answer the following questions: How much of a role did Allied occupation forces play in reshaping postwar education systems and revising their textbooks? How much of a role did the occupied population play? Part I will also consider the relationships between the occupying powers: which strategies of knowledge construction did each of the occupying powers favor? Were some strategies more effective than others, and if so, why? Were there more similarities or differences across the occupation zones? Did textbook policy in the various zones inform each other? Lastly, Part I will consider how the recent past and issues of complicity and guilt were taught in these reconstructed education systems: What values were youth supposed to learn from this contemporary history?
1 REEDUCATION’S BEGINNING: ITALY, 1943 TO 1945

The reeducation project began upon the invasion of Italy, the first Axis power to come under occupation. On July 10, 1943, a British-American force of 160,000 landed in Sicily. Fearful of the advancing Allies, the Italian Fascist Grand Council met on the evening of July 24 to discuss the future of Mussolini’s dictatorship, and voted to strip him of supreme command. On July 25, King Vittorio Emanuele III deposed and arrested Mussolini and replaced him with Marshal Pietro Badoglio as prime minister. Badoglio kept Italy in the war on the German side but secretly negotiated an armistice with the Allies, which was announced on September 8. By this point, the Germans, aware of Badoglio’s intentions, had invaded and occupied the northern part of the peninsula, including Rome. On September 12, Mussolini was freed from his Gran Sasso mountain prison by the SS. After a brief stay in Germany, he returned to Italy and established the fascist Italian Social Republic (RSI), with its capital in Salò. Meanwhile, in the south, King Vittorio Emanuele III, who had fled Rome, controlled Sardinia and four provinces in the south-eastern part of the peninsula known as the “Kingdom of the South.”

Fighting did not end with the armistice. However, the subsequent fighting was not just between regular Allied and Axis forces, but also among different groups within Italian society. Between 1943 and 1945, a civil war was fought on the Italian peninsula, with the Kingdom of
the South fighting alongside the British and Americans against the RSI under Mussolini, backed by the German Wehrmacht.106 The Soviet Union also recognized Italy as a co-belligerent.107

Alongside this war between the nations, a partisan war was fought in the northern mountains of Italy, against the RSI and the German occupiers. The partisans represented various political parties but were largely Leftist in orientation; the various antifascist fighting forces came together in an umbrella organization known as the Comitato di Liberazione Nationale [National Liberation Committee or CLN]. During this time period of 1943–1945, RSI police interned Jewish Italians and allowed them to be deported off the peninsula, the vast majority to Auschwitz; an estimated 7,000–8,000 Jews were either killed on the Italian peninsula or deported.108 Thus, when the war finally ended in 1945, Italian society was shattered—with a number of different groups pushing competing narratives about what had happened.109
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The reeducation and textbook revision process in Italy unfolded in this very contested background. The Allied occupiers arrived in Italy in 1943 with very little preparation or forethought as to how they wanted to deal with the school system. They were confronted by a number of competing Italian interest groups—including the royalist government in the south, progressive anticlerical reformers, the Catholic Church, and the leftist partisans. Buffeted by various needs, exigences, and demands, the Allied educational officers and the Italian educationalists muddled along in a highly disorganized situation, trying to create new educational material suitable to instill Italian youth with a new democratic world-view. Yet, the Allied educational officers also had a long view. From almost the beginning, they knew that Italy was just the first reeducation project in a long series; thus, they continuously kept an eye to the future—anticipating the challenges that they would face in Germany.

1.1 The Occupiers

Upon the landing of troops in Sicily in July 1943, the Americans and the British set up an Allied Military Government (originally AMGOT, and later AMG) in Palermo. An armistice agreement was concluded with the Kingdom of Italy in early September of 1943 and an Allied Control Commission (ACC), also overseen by the military, was created on November 10, 1943, in order to liaise with the Italian government, now under the King in Brindisi.110 As compared to the AMG and its direct administration of Italian territory, the ACC was supposed to take a more hands-off approach, increasingly leaving responsibility for many rebuilding processes, including reeducation, to the Italians. For a time, there were overlapping jurisdictions—with the AMG and

the ACC both acting as independent organizations and both attempting to do some of the same jobs.111 Some territory was presided over by AMG and some by the ACC, and later on some by the Italian government. As Educational Adviser George Robert Gayre (Robert Gayre) reflected in his diary in late October 1943, “Whether Military Government is in the saddle or whether this new institution [the ACC], the Lord only knows.”112 Gayre continued a few pages later:

Thus we have a queer situation. The country is being run by a Military Government… and there is an Armistice Control Commission slapped on top of it, which is not yet a functioning organization—for the Italian Government is not yet functioning—but these new organizations are trying to run the Military Government of which they know nothing and seem to care less.113

These overlapping jurisdictions and conflicting roles were a source of problems for the reeducation process, as the command hierarchy for reeducation decisions was similarly murky.

The British Robert Gayre, who was Educational Adviser in Italy to the AMG since early September 1943, was supposedly in charge of educational affairs.114 However, when the ACC (referred to by Gayre in his diary as the “Armistice Control Commission”) was created, a new officer was sent to Italy to take control.


114 Gayre, Italy in Transition (1946), 17, 25.
Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Vernor (TV) Smith was sent in late October 1943 as a representative of the ACC to take over Gayre’s position. Smith was an American academic and politician. Born in 1890, Smith was Professor of Philosophy at the University of Chicago, as well as a former congressman-at-large for the state of Illinois at the time of America’s entrance into the Second World War. Smith strongly rejected both fascism and communism and his scholarly works revealed an intense preoccupation with the meaning of democracy.115 Prior to assignment to Italy, Smith taught classes on military government, as well as on the reeducation of German POWs.116 But the generals in charge of the AMG and the ACC were ambivalent about the personnel switch and for a time, there was uncertainty as to who was actually in charge. As Gayre described in his diary on October 30, 1943:

We play at a sort of comic opera division of responsibility in our office. T.V. and I sit together in the office, and if something applies to Armistice Control Commission conditions, he deals with it as the Director of Education and if it is about education arising from the universities and the Provveditori [provveditori agli studi—the top regional Italian education official] I deal with it as the Educational Adviser. But how long this chaotic condition can continue I do not know.117

On November 1, 1943, Gayre noted that the situation had been somewhat clarified. Gayre was to continue to be in charge at Headquarters, with each Italian region having a Regional Educational Officer (REO) or Regional Director of Education; Smith would be Gayre’s deputy (although Smith was later dispatched to the United Kingdom (UK) for two months to work on pre-occupation plans for education in Germany). In late February 1944, Gayre and Smith


swapped places, with Gayre being recalled to Great Britain as Chief of Education and Religious Affairs of Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF). With the ACC now firmly holding precedence (as of January 1944) and an increasing number of regions being added to its jurisdiction as the Allies advanced up the peninsula, Smith took full command of educational matters in Italy until the fall of 1944, when he too was redirected to the now more pressing areas of re-education in Germany and Japan. Smith then served as an advisory member of the United States Educational Commission in Germany and later, in a briefer capacity, as a member of the commission for Japan. Responsibility for re-education in Italy was turned over to Henry Rowell for a brief period of time and then ultimately to progressive American educator Carleton Washburne.118

Although much of our narrative will utilize the recollections of the first two ACC Directors of Education, Robert Gayre and Thomas Vernor Smith, it must be noted that they both had biases which led to somewhat unreliable judgments; at times they displayed somewhat ivory-tower detachment and barely concealed disdain for the Italian people. Gayre had German sympathies and contacts (connected to his extreme anti-Russian views), an interest in racial science, and possible fascist sentiments, which led to him being investigated by the British


Security Service during the war. In his diary, Gayre spoke of the “natural lawlessness” of the Sicilian people, and based on his interest in racial science, he may very well have thought them racially inferior.\textsuperscript{119} Smith, on the other hand, was a consummate moderate and spoke critically and condescendingly of Italians’ lack of population control, noting that this meant that too many children were born to fully nurture and educate them. Smith clearly looked down on the Italians for their perceived lack of moderation, writing in July 1944, “We do not hold ourselves responsible for the poverty, the illiteracy, dense population, the undervision and the other-pride of those tired people of a dazed land.” And indeed, he clearly did not feel the Allies should intervene in any great way to improve conditions in Italy, writing “We cannot but observe that… to save the foolish from the consequences of their own folly… is one sure way to fill the world with fools.”\textsuperscript{120} Both Gayre and Smith saw ample need for reform and defascisticzation in Italy, but, as we will see, they were willing to delegate much of that process to the local Italian population. This is likely because they saw the Italians as somewhat inept and disorderly, and therefore unlikely to be dangerous.

The third ACC Director of Education, the American Henry Rowell, saw less need for reform than his predecessors. Rowell was a classicist from Johns Hopkins University who had

\textsuperscript{119} In a 1948 letter, J. Chenhalls wrote to Winston M. Scott, the attaché at the American Embassy in London, “His [Gayre’s] loyalty to this country has never been in doubt,” but also that “he [Gayre] has proved in the past of considerable nuisance interest owing to his past connections with German leaders, and by the indiscreet way in which he has brought attention to himself.” Letter from J. Chenhalls to Winston M. Scott, Attaché, American Embassy, London, April 29, 1948, Document 110a; KV 2/2472 George Robert GAIR, aliases Robert GAIR, Robert GAYRE, George Robert GAYRE of Gayre and Nigg: British, January 1, 1939- December 31, 1956, Records of the Security Service, TNA; TNA Website: Discovery: KV 2/2472; Gayre, \textit{Italy in Transition} (1946), 40.

\textsuperscript{120} T.V. Smith, Lt. Col. AUS, Director of Education, “Education Report for Month of July,” WO 204/2627 Italy: Education Sub-Commission, Records Created or Inherited by the War Office, Armed Forces, Judge Advocate General, and Related Bodies, TNA; Thomas Vernor Smith, “The Re-Education of Germany, Italy, and Japan” speech at dinner meeting of The Friends of the Colleges at Claremont, California Club, Los Angeles, February 19, 1947, Box 12, Folder 15, Thomas Vernor Smith Papers (hereafter known as TVS papers), Special Collections Research Center at the University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA (hereafter referred to as UChicago); Smith, \textit{The Democratic Tradition in America} (1941), ix.
worked with the American Academy in Rome before the Second World War. He thus had had contact with Fascist Italy during the 1930s, as well as knowledge of the Italian educational system. Perhaps due to fond memories of that time, Rowell, at least initially, felt that Italian school textbooks would require little revision. In contrast, the last ACC Director of Education Carleton W. Washburne was a progressive educator in the legacy of John Dewey and an elementary and secondary school administrator from the American Midwest. He reportedly enjoyed good relations with Italian teachers and writings reveal none of the disdain present in Gayre’s and Smith’s. The four ACC Directors of Education in Italy—Gayre, Smith, Rowell, and Washburne—represented four points on a spectrum of attitudes of the occupiers. Each Director of Education brought with him a life experiences and a political/educational ideology or philosophy that affected how he viewed the task at hand.

Despite these varied attitudes, relations between the British and the Americans jointly serving in both the AMG and the ACC were reportedly good. Major General Lord Francis James Rennell of Rodd, who was Chief Civil Affairs Officer of the AMG 15th Army Group, described “the experiment of a joint Anglo-American administration” as “wholly successful; there was little friction and no recrimination.” Rennell continued:

Allied military government in Italy in its original conception was a joint Anglo-American enterprise in which the functions of British and American officers were complementary and not duplicated. They were, as was the local term, ‘wholly integrated.’

---
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Control Commission which took over was likewise an ‘integrated’ Anglo-American concern though never quite as much as was AMGOT.\textsuperscript{124}

This does not mean that there were no disagreements between the two occupying powers. Gayre observed that over time, divisions appeared between the British and American officers. He noted that in the days of the AMG, “I have not a single recollection of any situation arising which caused national divisions. There were great differences of opinion, but one would find Americans and English mixed up on each side.” However, he wrote “now [after the institution of the ACC] it is different. I hear things said against the Americans \textit{sotto voce}, and no doubt the reverse is also being said by Americans about the British, but being British I would not hear the remarks.”\textsuperscript{125}

1.2 Textbooks in Newly Occupied Italy

Shortly after Robert Gayre arrived in Sicily in September 1943, he paid a surprise visit to a school and received a whole set of textbooks from them. What he found inside them surprised and horrified him. The textbooks were completely permeated by fascism, with a third-grade book asking students to practice mathematics with the following problem, which refers to fascist youth organizations in Italy: “A Balilla member is eight years old; in how many years will he be an Avanguardista?”\textsuperscript{126} In the same series of books, first-grade students learned to read the phrase

\textsuperscript{124} Rodd, "Introduction," in \textit{Italy in Transition}, 15.

\textsuperscript{125} Gayre, \textit{Italy in Transition} (1946), 218.

\textsuperscript{126} Mussolini’s Italy had fascist youth organizations, similar to the better-known Nazi organizations of the Hitler Youth and League of German Girls. The \textit{Opera Nazionale Balilla} (ONB) was the umbrella organization that coordinated the activities of various fascist youth groups. Boys aged eight to thirteen were in the \textit{Gruppi Balilla}, while girls eight to fourteen were in the \textit{Piccoli Italiane}. Boys (fourteen through eighteen) and girls (fifteen through eighteen) were in the \textit{Avanguardie Fasciste} and the \textit{Giovani Italiane}, respectively. Alessio Ponzio, \textit{Shaping the New Man: Youth Training Regimes in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany} (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 2015), 34-36, http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/unc/detail.action?docID=4417140.
“‘Believe, obey, fight,’ here is the command of the DUCE. Do not forget that you are a true little soldier of your Nation.” Gayre wrote two days after his school visit, “It is clear…we have not a single text book which can be used.”

These fascist-imbued textbooks were one of the many serious obstacles that awaited those tasked with reeducation; however, initially, the defascistization of the schools was not a top priority. Although the Allies had invaded Sicily in July of 1943, in the midst of the fighting, a full-time Educational Advisor was not appointed until Gayre’s installment. In the meantime, the Advisor on Fine Arts and Monuments Mason Hammond dealt with questions related to the schools. The AMG top officers’ rather blasé attitude towards reeducation and the reopening of the schools can be discerned from early optimistic appraisals about the lack of difficulty of the

The textbook quote is taken from Gayre’s letter, but also has been located in the 1941 *Il libro della III classe.* Angelo Zammarchi, Cesare Angelini, and Ezio Bonomi, *Il libro della terza classe elementare religione, grammatica, storia, geografia, aritmetica* (Roma: La Libr. dello Stato, 1941), 191.


128 Gayre was unusual as a British officer in his desire for direct top-down action; as seen in the British zone of Germany, the British were, in general, more inclined to a more hand-off approach. Gayre to C.S.O., “Re-opening of Schools,” Folder 10000/144/8 AMGOT, Education, Reopening of Schools, Box 1486, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education, ACC - Italy Subject File, RG 331, NACP; White, *Progressive Renaissance* (2018), 182.

job at hand. Memos and letters from August and early September 1943, before Gayre’s arrival, reveal that top AMG officers were convinced that the textbooks could be easily revised and reprinted in time for schools to open in just two months—by October 1943.\(^\text{130}\)

But Gayre disabused the higher-ups of this notion when he took on the role of Educational Advisor. He was startled that there had been little planning before the occupation for the reopening of Italian schools. Gayre reflected with some frustration in the introduction to his published diary of his war years:

I have failed to understand…how any planners sitting in London and Washington could have overlooked the fact that Italian education could not be reformed without new school text-books. In all the years that had elapsed between Italy’s declaration of war upon us and our conquest of Italy there had been ample time in which to plan good texts with the aid of Italian educationalists, especially those in America. But I discovered on arrival in Italy, that nothing of this kind had been provided for.\(^\text{131}\)

Gayre’s reflections must, however, be taken with a grain of salt. There are some indications that replacement textbooks had been prepared in either England or the United States before the invasion, but had been rejected by Armed Forces Headquarters before Gayre’s arrival, for reasons that are unclear.\(^\text{132}\) Additionally, several Italian antifascists, including Gaetano Salvemini, had made their own suggestions for how to defascistize Italy and Italian schools. Gayre, however, seemed to have been largely ignorant of this, as well as most other aspects of


\(^{\text{132}}\) Smith, “The Re-Education of Germany, Italy, and Japan,” Box 12, Folder 15, TVS Papers, UChicago; Office of Strategic Services Research and Analysis Branch, “The Reform of Italian Education,” R &A No. 1374, 13 December 1943, Geographic Files, Italy- Government, Foreign (Occupied) Area Reports, Box 2217, 368B Administrative Services Division Operations Branch, The Adjutant General’s Office, Record Group 407 (hereafter referred to as RG 407), NACP.
the Italian situation. Gayre’s ignorance seems to be a verdict shared by both historians and contemporaries. Historian Tina Tomasi described Gayre, as acting “in the most complete ignorance of Italian matters, and Sicilian matters in particular.” Guido De Ruggiero, the Italian historian of liberalism and Minister of Public Education, observed in 1945 that “the inexperience of the Allies in the first period of the occupation” had created a series of problems later on, including “a series of measures that were incompatible with our legislation, and that, nevertheless, we were constrained to ratify, due to the terms of the armistice.” The fact that Gayre, who had little background in Italian affairs, was put in charge of reeducation in Italy further indicates the haphazard nature of the Allied reeducation effort.

But Gayre knew enough to push back on the previous rosy assessments of the reopening of Sicilian schools. After his above-mentioned surprise visit to the Sicilian school, Gayre wrote in a September 18, 1943 memo, “The problem is so complex and in such a chaotic state that only the most vigorous policy can get a real educational system working at all.” Gayre found himself facing enormous challenges. As he confided to his diary, there were “no schools, colleges, or universities open. Many of them [were] destroyed by bombardment.” Those schools that were still standing were occupied by war refugees and soldiers. Many teachers had fled and “even if we had them all here we are still faced with the task of sorting out the vicious and convinced fascist from the rest,” reflected Gayre. He bemoaned, “Was ever a country so disorganized?”

135 Gayre to C.S.O., “Re-opening of Schools,” Folder 10000/144/8 AMGOT, Education, Reopening of Schools, Box 1486, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education, ACC - Italy Subject File, RG 331, NACP.
1.3 The Philosophy of Textbook Revision

As far as Gayre was concerned, the Italian textbooks available in September 1943 were completely unacceptable. New ones had to be created. As Gayre’s successor Smith reflected in a postwar speech, “They [the teachers] must be furnished something to teach. We cannot allow them to go ahead with the poison that forced us to conquer them.” 137 However, the same supply issues that hampered the reopening of school buildings also limited what could be done in terms of textbook printing. There was a lack of accessible paper, binding cord, electricity, and personnel. There were additional issues of distribution, since Sicilian roads, which had already suffered from infrastructure problems before the war, had been further destroyed by the fighting.138

Sicily was not the only region facing these issues. As they expanded onto the mainland, the Education Subcommission encountered similar problems of insufficient materials, space, organization, and staff. In a December 1943 letter, for example, a REO complained that he shared with three others an office that “was formerly a bathroom, and is totally incapable of handling the staff necessary for an efficient operation.”139

Despite these severe obstacles, however, efforts to revise the textbooks began almost immediately. One of the first attempts is memorialized in a textbook evaluation sheet of Lipparini’s literature anthology “Aprile” for Italian middle schoolers, dated October 5, 1943 and completed by an Allied lieutenant. He explained, “I have attempted to spot every questionable

137 Smith, “The Re-Education of Germany, Italy, and Japan,” Box 12, Folder 15, TVS Papers, UChicago.
138 Gayre, Italy in Transition (1946), 36.
item...My guide rule has been: Fascism, Nationalism, glorification of war, ‘Greater Italy’ in its several forms, and horror tales, all of which can be safely considered unsuitable for children, particularly in the lower grades.” He then went through all 650+ pages of the anthology, suggesting items that should be deleted including “Mussolini on a rampage” and “a rather stupid war story.”

The job could not be done by the Anglo-American officers alone; much was delegated to Italian personnel. In their wartime and postwar writings, Allied educational officers proffered a number of reasons as to why this occurred. Gayre, in his wartime diary, isolated manpower shortages as the issue. Gayre noted that due to a lack of officers under his command in Sicily in the fall of 1943, a large amount of the textbook revision was passed to antifascist Italian educators. In his diary, Gayre seemed to indicate that such delegation of responsibility was only conceivable to the Italian people and would not have been allowed in the German case. In early October 1943, he wrote, “Thank God that the Italians are not Germans, for we could not trust so much responsibility to them as we must leave to our civilian staffs.”

Given Gayre’s conception of the “natural lawlessness” of the Italians, this may not have been an entirely complementary statement; he may have just perceived Italians as less dangerous in their ineptitude. However, it also reflected larger assumptions on the part of the AMG that the Italians were different than the Germans; they were not as devoted to fascism and could be trusted to

---
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supervise themselves, once the upper ranks had been purged. Allied propaganda as early as 1940 attempted to separate the “peaceful Italian people” from Mussolini and the Fascist regime.¹⁴²

Gayre appointed Italian academic Professor Vincent Grasso to work on textbook revision. However, upon Grasso’s untimely death, a commission of Italian educationalists of various political backgrounds was appointed by the provveditore agli studi of Palermo and supervised by both the Italian Professor Barressi and American official Carleton Washburne. The commission met in Palermo and went through the textbooks to eliminate objectionable bits. Later on, in the second stage of textbook revision, the libro di stato [“book of the state”—the state textbook introduced under the fascists in 1930] series was rewritten and then reprinted on paper made of the pulp of irredeemably fascist books. Symbolically, due to the lack of raw materials, new history would be written on the remains of the old.

When the ACC came into being in November 1943, these committees were increasingly placed under the control of local authorities, although the ACC Education Subcommission remained involved in the approval and printing of textbooks. Washburne noted in the monthly Education Subcommission report for August 1944, for example, that one officer’s particular duties included dealing with “that hussy who has haunted the Subcommission from the beginning—the printing of textbooks.” Later on, when the Education Subcommission’s headquarters moved on to Naples, another textbook committee was created to continue the work, this time with an additional representative of the Church.¹⁴³


In postwar writings, this tendency to delegate responsibility to Italian civilian staff was attributed not just to material need and manpower shortages, but also, at times, to governing philosophy. A common vocabulary about this philosophy clearly developed, which Allied officials used to explain their relationships and interactions with local Italian officials. Again and again in postwar writings, AMG and ACC officers—including Smith, Washburne, British REO Arthur Vessolo, and American executive officer Maurice Neufeld—used the terms “negative” and “positive” or “constructive” actions. All four agreed that the AMG and ACC had pursued a “negative” policy—eliminating instances of fascism, without imposing anything else “positive” or “constructive” from above.144 As Vessolo explained, “It was very necessary for the Allies to act vigorously on the negative side—that is to say, in eliminating Fascists and the most patent evidence of Fascism, but when it came to the more positive side, of active reconstruction, the Allied function became largely that of the adviser or consultant (with a power of veto, sparingly

---

Thus, in the construction of postwar knowledge, the Allies decided that in Italy, the Italians would play the dominant role.

This approach was also urged by Italian antifascists in exile. As Gaetano Salvemini and George La Piana wrote in their *What to Do with Italy*,

> Political re-education . . . consists first in giving them the opportunity of adopting a democratic system in their political life. Then they must be allowed time to conduct experiments for themselves in the principles and practices of democracy in action. It is fundamentally a process of self-re-education. . . . Democratic propaganda spread through the medium of the press, the radio, and other sources is vital to this process of education. But when this work is carried on by foreign agents, it assumes the aspect of an imposition, or, more dangerously of a calculated interference in domestic affairs which is neither disinterested nor altruistic.¹⁴⁶

Thomas Vernor Smith termed this choice a policy of “negativity.” In a postwar speech, Smith recalled, “We would tell the Italians only what they must not teach…We made it their business to find out what they were to teach. In our abstention from positive directives was their chance to be positive, which means to be free, which in turn is the meaning of democracy. It was their scholars who determined what went into our revised textbooks.”¹⁴⁷ Smith reflected further in another postwar speech, “The result was that when we purged the textbooks we never put into any of the textbooks one single line that could conceivably be construed as propaganda for our way of life. We filled it with flowers, and Ferdinands, and neutral stuff, and left it to the Italians, when the war was over, to put in whatever they pleased, just so they didn’t put into it Fascism.”¹⁴⁸

---


¹⁴⁶ Salvemini and LaPiana, *What to Do with Italy* (1943), 188.

¹⁴⁷ Smith, “The Re-Education of Germany, Italy, and Japan,” Box 12, Folder 15, TVS Papers, UChicago.

¹⁴⁸ Thomas Vernor Smith speech on “Occupation Policies in Japan” in the Gold Room, Congress Hotel, May 24, 1946, Box 12, Folder 15, TVS Papers; UChicago.
This “negative” approach was an outgrowth of larger Allied policies. According to Smith’s account, the choice to train local officials to censor and rewrite textbooks, as much as possible, instead of having Allied officials write the textbooks themselves was in accordance with U.S. Secretary of State Cordell Hull’s guidance that “it would be unwise for this government to undertake to apply, much less to impose, a foreign education program for the placement of American teachers in the schools of those countries or for the preparation of textbooks in the United States for use in such schools.”\(^{149}\) A similar line was taken in the ACC-published “A Review of Allied Military Government and the Control Commission in Italy,” which also stressed an Allied policy desire to “let the Italians do the job.”\(^{150}\) Arguably, this arose out of an idealistic desire to have the Italians experience liberty after two decades of fascism, but also out of a certain pragmatism that anything obviously imposed by a foreign power would be dismissed on those grounds.

Although Smith, Washburne, Vessolo, and Neufeld all agreed that a largely “negative” policy had been pursued, they disagreed as to whether or not this had been a successful or correct choice. Neufeld, who unlike our three other interlocutors was not a member of the Education Subcommission, in his 1946 article “The Failure of the AMG in Italy” was the most pessimistic in his assessment. He wrote, “Because of the negative approach to education, the job of eliminating fascism from the schoolbooks was tackled by cutting offending pages and, later, by printing new books without the fascist references. Nothing positive and constructive was substituted.” However, this policy had missed a crucial opportunity, Neufeld argued. If instead of

\(^{149}\) As cited in: Smith, *A Non-Existent Man* (1962), 192.

ripping out pages from the textbook, the AMG had focused on re-educating the teachers, “the offending pages might have remained in the books and reeducated teachers might have been able to point out the fallacies, in light of historical events, of the doctrines taught.” The other three, perhaps attempting to protect their legacy, were more sanguine about the approach, with Vessolo writing, “It is true in general that the major steps of educational reconstruction for the future must be taken by the Italians and nobody else: they cannot be imposed from without.”

1.3.1 Allied “Negativity” and the Catholic Church

This policy of letting the Italians take the lead on reform, however, opened up the Anglo-American occupiers to a series of lobby groups. Italians were politically divided and there were various ideological stains, which influenced how various actors felt the textbooks and the curriculum should be treated. When the Allies arrived in Sicily, they were buffeted by a number of proposals and requests from three major camps. Socialist teachers under the leadership of Gino Ferretti advocated for curricular reform. The provincial superintendent of Palermo Dr. Albeggiani defended the pre-fascist status quo as a representative of the Liberals. The third major interest group was the Church, led by Archbishop of Palermo, which pushed for a strengthening of the parochial schools in the region. The Church also pushed for the continuation of religious education in Italian public schools, with Vatican officials requesting

---

151 It should be noted that almost all the Italian teachers were retained. Only about five percent of classroom teachers were fired, but a far greater number of those in school administration were purged. Smith, “The Re-Education of Germany, Italy, and Japan,” Box 12, Folder 15, TVS Papers, UChicago; Neufeld, "The Failure of AMG in Italy,” 144.


that textbooks be Catholic in nature and teachers not be overly secular.\textsuperscript{154} As the Education Sub-Commission observed in a February 1944 report, “The field of Education is one in which many and often conflicting organizations are interested. The Church, for example, as well as all political parties see in education a sphere of influence of the utmost importance.”\textsuperscript{155}

The role of the Catholic Church and the Vatican in education remained a divisive issue, both among Italians and among the Anglo-American occupiers. Parochial schools were a particular source of discord between the British and the American education staff. As Gayre explained in his diary, “Unlike us in England, where we are used to Church and Catholic and Methodist schools which even receive state support, they [the Americans on staff] cannot get used to such an idea at all. They want one simple straightforward educational system of state education.”\textsuperscript{156}

The Vatican inserted itself into this Anglo-American difference of opinion, attempting to profit from it. The Vatican was full of praise for Gayre, with the Archbishop of Palermo writing that, “Thanks to the broadmindedness and benevolence of LT. Col. G.R. Gayre head of the Education Office A.M.G.O.T the Church has obtained in principle that freedom of schools which had been denied to her in the last eighty years in Italy.”\textsuperscript{157} When Gayre was recalled to Great

\textsuperscript{154} Letter from Monsignor W. Godfrey, Apostolic Delegation, London to Hon. Sir Alexander Cadogan, KCMG, Foreign Office, February 4, 1944, FO 371/44229 Vatican interest in educational matters in Southern Italy. Code 57 file 1892, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

\textsuperscript{155} “Report on the Work of the Education Division and Sub-Commission AMG- ACC,” WO 220/349, TNA.

\textsuperscript{156} Gayre, \textit{Italy in Transition} (1946), 134.

\textsuperscript{157} “Pro Memoria” Comment by Apostolic Delegate, March 22, 1944, FO 371/44229, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
Britain, the Apostolic Delegation in London expressed dismay, worrying that his American successors would not be as sympathetic to the Catholic Church’s desires. 158

The Church viewed many of the American education officials, including Washburne, with skepticism and hostility. Washburne had appointed the anticlerical socialist Gino Ferretti to the curricular committee in Sicily in late 1943 and Ferretti’s advocacy for the end of religious education in public schools was met with strict opposition by the Vatican. 159 Around the time of Gayre’s recall to London, the Apostolic Delegate to the United States delivered a summary of the situation in southern Italy to the US Department of State. This summary, written by Vatican Secretariat of State Walter Carroll, asserted that the American Subcommission members “have in mind the deChristianization of education.” Carroll feared that without Gayre to restrain the American members of the Subcommission, the outcome would be “disastrous.” Instead of Gayre being reassigned, Carroll requested that the American officers be. 160

The ACC ignored Carroll and recalled Gayre to London, nonetheless. The ACC also retained the American Subcommission officers, but promised the Church that the change in directorship did “not reflect any modification of policy.” Despite this reassurance, the Vatican continued to advocate for Gayre’s return, complaining that since Gayre’s reassignment conditions had deteriorated in Italy, with secular and fascist teachers returning to their teaching posts. 161 In an attempt to placate the Church, the ACC reigned in secularizing educational reform

158 “Despatch No. 27,” May 22, 1944, FO 371/44229, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.


161 “Despatch No. 27,” FO 371/44229, TNA; Lord Cranborne, Dominions Offices, “Note of a Conversation with Apostolic Delegate on 13th September, 1944,” FO 371/44229, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
efforts and essentially forced Gayre’s predecessor, Smith, to continue the policy of compromise with the Church.\textsuperscript{162}

From all this, it is clear that the Church was engaged in a campaign to maximize its influence in the education of young Italian citizens.\textsuperscript{163} The perennial Italian debate over how the Church should relate to the Italian state and how much power the Church should hold took on new importance in the power vacuum created by Mussolini’s deposal. The Church had only formally recognized the Kingdom of Italy in 1929—sixty-eight years after its formation. It has been Mussolini who had initially brought the Church into the fold.\textsuperscript{164} Thus the loss of Mussolini as head of government created a further question: how would the Church relate to the state and education in a non-fascist Italy? This would be a matter of ongoing negotiation.

\subsection*{1.3.2 \textit{Shifts to a More Constructive Approach}}

As the Anglo-American occupiers served as mediators in these conflicts between various Italian pressure groups, they also increasingly took on a somewhat more “constructive approach.” However, there appeared to be some uncertainty as to whether this new approach was

\textsuperscript{162} White, \textit{Progressive Renaissance} (2018), 85.

\textsuperscript{163} Major Koopman of the Education Division of the AMG would have agreed with this assessment. He wrote in March of 1944 after a meeting with Vatican officials that “the Church is seeking political power utterly regardless of its effect on world peace.” G. R. Koopman, Major, AUS, Chief, Division of Education to Regional Commissioner, Subject: Conference with Bishop Carroll and Mr. Mohler, March 3, 1944, WO 204/2779 Italy- Educational Policy, Records Created or Inherited by the War Office, Armed Forces, Judge Advocate General, and Related Bodies, TNA.

by accident or by design. Neufeld clearly favored the former explanation, writing that these constructive activities “crept in almost as though they were afterthoughts.” Neufeld, “The Failure of AMG in Italy,” 144.

Washburne, however, saw these constructive elements as part of a deliberate policy shift in Italy. He noted that under the “New Deal for Italy” policy pursued by the ACC (later just the AC, as the “Control” component was dropped), the Education Subcommission was empowered to “foster cultural rehabilitation in Italy instead of being in danger of military criticism for doing so.”

Examples of such activities included bringing educational specialists to Italy to offer advice, setting up travel fellowships for Italians to study in the United States and European countries, and facilitating the creation of youth groups, such as Boy Scouts and Girl Guides. These “constructive” developments in Italy echoed programs that would later be implemented in the American and British zones of Germany and should be viewed not as an aberration but as a genuine evolution of Anglo-American re-education policy.

Another example of “constructive” educational policy was the creation of new programs of study. A February 1944 draft of the elementary school plan of study—created by a committee composed of Washburne, a University of Naples pedagogy professor, a cardinal’s secretary, and two Italian school directors—explained that elementary history students must be taught “a clear distinction between genuine national sentiment” and “the brutal, egotistical, rapacious, warlike nationalism that pushes to unjustly attack other peoples and molest other civilized races.”

Notably, the program made no mention of teaching these values by discussing Italy’s

---

165 Neufeld, “The Failure of AMG in Italy,” 144.

166 A Review of Allied Military Government and of the Allied Commission in Italy, 64; Washburne, “Education under the Allied Military Government in Italy,” 262.

experiences with fascism; in fact, the history curriculum seemed to end more or less with 1918. Instead, these values would be communicated by discussing the great figures of science, culture, and medicine and by depicting Italy as part of a mission of “civil progress in the grand family of nations.” Study plans were eventually printed by the Subcommission and then distributed to all schools by the beginning of 1945.

1.4 Competing Jurisdictions

The Church and the socialists were not the only groups with whom the Allied officials needed to work. Perhaps even more important was the Italian government. Because Italy was a “co-belligerent” power after the signing of the armistice, the United States occupiers had to strike a very delicate balance when working with local officials and piloting educational reforms. As the Education Subcommission’s overview of education in Italy observed, “In Italy—unlike in Germany—we were prepared, for the sake of stability, to negotiate with select remnants of the existing order, once Mussolini and his prime henchmen were out of the way and their polices abandoned.” Because of this inclination towards cooperation, the Americans and the British did not have much say in the appointment of Italian cabinet posts including the Minister of

---

168 “Programmi di studio di indicazione didattiche per la scuola elementary per l’anno scolastico 1943-44, consigli per la modernazione della scuola elementare (edizione riveduta)” enclosed in letter from Carleton W. Washburne, Major, A.U.S., Acting Deputy, Educational Advisor to Chief, Education Division, Sicily Region, “Elementary Programs, Part II,” February 7, 1944, Folder 10100/144/36 (1 of 3) Text Books, Correspondence with HQ’s (Oct. 1943), Nov. 1943- May 1944, Box 3761, UD 1978A Region I. Sicily Education, Allied Control Commission- Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP.


Education, later called Minister of Public Education [sometimes called the Minister of Public Instruction or Ministero della Pubblic Istruzione (MPI)]. Giovanni Cuomo, who occupied the post from February to April 1944, was described by Gayre as “a weak man and too old for his work, and there is no doubt that what we have done here in Sicily, and we are now beginning in Italy, is disturbing to him because of its thoroughness.”

The Education Subcommission had found itself in combat with Minister Cuomo even before his promotion to MPI, when he was Undersecretary for Education. These tussles illustrated the difficulties of setting policy during wartime in a country with various jurisdictions—with supposedly sovereign government, but also two different occupying military government organizations. The major points of contention regarded Cuomo overstepping his authority to make professional appointments in areas controlled still by the AMG, his insistence on continuing to pay those who had been dismissed for their fascist views, and what the Education Subcommission perceived to be his inefficiency at defascistizing educational

---


172 Although Severi was Minister in January 1944, his undersecretary Cuomo was formally in control of education in the “Kingdom of the South,” or the area of Italy under the Italian government’s control. White, *Progressive Renaissance* (2018), 46.
personnel. Yet, the Education Subcommission was willing to accommodate Cuomo, to a point, in order to promote stability.

In spring 1944, the more reform minded MPIs Adolfo Omodeo and Guido De Ruggiero came to power in succession. Both had close relationships with Benedetto Croce (although both were more affiliated with the political Left than their mentor) and both were affiliated with the Action Party. Omodeo, and his successor De Ruggiero, especially, began a systematic purge of fascist educators. De Ruggiero described the defascistization of schools and the textbooks as a matter of “particular attention” and judged the Anglo-American Education Submission’s work positively. The Education Subcommission likewise praised De Ruggiero and his successor

---


174 In deference to the Vatican, it seems that sections on religion in the libri di stato were hardly touched, except to take away explicit references to Mussolini, and eventually the King. White, Progressive Renaissance (2018), 156. Directive from the Regional Education Officer to authors, editors, and provveditori agli studi, “DIRETTIVE PER OTTENERE L’APPROVAZIONE DI LIBRI DI TESTO PER LE SCUOLE ELEMENTARI,” October 28, 1944, Folder 10000/144/432 vol III (5) (Closed), Printing of Elementary Textbooks, (1944) Jan.- Nov. 1944, Box 1510, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education, ACC - Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP.

175 The Action Party was initially a political party founded by Mazzini in 1853. During the fascist period, a political party “of republican tendencies” evolved out of the Justice and Liberty movement, founded by Carlo and Nello Rosselli; it took the name “Action Party” as well. The Action Party bridged the gap between liberalism and socialism. One prominent member of the party was Feruccio Parri. Silvio Paolucci, Ottocento e novecento, Nuova edizione internamente rielaborata [2.] ed., vol. 3, 3 vols., Storia per la scuola media (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1970), 319. White, Progressive Renaissance (2018), 7, 77-78.

Arangio Ruiz as “able men, very cooperative” who “appreciated the work of the Subcommission.”177

However, by fall 1944, more conservative forces were on the rise. Arangio Ruiz, though cooperative with the Subcommission, represented more traditionally liberal forces and under him attempts at a fascist purge were largely stymied; he was followed by the Labor Democrat Enrico Molè, who had little interest in the Education Subcommission and/or educational reform. Progressive reforms were further stalled with the ascendancy of the DC in 1946. Guido Gonella, a Christian Democrat, took the position of MPI from 1946 to 1951. Gonella, who had been a militant member of Catholic Action, resented American pedagogical reforms and progressive ideas. He brought his own team of administrators to the ministry, including some fascist holdovers.178 Thus, by the time the Italian ministry took full control over the textbook vetting process in late 1944, attempts at reform and personnel purges were largely waning.

Even as the task of screening books began to be gradually turned over to the Italian government and its MPI, the ACC added new regions to its supervision. At each major stop as the Allied armies advanced along the peninsula, they created textbook commissions, which examined books and put forth lists of books that had to be confiscated, books that were useable if pages were torn out, and books that were approved. New challenges arose when the north of Italy finally came under Allied control in late 1944 and early 1945. Suddenly, the Education Subcommission had to create five new northern regions. Here, they had to contend with the sometimes helpful and sometimes difficult presence of the CLN (sometimes referred to in

177 Closing Report, April 19, 1946, WO 220/349 ACC Education Division, Sub Commission- Reports, Records Created or Inherited by the War Office, Armed Forces, Judge Advocate General, and Related Bodies, TNA.
178 Tommaso Dell’Era had a more favorable evaluation of Arangio Ruiz’s work on defascistization than Steven White. For information of the various Italian Ministers of Public Instruction, please see: White, Progressive Renaissance (2018); Dell’Era, “Tra educazione nazionale e pubblica istruzione.”
Venezia-Giulia as PNOO) and the “partisan republics.” The CLN had already, in many cases, created provincial education committees and had already called for revision of textbooks in these newly liberated areas, but in some cases the CLN pushed for what the Subcommission believed to be an unacceptable communist political indoctrination of students.179 Particular issues were faced in Venezia-Giulia, where Washburne reported in October 1945’s monthly report that the Slavic schools “distributed textbooks rife with Tito-communist propaganda.” For example, first-grade students read the following in their reading primers: “The war is over; Tito’s partisans have won the war. My father is a partisan. The great Stalin calls us from the plains of Russia, and from these mountains our friend Tito answers.”180

1.5 The Problem of the Libri di Stato

Now that we have considered the drammatis personae of the textbook revision, let us evaluate what they were able to accomplish. Firstly, one must note that they were not able to revise the textbooks fully before schools were reopened in Sicily on December 1, 1943.181


180 Quote reprinted in: White, Progressive Renaissance (2018), 148. Reports on these issues can be found in: Folder 10000/144/165 Education S/C, Monthly Reports Feb. 1944-Mar. 1946, Box 1494, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education; ACC - Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP; Carleton W. Washburne, Lt. Col. AUS, Director of Education, Monthly Report for February 1945, including Appendix A by John P. Simoni, Capt., CMP, Chief Education Officer, WO 220/349 ACC Education Division, Sub Commission- Reports, Records Created or Inherited by the War Office, Armed Forces, Judge Advocate General, and Related Bodies, TNA. The Italian region Venezia-Giulia is home to Trieste and was annexed to Italy only after the First World War. It has a large Sloven population. For more on these issues, please see: Glenda Sluga, The Problem of Trieste and the Italo-Yugoslav Border: Difference, Identity, and Sovereignty in Twentieth-Century Europe, Suny Series in National Identities (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001).

181 Washburne, "Education under the Allied Military Government in Italy," 266; White, Progressive Renaissance (2018), 59; Closing Report, April 19, 1946, WO 220/349, TNA.
Under the fascist regime, there had been a single set of state textbooks for the elementary school grades [libri di stato]. In these fascist-era libri di stato, history began to appear in the third grade and subsequently was taught in the fourth and fifth grades. A December 1943 report on “The Reform of Italian Education,” written by the Office of Strategic Services Research and Analysis Branch (OSS R&A Branch), noted that “the sections on reading, history, and geography are naturally best suited for conveying Fascist propaganda.” For example, the fourth-grade reader taught children that Italy had a right to control the Mediterranean.\(^\text{182}\)

The Allied occupying powers began to compose new manuscripts for revised libri di stato in November 1943; printing, however, only began in March 1944 due to lack of materials.\(^\text{183}\) In the intervening time, it was determined that fascist-era textbooks should not be allowed to remain in circulation, even though new textbooks were not immediately available. The OSS creators of the “The Reform of Italian Education,” were so determined not to utilize these uncensored textbooks that they recommended that instructors teach without a textbook or using the radio; to encourage turn-in of the fascist-era textbooks, the OSS R&A Branch recommended paying a bounty for each textbook turned in. Whether or not this policy was ever implemented is inconclusive.\(^\text{184}\)

Those operating on the ground, however, recognized that teaching without textbooks was not really an option. As TV Smith reflected in a postwar speech:

\(^{182}\) OSS R&A Branch “The Reform of Italian Education,” Geographic Files, Italy- Government, Foreign (Occupied) Area Reports, Box 2217, 368B Administrative Services Division Operations Branch, The Adjutant General’s Office, RG 407, NACP.

\(^{183}\) Washburne, "Education under the Allied Military Government in Italy," 266.

\(^{184}\) OSS R&A Branch “The Reform of Italian Education,” Geographic Files, Italy- Government, Foreign (Occupied) Area Reports, Box 2217, 368B Administrative Services Division Operations Branch, The Adjutant General’s Office, RG 407, NACP.
Theoretically, the textbook problem would appear simpler than the building problem, if for no other reason than that good teaching, even superior teaching, frequently may be done without textbooks. But not in lands conquered for ideological reasons...Fascism, Nazism, and Japanese feudalism destroyed the independent judgement of their citizens, including those of teachers...Such teachers are utterly lost without being told what to teach.\(^{185}\)

Smith’s language might have been inflammatory, but this conviction was clearly shared by others. Gayre wrote in a September 18, 1943 memo, “The Italian teacher virtually cannot teach without a textbook, so reliant has he become upon this method.”\(^{186}\) Therefore, before new textbooks were printed, schools opened using fascist-era *libri di stato*, with inappropriate sections torn or blacked out; teachers were also provided with mimeographed outlines of curriculum from which to teach in place of the offensive textbooks.\(^{187}\) However, this policy of just ripping out offensive pages proved problematic, because initial sweeps of the book missed certain obviously fascist passages.\(^{188}\)

The revised textbooks had to be produced—and quickly. By the spring of 1944, Washburne reported that they had printed 200,000 revised *libri di stato* textbooks, with selected publishing houses having a monopoly over *libri di stato* printing in various areas in the south of

\(^{185}\) Smith, “The Re-Education of Germany, Italy, and Japan,” Box 12, Folder 15, TVS Papers, UChicago.

\(^{186}\) Gayre to C.S.O., “Re-opening of Schools,” Folder 10000/144/8 AMGOT, Education, Reopening of Schools, Box 1486, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education, ACC - Italy Subject File, RG 331, NACP.


Italy.\(^{189}\) But this achievement, though laudable, was not sufficient to supply all Italian schools in the liberated areas. Even when schools opened again for the 1944-1945 school year in early October, only one quarter of children in “liberated” Italy had newly revised *libri di stato* due to paper shortages; the rest made do with the old fascist-era textbooks with the pages torn out.\(^{190}\)

As late as November 1944—more than a year after the Allied invasion of Italy—teachers in Sardinia had to use modified versions of the old fascist-era primer—with “F” for Fascism having been changed to “F” for “Farina” [flour].\(^{191}\)

But the educational reformers then found that textbook supply was not the only obstacle. In those areas that were able to secure an ample supply of revised *libri di stato*, the Allies and Italian educators found that even these newly printed textbooks were not fully satisfactory. As Washburne recalled, “In our scrupulous efforts not to change the sections of the textbooks that dealt with religion we had failed to remove a prayer for Mussolini (the Vatican later gave us a new prayer to substitute for it).”\(^{192}\)

---


\(^{191}\) Carleton W. Washburne, Major, AUS, A/Director of Education, Report for November, 1944, written December 12, 1944, WO 204/2627 Italy: Education Sub-Commission, Records Created or Inherited by the War Office, Armed Forces, Judge Advocate General, and Related Bodies, TNA.

\(^{192}\) Washburne, "Education under the Allied Military Government in Italy," 267.
approved, revised *libri di stato* contained passages such as, “One honors the flag and defends it until death.”¹⁹³

Not all agreed with this decision to publish revised versions of the *libri di stato*. However many prayers for Mussolini were erased, some felt that the books retained their fascist aura and that the very notion of a state monopoly on textbooks was authoritarian in nature.¹⁹⁴ De Ruggiero, who held office as MPI from June 1944 to December 1944, wrote to the Education Subcommission in September 1944 to voice his dissatisfaction with the continuation of the state monopoly on elementary textbooks.¹⁹⁵ De Ruggiero noted somewhat bitterly in his letter that when he became Minister in June 1944, all organization and logistics had already been decided upon for the reprinting of elementary textbooks “and in accordance with the terms of the armistice I had to suffer the initiative of this Headquarters, although utterly opposed to it.” De Ruggiero argued that the *libro di stato* was “a typically fascist institution, which annuls liberty of teaching; and however much expurgated and epurated, it preserves indelibly the vice of its origins.”¹⁹⁶ De Ruggiero’s complaints were shared by some of the Education Subcommission officers. When asked to respond to De Ruggiero’s letter, British officer Harry Rawlins Beard, who was then responsible for printing the revised *libri di stato* series, agreed in great measure, writing “History and Geography are sore subjects. Expurgation cannot alter facts and facts

---


¹⁹⁴ Neufeld, "The Failure of AMG in Italy," 585.


¹⁹⁶ Letter was translated by ACC from Italian into English for the original recipients. De Ruggiero, Minister of Public Instruction to Colonel Rowell and Major Washburne, September 17, 1944, Folder 10000/144/429 General Policy Feb. 1944-May 1946, Box 1510, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education; ACC - Italy Subject File; Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP. Also quoted in White, *Progressive Renaissance* (2018), 121.
usually invite comment…The ‘Impero’ was glorified in the study of Roman conquests, and I have even seen an Axis implied in the Holy Roman Empire.”  

In response to De Ruggiero’s complaints, then ACC Director of Education Henry Rowell and the Minister met. In the meeting summary, dated September 20, 1944, Rowell wrote, “I would point out…that this Subcommission never considered the continuation of the practice of a libro unico [single book series] as anything more than unavoidable expedient.” Rowell pointed out that “in Sicily and the South of Italy, conditions imposed the productions and use of a single text and its adoption was often the only thing which made schooling possible [in school year 1943-1944].” However, Rowell recognized that “the present rehabilitation of Italy under a liberal government and the character of the territory which is now being liberated have created new conditions.” Thus, at the meeting, the De Ruggiero and Rowell decided that as the northern territories of Italy were liberated over the course of school year 1944-1945, there would be no obligation for teachers to use the state textbooks, although some would be provided for teachers who wished to use them. Instead, the newly liberated industrial centers of Turin, Milan, and Florence, which were home to the major printing houses, would be allowed to produce a free-market of textbooks. 

Due to agreements with the publishers, the South would continue to use …

---


the revised *libri di stato* during 1944-1945.\textsuperscript{199} Free-market publishing of schoolbooks returned to all of Italy for the 1945-1946 school year, although a ministry commission ensured that the new commercially produced titles conformed to the newly promulgated elementary school curriculum and contained no fascist propaganda.\textsuperscript{200}

This free market, unfortunately, did not successfully lead to the complete eradication of objectionable material from the schoolbooks. In the 1946 Venetian publishing house Edizioni Sorteni’s *Vita serena: sillabario e prime letture* [Peaceful Life: Syllabary and First Readings], students practiced their penmanship of the letter “m” with the word “moro” [black/African]. “Moro” was then illustrated in the book with an offensive caricature of a person of African descent. Racism was not this reader’s only defect. As student practiced forming the letter “c,” they were given the sentence “Il fucile è un’arma da fuoco” [The rifle is a fire-arm]. While the sentence is not objectionable in itself, it is also hardly “See Spot run.” It demonstrates a preoccupation with weapons and guns, which appeared in at least one other instance in the book. The sentence’s inclusion is particularly surprising given that Italian postwar schools were supposedly attempting to undo the militarism that Mussolini’s Italy had injected into schooling.\textsuperscript{201} *Vita serena* was not alone in this tendency. Steven F. White, who examined the Florentine house Le Monnier’s *Voci serene (a scuola bimbi!)* [Peaceful Voices (Kids to

---

\textsuperscript{199} Henry T. Rowell, Lt. Col. CMP, A/Directory of Education to Guido De Ruggiero, Minister of Public Instruction, “Conference with the Minister of Public Instruction,” September 23, 1944, Folder 10000/144/429 General Policy, Feb. 1944-May 1946, Box 1510, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education; ACC - Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP.

\textsuperscript{200} Publishing houses that created approved books were given paper form American sources at prices one third of that of the black market. White, *Progressive Renaissance* (2018), 121-22; Closing Report, April 19, 1946, WO 220/349, TNA.

\textsuperscript{201} Attilio Dusso, *Vita serena: sillabario e prime letture* (Venezia: Edizioni Sorteni, 1946), 12, 53.
School!] series, noted that the series also had a fair amount of militarism, but avoided fascist dogma and therefore was considered acceptable.  

In truth, this decision to allow a free textbook market in the northern portion of the peninsula beginning in 1944 was confirmation of an already existing practice. After Mussolini’s fall in July 1943, but before the armistice with the Allies, Prime Minister Badoglio’s Minister of National Education Leonardo Severi had begun the defascistization of schoolbooks and had abolished the *libri di stato*. This policy had been stymied by material problems, but between 1943 and 1944 (during the RSI period), the northern textbook publishing centers of Florence, Turin, and Milan produced some new textbook series to supplant the fascist *libri di stato*; southern Italy, which largely lacked publishing houses, never made the switch before being occupied by the Anglo-American forces.

When the Allies finally arrived in the northern centers, they found entirely new textbooks published by editorial houses Le Monnier (Florence), SEI (Turin) and La Prora (Milan); these textbooks were screened by newly created textbook commissions for approval or were compared against approval existing lists. There was a distinct preference by the populace for these free-market textbooks, with Beard noting, “There is no enthusiasm for the state series of books in Florence, where they are regarded as a ‘Fascist book,’ even in their epurated condition.”  

Despite this, certain structural factors still favored the state textbooks in the northern markets,

---


such as lower prices for paper. Furthermore, the statistics noticeably show that no non-\textit{libri di stato} 4th and 5th class religion textbooks were printed in Florence during the 1944-1945 school year. This is particularly important to our inquiry, since the religion books also contained the history and grammar curricular sections. Thus, the books, about which Beard complained, that glorified the ancient Roman “Impero” were likely the only ones on the market (at least in Florence) at the time.

\textit{Table 1: Printing and Distribution of Elementary Textbooks in Florence, 1944-1945}\footnote{Statistic found: “Printing and Distribution of Elementary School Text-books, 1944/45,” enclosed in report by Sir P.M. Magnus, BT, Major, “Probable Requirements of Materials for Elementary School Text Books for the Whole of Italy, Year 1945/46” March 14, 1945, Folder 10000/144/430 General Feb-May 1945, Box 1510, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education; ACC - Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP. Information on textbook contents can be found: Beard, “Report on Handling over supervision of Elementary School Text Books,” Folder 10000/144/429, Box 1510, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education, ACC - Italy Subject File, RG 331, NACP.}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & \textit{Libri di stato} textbooks & & \textit{Non-libri di stato} textbooks & \\
 & Printed & Distributed & In Process of Printing & Printed & Distributed & In Process of Printing & \\
\hline
III. Reader & 30,045 & 30,045 & --- & 17,950 & 3,950 & --- & \\
III. Subsidiary Subjects (all subjects other than Reading) & 37,011 & 34,831 & --- & 2,900 & 200 & --- & \\
IV. Reader & 24,849 & 24,849 & --- & 19,000 & 8,800 & 7,700 & \\
IV. Arithmetic (also containing) & 28,142 & 26,852 & --- & 1,300 & 900 & --- & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnote{Beard, “Report on Handling over supervision of Elementary School Text Books,” Folder 10000/144/429, Box 1510, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education, ACC - Italy Subject File, RG 331, NACP; Willis E. Pratt, Captain AUS, Education Officer, AMG, 8th Army Rear of the Prefect, “Education Directive No. 3,” January 2, 1945, Folder 11500/115/172 Educational Sept. 1943- Mar. 1945, AMG 8th Army, General, ACC - Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP. Evaluation forms can be found in Folder 10000/144/471 (I) Non-State Elementary School Textbooks & Proposed Manuscripts, Nov. 1944-Feb. 1945, Box 1513, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education, ACC - Italy Subject File; Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP.}
Beard’s reservations about the Italian state textbooks deepened over the course of his assignment to the Education Subcommission. In early 1945, documents appeared indicating that Beard had requested to be relieved from his duty of overseeing the publication, printing, and distribution of Italian elementary textbooks.\(^{206}\) In his final report on the topic, Beard let loose the frustration that had clearly been developing for some time. Beard wrote that he had requested to be reassigned because he did “not wish to be in any way associated with the continued publication of these books,” which still contained “indelible traces of subversive Fascist propaganda.” Beard noted that the 5th class’s book still showed the 1940 boundaries of Nazi Germany and asserted that “there are hints of Mussolini’s ‘demographic’ [presumably racist and

\(^{206}\) Other documents seem to place the date in late 1944: Handwritten summary of Harry Rawlins Beard’s service record, Folder 10000/144/64, Box 1489, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education; ACC - Italy Subject File, RG 331, NACP.
racialist] ideas and his sneers at the ‘decadent’ nations.”

Beard (writing about himself in the third person) noted that “altho he has frequently ventured an opinion, the suitability or unsuitability of the books has always been treated as a policy matter above his head.”

Not all in the Education Subcommission shared Beard’s convictions. From Beard’s superior Washburne’s response to the report, it was clear that Beard had gone rogue. Washburne advised Beard that he might wish to revise the summary of his report to “remove the evidences of bias and feeling” in certain passages before Washburne passed it along to the higher-ups at the Civil Affairs Section. Washburne told Beard, “In these passages you do not show yourself to advantage” and threatened that if Beard decided to keep these passages in his report summary, Washburne would have to write “an accompanying statement which would inevitable [sic] reflect disadvantageously on you.” Furthermore, Washburne instructed Beard, “In a closing summary it is not fitting to open up controversies within the Subcommission and to express personal bitterness.”

This exchange reveals that there was a real difference of opinion among the Subcommission staff as to whether the libri di stato series was acceptable. Although Washburne was an educational reformer by background, he was dealing with complex pressures

---


208 Beard, “Summary of Report on Handling over supervision of Elementary School Text Books,” Folder 10000/144/429, General Policy, Box 1510, UD 1978 Headquarters-Education, ACC - Italy Subject File, RG 331, NACP.

and a real need to maintain a certain “status quo” in Italy. Radical reform in the textbooks would not be pursued.

1.6 Still Troublesome Secondary School Textbooks

Secondary school textbooks were a different story. The fascists had never created a single series for secondary school books. “The Fascists had never gotten around to making Euclid demonstrate fascist doctrine or Cicero orate against the democracies. Consequently, except for the anthologies, modern history, and geography, most of the secondary books were innocuous,” said Washburne.210 Regardless, these textbooks were still examined—sometimes by newly appointed Italian regional education heads (provveditori agli studi), sometimes by the Education Subcommission and sometimes by regional or local textbook commissions. Publishers, authors, and provveditori agli studi would also sometimes advocate for certain books to be approved by the REOs in the ACC regions.211 The textbooks were categorized as either approved, approved

210 Ibid., 267.

211 An example of such a petition is one by author Mario Sansone who requested that his “An Historical Outline of Italian Literature” be reprinted. In the petition, Sansone wrote this his “work, completely free of Fascist feelings, is—both for the idea of the writer and the unanimous opinion of critics—an interpretation of the history of Italian culture and poetry according to the theoric views of Benedetto Croce.” Sansone noted that his work had not been reprinted previously because of a lack of paper and petitioned the AMG for an allocation. The request, however, was denied due to the lack of paper. Prof. Mario Sansone to Allied Military Government, Division of Education, “Reprinting of a Book” (translated from Italian to English by ACC for original recipient), Folder 10000/144/429 General Policy Feb. 1944-May 1946, Box 1510, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education; ACC - Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP; Willis Pratt, Capt. AUS to Prof. Mario Sansone, “Stampa di libri di testo,” February 24, 1944, Folder 10000/144/429 General Policy Feb. 1944-May 1946, Box 1510, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education; ACC - Italy Subject File; Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP. Other examples of petitions/requests to publish can be found: Folder 10000/144/115, PWB, Authorization for Secondary School Books, Apr.- Nov. 1944, Box 1491, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education; ACC - Italy Subject File; Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP. For general information on the rather haphazard nature of secondary school book approval, please see: Carleton W. Washburne, Major. AUS, D/Director to Regional Education Officers, “Conference with Minister” by Washburne, May 16, 1944, Folder 1000/144/166 Education S/C, Weekly Reports, Mar. 1944-Aug. 1945, Box 1494, UD 1978 Headquarters- Education; ACC - Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP; Carleton W. Washburne, Director of Education, “Special Orders and Authorizations
with pages extracted, or disapproved. Eventually a ministerial commission was formed in Rome to examine all the secondary books present there; this formal commission created a master list that could be distributed to all regions.

Overall, the revision of secondary school textbooks was regarded as a less important task than the screening and revision of the elementary school ones. This was likely due to the smaller school population. According to Washburne, only twelve percent of young Italians attended lower secondary school (scuola media inferiore, serving children ages eleven through thirteen or fourteen), either at a scuola media or at a professional school. Only six percent attended upper secondary school, at a high school of classical instruction (classical or scientific liceo or istituto magistrale), a technical institute or school, an art school or a “feminine” school. (Upper secondary schools served children of ages fourteen and over.) Perhaps consequently, almost all the secondary school textbooks were approved by the commissions.

Despite the fact that most of the secondary textbooks were approved by the Education Subcommission and the textbook commissions, documentary evidence suggests that secondary school history textbooks proved troublesome. As early as September 1943, textbook evaluations

for Opening and Functioning of Schools;” Folder 10100/144/3 Miscellaneous, Volume I, May 1936-Nov. 1943, Box 3757, UD 1978A Region I, Sicily, Education; ACC - Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP; Closing Report, April 19, 1946, WO 220/349, TNA.

Closing Report, April 19, 1946, WO 220/349, TNA.

Carleton W. Washburne, Major, AUS, A/Director of Education, Report for September 1944, written October 11, 1944, WO 204/2627 Italy: Education Sub-Commission; Records Created or Inherited by the War Office, Armed Forces, Judge Advocate General, and Related Bodies, TNA.

Arthur Vessolo cited slightly different percentages than Washburne—with eleven percent of children remaining in school past the age of fourteen. Regardless of which statistic we take as fact, very few Italian children attended school past the age of eleven. Washburne, "Education under the Allied Military Government in Italy."; Vessolo, "Italy: Education under Allied Military Government."; Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, La ricostruzione della scuola italiana: dalla fine della guerra alla riforma degli ordinamenti scolastici (Roma: Centro didattico nazionale, 1950), 1-15.
suggested that blacking out offending lines would not suffice for many history textbooks. On
September 30, 1943, an Allied lieutenant submitted an evaluation to Gayre, this time for Volume
III of a history book by Currado-Larozzi, entitled “Roma-Italia,” which covered the period of the
Risorgimento and Kingdom of Italy and was meant for the students of approximately age thirteen
to fourteen years of age. He wrote, “The tone throughout is essentially militaristic. Each
individual encounter, battle, plot and counter-plot is celebrated with true Fascist
grandiloquence.” The reviewer observed that at one point the monarchy was so tightly tied to
fascism, that the textbook author wrote of Queen Margherita, “She was able to see, with great
admiration, the grandiose work which Fascism was accomplishing under the all-seeing guidance
of its marvelous Head [sic].” The reviewer concluded, “I recommend that this book be entirely
condemned: The sections which might be salvaged are so hopelessly militaristic that it would be
useless for our purposes.”

Of the one hundred and forty-seven history textbooks examined by the ministerial
commission for the defascistization of textbooks in November 1944, eighteen were totally
prohibited, fifty-four were approved for conditional use as long as troublesome passages were
removed (usually discussing anything after the First World War), and seventy-five were
approved unequivocally. This policy of pruning out the chapters following the First World War
followed a directive given by the Badoglio government in 1943, in order that the most
propagandistic portions of the fascist curriculum—such as the “March on Rome”—would not be
taught. The Allies agreed. An Education Subcommission report on Venezia-Giulia noted,

---

September 30, 1943, Folder 10000/144/9 Italy, Texts of Schools, Sept. 1943-Dec. 1944, Box 1486, UD 1978
Headquarters- Education; ACC - Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters,
RG 331, NACP.

216 Ascenzi, Education and the Metamorphoses of Citizenship in Contemporary Italy (2009), 259-60.
“Since the history of the last few years cannot yet be taught objectively, neither Italian nor Slavic children are being taught for the time being, any history of the past twenty-five years. When peace has been signed and emotions have subsided so that recent history can be taught without prejudice this omission should cease.” 217 Italian publishers and authors also seemed in agreement with this policy. The introduction to the 1947 secondary school textbook *Corso di storia per l’istituto magistrale, Vol. IV: Età contemporanea* [Course of Study for the Magistral Institute: vol. IV Contemporary Era] by Raffaello Ferruzzi noted that its narrative would end in 1919 because the “historical cycle” of “the struggle between the Great Powers for universal dominion was still ongoing and therefore difficult to evaluate. 218

***

This willingness to let the last twenty-five years of history rest for a time could also be attributed to the fact that the Allies had bigger problems to which to attend. From almost the very beginning, the Education Subcommission officers in Italy knew that their work was only the first reeducation project in a long series. As early as February 1944, when the work of reeducation in Italy was very much still ongoing, Education Subcommission officers wrote in their reports “lessons” that were clearly intended to be applied to future reeducation theaters—most immediately in Germany. For example, Gayre wrote in a February 1944 overview of his work, “As a result of experience in Italy it is most strongly stressed that there must be adequate planning and preparation before the invasion. This includes making lists of names of active

217 Appendix 4, Press release and summary for CAO’s- 3 March, 1946, WO 220/349 ACC Education Division, Sub Commission- Reports; Records Created or Inherited by the War Office, Armed Forces, Judge Advocate General and Related Bodies, TNA.

enemies and friends, and the writing of new texts and directives. There must also be an adequate staff in the early days, even if it must be reduced at a later stage.”219 This was clearly written with an eye to the future and Gayre’s future transfer to SHAEF.

Gayre was not the only Education Subcommission officer transferred to another theater. As the war spread to northern/central Europe, many of the same British and American education officers who had served in Italy departed to Germany, Austria, and Japan. They did not always appreciate the transfer. In late 1944, Gayre wrote to Washburne, who was then Director of Education in Italy, “Take my advice and remain where you are. If I had known what the conditions would be for the other sphere of activity, I should have never have touched the business.”220 Gayre’s rosy memories of his previous service in the Italian theater may have been colored by the fact that he was dismissed in late 1944 from his position coordinating postwar educational policy for the British zone of Germany because of his right-wing views.221

It had long been known that Gayre had contacts with the German War Office and Foreign Ministry and racist views that favored Germans over Russians (which led to him being investigated by the British Security Service early in the war). However, AMG took Gayre on into

service without any sort of vetting and without consulting the Security Service. As one officer wrote in Gayre’s Security Service file in early 1944:

I think that if we had been consulted on the case, we should not have approved of GAIR’s employment by A.M.G., having regard to the facts that he holds some of the views usually associated with Fascism and is at the same time boastful and indiscreet… I do not think, however, that he is disloyal

In the end, the 1944 publication of Gayre’s book, *Teuton and Slav on the Polish Frontier*, which engaged in racialist thinking including the discussion of Germans as members of a “Nordic race,” created a debacle and spelled the end of Gayre’s work in Allied re-education projects.222

Yet despite Gayre’s only brief tenure at SHAEF, he and other officers who were transferred to other reeducation projects would draw on lessons and practices first pioneered in Italy in these new theatres of war and occupation. They would also go far beyond the strategies practiced in Italy in some cases and the reeducation projects, particularly in Germany and Japan, would outlive their Italian predecessor, as the Education Subcommission in Italy was disbanded in April 1946.223

A further evaluation of the similarities and differences between the Italian and German textbook projects will be addressed in the next chapter. We will now turn to Germany, where there were many more forces and constituencies in play and where everyone involved was far more concerned about the stakes of a failed outcome.

---

222 For quote see Minute 65 in file KV/2472. For other information, consult the whole of file KV 2/2472. Evidence was never found that supported the suspicions against him.

223 Closing Report, April 19, 1946, WO 220/349, TNA.
We have decided not to kill the Germans, but to educate them.
- British member, Minutes of the Allied Kommandatura Education Committee, August 1945

Unless the war mentality that has permeated the bulk of the German nation for the past 70 years is to be replaced by a peace mentality, the 2nd world war and the ensuing period of control will have failed in its purpose. Only a new way of life, rooted in the true and lasting standards of the Christian religion can bring about the permanent change from war to peace mentality. The re-education of the German child is perhaps the best means by which this rebirth can be finally achieved.
- “Memorandum on the importance of achieving a complete change in the character of German textbooks,” August 1945

Like in Italy, the revision of textbooks, and more broadly, education in postwar Germany was linked to undoing the damage of fascism and to broader processes of denazification. The goal of reeducation (or later “reorientation”) was not only to encourage rebirth for these defeated postfascist nations, but also to provide peace and security for a new Europe by inculcating youth with a new democratic world view. But the occupying powers faced a problem—how to impose democratic norms as occupying powers without those norms being rejected as authoritarian impositions.

---

224 “Minutes of a Meeting of the Allied Kommandatura Education Committee,” 28 August 1945, Folder 1 “Minutes August 1945,” Minutes-Allied Kommandatura Educ. & Rel. Affairs, 1945-48, Box 152, Records of the Education & Cultural Relations Branch, Records for the Berlin Sector, Office of Military Government for German (U.S.) (hereafter referred to as OMGUS), Records of United States Occupation Headquarters Record Group 260 (hereafter referred to as RG 260), NACP.

225 “Memorandum on the importance of achieving a complete change in the character of German textbooks,” FO 1032/710 German School Textbooks, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
Occupied Germany presents a much more complicated research subject than occupied Italy, since the approaches taken varied from occupation zone to occupation zone. Unlike Italy, which was managed by a joint Anglo-American military government, in Germany each of the four powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union—had full jurisdiction over their individual occupation zone. Unfortunately, most scholarly work has focused on just one occupation zone and has largely ignored the interconnections and collaborations between them.226 An exception to this trend is Arthur Hearnden’s *Education in the Two Germanies* (published initially in German as *Bildungspolitik in der BRD und DDR*). But Hearnden was limited by the fact that much of the archival files were not open when he wrote his book in the early 1970s.227

The Soviet zone, in particular, has been treated as a very separate case. The educational collaborations and commonalities between it and the Western zones have largely been ignored in Cold War-era scholarship, in favor of an oppositional narrative.228 This dissertation chapter, which both draws upon the files to which Hearnden was not able to access and goes beyond Cold War-era dichotomies, will focus on the similarities, differences, and entanglements of the four powers’ educational and textbook revision policies in Germany. It will then seek to connect these back to the Allies’ first attempts at educational reconstruction in Italy.

---


227 The dissertation author has chosen to use the plural “Germanys” rather than “Germanies,” but has retained “Germanies” if it exists in secondary literature. For example: Hearnden, *Education in the Two Germanies* (1974); Hearnden, *Bildungspolitik in der BRD und DDR* (1973). Other scholars, such as Jeffrey Herf, use “Germanys:” Jeffrey Herf, *Divided Memory: The Nazi Past in the Two Germanys* (2009).

Continuing this trend of very compartmentalized historiography on postwar reeducation projects, most scholars have ignored the linkages between the Italian and the Germans cases in their analyses of educational reform in the postwar era. Often Italy is left out of the equation in favor of a bilateral Germany-Japan comparison. But, the links between Italy and Germany (and also Japan) were clear to those on the ground in Europe in the immediate postwar. In 1947, Thomas Vernor Smith, the former Director of the Allied Control Commission (ACC) Education Subcommission in Italy, outlined his understanding of these postwar education projects. He wrote, “I hazard the impressions: (1) that in the three major countries conquered our problems are common and triune; (2) that the educational policy of American forces is fairly unitary and chiefly sound.” According to Smith’s account, the policy of educational rebuilding was relatively consistent across the occupied nations. However, was this really the case? Were the same standards applied? Were the same resources provided?

I argue that an institutional learning process occurred in occupied Italy that enabled the more thorough approach later applied in Germany. Despite Smith’s rhetoric of a uniform policy, a far more hands-on approach was taken in German than in Italy; thus, Germany represented both a continuation and a more aggressive implementation of the process of educational restructuring and textbook revision that had begun in Italy. The link between Italy and the later occupation in Germany is clear as early as letter from Carleton Washburne, dated November 16, 1943, in which he wrote, “Educational planning for Germany: These facts and this experience in

229 A notable exception is Steven White’s Progressive Renaissance, which focuses almost exclusively on the educational rebuilding of Italy before turning to comparative analysis in the book’s conclusion. White, Progressive Renaissance (2018); Shibata, Japan and Germany under the U.S. Occupation: A Comparative Analysis of Post-War Education Reform (2008); Rosenzweig, Erziehung zur Demokratie?: amerikanische Besatzungs- und Schulreformpolitik in Deutschland und Japan (1998); Julian Dierkes, Postwar History Education in Japan and the Germanys: Guilty Lessons (London; New York: Routledge, 2010).

230 Smith, “The Re-Education of Germany, Italy, and Japan,” Box 12, Folder 15, TVS Papers, UChicago.
Italy convince Lt. Col. Gayre and me that… the first steps… for the production of textbooks before our occupation of Germany, should be taken immediately”

2.1 Pre-War Preparations in the West

The task was taken up with haste. Driven, in part, by the textbook problems encountered in Italy, the American and British educational officials, including Robert Gayre, who had been dispatched from Italy to London to help, began working on textbooks for Germany before the actual invasion. Like the fascist-era Italian books, the textbooks published after the Nazi rise to power were deemed wholly unacceptable for their militarism, racial ideology, and adoration of the charismatic leader. History textbooks were particularly ideologically tinged. As an August 1946 American report on textbooks recounted, “History books showed a deadly monotony in chapter endings to the effect that the development of Germany had now culminated in perfection under the guidance of the Führer; for example, Bismarck had unified Germany, but real unification had only now been achieved under Adolf Hitler.” It was not just the history textbooks that were problematic, but also textbooks in “supposedly propaganda-free subjects” like mathematics. An American Education & Religious Affairs (ERA) officer Marshall Knappen recalled in his memoir: “For example here is an arithmetic problem: ‘The moneylender charged

---

231 Carleton W. Washburne, Major A.U.S., Deputy Educational Adviser, HQ AG to Major General Hildring, General Staff, War Dept., “Education in Italy and Germany,” November 16, 1943; Folder 10100-144-36 (2 of 3) Text Books, Correspondence with HQ’s (Oct. 1943), Nov. 1943- May 1944, Box 3761, UD 1978A Region I. Sicily, Education, Allied Control Commission- Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupational Headquarters, RG 331, NACP.


233 Ibid.
the farmer’s widow 12 per cent interest per year on a loan of six hundred marks for four years. Out of how much money did the Jewish swindler cheat the widow?""""234

Nazi-era textbooks were clearly unacceptable. But where to find new books? The American and the British determined that tearing out the problematic pages from the Nazi-era textbooks “would only stimulate juvenile interest in the original passage,” reflected Knappen.235 Textbooks from the German-speaking areas of Switzerland were considered as possible substitutes, but these books tended to be very “local” in character, with references to landmarks of Bern, for example. As Knappen put it: ”Something more indigenous to Germany had to be found if we were not to defeat our own cause by rousing nationalist feelings with the enforced study of books intended to inculcate foreign ideas and attitudes.”236 The Allies also considered using textbooks composed by American and English authors as being too obviously “foreign.” Also dismissed on the same ground was a series of history books that had already been published by German émigrés; the Allies feared that the occupied German population would resent textbooks written by Germans who had not lived through the war. Thus, the Americans and the British determined that textbooks produced in Germany during the Weimar era were really the only option for emergency textbooks. 237

Weimar-era textbooks, which should have been devoid of Nazi militarism, were retrieved from the Teachers’ College of Columbia University. American and British officials evaluated them separately. They considered additional books sent from the Stockholm State Library and

234 As printed in: M. Knappen, And Call It Peace (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1947), 64.

235 Ibid.

236 Ibid.

237 The British, however, also experimented with having Prisoners of War write schoolbooks. Ibid., 63-65; Letter from Bennett, Political Intelligence Office to Kirkpatrick, Control Commission for Germany, November 12, 1944 (document 33A), FO 1032/710, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
the British Board of Education Library. But to the American and British officials’ dismay, these textbooks were also largely deemed unacceptable. After combing through 402 possible textbooks between October 1944 and July 1945, a British textbook officer only approved eight books for use in primary schools; both post-1933 and pre-1933 textbooks were judged objectionable on the grounds of nationalism and militarism. The Americans found similar issues, although they were slightly less bothered by the textbooks than the British, because they felt that a nationalistic bias was somewhat unavoidable in textbooks. The British and Americans were ultimately able to come to an agreement as to which Weimar-era textbooks should be reprinted.

The British and the Americans were not the only occupying powers who dismissed the Weimar-era books. The French occupation authorities, for example, only authorized the use of books published before 1933 if they had been screened by the Directory of Public Education, due to the excessive militarism and nationalism (particularly anti-French nationalism) in certain textbooks. The Soviet Military Administration in Germany (SMAD) concurred and issued Order Number 40 on August 25, 1945, which banned the use of textbooks printed before 1945; texts from before 1933 were only allowed with unacceptable passages removed.

---


240 Knappen, And Call It Peace (1947), 66-67; Textbooks in Germany.

241 Letter from Donald Riddy to W. R. Richardson Esq., Ministry of Education, November 22, 1944, FO 1032/710, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.


As has been hinted at above, American and British officers initially engaged in joint planning for educational reconstruction in Germany, in a similar structure to the Education Subcommission in Italy. American officers were sent in 1943 to Britain as members of the ERA Subsection, German Section, Special Staff—Civil Affairs, SHAEF. Some of those assembled were already experienced in educational affairs in Italy—including Robert Gayre and George Geyer, who had directed the reopening of schools in Naples. In 1943, it was clear to the Anglo-American officers that the Soviets, too, would play a role in military government and setting educational policy, but was not yet apparent how they would interact with the other governments. The Soviets were not involved in this joint pre-occupation educational planning, nor were the French, who, still occupied themselves, were not expected at this point to play a large role in any postwar occupation of Germany.²⁴⁴ American and British educational officers up until early 1944 worked together to create educational policy for the soon-to-be-occupied Germany, but then higher officials determined that the two countries’ educational staffs should be formally separated. Higher-ups feared that if the Anglo-Americans continued collaborating and made firm decisions about school policy, which they then presented the Soviets with as *fait-accompli*, this would be antagonizing.²⁴⁵

2.2 The Occupation & the Occupiers: Education Restructuring and the Textbooks

As Britain and United States made reeducation plans in London, events were proceeding on the ground. The Allied armies began moving into Germany. In fall 1944, the town of Aachen, in western Germany, was occupied—the first major German town to come under Western Allied


²⁴⁵ Ibid., 57.
control. U.S. army authorities created a commission of five German citizens and gave them the task of re-organizing Aachen’s schools. One of the biggest issues faced was locating acceptable schoolbooks. Finally, the London group of educational planners sent printing plates of a selected textbook to Aachen and the local newspaper press was commandeered; the first “postwar” schoolbooks (referred to as “emergency textbooks”) were printed in time for the elementary schools to reopen in June 1945.246

In February 1945, the four occupying powers—the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union— divided Germany into four zones of occupation at the Yalta Conference. Each power had jurisdiction over the schools and universities of its zone. The capital, Berlin, was to be ruled by all four powers.247 However, the Soviets reached Berlin before the Western Allies, and thus they began reorganizing the school system and city school administration without the other occupying powers’ input. Once all four powers had reached the city, however, it was determined that a quadripartite body known as the Allied Kommandatura would oversee the German civilian government, the Magistrat; the Allied Kommandatura Education Committee (AKEC) was set up to handle educational direction in the city and was responsible for approving all textbooks used in the schools.248 The Potsdam Agreement of August 1945 formalized the

246 Decisions regarding Aachen’s textbooks were jointly made by both American and British control commission authorities. See correspondence between Marshall Knappen, Acting Chief, Education & Religious Affairs Branch, US Group C.C. and Donald Riddy, Director, Education & Religious Affairs Branch, Control Commission for Germany (BE): Folder 2 “Textbook Part II,” Records Re Cultural Exchange and School Reopenings, Box 79, Records of the Education Branch, Records of the Education and Cultural Relations Division (hereafter referred to as ECR Division), OMGUS, RG 260, NACP. Tent, Mission on the Rhine (1982), 41-43.

247 Hearnden, The British in Germany, 12; Puaca, Learning Democracy (2009), 25.

248 The Soviets had already approved several textbooks for use in Berlin schools, however, before the other Allies had arrived in the city “Minutes of a Meeting of the Allied Kommandatura Education Committee,” 13 August 1945, Folder 1- “Minutes August 1945,” Minutes- Allied Kommandatura ERA, Box 152, Records of the ECR Branch, Records of the Berlin Sector, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.

248 “Memorandum on the importance of achieving a complete change in the character of German textbooks;” Tent, Mission on the Rhine (1982), 238-39.
occupying powers’ responsibility towards education in Germany, stating: “German education should be so controlled as completely to eliminate National Socialist and militarist doctrines and to make possible the successful development of democratic ideas.”

But in doing so the educational officials faced a number of obstacles. There was great material and physical want in postwar Germany. In Braunschweig [Brunswick] in the British zone, only twenty-eight percent of elementary schools were ready for immediate use by pupils. 12.5% of the city’s elementary schools had been completely destroyed and the rest needed either minor or major repairs. Food was also an issue. United States medical authorities estimated that the average daily caloric intake in August 1946 in the federal states of Bavaria and Hesse was 1263 calories (compared to the normal diet for a child of aged six to ten of 2000 calories a day). To even begin addressing the fascistization of German youth, the physical and economic destruction had to be addressed. As the minutes of the AKEC stated, “School children cannot work in a way that is good to themselves, their conquerors, or anyone else without sufficient food.”

A further difficulty was the distribution of the school-aged population in German schools. In Italy, the focus had been almost exclusively on the primary schools because only forty percent of Italian children completed the fifth class of primary education and only about twelve percent

---

249 “Policy Instruction No. 12 Dated June, 1947 Issued by Headquarters, Control Commission for Germany, (DE), Educational Policy in the Light of Ordinance No. 57,” FO 1050/1262 Transfer of Powers to the Länder in Respect of Education- General Policy vol. II, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.


252 “Minutes of a Meeting of the Allied Kommandatura Education Committee,” 28 August 1945, Folder 1- “Minutes August 1945,” Minutes- Allied Kommandatura ERA, Box 152, Records of the ECR Branch, Records of the Berlin Sector; OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.
completed compulsory education (ending at age fourteen). In contrast, students tended to stay in school in Germany for much longer. In Germany, all students attended a common primary or elementary school (*Grundschule*) between the ages of six to ten. After four years of common schooling, approximately ten percent were selected for the *Gymnasium* after the fourth class of primary school. This small group would remain in school for eight or nine additional years before taking the *Abitur*, which allowed them to enter university. The rest of the students would continue in the upper classes of elementary school (*Volksschule*); after compulsory education, many would then continue on with part-time classes at vocational schools (*Berufschule*) until they were eighteen. In some federal states, there was also a *Mittelschule*, which represented a middle track. This type of school would later become known as the *Realschule* and offered six years of additional education (as opposed to the *Gymnasium*’s nine), which prepared students for clerical, civil service, or white-collar jobs. 253 Most German students attended school up until the end of compulsory education. Therefore, the Allies could not afford to only focus on the first four or five years of schooling, as they had in Italy. Furthermore, given the strong linkage between the upper grades and the Hitler Youth, the Allies felt that older students “would constitute by reason of their age, number and immediate past history as a special problem for Military Government,” reported British Education Branch director Donald Riddy. 254

---

253 In 1936, the number of years had been reduced from nine to eight to allow for more participation in the Hitler Youth. It was returned to nine in the Western zones either during the occupation period or immediately following it. Hearnden, *Education in the Two Germanies* (1974), 28-31; Vessolo, “Italy: Education under Allied Military Government;” Washburne, “Education under the Allied Military Government in Italy;” Puaca, *Learning Democracy* (2009), 83; Office of Military Government for Germany U.S. Education and Cultural Relations Division, *Handbook of Education Statistics, U. S. Occupied Area of Germany* (1949), 3.

2.2.1 American-Zone Germany

The war in Europe ended in spring 1945; the Americans wanted to reopen elementary schools in their zone by October 1 of that year. The problem was the textbooks. Printing in Aachen and Bonn had created 20,000 emergency textbooks, but these were far from enough. An estimated 4.5 million books would be required for all the elementary schools in the entire American zone and the previous 20,000 books were shared property with the British anyway.\(^{255}\)

As in Italy, the educational officers also faced problems of supplies. They needed ink for printing and wire for binding. They required coal to reopen paper mills and they needed to secure the use of a press. The American educational officers commandeered the presses of the *Völkische Beobachter* in Munich to print textbooks for the American zone (including eight reading books, five mathematics books, three books for history, and four books for natural science). Thus, in true historical irony, some of the first attempts at denazified textbooks rolled off the presses that had for twenty-five years printed the propagandistic newspaper of the Nazi party.\(^{256}\) Printing houses were contacted to help carry out the enormous order of emergency textbooks, as well.\(^{257}\) Like in Italy, however, the initial emergency textbooks were not entirely satisfactory. Many of them still had a revanchist, nationalistic nature, which brought the public “painful embarrassment,” as even German press outlets *Horizont* and *Neue Zeitung* reported. For example, in *Deutsches Rechenbuch für das 7. und 8. Schuljahr* [German Arithmetic Book for 7th

\(^{255}\) Knappen, *And Call It Peace* (1947), 82-83.

\(^{256}\) Ibid., 83. *Textbooks in Germany*, 2.

\(^{257}\) See correspondence: Folder 33 “Special Report on Textbooks,”. Records of Cultural Exchange and School Reopenings, Box 78, Records of the Education Branch, Records of the ECR Division, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.
and 8th Grades], students were given a three-page long problem in which they were instructed to calculate the losses brought upon by the Treaty of Versailles.  

After the initial round of emergency textbook printing, a vetting process began. The exact process varied a bit over the course of the occupation, but an August 1946 report provides a snapshot: Textbooks were submitted by the German educational authorities to their Office of Military Government, United States (OMGUS) Land [German federal state] office; from there, the books were sent on to the Textbook Section at OMGUS headquarters. At the Textbook Section, the books were checked against the list of books already censored and then sent to a textbook analyst, who used textbook evaluation sheets to examine the book, and then a textbook specialist. A decision was made about the book and then disseminated. Initially, the textbook evaluation criteria were similar in nature to those in Allied-occupied Italy. However, over time, the textbook evaluation process in Germany departed from its Italian predecessor by increasingly basing its judgements not only on the lack of objectionable material, but also on pedagogical

---

258 Translation of Redaktion Horizont, “Die neuen Schulbuecher” in Horizont, 9 June 1946, Folder 13 “Textbook Section Meetings,” Records Relating to Education, Box 95, Records of the Education Branch, ECR Division, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.

259 Textbooks in Germany, 3-4.
value. Private publishers printed the newly vetted textbooks, but due to paper shortages, OMGUS controlled how the paper supply was allocated.

Initial evaluations of submitted textbooks found them quite wanting. To assist in the production of new, more desirable textbooks, OMGUS set up several Curriculum and Textbook Centers, beginning in 1947, in order to give German textbook authors access to materials and secondary sources in order to construct new textbooks, which would inculcate youth with democratic values. As of 1950, there were fourteen of these centers (renamed Education Service Centers). Each center had an American director and between seven and twenty German employees, with specialties in library science, translation, editing and illustrating. Some of these

---


263 Office of Public Affairs Office of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, Education and Cultural Relations Division, A Guide to Education and Cultural Relations ([Bad Nauheim], 1950), 27. Puaca gives the date for the first centers as 1946; The High Commission for Occupied Germany places the date, however, at 1947. Puaca, Learning Democracy (2009), 31.
employees were also engaged in the work of creating and vetting textbooks. The investment of creating these centers eventually paid off as the number of secondary school books evaluated as “B” or “not approved” dropped from 42.9% of all submitted secondary school books in 1945 and 22.34% in 1946, to 5.3% in 1947, 8.82% in 1948 and 5.54% in 1949.

Figure 1 and Table 2 below show the number of textbooks vetted between 1945 and 1949 in the American zone. It should be noted that in 1949, the vetting procedure (which had previously taken place at OMGUS headquarters) was turned over to the individual OMGUS federal state offices. Eventually, science and technical books for the higher grades were exempted from screening, as long as German authorities provided a written guarantee to OMGUS that there was nothing objectionable in the books.

---

264 “War Department Position Description Position No. OMG- MG-13” for Neumann, Harry, Folder 40 “Job Descriptions German Personnel 1948,” Correspondence and Related Records, 1947-49, Box 291, Records of the Education Division, OMGBremen, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.

265 This data also appears in the figure and graph below: “Textbook Evaluation 1945 through 1949,” Folder 50 “616.Textbooks.” General Records, 1946-1954, Box 625, ECR Division, OMGHesse, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.

The 1949 data is complicated by the several book titles were evaluated more than once. As OMGUS explained it, “The total exceeds the total of titles by Ed. Branch, since number of books had several times been evaluated this office (i.e. re-submitted after required changes were made.)” A Guide to Education and Cultural Relations, 27.

Figure 1: Textbook Evaluation Results for Secondary Schoolbooks in the American Zone of Occupation, 1945-1949

Table 2: Textbook Evaluation Results for Secondary Schoolbooks in the American Zone of Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>A Approved</th>
<th>B Not Approved</th>
<th>C Conditionally Approved</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Evaluated as B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>42.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>22.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>5.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But, as OMGUS itself noted, just because the textbooks were approved, did not mean that they were available in the zone. Most teachers did not have access to a sufficient number of the approved texts. Often, teachers used a few pre-Nazi texts and their own knowledge to teach lessons verbally to students; if there were textbooks, they were shared among anywhere between...
two and fifty students.\textsuperscript{267} Furthermore, even if books were approved by OMGUS, if the German Ministry of Education in a federal state did not approve it, the book could not be used. As late as 1950, for example, Bavaria had failed to approve any history book for use in Bavarian schools, although OMGUS had approved several.\textsuperscript{268}

Bavaria’s intransigence was made possible by the fact that over the course of the occupation, the American occupation officials increasingly handed-off responsibility for school administration and for the textbooks to local German authorities. For example, OMGUS’s federal state offices asked the federal state Ministers of Education to form committees for the creation of new schoolbooks (a similar process to what took place in Italy). A zonal textbook committee (later called the Working Group on Textbooks) was also formed, which included both German and OMGUS representatives. These attempts to delegate control met setbacks, however. Paper shortages stymied efforts at new textbook production. Furthermore, these textbook committees were slow to submit manuscripts and when they did, they were usually not brand-new texts, but just revisions of previous ones, with many of their unsatisfactory qualities.\textsuperscript{269}

Despite these setbacks, the Americans remained committed to slowly handing off powers. As the U.S. High Commission on Germany Education and Cultural Relations (ECR)

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{267} \textit{Textbooks in Germany}, 18.
\item \textsuperscript{268} Letter from Robert C. Dawes, Chief, Education and Cultural Relations Branch to Dr. James M. Read, Chief, Education and Cultural Relations Division, Office of the U.S. High Commissioner, 16 February 1950, Folder 34 “Publishing of Textbooks,” Records Relating to Policy and Planning, Box 33, ECR Division, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.
\item \textsuperscript{269} \textit{A Guide to Education and Cultural Relations}, 7; \textit{Textbooks in Germany}, 19-23. “Minutes,” Textbook Officers Meeting, 18-19 September 1947, Folder 12 “Textbooks Conferences 1947,” Correspondence and Related Records 1947-49, Box 289, Education Division, OMGBremen, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP; “Sitzung der Arbeitsgemeinschaft Schulbücher am 21. Mai 1947,” Folder 12 “Textbooks Conferences 1947,” Correspondence and Related Records 1947-49, Box 289, Education Division, OMGBremen, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP; “Report on the Meeting of the Zonal textbook Committee on 26th November 1946 in Stuttgart,” Folder 16 “Approval of Textbooks,” Correspondence & Other Recs of the Education Branch, Box 676, ECR Division, OMGHesse; OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.
\end{itemize}
Division described in 1950, “Persuasion rather than directive has been the preferred method of Military Government from the beginning of the occupation in all matters pertaining to education and cultural affairs, it was made clear...[in October 1948] that the time had come when advice, demonstration and example were the only means of influence used.” 270 This was because, in the Americans’ view, it was important that reforms come “from within” not from without since “reforms imposed from without are temporary and lead to a return to previous practices.”271

2.2.2 British-Zone Germany

This practice of delegating responsibility to local authorities was similar to that applied by the Anglo-Americans in Italy. Despite that fact that the British and American educational programs for Germany had diverged in 1944, it was a philosophy of educational reform that the British, also, retained in Germany. In July 1945, the Control Commission for Germany (British Element) established the Textbook Section of the Education Branch in Bünde. The Textbook Section, once established, began vetting textbooks, which were currently available in schools and were submitted by German educational authorities—a similar process to that practiced by the Americans.272 By October 1945, one and a half million Weimar-era reading and arithmetic textbooks had been vetted and distributed to primary schools throughout the zone on an emergency basis. These textbooks were considered temporary and essentially the best of a bad bunch and were originally printed with the disclaimer:

This text-book...has been selected after a thorough examination of the books in use in Germany before the Nazi accession to power. It is a text-book of German authorship and has been reprinted without textual alteration. This does not imply that it is entirely


271 Ibid.

suitable from an educational point of view or otherwise. It is merely the best book which could be found in the circumstances and must serve until Germany produces better textbooks of its own.273

A similar warning appeared in the emergency textbooks printed in the American zone.274

As they vetted these textbooks, the Textbook Section had to determine the criteria on which these textbooks would be evaluated. They issued a report on “German Textbook Literature: An Analysis of Tendencies,” which laid out the following guidelines:

No book may be approved which:

a. Glorifies nationalism
b. Seeks to propagate, revive or justify the doctrines of National Socialism or to exalt the achievements of National Socialist leaders
c. Favours a policy of discrimination on ground of race, colour, political opinion or religion
d. Is hostile to any of the United Nations, or tends to sow discord among them
e. Expounds the practice of war of mobilisation or preparation for war, whether in the scientific, economic or industrial fields, or promotes the study of military geography or military history
f. Encourages cruelty and morbidity
g. Encourages extreme nationalism275

The British attempted to direct general educational policy in their zone, and most specifically textbook revision, using indirect control. The British tended to rely more on informal contacts between British and German officials to convey ideas and influence policy than the Americans did. Consequently, they had more education officers in the field than the Americans—with the American military government only having seventy people on its educational staff, as compared to two hundred and twelve on the British staff in the fall of 1947.276


274 Tent, Mission on the Rhine (1982), 41-43.

275 Davis, "The Problem of Textbooks," in The British in Germany, 114.

In the realm of textbooks, control for production was quickly turned over to the Germans in the British zone. Early in the occupation, British military officials began to informally hand over responsibility for vetting textbooks and manuscripts to federal state-level textbook committees, which were set up in early 1946 and composed of German officials. Under this federalized system, the federal state committees collaborated with representatives of the British textbook officers and with schoolbook publishers to provide curricular Richtlinien [guidelines] to schools; it was on these Richtlinien that the textbooks were based. Each federal state was able to authorize its own textbooks, in coordination with the Central (Zonal) Textbook Committee, which had been formed in December 1945 and included German representatives from the British zone, as well as from the British Sector of Berlin. The delegation of powers to the federal states [Länder] continued on January 1, 1947 with Ordinance Number 57 “Powers of the Länder in the British zone,” which gave the federal states specific constitutional rights, including control over education. 277

This constitutional shift towards delegation of education to the federal states also coincided with the creation of a new position in British military government—the Educational Adviser to the Military Governor, a position that was initially filled by Robert Birley. 278

---


was born in 1903 in Midnapore, India and was the son of a member of the Indian Civil Service. After his mother’s death, he was raised in Bournemouth by his grandparents and graduated from Oxford. Before taking a position with the British Military Government, Birley was a history teacher at Eton College and the headmaster of Charterhouse School. \(^{279}\) When Birley arrived in Germany in April 1947 as Educational Adviser, he began steering the British Educational Branch towards an organization less engaged in bureaucracy and policy, and more oriented towards building individual relationship with teachers and schools—reinforcing the indirect approach already begun by his predecessors.\(^{280}\)

Despite the delegation of educational powers to the federal states with Ordinance Number 57, textbook production was not immediately decentralized in light of material shortages.\(^{281}\) Textbook oversight also voluntarily continued on a zonal basis with the Central Textbook Committee continuing to meet regularly with representatives of the British Education Branch and with the zone’s textbook publishers. \(^{282}\) While the general intention was to shift towards decentralization of textbook oversight from the zonal to the federal state level, the Germans clearly felt that some centralized arrangements and cooperation with the occupying power were still necessary.\(^{283}\)


\(^{281}\) “Educational Policy in the Light of Ordinance No. 57” draft, FO 1050/1261 Transfer of Education Powers to the Länder- General Policy vol. I, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.  

\(^{282}\) Hedley Davis to R. V. Hume, “Conference of Zonal Textbook Committee and bi-zonal school publishers’ association held in Bünde on 24th and 25th November, 1948,” December 2, 1948, FO 1050/1097 Supply of Textbooks vol III, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.  

\(^{283}\) “Policy Instruction No. 12,” FO 1050/1262, TNA.
The British thought so, as well, but perhaps for different reasons. A Textbook Section member wrote in 1948, “To ignore this vital issue [textbooks] with a nation such as Germany is to risk their schoolbooks becoming the hunting-ground of propagandistic politicians.” As he reminded his report’s readers, “the masses who pass through the elementary school classrooms…constitute….the electors or sheep of to-morrow.”

Even after Ordinance Number 57, the British maintained “post-censorship” of textbooks and at times stepped in when they felt that manuscripts that had already made it through the federal state-based approval process were unacceptable. Furthermore, the British continued to push for teachers to be able to pick the books for their own classes and tried to oppose the creation of state-controlled publishing houses. As a means of indirect control, the British also proposed schemes of international collaboration in textbook construction—particularly on the construction of history textbooks—so as to continue their influence even after the creation of the Federal Republic.

In order to give British zone German textbook writers positive examples of textbooks, “source libraries” were created throughout the zone. These source libraries were managed by German officials but supervised by the British Military Government’s Education Branch. The British source libraries were similar in composition to the American Curriculum and Textbook

---

284 T.J. Leonard, report on “History Teaching in German Schools in 1948,” October 1948, attached to letter from Leonard to Brigadier R.V. Hume, Director of Education Branch, October 8, 1948, FO 1050/1025 Teaching of History in Schools, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.


286 T.J. Leonard, “History Teaching in German Schools in 1948,” FO 1050/1025, TNA; H. W. Davis, Textbook Section to Director of Education, Education Branch, “History Textbook (Mr. Birley’s proposal for an International History Textbook Committee),” February 9, 1949, FO 1050-1098 Supply of Textbooks v. V, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

Centers and there was a great deal of collaboration and exchange of textbooks between the two institutions.\textsuperscript{288} Beginning May 1947, a section of American textbooks was kept in the British source libraries. Also present were Swiss books (written in German) and books published in the French zone, although as Textbook Section member Kathleen Southwell Davis recalled the British felt that the French zone textbooks stressed military history overmuch.\textsuperscript{289} The British officials attempted to get textbooks from the Soviet zone, and for a time were successful, but ultimately were dismayed by the tone of the Soviet books. Attempts at collaboration with the Soviets eventually failed.\textsuperscript{290}

The source libraries were not always completely successful in inspiring the desired sort of textbook, however. For example, a proposed textbook on the history of the Church, composed by Karl Kastner, wrote of the Jews, “Never since the world began was a race so prolific in crime.”\textsuperscript{291} Even if the postwar textbooks dispensed with open racism and antisemitism, they sometimes portrayed the German people as victims of other European peoples. In 1949, Davis

\textsuperscript{288} See book exchange in Folder 2 “British Source Libraries,” Records Relating to Textbooks and Other Publications, Box 108, Records of the Education Branch, ECR Division, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.

\textsuperscript{289} Davis, "The Problem of Textbooks," in \textit{The British in Germany}, 121. Kathleen Southwell Davis is one of the only British officials who left behind reflections on this particular part of textbook revision process. Her writings are used in almost every major work on re-education in the British zone of Occupation. Despite this, she has, to my knowledge, never been biographically profiled in any depth and there is little information available on her. The result is a historiographical focus on the British zone educational reform that is particularly “male.” Hearnden, \textit{The British in Germany}, 312-13.


\textsuperscript{291} Davis, "The Problem of Textbooks," in \textit{The British in Germany}, 116-19; “German Textbook Literature: An Analysis of Tendencies” (Document 13A), FO 1050/1097 Supply of Textbooks vol. III, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
critiqued a reading book for the 7th and 8th classes, which contained a story in which a German child went to England and received from her English host a fragment of the Cologne Cathedral. Davis concluded, “There is a very simple essence for German children here:-- Poor Germany is attacked; her cultural monuments are destroyed by the English.”

Davis noted that in contrast to this image of German victimization, “there is nothing whatever in this whole book to indicate the sufferings of other nations as the price of German agression [sic]. . . What is Germany doing, even in thought, to make restitution to the Jews and the Poles and the nations she afflicted before affliction struck her and whose sufferings continue to be far more prolonged.” Thus, unfortunately, even in the British zone, characterized by collaborative relations between the occupiers and the occupied, some objectionable textbooks continued to be produced.

2.2.3 French-Zone Germany

While there were a number of similarities between the American and British methods of textbook revision, the French zone went about the task very differently. The French were not as concerned as the American and the British were about not imposing obviously foreign textbooks on the German population of their occupied zones. They thus utilized the imported Swiss textbooks, which the Americans and the British had dismissed. For example, the first-grade reader published in 1946 for use in the French zone was actually the first-grade reader used in Basel. As the front matter of the Kinderfibel stated, “This Reader serves as an aid, until final

292 Kathleen Southwell Davis to H. Walker Director of Education Branch, “‘Der Güldene Schrein’ Lesebuch,” June 29, 1949, attachment includes “‘Der Guldene Schrein.’ Lesebuch fuer das 7. und 8. Schuljahr. Hrsg. Vom Kathloschen Lehrerverband Nordrhein-Westfalen. Ferdinand Kemp Verlag,” FO 1050/1098 Supply of Textbooks vol. V; Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

293 Davis to Walker, “‘Der Güldene Schrein’ Lesebuch.” FO 1050/1098, TNA.
textbooks, edited by German teachers, arrive.”294 The French zone also utilized textbooks written by German émigrés in America, as well as some French textbooks translated into German, and textbooks created by a committee of French professors. While the Americans and the British had set up resource centers to assist the German populations of their zones in the creation of their own textbooks, there was no similar effort in the French zone.295

The French zone, however, had much greater successes than the other zones in the physical act of printing textbooks. Various visitors reported the successes of the French zone’s presses in printing huge number of books. One visitor noted that the French had produced textbooks at a ratio of 850 books per 100 students, as compared to 800 books to 100 students in the Soviet zone and 160 books to 100 students in the American zone.296 Initially, most schoolbooks were printed through a publishing house—Lehrmittel-Verlag, Offenburg—founded by the French military government, but later other publishing houses were authorized. Despite this, the French military government maintained much greater control than the Americans and the British over textbook creation and printing, writing as late as July 1949 that “Pre-publication control of school books, political and historical books and that of geographic maps is maintained until further notice. It is based on the necessity of preventing the propagation of historical

294 For example, see: Kinderfibel (Mainz: Lehrmittel-Verlag Offenburg, 1946), 1; Davis, "The Problem of Textbooks," in The British in Germany, 121.


296 Vermeil, "Notes sur la reeducation en zone française," in Education in Occupied Germany/ L'éducation de l'Allemagne occupée, 114; Bidwell, "Emphasis on Culture in the French Zone," 79.
This paucity of local German involvement in French zone textbook production may have been a side effect of the French’s main goals in the reeducation of the German people. Unlike the British and the Americans who were separated from the Germans by large bodies of water, the French shared a border with the Germans—one that had very recently been violated and France, itself, occupied. Thus, the French may have had more to fear from a revanchist Germany. Helen Liddell, a member of the British Royal Institute of International Affairs, certainly thought so, writing in her 1948 study of education in occupied Germany, “French mistrust of Germany is, with reason, more profound at all events than that of their two Anglo-Saxon allies. French belief in the necessity, and virtue, of direct control is correspondingly greater.”

A 1948 report from a French officer stationed in Württemberg stated expressed a similar sentiment: “It is up to us to incarnate in the personnel of our occupation administrative corps (tripartite corps, if one wants) the principal of authority in order to avoid a more or less well intentioned German doing things in our place and in order to be able to destroy the apprentice dictators of tomorrow.”

---

297 Quotation from: Secrétariat Général Division Education Publique, “Situation Statistique au Ier Juillet 1949 (Documentation trinestrielle),” Folder 16 “French Zone Publications,” Records Relating to Textbooks and Other Publications, Box 109, Records of the Education Branch, ECR Division, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.

Historian Angelika Ruge-Schatz presented French schoolbook publishing as a monopoly of the military government, with only three authorized publishing houses, but in actuality, documentary evidence indicates that other textbook publishing houses were operating in the French Zone. See: Secrétariat Général Division Education Publique, “Situation Statistique au Ier Juillet 1949,” Folder 16, Records Relating to Textbooks and Other Publications, Box 109, Records of the Education Branch; ECR Division, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP; “Liste pour diffusion d’Ouvrages Selectionnes Sortis des Presses en Zone Française d’Occupation en Mai 1949,” 2 June 1949, Folder 16, Records Relating to Textbooks and Other Publications, Box 109, Records of the Education Branch, ECR Division, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP; Ruge-Schatz, Umerziehung und Schulpolitik in der französischen Besatzungszone 1945-1949 (1977), 120-21.

298 Vermeil, "Notes sur la reeducation en zone française," in Education in Occupied Germany/ L’éducation de l’Allemagne occupée, 115.

299 It is unclear how the British got ahold of this report, which was written in French and does not seem to have been meant for the British. Saulgau, RB Württemberg report, April 20, 1948, attached to letter from CO II Edn & Rel,
end, the French military government would not allow the Land governments in their zone to
become involved in educational matters and maintained exclusive jurisdiction in this field until
the end of 1948.  

In a report of a British visit to the French zone 1948, the Educational Adviser Robert
Birley and his subordinate Director of the Education Branch Rex V. Hume commented on the
French’s desire to maintain direct control. They viewed the French’s educational policies as an
extension of “the colonizing methods which in the past they have used throughout the world.”
They noted that the French Director of Education had been previously Chief of General Security
in Beirut, during the French mandate in Syria and Lebanon. This parallel between French
colonialism in the Middle East and Africa and the French occupation of Germany certainly has
merits. In both locales, the French idea of a mission civilsatrice and spreading French culture had
resonance. Historian Karen H. Adler noted that “the French occupation of Germany…was
initially, perhaps, closer to imperial ambition than the other Allies were prepared to
countenance.” However, Adler, who believed that racism is a necessary characteristic of
 colonialism, argued that “both the Cold War and the lack of a sense of racial superiority that
French forces adopted with respect to the Germans, and a real and realized, desire for German
self-determination—achieved in four years—make post-war Germany somewhat of a colonial
anomaly.”

HQ Regierungsbezirk Detmold to Education Branch, HQ, Bad Rothenfelde, August 18, 1948, FO 1050/1104
Relations with French on Educational Matters, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.


“Report on Tour in French Zone by Educational Adviser and Director, Education Branch, 20-26 June 1948,” FO
1050/1104, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

A further note of caution can be sounded by the conclusions of historian Arthur Hearnden, who argued that the
French actually handed over day to day administration of education to the local German population before the
Americans or the British; however, Hearnden acknowledged, the French maintained “very close surveillance.” Alice
The fact that the British were accusing the French of colonial intentions should inject another note of skepticism, or at least historical irony. At the same time that Birley, the son of a British colonial officer in India, and Hume were critiquing the French colonial failures, the British were simultaneously ending mandates and colonial rule of their own, resulting, in many cases, in wars and ethnic cleansing. Furthermore, the British practice of delegating to local authorities did not necessarily make their treatment of occupied Germany any less colonial. British and French styles of colonialism had always been different—with the British favoring delegating to local elites and the French favoring direct control. Thus, while the British were criticizing the French for their misguided “colonial” attitudes, arguably, the British were engaging in patterns in their zone consistent with their colonial policies. 303

However, Hume and Birley’s concerns with the outcome in the French zone stemmed not just from a disdain for the French style of colonialism; failure in the French zone could infect the British zone, as well. Birley and Hume concluded their report by recounting that a German Youth leader in the British zone had “categorically state[d] that the springs (in the British Zone) of a new German nationalism among Youth are to-day located in clearly defined areas, namely


And indeed, the first choice for Director of the British Education Branch had been R.A. Butler, President of the Board of Education in India. Donald Riddy had been named Deputy Director to leave the position open for Butler. When Butler was unable to leave his post, Riddy was given the post of Director. Jürgensen, "British Occupation after 1945 and the Problem of 'Re-Educating Germany’,” 231-32.

the Russian Zonal Boundary area, the French Zonal Boundary area and (outside our Zone) the Saar [controlled by the French].” 304 Thus, the French and the Soviet zones were causes for concern. In the British view, by refusing to delegate control, they were allowing for the possible resurgence of all they had fought against.

### 2.2.4 Soviet-Zone Germany

Although Cold War rhetoric makes it seem sometimes as if the Western Allies were more or less united in school policy as opposed to the Soviet Union, which “went its own way,” in actuality there are a number of similarities between the French and Soviet zones when it comes to educational reform. Both the Soviet and the French military governments preferred to govern with “direct action.” Hellen Liddell noted, “Two of the Occupying Powers, Russia and France believe it is possible for them to ensure that during the period of occupation certain changes are made in the German educational system which will, in their turn, change the composition of the ‘governing classes.’”305 To this end, the Soviet Military Authority provided binding orders on educational priorities, which promoted centralization and uniformity.306

Radical reforms were pushed through in the Soviet zone. As Karl-Heinz Günther and Gottfried Uhlig wrote in the *History of the Schools in the German Democratic Republic*, published in 1972 by the East German state-controlled publishing house *Volk und Wissen Verlag*, “The issue was therefore nothing less than changing the class character of education,

---

304 “Report on Tour in French Zone,” FO 1050/1104, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

305 Vermeil, "Notes sur la reéducation en zone française," in *Education in Occupied Germany/ L'éducation de l'Allemagne occupée*, 107, 12.

transforming the school from an instrument of imperialism into a weapon of the anti-imperialist struggle.”\(^{307}\) This meant doing away with the tiered school system (which had been largely maintained in the Western zones), which was felt to confer privileges to upper classes.\(^{308}\) A new state-run comprehensive school (\textit{Einheitsschule}) was developed over the years of the occupation and the first years of the new East German state. The \textit{Einheitsschule} was composed of an eight-year \textit{Grundschule} and then a choice of three years part-time at a \textit{Berufschule}, along with an apprenticeship, or four years of a full-time \textit{Oberschule}. Thus, unlike in the Western zones, in the Soviet zone, all children attended the same schools during the years of compulsory education. While there were similar pushes for school reform in the Western zones, they were effectively delayed and opposed by the Christian Democrats and the Liberals; due to the essentially single party state created in the Soviet zone, the two parties were not able to successfully mobilize in the East.\(^{309}\) Later, the GDR adopted a ten-year \textit{Polytechnische Oberschule}, which all students attended until age 16 (with the exception of gifted athletes and dancers etc.) Thirteen percent then went on to another two years of education at the \textit{Erweiterte Oberschule}.\(^{310}\)

Although the Soviets desired radical reform from above, they also worked effectively with German local educationalists. The \textit{Volk und Wissen Verlag}-published \textit{History of the Schools of the German Democratic Republic} emphasized that the early nuclei of democratic school administration came out of “Communists, Social Democrats and bourgeois antifascists who felt responsible for the fate of the school children and the young people.” They created emergency

\(^{307}\) Ibid., 13.

\(^{308}\) Ibid., 9, 13.


schools and their local grassroots organization was eventually taken over by “well-tried representatives of the workers’ parties.” Later on, the *Detusche Zentralverwaltung für Volksbildung in der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone Deutschland* [Central Administration for People’s Education in the Soviet Occupation Zone of Germany or DVV] was set up to provide centralized leadership.\(^{311}\) While *Volk und Wissen Verlag* was a state-controlled publishing house and this history most likely reflects the desired narrative of the East German state, even Western contemporaries agreed that local German educationalists and teachers had prominent roles in these early reforms. The British Helen Liddell noted that the Soviets had given a number of German reform educationalists positions of power in the new German central administration. The American Robert Havighurst seconded this opinion, writing in 1947, “My hypothesis is that the Russians work through Germans in whom they have confidence, and give them a very great deal of authority to the Germans, checking them only on matters of general policy.”\(^{312}\)

School reform plans for the Soviet zone had already been developed before the war’s end. The National Committee for Free Germany (NKFD), a group of German expatriates who had fled to Moscow during the Nazi regime, created a commission of German émigré school teachers in February 1945. The Politburo of the German Communist Party (KPD), under the leadership of Walter Ulbricht, instructed the commission to work on issues of denazification, the creation of local school administrations, and the creation of textbooks. The priority for textbook


\(^{312}\) The indigenous nature of these reforms has largely been forgotten in scholarship that stresses the totalitarian top-down shaping nature of the Soviet Zone and East German school systems, see: Rodden, *Repainting the Little Red Schoolhouse* (2002); Naimark, *The Russians in Germany* (1995); Rodden, *Textbook Reds* (2006). However, more recent scholarship has emphasized this: Blessing, *The Antifascist Classroom* (2006); Helen Liddell, "Education in Occupied Germany: A Field Study," in *Education in Occupied Germany/ L'éducation de l'Allemagne occupée*, ed. Helen Liddell (Paris: Librairei Marcel Rivière et Cie, 1949), 107-08; Havighurst, *Report on Germany, for the Rockefeller Foundation* (1947), 104.
production was history textbooks; guidelines were already created by summer 1945, which were published in 1945 and 1946. \(^{313}\)

Because of the luck of geography, the Soviet zone had certain advantages over the other zones in textbook production. Leipzig, the prewar center of publishing and printing, was located in the Soviet zone. Therefore, the Germans in the Soviet zone did not suffer from the same shortage of paper and books that was mentioned frequently in other zones’ accounts. According to statistics provided by the Havighurst report of 1947, the Soviets claimed to have printed 17 million new textbooks for 3 million children (or 5.6 books per child) since the beginning of the occupation, as compared to the American-produced 3 million textbooks for 3 million children (1 book per child), the French 6.3 million books for 900,000 children (7 books per child) and the British 12.5 million books per 3.5 million children (3.6 books per child). \(^{314}\) The Soviets (and the French) were clearly ahead of the Anglo-Americans in this regard.

The Soviets and their German collaborators moved quickly to set up the *Volk und Wissen Verlag* publishing house in Berlin and Leipzig. The publishing house, a new postwar creation, received its license from the Soviet military government in September 1945. Initially, it had seventy employees; by 1951, it had grown to over two thousand. The educational publishing house initially focused on translating Soviet school texts and pedagogical works and also


\(^{314}\) These rough statistics are also reported by Lidell and Bidwell, but logically these numbers cannot include the emergency textbooks printed and likely represent new books published and printed. Vermeil, "Notes sur la reeducation en zone française," in *Education in Occupied Germany/ L’éducation de l’Allemagne occupée; Havighurst, Report on Germany, for the Rockefeller Foundation* (1947), 104; Bidwell, "Emphasis on Culture in the French Zone," 79; Sam H. Linch, A/Asst Deputy Director, “Telephoned to Dr. Grace for Saturday, 5 February 1949, Staff Conference,” 4 February 1949; Folder 12 “Conferences II,” Records Relating to Textbooks and Other Publications, Box 109, Records of the Education Branch, ECR Division, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.
reworking Weimar-era texts. However, as early as the 1946-1947 school year, the publishing house began working on the development of new textbooks and in 1946, the house produced its first pedagogical journal.\footnote{Heidemarie Dammenhayn et al., \textit{1945 - 1995 - Fünfzig Jahre Volk Und Wissen Verlag} (Berlin: Volk und Wissen Verlag, 1995), 4-5; Office of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, \textit{Sovietization of the Public School System in East Germany} (1951), 20-21.} The state-controlled \textit{Volk und Wissen Verlag} dominated the textbook market in the Soviet zone, but there are indications that there was some private competition, at least at the beginning. There exist in the OMGUS files some textbook evaluation sheets of “Russian Zone” edition textbooks published by houses other than \textit{Volk und Wissen Verlag} (presumably private publishers). This may have been something that was allowed in the Soviet zone in the early days of the occupation only, as the books in question appeared in 1945.\footnote{For example, see: “Textbook Evaluation Sheet” for \textit{Rechenbuch für die 5. Klasse}, 26 September 1946, [Folder 14] “Approvalo [sic] Textbooks,” Correspondence & Other Recs of the Education Branch, 1945-49, Box 675, ECR Division, OMGHesse, RG 260, NACP; Günther and Uhlig, \textit{History of the Schools in the German Democratic Republic 1945 to 1969} (1973), 32.}

By \textit{Volk und Wissen Verlag}’s own admission, the Soviet zone textbooks had a clear mission. According to a 1948 author’s conference at \textit{Volk und Wissen Verlag}, it was particularly important that the proper attitude be inculcated towards the Soviet Union. “Even today,” reflected the \textit{Volk und Wissen Verlag} report, “where under the leadership of American monopoly capitalism an uncontrolled warmongering towards the Soviet Union is practiced, it is necessary to illustrate the nature and the world-historical meaning of building socialism.”\footnote{H.W. Davis, Textbook Section to Birley, “Attached Papers,” November 11, 1948, attached papers include copy of decree by North Rhine Westphalia Cultural Ministry on “Approval and Introduction of Textbooks,” correspondence with Mr. Ignatoff from OMGUS, and “Diskussions grundlage für die Autorenkonferenz des Verlages Volk und Wissen am 15 September 1948,” FO 1050/1097 Supply of Textbooks vol. III, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.} In 1951, the United States High Commissioner for Germany (HICOG), OMGUS’s successor organization, wrote that “East German educational authorities have done all possible to insure that the raw
material of instruction, whatever the subject, is so slanted as to promote the bolshevist concept.”318 However, although HICOG was gnashing its teeth in the early 1950s about Communist “seizure” of the school system and “slanted” educational material, its predecessor OMGUS had been willing for several years to work with Soviet educational officials on joint projects and even to authorize the use of *Volk und Wissen Verlag* produced textbooks in the American zone of Germany.319 The British, too, initially had had positive things to say about the Soviet textbooks. The British “German Textbook Literature: An Analysis of Tendencies” report, which is undated but likely was created in late 1947/early 1948, praised the Soviet zone publishing house’s collecting library for school children and noting “there is every inducement to buy these books, on series.” The same report, however, acknowledged that “on examination, tendentious lines are visible,” primarily in history textbooks.320

2.3 The Particular Problem of History Textbooks

In a 1948 memorandum, Herbert Walker, a British zone educational official wrote, “I don’t think we shall be far wrong in regarding the teaching of history as the crux of our problem and in recognizing that unless the teaching of history is right the German educational system will

---

318 *Sovietization of the Public School System in East Germany*, 3-4.


320 “German Textbook Literature,” FO 1050-1097, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
never be sound and healthy.” It was not just the occupiers who felt this way, Braunschweig-based history professor Georg Eckert reflected, “I recently had two long conversations with former Hitlerjugend [Hitler Youth] leaders, in which we quite frankly discussed current problems….During all these debates, I encountered over and over again the terrible effects of former misinterpretations of history… It is here that we must concentrate our efforts.”

As in the Italian case, history textbooks in the occupied zones of Germany faced special barriers. Because the topic tended to be more heavily inflected with Nazi ideology than chemistry, for example, the occupation forces tended to postpone creating new history books for the schools. The teaching of history was considered so problematic, for example, that the AKEC endorsed a recommendation in October 1945 that “the teaching of history be postponed to the next term and that during the current term it be replaced by authorized subjects (languages, mathematics).” In many of the zones, as well, history education, was postponed until the occupation authorities could get a better handle on what to teach.

---

321 H. Walker to “Educational Adviser & Director” (Document 7a), FO 1050/1025 Teaching of History in Schools, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA; Jürgensen, "British Occupation after 1945 and the Problem of ‘Re-Educating Germany’," 238.

322 “Extract from a letter written by Prof. Dr. Eckert, Brunswick to Mr. Leonard Buende, 8 October 1948,” attached to letter from Leonard to H. Walker, October 26, 1948, FO 1050/1025 1025 Teaching of History in Schools, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

323 This is not to say that chemistry books were not also problematic. A 1947 textbook evaluation sheet of the chemistry book Scheid-Flörke Lehrbuch der Chemie, Ausg. B für Mädchen Part II found that the book was “full of references to the Nazi regime, its institutions, ideology, and war measures for conservation of materials and protection against enemy attack and is therefore totally unsuitable for use in its present form.” “Textbook Evaluation Sheet” for Scheid-Flörke Lehrbuch der Chemie, 10 June 1947, Folder 2, “Correspondence on Textbooks Vol. II,” Correspondence & Other Recs of the Education Branch, Box 677, ECR Division, OMGHesse, RG 260, NACP.

324 “Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee for Education and Religious Affairs held on 22 October 1945,” Appendix D; Folder 3 “Minutes October 1945,” Minutes- Allied Kommandatura ERA, Box 152, Records of the ECR Branch, Records of the Berlin Sector, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.
2.3.1 *Berlin*

AKEC members felt that German history instruction had previously been so infected by Nazi racial ideology that some time was needed to address this problem; AKEC’s First Year Report described history teaching in Berlin during the Nazi era as “full of falsifications, based on race theory, militarism, and national chauvinism, directed by Hitler’s leaders to prepare the population for criminal war and also because members of the NSDAP [Nazi party] prevailed among the teachers of history.”  

While history as an academic subject was banned in Berlin for the first school year after the war, this did not mean that there was no discussion of the recent past in schools. In early 1946, for example, all four occupying powers endorsed a plan by which Berlin teachers were sent to attend a portion of the Nuremberg Trials, so as to better facilitate discussion of the trials in schools.  

This was a rare moment of agreement for all representatives of the AKEC with the Soviet representative, according to the minutes, “express[ing] appreciation of the helpful attitude of the Americans on whom the main burden of the scheme would fall.” Historian Gregory Wegner argued that it was this discussion of how to teach about the trials in schools that prompted the “first substantial round of negotiations on the reform of the history curriculum.”

---


326 “Minutes of the Meeting held on 28 Jan 1946,” Folder 6 “Minutes January 1946,” Minutes- Allied Kommandatura ERA, Box 152, Records of the ECR Branch, Records of the Berlin Sector, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.

327 Ibid.

A new publication in the Soviet zone also provided an impetus. A group of teachers led by the German communist Paul Wandel published in 1945 and 1946 a series of Richtlinien for history instruction in the Soviet zone. Wandel was born in 1905 in Mannheim to a working-class family. He became a member of the KPD in 1925 and when the Nazis came to power in 1933, he immigrated to the Soviet Union. When he returned to Germany in 1945, he became president of the DVV (1945-1949) and then of its successor organization, the Ministerium für Volksbildung [Ministry for People’s Education or MfV] (1949-1952).329 Wandel’s Richtlinien, the third portion of which was published in July 1946 and featured a much stronger focus on 19th and 20th century history than the Weimar-era history curricula had, became the basis of much of the AKEC’s debate. Wandel’s guidelines were particularly notable for instructing history teachers to use evidence from the Nuremberg Trials to teach show their students that “the Second World War was a crime against the German people and the world and that only with renouncing of the violent methods of National Socialism, of aggressive imperialism, and of militarism and the creation of a stark and consistent democracy can the future of Germany be secure.” The Richtlinien also instructed teachers to teach students about the Nazi persecution of the Jews (although a more superficial Lehrplan [curriculum] for history in all grades published by Volk und Wissen Verlag in the same year did not).330

The American AKEC representatives rejected the Richtlinien because they had a Marxist bent.331 Several plans for history education were drawn up by both Allied and German sources

329 Wer war wer in der DDR?: ein biographisches Handbuch, s.v. “Paul Wandel.”


and AKEC subcommittees laboriously reviewed and edited them. Discussions in the AKEC, however, became heated between the American and Soviet representatives around a number of issues, including accusations that the American representative had leaked disagreements between him and the Soviet representative to the German press, the Soviets’ distribution of a history textbook in their sector without AKEC authorization, and OMGUS’s decision to begin sponsoring the *Wege der Völker* history book series.\(^{332}\)

The debate on the history curriculum dragged on, forever postponed to the next AKEC meeting. In the intervening time, history was not supposed to be taught in Berlin.\(^{333}\) Berlin parents became angry about the lengthy absence of history from the schools, writing letters of protest to OMGUS and local German authorities calling for a return to a full schedule of

---


---

\(^{333}\) However, in September 1946, the British representative on the AKEC observed that history was being illicitly taught in schools in Charlottenburg because of a misunderstanding; the AKEC had approved the teaching of history “in principle,” but not “in practice.” The schools of Charlottenburg had apparently not understood this distinction. “Minutes of the Meeting held on 23rd September 1946,” Folder 15 “Minutes September 1946,” Minutes- Allied Kommandatura ERA, Box 152, Records of the ECR Branch, Records of the Berlin Sector, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP; “Minutes of the Meeting held on 3 February 1947,” Folder 18 “Minutes January 1947” Minutes- Allied Kommandatura ERA, Box 152, Records of the ECR Branch, Records of the Berlin Sector; OMGUS, RG 260, NACP. “Notes of Meeting of Education Committee 12/3/48,” Folder 31 “Minutes March 1948” Minutes- Allied Kommandatura ERA, Box 153, Records of the ECR Branch, Records of the Berlin Sector, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP. For documents showing OMGUS’s approval of textbooks for the U.S. Sector of Berlin, please see: Folder 5 “Textbooks,” Box 126 General Records 1945-1950, Records of Education & Cultural Relations Branch, Records for the Berlin Sector, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP. For more background information, see: Wegner, "Germany's Past Contested," 5, 10.
academic subjects. However, AKEC only agreed upon and signed the final text of a curriculum for history education in June 1948. The result—“The Teaching Plan for History Instruction in Berlin Schools”—was a much toned-down version of Wandel’s Richtlinien; it attempted to be ideologically neutral and did not emphasize a struggle between capitalism and socialism. However, like the Richtlinien, it did instruct teachers to teach about the Nazi period; it also mentioned concentration and extermination camps, but did not identify Jews as one of the Nazis’ primary victim groups. Unfortunately, the common teaching plan was never implemented, due to the burgeoning Cold War and the Soviet blockade of Berlin, which began at the end of June 1948. With the breakdown of relations, textbooks were then approved by a Tri-Partite Education Committee, consisting of the Americans, British, and French.

Berlin was a particular problem because all four occupying powers had to agree on a textbook policy and a history education policy together. As the Soviet representative said in early 1948, “Berlin is a sort of Germany-wide laboratory and here we have to find a textbook that would satisfy all four sides.” Berlin’s special nature led to many delays on basic decisions. But it also led to what scholar Gregory P. Wegner has described as “both conflict and a


336 “Notes on the meeting of March 12, 1948,” Folder 31 “Minutes March 1948,” Allied Kommandatura ERA, Box 153, Records of the ECR Branch, Records of the Berlin Sector, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.
surprising accommodation by both sides.”

Although slow-moving, the AKEC’s deliberations over education in Berlin “remained the only area within the entire occupation zone where Soviet and American education officers established a dialogue over a specific dimension of school knowledge,” noted Wegner. In the various zones, where there was only one occupying power, it was (only) slightly less complicated.

2.3.2 American-Zone

History teaching in the American zone was approved in January 1946. However, this history education largely neglected the recent past. School observations reveal that this history instruction was based on a Weimar-era history book that only ran until the beginning of the 19th century. As a British officer who visited several schools in American-controlled Württemberg observed, “As in the British Zone, such books have only been supplied until other books can be produced, and none is considered very satisfactory either by the Americans or the Germans. . . . The History book lays too much emphasis on wars, say the Germans, and it is too difficult for Volksschulen, besides being presented in an uninteresting manner.”

American textbook analysts found history textbooks, in general, quite wanting. In an August 1946 report on “Textbooks In Germany American Zone,” OMGUS presented its textbook approval statistics between the beginning of the occupation and August 1, 1946. Out of
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339 E.M. Ellis, Education, HQ Military Government Hansestadt Hamburg to Walker, Education Branch, Zonal Executive Office, “School Visits in the American Zone,” 1 November 1946, attachments include reports on schools and general impressions, FO 1050/1258 Education Reports from Other Zones, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA; E.M. Ellis to Walker, “School Visits in the American Zone,” 28 October 1946, attachments include reports on schools, FO 1050/1258 Education Reports from Other Zones, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
1,885 textbooks screened, 987 (or 52.3%) textbooks had been approved, 433 (23.3%) had been conditionally approved subject to revisions and 455 (24.4%) had been disapproved. History textbooks, however, fared worse than the general textbook population. Out of 73 history textbooks analyzed since the beginning of the occupation, 49 (67%) were disapproved, while only 20 (27%) had been approved and 4 (6%) conditionally approved. History had the highest disapproval rating of any of the subject areas, this time followed by Latin (58%) and Geography (58%).

Table 3: Textbooks by OMGUS Screened between the Beginning of the Occupation and August 1, 1946 by Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>A Approved</th>
<th>B Not Approved</th>
<th>C Conditionally Approved</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Evaluated as B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry and Physics</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books for those with Speech or Hearing Impediments</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

340 Textbooks in Germany, 5.

341 Adapted from table found in: Ibid.
Looking at textbook evaluation sheets from this period, one starts to see the grounds on which the textbook analysts were making their judgements. In a November 1946 evaluation of the text *Vom Wiener Kongress bis zum Jahre 1861* [From the Congress of Vienna to Year 1861], the evaluator observed: “This book of historical source material contains many valuable excerpts. The book has however been compiled essentially for the purpose of playing up the military role of Prussia; it contains a strong nationalistic bias.” The evaluator classified the text as “B” and wrote “not suitable in present form.”\(^\text{342}\) The emphasis on violence and militarism was apparently a prominent characteristic in many of the schoolbooks—even those classified “A.” A July 1946 evaluation of *Die germanische Welt* [The Germanic World] noted that “Altho’ this book dwells at considerable length on the war-like nature of the early ‘Germanen,’ such a portrayal is at once historically correct and necessary to enable students to arrive at an understanding of later German history.”\(^\text{343}\)

Given the unsuitability of many of the history textbooks they were receiving for vetting, OMGUS placed a special emphasis on nurturing the creation of new history textbooks.\(^\text{344}\) Thus, OMGUS sponsored a number of committees, which were formed to focus on history and social studies education.\(^\text{345}\) OMGUS was to provide guidance and approval, not write the new history textbooks themselves. As an ECR officer wrote in a 1948 memo:

\(^\text{342}\) “Textbook Evaluation Sheet” for *Von Wiener Kongress bis zum Jahre 1861*, 7 November 1946, Folder 16 “Approval of Textbooks,” Correspondence & Other Recs of the Education Branch, Box 676, 1945-49, ECR Division, OMGHesse, RG 260, NACP.

\(^\text{343}\) “Textbook Evaluation Sheet” for *Die germanische Welt*, 30 July 1946, [Folder 14] “Approval of Textbooks;” Correspondence & Other Recs of the Education Branch, 1945-49, Box 675, ECR Division, OMGHesse, RG 260, NACP.


\(^\text{345}\) Example: Folder 9 “Report of Committees for History, Geography + Society,” Box 698, Correspondence & Other Recs of the Education Branch, ECR Division, OMGHesse, RG 260, NACP; Folder 21 “The Work of the
It seems clear that the Germans need guidance in writing books that contain an entirely new approach to history which must be experimentally developed. The fact that this work is being done by a number of different groups will result in varied approaches to the problem, a most wholesome solution. The more freedom that is given the Germans in this undertaking, the better their attitude will be.\textsuperscript{346}

The most prominent and successful American-sponsored history textbook project was the *Wege der Völker* [Paths of the Peoples] textbook series. The *Wege der Völker* series was written by German teachers, who, after being selected by OMGUS, worked in the Textbook and Curriculum Centers to write a new series of history textbooks for grades five through twelve. The teachers selected had largely been involved in either passive or active resistance to Nazism. Their first books began to be used in the Western occupation zones in late 1948.\textsuperscript{347} The earliest version of the *Wege der Völker* eighth grade book (Volume IV), which concentrated on contemporary history, appears to have been published in 1949. Historian Brian Puaca noted that *Wege der Völker*’s fourth volume’s “strategic placement in the curriculum meant that even pupils who left school after the eighth class—the minimum requirements of the educational system—would nonetheless have studied Germany’s recent history.”\textsuperscript{348} Although published by the small

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item Dr. Leo J. Brueckner, Elementary Education, to Chief of Education and Religious Affairs, Attn: Dr. R. T. Alexander, “Issues Related to New Textbooks” 14 February 1948, Folder 7 “Textbook Allocation,” Records Relating to Education, Box 94, Records of the Education Branch, ECR Division, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.
\item Contemporary history was also taught in Volume VII for the 11th grade, as well. “Wege der Völker” list of volumes; Folder 5 “Textbooks,” General Records 1945-1950, Box 126, Records of Education & Cultural Relations Branch; Records for the Berlin Sector, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP; Puaca, *Learning Democracy* (2009), 83.
\end{itemize}
West Berlin publishing house Berthold Schulz, *Wege der Völker* was very widely adopted across various *Länder*, unlike many other of its contemporaries.349

The *Wege der Völker* series was a pioneer pedagogically. It furnished assignments and discussion questions for group work and classroom debate.350 In *Wege der Völker*’s narrative, German history was presented as a progression towards democracy; the Nazi period was an aberration from this trend towards freedom and popular participation.351 Thus, unlike many textbooks printed in the immediate postwar era, it actually covered the Nazi period and went as far as to discuss the postwar years including the Marshall Plan. It also attempted to have progressive social focuses, such as a chapter on the role of women in world history.352

Scholarly attention has thus far focused on the pedagogical innovations and historical significance of the *Wege der Völker* series, but only Gregory P. Wegner’s 1988 doctoral dissertation has really looked into its representation of the Holocaust and Wegner’s discussion fails to directly compare *Wege der Völker* to other textbooks being simultaneously produced.353 I seek to determine how ahead of the curve *Wege der Völker* Volume IV truly was by judging it against another contemporaneously published middle school history textbook. Essentially, how

350 Ibid.
351 Ibid., 83.
352 This chapter, in particular, caused the writers of Volume IV a fair bit of trouble. A progress report on the series noted, “This chapter has been written by three different authors in succession. It seems to be a topic too difficult to handle for men. The present author, Krammer, a woman, does not seem to find it too easy, either.” Harry B. Wyman, Chief of General Education and Curricula to J.C. Thompson, Chief of Branch, “Present Status of History Books and Manuscripts,” 25 March 1949, Folder 5 “Textbooks,” General Records, 1945-50, Box 126, ECR Branch; Records of the Berlin Sector, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.
successful were the OMGUS Textbook and Curriculum Centers at engendering the production of textbooks that reflected on Nazi crimes and national complicity?

When one compares the 1949 edition of *Wege der Völker* Volume IV to another contemporary history textbook *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen* [Klett’s Historical Instructional Materials for the Middle Grades] published for grade nine by the major Stuttgart-based publishing house Ernst Klett Verlag [Ernst Klett Publishing House] in 1951, the increased attention that *Wege der Völker* paid to depiction of Nazi genocidal crimes is clear.\(^{354}\) *Wege der Völker* presented a narrative of 958 words all in one section of the book, as compared to the 526 words, divided among three smaller sections, devoted by *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen*. Even if one controls for the size of the whole book, *Wege der Völker* still devoted proportionally more space (see Table 4):\(^{355}\)

---


Table 4: Representation of Nazi Crimes in Wege der Völker vol. IV (1949) and Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen vol. IV (1951)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Word Count of Section</th>
<th>Page Count of Section</th>
<th>Total Pages in Book</th>
<th>Percentage of Book Devoted to Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wege der Völker vol. IV</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen vol. IV</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While devoting more space to the consideration of the Holocaust than Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen, Wege der Völker’s discussion of the events was far from satisfactory. It presented a narrative of some major events of the Nazi persecution of the Jews—including the origins of political antisemitism, the ejection of Jews from the German civil service, the Nuremberg laws, Kristallnacht, and concentration camps; however, it problematically omitted the extermination camps or the number of Jewish victims.356 Furthermore, both Wege der Völker and Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen suffered from use of passive voice without agents to describe the crimes against the Jews. “Very few escaped extermination; whether they succumbed to starvation at home or whether they eluded the pitiless persecution through suicide . . . or found a slow excruciating death in a concentration camp or in a Polish ghetto,” explained Wege der Völker. “The Jews were… devilishly murdered. Many million men, women, and children met this horrible fate,” narrated Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen 357 These grammatical

356 Puaca, "Mastering the Past?,” in As the Witnesses Fall Silent, 363.

357 Schulze et al., Demokratie im Werden (1949), 286; Pinnow and Textor, Geschichte der neuesten Zeit (1951), 173.
constructions made it so the student reading the textbook did not have to consider who had perpetrated these crimes against the “many millions.”

Both texts also devoted a significant portion of their word count to reassuring students that the non-Jewish population had opposed the persecution of the Jews and had been either unaware of the murders occurring in the East or unable to stop them. Harold Marcuse has termed these explanations “the myth of ignorance” and “the myth of resistance.” They, along with the “myth of victimization” served as “the three founding myths of the Federal Republic” and developed between 1945 and 1955 in Marcuse’s formulation. Marcuse explained in his book *Legacies of Dachau*, “These myths were suitable for effacing the memory of genocide and replacing them with a much more palatable history.” 358

For example, *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen* stated, “From the beginning of the war, they were forced to wear a gold five-sided star. Goebbels’s press criticized the populace, because they felt pity for those wearing the star and showed them courtesy not infrequently.”359 *Wege der Völker* told a similar narrative, writing that the mandated wearing of the yellow star roused “sympathy and helpfulness” among the general population. Any efforts to help the Jews, were, however, foiled, recounted the textbook: “But, too late! One could alleviate a little the Jews’ agonizing path, doing it despite all the spying and risks to oneself; but their fate could not be changed. The people were helpless against a system, which became even ever more devilish.” 360 In this presentation, the non-Jewish German people were

---


presented as the true victims, struggling against a monstrous system; the Jews were secondary to this narrative.

The Klett textbook embraced even more overtly exculpatory language when discussing the extermination camps of Auschwitz and Majdanek (subjects neglected in the Wege der Völker textbook). It emphasized, “This extermination work was practiced with greatest secrecy. An American judge testified at the Nuremberg trials that: ‘The testimonies of those who were involved in the awful systemic mass extermination, show with great plausibility that no more than a hundred persons in total were aware of the thing at all.’”\textsuperscript{361} There is, of course, no record of this ever being said, nor is this statement factually correct; however, it served to deny the complicity of the general population. The externalization of blame present in the Klett textbook’s presentation represents one of the “five strategies of repression” that postwar Germans used to deflect guilt, as identified by Aleida Assmann in \textit{Shadows of Trauma}.\textsuperscript{362}

In all, of the 318 words of the sections in \textit{Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen}, only 254 words were devoted to describing the crimes against the Jews; the other 64 words (or 20\% of the text) were dedicated to explaining how the general population had either opposed discrimination against the Jews or had been unaware of the genocide. In the \textit{Wege der Völker} narrative, the percentage is slightly lower, but still a full 16.7\% of the text is devoted to how the non-Jewish population opposed the persecution and genocide of the Jews and attempted to stop it, to no avail. It is clear that neither middle school textbook in question fully dealt with the Nazi crimes, particularly against the Jewish people or acknowledged complicity beyond Hitler and a small unnamed group of virulent antisemites.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Pinnow and Textor, \textit{Geschichte der neuesten Zeit} (1951), 173.
\item Assmann, \textit{Shadows of Trauma} (2016), 141-45.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
However, it should be acknowledged that the *Wege der Völker* textbook authors at least attempted to grapple with the matter in depth; it spent proportionally less space of its narrative excusing the non-Jewish German population and more space attempting to present an (admittedly incomplete) narrative of this recent “dark chapter” of German history. Perhaps this was the legacy of the American Curriculum & Textbook Center that was these authors’ host—the space to begin to work with a troubling subject that would not be satisfactorily dealt with in West German textbooks for many years.363

2.3.3 *British-Zone*

Like the American zone, the British zone struggled with a lack of history textbooks. When the British military government asked its officers to complete a survey of history teaching in the zone, this was one of the most frequent complaints.364 The need was so acute in Gelsenkirchen that “it is felt that any reasonably current and objective history book, if available in sufficient quantities, would be pounced upon with joy whatever its origin,” reported the British. The Control Officer from Detmold:

> describes the lack of textbooks as probably the greatest contributory factor towards the signal failure of the Western Occupying Powers to make any marked progress in persuading the Germans even to consider any form of democratic government. It is realized that paper is in very short supply but far sighted policy of control should have ensured the release of paper for the production of books dealing with the most

---


364. Survey reports found in FO 1050/1025 Teaching of History in Schools, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
fundamental things of man’s early life, his history, his form of government and his social institutions.365

The reasons for these shortages varied from federal state to federal state. During the blockade of Berlin for example, there were insufficient school materials in the British sector there; after the blockade, however, there was a surplus of books, but they were priced so high that students could not afford them. The vetting process was, by 1949, conducted by federal state-based textbook commissions. These commissions, however, were often slow moving—leaving a surplus of un-reviewed (and therefore unusable) books—for either political or educational reasons. Other federal states in the British zone—such as Lower Saxony and Hamburg—reported more success in getting sufficient quantities of high-quality books to their students. 366 Yet, it was important to the British that history textbook publication remain in the hands of the German governmental authorities and publishers. 367 As British officer Rex Hume wrote in 1948, “If we want history taught impartially we must either teach it ourselves à la Française, with all that would imply, or do more to encourage the weak but willing focus on the German side.” 368

365 Report by H. J. Walker, Chief Education Control Officer, Land North Rhine-Westphalia, “Interim Report on Teaching of History in German Schools,” attached to cover letter from Walker to Hume, Director of Education, September 21, 1948, FO 1050/1025, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

366 “Minutes of the Fourth School Education Officers Conference held at the Office of the Educational Adviser, 11 Berstrasse, Bielefeld, on the 12th and 13th of October 1949,” 9 November 1949, FO 1050/1031 Secondary Schools - Education Control Officers (ECOs), Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

367 “Minutes of the Second Conference of Secondary Education Control Officers held at Bod Rothenfelde on 9th and 10th February 1949” in FO 1050/1030 Secondary Schools ECO Conferences, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

368 Note from R.V. Hume, Director Education Branch to Educational Adviser, July 30, 1948, attached to report by T. J. Leonard, “History Teaching in 1948” FO 1050-1025, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
What Hume termed, somewhat uncharitably, the “weak but willing focus” in the British zone largely came out of the city of Braunschweig.\footnote{Braunschweig was the city that gave Hitler German citizenship in February 1932 and had a long history of Nazi activity; therefore, it was somewhat surprising that such reform efforts would come out it. Ponzio, \textit{Shaping the New Man}, 140.} There, Professor Georg Eckert, a historian, and \textit{Schulrat} [school inspector] Karl Turn, a member of the Central Textbook Committee, created a History Working Party [also referred to as the Braunschweig Research Group for History Education] at the end of 1946.\footnote{“Bericht über die bisherige Tätigkeit der Geschichtsarbeitsgemeinschaft Braunschweig,” attached to letter from Leonard to H. Walker, October 26, 1948, FO 1050/1025, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.} Karl Turn (1905-1953) was a school reformer during the Weimar Republic. As member of the secular schools movement, he was forced to leave his teaching post in Braunschweig in 1931. Although opposed to Nazism, he joined the NSDAP in 1933 and found a teaching position in Hamburg. However, during the Nazi period, he also worked as a courier for a resistance group. After the war, Turn had a number of positions in school administration in various cities in Lower Saxony.\footnote{Wilhelm Pieper, \textit{Niedersächsische Schulreformen im Luftflottenkommando} (Bad Heilbrunn: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, 2009), 71-72.} The more junior Georg Eckert had been born in Berlin in 1912 to Leftist parents and was a member of socialist youth groups. As he prepared from his teaching exams in 1937, Eckert joined the Nazi party. During the war, Eckert served in the military in France from 1940-1941 and later in occupied Greece, where he helped shield some of Thessaloniki’s Jews from being sent to concentration camps. After the assassination attempt on Hitler on July 20, 1944, Eckert deserted from the German army and joined the Greek People’s Liberation Army until February 1945, when he surrendered to the British. With the end of the Second World War, Eckert returned to Germany and found work at the \textit{Kanthochschule} in Braunschweig.
The Braunschweig History Working Party began creating the first postwar history curriculum. They believed in teaching from primary sources and created a series of small history booklets, the first of which were published on the scrap paper of the local newspaper. These booklets were positively received, even by a Soviet textbook examiner as part of a textbook exchange with the British zone. The working party later also organized conferences for teachers on history education, including on the teaching of contemporary history (such as the Weimar Republic and the “Stab in the Back Myth.”) The group in Braunschweig then participated in the first International History Textbook Committee, the first Anglo-German Conference of History Teachers (held in 1949 and then subsequently in 1950), and the Franco-German History Rally. Eckert also went on to become chairman of the Deutscher Lehrer und Lehrerinnenverband [German Teacher Organization], a group that worked with the British Historical Association to exchange and evaluate British and German history textbooks. These two organs also worked together to create a series of pamphlets dealing with controversial issues in history—the first of which considered the buildup to the Second World War. The Braunschweig group later gave birth to the International Institute for Textbook Improvement in 1951, which was eventually renamed the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research (GEI).372


“Bericht über die bisherige Tätigkeit der Geschichtsarbeitsgemeinschaft Braunschweig,” attached to letter from Leonard to H. Walker, October 26, 1948, FO 1050/1025, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA. “Minutes of the Fourth School Education Officers Conference held at the Office of the Educational Adviser, 11 Berstrasse, Bielefeld, on the 12th and 13th of October 1949,” 9 November 1949, FO 1050/1031, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
But all was not well for the Working Party, especially in the early years. After three years of occupation, there was a resurgence of nationalism. Writing textbooks in this unstable postwar environment, the Working Party members feared for both their economic and physical well-being. According to a 1948 report by T.J Leonard of the British Textbook Section, one of the group said, “Anything we write nowadays, we write at the risk of our lives, as for all we know, one of these days we shall find ourselves in the hands of the extreme right. We democrats are already marked men.” The group also told Leonard, “We know for a fact that our personal files are secretly copied and handed on to political organizations.” So real was the danger that Leonard chose not to identify either the group name or any of the men quoted in his report; but, based on context, Leonard was clearly referring to the Braunschweig History Working Party organized around Eckert and Turn. The group continued to write history books despite the risks they incurred, but Leonard noted that it had made them rather cautious. Leonard wrote, “In reply to some of our criticism of their mss. [manuscripts], they have stated that it was not advisable to give German teachers and students the whole truth about the past at once, it must be served to them gradually in weak doses.” For the Braunschweig Working Party, the writing of history textbooks was a vital political act, but one that could incur very real consequences.

Another attempt at creating a new history book for the occupied zones of Germany was the secondary school world history book *Geschichte unserer Welt* [History of our World]. This book was written by a committee of German émigrés living in the United States and headed by historian Fritz Karsen. It planned to, in the words of Karsen, “place the Prussian German in its

---

373 Letter from J. Churchill, Esq. German Education Department [to R.V. Hume] September 3, 1948, FO 1050/1025, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

374 Report by T. J. Leonard, “History Teaching in 1948” FO 1050-1025, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
proper perspective to the history of mankind, and to place emphasis on the cultural, economic and social evolution of world history in its correct relation to the diplomatic and political history."375 The committee had begun writing the book during the war and submitted the first volume of the manuscript to the Textbook Section in October 1945. Initially, three volumes were planned, with the third volume covering contemporary history up until the end of the Second World War, but the third volume was never printed. Karsen’s book was adopted for use in the British and French zones, but ironically not in the American zone, as German teachers in the American zone objected to a history book written by “outsiders.”376

Karsen’s textbook did not always find acclaim. The British officer in Detmold called it “a miserable hotch-potch—little more than an agglutination of paragraphs and sections from several complete works” and another British officer described it as “dull in style, unattractive in presentation and mawkish in sentiment. It is disliked by all teachers who have read it.”377 The French, too objected, to some aspects of the book—with a French member of the International Commission for the Survey of Schoolbooks lamenting that “France is too often treated in a tone

375 Letter from Fritz Karsen to General Ryan, G-5 Twelfth Army Group, 7 July 1945, attached list of contents of World History, Folder 3 “000.8 Textbooks Part III,” Records Re Cultural Exchange and School Reopenings, Box 79, Records of the Education Branch, ECR Division, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP.


377 Report by H. J. Walker, Chief Education Control Officer, Land North Rhine-Westphalia, “Interim Report on Teaching of History in German Schools,” attached to cover letter from Walker to Hume, Director of Education, September 21, 1948, FO 1050/1025, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
of contemptuous indulgence opposite the powerful Bismarkian Germany.” However, in the early years, the British and French educational authorities considered it the best available.

At one point, the British sent copies of Karsen’s book to the Soviets, as well, to examine as part of a textbook exchange. The Soviet examiner, Professor Mitropolskij, deemed it “a concentrated summary of conservative middle-class historical science in Germany.” Since the book “made no political evaluation of historical facts and events” it was considered by Mitropolskij to be “on both educational and political grounds forbidden.” Although the Soviets objected to Karsen’s book on different grounds than the other three powers had, none of the four had found it particularly desirable. Kathleen Southwell Davis, who recounted in the 1980s this episode with Mitropolskij, cited it as an example of the incompatible educational goals of the British and the Soviets. However, I would argue that this exchange should not be read solely as an episode of alienation between the Soviets and the Western Powers, but simultaneously as one of interchange and discourse. Clearly, both powers were proceeding from very different ideologies about how history instruction should be oriented. But at least they were open to discussing how best to provide strong historical materials to German students in the classroom and in the end all four occupying powers came to similar decisions about Karsen’s book.

Despite these best efforts to provide high quality history textbooks, many German history teachers in the British zone (and in several of the other zones) simply omitted the teaching of history altogether. As Eckert wrote in a 1948 report, “formerly politically tainted teachers”

---


379 Davis, "Das Schulbuchwesen als Spiegel der Bildungspolitik von 1945 bis 1950," in Umerziehung und Wiederaufbau, 159-60. Davis refers to him as “Mistropolsky,” while DVV documents have his name as “Mitropolskij.”
feared losing their positions by expressing a historical narrative “which might be undesirable to Mil. Gov. They, therefore, prefer to express no opinion at all and not to teach any period later than that of the ancient Germans.” Many teachers who had come of age in the Nazi system or even in the Kaiserreich also found it difficult to teach a conception of history totally alien to their earlier endeavors.380 Gertrude Schulze, a teacher in West Berlin who was a contributing writer to the Wege der Völker series, revealed in a 1980s interview that she chose not to teach the history of Nazi period until the 1950s, since many of her students’ parents were former SS officers.381 This cautious approach with regards to history education was not just on the part of the Germans. Even some of the British officers echoed it. In a 1946 report, a member of the British Education Branch in North Rhine-Westphalia opined, “In the opinion of this HQ it is far too soon to treat events of the last twelve years and really serves no useful purpose.”382

2.3.4 French-Zone

The French seemed to echo that conviction, as well. When French zone schools opened their doors after the end of the war, the occupational authorities forbade the teaching of history in Volksschulen.383 In the Gymnasium, only ancient history and art history were taught.384 It was

380 Georg Eckert, Translation of “Report on the teaching of History in German Schools by a German History Professor (member of the Brunswick Group),” September, 1948,” attached to letter from T.J. Leonard to H. Walker, October 19, 1948 FO 1050/1025, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.
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not until March of 1947 that the French held a major meeting of German educational authorities in their zone to discuss curricular plans—including those for history.

According to the agreements at the meeting, history teaching in the French zone should emphasize the interconnectedness of countries, as well as the cultural progress of nations, rather than their war-time successes. It was important, however, that the more shameful incidents of history should not be ignored. The “Curriculum for History” stated, “The example of the Jacobinism at the same time will show what awful danger is conjured when one breaks away from the cultural norms of true human rights. The comparison with National Socialism suggests itself.”\(^{385}\) However, despite this meeting, little progress was made in creating new substantial curricular plans for history. Since, in the French zone, teachers only taught history prior to 1933, there was no real urgency felt to totally revise the curriculum. Thus, they remained largely as they had been, just with the most Nazified aspects omitted.\(^{386}\)

History textbooks continued to be an elusive problem. The French utilized Karsen’s book and also attempted to have their own historians write a history book for use in French schools.\(^{387}\) Yet, clearly this project was not met with overmuch success. As Edmund Vermeil, a professor of German culture at the Sorbonne and a participant in an international study on education in Germany, wrote in 1947/1948, the problem of German history books did not seem close to being resolved. He noted the difficulties involved, since, in his view, real denazification did not just mean getting rid of Nazi ideology, but also the Prussian nationalism of Frederick II and Bismarck. He concluded, “We do not think that the true German history manual, which is really

---

\(^{385}\) As cited in: ibid., 76-77.
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\(^{387}\) Davis, ""Das Schulbuchwesen als Spiegel der Bildungspolitik von 1945 bis 1950," in *Umerziehung und Wiederaufbau: die Bildungspolitik der Besatzungsmächte in Deutschland und Österreich*, 158.
both critical and impartial enough to open the eyes of the thinking Germans, especially the younger generations, has yet to be written". Thus, history education in the French zone was a largely unresolved affair.

2.3.5 Soviet-Zone

History education was similarly delayed in the Soviet zone. Because of the particularly heavy infusion of Nazi “imperialist” ideals into the history curriculum, revision of the history curriculum took some time, even given the preparatory work that Ulbricht’s committee had conducted in summer 1945. History lessons were only begun again during the school year 1946/1947, with the guidance of various documents, such as Wandel’s Richtlinien and the Lehrpläne für Grund- und Oberschulen in der Sowjetischen Besatzungszone Deutschlands, Geschichte. These German-produced documents, however, served only as a jumping-off point for the creation of history curricula in the Soviet zone; after the history curriculum’s initial publication in mid-1946, the plans were revised only a half year later after critiques from the Soviet authorities, German historians, and German history teachers. One particular criticism was that some aspects of the plans, particularly the portrayals of the First and Second World Wars,
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390 It seems that these topics were not always taught in the exact year laid out by Wandel’s Richtlinien. For example, it appears that World War II was taught about in the seventh grade at times, as opposed to the eighth. Günther and Uhlig, History of the Schools in the German Democratic Republic 1945 to 1969 (1973), 43. Richtlinien für den Unterricht in deutscher Geschichte; Lehrpläne für die Grund- und Oberschulen in der sowjetischen Besatzungszone Deutschlands, Geschichte; Deutsche Zentralverwaltung für Volksbildung in der sow. Beatzungzone an die Regierren der Länder und Provinzen- Ministerium für Volksbildung- "Referat Dr. Hadermann ‘über den Stand des Geschichtsunterrichts’ gehalten auf der Konferenz der Minister für Volksbildung am 18.12.1946,"“ 27 December 1946 [File page 22], DR 2/3821, Ministerium für Volksbildung (hereafter referred to as MfV), Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde, Berlin, Germany (hereafter referred to as BA Berlin).
were superficial or doctrinally dogmatic—leading to confusing depictions.\textsuperscript{391} Thus, clearly in the early years, there was genuine discussion about how best to teach this most recent history in the Soviet zone.

The Soviets stressed that history lessons be entrusted only to teachers of unimpeachable political character. As the Soviet leader of the Education Department of SMAD, instructed DVV-head Wandel, history teachers had to have shown themselves to be “real democrats and active antifascists.” The teachers’ political backgrounds were considered particularly important because the teachers were meant “to be capable, not only of conveying to the children knowledge of historical events,” but also “capable of awakening in the children through scientific analysis of the historical processes a democratic belief, hatred of fascism and militarism. . .”\textsuperscript{392}

Once history lessons were resumed, they notably included history up until the present period. Not only responsible for giving lessons on history since ancient times, teachers were also responsible for teaching \textit{Gegenwartskunde} [Current Affairs] on such subjects such as “the victims of fascism” and “the Nuremberg Trial.” While teaching the most recent history, including the Nazi past, seems to have sporadically taken place in the American and British zones, it was central to the socialist vision of reforming the Soviet zone of Germany.\textsuperscript{393} As


\textsuperscript{392} P. Z., der Leiter der Abteilung für Volksbildung der SMA in Deutschland to Wandel, Präsident der Dtschischen Verwaltung für Volksbildung, 15 May 1946 [File page 32], DR 2/3821, MfV, BA Berlin.

\textsuperscript{393} See: Appendix C to Part C “Volkschule- Oberstufe- Plan for History Teaching.” Attached to letter from Walker, Senior Control Officer, Education Branch, HQ Land Schleswig- Holstein to Education Branch, HQ Control Commission for Germany (BE) on “EDUCATION CONTROL- Allied Education Committee: Working Party on Establishment of Uniform Curricula for German schools” FO 1050/1024, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA; “Plan of Instruction for High Schools in the Regierungsbezirk Wiesbaden,” Folder 5 “Curriculum File,” Correspondence & Other Recs of the Education Branch, ECR Division, OMGHesse, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP; Liddell, "Education in Occupied Germany: A Field Study," in \textit{Education in Occupied Germany/ L'éducation de l'Allemagne occupée}, 109-10; DVV to Regierren der Länder und Provinzen- MfV, “Referat Dr.
History of the Schools in the German Democratic Republic, published in 1972 by Volk und Wissen Verlag narrated of this early postwar period, “It was now possible to teach history in such a way as to show the inevitability of the defeat of German imperialism in the Second World War, to familiarize young people with progressive traditions of the German people and to stimulate them to take part in antifascist democratic construction.”394 The importance attached to history instruction also can be seen in the extraordinarily detailed reports left behind by DVV visits to Soviet zone cities and towns to survey history instruction there, as well as the professional, personal, and political competence of the history teachers.395

Despite the importance placed on teaching the history of the recent past, as well as Volk und Wissen Verlag’s increasing success at printing textbooks, production of indigenous history textbooks in the Soviet zone lagged behind.396 There were, however, some materials created; a series of small booklets was published as part of the Volk und Wissen Verlag’s collecting library for school children. Instructional/work pamphlets were used for certain subjects, including history, and German translations of Soviet history books were also published.397 As early as mid-1947, plans began in the Soviet zone for a full series of history books, written by German authors, as well as a teacher guide book for history education.398 In creating the teacher guide
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book, the authors were instructed to consider exemplars of other history textbooks—not only history books from the Soviet Union, but also Weimar-era textbooks, as well as, most surprisingly, history textbooks that had been printed into the Western zones. But, the full series of history books was delayed until 1951-1952, due to a shortage of “suitable” authors and qualified personnel at Volk und Wissen Verlag.

The Soviet zone faced further obstacles in history education—in many ways similar to those faced in the other zones. There was a paucity of history teachers and many classes went without history education entirely, including thirty eight percent of classes in Mecklenburg in summer 1948. There was also the problem of adjusting teachers’ attitudes towards history education. A head of a Hochschule [college] in Berlin observed that teachers who had been educated during the Kaiserreich or the Weimar-era had trouble adapting their history teaching style to the new times—a very similar observation to one made by Georg Eckert in the British zone. The Hochschule head wrote to the DVV, “What I have seen in school classes during history instruction has almost always disappointed me. There are many, that believe that the way that one earlier spoke at length about Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm, must now be the way one speaks about Karl Marx and August Bebel and they believe that this now is the really new history instruction. They often do not realize that it is not just about that.” According to the school head, older teachers failed to realize that surface level changes could not just be made. They had to adjust their whole process and philosophy of history instruction. Younger teachers


were preferred—*Neulehrer* who had been trained in the Soviet zone—but these younger teachers required new history schoolbooks, especially since their first memories of history had been generated during the Weimar era.\(^{402}\) Systematic textbooks were necessary not just a request of the *Neulehrer*, but also of the broader teachers’ unions.\(^{403}\) Thus, history textbooks were seen as both an obstacle, but also a potential means of democratic transformation in the Soviet zone.

### 2.4 The Four Powers in Germany

History education and history textbooks were an extreme preoccupation for all four of the occupying powers. However, the way the powers went about encouraging the creation of new textbooks was very much linked to their individual styles of occupation and administration. In 1950 article, British Educational Advisor Robert Birley observed that British and American occupation educational policy in Germany largely mirrored each other—with the years before 1947 marked by more vigorous hand-on activity and the period of 1947 onward representing a gradual turnover of power to local German authorities.\(^{404}\) The French zone was a slightly different story. As the Western occupation zones increasingly merged together their functions, the French wished to maintain more educational control than their American and British allies would allow. However, they more or less fell in line by the time of the Occupation Statute in

---


The Soviets increasingly diverged from the Western three powers in educational (and general) policy over the course of the late 1940s. They were the only power to create and maintain a state-run textbook publishing house. However, it is important to remember the instances of cooperation and agreement that did occur between the four parties on educational reform and textbook revision—seen particularly in the creation of the history curriculum by the AKEC in Berlin, the presence of Soviet books in British source libraries and American Curriculum and Textbook Centers, the exchange of textbooks such as Karsen’s Geschichte unserer Welt, and also the authorization of the use of Soviet textbooks for the first few years of the Western occupation zones.

***

When the new German states were created in 1949, German textbook revision and educational restructuring had been a preoccupation of the occupying powers for already six years. During those six years, the four occupying powers were each able to decide upon an independent educational policy by which to pull Nazified school textbooks from the schools and replace them with more palatable alternatives. Initially these books were replaced by “emergency textbooks”—Weimar-era school texts, which had been screened by the occupying powers. But due to these texts’ deficiencies—their militarism, nationalism, and territorial revanchism—all four occupying powers determined that new textbooks needed to be created to take their place. This was achieved with greater or lesser degrees of success in the various zones due to availability of material goods, importance attached to the project, and relations between the occupiers and the occupied. The most successful approaches were those that drew on the talents
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of the Germans in the occupied zones; for successful reform, it had to be perceived as coming for
the most part from within rather than without.

But even in cases when abundant material goods and supports were provided and there
was goodwill on the ground, difficulties still abounded. Even the OMGUS-sponsored *Wege der
Völker* series and the highly supervised rewriting of the history curriculum in the Soviet zone did
not yield the total change in historical and educational philosophy among German educators that
the occupiers desired, thus illustrating the difficulties of reorienting a historical culture in the
schools during the first postwar years.

**Part I Conclusion**

To close, we will return to the guiding questions of Part I: What similarities and
differences were there in the textbook policies of the occupied zones Germany and Italy? Were
the same resources and guidance provided in both occupied countries? However, since the
British and Americans were the only two occupying powers really involved in shaping
educational policy in Italy, in order to compare like-with-like, we must really focus specifically
on the British and American zones of Germany. To dispense with the most obvious difference
between the two occupied situations, instead of a collaborative effort between the British and the
Americans in educational policy that we saw in Italy, each occupying power was able to go its
own way in Germany. This led to the slight differences and fissures that we observed between
the British and the Americans in Italy being given room to grow in quadripartite occupied
Germany.

In Italy, we saw earlier hints of discord between the British and the Americans in terms
of how fully to push for school reform. In particular, the British officers in the Education
Subcommission were more supportive of parochial schools in Italy (and also tended to be perceived more positively by the Vatican). They also pushed less for a single state education system. While in Germany both the British and Americans supported the maintenance of private (including parochial) schools against the pressure of the Soviet authorities, there continued to be a dynamic in which the Americans pushed harder for school reforms that would lead to a more egalitarian state school system for all children, while the British were more content to support the existing order of things and only to gradually coach and coax German educational officials towards reform406

That said, as seen in the analysis above, British and American attitudes in educational reform and textbook revision in Germany were remarkably similar. Of the four occupying powers, they were by far the most aligned. This may very well have stemmed from the geopolitical “Special Relationship” that developed between Great Britain and the United States during the war, but also arguably from shared experiences in developing educational policy in occupied Italy. Even for those officers who were not involved in reeducation projects in both Italy and Germany, it seems reasonable to assume that the institutional knowledge collected from 1943 to 1945 in Italy informed policies that would be later fleshed out in Germany.

One can see this, for example, in the American Curriculum and Textbook Centers and the British source libraries in Germany. These institutions were a centerpiece of both British and American textbook revision policy. They were much talked about in meeting minutes of the Educational Branches of both American and British military governments for many years. The Textbook Centers and source libraries were meant to give Germans the tools to create their own

textbooks. While the parallels between the Textbook Centers and the source libraries have long been recognized, what arguably has been ignored is the likely forbearer of these projects—an initiative in occupied-Italy. Buried deep in a March 1945 report of the Anglo-American Education Subcommission in Italy is a brief mention of the creation of a small library of textbooks and reference books for the use of Italian schoolbook educators and publisher. 407 The activities of the Education Subcommission in Italy were in the process of wrapping up at this time, with many officers being transferred to other theaters, such as Germany and Austria and this textbook library project is not mentioned often in the Education Subcommission records, suggesting that it did not have a big resonance. Given the interchange in personnel between Italy and Germany, however, it is not illogical to conclude that this effort of Anglo-American Education Subcommission in Italy was the forbearer of the much more effective British “source libraries” and American Curriculum and Textbook Centers in Germany. 408

Despite these similarities between the Italian and German theaters, there were also several major differences. Firstly, far more personnel were devoted to educational restructuring in Germany than in Italy. The Anglo-American Subcommission had only 18 officers, even at its largest point. 409 In comparison, in Germany in the fall of 1947, the Americans had 70 educational staff members, the British had 212, and the French had 461. 410 There was clearly

407 As reported in the March 1945 report of the Education Subcommission; “Summary of Monthly Report March,” 11 April 1945; Folder 10000/144/165, Allied Control Commission-Italy Subject File, Records of Allied Operational and Occupation Headquarters, RG 331, NACP.
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more importance attached to the educational mission in Germany than the one in Italy. Secondly, instead of pushing reform, the Educational Subcommission in Italy spent much of its first year (1943) trying to pursue policies that would not “rock the boat” and would help sustain the two remaining pillars of authority of Italian society—King Vittorio Emanuele III (who subsequently abdicated) and the Vatican.411 The resistance in the north of Italy raised fears in the ACC of a communist revolution, which led the Allies and the Italian ministry to stifle attempts at educational reforms stemming from the Committee for National Liberation (CLN). Since no pillars of authority existed in Germany that the Allies wished to preserve and there was no large-scale organized partisan group, the educational reformers there faced no similar obstacles and thus more ambitious projects—such as the promotion of history curricula and textbooks that taught explicitly about Nazism’s crimes—were able to be realized in Germany.412

But perhaps the most influential factor was that the Allies perceived the Italians as less dangerous and less fascistized than the Germans, and therefore in less need of coaching in the democratic way of life.413 As the Education Subcommission in Italy once wrote, “Italians could be considered to be on a different footing from Germans, and were unlikely to have been won over to Fascism heart and soul.”414 To that end, German textbook writers and history teachers were encouraged to teach explicitly about fascism and the recent past in a way that the Italians were not. This disparity would have a lasting effect on the German and Italian school systems’ treatments of the Second World War and the Holocaust for many years to come.
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One of the most interesting differences between educational reforms and textbook revision in Italy and Germany concerns not what happened during, but after the main educational reform process. The Education Subcommission in Italy began disbanding in the months immediately following the defeat of Germany and Japan; many field staff were reassigned and the rest turned over their control to the Italian government. The Education Subcommission formally ended its work in early 1946. A post was found for Carleton Washburne to remain in Italy as part of the United States Information Service, but only at the request of the Minister of Public Education Arangio Ruiz. 415 There was no real organized policy to continue Anglo-American educational influence in the new Republic of Italy.

In contrast, extensive documentation on the arguments between the occupying powers in the lead up to the creation of the Federal German Republic in May 1949 and the issuing of the Occupation Statute reveal that the British, Americans (and especially the French) intended to keep involved in the development of German education and German textbooks. All three Western occupying powers planned to keep their educational divisions operational even after the creation of the Federal Republic and there were many arguments between the three as to just how much control they had to cede under the Occupation Statute. The British Educational Adviser Robert Birley served as the most vociferous champion of delegating educational control to the German educational authorities. But even Birley recalled of his August 1, 1949 meeting with the German Ministers of Education of the British zone:

I told them that in future they would be able to organize the production and use of textbooks as they liked, within the limits of the security interests reserved to us in the Occupation Statute. I asked them to remember that a School Textbook Book, although not nearly as important as many people thought, was unfortunately very easily quotable and I said that they might well jeopardise the good relations that had been built up in the

educational world between the two countries if they let through aggressively nationalistic text-books.\textsuperscript{416}

Such words do not really sound like the representative of a power that is willing to abdicate all influence and control.

Nor was the Eastern portion of Germany left to its own devices. In fact, instead of reluctantly releasing control, Soviet ideology became increasingly important in the schools. Soviet-style reforms were imposed and Marxism-Leninism became the core of history education.\textsuperscript{417} Thus, on both sides of the divided Germany, Allied involvement in educational reform clearly did not end in 1949.

Germany represented both a continuation and a more aggressive implementation of the process of educational restructuring and textbook revision that had begun in Italy. Arguably, some of the greater successes and follow-through demonstrated in Germany were owed to experiences in Italy before the end of the Second World War. There were, however, some differences between the two cases. These stemmed from both the political particularities of the postwar situations and also from the Allies’ preconceived notions of the Italian and German people. Nonetheless, it behooves us to consider both cases, not in isolation, but as part of a greater process of reeducation and postfascist coming to terms with the past.

\textsuperscript{416}Quote from: Educational Adviser to Political Adviser on “Meeting with German Ministers of Education,” August 9, 1949; FO 150/1155 Future Educational Policy vol. V, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA. Arguments between the French, British, and Americans as to how much control for education could be maintained after the Occupation Statute can be found in: FO 1050/1153 and FO 1050/1154, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

\textsuperscript{417}Blessing, \textit{The Antifascist Classroom} (2006), 197.
PART II: THE FIRST TEXTBOOKS, 1949 TO 1967

Part II of this dissertation represents a turning point. During the years 1949-1967, the new postfascist states of the Republic of Italy, the German Democratic Republic, and the Federal Republic of Germany began to step out of the shadows of their postwar occupiers. They were able to start formulating their own policy about how to teach the recent past without the direct intervention of the Western Allies or the Soviet Union. That is not to say that the former occupiers were not invested nor involved in the educational outcomes in these states. In fact, one of the central arguments of Part II is that West Germany was subject to overwhelming international scrutiny, particularly from some of its formal occupiers (as well as other groups), which prompted it towards a much more serious engagement with complicity and the fascist past.

Educational progress and reform during the 1950s and most of the 1960s tended to be slow, local, and incremental. It lacked the eye-catching total educational restructuring that was seen in the Soviet zone of Germany during the late 1940s or the dramatic textbook revisions in Western Allies-occupied Italy and Germany. In many cases, particularly in West Germany and Italy, there was a return to the prewar status quo for a few years before changes began to be made, often because initially the recent past seemed too close, too controversial, and too political to be dealt with at length, especially by those teachers and textbook authors who were directly implicated in it. Consequently, historians have largely characterized the educational situation in the 1950s as a period of “restoration” with progressive impulses stifled by “Catholic
imperialism” in Italy, conservative traditionalism in West Germany (FRG), and increasing SED leadership and Marxist-Leninist pedagogy in East Germany (GDR).418

Historians and other scholars have carried this conventional wisdom of stagnation or stasis largely into their evaluations of history textbooks’ treatment of fascism, the Third Reich and the Holocaust, as well. There is a great paucity of scholarly work done on Holocaust education in Italy before the 1990s.419 The general assumption in the scholarly community is that there is little worth studying there, because little is perceived to have changed before the 1970s and 1980s. The small amount of literature on treatment of the Holocaust in East German schools and textbooks has largely emphasized stasis. Indeed, one Wolfgang Meseth remarked in a 2012 journal article, “Although there were several reforms in the GDR’s school curriculum during the state’s existence, the teaching of the Nazi past remained as static as the country’s general politics of the past as a whole.” 420

Scholars of West German textbooks have also largely assumed stagnancy—at least in the period before 1968 (and some scholars, such as Stephan Pagaard, would argue even later). Conventional wisdom states that how the Holocaust was remembered and taught really only changed in the late-1960s and 1970s.421 However, some little-cited 1960s scholarly articles, as

---

418 White, *Progressive Renaissance* (2018); Robinsohn and Kuhlmann, "Two Decades of Non-Reform in West German Education."


420 von Borries, "The Third Reich in German History Textbooks since 1945," 46; Meseth, "Education after Auschwitz in a United Germany," 17.

well as more recent scholarly works by Brian Puaca and others, push back on this notion of silence and have noted some of the more progressive attempts at school reform and educating about the Third Reich during the 1950s and early 1960s. Puaca has argued that the 1960s were a “transitional decade in the treatment of Nazism and the Holocaust in the West German schools.”

This idea of stagnancy overlooks the very real and vital changes taking place in these three states’ education about the fascist past during the 1950s and 1960s. I argue that, pushed by domestic and international outcry about neo-fascist and neo-Nazi vandalism, our two western subject states felt that they had to take a serious look at how the contemporary history and its past crimes were being taught to younger generations. This meant some attention to crimes against the Jews, even if the educational treatment of this matter was not enough for later observers. It should be noted, however, that West Germany moved much more swiftly and comprehensively than Italy in this matter. East Germany, which had since the beginning educated about Nazi crimes, also increased its coverage of Jewish victims during this period, likely to “keep up” with its capitalist neighbor.

---


423 Puaca, "Mastering the Past?" in As the Witnesses Fall Silent.

424 For further historiographical overview of this problem, see Puaca’s 2015 article: ibid.
That said, it must be acknowledged that the advances during this period were limited, especially by contemporary standards. Even as the early textbooks began to haltingly admit some complicity, this limited reckoning with the past was accompanied by a hardy resistance narrative. The counterpoint to this increasing discourse about crimes was an increasing discourse about resistance, which served to “redeem” the postfascist states from the crimes of their predecessors. These two narratives—one of complicity and one of resistance—were inextricably bound to one another and will be dealt with in the two chapters that compose Part II.

When does the recent past become history? At what point does a nation-shattering experience become removed enough from daily experience to become part of a textbook narrative? What value do students gain from studying this most recent history? These are questions that preoccupy us still today and that resonated especially deeply for postwar Italians and Germans in the 1950s.

As discussed in Part I, the fascists and the Nazis had instrumentalized contemporary history as a means of political and ideological indoctrination. Thus, educators in the immediate postwar had shied away from it, preferring to not teach such a controversial subject at all. How then could it be introduced back into the schools and what would impel the educators to do so? In all cases, the deciding factor was “political education.” All three postwar states saw teaching the crimes of the fascist and Nazi regimes as a means of steering the youth away from the mistakes of the recent past and inculcating them with a properly democratic world view. It was much of the same logic that had been employed by the Allied occupiers a decade before.

This chapter will begin with a consideration of contemporary history education in our three subject countries in the 1950s and early 1960s and then turn to the textbooks themselves and their narratives about the Holocaust. Pushing back on the scholarly literature that assumes 1968 to be a turning point in Holocaust memory and Holocaust education, this chapter interprets the late 1950s and early 1960s as a moment of great change in how West German and Italian textbooks depicted contemporary history, and more specifically the Holocaust.
The Holocaust emerged as a topic of concern in Italian and West German textbooks during the 1950s and early 1960s in response to a spate of neo-fascist and neo-Nazi youth activities, as well as a result of various schooling reforms. While Italy was pushed towards a limited engagement with contemporary history by internal concerns, West Germany and its education about Nazi crimes was subject to far more domestic and international scrutiny. Buffeted in the late 1950s by criticism by domestic and international Jewish organizations, the international Western press, and scholars and periodicals form the Eastern bloc, West Germany was forced to make more energetic strides than Italy towards recognizing its complicity in the Holocaust; yet, this reckoning was still highly ambivalent with regards to how much the ordinary German knew about the Holocaust at the time. In East Germany, in contrast, Nazi crimes had long featured prominently in textbooks, but an increase over the 1960s can also be observed, likely emerging out of its competitive relationship with its capitalist neighbor, West Germany. The racial dimension of the Holocaust, however, was largely overlooked in the socialist state’s schoolbooks in favor of a class-struggle narrative.

This chapter, therefore, dates the first instances of increased attention to Holocaust education to the late 1950s and early 1960s, challenging scholarly narratives that argue that either the 1961 Eichmann Trial or the 1968 student movements were central to focusing public attention on the Holocaust.425 This matters because it suggests that this new attention to education about Nazi crimes could have had a causative influence on the increased attention that

the Nazi/fascist past received during the student revolts—some of the students who were in middle school in the early 1960s, were university students in 1968.426

3.1 To Teach or Not to Teach Contemporary History?

In Italy, the teaching of contemporary history had been used as a political tool by Mussolini’s fascist regime. Thus, after the ascension of the Badoglio government in 1943, contemporary history had been eliminated from Italian history programs and history textbooks. After the war ended, due to material shortages, very few new textbooks were created, although the libri di stato were abolished in 1945. Therefore, even in to the 1950s, some Italian children were still learning from the same postwar textbooks that ignored the period after 1917. Even more problematic than their incomplete scope was their authorship. These textbooks were often written by authors who had been quite prolific during the fascist period, such as Alfonso Manaresi, the author of the Pantheon series.427

The incomplete nature of the Italian educational transformation came to national attention in 1952, during parliamentary debates over the so-called Scelba law, a law intended to suppress neo-fascist activities. Formally the law was called “Rules for the repression of fascist activity.”428 During the debate, a few parliamentarians made the connection between the

426 Brian Puca has also pointed out that “the instruction that student protests received as secondary school pupils assisted them in their protests in a number of ways.” Puca argued that the international perspective that West German students gained in their secondary school education, as well as their experience with student self-government and the free press, were instrumental in student organizing in the 1968 era. Puca, Learning Democracy (2009), 198-200.


problems of the schoolbooks and the youth fascist activities, including communist Antonio Banfi:

What bitterness I feel, when leafing through the textbooks which are students are given, I find that the authors have prudently stopped at the end of the Great War—on the threshold of Fascism! Are we perhaps waiting for a re-assessment of it? Are we waiting for a historical appeal for the cancellation of our greatest achievement, the most heroic on the part of the Italian people upon which all its future depends [the resistance]? But why should this surprise us when the spirit behind the teaching is still guided by a fascist or pre-fascist mentality and nothing has been done to change this?429

Other parliamentarians from various parties, including Giorgio Bo of the DC Party and Italian Republican Party leader Ferruccio Parri, echoed Banfi’s words, expressing dismay that a law was needed to punish neo-fascist activities, when no real effort had been made to educate against them.430

A simultaneous scholarly debate arose out of a conference on history instruction organized in Perugia by the Association for the Defense of State Schools; scholars debated back and forth in print on the merits and means of expanding the school history programs and updating school history textbooks.431 Some, such as historian Piero Pieri, felt that “the Resistance and the partisan struggle meant … a generous effort toward spiritual renewal, purification after many years of shame… All this cannot be silenced, cannot be hidden from the young: we are talking about an enormous moral heritage which must be saved and transmitted.”432 Many other scholars, such as Gaetano Salvemini, cautioned against


430 Parri was a resistance hero and the former leader of the Action Party. Ascenzi, Education and the Metamorphoses of Citizenship in Contemporary Italy (2009), 263-65.


432 Ascenzi, Education and the Metamorphoses of Citizenship in Contemporary Italy (2009), 266.
instrumentalizing the contemporary past to teach values, fearful that it would backfire. Salvemini wrote:

Every teacher is a man who has his own way of thinking, if he really thinks; and if he does not think at all, it is better that he does not teach anything and leave his pupils to play dominos while he holds class without saying anything. The illusion that a ministerial circular or a program, even a very detailed one, can teach a teacher what he needs to teach or not teach or how to teach or not teach is childlike….

Even if you put in his hands an obligatory textbook written by you personally, this teacher will insert at a good moment a sardonic smile, a shrug of the shoulders, and significant silence.433

Salvemini advocated against teaching contemporary history, so to not infect students with propaganda. He felt that in 1952, it just was far too controversial to teach about fascism and the Second World War.434

Salvemini’s words, however, were not heeded. In 1953, liberal historian Luigi Salvatorelli published a small pamphlet narrating the most recent history, Venticinque anni di storia, 1920-1945 [Twenty-Five Years of History, 1920-1945], which was distributed by the Ministry of Public Education to all students and teachers in the last year of secondary school. Some, from liberal or clerical backgrounds, applauded Salvatorelli’s text; for example, a Catholic scholar Mario Bendiscioli, wrote in a review in Humanitas that “We will see that it [Salvatorelli’s pamphlet] runs not only into the hands of history teachers, to whom the Ministry intends to distribute it, but also to many who are conscious of the necessity to connect the complex facts, the numerous ideologies, the international institutions that dominate the present, with their immediate antecedents.”435

Salvatorelli’s interpretation of the recent past, however,

433 Gaetano Salvemini, "La storia nelle scuole," Il mondo (October 6 1953).
434 Ibid., 266; Ascenzi, Education and the Metamorphoses of Citizenship in Contemporary Italy (2009).
was controversial for those on the Left. In his pamphlet Salvatorelli characterized 1943-1945 as a “civil war,” which Marxist and Actionist [liberal-socialist, antifascist party] scholars opposed and which led to a harsh scholarly reception of the book in certain circles.436 The communist Ernesto Ragioneiri also saw the publication of Savatorelli’s text as inadequate, given that the MPI Antonio Segni, had promised at the end of the Scelba debates to both distribute an official publication and also to restore contemporary history to the didactic programs.

As a result of the outcry, the Ministry of Public Education slowed its push to introduce contemporary history into Italian schools.437 A 1954 program for the scuola media inferiore, which included various tracks of middle school education for students approximately aged 11-14, for example, instructed only that students in the “third class” of the scuola media inferiore (aged approximately 13-14) should be taught topics through the First World War.438 Nor was contemporary history taught in the upper grades. In his memoir, A.S. (b. 1939) reflected of his 11th grade history class in liceo (likely during school year 1957-1958), “In history, the programs stopped (who knows why) at the end of the 1800s.”439

It was not until the early 1960s that real progress would take place in the political realm in encouraging the teaching of contemporary history. A number of new educational laws were

436 The idea of the Italian partisan struggle against the Italian Social Republic as a “civil war” only gained wide scholarly acceptance in the 1990s, after the publication of Claudio Pavone’s Una guerra civile. The idea of a “civil war,” however, suggested moral equivalency, which the Marxist and the Actionists were not willing to accept. Claudio Pavone, A Civil War: A History of the Italian Resistance, trans. Peter Levy (2013); Claudio Pavone, Una guerra civile: saggio storico sulla moralità nella resistenza, Nuova cultura (Torino: Bollati Boringhieri, 1991); Claudio Fogu, “Italiani Brava Gente: The Legacy of Fascist Historical Culture on Italian Politics of Memory,” in The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe, ed. Richard Ted Lebow; Wulf Kansteiner; Claudio Fogu (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 162.

437 Ascenzi, Education and the Metamorphoses of Citizenship in Contemporary Italy (2009), 264-72.

438 Piano di studi per la scuola media inferiore e programma per gli esami di ammissione agli istituti medi inferiori. (Milano: L.di G. Pirola, 1954), 8.

439 A.S., Il passaggio degli alpennini, 73. Collection: National Diary Archive, Pieve Santo Stefano
passed as part of the “Opening to the Left”—by which DC invited the Italian Socialist Party (PSI) into the government. These initiatives included the creation of new programs for the teaching of history in various levels of schooling, including for the newly created scuola media statale.440 The scuola media statale was the first mandatory unified middle school for all Italian students.441 That being said, even this new program was “a bit strange,” as professor Adriano Gallia from Liceo Scientifico Einstein in Milan described during a 1965 meeting of Italian and German historians. “It talks about the end of the colonial period, but not of fascism and communism.” According to Gallia, textbooks and teachers, however, tended to speak about contemporary history with greater “latitude.”442

Previously, Italian children had attended various tracks of middle school education. These included an academic middle school, a vocational/industrial middle school or a middle school that prepared for commercial activities, and as discussed in Chapter 1, many in actuality did not attend school past the fifth grade. The fascists had attempted to introduce a “unified” middle school with Bottai’s Carta della Scuola [School Charter] in 1939, but despite being nominally “unified,” not all middle school pupils attended it, since many economically disadvantaged students still attended lower-tier, less academic schools. The fascist-era “unified” middle school never quite gained traction and during defascistization had been largely abandoned.443

441 Cesare Scurati, "Vicende e contenuti," in Orientamenti e programmi della scuola materna, elementare e media (La Scuola, 1993); White, Progressive Renaissance (2018), 30-31, 66, 115-18,70.
443 Scurati, "Vicende e contenuti," in Orientamenti e programmi della scuola materna, elementare e media; White, Progressive Renaissance (2018), 30-31, 66, 115-18,70.
Thus, the introduction of the mandatory unitary middle school in 1962 was a watershed moment for Italian education and led to the creation of several long-running textbook series, such as Silvio Paolucci’s *Storia* [History] and O. Ortolani and M. Pagella’s *Il tempo e le opere* [Time and Endeavors], which was later succeeded by *I giorni della storia* [The Days of History]. If the first newly constructed history textbooks produced for history in the postwar era (c. 1948-1962) were the “first generation” of books, the Paolucci and Ortolani/Pagella books, and their contemporaries, could be considered the “second generation.” The “second generation” books will be touched upon in Chapters 3 and 4, but will considered at much greater length in Chapter 5.

Thus, it was not until the 1960s that the government began to really encourage the teaching of the recent past. However, the “first generation” textbooks, mentioned above, began tentatively to extend beyond World War II before the Ministry’s formal encouragement. If one looks at a sample of seventeen Italian middle school history textbooks published between the years 1949 and 1966, one can see the first tentative grappling with contemporary history. The earliest book in our sample—Manaresi’s *Pantheon*—ignored the period after 1917, as was characteristic of textbooks published in the late 1940s. However, beginning in the early 1950s, newly composed Italian textbooks’ historical coverage began to extend beyond the First World War, but only in very limited ways. Often textbook authors chose not to give the recent past a full narrative and/or analysis. Instead they dealt with it in some sort of abbreviated form, such as a chronology, summary, or appendix. That said, it is still is quite notable that despite the fact that

---

444 “Middle school” is a problematic term in the Italian school system, since there was no mandatory central middle school in the Italian school system in 1962. The fascists had attempted to introduce it previously in 1939, but it was never fully implemented, so from 1940-1962, there remained a haphazard school system with only some middle schools. I have only selected textbooks marked as “scuola media,” “scuola media inferiore,” or “scuola media unica/unificata” or that I have been able to find some indication that it was used for students approximately aged 10-14.
contemporary history was not formally in the curriculum, students could have found it in the backs of their books as early as the early 1950s.

As we can observe in Table 5, it was only beginning around 1960 that the textbooks consistently began to treat fascism and the Second World War as period of historical study equal to all the others. The period of 1918-1945 was no longer relegated to an unimportant epilogue of the textbook. This largely coincided with the coming of age of a new generation of teachers, as well as the introduction of the new programs of study mentioned above, the earliest of which (published in 1963) instructed teachers to teach “up until our days.”

445 Orari e programmi d'insegnamento per la scuola media statale (Roma: Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1963).
Table 5: Italian Middle School Textbooks Published Between 1949 and 1966 and Their Coverage of the Fascist Past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Publication Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Deals with post-1917 history</th>
<th>Deals with post-1917 history, in an extended, not in an abbreviated form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pantheon</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genti in cammino</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le vie della civiltà</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Guarino/Sanfilippo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Età</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Mazzali</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L’uomo de la sua storia</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Nicolini/Consonni</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il nuovo Pantheon</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il cammino dell’uomo</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Martinelli</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La storia</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Zolla</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popoli in cammino</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Santanastaso</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Chronology and/or summary and/or appendix
10. *Il nuovissimo Pantheon* 1962 Mananaresi Yes Yes
11. Noi e la storia 1963 Rossi Yes Yes/No
12. L’uomo nei secoli 1963 Antocicco/Caliendo Yes Yes
13. *Il tempo e le opere* 1965 Ortolani/Pagella Yes Yes
14. Aspetti di civiltà 1965 Rossano Yes Yes
15. Storia 1965 Paolucci Yes Yes
16. Viaggio nel tempo 1966 Bacci Yes Yes
17. *L’uomo e la sua storia* 1966 Nicolini/Consonni Yes Yes

***

In contrast, in the new East Germany, the first middle school contemporary history textbook was published in 1952 and it contained extensive discussion of the post-1917 period. The most recent history was integral to the socialist state’s self-conception as an antifascist entity, as well as its philosophy of history education. As DPZI department leader Emil Hruschka wrote in the early 1950s, “It is of great importance for patriotic education that the origins of the imperialist war and the nature of fascism are exposed in the 8th grade textbook in a form accessible to children.”

The 1952 subject plan revealed the following topics for the 8th grade history curriculum:

---

448 Fascism was treated in a narrative section, but the Second World War is not.


450 However, contemporary history was sometimes also taught as part of *Gegenwartskunde* or “current events.” Kruase, “Entwurf: Stellungnahme zu dem Brief von Herrn Minister Wandel vom 26. März 1952” April 3, 1952; “Lehrmaterialien für den Geschichtsunterricht- 1951-1952,” DPZI 418, Deutsches Pädagogisches Zentralinstitut, Bibliothek für Bildungsgeschichtliche Forschung des DIPF, Berlin, Germany.

Table 6: Topic Divisions of the 8th grade plan for history, East Germany, 1952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number of Instructional Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Great Socialist October Revolution and Socialist Building in the Soviet Union</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The November Revolution in Germany</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Weimar Republic</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fascist Dictatorship and the Second World War</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reconstruction of the Destroyed Areas and the Democratic Rebuilding of Germany</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing review</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the non-review topics, “The Fascist Dictatorship and the Second World War” received the second most attention. 21.5 % of the prescribed history instruction hours for the 8th grade class for the year were devoted to this particular topic. When the 1952 eighth grade textbook was published, 24.5 % of the book was devoted to the history of National Socialism.\(^{453}\)

Later school plans reveal that the number of hours devoted to history education shrunk, but proportionally the amount of time devoted to teaching about the Nazi dictatorship grew. While the 1953 history plan shrunk the discussion of the Nazi dictatorship to only fourteen percent of the mandated instructional hours, the 1957 history plan for eighth grade required students to spend eighteen of their sixty instructional hours in history on the Nazi period (thirty

---

\(^{452}\) Topics are translated from the original German: Ministerium für Volksbildung, *Lehrplan für Grundschulen: Geschichte 5. bis 8. Schuljahr* (Berlin: Volk und Wissen Volkseigener Verlag, 1952).

\(^{453}\) Bröning, *"Jewish Monopoly Capitalists"* (2003), 81.
The 1966 plan for ninth grade (where contemporary history was by then then being taught) shows that eleven instructional hours were to be spent on “Germany in the time of the fascist dictatorship. The fight of the KPD for the Working-Class Action Committee and the antifascist popular front for the overthrow of the Hitler dictatorship and the prevention of war (1933-1939)” and ten hours were to be spent on “The Second World War (1939-1945)” and the “Potsdam Agreement.” Thus, approximately, twenty-one out of the sixty-four mandated hours in 9th grade (thirty-three percent) was to be devoted to the Nazi past. The topic clearly had not lost its importance since 1952 and had, in fact, greatly increased in prominence—echoing trends that we saw in Italy and will observe in West Germany.

The importance of contemporary history education is also born out in some personal recollections. Joel Agee (b. 1940), a Jewish-American who lived from 1948 until 1960 in East Germany, was the stepson of GDR functionary and editor in chief of the magazine Aufbau Bodo Uhse. Agee attended East German schools during his childhood and describes in his memoir East German attitudes towards Jews and the Holocaust during the early postwar years. He noted, “I took for granted that, during the twelve years I lived in East Germany—right after the Second World War—no one ever used the word ‘Jew’ as an epithet against me, not even by implication. Now, upon reflection, I see what a truly astonishing fact it is, and what a feat of statecraft it

---


represents.” Agee attributed this attitude to the East German government’s policy and notes that “the virtue or villainy of fictional characters in children’s books, while it was often rather crudely linked to social class (workers good, bourgeois bad), was never established by reference to race or nationality. Our schoolbooks and the movies we saw were designed to instill a respectful and friendly attitude towards foreign cultures.”

It should be noted that although Agee recalled no antisemitism being directed against him, he did remember instances directed towards his mother, who “had no intention of adapting her appearance to the norm of East German womanhood.” In one instance, a drunken man in a pub yelled at her that she was a “Verdammt Judenhure” [damned Jewish whore].

Agee also recalled that memory of Nazi crimes (or at least a particular type of memory of Nazi crimes) was a large part of the school curriculum. He wrote, “All East Germans were informed of what the Nazis had done. Whether they liked it or not, they were informed. Especially schoolchildren.” Agee remembered that a former concentration camp prisoner at Dachau came to speak to Agee’s school class, although no mention is made in the memoir as to whether the concentration camp prisoner had been Jewish or not. Such survivor visits apparently continued even into the later years of the GDR, as next generation East Germans, such as former neo-Nazi Ingo Hasselbach (b. 1968), mentioned in their memoirs.460

***
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Similar to East German textbooks, newly composed postwar West German textbooks consistently included contemporary history, beginning in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Unlike in Italy, where textbook production was largely left to Italian devices after 1945, the Western Allies (particularly the United States) had stayed involved in pushing the production of new textbook manuscripts in their zones and in providing resources for new history books. Two early textbooks series, previously discussed in Chapter 2, the *Wege der Völker* [Path of the Peoples] series, the *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen Ausgabe A* [Klett’s Historical Instructional Materials for the Middle Grades, Version A] both devoted substantial extended space to history after 1918.\(^{461}\) In this, their attention to contemporary history, West German textbooks mirrored (or in some ways ran ahead of) trends in the realm of academic historical writing.\(^ {462}\)

However, just because contemporary history sections appeared in the textbooks did not mean that they were actually used. Unlike in East Germany, where Joel Agee’s memoir attests to the fact that contemporary history was an integral part of the school experience, in West Germany, the topic was often overlooked. Yudit Yago-Jung (b. 1946)—whose father was of Jewish ancestry and was imprisoned in labor camps between 1943 and 1945—remarked:

> My teachers simply avoided the subject because they themselves were too directly implicated in the events. For them history books ended in 1933. In history class we would spend half a year treating the Weimar Republic in detail only to end up racing through the ‘modern’ history from 1933-1945 with a kind of vague nostalgia in the last class before

\(^{461}\) Pinnow and Textor, *Geschichte der neuesten Zeit* (1951); Schulze et al., *Demokratie im Werden* (1949).

the summer vacation. After the vacation it was Konrad Adenauer and the post-war miracle.463

Ursula Duba (b. 1939) had similar recollections, recounting in her autobiographical poem:

After nine years of studying
Antiquity
the Dark Ages
the Middle Ages
the Renaissance
the Age of Enlightenment
the Industrial Revolution
the Nineteenth century
ten minutes before graduation
the teacher had told the class
that WWI started in 1914 and ended in 1918
that Hitler was elected in 1933
that WWII had started in '39 and ended in '45
and that was all they learned about the history of the twentieth century
whereupon the teacher had dismissed them
with good wishes for the future.464

Brian Puaca, a historian who has studied history education in West Berlin during the 1950s, concurred with these memoir observations, indicating that Yago-Jung’s and Duba’s experiences were not sporadic incidents, but part of a larger trend. Puaca noted that often West Berlin teachers, uncomfortable with teaching contemporary history, engaged in “passive resistance” and simply failed to “make it out of the 19th century.” When asked why they had not completed the curriculum, though, Puaca noted, they did not openly express their discomfort and instead offered explanations such as “prolonged sickness of the teacher; necessary review addressed in previous years; extensive coverage of periods or issues that teachers deemed of particular importance (such as the Middle Ages, Renaissance, or Austrian history); extended

463 Yago-Jung, Bathrick, and Zipes, "Growing up in Germany: After the War after Hitler "Afterwards"," 75.

class trips; and a lack of understanding regarding how far the ‘courage to leave things out’ extended.”465 Nor, was this just the case in Berlin. When the government of the federal state of Hesse conducted a survey in 1959 of all graduating Gymnasium students, they found that only forty-three percent had had classroom instruction on the Nazi period.466

Other students of this age cohort remembered learning about the Nazi period and the Holocaust in school, but they did not fully make the connection between that past and the actions of their parents’ generation. For example, Anna (b. 1947) who only discovered that her father had been a concentration camp guard when she was thirteen and he was put on trial, recalled, when interviewed in the 1980s:

Of course I knew that there had been concentration camps and that 6 million Jews had been murdered. We’d been told about it in school. But I had also been told fairy tales in school, stories like Little Red Riding Hood. And we learned about the Crusades and later, when I was older, about the French Revolution. And still later, about World War II and the gas chambers. But who, for God’s sake, had ever told us that our own parents had been there?” 467

Susanne (b. 1945), whose father was convicted of war crimes in 1948, recalled that when she was fourteen, she had had a teacher that had been an émigré who had fled to London during the war. She remembered:

He tried so hard to describe the horrors of the Nazi era for us. But all he accomplished was to make himself miserable, not us. When he talked about it he would tremble from head to toe and turn away to wipe away his tears. We sat there stoically, like Sunday at mass. All the pictures and films he showed us, the stories he told—they meant no more to us than anything we learned in school.468

465 Puaca, Learning Democracy (2009), 141.

466 Mattheisen, “History and Political Education in West Germany,” 42.

467 Her interview was conducted by Peter Sichrovsky, who was born in 1947 to a Jewish family. His father had fled Vienna in 1938 and returned after the war. Peter Sichrovsky, Born Guilty: Children of Nazi Families, trans. Jean Steinberg (New York: Baise Books, Inc. Publishers, 1988). Quote was taken from page 22.

Of course, both Anna and Susanne were interviewed in the 1980s and the changing memory context may have influenced how they “remembered” their school days in the 1950s. Yet nonetheless, one can sense that there were difficulties in teaching about the recent past in 1950s West German classrooms.

Teachers’ reluctance to talk about the past could have negative consequences—sometimes leaving students with little knowledge about the recent past and a sense of victimization. Kathleen Southwell Davis, member of the British Education Branch, described a visit in the early 1950s to school in Posen that catered to an expellee population. She recalled:

One child from Posen had written: ‘Our enemies have robbed us of our homeland’ and ‘Feind,’ ‘enemy,’ appeared in other children’s descriptions. They had no written evidence of the background of their circumstances—the invasion of Poland, the transference and eviction of Polish, Jewish, Czech populations, and the devastation of Western Russia—and the master did not appear to have explained it to them.469

Without formal education around the most recent past—or with ineffective formal education on the topic—many students were left with “three generational memory.” As Aleida Assmann has explained, “Children and grandchildren adopt a share of the memories of the older family members in their own repository of memories.” 470 Some of these parents, either embarrassed by their implication in these events or traumatized by their experiences, remained silent, leaving some young people with almost no knowledge of German history from 1933-1945, although curious pupils certainly could have conceivably turned to some film and literature

469 Davis, "Nationalism in German Schools," 448. For further information on narratives of flight and expulsion and how they were represented in schools, see chapter 8 of Peter N. Gengler, “Constructing and Leveraging 'Flight and Expulsion': Expellee Memory Politics and Victimhood Narratives in the Federal Republic of Germany, 1944-1970” (Ph.D., The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2019).

470 Assmann, Shadows of Trauma (2016), 13.
to find out more about the period. Other parents may have expressed laudatory views of the Nazi period.471

Various domestic and international press outlets held youth ignorance responsible for a wave of antisemitic youth action swept through West Germany in 1958-1960 (discussed at greater length below). When a number of youth were caught defacing synagogues and Jewish homes, many in the press assumed that these acts must stem from ignorance of the past, although there is little to no evidence cited as to how the press and public officials came to that conclusion.472 Not all West Germans, however, agreed with the media’s conclusions as to the source of the vandalism. A sizable proportion of the general population felt that the antisemitic defacements might have been stirred up by the East German communists as an attempt to discredit West Germany.473 An article in the Hartford Courant summed up the situation: “The vandalism may be due to idle irresponsibility, hooliganism, or even Communist prompting. But if young people are kept in ignorance, their minds can be fertile field for a new outbreak of unreason.”474


Therefore, in all three subject states, contemporary history education was linked to generating appropriate mindsets in the youth. Antisemitic, neo-fascist, and neo-Nazi behaviors in the youth were attributed to insufficient education about the recent past. Echoed the philosophy of history education of their former occupiers (discussed in Chapters 1 and 2), Italy, West Germany, and East Germany all determined that history education was essential to inculcating youth with the values of a democratic and civil society. However, despite the great impetus to teach about fascism, Nazism, and their crimes, there remained a weighty question: How to teach about the crimes’ perpetrators and Jewish victims in the schools?

3.2 Jewish Victims and Nazi-Fascist Perpetrators in the Textbooks

3.2.1 Italian Textbooks

In Italian textbooks of this period, the Jewish identity of Holocaust victims was often obscured. A much greater focus was on political deportees or partisans who were captured and deported to camps in the Third Reich. (Narratives about partisans and the resistance will be addressed in Chapter 4). While many textbooks mentioned the racial dimension of Hitler’s ideology, Italian textbooks did not reliably identify Jews as a particular group singled out for persecution by the Nazis until the early 1960s.

For example, in the *Pantheon* series by Alfonso Manaresi—of which editions published in 1949, 1957, and 1962 have been located and analyzed—it is not until the 1962 edition that the persecution of Jews is mentioned at all. 475 In a discussion of the Nazi platform, that edition of

Pantheon explained that Nazis believed that people of the German “race” should join together and rule over the world. The textbook continued:

These conceptions must have drawn origin from the following: racism, that is the exaltation of an alleged superiority and an alleged purity of the German race, and antisemitism, that is the fight against the Jews, who were very numerous and influential in Germany and who were allegedly responsible for all German misfortunes, and who had to be later fought with barbarous systems of persecution and extermination.476

Aside from being a very belated introduction to the crimes against the Jews, this passage even seemed to suggest that perhaps the Jews had brought their fate upon themselves. Except for the use of the term “allegedly,” the textbook did not challenge Nazi racial ideology, but instead reported its content as if it was fact.

A look at the greater textbook marketplace confirms that Pantheon was not alone in failing to introduce students to the specifically Jewish nature of the Holocaust until the 1960s. As shown in Table 7, before 1960, only two out of the seven books in our sample (twenty-nine percent) specifically mentioned either antisemitism or persecution of the Jews in Germany. After 1960, nine out of ten sampled books did (ninety percent). However, even as the textbooks began to consider Jews as a specific victim group of Nazi crimes, they were quite light on the actual specifics. Only two textbooks out of the sample of seventeen provided the number of Jewish Holocaust victims to their students.477

---

477 Zolla, La storia (1961), 354; Bacci, Viaggio nel tempo (1966), 254.
Table 7: Italian Middle School Textbooks Published Between 1949 and 1966 and Their Coverage of Persecution of Jews and the Holocaust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Publication Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Specifically mentions antisemitism or persecution of Jews in Germany</th>
<th>Mentions # of Jews killed in the Holocaust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pantheon</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>No coverage post-1918</td>
<td>No coverage post-1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Genti in cammino</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Le vie della civiltà</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Guarino/ Sanfilippo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Età</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Mazzali</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. L’uomo e la sua storia</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Nicolini/ Consonni</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Il nuovo Pantheon</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Il cammino dell’uomo</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Martinelli</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. La storia</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Zolla</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Popoli in cammino</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Santanstaso</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Il nuovissimo Pantheon</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Mananaresi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Noi e la storia</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Rossi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. L’uomo nei secoli</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Antocicco/ Caliendo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Il tempo e le opera</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Ortolani/ Pagella</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Aspetti di civiltà</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Rossano</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Storia</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Paolucci</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Viaggio nel tempo</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Bacci</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes^{479}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. L’uomo e la sua storia</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Nicolini/ Consonni</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^{478} Same textbooks as cited in Table 5
^{479} Underestimated by a million
When it came to issues of Italian culpability in the persecution of the Jews, the Italian textbooks were also largely silent. None of the three editions of the *Pantheon* series discussed above mentioned the 1938 Italian racial laws or Mussolini’s Italy’s persecution of Jews. Only seven out of the seventeen books sampled mentioned the racial laws and state-mandated persecution of Jews adopted in Italy beginning in 1938 (*Table 8*).

*Table 8: Italian Middle School Textbooks Published Between 1949 and 1966 and Their Coverage of Italian Racial Laws*481

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book (underlined titles are those that are considered as case studies in this dissertation)</th>
<th>Publication Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mentions antisemitism or the racial laws in Italy, 1938-1943</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Pantheon</em></td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Genti in cammino</em></td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Le vie della civiltà</em></td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Guarino/ Sanfilippo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>Età</em></td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Mazzali</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>L’uomo e la sua storia</em></td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Nicolini/ Consonni</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>Il nuovo Pantheon</em></td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>Il cammino dell’uomo</em></td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Martinelli</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <em>La storia</em></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Zolla</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <em>Popoli in cammino</em></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Santanastaso</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. *Il nuovissimo *&lt;br&gt;<em>Pantheon</em></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <em>Noi e la storia</em></td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Rossi</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


481 Same textbooks as cited in Table 5.
The absence, however, is particularly glaring in the case of Pantheon books because Manaresi, who also wrote school books also during the fascist era, did mention the Italian racial laws in his 1941 edition of his contemporary history book for middle schoolers. In this edition they were described as follows: “To maintain the purity of the Italian race, Fascism moreover removed Jews from political and domestic life with suitable laws (1938), tearing apart their hulking moneygrubbing affairs, greedy for dominion.”

Even when the laws were mentioned, as in both the 1954 and 1966 editions of L’uomo e la sua storia [Man and his History], the textbooks made sure to make clear that the majority of Italians rejected them. For example, the 1954 edition of L’uomo e la sua storia stated: “Italians, for ex., could not approve of the extension in our Christian and tolerant country of laws against the Jews, considered in Germany as inferior people, persecuted, put in concentration camps or slaughtered. Nor could the Italians share the idea that the Germans were a superior people, destined to lead all others in Europe and in the world.” From the textbook’s wording, it was

---

482 Said that Jews were persecuted in Italy, but with no mention of the racial laws. It was also unclear from the sentence structure who did the persecuting—the Italians or Hitler.

483 Manaresi, L’Italia contemporanea per la terza classe ginnasiale (1941), 211.

484 Nicolini and Consonni, L’uomo e la sua storia (1954), 246.
not even clear if the racial laws were ever even implemented in Italy! 485 If anything, the denial became even more vehement by the 1966 edition of the same textbook. A similar passage appeared in 1966 with an additional sentence: “Every *racism* was foreign to the Italian conscience, which was horrified by the extermination of millions of Jews, carried out by the Germans in horrible concentration camps.”486

The Italian textbooks were even more mum on discussion of the fate of Jews under the RSI. Out of the sample of seventeen books (see Table 9), only *Il nuovissimo Pantheon* [The Newest Pantheon] (1962) and *Il tempo e le opere* (1965) gave any hint of the persecution or deportation faced by Jews in Italy between 1943 and 1945 in the north of the peninsula, and only *Il nuovissimo Pantheon* alluded to Italians’ role in the persecution. Even in these two cases, the mentions were quite indirect and took place in the context of other themes, which clearly the textbook judged to be more important. For example, in *Il tempo e le opere*, Jewish suffering was only alluded to in the context of a warm and effusive description of the resistance, particularly that offered by the Catholic Church:

> A particular form of resistance happened on the part of the Catholic Church, at the forefront of offering protection to the persecuted without distinction. Parishes, convents, papal palaces were places of asylum where lives were saved, bodies were fed, treated and clothed, and souls comforted with the loving message of Christ. The Jews in particular experienced the efficiency, zeal, and humane and divine warmth of the Christian institutions.487

Why the Jews needed protection during the years 1943-1945, however, was never made clear. *Il nuovissimo Pantheon* was only slightly more explicit in its mention. It explained that most

485 Which, they certainly were: Sarfatti, *The Jews in Mussolini’s Italy* (2006); Sarfatti, *Mussolini contro gli ebrei* (1994).


Italians did not follow the Italian Social Republic or join its national guard because of “the odious task of collaborating with the Germans in search for deserted Italian soldiers, in the persecution of the Jews.”\textsuperscript{488} In both cases, the persecution of Italian Jews was a throw-away line, dropped into a sentence that was in service of a larger idea—that the Italian people rejected fascism and opposed the Italian Social Republic and the true enemy—the Germans.\textsuperscript{489}

\textbf{Table 9: Italian Middle School Textbooks Published Between 1949 and 1966 and Their Coverage of Persecution of Jews during the Italian Social Republic (1943-1945)\textsuperscript{490}}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Publication Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Mentions persecution/deportation of Jews in Italy, 1943-1945</th>
<th>Mentions Italian police/RSI’s role in deportation of Italian Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pantheon</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Genti in cammino</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Le vie della civiltà</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Guarino/Sanfilippo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Età</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Mazzali</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. L’uomo e la sua storia</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Nicolini/Consonni</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Il nuovo Pantheon</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Il cammino dell’uomo</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Martinelli</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. La storia</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Zolla</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Popoli in cammino</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Santanastaso</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{488} Manaresi, \textit{Il nuovissimo Pantheon} (1962), 239.

\textsuperscript{489} Weiner, "Tendentious Texts."

\textsuperscript{490} Same textbooks as cited in Table 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Yes/No 1</th>
<th>Yes/No 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Il nuovissimo Pantheon</em></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Mananaresi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Noi e la storia</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Rossi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>L’uomo nei secoli</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Antocicco/Caliendo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Il tempo e le opera</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Ortolani/Pagella</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Aspetti di civiltà</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Rossano</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Storia</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Paolucci</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Viaggio nel tempo</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Bacci</td>
<td>Yes 491</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>L’uomo e la sua storia</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Nicolini/Consonni</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, Italian textbooks created before 1960 gave scant attention to contemporary history and almost ignored the crimes against the Jews. With the creation of the *scuola media statale* in the early 1960s, however, Italian textbooks began to treat the Holocaust and its Jewish victims. But these early descriptions of Nazi crimes against the Jews tended to be very light on specifics and glossed over, almost entirely, Italian culpability in the persecution of the Jews. The 1938 racial laws and the role of the RSI in the deportation of Italian Jews were rarely addressed, and if they were, they often were blamed upon German influence—“the external other.” 492

### 3.2.2 East German Textbooks

Upon close analysis it is clear that East German textbooks and the East German history curriculum, from the beginning, discussed Nazi crimes and Nazi racism, with great condemnation. A draft of the 8th grade history curriculum created in early 1950 by the DPZI

491 It only mentions that the Vatican hid Jews, but does not say why. Bacci, *Viaggio nel tempo* (1966), 264.

492 Weiner, "Tendentious Texts."
listed as a topic “ideological war preparation,” a section that included “the lie of the ‘Master race’, the Nuremberg laws, anti-Soviet hate.” Another topic “the suffering of oppressed peoples” included discussion of “The rounding up of the population. Elimination of ‘inferior peoples’ (hostages, concentration camps [sic-lack of closed parentheses])” 493

However, East German schoolbooks tended to bundle Jews in with the rest of the Nazis’ victims. Due to socialist ideology, the different victims of these crimes tended to be indistinct and conflated, disseminating a political and economic understanding of the Third Reich, which downplayed the racial aspects. When the 1952 textbook listed out the victims of the extermination camps, Jews were just one item in a long list: “professors, engineers, clerics, politicians, workers, Jews, French, Czech citizens, Soviet soldiers and officers.” 494 As a number of scholars have remarked, in the 1960 edition of the 10th grade textbook, there was a picture of Jewish women and children wearing stars of David and against a wall. However, the caption under the picture identified these individuals with the following phrase: “German fascists deported thousands of Poles to Germany and enslaved them to work in German armament factories.” 495 This issue seems to have been corrected by the 1965 edition of the textbook, with a different picture appearing with the caption “Jewish Polish citizens were expelled from houses and farms and deported to extermination camps.” 496 When notions of “race” were referred to,


494 Wandel, Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Schuljahr (1952), 269; Bröning, "Jewish Monopoly Capitalists" (2003), 89.


they often alluded, not to the Jews, but to Slavic peoples. For example, the 1952 8th grade textbook characterized the Nazis’ “racial hate” of the non-Jewish Slavic and Soviet peoples as “even more savage” than the persecution visited upon the Jews. 497 The particular fate faced by European Jews, based on their perceived racial identity, was marginalized.

This paradox of the East German textbooks was noted as early as 1961 by Mark Krug in his comparative textbook study in *The School Review*. Krug wrote that textbooks “give a detailed description of the persecution of German and Polish Jews and condemn it as senseless barbarity,” but noted “but even in describing this great human tragedy, one textbook could not forego the urge to inject a dose of Marxist-Leninist interpretation” 498 Krug also observed that “The Communist textbooks consistently underplay the anti-Jewish character of the Nazi terror,” instead characterizing the worst of the barbarity as directed against the “Polish population.” 499

It should be noted that such “nationalizing” of the victims of National Socialism and downplaying the racial aspect of their persecution was not unusual in either Eastern or Western Europe in the 1950s; until the 1960s, historical scholarship in both Eastern and Western Europe made little distinction between the racial and political victims of Nazi Germany. 500 However, this tendency continued for a much longer time in the Soviet bloc, because of its convenience to the socialist narrative, which involved a Marxist-Leninist interpretation of history that presented the Third Reich in terms of the class struggle, with Nazi “monopoly capitalists” oppressing the

499 Ibid., 474.
working class.\textsuperscript{501} This reading of fascism as the most reactionary form of capitalism was codified at the Seventh Comintern Congress and is known as the “Dimitrov Doctrine.”\textsuperscript{502}

But unlike contemporaneous Italian and West German textbooks, East German textbooks cited the number of Jewish victims of the Nazis. The East German textbooks published in 1952, 1953, 1956, and 1960 all cited at some point the number of Jews killed by the Nazis. Before 1960 the number was quoted at 5 million and after the number appeared as 6 million. In his analysis, historian Michael Bröning pointed out that by citing the number of 6 million beginning in the early 1960s, the East German textbooks “decided to estimate the number of Jewish victims higher than Western historians of that time did. This indicates that despite all mentioned debatable statements, the history of Jewish suffering during the Holocaust was not generally belittled in the GDR-textbook.”\textsuperscript{503} The fact the GDR textbooks provided accurate and specific numbers of Jewish victims from the very beginning is particularly striking because, as discussed above, only two Italian textbooks out of our sample of seventeen books published before 1966 provided such a number and the West German \textit{Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk} series did


not begin to give a specific accounting of the number of Jewish Holocaust victims until its 1960 revision.\textsuperscript{504} This fact has not been sufficiently appreciated in the scholarly literature; scholar Bodo von Borries, for example, has claimed that it was not until the 1988 edition of the East German textbooks that the actual number of Jewish victims was listed.\textsuperscript{505} This is not the case. Borries is correct that the number of Jewish victims was certainly not particularly prominent in East German textbooks and actually disappeared in the 1965 edition.\textsuperscript{506} But it should be noted and emphasized that for at least the first decade of indigenous textbook production, East Germany was the only one of the three postfascist states that published the number of Jewish victims in their textbooks; they were very much out front on this issue.

When we adapt the chart used to analyze the Italian textbooks to the German case, it becomes clear that East German textbook coverage of the persecution of the Jews was largely comprehensive even from the beginning, especially if one compares them to the West German textbook \textit{Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk} (\textbf{Tables 10 and 11})\textsuperscript{507}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{505} von Borries, "The Third Reich in German History Textbooks since 1945," 48.
  \item \textsuperscript{506} Paterna et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1969).
  \item \textsuperscript{507} The chart was adapted by substituting the Nuremberg laws for the 1938 Italian race laws and Kristallnacht for persecution of the Jews in Germany.
\end{itemize}
Table 10: Topic Coverage in the West German Textbook Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk in Various Editions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version (Ausgabe)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Deals with post-1918 history</th>
<th>Discusses the Nuremberg Laws</th>
<th>Discusses Kristallnacht</th>
<th>Gives # of Jews killed in the Holocaust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ausgabe A</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ausgabe A</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ausgabe A</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ausgabe B</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ausgabe B</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Topic Coverage in East German Textbooks in Various Editions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Edition Year</th>
<th>Deals with post-1918 history</th>
<th>Discusses the Nuremberg Laws</th>
<th>Discusses Kristallnacht</th>
<th>Gives # of Jews killed in the Holocaust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Schuljahr</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Schuljahr</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Schuljahr</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


As seen from in the charts, the 1952 edition of the East German textbook was surprisingly complete in its description of the persecution of the Jews. The 1953 and 1956 editions of the grade 8 textbook were somewhat shorter, abridged versions of the 1952 Urtext [original text] and therefore were missing some details, such as the discussion of Kristallnacht. Later texts—such as the 1960 and 1965 editions—discussed Kristallnacht once again. And based on a lesson observation recorded by DPZI officials of a 2nd year Berufschule class (approximately 10th grade) in November 1957, it seems that the topic was, in fact, taught, although it is not clear from the report if the actual textbook was used in the lesson.\(^{511}\)

In particular, the 1965 textbook edition featured a large number of pages—more than ever before—discussing the persecution of the Jews, especially the Nuremberg race laws and Kristallnacht. The concentration camp system was discussed in great detail and Jews were enumerated as one of the system’s victim groups. Extermination camps were also mentioned, and there were several oblique references to Jews being deported to them.\(^{512}\) The 1965 textbook’s increasing number of pages devoted to this topic could reflect the competitive nature of East German education’s relationship with West German education. Given that, at the time,

\(^{510}\) In the 1960 books, consideration of the Nazi period was split between the grade 9 and the 10 books.

\(^{511}\) Description of instructional observation on November 1, 1957, “Verschiedenes zum Geschichtsunterricht- 1953-1958,” DPZI 4913-2, BBF.

the West German educational system was very publicly grappling with how to increase coverage of the Nazi period in the schools, East Germany may have felt impelled to match its capitalist neighbor. That said, the number of Jews killed by the Nazis disappeared in this text and crimes against the Jews were not mentioned in the textbook’s description of the Nuremberg Trials, as they had in a previous edition.\footnote{Paterna et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1969), 287-88. Doernberg, Rüting, and Schöler, \textit{Geschichte 10: Lehrbuch für Geschichte der 10. Klasse der Oberschule} (1960), 89.} Therefore, the 1965 edition of the East German textbook has an ambiguous legacy; although it increased its discussion of the Nazi past, in line with GDR ideology and as the West German textbooks of this period were doing, it diminished the focus on the Nazi racial victims.

The East German textbooks mirrored their contemporaries in West Germany in other ways, as well; these similarities usually centered on distancing tactics on issues involving complicity. As early as 1961, Krug observed that East German textbooks, like West German textbooks tended to displace guilt for the crimes against the Jews onto a small group of fascists.\footnote{Krug, "The Teaching of History at the Center of the Cold War: History Textbooks in East and West Germany," 474-75.} In this observation, Krug was correct. Much as \textit{Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk} attempted to avoid blame by claiming that only a few were involved in the persecution and murder of the Jews, so too did the East German books. For the most part, the East German textbooks did not talk at all about the German population’s response to the persecution of the Jews, giving the sense that it was happening in isolation from the general population. In the 1952 and 1953 editions, the textbooks discussed Germans being taught racial doctrine and “racial hate,” but there was no discussion of how the general population reacted to the violence against and rounding up of their Jewish neighbors. The perpetrators of such crimes were simply referred
to as “the Nazis” or “the fascists,” making it unclear how those perpetrators related to the German population.\footnote{Wandel, \textit{Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Schuljahr} (1952); Wandel, \textit{Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Schuljahr} (1953), 201-02.} Furthermore, as Michael Bröning has pointed out, the 1952 textbook portrayed the German people as the first victims of National Socialism; they were presented both as the objects of the Nazis’ physical terror and as well as unwillingly seduced by Nazi racial ideology.\footnote{Bröning, \textit{“Jewish Monopoly Capitalists”} (2003), 86-87.}

That said, it should be noted that curricular documents from 1950-1951, before the creation of the first indigenous contemporary history textbook, stated that students should come away from history instruction with “a clear recognition of the inadequate resistance of the German people against the Nazi barbarians and the therefore resulting complicity of the German people in Nazi crimes, that obligates reparation”\footnote{“Unterrichtsergebnisse: Als Ergebnis des Geschichtsunterrichts im 8. Schuljahr ist folgendes zu errichen;” “Geschichtsunterricht Lehrplanarbeit Grund- und Obe- 1950-1951,” DPZI 230-1, BBF.} However, this statement did not make specific reference to crimes against the Jews and in the hierarchy of victims in the GDR, Jewish “victims of fascism” were recognized at a lower level than “fighters against fascism,” which were primarily Communist active resistance fighters.\footnote{Mike Dennis, "Between Torah and Sickle: Jews in East Germany, 1945-1990," in \textit{State and Minorities in Communist East Germany}, ed. Mike Dennis and Norman LaPorte, Monographs in German History (New York: Berghahn Books, 2011), 30.} The complicity of the German people in the crimes against the Jews were clearly not the GDR’s main focus.

When the 1952 textbook was published a year later, no specific reference to the German population’s response to crimes against the Jews appeared and no such discussion would appear until the 1965 edition of the East German 9th grade textbook. When finally addressed in the 1965
textbook, there was a certain amount of ambiguity to the statement: “The German people saw the ravages of the fascists against the Jews with horror, even though the years long antisemitic hate had left traces in their consciences.” This sentence reveals the same type of ambivalence that marked the 1950s and 1960s editions of the West German *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk* (discussed below), when discussing the complicity of general population.

The East German textbooks took recourse to another tactic. As discussed in my 2018 article in *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies* and Bodo von Borries’s 2013 article in *Journal of Contemporary History*, East German textbooks availed themselves of an “external other,” much as Italian textbooks of the period did (by blaming Germany for the deportation of Italian Jews). East Germans externalized blame by pointing out the former Nazis “liv[ing] in security and well-being, residing in office and in dignity” in West Germany. For example, the 1960 textbook noted that Hans Globke, then Secretary of State to West German Chancellor Adenauer, had written the commentary to the Nuremberg race laws. The textbook continued, “Today antisemitic excesses pile up in West Germany under the protection of this [Globke] and other notorious antisemites and the same fascist demon lives on.” Clearly, the textbook was referring to the antisemitic defacements taking place in West Germany during this time. The East German

---


textbooks used these to delegitimize its capitalist neighbor by presenting the FRG as “the Third Reich’s moral heir and as carrying the responsibility of its fascist predecessor,” as scholar Michael Bröning observed. Thus, the GDR, the “other Germany,” was exonerated of culpability. This narrative carried through not just the textbooks, but also other forms of public commemoration. 523 As Minister President Otto Grotewohl said at the September 1958 dedication of the Buchenwald memorial:

Today there are two German states in the world. One has learned from the lessons of history. It has found good and righteous lessons. It is the GDR [East Germany], a state of freedom and socialism. The West German state, is, however, a depository of reaction, in which militarists and fascists have managed to regain power and whose aggressive character is demonstrated by their reactionary acts. 524

East German textbooks have earned the reputation in scholarship for being static, dogmatic tools of propaganda. 525 It cannot be disputed that they were certainly heavily infused with Marxist-Leninism and that history was told through a certain “socialist lens.” 526 That said, it is clear that they should not be treated as retrograde outliers. At times the East German textbooks ran ahead of their western contemporaries (such as the citing of the number of Jewish Holocaust victims).

523 Bröning, "Jewish Monopoly Capitalists" (2003), 110. Weiner, "Tendentious Texts."


526 Weiner, "Tendentious Texts."
3.2.3 West German Textbooks

Unlike East German books, West German textbooks had little recourse to an “external other.” Therefore, from the very beginning, they had to attempt to deal with issues of their own culpability for the genocide of the Jewish people. However, these first attempts were often marked by confusing language, brevity, and obfuscation, as we can see in our case study below:

In the 1951 edition of *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe A* three passages addressed the persecution and murder of the Jews. The first mention came in a discussion of Hitler’s thoughts on race and discussed the 1933 boycott of Jewish goods, as well as Jews’ expulsion from public offices.527 Another, entitled “Persecutions of the Jews” discussed the 1938 Kristallnacht pogrom. Between the 1951 and 1959 editions of *Ausgabe A*, this section was not revised at all. A third, longer passage in the textbook entitled “Increasing Terror” discussed a hodgepodge of topics including state repression of dissent, the killing of the mentally handicapped, the persecution and murder of the Jews, the incarceration of individuals in concentration camps, the persecution of the churches, the use of slave labor, and the inner conflict faced by ordinary Germans over whether or not they should serve Hitler.

The “Increasing Terror” section underwent some noticeable revisions over the course of the 1950s and serves as a poignant illustration of how education about the Holocaust changed over the course of the 1950s in West Germany. Table 12 shows the revisions of the parts of this section that address the Nazis’ persecution and murder of the Jews. Deletions have been highlighted in yellow and additions have been marked in blue:

527 Pinnow and Textor, *Geschichte der neuesten Zeit* (1951), 144.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The <em>Fight against the Jews</em> was also sharpened. From the beginning of the war, they were forced to wear a gold five-sided star. Goebbels’s press censured the populace, because they felt pity for those wearing the star and showed them courtesy not infrequently. Since 1941 the Jews were arrested en masse in both the Reich and in the occupied lands and devilishly murdered. <em>Many million</em> men, women, and children met this horrible fate. In <em>concentration camps</em> the number of inmates increased massively. Exact data is perhaps not possible. Until 1937 approximately 15000 prisoners were supposed to be admittedly yearly in the concentration camps, in the last year of the war in contrast 335,000. During the war in addition to these “Normal camps,” marked “Extermination camps” were constructed (Auschwitz, Madajanek etc.) in these above all the monstrous mass murder of the Jews was carried out. This extermination work was practised with greatest secrecy. <strong>Deletion: An</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The <em>Fight against the Jews</em> was also sharpened. From the beginning of the war, they were forced to wear a gold five-sided star. Goebbels’s press censured the populace, because they felt pity for those wearing the star and showed them courtesy not infrequently. Since 1941 the Jews were arrested en masse in both the Reich and in the occupied lands and devilishly murdered. <strong>Deletion: Many million</strong> men, women, and children met this horrible fate. In <em>concentration camps</em> the number of inmates increased massively. Exact data is perhaps not possible. Until 1937 approximately 15000 prisoners were supposed to be admittedly yearly in the concentration camps, in the last year of the war in contrast 335,000. During the war in addition to these “Normal camps,” marked “Extermination camps” were constructed (Auschwitz, Madajanek etc.) in these above all the monstrous mass murder of the Jews was carried out. This extermination work was practised with greatest secrecy. <strong>Deletion: An</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The <em>Fight against the Jews</em> was also sharpened. From the beginning of the war, they were forced to wear a gold five-sided star. Goebbels’s press censured the populace, because they felt pity for those wearing the star and showed them courtesy not infrequently. Since 1941 the Jews were arrested en masse in both the Reich and in the occupied lands and devilishly murdered. <strong>Deletion: Many million</strong> men, women, and children met this horrible fate. In <em>concentration camps</em> the number of inmates increased massively. Exact data is perhaps not possible. Until 1937 approximately 15000 prisoners were supposed to be admittedly yearly in the concentration camps, in the last year of the war in contrast 335,000. During the war in addition to these “Normal camps,” marked “Extermination camps” were constructed (Auschwitz, Madajanek etc.) in these above all the monstrous mass murder of the Jews was carried out. This extermination work was practised with greatest secrecy. <strong>Deletion: An</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The revisions in the 1950s had less to do with the crimes against the Jews and more to do with what Germans had known about the crimes. Particularly notable was the elimination of the alleged quote from the American judge at the Nuremberg trial. The quote appeared for the first time in the 1951 edition of *Kletts Ausgabe A* and continued to appear through at least the 1956 edition; it also was included in the 1956 (first) edition of the “Terror and Crimes” subsection of *Ausgabe [Version] B* (which was roughly equivalent to “Increasing Terror” in *Ausgabe A*). The Nuremberg quote was, however, eliminated in the 1957 edition of *Ausgabe B* and in the next extant edition of *Ausgabe A* (1959). Clearly, by the mid- to late 1950s, it had become unacceptable to print this blatant lie. Indeed, in a 1960 evaluation of the 1956 edition of *Ausgabe B*, the office of the Senator of People’s Education for Berlin, questioned this line and noted that
it “exhibited a dangerous tendency” 529 In the quote’s place, Ausgaben A and B presented two variations on the same sentence explaining that while many might have suspected the terrible crimes against the Jews, they did not speak up against them for fear of their lives. 530 These distancing tactics, however, arguably had a large effect on young people passing though the school system. When people under the age of 30 were asked in a public opinion poll in June 1961, “Although you cannot speak from personal experience, do you think that most people in Germany during the Third Reich knew about the mass extermination of Jews, or not?,” forty-four percent of respondents answered “very few knew.”531

New information on the actual victims and the extent of Nazi crimes would wait until the 1960 edition of Kletts Ausgabe B.532 The 1960 edition of Ausgabe B premiered a totally rewritten and largely expanded version of the “Terror and Crimes” subsection, which was triple in size as compared to previous editions (Table 13):


531 Noelle and Neumann, The Germans, 187.

532 Initial analysis of Ausgabe B was published in: Weiner, "Tendentious Texts."
Aside from the “Terror and Crimes” being notably larger than in previous editions of the book, it also featured new and more explicit information. For the first time, the number of Jewish victims was mentioned. The previous editions of Ausgaben A and B had failed to provide actual numbers.

---

of Jewish victims, resorting instead of generalizations, such as “many millions.” And indeed, this previous vagueness had not been lost to contemporary observers. When the Cultural Ministry of Schleswig-Holstein commissioned three of its teachers to review history books in use in the schools, the 1957 edition of *Kletts Ausgabe B* was among the books considered. The reviewers noted of the book, “The elimination action of the NSDAP against the Jews and ‘unworthy lives’ are addressed; missing, however, are additional figures, to make these actions frighteningly explicit.”

Analysis of the textbooks, themselves, therefore point to the early 1960s as a tipping point—a point at which the specifically Jewish nature of the tragedy began to be acknowledged. This was a *full year* before the Eichmann trial, which is often cited by scholars as prompting the public’s engagement with Holocaust memory and education.535 The late 1950s and the early 1960s marked the textbooks’ first acknowledgements that the general population had known about Nazi crimes. Still, however, they engaged in distancing tactics, such insisting upon the ignorance of the vast majority of the German people (or what Harold Marcuse terms “the myth of ignorance”) or equivocating on the number of victims by using generalized terms like “many millions.”

The deficiencies in the *Klett* books matter, because according to usage statistics from this time period, they were quite popular. A chart created c. 1960 of the history books in use in the federal state Lower Saxony which dealt with the Nazi past indicated that 106 schools utilized

---


*Kletts Ausgabe A.* 537 These books were used by *Gymnasium* students in approximately grade 9 (students aged about 14-15). Taking into account textbooks utilized in all school levels and all school grades, *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen* was the single most adopted history book in Lower Saxony, which dealt with the Nazi past. 538 Lists submitted by the federal state Bremen in early 1960 also show that they utilized *Kletts Ausgabe B* in their *Gymnasien* [plural *Gymnasium*]. 539

Nonetheless, as problematic as even these first attempts to deal with crimes and culpability were, it should be noted that the Klett textbooks in many ways ran ahead of the general historical profession—both in West Germany and elsewhere. West German historians, even those engaging in *Zeitgeschichte*, tended to shy away from study of the Nazi crimes against the Jews, as Nicolas Berg, in his *Der Holocaust und die westdeutschen Historiker: Erforschung und Erinnerung* (2003, published in English in 2015 as *The Holocaust and the West German Historians: Historical Interpretation and Autobiographical Memory*), has pointed out. The West German *Zeitgeschichte* historians tended to focus instead on the Nazi rise to power. Although Raul Hilberg published his pioneering work in 1961, he was shunned largely by both the West German *Zeitgeschichte* historians and his American colleagues. He should not be taken as the marker of the historical profession’s engagement with the Holocaust in the early 1960s. 540

---

537 While not indicated on the chart which *Ausgabe* was used, the total number of pages in the book corresponds to the 1956 and 1959 editions of *Ausgabe A*. Chart can be found: “Die Geschichtsbücher Niedersachsen u.a. NS-Schuld-Probleme,” [File Page 066], B 304/1949 2 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.


this makes the admittedly paltry achievements of the middle school textbooks particularly notable.

3.2.3.1 The Turning Point

What, then, spurred the textbooks forward in engaging with Nazi crimes and specifically the racial dimension of them? Internal policy documents from this period suggest a number of influences, including: international pressure from foreign governments and foreign press; domestic pressure from German educators and press outlets; pressure from the “other Germany;” pressure from Jewish groups both inside and outside Germany; as well as transnational events, including the world-wide wave of antisemitic vandalism in late 1959-1960, Cold War conflicts, and high-profile war crimes processes, such as the Koch and Eichmann trials. I argue that this confluence of events in the late 1950s and early 1960s pushed the West German textbooks forward in this path.

Antisemitic vandalism occurred with some frequency in West Germany in the 1950s, but seems to have attracted the attention of prominent German politicians, foreign governments and world Jewish organizations in early 1959. It is unclear if the number or severity of antisemitic incidents appreciably increased, thus prompting this increased attention. What is clear, however, is that in December 1958, a number of newspapers in East Germany and in other Communist bloc states began to take fire at West German history textbooks’ handling of the recent past. A


542 It should be noted that there was also antisemitic vandalism going on in East Germany at the time. In June 1959, the Jewish cemetery at Schönhauser Allee in East Berlin was vandalized. E. M. Orland, "East Germany," The American Jewish Year Book 61 (1960): 248, accessed April 9, 2020, www.jstor.org/stable/23605159.
December 4, 1958 article from the SED party newspaper *Neues Deutschland* accused West German schools of being tools of “psychological war preparation” and perpetuating anti-Soviet hate. It reprinted and criticized portions of particular West German school books.543 A December 12, 1958 article from the East Berlin *National-Zeitung* critiqued West Berlin schoolbooks for creating a deformed picture of history and accused West Berlin schools of indoctrinating children in fascist and Nazi ideas.544 For the most part, these articles focused primarily on the supposed revanchist and neo-fascist rhetoric in the West German textbooks and did not touch upon the West German textbooks’ handling of the extermination of the Jews. The exception to this trend was the extraordinarily long critique of West German textbooks published by the Polish agency *Zachodnia Agencja Prasowa*, which took aim at the West German textbooks on a number of issues, including school atlas *Völker, Staaten, und Kulturen* [People, States, and Cultures] for its misleading depiction of the Final Solution, which underplayed the number of Jewish victims.545 West Germans—or at least West Germans who were employed in areas concerning education and textbooks—clearly took note of these critiques. All the above-cited Communist bloc press clippings were located in the West German KMK files; clearly, they found them important enough to collect them.

Non-German Western observers also seemed to have picked up on the critiques (or were perhaps independently making some of their own). A British magazine *Common Ground* published an article by Canton Eaton criticizing German history textbooks as:


545 “ZACHODNIA AGENCJA PRASOWA, Nachrichtenagentur West, Warshau, Dezember 1958, DAS LERNEN DIE KINDER IN DER BUNDESREPUBLIK!,” [File Pages 550-569], B 304/6137 2 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.
giv[ing] cause for grave concern to all who are concerned about the teaching of the truth. With the full approval of the West German Government the evils of Nazism are laid at the feet of the Allies, the concentration camps are questioned, Hitler has been misunderstood by us all, the Nuremburg trials are said to have been riddled with false witnesses and Germany has little for which to repent.546

The publication of this article prompted a 1959 investigation by the United Kingdom-based Anglo-Jewish Association into the “Recrudescence of Nazism in German Text-Books.” When approached about Canton Eaton’s article as part of the investigation, Professor Georg Eckert of the International Textbook Institute in Braunschweig wrote in a February 26, 1959 letter to M.C. Lutz of the British UNESCO Commission: “It is noticeable that from December 1958 onwards, guided attacks have been directed in the East German, Polish and other Communist presses against the text-books of West Germany and especially those of West Berlin….This action is in clear connection with the political crisis of Berlin.”547 Eckert suggested that public opinion in England on the matter of German textbooks had been influenced by the Communist bloc press critiques. The Anglo-Jewish Association investigator admitted that this could be true, at least in part. 548

American Jewish organizations also expressed concern. The 1959 edition of the American Jewish Year Book noted that:

Young people knew very little about the Nazi period, since the majority of school teachers preferred to avoid ‘controversial’ questions. History textbook dealt with the subject only inadequately. A statement in the manuscript of a history book that ‘several million’ Jews had lost their lives during the Third Reich was queried by the Bavarian Ministry of Culture and replaced by the term ‘very many’ Jews.549


547 “Anglo-Jewish Association, Meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee, July 14th 1959 at 8:30pm, Item No. 5- Recrudescence of Nazism in German Text-Books,” [File Pages 417-421], B 304/6137 2 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.


But the issue was not just being raised internationally. West German television and print journalists lobbed their own criticisms, as well. The television magazine Blick in die Zeit [A Look at Our Times] featured concentration camp survivor Eugen Kogon asking West German high school students about National Socialism in its January 1959 issue. This was followed in April 1959 by the broadcast of the documentary Blick auf unsere Jugend: Die Schüler und Hitler [Focus on Our Youth: The Students and Hitler] on Hessischer Rundfunk. Filmmaker Jürgen Neven-DuMont exposed the ignorance of West German students and found that in a class of thirty-three Gymnaisum students questioned, only thirteen said that they knew many Jews had been killed during National Socialism and only nine of these students presented “reasonably accurate” responses. 550 The print media was also not silent. For example, a May 23, 1959 editorial by the Stern editorial staff critiqued the youths’ knowledge of the National Socialist period. The Stern staff closed its editorial by noting, “On the occasion of a half year of the Stern reporting on the Koch trial in Warsaw: One is not done with his past when he runs away from up it. In the education of our children we have until now obviously done little else.”551 In this case, the Erich Koch trial of 1959 had clearly prompted the Stern editorial staff to reconsider the education of German youth.


551 Harold Marcuse noted Michael Schornstheimer’s findings about the a great shift in how the Stern historical magazine spoke about the Nazi past; previously in the 1950s, it had engaged in “downplaying of Nazi atrocities, attempting to portray the good in Nazi leaders, and discrediting efforts to learn from the transgressions of the Nazi era;” only a few years later, the magazine was quick to point these flaws in neo-Nazi movements. Marcuse, Legacies of Dachau (2001), 211. Michael Schornstheimer, Bombenstimmung und Katzenjammer: Vergangenheitsbewältigung: Quick und Stern in den 50er Jahren (Köln: Pahl-Rugenstein, 1989); Echo der Presse clipping, “Lieber Stern-Leser,” 23 May 1959, [File Pages 429-430], B 304/6137 2 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.
The Eastern bloc had intended for the Koch trial to cause consternation in West Germany. Erich Koch was the former chief of the Bialystok District administration and the Reich commissar for Ukraine. 552 Scholars Gabriel Finder and Alexander Pruisin have claimed that the trial was “meant to highlight the fairness of communist justice as well as to assail the judicial system in West Germany, where the courts routinely acquitted defendants on trial for Nazi crimes or handed out light sentences to convicted Nazi war criminals.”553 Koch’s trial was considered of particular symbolic value, since the 1958 trial of Einsatzkommando members in Ulm, West Germany, had resulted in relatively light sentences for the accused.554

Around the same time, Theodor Heuss, the Federal President of West Germany, received representatives from the German Coordinating-Council for Christian-Jewish Cooperation [Deutscher Koordinierungsrat für Christlich-Jüdische Zusammenarbeit] and “later a qualified Jewish man from Paris, who represents a large Jewish organization in America,” who was likely Zachariah Shuster, the European Director of the American Jewish Committee. Both the German Coordinating-Council for Christian-Jewish Cooperation representatives and Shuster wished to talk about incidents of antisemitism in West Germany, which they felt were linked to issues of education. As a result of these meetings, Heuss wrote in March 1959 to the KMK President, asking if the KMK could consider these issues at its next meeting. “Such a discussion” wrote Heuss “should not be just for show, to be shared to the public, instead I can imagine, that a rigorous pedagogical-historical consideration of a) how this whole subject is handled into the pedagogical academics, b) how it is touched upon in the schools in the various age levels and


554 Ibid., 230.
gradations, could clarify this problem all at once.”555 Real attention had to be given to the problem at hand.

Pushed into action, the KMK began devoting a number of meetings to issues of contemporary history and the representation of National Socialism in history textbooks. The first of note was an April 23-24, 1959 plenary session of the KMK, which evaluated treatment of “current events” in history and German education. This was likely the meeting requested by Heuss. But the meetings did not stop there. Meetings of the KMK and also the subsidiary school committee thereafter regularly considered this and related issues in 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962.556 Work also began on the federal states level. Throughout 1959, new decrees were created in the various federal states of their own to push for the instruction of contemporary history. The federal states also assigned evaluators to review the history textbooks in use in their schools.557

The KMK issued a number of resolutions, some apparently for internal use, but others to be distributed nationally. The first major public policy statement put forth by the KMK on the issue was the 1960 binding resolution on “Handling of the Most Recent History in History and Social Studies Instruction.” The 1960 resolution began, somewhat defensively, by noting the long history of the KMK’s engagement with political education, long before the “particular incidents of the past year.” It explained that as early as 1950, the KMK had assembled guidelines and then had published a resolution on “Objectives for History Education” in 1953. The 1960

555 Heuss to Osterloh, 12 March 1959, [File Pages 450-453], B 304/6137 2 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz; Letter from Zachariah Shuster, European Director of American Jewish Committee to Christa Schermuly, KMK, 1 February 1960, [File Pages 297-298], B 304/3653, KMK, BA Koblenz.


resolution further noted that the KMK had long realized and stressed the need for parents to reinforce the work of teachers in political education. The 1960 resolution explained that at the plenary meeting of September 24-25. 1959, the KMK school committee had reviewed methods and guidelines, as well as decided to go over a selection of history and geography textbooks to determine how the various federal states had interpreted the KMK’s guidance on political education. After assessing the guidelines of the various federal states, the KMK school committee had then decided to put forth this binding resolution. The resolution was overarching, discussing many topics including teacher training and interactions between students and teacher. The resolution also touched on the school books, noting that textbook review (decided upon at the September 1959 meeting) would continue and advice for the evaluation and improvement of the books would be given to the publishing houses. 558

In February 1960, the KMK had already been working on this issue for almost a year, but the timing of this public resolution was particularly important due to events a month and a half earlier. A wave of antisemitic defacement throughout West Germany (and the world) had begun after two neo-Nazis vandalized the newly rebuilt Cologne synagogue on Christmas Day 1959. 559 These incidents sharpened both domestic and international attention on West Germany’s educational practices surrounding “the most recent history” and prompted a number of press

558 “Behandlung der jüngsten Verangenheit im geschichts- und gemeinschaftskundlichen Unterricht in den Schulen (Beschluß der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 12. 2. 1960*),” in Sammlung der Beschlüsse der ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, ed. Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Nieuwied: Luchterhand, 1964-).

inquiries from Western foreign papers about the state of history education and the history textbooks.\footnote{Christa Schermuly, “Aktenvermerk: Antisemitische Ausschreitungen im Gebeit de Bundesrepublik, Anfragen von Ausländern,” 13 January 1960, [File Pages 115-116], B 304/1949 2 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.}

It should be noted that in many ways, the weaknesses of the West German educational system and its teachings on Nazism reflected similar problems faced throughout the world. Indeed, the critical international articles with regards to West German textbooks were sometimes followed by some soul searching as to how Nazism was taught closer to home. A number of American newspapers ran articles pointing out the inadequacies of their own local textbooks.\footnote{For example: "Nazi Regime Is Whitewashed in City Schools' History Books," \textit{Philadelphia Inquirer}, February 21, 1960.}

\textit{The New York Herald Tribune}, for example, published an article in February 18, 1962, which cited a study by the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai Brith, which had concluded that only one out of the forty-eight most utilized American history textbooks contained a “satisfactory” depiction of Nazism’s persecution of the Jews. One third of the surveyed textbooks did not even address the topic. Yet, these articles, such as the one in the \textit{Herald Tribune}, although focusing primarily on local textbook issues, continued to make reference to the problems and deficiencies of the West German books.\footnote{Terry Ferrer, "Textbooks Inadequate on Nazi Horror," \textit{New York Herald Tribune}, February 18, 1962.} Thus, the pressure upon the KMK to take action did not abate.

The pressure mounted also from the East. The antisemitic incidents prompted a letter, signed by 300 people, from the teachers and parents of the Wilhelm Pieck School in Pankow (East Berlin) protesting the “anti-Semitic wave of hatred that has broken out in West Germany.” The signatories, addressing the KMK, mentioned the Nazis and “Jew murderers” in positions of power in Adenauer’s cabinet, and also the active Nazis present in the educational system (noting several by name, along with their former Nazi affiliations). They “demand[ed] the democratic
upbringing of German youth, as it is realized in the German Democratic Republic” and “call[ed] upon…the responsible ones of the Cultural Ministries of the West German States [to] put an end to fascism and initiate a democratic arrangement in West German schools.” 563 Clearly, East German groups seized upon the opportunity, enlisting the issue of education about the Nazi past into the Cold War competition. With such a presentation, the GDR could displace its citizens’ own complicity in Nazi crimes onto their western neighbors.

If the frequent international news coverage—some of it painstakingly clipped out and placed in the KMK files—and the direct petitions did not alert the West German cultural ministries that the world was watching, direct communication from the West German Foreign Office did. Secretary of State Scherpenberg of the Foreign Office sent a telegram to the KMK on the meeting at which the KMK was scheduled to consider the declaration on the “Handling of the Most Recent History in History and Social Studies Instruction.” Although apparently, the telegram was not received until after the meeting was over, it was clear that the West German Foreign Office had intended to affect the outcome. The telegram noted that British Foreign Minister Selwyn Lloyd had requested information and materials on the antisemitic acts occurring in the FRG for an upcoming talk in the House of Commons. He had particularly requested schoolbooks. The West German Foreign Office had provided three books including Kletts Geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe B. Scherpenberg recounted all this to the KMK and closed with “I would be thankful, if the above-mentioned foreign policy point of view with reference to the composition of German history schoolbooks could be kept in mind.” 564


564 Letter (draft) from Kurt Frey to Dr. Sattler, Leader of the Cultural Department at the Foreign Office, 20 February 1960, [File Pages 218-219], B 304-6137 1 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz. Copy of a telegram from van Scherpenberg to Senator Tiburtius, 11 February 1960, [File Page 222], B 304/6137 1 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.
Under various pressures, the KMK issued a directive that mandated the teaching of contemporary history at all school levels. The KMK also prevailed upon the federal states to be quite critical in their evaluations of the textbooks. However, the work from federal state to federal state was apparently haphazard. Some states were much stricter than others. The reviewers from Schleswig-Holstein, a federal state with a Christian Democratic Union (CDU) Minister-President at the time, determined that the books being used were “in general free from tendentious distortions and aim for an objective representation of the time of most recent history,” and that any issues could be easily corrected in new editions. On the other hand, judgements in Berlin, under Social Democratic Party (SPD) administration, for example, were much harsher (although the Berlin Senator for the People’s Education was a member of the CDU). Evers, head of the school committee for the office of the Senator for the People’s Education in Berlin and an SPD reformer, submitted a July 1960 report to the KMK that 19 books had been found unsatisfactory for use in Berlin schools. The publishers had already been informed that these books were not to be sold and had been issued new instructions on how to improve the books. At least one federal state neglected the job entirely. Saarland informed the KMK in February 1960 that “an evaluation of history books in view of National Socialism did


not take place, arguably however the approval of history books was done based on the overall quality of the work.\textsuperscript{569}

In many cases, the federal states were evaluating the same books, but coming to different conclusions. For example, the reviewers from Schleswig-Holstein concluded that \textit{Kletts Geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe} B (1957 edition) was “despite the complaints…the best in content and structure that the reviewers have evaluated up until now.” In contrast Berlin textbook reviewers banned both \textit{Ausgaben} A (1956 edition) and B (1956 edition) of the same book.\textsuperscript{570} The Berlin evaluators wrote of \textit{Ausgabe} B:

\begin{quote}
The selection of topics tries live up to objective history description. But Terror and Crimes (p. 191), the entire Persecution of the Jews (p. 191, tot., a half page) and the Resistance Movement (p. 192 and in small amounts on pp. 163, 164, 173) are insufficiently handled (in words and pictures). Those, which the world public has judged to be Nazi crimes, are not sufficiently stressed. So the student who holds the book in his hands can under no circumstances reach a correct judgment of the Nazi period.\textsuperscript{571}
\end{quote}

There were minimal changes between the 1956 and 1957 editions of \textit{Kletts Ausgabe} B, especially in the section that the Berlin evaluators criticized most—“Terror and Crimes,” which we have evaluated above.\textsuperscript{572} With the exception of the disappearance of the false Nuremberg judge quote and its replacement with a paragraph about the great secrecy under which the Nazi annihilation of the Jews was practiced, there were basically no material differences between the


\textsuperscript{571} Ibid
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1956 and 1957 editions of this section. Therefore, Schleswig-Holstein praised and Berlin condemned more or less the same textbook manuscript.

Faced with conflicting instructions, the schoolbook publishers were befuddled. In September 1960, *Ernst Klett Verlag* wrote to the KMK, complaining that while the KMK had intended to provide school book publishers with “general” advice on how to better the schoolbook’s portrayal of the National Socialist period, this was not, in fact taking place.573 Some of the federal states were submitting the results of their evaluations to the KMK school committee and some were simply contacting the publishing houses directly, demanding changes to the books and threatening to block the books’ use in schools if the changes were not made (as Berlin had done). *Ernst Klett Verlag* felt under a deluge, especially, since different federal states had come to different evaluation results and were thus presumably requesting different changes. *Klett Verlag* suggested that in the intervening time before the KMK published binding regulations, an institution might be named (Eckert’s International Schoolbook Institute was suggested) to give the publishers advice and to approve books in order to promote “calm.”574

Closing this period of feverish activity, the KMK issued a more specific resolution in 1962. This resolution, entitled “Guidelines for the Handling of Totalitarianism in Instruction,” instead of espousing general principles as the 1960 resolution had, instead proffered a definition of totalitarianism, with which students were to become familiar.575 The resolution then went on

---

573 As of the 64th plenary meeting on March 24-25, 1960. See notes from the meeting: File Page 258-259, B 304/3651 2 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.


575 “Richtlinien für die Behandlung des Totalitarismus im Unterricht (Beschluß der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 5. 7. 1962*),” in *Sammlung der Beschlüsse der ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, ed. Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Läänder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Nieuwied: Luchterhand, 1964-).
to introduce National Socialism and Bolshevism as the two forms of totalitarianism and also listed various topics associated with each, about which presumably children were to be taught. Of the five major points attached to the definition of National Socialism, the second, “The Terror System of National Socialism” was the one that dealt with crimes against the Jews. The description of this point read: “Fight against political opponents and Christian Churches—SS, Gestapo, concentration camps—racial politics: eradication of the Jews and extermination of ‘unworthy lives.’” The resolution closed with “methodological advice,” including that “the fact that the two systems [National Socialism and Bolshevism] fought each other should not belie their close affinity.” The motivation of the resolution was also explained: Through learning about these forms of totalitarianism, a democratic spirit should be awakened in students. The resolution emphasized, “Success depends—particularly in the handling of National Socialism—to a high degree on the frankness with which the teacher and student meet each other.” 576 Clearly, the resolution was attempting to promote an egalitarian environment designed to expose students to the crimes of the Nazi past and learn from them, within a certain Cold War context.

Some textbook series took these guidelines to heart. Historian Brian Puaca has analyzed the Braunschweig-based history teacher Hans Ebeling’s textbook series. Puaca notes that Ebeling’s history books were first published in the 1950s as Deutsche Geschichte; however, his new series Die Reise in die Vergangenheit was published in 1964, which presented a much more critical view of German complicity in crimes against the Jews. The textbook read in the revised edition:

Most Germans had heard here and there of the existence of concentration camps and other things. Only a few, however, could imagine the things that went on in them, since every watchman and released prisoner was bound to the strictest silence. Few German citizens realized the extent of the mass extermination. The shocking extent of the crimes was only revealed at the end of the lost war. And on the other side, foreign countries

576Ibid.
could not understand how Germans allegedly could not know anything about them! Even today there are many who do not want to know anything about these crimes. But it is folly and cowardice to close oneself off from the truth.\textsuperscript{577}

That said, this was an ambivalent success; not all teachers implemented the guidelines correctly and not all students found that the KMK recommendations led to a democratizing antifascist environment. Dany Diner, who was born in Israel in 1946 to East European Jews and moved to Germany at age eight, recalled:

A superficial anti-Nazism was superimposed by school curricula and further watered down in the form of anti-totalitarianism. It remained a very thin veneer which cracked when, for example, the aging philologist, a former occupation officer in France, mourned nostalgically in the classroom for the many sweet fruits of the occupation he was prevented from fully reaping; or when a younger teacher could no longer conceal his primary educational goal and quickly supplement the curriculum in order to convey his admiration for the spirit of camaraderie during World War II among anti-aircraft personnel and night-fighter pilots. In the fact of such open/hidden nostalgia the best I could do was to duck behind the protecting back of the person in front of my desk.\textsuperscript{578}

In this complicated environment, West Germans’ work in 1960s on the textbooks was ongoing; Jewish organizations also continued to be involved. Through the mid-1960s, the German Coordinating-Council for Christian-Jewish Cooperation, in particular, remained in contact with the KMK, the West German UNESCO commission, and the International Textbook Institute.\textsuperscript{579} The German Coordinating-Council for Christian-Jewish Cooperation pushed, in particular, for education around historical Judaism, arguing that this was necessary for West


\textsuperscript{579} Letter from Franz Zeit, German UNESCO Commission to Kurt Frey, General Secretary of the KMK, 23 June 1964, [Page 290], B 304/ 3651 2 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.
German students to understand the crimes of the Third Reich. Without such an understanding of Judaism, the German Coordinating-Council for Christian-Jewish Cooperation argued, “students will . . . end up hardly able to identify with the victims and sympathize with their fate, because they seem too foreign to them.” After lengthy correspondence in 1964 and 1965 about a proposed study of the treatment of Jewish history in school textbooks, the KMK ended up facilitating a collaboration between L. Mugdan of the German Coordinating-Council for Christian-Jewish Cooperation and the International Textbook Institute. The collaboration was conceived of as a continuation of a recently published pamphlet-length study of *Jüdische Geschichte in Deutschen Geschichtelehrbüchern* [Jewish History in German History Textbooks], written by Saul B. Robinson and U. Chaim Schatzer and published as part of a series edited by the International Textbook Institute.

The International Textbook Institute was another source of textbook reform during these years. Aside from conducting studies on the portrayal of Jewish history in textbooks, the Institute, which had arisen out of the History Working Party (Chapter 2), facilitated and engaged in bilateral textbook commission with a variety of countries in Europe and Asia throughout the 1950s, including England, France, Italy, Yugoslavia, Japan, India, Korea, Indonesia, and the Benelux nations. While these textbook commissions were meant to decrease national stereotypes

---
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in the textbooks, not all welcomed the projects. At a schoolbook conference held at *Volk und Wissen Verlag* in 1961, one speaker (identified only as *Kollege Hub*) at the East German publishing house depicted them as attempts to spread a false “NATO conception” of history, which had several major characteristics including: “the cover-up of the reactionary role of German imperialism and militarism; the trivializing of its crimes, above all those of fascism; [and] pardoning the fascist regimes.” The same speaker described the collaboration between the West German Institute and Dutch historians as resulting in textbook passages which purportedly used the Dutch resistance movement to justify Wehrmacht atrocities. “So Anne Frank and her murderers were equally guilty,” said Hub with displeasure.

Therefore, despite the flurry of activity in West Germany around the revision of the textbooks in the early 1960s, the scholars gathered at *Volk und Wissen Verlag* deemed their progress insufficient. This was largely because the textbook representations of the Nazi past had become part of the Cold War contest between the two Germanys—with each Germany trying to demonstrate that it had properly learned the lessons of the past.

### 3.3 Teaching Contemporary History in the 1950s

The 1950s in Italy and West Germany were largely marked by a certain reluctance to teach contemporary history. Eventually, however, in response to a variety of factors, including a perceived upswing in youth neo-fascist and neo-Nazi activities, greater emphasis was placed on contemporary history education at the end of the decade, as a means of teaching democratic

---


values. The postwar governments of Italy and West Germany mimicked the language of their Allied occupiers a decade earlier, with speeches and discussions about how to educate the young in order to develop a peaceful and democratic world view.

In these two countries, teaching about the contemporary past also meant teaching about fascist and Nazi crimes. The first limited depictions of the fascist era appeared in all three countries’ textbooks in the by the early 1950s, but a stronger push for contemporary history education in the late 1950s and early 1960s, as well as the first high profile war crimes trials since Nuremberg, meant that depictions of the crimes against the Jews also came under more scrutiny.584 Especially in West Germany, where the textbooks came under particular criticism from both Western and Communist bloc countries, it was determined the certain changes had to be made in how one taught about the most recent past.

Long before the student revolts of 1968, textbook writers and education officials in West Germany and Italy became concerned about what was being taught in schools about National Socialism and fascism. In Italy, a reform to the educational system also demanded a whole new generation of textbooks. A veritable revolution in the curriculum, therefore, took place in the early 1960s. Contemporary history became increasingly valued by the school systems (although not always by the individual school teachers). The textbooks were rewritten to begin dealing with Nazi-fascist crimes. The resulting textbooks were still highly problematic. However, one cannot deny that some sincere soul-searching took place during these years about how to present the problematic past.

In East Germany, in contrast, attention to contemporary history had long been part of the state’s ethos. The 1950s and 1960s East German history textbooks were marked by a Marxist-

584 These included the Ulm trial in 1958, the Eichmann trial in 1961, and the Auschwitz trials of 1963-1965.
Leninist class struggle narrative. But despite this narrative that underplayed the racial dimensions of Nazi empire-building, the East German textbooks taught students in much greater detail about Nazi-fascist crimes than their Italian and West German contemporaries. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, East Germany came under some of the same pressures as those that affected West Germany, such as war crimes trials that captivated the attention of the international community and the wave of antisemitism sweeping the world in 1959. Therefore, we can observe some of the same trends across the East and West German textbooks— for example, the increased focus on Nazi crimes. However, East Germany did not encounter many of the same factors as West Germany. The East German Jewish community was extraordinarily small—by 1956, it had decreased to 1,900. The SED was also often at odds with international Jewish organizations over reparations claims; this adversarial relationship likely did not lend the international Jewish groups much influence on East German education. 585 Like Italy, the GDR also had recourse to an “external other” on which it could blame Nazi crimes—its capitalist neighbor. The FRG also attempted to externalize blame by presenting National Socialism under the banner of “totalitarianism” and comparing it to Bolshevism, but this seemingly did not work as well as the Italian and East German externalization tactics. Thus, we do not observe the same dramatic changes in the East German textbooks that we will see in our discussion below about the West German ones. However, the 1960s East German textbooks devoted an increasing amount of space to the Third Reich and Nazi-fascist crimes.

Yet this limited reckoning with crimes and complicity during the 1950s and early 1960s was accompanied by a hardy resistance narrative which demonstrated that not all Germans and Italians took part. These two narratives—one of complicity and one of resistance—were

585 Dennis, "Between Torah and Sickle: Jews in East Germany, 1945-1990," in State and Minorities in Communist East Germany, 34.
inextricably bound to one another, as even demonstrated by their spatial placement in the textbooks. In textbooks (particularly West German and Italian ones), the “resistance” subsection can often be found immediately after the “crimes” or “Holocaust” subsection. Sometimes these two sections were even grouped together under a single chapter heading, such as “The New Order: The Victims and the Rebels” as they were in Silvio Paolucci’s Storia (1964). Thus, Chapter 4 will turn its attention to the second topic in this sequence: “the Rebels” and will explore the meaning of this narrative.
What has the democratic Republic done in these last five years to consolidate the new institutions in the life of the nation? Very little. . . . Just think that still today the opportunity has not been taken to substitute all the textbooks which pass through the hands of our students. There are still works written and printed during the fascist period which are full of its mentality and impregnated with its lies. Among all the public competitions, we did not find time nor have the money to hold one for the production of a text which explains to the younger generations what exactly Fascism was...Who has been able to explain that the Resistance, despite the excesses that sometimes happened and that if blameworthy should be condemned, has constituted and constitutes one of the most illustrious pages of our thousands of years of history and is the main reason why Italy can hold her head up high among civilized nations? 586

-Giorgio Bo, DC parliamentarian, January 22, 1952

Across all three of our subject countries, the importance of teaching students about the resistance as a means of instilling civic and democratic values was repeatedly stressed. The issue became particularly prominent during discussions about the introduction of contemporary history education, which took place in East Germany in the late 1940s and in West Germany and Italy in the 1950s. For example, as seen in the above quote, during debates in Italy in 1952 over the Scelba law, a law intended to suppress neo-fascist activities, parliamentarians, such as Giorgio Bo, lamented the fact that lack of education about the resistance against “Nazi-Fascism” had meant that fascist-era mindsets had continued to circulate, thus leading to neo-fascist activities

586 Quote is partially cited (and translated) in: Ascenzi, Education and the Metamorphoses of Citizenship in Contemporary Italy (2009), 263. I referred to the original and elaborated the translation. Original text can be found: Atti parlamentari del Senato della Repubblica, 29912-13.
among the youth.\textsuperscript{587} Teaching about the resistance, therefore, was seen as the cure to this disturbing behavior. It was perceived as absolutely necessary to inculcate students with a new worldview.

It is important to define what this chapter means by “resistance.” The meaning of the term “resistance” has been a topic of sharp historiographical debate, as Ian Kershaw explores in \textit{The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives of Interpretation}. Initially, in the West German context, the term had meant armed resistance, primarily the July 20\textsuperscript{th} attempt on Hitler’s life.\textsuperscript{588} Beginning in the 1960s, but more fundamentally in the 1970s and 1980s, historians focused more on the behavior of ordinary Germans. This necessitated a broader understanding of the term “resistance,” which now included both active and passive behavior. To encompass this more expansive sense of the term, in the many volume \textit{Bayern in der NS-Zeit}, historian Martin Broszat introduced the term \textit{Resistenz} (as opposed to the typical German word for resistance, \textit{Widerstand}), which focused more on functional impact than on moral-ethnic motivation. \textit{Resistenz}, argued Broszat, allowed one to evaluate factors that limited National Socialist domination; thus, the historian could evaluate historical actors’ behavior that that was simultaneously partially in opposition to the Nazi regime, while also partially approving.\textsuperscript{589} For example, listening to swing music or dressing in Western clothing—were actions opposed by the Nazi regime. Although, they had no inherit political-moral basis, they nonetheless impeded the

\textsuperscript{588} For examples of such research, see the works of Peter Hoffmann. For example: Peter Hoffmann, \textit{History of the German Resistance, 1933-1945}, 3rd English edition ed. (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996).
cultural penetration of Nazism.590 Other historians, however, disputed Broszat’s term, with Marlis Steinert arguing that the term was far too broad and even included “silent acceptance.”591 Given this chapter’s focus on the 1950s and 1960s textbooks, this chapter will primarily prioritize the more narrow “resistance” definition, but will point out aspects of the broadening of the definition over time.

This chapter concentrates primarily on internal resistance during the wartime years, meaning resistance that took place in one’s own category. Textbooks, especially those published in the 1960s, increasingly discussed “resistance” to Nazism and Fascism in a broader European context. But when addressing this dissertation’s main questions of how a “dark chapter” was taught in postfascist states, how partisan resistance in occupied Greece or Czechoslovakia was depicted is tangential. To get at issues of complicity in wartime atrocity, which lies at the heart of this dissertation, we must focus on internal German and Italian resistance (with occasional reference to émigrés and exiles). For similar reasons, this dissertation chooses to primarily deal with resistance during the wartime years, unless pre-war and wartime resistance were amalgamated in once section, as they were in the East German textbooks of the 1950s. The Fascist and Nazi regimes were responsible for perpetuating the most recognized crimes against humanity were conducted by Fascism and Nazism during these years and, therefore, if we presume that resistance is the counterpoint to crimes, then we must also limit ourselves to resistance during the same period.

These resistance narratives played an important role in creating a new democratic worldview in the youth, but also in the process of postfascist and postwar nation-building; the resistance narratives “redeemed” the postwar state and made the increasing discussion of wartime crimes and the Holocaust possible. Political scientist Mark Wolfgram explained: “The concept of redemption and the cleansing of guilt through blood sacrifices were easily understood by the general German population. In both national mythologies of ‘the resistance,’ those who had fought and died in their struggle against the demonic Nazis had enacted a noble sacrifice that then redeemed the whole nation.” The “other Germany” of the wartime years therefore redeemed the German states of the present.”

Although Wolfgram was discussing East and West German memory culture, he could have easily been talking about Italy, which experienced a similar phenomenon. In all three postfascist states, a messianic narrative emerged in which the resistance rehabilitated the state from the sins of the Nazi/fascist period.

The resistance narratives became increasingly important in the late 1950s and 1960s, as a counterpoint to the increasing discussion about crimes. As the sins of Fascism and Nazism became more openly acknowledged, a more robust absolution was necessary. The late 1950s and early 1960s also saw another important development in resistance narratives. For various political reasons, the textbooks had to begin to incorporate protagonists who did not necessarily “belong” to their narratives in the strictest sense. For example, East Germany began to adopt bourgeois military resisters as a means to justify the creation of their National People’s Army. Furthermore, following historiographical trends, there began to be a focus, at least in the West

592 Wolfgram, "Getting History Right" (2011), 82.
German case, on female resistance, as well as “passive” or social non-military resistance, although this would not come to full fruition until the 1970s (as discussed later in Chapter 5).

4.1 Founding Myths

4.1.1 The Italian Founding Myth: The Partisan Resistance

As seen above, Italian politicians and educators intended to use the resistance to teach democratic values and redeem the postwar state. However, while the resistance was always a part of public memory, educational efforts about it were a bit delayed in Italy compared to the German cases. For the first decade and a half of the new Republic of Italy, the resistance was largely celebrated in public life as the “Second Risorgimento.”593 The experience was nationalized, or as historian James Edward Miller noted, “The founders of Italy’s democracy shrewdly expanded the definition of ‘resistance’ to include not only those who fought, but also those who in any way supported the struggle against Fascism, either actively or passively, or had simply suffered from the regime’s actions. Under this expanded definition, the Resistance became a true national experience.”594 The expansion of the resistance narrative had two major benefits: it prompted the Allies to be more forgiving of Italy and it also helped create an

593 The “Risorgimento” refers to the nineteenth century process of unification of the Italian nation. Recalling the “Risorgimento” allowed Italy to re-align itself with respect to Germany. The Italy of the Risorgimento era had defeated Austria to unify its territory. The Risorgimento not only allowed both the monarchy and anti-fascists to draw upon a tradition of “liberation” it also allowed Germans to be portrayed as Italy’s centuries’ old enemy. Fogu, "Italiani Brava Gente," in The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe, 151. Focardi, "Italy's Amnesia over War Guilt: The "Evil Germans" Alibi," 12-13.

antifascist consensus for postwar government. Allied propaganda during the war had also played a significant role in creating this narrative.595

Underneath this overarching rhetoric of a national resistance, however, divisions percolated. One can see these tensions even in Giorgio Bo’s quotation at the beginning of this chapter: “Who has been able to explain that the Resistance, despite the excesses that sometimes happened and that if blameworthy should be condemned, has constituted and constitutes one of the most illustrious pages of our thousands of years of history and is the main reason why Italy can hold her head up high among civilized nations?” The mention of “excesses” indicated that despite this profession that the resistance was “one of the most illustrious pages of our thousands of years of history,” the center-right politician still felt some uneasiness about the resistance. Bo was not alone in this regard. Communists, who had made up a large part of the Italian resistance, were largely perceived poorly in the 1950s by moderate public opinion because of the emerging Cold War context.596 Furthermore, local populations who had suffered reprisals by the German occupiers often blamed the local partisans for bringing destruction upon them in what John Foot calls “divided memory.”597

Perhaps because of this ambiguity, in contrast to the East and West German cases, the resistance took some time to become prominent in Italian history textbooks. It was not until the early to mid-1960s, when resistance narratives were already well established in the Germanys,


that the Italian resistance found any type of resonance at all in the schoolbooks. Scholar Emiliano Perra, who studied Holocaust films and TV programs in postwar Italy, attributed the rise of the resistance narrative to a number of factors, including the “swastika wave” (which as we saw in Chapter 3 also affected Italy), the election of the reformist pope John XXII, and the 1960 crisis of the Tambroni government. That said, Perra noted that as early as 1958, Italian Prime Minister Adone Zoli participated in a rally of the Italian Partisans’ National Association, thus inherently legitimizing it; therefore, there was a slow shift in attitudes towards the resistance near the end of the decade.\textsuperscript{598} This low level of discussion in the books of the 1950s and subsequent jump in the books of the 1960s can also be attributed to the fact that it was only with the creation of the \textit{scuola media statale} in 1962 that textbooks began to treat contemporary history (including fascism and the Second World War) as periods of historical study equal to all the others (as discussed in Chapter 3).\textsuperscript{599}

Discussion of the resistance in the 1950s textbooks was largely limited, but there were several common themes. The textbooks presented the partisans as many in number and tended to describe their acts against the Germans. As seen in Table 14, as early as 1952, some textbooks in the sample took pains to align the general population with the partisans and the Allies by either mentioning popular support for the partisans and Anglo-American troops and/or hostility

\textsuperscript{598} Perra, \textit{Conflicts of Memory} (2010), 53-54.

\textsuperscript{599} That said, even as late as the early 1970s, some felt that contemporary history was not receiving sufficient attention. Italian academic Guido Quazza, writing in 1971, complained that the last year of the \textit{scuola media} history curriculum, which was meant to cover contemporary history, started in 1789 or 1815, which was too early to allow teachers and pupils to confront with seriousness real and true contemporary history, which, in reality, begins with 1914, that is the years in which Europe stopped being rule of the world.” Consequently, “the student, with regard to the last fifty years, is left at the mercy of means of mass communication. And because these means are in the hands of particular centers of power, the same who impeded a profound renewal of both liberal and Fascist Italy, it is that that critical innovative spirit which is the essence itself of the Resistance… is left not only outside of school but also outside of the juvenile world.” Guido Quazza, “La storia contemporanea nella scuola italiana,” in \textit{Libri di testo e resistenza: atti del convegno nazionale tenuto a Ferrara il 14-15 novembre 1970} (Editori Riuniti, 1971), 27-28.
towards the Germans. From 1962 onward, all but one of the books sampled made similar assertions, likely reflecting both the increasing dominance of this narrative and the textbooks’ increasing coverage of the period (as seen in the correlation between dealing with post-1918 in a non-abbreviated form and mentioning popular support for Allies/partisans and/or hostility to the Germans).

Table 14: Popular Support for the Resistance and Hostility to the Germans in Italian History Textbooks, 1949-1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Publication Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Deals with post-1918 history</th>
<th>Deals with post-1918 history, in an extended, not in an abbreviated form</th>
<th>Mentions popular support for partisans or Anglo-American troops and/or hostility to the Germans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pantheon</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Genti in cammino</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Le vie della civiltà</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Guarino/Sanfilippo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Età</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Mazzali</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. L’uomo de la sua storia</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Nicolini/Consonni</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Il nuovo Pantheon</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Il cammino dell’uomo</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Martinelli</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. La storia</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Zolla</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Popoli in cammino</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Santanastaso</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Il nuovissimo Pantheon</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Manaresi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

600 Same textbooks as cited in Table 6

601 Chronology and/or summary and/or appendix
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Noi e la storia</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Rossi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/No&lt;sup&gt;602&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. L’uomo nei secoli</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Antocicco/ Caliendo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Il tempo e le opera</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Ortolani/ Pagella</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Aspetti di civiltà</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Rossano</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Storia</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Paolucci</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Viaggio nel tempo</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Bacci</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. L’uomo e la sua storia</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Nicolini/ Consonni</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we look at our case study of the *Pantheon* series by Alfonso Manaresi, the 1962 edition was the first surveyed that dealt with these questions outside of an appendix or chronology; the 1957 edition had presented the period as largely a chronology and gave the resistance very little narrative.<sup>603</sup> The 1962 edition portrayed Italians of the RSI as forced to fight on the side of the Germans. According to the textbooks, Mussolini, after his rescue from Gran Sasso mountain by the German SS was “conducted to Germany and reduced at this point to a lifeless instrument of Hitler’s will.” Mussolini, the text continued, “applied himself to *bringing Italy back into the war, on the side of Germany.*” Reentering in Italy, he proclaimed Salò on Lake Garda the seat of government, and tried to revive fascism and force Italians to take up arms on the side of the Germans.”<sup>604</sup> The use of the terms “conducted,” “reduced,” and “forced,” limited Mussolini and Italians’ agency and thus their culpability. The majority of Italians were presented as deeply skeptical of the Italian Social Republic’s values. The text read, “Those who accepted the Social

---

<sup>602</sup> Fascism is treated in a narrative section, but the Second World War is not.


Republic were all in all very few: only a few registered for the new militia, called the National Republic Guard, which was responsible for the odious task of collaborating with the Germans in search for deserted Italian soldiers, in the persecution of the Jews and as far as they dared manifested their aversion to the resurgent fascism.605

In contrast to the RSI, Manaresi’s textbook described the resistance as:

a movement of tenacious opposition to the Germans and to neo-fascism, that took the name of Resistance. It drew its origin far away from the groups of antifascist opposition in refuge abroad (the so-called “exiles”), some of whom were secretly reentering Italy, while the adversaries of the Mussolini regime, already confined or in prison, had been let free by the Badoglio government. This movement, to which also intellectuals and bourgeois belonged, gathered youth who went into hiding in the mountains to escape forced enlistment in the army of the Social Republic and forced labor in the war industries in Germany, as well as the workers, who with strikes and sabotage, obstructed the transportation to Germany of factory equipment. Thus had begun a risky guerrilla warfare with the Italian “partisans” seeking to above all prevent direct reinforcements to German divisions stationed in our territory.606

Manaresi’s text presented a resistenza tricolore narrative, which was originally promoted by, among others, communist Palmiro Togliatti in the immediate postwar period. The resistenza tricolore narrative, like the “Second Risorgimento” narrative, stripped the resistance of its Marxist undertones and therefore allowed it and antifascism to serve as the bedrock of the postwar Italian state. Togliatti promoted such as a narrative because it delegitimized anticommunism, recognized the contribution of Leftists resisters and allowed for the Italian Communist Party [PCI]’s short-lived entry into postwar coalition government.607 As scholar Claudio Fogu described, “In the new version of the story…one could underline the contribution

605 Ibid., 239.
606 Ibid.
607 The term resistenza tricolore refers to the tricolor of the Italian flag. This term is borrowed from: Filippo Focardi, La guerra della memoria: la resistenza nel dibattito politico italiano dal 1945 a oggi (Roma: Laterza, 2005) as cited in Clifford, Commemorating the Holocaust: The Dilemmas of Remembrance in France and Italy (2013), 82.
of Christian Democrats and others as the erstwhile partners of the Communists in the Resistance and in the short-lived postwar governments of national unity."

In an attempt to facilitate this postwar collaboration, many fascist were pardoned for crimes that they committed through the Togliatti amnesty, which in turn facilitated a narrative of amnesia.

Thus, Manaresi presented a largely depoliticized narrative of national unity, which set the many vigorous adherents of the resistance against the few and resentful Italians, who had been forced to work for the Germans and the RSI. Yet, taking into account the size of his textbook, the attention that he paid the resistance was remarkably small. Approximately 1.5 out of a total of 256 pages of the book considered the resistance struggle (0.6 %). Manaresi was of the “old guard” of textbook writers; he had published since during the fascist regime. It would take a new generation of textbook writers in the mid-1960s to create a more ample, accurate, and nuanced narrative of the resistance.

4.1.2 The East German Founding Myth: Socialist & Communist Resisters

From the very beginning, before the East German state was even founded, the instructional bureaucracy made clear that teaching about the resistance to Nazism was central to

---

608 Other communists, however, were unwilling to accept this and emphasized the communist character of the heroic resistance, in what has been termed by historian Filippo Focardi as the resistenza rossa narrative. Donald Sassoon, "Italy after Fascism: The Predicament of Dominant Narratives," in Life after Death: Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europe During the 1940s and 1950, ed. Richard Bessel; Dirk Schumann, Publications of the German Historical Institute (Washington, DC: German Historical Institute, 2003), 268-69. Focardi, La guerra della memoria as cited in Clifford, Commemorating the Holocaust.

609 Paolo Saporito, "Cultural Memory against Institutionalised Amnesia: The Togliatti Amnesty and Antonioni’s I Vinti," Modern Italy : Journal of the Association for the Study of Modern Italy 23, no. 3 (August 2018), http://dx.doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/mit.2018.18.

contemporary history education and the creation of a proper socialist democratic world view.

Instructions issued at a 1948 conference at the state publishing house *Volk und Wissen Verlag* included:

> History reading sheets or historical narratives must address the fight against war and fascism. . . . Such fighters for peace, freedom, and humanity, such as the Scholl siblings, Ernst Thälmann, Karl von Ossietzky, Wilhelm Leuschner and other participants in the German antifascist resistance movement must with their lives, struggles, and deaths take an honored place in our schoolbooks and youth literature.611

Thus, in the socialist zone of Germany the antifascist resistance struggle from the very beginning was very clearly emphasized. What is most interesting, however, is that several individuals held up as heroes by *Volk und Wissen Verlag* were not actually all communists or socialists. While Ernst Thälmann was a famous communist leader murdered by the Nazis, the Scholl siblings were motivated not by socialism, but by Christian faith.612

The first indigenous contemporary middle school history textbook, produced in the GDR in 1952, largely followed these instructions. In this text, the resistance movement in Germany was described as widespread, with participants coming from all parts of society; however, the textbook asserted that the German working-class and communists made up the largest proportion of these antifascists. “This,” the 1952 textbook commented, “is no accident; because the dictatorship of monopoly capitalism was directed above all else against the working class.”613 As historian Jon Berndt Olsen wrote of East German memory culture, “The state needed the public

---

611 H.W. Davis, Textbook Section to Birley, “Attached Papers,” 11 November 1948, attached papers include copy of decree by the North Rhine Westphalia Cultural Ministry on “Approval and Introduction of Textbooks,” correspondence with Mr. Ignatoff from OMGUS, and “Diskussions grundlage für die Autorenkonferenz des Verlages Volk und Wissen am 15 September 1948,” FO 1050/1097, Records Created or Inherited by the Foreign Office, TNA.

612 This was representative of East Germany’s “national front” phase. Jarausch, *Out of Ashes* (2015), 434-35.

to view the communists as the greatest victims so that their triumph (the creation of the GDR) would be even more heroic.” By emphasizing the communists’ victimhood and opposition to the Nazis, East German textbooks created a heroic “other Germany,” of which the postwar East German state was the heir.

While the 1952 textbook emphasized the preeminence of communist resisters, for the most part it did not prioritize or feature any one group over the other. The 1952 textbook (and the 1953 and 1956 revisions) discussed the resistance activities of the Saefkow group, the Schulz-Boysen/Harmack group (also known as the Red Orchestra), the group around Heinz Kapelle, Werner Seelenbinder, Erich Honecker, and the Scholl siblings. Also included were “the reactionary role of the generals in the fight against Hitler” (the July 20th conspiracy, discussed further below), “brave women” such as Liselotte Hermann and Grete Walter, Ernst Thälmann and the National Committee of Free Germany (NKFD)—a group of antifascists and prisoners of war that formed in the Soviet Union during the war. Of all those mentioned, Ernst Thälmann, and his murder by the Nazis in 1944 in Buchenwald, was perhaps the most emphasized in the 1952 East German textbook edition, likely because the East German youth organization that many of the student readers had belonged to was called the “Thälmann Pioneers.”

---


615 This concept of “the other Germany” of “the resistance” providing a mythical redemptive narrative is explored in: Wolfgram, “Getting History Right” (2011), 106-47.


to the textbook, Thälmann was killed because he could have served “rallying point for all
enemies of the Nazi dictatorship.” It further intoned:

Never will our people, never will our youth forget the name of Ernst Thälmann. He is a
symbol of a heroic fight against fascist barbarism, symbol of a life, that was devoted to
the tireless fight for the freedom and happiness of humanity. Therefore, President
Wilhelm Pieck, one of the closest friends and comrades of Ernst Thälmann exclaimed to
the German youth:

‘The shots in the Buchenwald crematorium killed the man, but his spirit lives. In this
spirit let us fight, until we have accomplished his work: Peace for men and friendship
with all free-loving peoples!’

With the exception of the heroic figure of Ernst Thälmann, however, resistance activities
were presented as relatively uncoordinated. In fact, the 1952, 1953, and 1956 editions made a
point of noting at the very beginning of the section on internal wartime resistance in Germany
that “the long-lasting brutal terror of the fascists had torn large painful holes in the ranks of the
communists and weakened the German Communist Party. Therefore, it happened that during the
Second World War in Germany itself there was no large-scale organized resistance
movement.” All of the 1950s editions of the textbooks closed their resistance sections by
pointing out that the resistance, though a “bright light out of the dark night of fascist barbarism,”

619 Ibid., 285.
620 There was slight variation in the wording in this sentence in the three editions, but they largely said the same
thing. The quote in the text is taken from the 1956 edition: *Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Schuljahr*
(1957), 168. For the other sentences, see: Wandel, *Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Schuljahr* (1953), 246;
was isolated from the vast majority of the German people, who had not resisted. Documents from the DPZI from c. 1951 also show the development of this narrative line.

The 1960s editions (published 1960, 1962, 1965) of the East German middle school contemporary history textbooks shifted their narrative emphasis somewhat. The KPD and the NKFD grew in prominence and emphasis and its organizational role was emphasized, abandoning, to some degree, the decentralized resistance narrative of the 1950s textbooks. Andreas Dorpalen made a similar observation of this shift in the portrayal of resistance in East German historiography. As seen in Figure 2, the word count of the textbook section addressing the activities of the NKFD jumped dramatically in the 1960 edition of the textbook. Subsequent mentions of the NKFD were also added to a section addressing the collapse of Nazi Germany, which Figure 3 takes into account. The NKFD was presented as the forerunners of the East German state. “The National Committee showed the way to beat German imperialism and militarism and therefore to save the German people and the German nation. Its program contained thoughts that later found their realization in the German Democratic Republic,” intoned the 1960 edition of the tenth-grade book.

---


622 “Als Ergebnis des Geschichtsunterrichts im 8. Schuljahr ist folgendes zu errichten,” DPZI 230-1, BBF.


624 Doernberg, Rüting, and Schöler, Geschichte 10 (1960), 64.
More than featuring increased discussion about the group, the textbooks from the 1960s presented a narrative of the NKFD at the top of a resistance hierarchy. As the 1960 edition explained: “The National Committee was the political and organizational center of all German
patriots. The movement of the National Committee ‘Free Germany’ developed also in Germany. It allowed the most different illegal resistance groups to join forces.”\textsuperscript{625} The 1965 edition went even a step further. In previous editions, the various resistance groups within Germany, such as the Saefkow group and the Red Orchestra, had been presented as largely separate from the NKFD (although the Sefkow group had shared the same name). The 1965 edition, however, depicted these internal German groups as under the aegis, or at least inspiration, of the NKFD and the KPD. The text narrated, “With the foundation of the National Committee ‘Free Germany’ began a new chapter of the antifascist resistance movement in Germany. The politics of the NKFD agreed with the political line of the illegal working groups in Germany and showed them the direction and goal of the fight.”\textsuperscript{626}

In this same edition, resistance fighters such as Anton Saefkow, Franz Jacob, Berhard Bästlein, Theodor Neaubauer, Georg Schumann, and Robert Uhrig were prominently defined almost entirely by their membership or “functionary” status in the KPD; previously, resistance fighters’ relationships to the KPD had been mentioned, but not emphasized to this extent.\textsuperscript{627} The activities of all these groups were now physically grouped together under the subheading “The antifascist resistance fight in Germany. The founding of the National Committee ‘Free Germany,’” instead of in separate subsections, as they had been in previous book editions.\textsuperscript{628}

This case of the NKFD presents the opportunity to witness the consolidation of a political narrative of a founding resistance myth over time. Once relatively decentralized, although emphasizing communists, the East German textbooks’ resistance narrative of the 1960s was

\textsuperscript{625} Doernberg, Rütting, and Schöler, \textit{Geschichte 10} (1960), 62-64.

\textsuperscript{626} Paterna et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1969), 268.

\textsuperscript{627} Ibid., 270.

\textsuperscript{628} Ibid., 268-71.
sharpened to serve the political end of providing East Germany with a “founding myth,” upon which the SED could base its postwar state.

4.1.3 The West German Founding Myth: Conservative Resistance & The July 20, 1944 Conspiracy

While the East German textbook authors coalesced around the “founding myth” of the NKFD, their capitalist counterparts in West Germany chose a different group of resisters on which to base the Federal Republic’s “founding myth.” Early presentations of resistance in West German schoolbooks focused on two major groups of people: governmental officials and army officers.

The 1951 edition of Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe A included major sections that directly discussed resistance against Hitler. The first section, entitled “Ein unterbliebener Staatsstreich [An Aborted Coup],” outlined plans made by the Foreign Office and members of the army in 1938 to overthrow Hitler between the Godesberg Memorandum and Munich Conference. They had planned to turn upon Hitler once the British refused him the Sudetenland; however, when Chamberlain instead decided to appease Hitler, the coup was called off. Or as the text stated, “Foreign compliance revoked the basis of the putsch plan, which could have given German fate a turn for the good. An uprising against a Hitler, who went from success to success and to whom the statesmen of the leading powers made significant concessions, would be only understood by a few.” 629 The section then finished with a quote by Carl Görderler, who was to be the civilian Reich Chancellor in the case of a successful putsch. “The German people did not want a war; the army would have done everything to avoid it. The world was duly

629 Pinnow and Textor, Geschichte der neuesten Zeit (1951), 155-56.
warned and was informed; if one had taken heed of the warning and accordingly acted on it, then Germany would already today be free of its dictators.” Later editions would be even more explicit in their criticism of the Allied powers. The 1959 edition presented a different version of the Gördeler quote:

The German people did not want a war; the army would have done everything to avoid it. If England and France had just taken the risk of a war upon themselves, Hitler would never have used force. And then he would have been disgraced and not, what is now the case, the good elements of my people. It would have been the end of Hitler.

The textbook thus displaced responsibility for Hitler and Hitler’s actions to the Western Allies, who had not moved with enough conviction against the Nazi dictator.

The second passage in the 1951 edition, located in the section “Leid, Terror und Widerstand im Reich [Suffering, Terror, and Resistance in the Reich], focused on the July 20, 1944 putsch. In summer 1944, German army officers, dismayed by the course of the war, attempted to assassinate Hitler. Colonel Claus Schenk Graf von Stauffenberg planted a bomb in Hitler’s private bunker, the “Wolf’s Lair.” The assassination failed and Hitler’s wounds were only relatively superficial. As such, the putsch was foiled and many of the conspirators were

---


631 Gördeler’s letter was first published as Goerdelers politisches Testament (1945). It was quoted by Gerhard Ritter in his Carl Goerdeler und die Deutsche Widerstandsbewegung (1954), however, Ritter used some ellipses when quoting from the letter, therefore omitting several sentences. The version of the quote that appears in the 1959 edition of the Klett textbook is a condensed version of the Gördeler quote that appears in Gerhard Ritter’s Carl Goerdeler und die Deutsche Widerstandsbewegung (1954).

The quote that appeared in the earlier Klett textbooks appears to have been drawn directly from Goerdelers politisches Testament and therefore includes sentences that had been omitted from Ritter’s work (and the subsequent Klett textbooks.) In both cases, however, the textbooks condensed various segments of 7-page long letter without any markings that they were doing so. Friedrich Krause, ed. Goerdelers politisches Testament: Dokumente des anderen Deutschland mit einer Original-Lithographie und einer Schriftprobe (New York City: Verlag Friedrich Krause, 1945), 57-64. Pinnow and Textor, Geschichte der neuesten Zeit (1959), 157; Gerhard Ritter, Carl Goerdeler und die deutsche Widerstandsbewegung (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt GmbH, 1954).
executed at German army headquarters. The 1951 edition presented the conspirators in glowing terms and depicted them as the forerunners of the new Federal Republic of Germany: “Their love of their country cannot be disputed, just as little as their extraordinary ethical magnitude and their idealism. Their thoughts over the future constitution are in part realized in the Bonn Basic Law (1949).”

The textbooks, however, were working against an obstacle. Initially, many West Germans were uncomfortable with the July 20th conspirators and viewed them as treasonous. Some veteran groups were strongly opposed to the conspirators’ prominent role in the public imagination. For example, Johannes Friessener, the acting chairman of the Verband deutscher Soldaten [Union of German Soldiers] contended that soldiers “cannot condone clandestine attempts to murder his supreme warlord.” When West Germans were surveyed in June 1951, thirty percent judged the men of the July 20th conspiracy negatively and forty percent positively (sixteen percent gave no judgement and eleven percent said they knew nothing about it). In a 1964 survey, when asked if the July 20th officers had served or betrayed Germany, fifty-two percent answered that they had served Germany, while fifteen percent answered that they had betrayed their country. When the question was reframed to ask if it was to an officer’s credit if

---


634 Herf, *Divided Memory* (1997), 326.


he was a member of a resistance group, twenty-nine percent replied that it spoke for him, while thirty-two percent answered that it spoke against him.\footnote{Noelle and Neumann, \textit{The Germans}, 201; Edgar Weick, "Die Wiederspiegung des Widerstandes gegen den Nationalsozialismus in den Schulbüchern," in \textit{Deutscher Widerstand 1933-1945}, ed. Edgar Wieck (1967).} There was clearly a deeply ambivalent public view towards these army officers.

This was problematic for the West German state. For various reasons, beginning in the early 1950s, it was convenient to rehabilitate the men of the July 20, 1944 conspiracy in the public mind. The July 20\textsuperscript{th} conspiracy offered a redemptive narrative that propped up important social classes in the new Federal Republic of Germany Mark Wolfgram explained why this narrative was particularly important to the West German state:

Theater and class help to explain why July 20 became the focus of resistance memory after the war. First, it was the single most dramatic act of resistance attempted by an organized group. The narrative has a central hero, Claus von Stauffenberg, and begins with hope, possibility, tension, and danger. After a clear climax in which the hero has placed the bomb and believes in his success, the narrative ends with betrayal, coincidences guided by the hand of fate, tragedy, failure, and ultimately the death of the hero. The narrative becomes a struggle between the good Germany and the evil embodied in Hitler alone. The failure of the coup plot is told and retold in postwar society as a traditional tragic tale. Second, the heroes of the twentieth also were from the German bourgeois elite. After the war, members of this class within the state, social, and capitalist spheres were in a unique position to trumpet their special status in Germany society and to offer a redemptive message to the masses to help reforge a new social contract.\footnote{Wolfgram, "Getting History Right" (2011), 83.}

An active voice in this regard was FRG president Theodor Heuss. As early as 1952, Heuss publicly referred to the conspirators as representatives of “the other Germany” and on the occasion of a speech to students the Free University about the resistance in 1954, his office corresponded with Max Horkheimer, who wrote:

\textit{A great deal would be gained if, in the new Germany, events such as those of July 20 would serve to educate its citizens. This would accomplish far more than expressions of abstract respect for democracy as such. Democracy is a vague concept, which has no}
automatic link to freedom and justice. It demands the spontaneity of the individual, which cannot be exhausted in formal principles.\textsuperscript{639}

Perhaps as a result of this state push, the \textit{putsch} became increasingly central to the West German textbooks’ narrative in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Although the 1951 edition of the Klett middle school textbook had clearly spoken about the conspirators with admiration, the attention paid to the resistance, in general, and the \textit{putsch}, specifically, increased in the second version of the textbook released by \textit{Klett Verlag (Ausgabe B)} beginning in 1956 and jumped again during a revision of \textit{Ausgabe B} published in 1959 (\textbf{Figures 4 and 6}).\textsuperscript{640} Nor was this an isolated trend in the Klett middle school books. As one can see in \textbf{Figure 5}, the \textit{Wege der Völker} books underwent a similar trend. A major revision in 1957 and the renaming of the series to \textit{Spiegel der Zeiten} [Mirror of the Times] coincided with a consideration of the July 20\textsuperscript{th} \textit{putsch} that used 3.5 as many words more than in the 1955 edition (\textit{Ausgabe A/B}).


\textsuperscript{640} Weiner, "Tendentious Texts."
Figure 4: Word Count of Depictions of Resistance in Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk, Ausgaben A, B, and C641

Figure 5: Word Count of Depictions of Resistance in Wege der Völker, Spiegel der Zeiten, Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk, Ausgaben A, B, and C642
The timing of this increase in both series may have had to do with a number of factors. Initially, it may have been prompted by the rearmament of West Germany in 1954 and the creation of the *Bundeswehr*. Rearmament was heavily opposed by the West German population.\textsuperscript{644} The *Bundeswehr*, which was populated with former *Wehrmacht* officers, needed to be rehabilitated in the public mind, as a whole; connecting the new West German armed forces to the anti-resistance movement of the July 20\textsuperscript{th} conspiracy was a way to do so.\textsuperscript{645} The July 20\textsuperscript{th} *putsch* and the textbooks’ discussion of the conspirators “love of country” and “ethical magnitude” was a great help in this regard, as was the presentation of these bourgeois and noble army officers full of conscience and sacrificing themselves, almost messianically, for their

\textsuperscript{643} Same books as considered in Figure 4.

\textsuperscript{644} Large, *Germans to the Front*, 45-49; Large, "'A Gift to the German Future?'", 53.

\textsuperscript{645} Weiner, “Tendentious Texts.” For more background on the *Bundeswehr*’s relationship with the July 20\textsuperscript{th} conspiracy, see: Wolfgang von Groote, "Bundeswehr und 20. Juli," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 12, no. 3 (1964); Large, *Germans to the Front*, 113, 84; Large, "'A Gift to the German Future?'"
country. In 1957, *Wege der Völker/Spiegel der Zeiten* began utilizing a Stauffenberg quote, which depicted great ethical and religious introspection. He was recorded saying: “We examined ourselves before God and our consciences, it must come to pass.” The 1960 *Kletts Ausgabe B* also included the Stauffenberg quote, as well as one by General Major von Tresckow: “I am still of the fervent belief that we dealt with it correctly. I regard Hitler not only as the nemesis of Germany, but also the nemesis of the world. When of yore God promised Abraham that he would not destroy Sodom, if only ten righteous men were within, I hope also that because of us, God will not annihilate Germany.”

The religious overtones are obvious, not just in close reading, but also when using textual software analysis. When comparing the passages on the July 20th conspiracy of various editions of the West German textbooks published between 1949 and 1968, the term “*Gott*” [God] appears for the first time in the 1958 *Spiegel der Zeiten* and then reappears in five of the eight books of the sample published between 1959 and 1968, often in the contexts of the above quotes.

---


647 Stellmann, *Die neueste Zeit* (1957), 118.


seen in Figure 7, the use of “Gott” reached its height in the 1960 and 1961 editions of *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe B*.

*Figure 7: Relative Frequency of the Term "Gott" in West German Textbooks*

![Figure 7](image_url)

The rise of this robust messianic narrative of the self-sacrificing army officers who had died to redeem their country can be attributed not only to the need to rehabilitate public opinion about the *Bundeswehr*, but also to the increased scrutiny under which the West German textbooks had come in the late 1950s and 1960s. As documented in Chapter 3, a spate of antisemitic incidents, as well as domestic and international criticism of the West German textbooks, prompted a number of internal reviews of how schools were teaching the Nazi past. During this process, the textbook evaluators in Berlin criticized the 1956 edition of *Kletts Ausgabe B* for its “insufficiently handl[ing]” of the resistance, among other things.\(^{650}\) Since the

---

Senator for People’s Education office in Berlin communicated its critiques to the publishers sometime before July 1960, it is not unreasonable to assume that some of the changes in the textbooks’ depictions of resistance in general, and of the July 20th putsch in particular, could be attributed to these evaluations. 651

By 1962, the textbook publishers received more formal instructions. When the KMK published its 1962 “Guidelines for the Handling of Totalitarianism in Instruction,” the resolution’s “methodological advice” included the note that “the stance that the men and women of the resistance and those persecuted by totalitarianism demonstrated, in instruction and also in school holidays, is to be recognized as exemplary.”652 The central place of the resistance in West German textbooks was, therefore, solidified.

Over time, the putsch became a less contentious and perhaps also less relevant issue. By 1970, when asked “Do you by any chance know what happened on July 20, 1944—what took place on that day?” only fifty-nine percent correctly identified putsch. Those that answered either correctly or vaguely (four percent) were then asked “How should one judge the men of the 20th of July in your opinion?” Thirty-nine percent were “in favor,” while only seven percent were against. The remaining fifty-four percent were divided between “unsure of judgement” (seven percent), “no judgement” (ten percent), and “not informed” (thirty-seven percent).653


652 “Richtlinien Für Die Behandlung Des Totalitarismus Im Unterricht (Beschluß Der Kultusministerkonferenz Vom 5. 7. 1962*),” in Sammlung der Beschlüsse der ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland.

It is unclear what effect the schoolbooks might have had on this change of opinion, or if the strong feelings towards the *putsch* simply mellowed with the lapse of time. It is, however, worth noting that the youngest group surveyed (aged sixteen to twenty-nine in 1970) were the most likely to not know what happened on July 20, 1944. If they did know, they were most likely to characterize themselves as “not informed” when asked to give a judgement. At least a segment of this this youngest group would have likely been exposed to the above-mentioned history schoolbooks in middle school during the late 1950s and early 1960s. Perhaps the textbooks were not having the effect that the authors and the educational reformers had hoped. Or perhaps the *putsch* was simply less relevant to young Germans.

Beyond communicating information to the youth, which clearly was not successful in all cases, what was the desired effect of these West German textbook resistance sections? Resistance in West German schoolbooks frequently was presented as the coda to a textbook section about the crimes of the Third Reich. For example, it appeared in the 1951 edition of *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe A*’s section on “Suffering, Terror, and Resistance in the *Reich.*” Consequently, the discussion of resistance often appeared as an answer or a counterbalance to a discussion of Nazi crimes, which, as discussed in Chapter 3, increasingly included the extermination of the Jews of Europe over the course of the 1950s and 1960s.

This linkage between Nazi crimes and resistance narratives was more widespread in public consciousness than just in the physical set up of the schoolbooks. The

654 Ibid.

Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Lehrerverbände [Working Group of German Teaching Organizations, AGDL], for example, issued a “Declaration on the occasion of the Eichmann trial,” in which it wrote that “The impending trial of Eichmann will once more remind the world of the crimes of the Third Reich.” However, the AGDL seemed to fear that the trial and its extensive discussion of the Nazi persecution and genocide of the Jewish people would promote an idea of collective German guilt. In its declaration, which was clearly written for international audiences, as it was translated into both French and English, the AGDL stressed that “it would only be half true if one should try to construe from the past a collective [sic] guilt for all Germans. Though millions of them succumbed to demagogical Nazi propaganda, it is equally true that innumerable Germans offered resistance.” The declaration continued, “At a moment when the dividing line between the guilty and the not-guilty is in danger of becoming blurred, the AGDL feels to stress here these well documented facts of recent history. The AGDL considers this action its right as well as its duty, because in January 1958 it openly spoke up against the resurgence of antisemitism in the Federal Republic.” Essentially, the AGDL felt an outspoken attitude about crimes and antisemitism necessitated an outspoken recognition of resistance. The textbooks seemed to share in this assessment.

656 Since the creation of the German Empire in 1871, there were teacher organizations, often split on confessional grounds. There was a new effort, however, after the Second World war to create a common teacher organization—the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Lehrerverbände [Working Group of German Teaching Organizations, AGDL]. In 1948, deputies of the teacher working groups from the American and British zones met for the first time to attempt to form a common organization; a permanent foundation for the group, meant to represent all teachers in the Western Zones, however, was not set until mid-1949. Phillips, Educating the Germans, 303; Wolfgang Kopitzsch, "Die Gründung der Arbeitsgemeinschaft deutscher Lehrerverbände (AGDL) 1945 bis 1949 und die Entstehung der GEW (ADLLV)," in Georg Eckert: Grenzgänger zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik, ed. Dieter Dowe et al. (Göttingen V&R unipress, 2017); “Declaration on the occasion of the Eichmann trial” from the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Lehrerverbände (April 1961),” [File Pages 096-099], B 304/6137 1 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.

4.2 New Figures in the Narrative

4.2.1 Italy: Introduction of the Leftist Revolutionary Resistance

Like in West Germany, the rise of the resistance narrative in Italian textbooks came at a sensitive and momentous time politically. The DC had “ditched” the political Left in 1947 and, like the CDU in Germany, had dominated the Italian political scene since then. In 1960, however, DC politician Ferdinando Tambroni was forced to step down as prime minister after being discredited by the support of monarchists and neofascists and after the police, on his orders, opened fire on demonstrators in Genoa, Catania, and Palermo. A center-left coalition came to power, supported by left-wing DC parliamentarians and the PSI, in what has been termed the “opening to the Left.”

This political change mattered because there was increasingly an impetus from the Left to include more about the resistance in school. For example, in February 1958, the PCI’s journal on pedagogical developments, *Riforma della scuola* [School Reform] published a letter from teacher Antero Vaj on the question of teaching fascism and the resistance in schools. The journal then solicited responses from its readers on the question “Is it possible and appropriate to teach in elementary and middle schools the history of the fascist ventennio [twenty-year period] and of the Resistance?” They then published a series of responses, many of them from those who had participated in the 1952 conference in Perugia over the course of the year.

---


660 Articles included: Antero Vaj, "Il margine ai programmi scolastici: la storia del ventennio fascista e della resistenza," *Riforma della scuola* 4, no. 2 (1958); Aldo Visalberghi et al., "Il nostro referendum: la resistenza nella scuola: contro la pedagogia del nascondere," *Riforma della scuola* 4, no. 6-7 (1958); Lamberto Borghi et al.,
The resistance narrative reached new relevance in the textbooks in the mid-1960s, as seen in Figure 8. There was a huge increase in the amount of consideration that Italian middle school history textbooks gave the resistance beginning around 1963 and likely linked to the introduction of the scuola media statale the year prior and the new books created for these schools.

Figure 8: Percentage of Textbooks Published between 1949 and 1966 Devoted to Treatment of the Italian Armed Resistance, 1943-1945

While these new history books gave the resistance more attention than Il nuovissimo Pantheon had, they often still reflected the familiar narrative of the resistenza tricolore. The

1966 L’uomo e la sua storia, for example, described the resistance as “intellectuals, employees, workers; men of every political and religious creed.”\textsuperscript{661} As seen in Table 15, six out of the ten books in our sample published after 1960 made a point of describing the resistance in particularly expansive terms, but did not make much of their political identity. Stripped of its revolutionary and subversive character, the resistance “belonged to everybody now” explained historian Alessandro Portelli; it had become a “pillar of the status quo.”\textsuperscript{662}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
Book & Publication Year & Author & Narrative of the resistenza tricolore \\
\hline
1. Pantheon & 1949 & Manaresi & N/A \\
2. Genti in cammino & 1952 & Silva & No \\
3. Le vie della civiltà & 1952 & Guarino/ Sanfilippo & No \\
4. Età & 1954 & Mazzali & No \\
5. L’uomo de la sua storia & 1954 & Nicolini/ Consonni & No \\
6. Il nuovo Panthenon & 1957 & Manaresi & No \\
7. Il cammino dell’uomo & 1959 & Martinelli & No \\
8. La storia & 1961 & Zolla & No \\
9. Popoli in cammino & 1962 & Santanstaso & No \\
10. Il nuovissimo Pantheon & 1962 & Manaresi & Yes \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Narratives of the “resistenza tricolore” in Italian History Textbooks, 1949-1966\textsuperscript{663}}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{661} Nicolini and Consonni, L’uomo e la sua storia (1966), 248.


\textsuperscript{663} Same textbook sample as in Table 6.
Some textbooks published during this period, however, presented a more politically conscious and socially revolutionary narrative. The *Storia* series, written by Silvio Paolucci, and published by Zanichelli in Bologna from the mid-1960s to present day, made a point of explaining the ideological cleavages between members of the resistance. Paolucci (b. 1925), himself of the political Left in a city which is known as “*la dotta, la grassa, la rossa* [the educated, the fat, the red]” wrote:664

> It was clear in fact very quickly that the military goal of the expulsion of the Germans could not be separated from the proposal of creating a “a new state, on the fragments of the old.” Therefore as opposed to the “Badogliano” military formations, for whom the expulsion of the Germans was the ultimate goal to reach, there were established political bands, directed and formed by the antifascist parties, the *Garibaldi* (communist), *Matteotti* (socialist), *Justice and Liberty* (Action party), and *Green Flame* (Catholic) brigades. For these the expulsion of the Germans was just the first act in a revolution that would make Italy a democratic nation, radically eliminating from Italian society the causes that gave rise to Fascism: economic backwardness, social inequalities, omnipotence and corruption of the rulers, lack of liberty of the citizens.665

---


Unlike the other case study textbooks, which were rather vague about the political parties involved in the resistance, the Paolucci text, described by a contemporary observer as “rather demanding, secular, with an ideological hue ‘of the Left’” took care to list them and also to include the Communist party. Paolucci also made clear that these revolutionary parties did not share supporters of Badoglio’s goals; they wanted an entire remaking of the system. As Paolucci’s editor for his books since the 1980s, Luciano Marisaldi, observed, Paolucci was always very invested in representing multiple points of view. Paolucci’s textbook, therefore, represents a step away from the sanitized “all Italian” narrative of the resistance, which stripped it of its radical origins and intentions.

Even the less overly political textbooks, however, pushed this idea of a rebirth or revolution of the Italian nation. While Paolucci expressed this in political terms, the authors of the 1966 L’uomo e la storia, U. Nicolini and D. Consoni, harkened back to the commemorative narratives of the early Italian Republic and presented the struggle in messianic terms:

This, the contribution of blood of Italians for their second rebirth [secondo Risorgimento]; contribution of lives, to which one must join the tears of mothers, widows and orphans; this, the price of redemption of a people that, oppressed for twenty years of dictatorship, once again had been able to demonstrate its constant aspiration, its calling to the ideals of the homeland [patria], of justice, of liberty, of democracy, its combative force, its courage, its value.

And to those who had fallen and suffered, Italy owes not just its liberty which it enjoys, but also the recognition of ex-enemies who made less severe the difficult conditions of peace threatened by the winners, admiring what the Italian people had been able to do to expel the invader and to liberate themselves from the yoke of the dictatorship.”

666 Quote from: Dellavalle, "La storia della resistenza nella scuola media unica," in Libri di testo e resistenza, 59.

667 Marisaldi, Russo, and Giordani, interview.

668 Nicolini and Consonni, L’uomo e la sua storia (1966), 250.
For Nicolini and Consoni, the struggle for freedom “redeemed” the people, leading to a “second
rebirth” or second forming of the Italian state. The parallels to the redemption narrative favored
by the West German *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk* series are uncanny.

The resistance struggle in Nicolini and Consoni’s textbook was a struggle against the
hostile German invader, a struggle against both the German invader and Italian fascists,
presented by Paolucci. Nicolini and Consoni’s depiction of the resistance and Paolucci’s
depiction of the resistance, therefore, represent two narrative streams present in the Italian
textbook market in the mid- to late-1960s. Given the many divisions that existed in Italy in
regard to memory about the resistance, the bifurcation of these textbook narratives is not
particularly surprising.

Italian textbooks of the 1960s therefore began to incorporate new protagonists into its
developing textbook narratives about the resistance, but remained focused on the partisans.
While in many cases, Leftist resisters were amalgamated into an “all Italian” patriotic *resistenza
tricolare*, some books like Paolucci’s 1965 *Storia* began to take tentative steps towards more
differentiated narrative that underlined the differences between the partisan fighters. The full
development of this more nuanced narrative, however, would take many years and will be picked
up again in Chapters 5 and 6.

4.2.2  *East Germany: A Softening towards the July 20, 1944 conspiracy*

East German textbooks, too, began to appropriate new protagonists into their
foundational narrative in the early 1960s. A striking and surprising example of this can be seen
in East German textbooks’ depictions of the July 20th officers’ *putsch*. At first glance, the July
20th conspiracy did not appeal to the East German “socialist lens.” The East German project and its vision of the “other Germany” required communists, not bourgeois army officers, to take center stage.\textsuperscript{669} Indeed East German textbooks harshly criticized the July 20th conspirators, characterizing them as acting in order to “separate themselves from Hitler in order to salvage German imperialism and militarism.” The schoolbooks accused them of not wanting peace and instead desiring to continue the war with the USSR.\textsuperscript{670} The 1952 East German textbook cautioned that “the conspiracy of the generals should not, however, be equated with the resistance fight of the working class. The socialist resistance fighters directed a conscious class war against fascism, they fought for the peace and for the elimination of imperialism, while the Generals of the old imperial order wanted to maintain it.” While the 1952 text acknowledged that some of the conspirators really were “animated by the honest will to replace the fascist dictatorship with a democratic order,” it concluded that “it does not change anything.”\textsuperscript{671}

The representation of the July 20th conspirators had apparently been the object of some controversy. As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, it took the East German state some time to print their own indigenous middle school contemporary history textbooks, even though plans and discussions for these books had begun in the mid- to late-1940s. The first step in creating the indigenous history series seems to have been the development of history lesson plan, which was still under heavy discussion in early 1951. During this process, the DPZI solicited critiques from various individuals on their draft plan. Dr. Emil Hruschka of the DPZI helpfully summarized the critiques in an extensive report. One of the lesson plan reviewers, Werner Richter, apparently

\textsuperscript{669} Woolfram, "Getting History Right" (2011), 121-22.

\textsuperscript{670} Wandel, Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Schuljahr (1952), 283.

\textsuperscript{671} Ibid.
took issue with the fact that the July 20th conspiracy was the “only material event treated,” presumably as opposed to the other resistance depictions, which discussed groups rather than events, although this is unclear based off the documentation. Richter wrote that “July 20th was nothing more than an attempt of the reaction in view of the fixed defeat of fascism to salvage their own plan.” Richter suggested that the July 20th conspirators be compared to the Brussels Party Conference of the KPD, “as embodiment of the plans of the reaction and of progress on the other side. Naturally it must end with a short outlook to the state structures of both the Bonn Separate State [Bonner Separatstaates] and of the DDR.”

But, as Mark Wolfgram observed of news coverage and television programming in the two Germanys, a certain mixing of the protagonists of the East and West German narratives began to occur in the 1960s; the East began to appropriate bourgeois resisters, while the West began to include Leftist figures. A similar phenomenon took place in the school books. In particular, over time, some of the July 20th conspirators received increasingly more attention in the East German textbooks. As seen in Figure 9, while the first July 20, 1944 section present in the 1952 East German textbook was only 181 words, sections in the 1960 edition and the 1965 editions clocked in at 266 words and 358 words, respectively.

---

672 I base this assumption on the eventual structure of the 1952 textbook. Emil Hruschka, Bemerkungen zur Kritik am Geschichtslehrplanentwurf des Deutschen Pädagogischen Zentralinstituts für die Grundschule,” pages 13 -15 March 20, 1951, DPZI, 1024 BBF.


674 Wolfgram, "Getting History Right" (2011), 82.

Even when the July 20th conspiracy had become increasingly central to the Federal Republic’s identity and the conspirators had been largely rehabilitated in the public mind in the mid- to late-1960s, the East German textbooks were not so far behind. The 1965 edition of *Geschichte, Lehrbuch für Klasse 9* discussed the *putsch* in 358 words, as compared to the 1964 *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe B*’s 482 words.676

It should be noted that early on in textbook production, there were moments when the East German textbooks discussed the *putsch* the same amount or even more than some of the West German textbooks on the market (Figure 10). For example, when the *putsch* still retained a heavy negative stigma in early 1950s West Germany, the 1952 East German *Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Klasse* represented it with 181 words, 61 more words than did the 1950

---

edition *Wege der Völker Ausgabe* A and the same as the 1953 *Wege der Völker Ausgabe* A-B.\(^677\)

However, given the fact that there was a free market for textbooks in West Germany as opposed to East Germany, there was far more variation in presentation; the 1952 edition of *Klett's geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe* A presented the *putsch* in 304 words.\(^678\)

---


\(^{678}\)Pinnow and Textor, *Geschichte der neuesten Zeit* (1952).
Increasingly in East German textbooks, some of the conspirators also received a slightly more sympathetic hearing—particularly the figure of Colonel Graf von Stauffenberg. While the 1952 textbook had acknowledged that some among the conspirators did really want democracy, Stauffenberg had not been cited as an example.\footnote{Wandel, \textit{Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Schuljahr} (1952), 283.} However, when new research emerged in the

late 1950s showing that Stauffenberg had attempted to contact the communist and socialist
resistance, he began to be viewed in a more positive light.\textsuperscript{681} One can identify a change in the
representation of Stauffenberg by the 1960 East German textbook revision. While still
enormously critical of the \textit{putsch} in general, the textbook edition published in 1960 characterized
Stauffenberg as patriotic.\textsuperscript{682} The 1965 edition of the textbook identified him as “among the
participants of the conspiracy” who were “honorable men who wanted to serve Germany. Their
goal was an immediate end of the war, the return of the annexed territories, and the creation of a
democratic Germany. They also had contacts with the KPD.” The 1965 edition also featured a
large portrait of Stauffenberg, just as large as that of Ernst Thälmann on the page immediately
following.\textsuperscript{683}

Mark Wolfgram observed similar trends in the discussion of the July 20\textsuperscript{th} putsch in the
SED party newspaper \textit{Neues Deutschland}. He noted that a 1954 article in \textit{Neues Deutschland}
worked hard to paint the July 20\textsuperscript{th} conspirators in as unflattering a light as possible; they had
acted too late and were not fully committed. But by 1959, the tone of the newspaper towards the
\textit{putschists} changed. Now, Stauffenberg was a patriot and the other conspirators’ failings were
their inability or unwillingness to work closely with the communists. A similar narrative was
taken in the East German television program \textit{Revolution am Telefon} [Revolution on the
Telephone], the first major East German television program on the July 20\textsuperscript{th} assassination
attempt, which premiered in 1965. In this TV program, one of the major aspects cited in
Stauffenberg’s favor was that he was willing to work with the Communist resistance, which was

\textsuperscript{681} Wolfgram, "Getting History Right" (2011), 110-11.

\textsuperscript{682} Doernberg, Rüting, and Schöler, \textit{Geschichte 10: Lehrbuch für Geschichte der 10. Klasse der Oberschule} (1960),
57; Nimtz et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1970), 229.

\textsuperscript{683} Paterna et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1969), 277-78.
supported by the NKFD.\textsuperscript{684} Wolfgram cited the Stauffenberg narrative as evidence of a "convergence between East and West German narratives of the German resistance" in the 1980s, but arguably the convergence began as early as the 1960s.\textsuperscript{685}

The rehabilitation of Stauffenberg coincided with the remilitarization of the East German state. Around the same time that a heroic Stauffenberg was introduced into the narrative, the East German National People’s Army was formed (1956). More importantly, compulsory service was introduced in 1962.\textsuperscript{686} The National People’s Army was not entirely popular among the East German populace.\textsuperscript{687} Therefore, it could be argued that the East German textbooks, like in keeping with their West German counterparts, began to appropriate the World War II-era putschists in order to make the German military tradition, as a whole, more attractive.

Accordingly, the relative frequency of terms with the base term “imperialist-” (e.g. Imperialist, imperialistische) decreased over time. On the other hand, relative frequency of terms with the base term “patriot-” increased (Figure 11).

\textsuperscript{684} Wolfgram, "Getting History Right" (2011), 85-86.

\textsuperscript{685} Ibid., 87.


\textsuperscript{687} Ibid., 157.
Thus, while the East German textbooks clearly did not fully embrace the July 20th conspirators, there was clearly a certain ambivalence about them by 1960s. New information about Stauffenberg’s resistance connections, as well as the creation of the East German army, likely prompted the textbooks to moderate their stance against some of the army officers, including Stauffenberg.

4.2.3 West Germany: Incorporation of Socialist and Communist Resisters

---

A similar broadening of the narrative took place in the West German case in the late 1950s and 1960s, also partially prompted by political considerations. As mentioned above, West German textbooks from the 1950s largely preferred to concentrate on resisters who came from the classes and institution that made up the bedrock of the new Federal Republic—conservative politicians, public officials and army officers. However, beginning in the late 1950s and early 1960s, some West German textbook series increasingly began to acknowledge and accept new figures into the narrative, including Leftist resisters, women, and members of the church—thus expanding the definition of “resistance” and the idea of what it meant to resist Nazi rule beyond a strictly military and political realm.

The 1957 *Wege der Völker/Spiegel der Zeiten*, for example, premiered language that mentioned the role of workers and labor leaders when describing the members of the July 20th conspiracy: “They came from all political and religious camps. One found among them Protestants and Catholics, officers and labor leaders, diplomats and students and workers. Among the leading persons were the former mayor Gorderler, Colonel General von Beck and General Field Marshall von Witzleben, the former ambassador to Rome von Hassel and the labor leaders Leuschner and Jakob Kaiser.”  

---

689 Quote from: Stellmann, *Die neueste Zeit* (1957), 117.
representing the Catholic bourgeoisie. While not the traditional protagonists of the resistance narrative, Leuschner and Kaiser could be enveloped in without much trouble.

The first mention of socialist resistance in the Klett series of books came in the 1960 edition of Ausgabe B. It featured a photo of the socialist Julius Leber, with the vague caption “Dr. Julius Leber (SPD; Member of the Reichstag, 1924-1933) before the Volksgerichtshof [People’s Court].” No information was given either in the main text or the caption as to why he came the court or in what year this occurred. The student readers, possessing none of this knowledge, probably ignored the picture, in that case, as it was confusing. The photo did not receive a full description until 1968 Ausgabe C, and even then, Leber’s role in the resistance and the July 20th conspiracy was still very vague: “Dr. Julius Leber in front of the People’s Court. He was born in Alsace in 1891, joined the SPD in 1913, was an officer in the First World War and served until 1920 in the border patrol in the East. He belonged to the Reichstag from 1924; beginning in 1933 he was in detention and in concentration camps multiple times. He was executed in the beginning of 1945.”

The first acknowledgements of Leuschner and Kaiser in Wege der Völker took place in a CDU-dominated Germany, but the increased attention given to Leber in the 1968 edition of Ausgabe C of the Klett series could also be attributed to the rise of the political Left. The Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD], which favored a greater critical engagement with the past, joined a coalition government with the CDU in 1966 and became the most powerful party in

---


691 Leber was a member of the July 20th conspiracy and was tried in later 1944 and sentenced to death. Pinnow and Textor, Um Volksstaat und Völkergemeinschaft (1960), 193; Hoffmann, History of the German Resistance, 1933-1945 (1996), 528-29.
However, it should be noted that all three trade unionist and socialist figures discussed—Leuschner, Kaiser, and Leber—had worked together with Carl Gördeler and Stauffenberg and could still be folded into the dominant West German founding narrative of resistance—the July 20th conspiracy and conservative resistance. None of them were communist or Stalinist and the West German textbooks through the 1960s refrained from mentioning the KPD or the NKFD. As such, Leuschner, Kaiser, and Leber were palatable.

*Wege der Völker* and *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk* were not alone in this pattern. Scholar Edgar Wieck observed that in his sample of 28 West German books, only five discussed the communist resistance directly, although he noted some indirect reference to communist resisters when discussing the “Red Orchestra,” for example. Many of the books, cited by Wieck, that did discuss the communist resistance tended to have been published in the mid- to late-1960s, but even they largely characterized communist resisters as under the control of the Soviet Union and desirous, not of democracy, but of communist totalitarianism. Thus, like the East German textbooks, the West German textbooks appropriated figures that did not initially figure into their narrative—Leftist resisters—but only if they could be successfully incorporated into the “founding myth” base narrative.

---


Other changes in the West German textbook narratives about resistance coincided with new historiographical trends—for example the recognition of female resistance. The early resistance narrative in West Germany was largely male. It was not an accident that in a Cirrus visualization of the section of the 1960 *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe B* considering the July 20th putsch, the term “Männer” [men] was particularly prominent (Figure 12).

*Figure 12: Cirrus Visualization of Most Frequently Used Terms in Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk, Ausgabe B (1960)'s Section on the July 20th, 1944 putsch*695

In sampling 22 middle school history textbooks (from three textbook series) published in West Germany between 1949 and 1971, a similar pattern emerges (Figure 13).

---

Although the trend is not extraordinarily strong, particularly high relative frequencies of the term largely disappear after 1960. *Kletts geschichtliche Unterrichtswerk* Ausgabe B is the outlier in this regard, with a relative frequency of 0.008503 from 1961 to 1967, but it should be noted that the last revision to the resistance section of this textbook took place in 1961; 1962-1967 were simply reprints of the 1961 text. The high incidence of the term “men” could simply have been out of convenience—a term to use instead of “officers” or “conspirators.” But, coupled with the terms “ethical magnitude” and “self-sacrifice” it also reveals also a narrative of heroic “martial masculinity,” connected to self-sacrifice for the “we.”

---

696Same corpus as in Figure 7.

In contrast, the *Wege der Völker / Spiegel der Zeiten* series mentioned women as part of the resistance from the very first volume (1949). This perhaps reflects the progressiveness of its textbook authors and the fact that they made a conscious attempt to include women into their depiction of history.\(^{698}\) In this case, *Wege der Völker / Spiegel der Zeiten* may have been ahead of the curve. Based on the data of the larger corpus of books, one can argue that it was not until the early 1960s, the “male” identity of the resistance became somewhat less important.

This coincided with the rise of an appreciation of non-military or social resistance. Societal, non-military ideas of resistance, were alluded to in early textbooks, such as the 1951 printing of *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtwerk Ausgabe A*, which possessed two sections that briefly mentioned “Christianity and the Church” as being in opposition to National Socialism and also discussed officers and officials failing to follow Hitler’s orders. Other instances of societal non-compliance were largely absent from the Klett resistance narrative until the 1954 edition of *Ausgabe A*, which saw the addition of information about Cardinal Graf von Galen, and the 1956 *Ausgabe B*, which expanded upon the theme in the section on wartime “Resistance.”\(^{699}\)

Beginning in 1956, the “Resistance” section of *Ausgabe B* bore the words: “Men of the Church consistently speak from the pulpit cautionary and admonishing words. Students from Munich, including the Scholl siblings, distribute fliers, in which they call for the overthrow of the regime; they go unbowed to death.” These sentences, focusing on pastors and the Scholl siblings reappeared in every edition of *Ausgabe B* through 1967. A similar sentence also appeared in the
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\(^{698}\) For example, a chapter on the role of women in world history, which held up manuscript completion. Harry B. Wyman, Chief of General Education and Curricula to J.C. Thompson, Chief of Branch, “Present Status of History Books and Manuscripts,” 25 March 1949, Folder 5 “Textbooks,” General Records, 1945-50, Box 126, ECR Branch, Records of the Berlin Sector, OMGUS, RG 260, NACP; Schulze et al., *Demokratie im Werden* (1949), 316.

1968 *Ausgabe* C, but, surprisingly, without mention of the Scholls: “Men of the Church consistently speak from the pulpit cautionary and admonishing word, their sermons copied from hand to hand.”\(^{700}\)

The Klett series underwent a major revision in 1968, with a switch to *Ausgabe* C. Much of the text was completely rewritten; the new sections in *Ausgabe* C focused slightly more on passive disapproval or non-conformism. For example, when discussing the German people’s response to *Kristallnacht*, the textbook contended, “Goebbels made it so the riots seemed to be the spontaneous expression of the people’s fury, but in reality, the German people disapproved of this action.”\(^{701}\) However, the overall emphasis remained on the July 20\(^{th}\) resisters.\(^{702}\)

In the *Wege der Völker/Spiegel der Zeiten* series, the Scholl siblings also appeared in the narrative at a similar time as in the Klett series. Beginning in 1957, the *Spiegel der Zeiten* narrative contained an explicit paragraph explaining that the July 20\(^{th}\) conspiracy, which dominated the resistance narrative in West German textbooks, was just a part of the German resistance movement. Also, in other situations responsible men and women found their way together in order to look for ways to avert the most terrible disaster of the German people. But the secret State Police invariably found the names of the resistance fighters and brought them to the block. So, both Scholl siblings, students from Munich University, who, in pamphlets, had called for German youth to the resistance against Hitler and to the rescue of the Fatherland, were sentenced.\(^{703}\)

By the mid-1960s, the churches and the Scholls were very well-established parts of the West German resistance narrative. Edgar Wieck, in his study of 28 West German textbooks

\(^{700}\) Menzel and Textor, *Staatensystem und Weltpolitik* (1968), 131.


\(^{703}\) Stellmann, *Die neueste Zeit* (1957), 118.
published in the 1960s, noted that almost all the books he surveyed included the resistance of the
churches and the Scholl siblings. In its section devoted particularly to internal wartime
resistance in Germany, the 1957 *Spiegel der Zeiten* still spent 644 words describing the July 20th
conspiracy, as compared to 83 words describing non-July 20th resisters as well as 110 words
describing the military situation at the time of the July 20th *putsch* and 51 words describing
Germany’s losses in the last year of the war. While it did acknowledge that other acts of
resistance occurred in Germany outside of the military officers, the July 20th conspiracy was still,
largely, dominant.

Responding to political exigencies and societal trends, the West German textbooks of the
late 1950s and early 1960s began to embrace a more inclusive narrative that featured Leftists,
women, and the church. But, the male military narrative of the July 20th conspiracy still remained
preeminent and unblemished. It would take many more years for this “founding myth” of the
West German state to be fully deconstructed.

### 4.3 The Resistance Narrative in Postfascist States

The resistance was essential to narratives about contemporary history in these postfascist
states. With so little to be proud of from the previous two to three decades, the resistance
represented a shining light for these postwar states. The resistance narrative also served a dual
purpose: all three states believed that teaching young people about the resistance would allow
them to emulate these heroes and therefore take on an appropriately democratic mindset,
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necessary for the postwar world. More practically, the resistance narrative also allowed these postfascist states to deflect complicity for wartime crimes by presenting themselves as heirs to the resisters, rather than the perpetrators.

But despite these similarities, the resistance did not play exactly the same role in Italian and German schoolbooks and public memory. Although there was public ambivalence towards the resistance in both Italy and West Germany during the postwar years, it can be argued that especially in both German states, the Allied occupiers and postwar politicians had made it clear that the Nazis were irrevocably “evil,” while the resisters were to perceived as “good.” It was easier to identify with the “good” resisters under these conditions (running against the grain of memory and personal experiences) and therefore, the resistance was a part of East German and West German textbooks from the very beginning. Italy, however, was struggling with a more ambiguous legacy. Because of the divided memory of Italian partisans, as well as the more general Italian uneasiness with teaching contemporary history, the resistance did not play as large a role in Italian schoolbooks until the early 1960s, although its role in the schools certainly was a matter of both political and scholarly debate for the decade before that.

Over time, however, in all three states, the resistance narrative expanded, both as a counterpoint to the increasing discourse about crimes, and to include new individuals who had not “belonged” to the original most restrictive narrative. Reflecting new political ruling coalitions that included Leftist parties, the Italian and West German textbook narratives increasingly included socialist and communist resisters. Exhibiting the need for a rehabilitated military tradition as East Germany rearmed, the socialist textbooks began to redeem the figure of Stauffenberg. These changes over the course of the late 1950s and early 1960s demonstrate that
these resistance narratives were never stagnant and were very much tied in with the postwar states’ political needs and exigencies. They would continue to shift over time.

**Part II Conclusion**

For the postfascist states, narratives about complicity and resistance were two sides of a precariously balanced see-saw. Thus, it is not illogical that an increase in one necessitated an increase in another. As a wave of neo-fascist and neo-Nazi youth activities, as well as domestic and international pressure (at least in the West German case), forced West Germany and Italy in the late 1950s to increasingly concern itself with Nazi-era crimes, a counterbalance was needed. If teaching children about crimes was to demonstrate to them “what not to do,” education about the resistance was designed to provide figures for emulation. Thus, the resistance narrative grew in importance in these two countries’ textbooks during this transitional time, as well. East Germany, whose criticism of West Germany prompted some these shifts in Holocaust education, felt similarly pressed to include an increasingly detailed depiction of Nazi-era crimes. But, just as in West Germany and Italy, this increase in coverage of Nazi oppression of Jewish victims coincided with an increasingly pointed resistance narrative.

By the mid-1960s, the textbooks in all three of our subject states clearly established that there were both perpetrators and resisters in their countries during the war, but most textbooks did not talk about the relative numbers of these groups. With the exception of some early East German books, they did not discuss with any honesty how the general population of “ordinary Germans” and “ordinary Italians” reacted to these perpetrator or resistance activities. A true grappling with the general populations’ compliance to dictatorial rule and lack of assistance for the resistance would only come in later years.
PART III: THE MEMORY BOOM, 1968 TO 1988

When one speaks of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* [coming to terms with the past], there are certain touchpoint events, which most scholars reference. These include the 1968 student revolts, the 1978 broadcast of the American miniseries “Holocaust,” and the growth of “the memory industry” in the 1980s. But the “big picture” events that scholars usually cite when discussing the development of Holocaust memory had little or, at least, delayed effects on the textbooks, most of which had very well-established narratives at this point. Interestingly, the 1978 miniseries, which is credited for having brought the term “Holocaust” into public parlance, had no such lexical effect on the textbooks; none of our three subject states’ textbooks adopted the term. The textbooks seemed increasingly in their own world.

While much of the narratives about the Nazi/fascist past remained shaped by the national particularities and structures discussed in Parts I and II, Part III witnesses the early steps towards converging narratives in our three subject countries. Some of the earliest evidence of convergence actually began slightly earlier. The new generation of textbooks, created in the 1960s, increasingly used pictorial and visual evidence. Placing the textbooks from our three subject countries side by side, it becomes clear that they included some of the very same
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photographs. Beginning in the mid-1960s, the same picture of Stauffenberg in profile as a young officer appeared in both West and East German textbooks.\textsuperscript{708} Around the same time, the same photo of a Jewish child being rounded up in the Warsaw ghetto appeared in some of the textbooks in all three of our subject states.\textsuperscript{709} A transnational pictorial vocabulary was being developed to deal with certain issues, although these pictures were mediated through pre-established narratives about complicity and resistance.

Later evidence of convergence can be seen in the 1980s, with all three states’ textbooks’ now featuring prominent narratives on the persecution and murder of Europe’s Jews across our three subject states and West Germany and East Germany offering increasingly similar resistance narratives. This greater emphasis, like the common pictorial vocabulary, however, continued to be filtered through the national narratives established in the 1950s and 1960s. In particular, the Italian textbooks’ depictions of the resistance still dwarfed (and at times engulfed) narratives about the Holocaust.\textsuperscript{710} A class struggle narrative also still shaped East German textbooks’ increasingly large discussion of the persecution of Europe’s Jews.

\textsuperscript{708} The photo appears for the first time in the 1965 edition of the East German textbook: Paterna et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1969), 277; Pinnow and Textor, \textit{Um Volksstaat und Völkergemeinschaft} (1960), 192.


\textsuperscript{710} As was common in Italian memory culture: Gordon, "Which Holocaust? Primo Levi and the Field of Holocaust Memory in Post-War Italy."
Part III will therefore provide an overview of educational and textbook developments around narratives of complicity and resistance from the late 1960s to the late 1980s. If Part II described the construction of precariously balanced see-saw of narratives of complicity and resistance, Part III will investigate if this see-saw was ever imbalanced and, if so, why.
AFTER THE PROTESTS: THE TEXTBOOKS FROM 1968 TO 1978

The historian Jeremy Suri wrote, “Like the window on a museum display case, the year 1968 separates us—physically and symbolically—from a world that appears appreciably different.” The global revolutions of 1968 have captured historian’s and ordinary peoples’ imaginations. The year 1968 (and the years surrounding it) was marked by challenges to the political, social, and cultural order. At the center of these revolutions were young people, challenging recognized authority. Although the unrest took place throughout the globe and many experiences were common, citizens in each country experienced 1968 in different ways and had different grievances, according to national and local circumstances. 711

In Italy and in West Germany, the ‘68er generation marshalled elements of the past in its political rhetoric—including the terms “fascism” and “Nazism.” As historian Emiliano Perra has explained, “Fascism and Nazism were constantly evoked in the cultural and political arena during the 1968 revolt and the long wave marking its immediate legacy throughout the 1970s in Italy” in order to discredit the parent generation. 712 In the Italian context, the student movement also explicitly identified with the “Resistance,” particularly the revolutionary partisans. 713 Protesting workers in Italy also drew upon the image of a rivoluzione mancata [missed

712 Perra, Conflicts of Memory (2010), 84.
revolution].\textsuperscript{714} In West Germany, the terms “fascism” and “Nazism” were also often rhetorically employed by the student movement. For example, in West Berlin, at a meeting after the 1968 shooting of the West German student Benno Ohnesorg, a student activist called out, “They’ll kill us all—you know what kind of pigs we’re up against—that is the generation of Auschwitz we’ve got against us—you can’t argue with the people who made Auschwitz.”\textsuperscript{715} “Auschwitz” was employed as an illustration of the barbarity of the older generation; but its mention did not signify a true reckoning with the complicity in past atrocities.

For the most part, this discussion of “fascism” and “Nazism” among the revolting students and workers lacked historical specificity. They were simply concepts applied to contemporary problems. As historian Ben Mercer, who analyzed the use of the term “fascism” in student movements in West Germany, Italy, and France, wrote, “As the comparative approach here demonstrates, the student movements—in West Germany as elsewhere—arose primarily to engage not the past but the present: not the heritage of fascism but the limitations of postwar democracy.” In general, the students were not concerned with actual Nazis, but with latent authoritarianism in their societies.\textsuperscript{716} Rudi Dutschke, a student activist in West Berlin who had grown up in East Berlin, for example, spoke of a “new fascism” which “reveals itself through the organized authoritarian institutions in all parts of the advanced capitalist society.” Examples of “structures of authoritarian-fascism” included the university, West German imperialism, and American imperialism.\textsuperscript{717} At times, the definition of “fascism” was made even more diffuse. The

\textsuperscript{714} Fogu, "Italiani Brava Gente," in \textit{The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe}, 156.


\textsuperscript{716} Mercer, "Specters of Fascism: The Rhetoric of Historical Analogy in 1968."

West German journalist Richard Kaufmann wrote in 1968, “Whoever moves a while in the circles of students and pupils knows that in the youngest generation the concept of fascism plays a key role. The Vietnam War? Fascist! Relations to the DDR? Bourgeois-fascist. Grand Coalition, emergency laws, press concentration: signs of the oncoming fascist storm! What, however, is the definition of this keyword to the German soul?”\(^718\) As the historian Konrad H. Jarausch described in the West German case, “But stretching the term ‘fascism’ to impugn all and sundry forms of authority and to reject ‘bourgeois secondary virtues’ like honesty or cleanliness deprived the concept of analytical utility.”\(^719\)

One of the things that “fascism” was ironically stretched to include was the State of Israel. In Italy, conflicts in the Middle East involving Israel led to a split between most of the Italian Jewish community and the communist Left; while the former pushed for a discussion of the particularity of Jewish suffering, the latter (represented in the 1968 movements) largely avoided the topic or embraced a generic antifascism to avoid expressing support for Israel.\(^720\) The issue of Israel also became divisive among the radical Left in West Germany after June 1967, as well. The shooting of Ohnesorg at protest opposing the Shah of Iran was closely followed with the outbreak of the Six-Day War; the resulting upheaval turned the West German New Left against Israel, which became identified as “fascist” and compared to Nazi Germany.

On the thirtieth anniversary of \textit{Kristallnacht}, a bomb was found in the Jewish Community Center in Berlin. A racial leftist group called “Black Rats, Tupamaros West Berlin” [\textit{Schwarze

\(^718\) As cited in: Mercer, "Specters of Fascism."


\(^720\) Perra, \textit{Conflicts of Memory} (2010), 80-85.
Ratten TW] took responsibility in a statement, in which they claimed that “the previous silence and theoretical paralysis of the Left regarding the conflict in the Middle East is a result of the German guilty conscience” 721 They continued, “Every hour of memory in West Berlin and in the FRG suppresses the fact that Kristallnacht of 1938 is today repeated every day by the Zionists in the occupied territories, in the refugee camps and in Israeli prisons. The Jews who were expelled by fascism have themselves become fascists who, in collaboration with American capital, want to eradicate the Palestinian people.”722

A similar line was taken in the socialist East Germany with regards to Israel. Initially, East Germany, and the entire Soviet bloc, had supported Israel. But Soviet policy reversed in 1949 around the time of the “anti-cosmopolitan purges;” the Soviet bloc increasingly began supporting Arab countries. Beginning in 1967, East Germany’s support of third-world anti-imperialism led the socialist state to attack Israel both rhetorically and materially, by providing weapons, military training, and diplomatic support to Israel’s opponents in military conflict. As historian Jeffrey Herf explained, “Once the Communists in the East and the radical Left in West Germany identified Israel with Nazi Germany, they managed to define the struggle against Israel as the antifascism of the period from the 1960s to 1980s.”723

Perhaps because of this upsurge in rhetoric about the fascist past, concentrated around 1968, some scholars have contended that the late 1960s and early 1970s served as a turning point in how the Nazi/fascist past was represented—both in general memory and in particularly in the
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722 As cited in: Herf, Undeclared Wars with Israel, 104.

723 Ibid., 5-9, 22, 33-74.
realm of education. For example, scholar Falk Pingel wrote in 2006 that the late 1960s and 1970s were a “period of change” in education about the Nazi past in West Germany. He attributed this supposedly large shift to the economic crisis of the 1970s and the student revolts in West Germany. According to Pingel, a new generation “growing up at this time [which] had not experienced National Socialism (except maybe as children) and questioned the interpretations prevalent in society.” Pingel generalized further, “This ‘break’ between the war-generation and the post-war generation was by no means limited to Germany.”

However, despite these vast political changes—including the students’ call for a reckoning with the fascist past and the Left’s changing relationship with Israel—this chapter argues that educational policies in West Germany, East Germany and Italy with regards to the Holocaust and resistance during the Second World War stayed relatively consistent. Despite the scholarly conception that the late 1960s (particularly 1968) served as a break, there was still a remarkable continuity in attitudes and educational practices between the mid-1960 and the early 1970s. Continuing the trend of the 1960s, the 1970s textbooks considered in greater detail the suffering and the persecution of the Jews during the Nazi regime. What was new and novel in the 1970s in the textbooks, especially in our two western case studies, was new attention to “ordinary people” during the Nazi/fascist era in their acts of resistance, but also, at times, in their acts of compliance. This time period was also marked by the introduction of more active methods in history instruction—including discussion questions, primary source analysis, and visits to sites of memory.
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724 Pingel, "From Evasion to a Crucial Tool of Moral and Political Education," in What Shall We Tell the Children?, 137-38.
5.1 Schooltime Recollections

Some of the most striking evidence of consistency is seen in autobiographical accounts from this period. Many Germans who attended school during the late-1960s and 1970s felt impelled in the 1990s to record their experiences of “coming to terms with the Nazi past,” particularly during their school days. Thus, a boom of memoirs and life writings appeared on the scene. Unfortunately, such a boom did not take place in the Italian context.

These writings are, as suggested by their time of composition, “self-reflexive” in nature. They should not be taken as evidence that a 14-year old school child in the 1970s was necessarily aware of the complex socio-political dynamics of remembering a “dark chapter” in the divided Germanys. Yet, the self-reflexive nature of these memoirs also makes them helpful for our investigation. The writers, for whom more than twenty years had passed since their school days, were able to identify trends and, make comparisons between various decades.\(^{725}\) If we take these memoirs as a whole, we can start to make some generalizations about what may have taken place on the classroom level.

For example, one thing that becomes apparent is that there were still members of the West German teaching corps who spoke about the Nazi past with admiration or nostalgia into the 1970s. What Dany Diner (b. 1946) referred to in Chapter 3 as a “superficial anti-Nazism…superimposed by the school curricula” still had not fully permeated.\(^{726}\) For example, Elena Lappin, a Czech of Jewish origin who emigrated with her parents to West Germany after
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\(^{726}\) Diner, Smith, and Postone, "Fragments of an Uncompleted Journey: On Jewish Socialization and Political Identity in West Germany,” 60.
the Prague Spring of 1968, recalled: “German reactions to my Jewishness would range from awkward philo-Semitism to cautious anti-Semitism, depending very much on the person I was dealing with as on the circumstances of our encounter. Thus, the same teacher would ask me solicitous questions about my family’s past, and on a different occasion mutter something concerning ‘all those lies about the camps.’”

Although the 1960s was marked by generational shift in the teaching corps, many still were veterans of the war. Thomas Feibel (b. 1962), born to German-Jewish parents in Santiago de Chile, emigrated back to Mannheim, West Germany in 1968 and recounted:

History was taught by the principal. He would swagger up to his desk. With his briefcase, an arsenal of ballpoint pens and pencils, and a sponge he would portray for our benefit the tragic course of the Russian Campaign. This armchair soldiering was based on his personal participation in the Second World War. He would imitate the noise of the tanks’ engines, the machine gun fire. His voice would grow louder and louder, his face would flush. We got the impression that at home he must have a scale model of the entire theater of war.

Although acting all this out gave him great pleasure, he never failed to urge the cause of peace. ‘This campaign, in the depths of winter, dear children—and you can’t begin to imagine what a winter! —was the worst thing Hitler did to us Germans,’ he would say after the little battle. Then his glance would catch mine out of the corner of his eye. I had followed his antics with as much fascination as my classmates. ‘Except of course for that business with the Jews,’ he would add, as if on command.
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728 Generational shift discussed in: Sven Beckert, "Quiet and Ashamed We Face the History of Our Town," in Remembering the Holocaust: Some Experiences of the German President's History Competition for Young People (Hamburg: Körber Foundation, 1995), 7-8.

It should be noted, however, that Diner, Lappin, and Feibel were all from Jewish backgrounds and therefore might have been more attuned to these issues than the average West German schoolchild.

Continuities between the 1970s and earlier decades can also be observed in the East German case. For example, the tradition of having resistance fighters come speak in schools, described in Joel Agee’s account of East German schools of the late 1940s and early 1950s, also appears in the memoir of Ingo Hasselbach (b. 1967). Hasselbach attended *Oberschule 31: Hilde Coppi*, named after the resistance fighter who, with her husband, had been killed by the Nazis. Their son Hans Coppi Jr., who was born while Hilde had been incarcerated in Plötzensee prison, came to school once a week to discuss anti-fascism with the students. Ingo recalled that Hans would tell them, “You must fight fascism all around you and forever. You must fight because of my mother, my mother who was guillotined for your right to live under socialism! The Nazis executed her, and therefore it is your *duty* and your *responsibility* to keep fighting for her.”

These visits did not always have the intended effect. Hasselbach, who eventually became a neo-Nazi, recalled, “I hated Coppi’s lectures. He was arrogant, and his every gesture had an air of smugness about it. . . . The more I listened to this boring, repetitive, and wooden little fellow, the less attractive ‘anti-fascism’ seemed, the more like a form of oppression. Most of the rest of the class swallowed it hook, line, and sinker, but there was a small group of kids upon whom, like me, Coppi’s lectures had the opposite of their intended effect: we were being turned *against*
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the idea of, anti-fascism.” Hasselbach seemed to attribute his turn towards fascism to the East German state’s push against it.

Clearly, many of the same instructional strategies were being pursued in the two Germanys across the decades. From these autobiographical accounts, it becomes apparent that West German or an East German history classroom from the 1970s looked very similar to one in the 1950s, but with some shifts in emphasis. Similar continuities can also be observed in textbook narratives about complicity and resistance.

5.2 Jewish Suffering

Representations of Jewish suffering in the textbooks did not change that much over the course of the 1970s. West Germany continued to be the only one of our subject countries whose textbooks dealt with the specifically Jewish identities of many of the Nazis’ victims and asked students self-critical questions about popular complicity; in Italy and East Germany, the Jewish identities of victims were briefly acknowledged, but then subsumed under more convenient national narratives, which exculpated the state. These were very similar tendencies to what was seen in schoolbooks from the early- to mid-1960s, although throughout the 1970s, there was increasing amount of instructional material devoted to teaching students about the genocide of the Jews.

731 Ibid.

5.2.1 Italy

Many of the same deficiencies in Italian textbooks’ narrative about Jewish suffering that were identified in the textbooks published in the early 1960s in Chapter 3 continued to be issues throughout the 1970s. The Italian racial laws of 1938, if mentioned at all (as late as 1980, the series Il cammino della storia was not mentioning them), were presented as something external to the Italian spirit and the Italian state, adopted only to conform to the alliance with Germany. The murder of Europe’s Jews was dealt with only in a relatively perfunctory manner and the persecution of Jews on the Italian peninsula was barely mentioned and if mentioned, was used to illustrate Italian resistance to the Nazis. For example, as discussed in Chapter 3, the 1965 book Il tempo e le opere wrote of the Catholic Church’s resistance to the Nazis during 1943-1945 and noted that “The Jews in particular experienced the efficiency, zeal, and humane and divine warmth of the Christian institutions.” This particularly problematic text was reprinted through 1970, but was eliminated when the text underwent a major revision before its re-release under the new name I giorni della storia in 1971.

Part of the persistence of these issues can be explained by the fact that, like in West Germany, some longstanding textbook series, despite being published in various editions and under various names, often were not fully revised. For example, Il tempo e le opere, published by
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734 Ortolani and Pagella, Il tempo e le opere (1965), 343.

the Florentine printing house Le Monnier, continued use the same text and photos discussing the persecution and murder of Europe’s Jews from its first edition in 1965 through its fourth edition in 1969. 736

The text was revised before being published as *I giorni della storia* in 1971, but only in certain parts. The persecution and genocide the Jews was not actually dealt with in any depth in the textbook narrative. In the first edition (1971) and second edition (1974) of *I giorni della storia*, for example, the genocide of the Jews was only depicted in pictures and selected primary source readings at the end of a chapter on “The Resistance and the Italian Republic.”737 In the 1984 edition, the treatment was similar, although the chapter had been renamed “The ‘Resistance’ and the Anglo-Russian-American Victory.”738

While the text mentioned that Jews were a particular target of the Nazis, there was a certain amalgamation of victims. The number of Jewish victims of the Holocaust was never cited. In the 1974 edition, a segment from Anne Frank’s diary appeared alongside an excerpt from ex-partisan Piero Caleffi’s memoir. The textbook entitled Caleffi’s excerpt “A survivor of an extermination camp speaks.” But no distinction was made between the experience of Frank, a Jewish child, and Caleffi, a non-Jewish adult partisan, despite the fact that Caleffi been incarcerated at Mauthausen, which was not an extermination camp.739 It may have been that the


textbook writers simply did not have a firm grasp of what qualified as an “extermination camp.” Anne Frank, for example, was also described as having died in a “German extermination camp,” while we know that she died of typhus in Bergen-Belsen.

Some textbooks, however, paid more attention to Jewish suffering. Silvio Paolucci in his *Storia* series, for example, devoted a great deal of space to the persecution and genocide of the Jews. Paolucci “probably had a personal incentive” to study themes related to the persecution of the Jews due to his marriage to a Jewish woman, noted his long-time editor Luciano Marisaldi. Marisaldi also contended and—this is born out through comparison to other textbooks—that Paolucci dealt with the persecution Jewish “in an attentive and very aware manner, very advanced for the time.” From the series very first edition in 1964 [the volume on contemporary history appeared in 1965], the legal persecution of the Jews in Germany was outlined in a section on Nazi Germany in the 1930s. Jewish victims of genocide were discussed in the first half of the chapter on “The New Order: The Victims and the Rebels,” renamed simply “The Victims and the Rebels” in the 1983 edition.

The chapter “The New Order: The Victims and the Rebels” began with a profile of David Rubinowicz, who was twelve years old in 1939 when the Germans invaded Poland. As the text explained, “But the destiny that awaited David and his family was more terrible than that reserved [riserbato] for his compatriots, since David was not only a Pole, but also a Jew.” The textbook narrated.

So David Rubinowicz followed the destiny of his family and of millions of other Jews from Poland and from all of Europe: vanishing one day, in some ghetto, killed by hunger
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740 Marisaldi, Russo, and Giordani, interview.
or illness, or perhaps some soldier of the S.S. made him the target of the bullets in his revolver, to demonstrate to his fellow soldiers the precision of his aim. But it is more probable that he found death in the gas chambers of some concentration camp, in the middle of some thousands of his coreligionists and that his body was incinerated in one of the crematorium ovens connected to the camps.

This description, in addition to excerpts from Rubinowicz’s diary, appeared in all of the editions of Paolucci’s Storia published in the 1960s and 1970s. In fact, the whole chapter “The New Order: The Victims and the Rebels” appears to have been reprinted largely without revision in the three first editions of the book—1964/5, 1970, and 1974. The section described the concentration camp system and its victims, who were “not just the Jews and political adversaries of the Nazis, but also prisoners of war and finally German common delinquents, thieves and killers taken out of prisons.” But, although the textbook described the camp system at length and how it contributed to the “degradation of the human being,” it did not differentiate between Buchenwald, Dachau, Mauthausen, and Auschwitz (all of which it called “extermination camps”), nor did it give the number of Jewish victims of the Holocaust, even in its 1974 edition, which was reprinted into the 1980s. It did, however, give the total number of the “victims of the concentration camps,” which it placed at eleven million.

Yet even in Paolucci’s books, victims were presented alongside rebels. The link was, interestingly enough, Anne Frank. Portions of the young Jewish girl from Holland’s diary were reprinted in the textbook and described as a “voice of hope and rebellion.” The textbook

---


743 Paolucci, Ottocento e novecento (1970), 312.

744 The number of Jews killed was added in the 1983 edition. Paolucci, Ottocento e novecento (1980), 289-91; Paolucci, Ottocento e novecento (1984), 273.
explained that “these words, so rich in faith for the future, despite the anguish of the present, resounded in occupied Europe. Many others, other than Anne Frank, continued to believe that man was destined for something different than creating extermination camps for his counterparts.” This hope for the future was described as the “dominant sentiment of many who organized the resistance to Nazism.” Thus, even Paolucci’s book series, so ahead of the other Italian series being published at the time, engaged in this blurring between victims and resistance fighters.

But this blurring of victims also speaks to an Italian tendency to equate “the Holocaust” with the entire concentration camp system, which, as the historian Robert Gordon explained, allowed for:

a slippage which suggests Italian victims might include not only Jews, but also the approximately 30,000 political prisoners (mostly captured Resistance fighters) deported to Mauthausen, Gusen, and similar camps; and potentially the vast number — up to 750,000 — of Italian soldiers interned and forced into labour camps by the Germans following Italy’s armistice with the Allies in September 1943.”

If the victims of the Nazi camp system were thus presented as a broad group of people, including Jews, partisans, and Italian soldiers, this allowed for shared Italian victimhood and displacement of complicity fully onto the Germans. It also allowed for the anti-fascist “rebirth” myth of the Italian nation. Clearly, Jewish suffering and resistance fighters continued to be bound together in Italian textbook narratives through the 1970s and into the 1980s.

---


746 Gordon, "Which Holocaust? Primo Levi and the Field of Holocaust Memory in Post-War Italy," 90.

747 Ibid., 91.
5.2.2  *East Germany*

East German textbooks from the 1970s had a number of similarities to Italian books when it came to the depiction of the genocide to the Jews. Similar to what we saw in the Italian books, for the most part, there was a great deal of continuity between East German textbooks depictions from the 1960s and the 1970s, although the books of the 1970s devoted an increasing amount of space to the concentration camp system. However, Jewish suffering continued to be sublimated in the narrative to meet the state’s nation-building needs.

Like the 1965 edition, the 1970 edition of *Geschichte 9* spent a fair amount of space discussing the persecution of the Jews, including the Nuremberg race laws and *Kristallnacht.*  

When describing the concentration camp system, the book explained:

> A particularly hard lot was faced by the communists, anti-fascists, and those persecuted on racial groups, especially the Jews, who were imprisoned in *concentration camps.* Hundred-thousands of Soviet citizens added to the numbers of prisoners from all European countries, including from Germany. Over eight million people of different nations and classes, primarily workers, communists, Soviet citizens, progressive members of the intelligentsia, and Jews were cruelly murdered in the concentration camps.

This passage stood opposite of a picture of train tracks leading into a concentration camp gate. The picture was accompanied with the caption, “The camp gate of Auschwitz-Birkenau, through which millions of people were transported into the gas chambers of the fascists.”  

The next page bore a large map of the concentration camps, extermination camps and ghettos throughout Europe, with a caption stating: “The fascist concentration camps in Europe during the Second

---


World War.”\textsuperscript{750} The same map, with the same caption, had appeared in the 1965 edition, as well.\textsuperscript{751}

This same page also featured excerpts from a correspondence between IG Farben and KZ Auschwitz. The correspondence presented in the 1970 edition of the textbook concerned IG Farben’s request for female prisoners for use in sleeping pill experiments. The correspondence ended with the excerpt: “The experiments were carried out. All the subjects died. We will notify you shortly concerning a new delivery.”\textsuperscript{752} This section of the textbook was clearly present in order to demonstrate the complicity of German capitalist industry. As the 1970 East German teaching aid for Class 9 instructed, “Name the war criminals who today still live in West Germany!” The history teaching aid also provided among its instructional questions: “Why can the named war criminals still live in West Germany unchecked (educational focus!)?”\textsuperscript{753} The role of IG Farben in the concentration camp system had been discussed in East German textbooks as early as 1952, so this thematic point would not have been new to the teacher or student reader.\textsuperscript{754}

Like in previous iterations of the East German schoolbook, Jews were mentioned as a targeted group by the Nazis. Antisemitism was even presented as the most severe manifestation of Nazi racial theory and according to at least one teacher report, this section was taught and even emphasized.\textsuperscript{755} Yet, in the textbook, in accordance with the Dimitrov Doctrine, Jews were

\textsuperscript{750} Ibid., 207.

\textsuperscript{751} Paterna et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1969), 252.

\textsuperscript{752} Nimtz et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1970), 209.


\textsuperscript{754} Wandel, \textit{Lehrbuch für den Geschichtsunterricht, 8. Schuljahr} (1952), 265.

\textsuperscript{755} Nimtz et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1970), 157. For teacher report, see: “Fragespiegel zum Geschichtsunterricht Klasse 9,” APW 9384-1, BBF.
bundled in with “workers, communists, Soviet citizens, progressive members of the intelligentsia.”\textsuperscript{756} The special nature of the persecution and murder visited upon them was not fully acknowledged. Furthermore, like in the 1965 edition of the textbook, in the 1970 edition, the number of 6 million Jews killed in the Holocaust was absent.

Interestingly, however, the number was included in the 1970s iterations of the Unterrichtshilfen [teaching aid] associated with Geschichte 9. Klasse. The first iteration of the teaching aid appeared in 1970 (coinciding with the textbook 1970 revision of Geschichte 9). The teaching aid went point by point through the Lehrplan [curriculum or subject plan], which corresponded almost exactly to the sections of the Geschichte 9 textbook. In the “teacher lecture” portion of the lesson on “The Potsdam Agreement and the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials,” the teaching aid told instructors to explain that the city of Nuremberg had been closely tied to the Nazi regime and was “the city of the criminal Nuremberg Laws of 1935, which allowed for the murder of 6 million Jews.”\textsuperscript{757}

Why then did the number of Jewish deaths disappear from the textbooks in the 1965 and 1970 editions, if it was still included in the teaching aids first published in 1970? This is an interesting question, which yields no good answers.\textsuperscript{758} It suggests that what students learned about Jewish suffering in the classroom was very teacher-dependent. Furthermore, it epitomizes the ambivalent attitude that East German educational materials seemed to have towards representing Jewish Holocaust victims suffering, with the evidence present, but somewhat

\textsuperscript{756} For more the Dimitrov Doctrine, see Chapter 3.


hidden. Perhaps this is why some individuals who went through the East German school system
do not remember learning about the Auschwitz or the Nazi murder of the Jews.\footnote{Hasselbach and Reiss, \textit{Führer-Ex: Memoirs of a Former Neo-Nazi} (1996), 61.}

Another example of this ambivalent attitude be seen in the section of the 1970 textbook
that dealt with the “Results of the Second World War.” Here, there was some interesting
discussion about the numbers of wartimes deaths, which illustrated East German thinking about
Jewish victims. The text explained:

The German people had after the peoples of the Soviet Union and Poland the largest
number of victims. Among the around six million German dead were approximately
410,000 bombing victims. 7.5 million were homeless. Around 270,000 people of Jewish
background were forced to emigrate until 1941. Of the remaining around 240,000 Jews
the fascists killed more than 80 percent. 200,000 Germans perished in the fascist
concentration camps and jails.\footnote{Nimtz et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1970), 237. The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum estimates that 165,000 German Jews died in the Holocaust, which, if we accept the East German number of 240,000 Jews in German in 1941, would be a death rate of 68%, rather than the 80% cited in this quote. \textit{Holocaust Encyclopedia}, s.v. "Jewish Losses During the Holocaust: By Country," accessed January 15, 2020, https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/jewish-losses-during-the-holocaust-by-country.}

The number of Jewish victims, specifically, were only enumerated in the case of Germany. The
losses of other countries were listed in a table, rather than mentioned in the narrative and the
number of Jewish victims in these countries were not recorded. A similar table had appeared in
the 1965 edition, as well.\footnote{Paterna et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1969), 289.}

This is particularly important because it is in Poland and the Soviet Union, where just the
total number of deaths were cited, that the proportion of Jewish deaths, as compared to deaths in
the general population, would have been most noticeable. Germany had a relatively small Jewish
population before the war. In 1933, there were 525,000 Jews in Germany (approximately 0.75%
of the total population). The 80 percent of 240,000 Jews in Germany in 1941 who were killed by the Nazis would not have made as much of an impact on the schoolchild reader. It is a relatively small number as compared to the 410,000 Germans killed in bombings or the 7.5 million Germans left homeless after the war (as the textbook enumerates).

But the numbers for Poland and the Soviet Union, if presented as they were in the German case, would have been far more striking. Between 82% and 90% of the pre-war Polish-Jewish population was killed in the Holocaust (2770,000-3,000,000 deaths). Poland had a total population of 34,849,000 in 1939 and a Jewish population of 3,350,000. Therefore, if we accept the East German textbook’s number of 6 million Polish deaths in the war (although more recent counts put the estimated number of Polish civilian deaths at closer to 5 million), approximately 50% of Polish deaths were those of Jewish-Polish citizens, while Jews made up only 9.6% of the total Polish population. It appears that the East German textbook only enumerated Jewish victims when they were German Jews. In other cases, they were considered Polish citizens or Soviet citizens, which confirmed the prevailing and convenient narrative of East European socialist peoples as the primary victims of the Nazi regime.

762 These numbers are more-or-less the most up to date and have been drawn from the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, but even if we accept the numbers presented in Geschichte 9 (1970), the German-Jewish population was 510,000. Holocaust Encyclopedia, s.v. "Jewish Population of Europe in 1933: Population Data by Country," accessed January 15, 2020, https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/jewish-population-of-europe-in-1933-population-data-by-country.

763 Holocaust Encyclopedia.


5.2.3  *West Germany*

As compared to Italian and East German schoolbooks, West German textbooks from the 1970s more prominently featured description about to Nazi crimes against the Jews. West German textbooks also increasingly reflected on “ordinary” people’s complicity in the Nazi regime and its crimes. Coinciding with the pedagogical introduction of discussion questions into the textbooks, students were also increasingly asked open-ended questions as to why ordinary Germans “went along” with the regime.

For example, *Ausgabe C* of *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen*, which was published in 1968 just a year after the last printing of *Ausgabe B*, featured a much-expanded discussion of the legal persecution that German Jews faced in the 1930s—with an extended discussion of the “Aryan Paragraph” and the Nuremberg Laws.⁷⁶⁶ When presenting the mass murder of the Jews during the war, *Ausgabe C* also discussed the Wannsee Conference and *Einsatzkommando*; neither subject had been mentioned in previous editions. Roma peoples (referred to in the text as “Zigeuner” or Gypsies) were also mentioned as victims of the *Einsatzkommando*.⁷⁶⁷

But, the even the revised Klett narrative was not particularly graphic in detail or extensive in explanation or evaluation, especially when one compares it to the contemporaneous *Zeiten und Menschen. Zeiten und Menschen Ausgabe B* by R. H. Tenbrock, K. Kluxen, and H. Stier was first published by the Schöningh house under that title in 1965; previously, it had been

---


published as *Geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk* for both upper schools (*Ausgabe A*) and middle schools (*Ausgabe B*) in the 1950s and 1960s.\textsuperscript{768} *Zeiten und Menschen* offers us the unique opportunity of following a textbook series from the 1960s through the 2000s, as it continues to be published today.

In general, as in previous textbook generations, discussion of the persecution and murder of the Jews in West German textbooks from the 1970s was divided up into two textbook sections. The first generally discussed the legal persecution of German Jews in the 1930s and was included in a chapter on the 1930s and the rise of Nazi Germany. The second generally discussed the genocide of the Jews during the war. If one compares the relative size of these two sections in the 1968 Klett textbook to the 1967 *Zeiten und Menschen*, it becomes clear that *Zeiten und Menschen* was remarkably more detailed. It also included more photographs and primary source excerpts.\textsuperscript{769}


\textsuperscript{769} In *Zeiten und Menschen*’s 1978 revision, some of the detail was condensed, but the textbook still provided ample information for the student reader and included some marked improvements. For example, a page of photographs of German bombing victims and urban bombing damage, which had previously been included in the middle of the section discussing the genocide of the Jews, was removed in the 1978 edition. Robert Hermann Tenbrock and Kurt Kluxen, *Zeiten und Menschen: geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk, Ausgabe B* ed., vol. 4 (1978), 103-07, 39-41; Tenbrock, Kluxen, and Stier, *Zeiten und Menschen* (1967), 136-40, 72-75. Menzel and Textor, *Staatsystem und Weltpolitik* (1968), 108-09, 30-31.
Table 16: Comparison of Representation of Nazi Persecution of the Jews and the Holocaust in late-1960s West German Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number of Pages Discussing the Persecution of Jews in the Pre-War Era</th>
<th>Number of Pages Discussing “The Final Solution”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td><em>Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe B</em></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td><em>Zeiten und Menschen Ausgabe B</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td><em>Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe C</em></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittleklassen* and *Zeiten und Menschen* began to hint at ordinary German’s complicity during this time period. The 1968 *Kletts Ausgabe C* featured the discussion question: “Why did the Jews not find more help among the population?” when referring to *Kristallnacht*. Zeiten und Menschen, in contrast, only added discussion questions to its text after its 1978 revision. But then it, too, asked a very similar question: “How do you explain the lack of willingness of the German people to defend the persecuted?”

However, unlike the authors of the Klett book series, the authors of *Zeiten und Menschen* chose to include a paragraph ruminating on the German people’s responsibility for the genocide

---


of the Jews since the book series’s first printing in 1967. This section also mentioned the lack of punishment that Germans involved in the mass killing of the Jews received in the postwar era:

Table 17: Comparison of a Passage on German Complicity from the 1967 and 1978 editions of Zeiten und Menschen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of Jewish victims of National Socialism is estimated at over 5 million—more people than today’s population of the Federal State of Hesse. The terrible crimes, that were committed against the European Jews—even if a few tens of thousands of Germans were directly involved—heavily stain the reputation of the German people in the whole world. The crimes demonstrate what murderous drive in people the commands of a totalitarian state can let loose and how short the distance between racial arrogance and mass death is. More than two decades since the crimes have passed, but still new appalling details come to light, people come before the court exposed as murderers, with them we have to find out with dismay, that they have lived privately as “ordinary citizens” for years.</td>
<td>The number of Jewish victims of National Socialism is estimated at over five million. The terrible crimes, that were committed against the European Jews—even if a few ten thousand Germans were directly involved—heavily stains the reputation of the German people in the whole world. The crimes demonstrate what murderous drive in people the commands of a totalitarian state can let loose and how short the distance between racial arrogance and mass death is.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a number of notable things about this paragraph—many of which are contradictory. The paragraph—particularly in its 1967 iteration—seemed intent on both minimizing German responsibility for Holocaust and exposing the “ordinary citizens” who were involved. In terms of minimizing tactics, the textbook, in both the 1967 and 1978 editions, cited the number of Jewish victims of the Holocaust at “over 5 million” rather than the commonly accepted six million. The

---

sentence, “The terrible crimes, that were committed against the European Jews—even if a few ten thousand Germans were directly involved—heavily stain the reputation of the German people in the whole world,” also represented a bit of ambivalence, since the textbook was careful to point out than only a few ten-thousand were involved in the actual killings and yet it was all Germans whose reputation was “stained” in the eyes of the world.

Yet, the discussion of “ordinary citizens” who had lived their lives for twenty years undetected in West Germany suddenly being unmasked as murderers cast a self-critical eye on the German populace. It also reflected the investigative and judicial proceedings in West Germany in the preceding decade. In 1958, the Central Office for the Investigation of National Socialist Crimes was created in Ludwigsburg, West Germany. Its investigations (and the subsequent trials), as well parliamentary debates in 1960 and 1965 over whether to extend the statute of limitations kept the Nazi past in the public mind.\textsuperscript{774} The trials also clearly underlined to the \textit{Zeiten und Menschen} authors how many murderers had been able to escape justice and slip back into everyday lives. The inclusion of this paragraph in the 1967 iteration of the textbook was quite progressive and indicates how far ahead \textit{Zeiten und Menschen} was, as compared to \textit{Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk} in questioning the complicity of “ordinary Germans.” Interestingly, the particular mention of the war crimes trials disappeared by the 1978 edition. It is unclear why this was; perhaps because they seemed less relevant with many of the major high-profile war crimes tribunals receding into the past.

Just as depictions of crimes against the Jews varied from textbook to textbook, the instructions on the matter being issued by educational authorities varied from federal state to

\textsuperscript{774} There were additional debates in 1969 and 1979, as well. Herf, \textit{Divided Memory} (1997), 335-36.
federal state. Some federal states were ahead of others, such as Lower Saxony, which prepared
an extensive instructional guide for the 40th anniversary of *Kristallnacht*, published in the August
1978 edition of the *Schulverwaltungsblatt für Niedersachsen* [School Administration’s
Newsletter for Lower Saxony]. Work on this theme had begun in May of 1978, upon the
prompting of the Lower Saxony Cultural Ministry in preparation of the 40th anniversary of
*Kristallnacht*. It was made clear, however, that the use of this material (prepared for Classes 5-
10) was not meant to eclipse or replace teaching about the guidelines for teaching about National
Socialism as normal in Classes 9 and 10.775

The working group prefaced its “didactic remarks on the theme “*Kristallnacht* and Jewish
persecution in the Third Reich” with an enumeration of the difficulties faced with dealing with
this subject in instruction, including:

- The inconceivability of the events
- Possible emotional defensiveness about the events
- Possible taboo of this theme in the family home
- The relatively large distance of today students from them
- Students’ lack of some experiences (ex. with classmates or neighbors of Jewish
faith)776

The “didactic choice” to discuss *Kristallnacht* was justified on the grounds of “the moral
commandment, even without any complicity to make reparation for past injustices—and it is
only possible through renewed concerned thought about the victim—and through the prevention
of new injustices.” The working group underlined that the November 1938 pogrom was not a
spontaneous action of the people, but rather an activity organized by the party and the state. It

775 “Die 'Reichskristallnacht' vor 40 Jahren- Gestaltungsvorschläge und Materialen,” *Schulverwaltungsblatt für
281.

776 Ibid.
also specified that students had to be made aware that the persecution of the Jews began in 1933 and had many steps including the Nuremberg Laws, Kristallnacht, and Auschwitz; students were also to be made aware that the steps in this process could have been “impeded by resistance.”

The Lower Saxony working group also suggested involving witnesses or representatives who could attest either to “the persecution of Jewish citizens by the National Socialists or Jewish life and Jewish culture.” The intention was that students would be shown that “Also in the students’ home city (municipality, region), Jews were then persecuted, eventually deported, and murdered. This awareness should be sought so to make it clear that nobody can ‘escape’ the history of his people.”

Two sequences of lesson were then set out with various topics, with possible content and suitable material laid out for each lesson. Both sequences began with a lesson on Kristallnacht and then proceeded to give information on Nazi antisemitic actions before the 1938 pogrom and afterwards. Both sequences ended with a reflection on German responsibility for reparations and with a discussion of the formation of the modern state of Israel. Both lesson sequences also included some reflection on how some Germans had known about the atrocities being committed, while others had resisted.

Others outside of Lower Saxony took note of this effort with satisfaction. At the November 1978 meeting of the KMK school committee, a petition was presented by the Jewish Community of Berlin. The petition noted how Lower Saxony taught National Socialism in its

---

777 Ibid., 282.
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779 Ibid., 282-86.
schools and suggested that it be emulated.\textsuperscript{780} In its response to the Jewish Community of Berlin, the KMK school committee referred back to a previously published resolutions—one on “Treatment of National Socialism in Teaching,” which had been recently issued in April of 1978.\textsuperscript{781}

This “Treatment of National Socialism in Teaching” resolution reaffirmed the KMK’s commitment to teaching about National Socialism. The 1978 resolution maintained that “This task continues to exist. Nowadays too, schools must actively work against uncritical acceptance of portrayals that trivialise or even glorify the Third Reich and its representatives, characterised as it was by dictatorship, genocide and inhumanity.” The 1978 resolution instructed the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the federal states to “draw the attention of schools to the problems as portrayed above. They will direct the schools to take up this matter with particular intensity in accordance with the guideline syllabuses [created by the federal states in response to the 1960 and 1962 KMK resolutions].” The KMK also requested that the Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung [Federal Center for Political Education] prepare educational material on this topic.\textsuperscript{782}

Why this flurry of activity in 1978? Was it only because of the anniversary of Reichkristallnacht or was there something at play? Arguably, yes. Just as the “swastika wave” and the TV program \textit{Blick auf unsere Jugend} of the late 1950s had drawn both the domestic and

\textsuperscript{780} Discussed in: Minutes of KMK 214\textsuperscript{th} meeting, 16 and 17 November 1978 in Bonn “33. Behandlung des Nationalsozialismus im Unterricht,” B 304-2475, KMK, BA Koblenz.

\textsuperscript{781}Ibid.

international media’s attention, something else exploded in the press in the 1977—a study, entitled “Was ich über Adolf Hitler gehört habe.” [What I’ve heard about Adolf Hitler]. The 32-year old Flensburg teacher Dieter Boßmann, published the results of his study of 3042 pupils between 10 and 23, from various classes from various school types, who were asked to write about their knowledge of Hitler in essay form. The KMK then, as it had in the early 1960s, likely felt impelled to address the issue with its 1978 resolution.

The results of Boßmann’s study were shocking to the West German and international public, since they seemed to indicate that West German teachers were not adequately teaching students about the Nazi past, even after the sustained educational emphases of the 1960s. Many Berufschule students [trade school] in their late teens surveyed answered that they knew almost nothing at about Hitler and that they had not learned about the subject in school. A 14-year-old Hauptschule [lower-tier secondary school] student responded, “I know most about Hitler through Jewish-jokes.” But even students who attended more “academic” schools, such as the Realschule and Gymnasium, responded, “I have never had the subject ‘Hitler’ in school. I know nothing about him,” “I only know that he lived,” and “I do not know much about Adolf Hitler because I have never been interested in him!” Others, however, attested to the fact that they had learned something about him in school, but that they did not remember much, or as one Realschule student wrote, “As we went through Hitler in history instruction, I did not pay

---


784 Lentz, "West German Youth Found to Be Ignorant About Hitler Period."

785 Boßmann, "Was ich über Adolf Hitler gehört habe. . .," 23.

786 Ibid., 26.

787 Ibid., 23-25.
attention because I loathe the war” and another added, “We also spoke about him in school, but I do not have a real idea of Hitler.”

Some of what the students knew about Hitler was also clearly incorrect, especially when it came to his attitudes and actions towards the Jews. For example, a significant number of students responded that Hitler was half-Jewish, himself. Some students characterized the numbers of Jews killed by the Nazis in the thousands or hundred-thousands. Some students overestimated the death toll, which as one 17-year-old who estimated that 16 million Jews had been killed in concentration camps. Some, however, had correct information; one 18-year-old trade school student answered correctly and succinctly, “Is responsible for the murder of about 6 million Jews and other political prisoners.”

Some student answers revealed very clear exculpatory maneuvers. One 20-year-old trade school student even responded, “But one should not forget that not only the Germans were cruel and ruthless during the wartime years. The other countries also used the same means and methods as the concentration camps [KZ], but this is not talked about as much.” One 15-year-old Gymnaisum [highest-tier secondary school] student responded, “Hitler wanted in this way only to do good for the German people [Volk].”

788 Ibid., 25.
790 Ibid., 164.
791 Ibid., 158-63.
792 Ibid., 158.
Boßmann’s findings grabbed public attention. They were reported in both domestic and international press, in many cases even before the results were printed in book form. 794 One of the most prominent press outlets to discuss Boßmann’s was the West German news magazine Der Spiegel. The article “Hitler kam von ganz alleine an die Macht” [Hitler came to Power Completely By Himself] cited President Walter Scheel, saying “We are in danger of becoming a country without history.” 795 Perhaps inspired by Boßmann, the American armed forces newspaper based in Darmstadt reviewed compositions on the subject written by American middle school and high school students living abroad in Hanau and West Berlin. They displayed many of the same inaccuracies. American students were cited as having written, “Hitler was some nut that came to Germany. I think he came from Italy “and “Hitler to me was a good man and he tried to everything he could for this place.” This ignorance was attributed to the fact that American schools in West Germany did not offer instruction in German history. 796 The Washington Post picked on the topic in October of 1977 with an article written by West German journalist Wolfgang Koschniek. In his article, Koschniek bemoaned the ubiquity of Nazism in entertainment (citing Joachim Fest’s “Hitler—a Career” and the presence of Nazi-oriented magazine stories) as well as the romanticized view of the Nazis that many of the students had in Boßmann’s study. Koschniek summarized the German students’ understanding of Adolf Hitler as follows:

Adolf Hitler was born in Austria around 1819 or 1933. He was an Italian half-Jew…

794 Boßmann, "Was ich über Adolf Hitler gehört habe. . . .", 9; Lentz, "West German Youth Found to Be Ignorant About Hitler Period."


All of a sudden, Hitler rose to power—largely because he was the only one who knew how to tackle the problem of unemployment. He was a very generous German king. His deputy was Bismarck, who has been languishing in a German Democratic Republic dungeon for more than 30 years…Everything was clean and perfect in Hitler’s Germany. For example, nobody had to fear finding his children throttled or his mother raped when he came home from work. Hitler saw to it that the streets were emptied of hippies and terrorists, of prostitutes and cripples, of Communists and other riffraff.

He dubbed his enemies Nazis and had them put in gas chambers. He also made one whale of a mistake killing 50,000 or so Jews, because this became very detrimental to the reputations of the Germans. Later he waged the Thirty Years’ War, which was also called the World War. He was the greatest military leader of all times and he conquered many, many countries for his fatherland. He never lost a battle. Konrad Adenauer was one of his friends. Later he turned nuts and was betrayed. At the end of the war, he jumped from a dam in the Ruhr and died. But he may also have managed to escape and run around as a madman in Russia or in Argentina. He is also said to have founded the Federal Republic and to have built the Berlin Wall.797

The press also bemoaned the positive values that the German students attributed to the Nazis. The New York Times, in an April 1977 article, noted that Boßmann, a Social Democrat, found that there was a real difference between his generation born immediately after the war and the youth of the 1970s. The article quoted him as saying, “When I heard about the mass killings, I came home crying to my mother to find out why she and other grown-ups had not tried to stop the evil.”798 Obvious was the contrast to the student essays, in which one boy wrote, “Aside of his many bad deeds, Adolf Hitler also did some good things, such as building the first autobahn.”799 Another student wrote “The streets became more safe and there was not such high criminality!”800 Some responses identified Adolf Hitler as “a good person” and at least one


798 Lentz, "West German Youth Found to Be Ignorant About Hitler Period."

799 Ibid.

800 Boßmann, "Was ich über Adolf Hitler gehört habe. . .,“ 280.
displayed antisemitic and neo-Nazi language. Boßmann and politicians like Scheel feared what these findings indicated about German history education.

History teachers and other scholars were struck with what became known as the “Boßmann shock.” Some historians, like Thomas Nipperdey, and pedagogues felt that the students’ lack of knowledge of history resulted from the integration of history, civics, and geography into one subject in school. Yet, as the Spiegel article noted, school authorities had produced guidelines and curricula in the past years that demonstrated a clear understanding of the Hitler period and “similarly the history books were improved.” The article contended, “The almost total confusion that was read out in Boßmann’s essay collection cannot by any means be attributed either to the guidelines or curricula or to the history books.” The Spiegel article attributed the students’ lack of knowledge instead to pedagogical weaknesses in the German teaching corps, as well as some of the ideological legacies of when the teachers were educated. Despite generational changes, many had been socialized and/or trained under the Third Reich, like Thomas Feibel’s principal at the beginning of this chapter. For example, a trade school student wrote that her history teacher “was and is a Hitler fan.”

It must be noted that this problem was not new. German children’s ignorance of the Nazi past had been remarked upon before. For example, Elena Lappin recalled of her first day of school in 1970:

---
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On my very first day in a German high school, our class received a distinguished visitor: a well-known Israeli journalist who was interested in German teenagers’ knowledge of their country’s past. He asked a simple question: what did they know about Hitler? My new classmates answered that Hitler was a dictator who was very good for the German economy because he built the Autobahn and solved the unemployment problem. They were critical of his nationalism and militarism, but did not mention the Holocaust. The Israeli visitor seemed amused, but the school principal, who was present during the discussion looked horrified and embarrassed. This was 1970, twenty-five years after the end of World War II.  

Clearly, the carefully crafted educational initiatives of the 1960s had not reached their desired effect, as much of the same ignorance that was criticized in the late 1950s and early 1960s was still present. Transmission continued to be a real problem. The “Boßmann shock” resulted in changes in pedagogy and the abandonment of the “broadcast-receiver model” in favor of a model that stressed the development of historical consciousness. The KMK, facing negative press attention on the education of Germany’s youth, likely felt that it had to act, reaffirming the necessity of teaching German youth about the Nazi past and its crimes with its 1978 resolution, even as the textbook narratives remained largely the same.

5.3 Resistance

Just as narratives about Jewish suffering had not shifted overmuch in the textbooks during the 1970s, nor did narratives about the resistance. However, there were some micro-changes. As the amount of space devoted to resistance narratives slightly increased in the textbooks, the process of “broadening” of resistance narratives to include new figures who would
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not have traditionally fit—a trend first identified in the 1960s books—continued in the books published during the 1970s. The 1970s textbooks were also marked by a new attention to “ordinary people” and their role in resisting or failing to comply with Nazism/fascism.

5.3.1 Italy

On the Italian side, there was a concerted effort on the part of some academics to broaden representations of resistance. Pressure came from Leftist scholars to recognize the inherently revolutionary acts of the partisans, as well as the civilian opposition to the RSI. There was, therefore, a push to create more class-conscious narrative. An example of this drive was the national conference on “History Textbooks and the Resistance,” held in Ferrara in late 1970. The conference was organized by the commune of Ferrara, the provincial administration, the committee for cultural events, and the Associazione Nazionale Partigiani d'Italia [National Association of Italian Partisans] of Ferrara. The papers given at the conference were published in 1971. 807

In general, the Italian textbooks of the early to mid-1960s had focused primarily on partisan armed resistance. The resistance had been presented in a messianic narrative, with “the blood of Italians” leading to a “second rebirth” of the nation. 808 Textbooks were willing to discuss workers (who may have had Leftist affinities), but usually only when they were grouped in with “men of every political and religious creed.” 809 Furthermore, this openness of discussing

---
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the roles of workers was largely restricted to issues of armed partisans in paramilitary organizations in the mountains; the textbooks largely ignored the more revolutionary social elements of the resistance, such as armed urban civilians, as well as acts of sabotage and workers strikes. Claudio Dellavalle of the Institute of History in the School of Education of Turin noted, in his contribution to the 1970 Ferrara conference on how the resistance was represented in the most frequently used middle school history textbooks in Turin, observed these trends. He also noted that while some textbooks mentioned civilian sabotage, they usually did not go into detail was to what exactly the sabotage was; furthermore, he contended, none of the books mentioned civilian strikes.  

Dellavalle was rather critical of the books’ lack of regard for the “subaltern social class” and the social-revolutionary aspects of the resistance. He argued, “Heavenly unity is the only political motive that one finds with a certain insistence in the texts, but not all the authors explain of what it consists, what ends it proposes.” Likely Dellavalle was referring to what scholar Filippo Foccardi has termed the “resistenza tricolore” narrative (discussed in Chapter 4). Dellavalle saw this discourse as a consequence of subjugating history to civic education. Yet, he concluded, “As the majority of the textbooks taken into consideration demonstrate amply, the channels between history and civic education are close. Boredom and annoyance for a difficult
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810 I would disagree with Dellavalle in this regard; Silvio Paolucci’s 1965 Storia, which was one of the books that Dellavalle studied, did make, at least, brief mentions of civilian strikes. Dellavalle, "La storia della resistenza nella scuola media unica," in Libri di testo e resistenza, 70-77; Silvio Paolucci, Ottocento e novecento, 1 ed., vol. 3, 3 vols., Storia per la scuola media (Bologna: Zanichelli, 1965), 293. Manaresi, Il nuovissimo Pantheon (1962), 239.

811 Dellavalle, "La storia della resistenza nella scuola media unica," in Libri di testo e resistenza, 74.

812 The term resistenza tricolore refers to the tricolor of the Italian flag. This term is borrowed from: Focardi, La guerra della memoria (2005) as cited in: Clifford, Commemorating the Holocaust, 82. Sassoon, "Italy after Fascism: The Predicament of Dominant Narratives," in Life after Death, 268-69.
lesson are the only ‘impressions’ that a child can derive from the history of the resistance as it presented to him in the book.”

Beyond publishing critiques, Dellavalle did a great service for the historian by publishing the usage data of books in the city of Turin and in the surrounding province. The data for middle schools [scuole medie inferiori] in Turin is reprinted below. Unfortunately, Dellavalle did not leave title information for the textbooks in question, but with some research, this can largely be determined:

Table 18: Most Frequently Used Textbooks in Italian Middle Schools in Turin, Taken from Claudio Dellavalle's 1970 Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Number of Sections</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Zelasco- Michaud</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nicolini- Consoni</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Brancati</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Caffo</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Paolucci</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Avveduto- Borello ecc.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ortolani- Pagella</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bruni</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Di Tondo- Guadagni</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Diaz-Banfi</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As explained in greater depth in “Appendix: Textbook Selection Methodology” for this dissertation, a number of case study series were selected, which had relatively long print runs. Four of those series are represented on Dellavalle’s listing, including: the Zelasco-Michaud series, which appeared as \textit{Il cammino della storia} and was used by 36\% of class sections in Turin in the early 1970s; the Nicolini-Consoni series, which was published as \textit{L’uomo e la sua storia} and was used in 12.7\% of Turinese middle school classrooms; the Paolucci series, which appeared as \textit{Storia} and was used by 5.2\% of class sections in Turin; and the Ortolani-Pagella series, which was published as \textit{Il tempo e le opere} through 1970 and was used by 2.5\% of class sections.

When one takes a closer look at these selected series, one finds that Dellavalle’s critiques were largely correct. The most popular \textit{Il cammino della storia}, for example, had only minimal discussion of the Italian resistance. What was there embraced the “celestial unity” narrative critiqued by Dellavalle; as the second edition of \textit{Il cammino della storia} described, “Nonetheless, on the mountains, in the countryside, in the cities, the partisans, who could count on the favor and the protection of almost all the population, continued in very difficult conditions their heroic fight, inflicting grave losses on the Nazis and on the fascists.”\footnote{Zelasco and Michaud, \textit{Il cammino della storia} (1968), 452.} The same narrative (and text) was reprinted through the 4\textsuperscript{th} edition of the book, which was published in 1980.\footnote{Zelasco and Michaud, \textit{Il cammino della storia} (1980), 440.}

Not all textbook series, however, were the same. As discussed in Chapter 4, Paolucci’s book series, first published in 1964/5 began to take tentative steps toward a more differentiated narrative that underlined the differences between the partisan fighters; some, explained the textbook, like the followers of Badoglio, wanted simply the expulsions of the Germans, while
others had more revolutionary desires—“a new state, on the fragments of the old.” Paolucci also devoted a great deal more detail and space to the resistance fight than other contemporary series. In addition to the incorporating the partisan resistance into his discussion of the course of the war in Italy, the third volume of Paolucci’s series also featured a special chapter on “The New Order: The Victims and the Rebels,” in which eight pages entirely were used to explain the resistance in Europe and particularly in Italy.

This discussion of the resistance remained more or less stable throughout the first three editions of Paolucci’s book (1964/5, 1970, 1974). Paolucci’s volumes continued to acknowledge that while many partisan groups found together in common cause, they had different goals for postwar society. There were occasional changes on the sentence level, though, usually to make the writing more comprehensible and accessible to students. In one of the more consequential changes to the passage on the resistance, an extra clause criticizing the Italian army for leaving military supplies to the Germans, “without even making an attempt of resistance” after the armistice of September 8, 1943 was added in the 2nd edition (1970). The original sentence (appearing the 1965) had also been critical of the Italian soldiers, who “turned around without even seeing a German.” But the addition of the clause discussing the military supplies in 1970 added weight to the condemnation. There were also some new text features added to the resistance section over time, such as definitions at the bottom of the page for terms


such as “Action Party” and end of chapter summaries in the 1970 edition.\textsuperscript{820} New photographs were added in the 1974 edition, which was reprinted through the early 1980s.\textsuperscript{821}

Thus, Paolucci’s \textit{Storia} series, which had a wide distribution of between 20,000 and 40,000 copies for each of its editions, although concentrated in the central-north portion of the countries, featured a different, more revolutionary, narrative about the resistance than other highly circulated texts on the market in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{822} But it should be noted that neither Michaud and Zelasco’s \textit{Il cammino della storia} nor Paolucci’s \textit{Storia} changed very much at all in their depictions of the resistance over the course of the 1970s. Whatever the series were doing in the late 1960s, they more or less carried on doing through the early 1980s. The advocacy represented by the Ferrara conference clearly had not yet penetrated into the schoolbooks.

5.3.2  
\textit{East Germany}

In East Germany there were certainly impetuses, as well, towards a broader resistance narrative. As discussed in Chapter 4, there were ongoing changes to the East German textbook narratives beginning in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Increasingly, resisters, who would not have traditionally featured in the socialist pantheon of heroes, were being featured in textbook narratives. This was particularly apparent when it came to the portrayal of the July 20\textsuperscript{th} conspirators.

\textsuperscript{820} Paolucci, \textit{Ottocento e novecento} (1970), 319.


The 1970 edition of *Geschichte* 9 was still critical of the July 20\textsuperscript{th} conspirators, describing them as members of the “monopolists and reactionary military officers” who “wanted even after the lost war to preserve the power base of German imperialism and militarism!”\textsuperscript{823}

That said, it acknowledged, “The conspirator group was however not politically homogenous. There were within also a few really national and patriotic-minded officers and representatives of the bourgeoisie. Among them was especially Colonel Claus Graf Schenk von Stauffenberg. His idea was to replace the fascist dictatorship with a democratic republic and to make peace immediately both in the West and in the East.”\textsuperscript{824} In this, the 1970 textbook continued a trend of an increasing focus on the putsch, as well as a rehabilitation of the figure of Stauffenberg, which had begun in the 1960 and 1965 editions of the East German textbook.


\textsuperscript{824} Nimtz et al., *Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9* (1970), 229.
The increasing discussion of the figure of Stauffenberg is not particularly surprising, given some of the changes in East German historiography during this period. Over the 1970s and 1980s in East Germany, there was a gradual “emancipation” from ideology in the historical profession. East German historians also had more contact with their West German counterparts; however, historians from the two Germanys remained split on certain issues, such as interpretations of contemporary history. Over the course of the 1970s and 1980s, there was also a new interest in historical figures in the East German historical profession, such as Frederick II and Bismarck, who had never before been part of the East German pantheon of

---

heroes.\textsuperscript{826} Why shouldn’t Stauffenberg be appropriated as a “progressive” figure if the Iron Chancellor was going to be?

While Stauffenberg and few others may have been rehabilitated, the conspiracy and the conspirators as a whole were not. Although the 1970 textbook had kind words for Stauffenberg, it made it very clear that

the chief cause of the failure of the July 20 conspirators was that they refused to draw upon the people. They stood above all as hostile to the working class and to the KPD. Therefore, they also did not look for the support of the anti-fascist resistance movement. Rather they wanted the people also in the future excluded from governance. With regards to foreign policy the conspirators planned to rely on the Western Allies. They even hoped for a conflict between them and the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{827}

This interpretation of the July 20\textsuperscript{th} putsch as a treacherous capitalist scheme was a deliberate attack on the legitimacy and nation-rebuilding narrative of the West German state. The 1970 textbook told students, “In West Germany, it is still frequently avowed that the conspiracy of July 20, 1944 was the only important resistance fight against the fascists. Reactionary West German politicians invoke the ideas of the July 20\textsuperscript{th} conspirators and claim that the West German state has realized their legacy.” The 1970 East German textbook asserted that West Germany used the July 20\textsuperscript{th} narrative to “historically justify the revanchist, neo-Nazi promoting politics of the ruling West German circles” and that this marginalized “the heroic fight of the tens of thousands of German communists and antifascists against fascism.”\textsuperscript{828} Given that the East


\textsuperscript{827} Nimtz et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1970), 230.

\textsuperscript{828} Nimtz et al., \textit{Geschichte Lehrbuch für Klasse 9} (1970), 230.
German middle school history textbook was not revised again until 1984, it is likely that students read these accusations until then.

While this rhetoric about the July 20th conspirators and the tactic of comparing them to communist resisters had been around for quite some time, it is worth noting how virulent the 1970 textbook was in its attack, especially with the specific mentions of contemporary West Germany. It is perhaps the most direct critique of West Germany’s representation of the July 20th conspirators seen in all the many iterations of this textbook. This is likely in response to the very prominent role that the conspiracy had come to play in West German public memory of resistance and the war. The East German textbooks clearly recognized the vital role that the events of July 20th played in West German rehabilitation. Trouble arose because West Germany’s conception of the “other Germany” was contradictory to East Germany’s “other Germany,” and therefore to the East German project, which required communists, not bourgeois army officers, to take center stage.\footnote{Wolfgram, "Getting History Right" (2011), 121-22.} As a result, the East German textbook narrative juxtaposed the July 20th conspirators with the members of the NKFD. In fact, at the end of the section on the July 20th conspirators, the 1970 East German textbook gave students the task: “Compare the goals of the conspirators of July 20, 1944 with those of the NKFD and clarify which of these goals corresponded to the interests of the German people!”\footnote{Ibid.}

Like in the 1965 edition, the guiding roles of the KPD and the NKFD were particularly emphasized in the 1970 edition of the textbook. The leaders of the Social Democratic Party were criticized for having emigrated and left the resistance to its fate and the danger faced by communist party operatives was illustrated by a picture of man hanging off barbed wire, dead, at
KZ Mauthausen. But when discussing the NKFD, the textbook emphasized its seemingly broad base. It clarified, “Of the members [of the NKFD] there were 13 workers, 1 farmer, 4 white-collar workers, 13 intellectuals, 1 cleric, 1 student, 1 publisher, and 4 career soldiers.” A similar listing of the various individuals making up the NKFD had appeared in the 1965 edition, but without the enumeration. However, the 1970 textbook made clear that “the leadership [of the movement ‘Free Germany’ lay with the working class and their party, the KPD.” The textbook continued, “It laid a cornerstone for the cooperation of the various strata of the German people after the liberation from Hitler-fascism in the National Front of democratic Germany.” Thus, just as its predecessors had, the 1970 textbook made clear that the German Democratic Republic was the heir to the heroic NKFD, which had been lead, above all by the KPD.

5.3.3 West Germany

There were also pushes to for a more expansive resistance narrative in the West German case; this push came from historiographical trends, which focused increasingly on “ordinary people.” As mentioned in Chapter 4, some West German historians in the 1970s and 1980s, including most prominently Martin Broszat of the Institute for Contemporary History (IfZ) embraced a conception of resistance that focused more on functional impact than on moral-

---


832 Ibid., 224.
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ethical motivation; behavior that the regime opposed—such as swing dancing in Nazi Germany—but had no underlying political-moral basis, could be perceived under this rubric as resistance acts. But this translated somewhat haphazardly into the textbooks, with only some textbooks embracing a broadened rubric of resistance acts and with the focus still primarily on military resistance, represented by the July 20th conspirators.

The textbook series Spiegel der Zeiten, for example, changed its depiction of resistance very little between the editions of the 1960s and that of 1971. The July 20th conspirators still occupied a dominant role and those in non-military social resistance to the Nazi regime were not prominently discussed. Historian Brian Puaca has commented—with reference to the book series’ depiction of Nazi crimes—that Spiegel der Zeiten was slower to adopt a more progressive reading of history that discussed cultural and social developments alongside military and political ones. Puaca attributed this to the fact that Spiegel der Zeiten was a revision of the much older Wege der Völker books and wrote that this “may explain why its narrative was more traditional than other contemporary texts.” Puaca’s reading is borne out when one considers how Spiegel der Zeiten treated depictions of resistance. Into the 1970s, it promoted a reading that favored military bourgeois resistance over revolutionary socialist resistance or passive non-conformism.
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837 A revised textbook [Ausgabe B] was later premiered in 1971; it, unfortunately, could not be located for this dissertation. Mentioned in: Puaca, "Mastering the Past?," in As the Witnesses Fall Silent, 369.
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Another older textbook series, *Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk für die Mittelklassen* was similarly stagnant when it came to its depictions of resistance—and of the Third Reich in general—over the course of the 1970s. The section considering resistance in *Ausgabe C*, first published in 1968, was very similar to that used in *Ausgabe B*. If anything, *Ausgabe C* only increased its praise of and focus on the July 20th conspirators. The 1968 *Ausgabe C*’s depiction of resistance was then reprinted unaltered through 1983.840 While the Klett textbook did discuss some forms of passive resistance, such as that of the churches, as mentioned in Chapter 4, it greatly emphasized the July 20th narrative.

While some textbooks may have been resistant to changing their narratives, other series were more open to it, such as the more newly revised *Zeiten und Menschen*. While the 1967 edition of *Zeiten und Menschen* still largely emphasized military resistance, only 53% of the text section “The Resistance” was devoted to the July 20th conspirators and the conspiracy’s aftermath.841 This was actually a much smaller focus than that of other textbook narratives on the market at the time. For comparison, the section on wartime resistance in the 1967 *edition of Klett geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe B* devoted 74% of its space to the July 20th conspiracy and its aftermath, while the 1968 edition of the Klett textbook’s *Ausgabe C* increased its focus even further to 88%.842


842 These percentages, however, does not include the timeline added to the end of the section in Ausgabe C. Menzel and Textor, *Staatensystem und Weltpolitik* (1969), 131-33. Pinnow and Textor, *Um Volksstaat und Völkergemeinschaft* (1967), 191-93.
The Klett *Ausgabe C* textbook’s focus on the July 20th conspiracy had a certain logic. As discussed in Part II, focusing on the heroic men of July 20th served as a counterbalance to the increasing discussion of Nazi crimes in the textbook. While the “Resistance” section had always followed the “Terror and Crimes” sections in previous Klett books, *Ausgabe C* made a point of joining these two themes together in the major section “Crimes and Resistance,” which featured discussion questions and a timeline of events at the end.

The questions read:

1. What is noticeable about the expressions “mercy killing” and “Final Solution”? 2. What are high treason and treason? 3. Did the men of July 20th want to eliminate Hitler only because they felt that the war was lost? 4. Where did the fronts run on the 20th of July?

The timeline appeared as follows:

1939  Hitler orders the elimination of “Lives unworthy of life”; he intensifies the terror and the persecution of the Jews  
1941  In Russia, the *Einsatzkommandos* begin the mass shooting of the Jews. In the occupied territories the partisans rise against the German occupation  
January 1942  Heydrich signs off on the “Final Solution of the Jewish Question” and plans the elimination of 11 million European Jews. The mass murder was conducted above all in elimination camps like Auschwitz and Treblinka  
July 20, 1944  Stauffenberg’s attempt on Hitler fails; prolific revenge struck the conspirators and other opponents of the system843

While at no point did the text ever directly suggest that the July 20th conspirators’ attempt on Hitler’s life was in reaction to the Holocaust, their pairing together in this section (along with a discussion of the killing of those with disabilities and the partisan struggle in occupied territories) suggested a connection.
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843 Menzel and Textor, *Staatsystem und Weltpolitik* (1968), 130-133.
Schnönigh’s Zeiten und Menschen presented a slightly different understanding of resistance than the Klett series. A good deal of the 1967 text was devoted to how difficult and dangerous it was to resist during the Nazi regime. In this case, resistance was defined as “active,” although “active Resistance” did not necessarily mean military resistance; it also included the Scholl siblings who distributed leaflets. The textbook also depicted a broad base of resisters from various political, social and religious backgrounds: “Various groups of Hitler-opponents: Socialists, trade unionists, Christians of both confessions and conservatives overcame their confessional and political differences that before 1933 had hindered their working together against emerging National Socialism.” It is notable, however, that the text neglected to mention communist resisters at any point in this section.844

Zeiten und Menschen Ausgabe B underwent major revisions in the period only once during the time period described in this chapter (1968-1978). The textbook’s first edition (1967) was reprinted eleven times through 1977. 1978 saw a new revision of the textbook, but the narrative text was almost identical—with only a few changes on the sentence level. The major changes in the sections dealing with the resistance consisted of adding five discussion questions, two of which had students analyze the July 20th conspirators’ motivations, while a third had students consider the military situation on July 20, 1944.845

Spiegel der Zeiten, Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk, and Zeiten und Menschen all showed a certain stagnancy in their narratives over the course of the 1970s. In all three series, a new narrative was premiered in the late 1960s which stayed more or less the same through the

844 Communists were, however, mentioned when the text discussed the earliest people incarcerated in concentration camps. Tenbrock, Kluxen, and Stier, Zeiten und Menschen (1967), 122.

early 1980s since there were no major revisions to these book series during this time period. A textbook that a ninth grader had in front of them in 1968 could very well have been essentially identical to the textbook that a pupil had in front of them in 1983. The textbook narratives during this time period essentially stabilized. This is not to say, however, that there was no push during this time period to change or adjust the textbook narratives. A variety of lobby groups in West Germany advocated for new considerations of the resistance in the textbooks and in the educational system as a whole over the whole course of the 1970s.

***

In some cases, the impetus for this increasing discussion did come out of the student movement. For example, in a June 16, 1971 letter, the German National Union of Students [Verband Deutscher Studentschaften] wrote to the cultural minister of North-Rhine Westphalia protesting the actions of CDU party members in the state assembly. According to the students, the CDU was attempting to impede the German Peace Organization’s efforts against “undemocratic, militaristic and nationalist teaching content.” The student union announced that the “democratic and socialist student movement” had made it a clear priority to support democratic teaching content, having voted upon it at their last meeting.846

But other advocacy about resistance education in the West German case emerged out of a very different environment and lasted after the student movement. There was a concerted campaign on the part of the Organization for the Victims of the Nazi Regimes- Union of Antifascists (VVN) to advocate for more education about the resistance throughout the late
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846 Letter from the German National Union of Students [Verband Deutscher Studentschaften] to the Cultural Minister of North Rhine Westphalia, 16 July 1971, B 304/3651, BA Koblenz.
1960s and through the 1970s. Based on documentation in the KMK files in the Federal Archive in Koblenz, it seems that the VVN began their pressure campaign in 1969 with a letter to Karl-Heinz Evers, the chairperson of the KMK and the educational senator from Berlin. The authors of the letter, J.C. Rossaint and Oskar Müller, noted the KMK’s 1960 binding resolution on “Handling of the Most Recent History in History and Social Studies Instruction.” They argued that despite the KMK’s efforts to promote the teaching of recent history, there had been very little work done on the resistance. This absence was glaring, contended the VVN, since “It was the German resistance, that opened for our people after 1945 the gateway to other peoples. This resistance was the political-moral capital that we threw on the scales, to regain gradually our neighbors’ trust.” Furthermore, without a “comprehensive and objective documentation” of the German resistance’s activities, a fundamental aspect of the youth’s education could not help but be neglected. The VVN continued:

The positive identification with its history is a prerequisite for the political and moral development of a people, and particularly for the creation of democratic consciousness of youth. For the years 1933 to 1945 this can only mean: the identification with the people’s resistance against fascism. That can however only happen when the diverse historical falsifications are confronted with a comprehensive and objective documentation of the German resistance.

To address this stated problem, the VVN, at their annual conference, had decided to advocate for the creation of a KMK commission on “History of the German Resistance.” Thus, Rossaint and Müller wrote Evers to encourage such an action and to suggest that representatives of the VVN belong to such a commission, along with representatives from scholarly institutions,

---

847 For translation help with the VVN’s name, I used: James Edward Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 75.

848 However, they incorrectly identified it as being promulgated in 1961.

849 Typo in original document; “Wagschale” not “Waagschale"
trade unions, churches, youth groups. The matter was particularly pressing, said Rossaint and Müller, given the advanced age and health problems of some of the persecuted and resistance members.850 The VVN, however, did not receive the reception for which they were hoping. The KMK referred the VVN to the IfZ; Martin Broszat, representing the IfZ, replied that while they were positively inclined to the topic, they did not have the financial and time resources to undertake it.851 Thus, it seems that the VVN was rebuffed.

The VVN continued their pressure campaign into the 1970s. In April 14, 1970, Rossaint of the VVN wrote to various federal state cultural ministers about their proposals as to how to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the May 8, 1945 capitulation. The VVN argued this anniversary needed to be celebrated as the end of fascism and a new beginning, “for which the many German people in the resistance to the Hitler regime fought and died.”852 The KMK referred this issue to the individual federal states and encouraged them to take whatever suggestions they find useful from the VVN’s materials.853 However, it appears that nothing binding came out of this line of correspondence.

The VVN also had specific critiques of the textbooks used in some of the West German federal states, which they attempted to address at both the state and national levels. For example,

850 Letter from the VVN (Oskar Müller and J.C. Rossaint) to the KMK (to Karl-Heinz Evers, the Chairperson) on 10 June 1969, [File Pages 60-61], B 304/6137 1 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.

851 Correspondence found: File Pages 53-56 of B 304/6137 1 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.


in a May 2, 1970 letter, the VVN wrote to the Lower Saxony Cultural Ministry criticizing the
depictions of resistance in two fourth grade *Heimatkunde* books. Of one of the books, the VVN
wrote, “We are of the view that these three words are too few to teach the student of the 4th
grade about the tragedy of Bergen-Belsen and Bergen-Hohne.” They further critiqued the fact that
Anne Frank was not mentioned in the book, given that she died in Bergen-Belsen.854 It seems,
however, that, once again, the VVN did not receive the positive response for which it hoped. It
appears that the Lower Saxony Cultural Ministry instructed the VVN to speak to the publishers
directly. Feeling, perhaps slighted, the VVN seemed to attempt to go over the Lower Saxon’s
Cultural Minister’s head to the KMK with regards to these textbooks. They, however, were
referred back to Lower Saxony.855

Undeterred, the VVN reached out again in 1973. They sent letters to the various federal
states proposing that members of the VVN be consulted and added to pre-existing commissions
on the theme “Fascism and anti-Fascism – Resistance and persecution.”856 They did not seem to
have overmuch success in this endeavor, at least in Rhineland-Palatinate. A copy of a letter from
the Rhineland-Palatinate Cultural Ministry dismissed the VVN’s request replied that their
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854 Letter from the Working Group for School and History of the VVN Lower Saxony to the Lower Saxon Cultural
Minister, Textbook Accreditation, “Darstellung der Widerstandsbewegung gegen den Faschismus in 2
Heimatkundelehrbüchern Niedersachsens” on May 2, 1970; Page 17 of B 304-6137 1 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.

855 Letter from the Lower Saxon Cultural Ministry to the VVN on “Überprüfung von Lehrbücher,” 23 September
1971, [File Pages 12-13], B 3046137 1 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.

856 Letter from J.C. Roissant and Max Oppenheimer of the VVN to KMK and its chairperson Senator Moritz Thape
commissions were adequately staffed by experts and that “the involvement of further persons is on this ground not necessary.”

The VVN was not the only resistance group involved in advocacy on this matter. The “July 20th Research Association” also engaged in lobbying—this time directly to the Federal President Walter Scheel, with more success. Scheel wrote a letter to the president of the KMK in October of 1975 reporting that:

The research association 20. July made me aware of the fact in that in pertinent textbooks the resistance against the NS Regime is represented only in a shortened form. The research association complained particularly that in school books as a general rule only the military resistance is discussed and the diverse advocacies and character of the civilian resistance found no attention. They also criticized that the impact of the resistance for the design of the legal and political foundation of the Federal Republic of Germany in the schools is scarcely recognized. The discourse of my predecessors Heuss and Heinmann about the resistance has in no way been reflected in the books.

I would be thankful to you if the Standing Conference of Cultural Ministers of the Federal States would take on this problem. The examination by teachers and students of the resistance and also of other historical fundamentals of our country is among, in my opinion, the most fundamental requirements that history instruction in our schools needs to meet. The knowledge of the requirements and the moral foundation of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany might be the condition under which the succeeding generation enters into the spirit of the democratic constitutional state, which was self-evident to the fathers of the Basic Law.

---


859 Letter from Federal President Walter Scheel to President of the KMK President Professor Dr. Joist Grolle, 8 October 1975, [File Pages 4-5], B 304/6137 1 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.
Scheel, therefore, took on the role that his predecessor Heuss had in the late 1950s. He served as a conduit by which advocacy groups could more effectively push the KMK to consider depictions of the Nazi past. Other groups also made use of the office of the Federal President in this matter. In January of 1976, Scheel wrote another letter to the KMK reporting that the “Union of German Resistance Fighters and Persecuted Organizations” had expressed similar concerns to him as the July 20th research group had. The school committee of the KMK was asked to meet and report back on the issues. 860

The KMK’s school committee’s response was essentially defensive. It noted that the KMK certainly agreed with the Federal President as to the importance of the resistance and that the KMK had already expressed its views on this in the *Richtlinien fur die Behandlung des Totalitarismus im Unterricht* (cited as having been published in 1972, but this was likely a typo, as it was issued in 1962) and in the *Behandlung der jüngsten Vergangenheit* (1960). The response to Scheel also noted also that the testing requirements for various subjects including Social Studies and Catholic religion also showed a commitment to these issues. It suggested that the protesting advocacy organizations were not fully aware of the KMK’s efforts and had received one negative report and generalized. 861

Despite this response, it is clear that the pressure did not abate. The minutes of the KMK school committee in September 1980 in Hamburg show that, again, the KMK school committee came to the issue of representations of the resistance in the textbooks; in this case the KMK president had asked them for a recommendation on this matter as soon as possible. Likely,
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860 Letter from W. Hahn of KMK to Federal President Walter Scheel, July 2, 1976, [File Pages 6-7], B 304/6137 1 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz. Letter from Federal President Walter Scheel to Prof. Dr. W. Hahn, 29 January 1976, [File Page 9], B 304/6137 1 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.

861 Letter from W. Hahn of KMK to Federal President Walter Scheel, 2 July 2 1976, [File Pages 6-7], B 304/6137 1 von 2, KMK, BA Koblenz.
Scheel’s push (as well as Boßmann’s study, described above) had had some effect. This, however, met some opposition from representatives of the federal states. Undersecretary Liepold, representing Bavaria, felt that there was no need for any such recommendation; Undersecretary Elser from Baden-Württemberg, was also against it, arguing, “It could be construed as exculpation.” With Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg abstaining, however, a resolution was passed at this meeting to form a working group devoted to creating a conceptual model on the theme “Resistance against National Socialism in Instruction.”

The eventual result of such a debate appears to be a resolution by the KMK in December of 1980 on “Recommendation on the treatment of the resistance during the National Socialist period in teaching.” The resolution embraced an expanded definition of resistance, which including both active resistance and passive non-compliance similar to Martin Broszat’s *Resistenz*:

Contemporary historical research has created new and improved foundations for confronting the subject of National Socialism, its causes and the effects of its reign. This also applies to the resistance to the National Socialist reign of violence, whose various manifestations can be identified and evaluated more discerningly and comprehensively today than only a few years ago. Today we do not only know about the existence of systematic, programmatic resistance by political groups (e.g. the Goerdeler circle, the Kreisau circle, Neubeginnen etc.), but also about widespread resistance among the population. This expressed itself in forms of non-conformism, individual refusal, and frequent instances of passive resistance. It is also evident that resistance arose from various ideological and political motives. This resistance cannot be reduced to a single common denominator; it should therefore not be regarded from only one angle and no single group should be portrayed as having a claim to represent the resistance. All forms of resistance however share a common point of departure: objection to the total National Socialist political invasion of everyday life; moral repugnance over violations of law; solidarity with the persecuted; the attempt to preserve a minimum of moral responsibility in a totally controlled state, even if only within the closest circle of family, community,
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862 Minutes of 231th meeting of the School Committee, 11 and 12 September 1980 in Hamburg, [File Pages 253-273], B 304/2481, KMK, BA Koblenz.
Church; and, with the increasing duration of war, growing awareness of the senselessness and the murderous character of that war.863

This resolution reflected a rather expanded understanding of resistance than had been prevalent only a decade before. For example, the resolution encouraged schools to teach resistance “in the overall context of National Socialist system of rule and politics” and argued that “besides looking at principled opposition, teaching must also consider partial resistance offered in specific situations.” Problematically, the resolution claimed that all forms of resistance however shared a common point of departure” and then listed six motivations, which many could attest were not fully shared across all resistance groups. However, the resolution, did meet the requests of the VVN and other resistance advocacy groups, who had argued throughout the 1970s for a greater recognition of resistance fighters.

Perhaps more interesting, however, were a few sentences towards the end of the resolution, which simultaneously attempted to address the concerns expressed by Liepold and Elser and embraced Broszat’s concept of Resistenz:

It must be shown that capitulation to dictatorship frequently began not with spectacular defeats but with small, everyday acts of cowardice. By the same token, it must be shown that everyday life was also the special province of silent resistance without no image of life in the Third Reich would be complete. However, it must also be demonstrated how fear and conformism were able to arise, robbing many of the courage to even recognise injustice, let alone to oppose it.864

---


864 “Recommendation on the treatment of the resistance during the National Socialist period in teaching.”
As historian Ian Kershaw has pointed out, Broszat’s use of *Alltagsgeschichte* and his focus on everyday non-conformity also raised the specter of everyday conformity, complicity and consent. A similar balance existed in this 1980 KMK resolution.

The resolution closed with a rationale as to why they the resistance must be taught. It read:

> In schools and in political education, the treatment of resistance against the National Socialist reign of violence pursues the goal of keeping the memories alive, communicating basic historic knowledge and heightening powers of political judgement….Therefore, in bringing the resistance alive in teaching and political education we are providing a key to the future of our democratic system.

In many ways, the KMK resolution’s wording echoed the themes of Müller and Rossaint’s letter from the 1969. Once again, we observe the language of teaching about the heroes of the resistance in order to engender in youth a properly democratic outlook. But since many of the major textbook series did not overhaul their narratives until the early 1980s, the effects of the KMK resolution were not be fully apparent until later in Chapter 6.

### 5.4 Other Pedagogical Shifts

However, even if the textbooks were not shifting over much, there were educational changes and shifts, often on the local level, which pushed instruction about the Nazi-fascist past forward. One of these areas in which we can see these shifts is in educational trips to concentration camps and memorial sites. There were some very early adopters in this
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instructional strategy in the 1960s, but, in most cases, educational trips to sites of memory were taken up in a large way in all three of our subject states in the 1970s.

The commune of Rimini in the province of Emilia-Romagna in Italy was an unlikely place to be a pioneer in Holocaust education. It had no historic Jewish community since the 1500s; there were no mass deportations in the area. It is a small sea-side touristic city. The decision to begin these trips, however, was made by the assistant to the mayor for public education, who decided, essentially on his own, that the history of the concentration camps needed to be taught about in the Rimini schools. For the first trip, held in 1964, the assistant to the mayor drove five students in his own car to Milan, where they met up with an agency to go to Mauthausen. After this initial trip, Rimini began to organize and finance trips for fifty students each year (in upper secondary school) to go to Mauthausen and its subcamps of Gusen, Ebensee, and Schloß Harthheim.867

When the 1964 students returned, they wanted to organize a show of the photographs that they had taken on their trip; the Rimini tourist organization, however, protested. Rimini was at the time a top tourist destination for West Germans, and the tourist organization felt that it would be “shameful” to criticize Germany in such a way if the commune wished to continue to attract German tourism. The trips and the accompanying shows upon return, regardless, continued. 868

These “memory trips” as they were called, were difficult to fund in Rimini. It was not until the 1970s that public organizations in Italy showed a willingness to pay for such trips. In 1975, the Piedmont Regional Council began to pay for school trips to concentration camps. The

867 Mauthausen and Dachau had been the camp to which most Italians had been deported, although most Italian Jews were deported to Auschwitz. Fontana, interview. Sarfatti, *The Jews in Mussolini's Italy*, 181, 87-202.

868 Fontana, interview.
“memory trips” spread throughout Italy during the 1970s and 1980s, but they were in no way required. The city of Rome only ran its first school trip to the concentration/death camps in 1998.869

In East Germany, school and educational trips to concentration camps, such as Buchenwald, had long been encouraged. In 1961, over 80,000 young people visited the Buchenwald memorial, however there was concern that students were not coming away from their visits with appropriate socialist historical consciousness. Beginning in 1962, the Buchenwald memorial began offering teacher training seminars. The issue became increasingly pressing as many students, and increasingly many teachers, did not remember the Nazi era. During the 1970s, the Buchenwald memorial increasingly made contact with schools and began offering internships to local Weimar-area students. 870

In West Germany, the federal state of Bavaria was a pioneer in encouraging schools to take their students to visit concentration camp memorials. Since a resolution by the Bavarian Landtag on May 31, 1960, the Bavarian State Center for Political Education supported trips to the concentration camp memorials of Dachau and Flossenbürg.871 According to statistics collected by historian Harold Marcuse, youth and school groups made up 2.5% of German visitors coming to Dachau concentration camp memorial in 1963, 14% in 1970, 21% in 1975, and 42% in


Therefore, in the decade in question—the 1970s—there was an extraordinary upswing in the number of school and youth groups visiting the camp.

Bavaria was not alone in encouraging trips to memorials or sites of memory. It seems that it was an increasingly adopted policy over the course of the 1970s. In the Kristallnacht 1978 instructional materials, Lower Saxony suggested school excursions to places of Jewish life, including synagogues, stores, or cemeteries. Notably, however, Lower Saxony did not appear to suggest that students visit Bergen-Belsen, located in the area. The 1978 edition of the textbook Zeiten und Menschen also suggested a visit to students in a discussion question at the end of the section on Kristallnacht: “Investigate if there was a synagogue and a Jewish cemetery in your home town (or in the nearby city). Is there anything to see at these sites, are there any commemorative plaques or other memorials?”

Thus, it is clear that in the 1970s, there was an acceleration of trends that had begun in the 1960s in terms of educational trips to commemorative sites. What had previously been the province of “early adopters” became a much more widespread phenomenon, encouraged increasingly by public institutions. For the most part, however, with a few exceptions, such as the 1978 Zeiten und Menschen, the textbooks did not engage with this new pedagogical experience.

---


5.5 The 1970s and Educational Reform

The 1970s was a quiet decade for textbook reform in all three of our subject states. In West Germany and Italy, many of the textbook series, whose base narratives were created in the mid to late-1960s, were reprinted more or less unchanged during this period of time. The East German textbook premiered in 1970 was printed identically until 1984. The textbooks seemed mostly unperturbed by both the global revolutions of 1968 and the increased media attention to the Holocaust during what Annette Wieviorka has termed, “the era of the witness.”

But that is not to say that the 1970s were a period of complete stagnation. There was advocacy—particularly evident in the West German and Italian cases—for new ways of teaching about the Second World War. There was a trend in all three of our subject states towards educational trips to sites of memory. There was a continuation of changes, began in the 1960s, over time in how resistance and complicity were presented in the textbooks. But because of the longue durée of textbook production, most of the changes as a result of this advocacy and these new pedagogical forms would not be fully reflected in the textbooks until the 1980s and 1990s.

6 A CHANGING LANDSCAPE: TEXTBOOK NARRATIVES IN THE CLIMATE OF
THE 1980s HOLOCAUST MEMORY BOOM

6.1 Introduction

In the first installment of NBC’s four-part “Holocaust,” we see Nazi thugs herding a
group of perhaps 100 men into a small wooden barn in the middle of an open field. The
troops push the men through the only door to the building while shoving aside an equal
number of women—the wives, mothers, and daughters of the men.

Once the men are locked inside, the Nazis pour gasoline around the barn. The women,
hysterical now, are screaming, pleading for mercy for their men.

The Nazis set the barn ablaze. Within seconds, we hear the frenzied shouts of the men
inside as fire sears their flesh. The women, emitting moans of despair, instinctively flee
the inferno. One minute later, the barn is gone.

It is a profoundly sickening scene, one of several that may haunt you long after watching
“Holocaust. The 9 ½-hour-production, telecast on four straight nights, begins at 7pm.
Sunday on WMAQ-Ch.5.

One part melodrama and one part history lesson, the program is a gut-wrenching tale of
persecution, murder, and eventual survival in the fact of a monstrous government bent on
the destruction of an entire race.…

By the time the four nights of “Holocaust” unreeled, tens of millions of Americans will
have gained immeasurable knowledge and enlightenment about one of civilization’s most
disastrous undertakings.

Other than scoundrels, it’s hard to imagine anyone being harmed by that.876

The American miniseries Holocaust was first broadcast on NBC network affiliates in the
United States in April 1978, but it soon became a global phenomenon. In June 1979, the Italian
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newspaper *La Repubblica* called it “the most talked about miniseries of all times.” After the broadcast of *Holocaust*, there was a large increase in worldwide media attention and cultural production about the murder of Europe’s Jews. In Italy, for example, RAI [*Radiotelevisione italiana*], the national broadcasting network, created a number of miniseries about the Holocaust throughout the 1980s, including the 1982 *Storia d’amore e d’amicizia* [Story of love and friendship]. The NBC *Holocaust* miniseries’s broadcast also helped galvanize the beginnings of large-scale survivor video testimony projects in the United States, France, and West Germany. On a smaller scale, the *Holocaust* miniseries also prompted a number of local educational and research initiatives in our three countries of study.

How did the Holocaust miniseries and the subsequent media Holocaust “memory boom” of the 1980s affect the textbooks and other educational media? I argue that despite this flurry of commemorative activity, the *Holocaust* miniseries and its subsequent media explosion, like the student movements of 1968, had little or delayed effects on the textbooks, most of which had very well-established narratives at this point. While one does see audiovisual material and film increasingly being incorporated into teacher’s guides and curricular plans across the 1980s, the textbooks, for the most part, remained stubbornly protective of their educational domain and resistant to the “memory boom” happening around them. The *Holocaust* miniseries and

---
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subsequent “memory boom” did stimulate a new generation of commemorative and educational initiatives, but these remained largely divorced from the actual textbooks.

### 6.2 The Holocaust Miniseries

Proceeding chronologically through our subject countries, the *Holocaust* miniseries was shown first in West Germany. The largest West German regional network WDR purchased the rights for the miniseries for 1 million DM ($550,000) and broadcast it along with other regional networks on the “Third Program” in January 1979. (Several regional networks had refused to show it simultaneously on the more broadly watched “First Program” due to minor factual inaccuracies and the series’ “suitability.”) More than 40% of West German television viewers watched each night of the series. While the government had created 20,000 information booklets to accompany the series, the demand for these booklets far exceeded the supply; 255,000 orders were placed, mostly from individuals under the age of thirty-five. The regional broadcasting stations received 35,000 phone calls from the series’ viewers, including from East German citizens, many of whom were able to see the broadcast from West German television; the GDR pointedly did not broadcast the series.\(^{881}\)

In Italy, the mini-series was broadcast between May 20 and June 19, 1979. Unlike in West Germany, where the broadcast took place over the course of five days (January 22-26,\(^{881}\)
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1979) in four three-hour increments, the broadcast in Italy was much more spread out—appearing in eight one-hour increments over the course of slightly more than a month on *Rete 1*. Historian Emiliano Perra has argued that this broadcasting choice diluted the miniseries dramatic effect in Italy.\(^{882}\)

According to Perra, the Italian debate about the *Holocaust* miniseries ignored the country’s responsibility for the deportation of its Jews; Perra argued that part of this could be attributed to the broadcasting schedule, but part of it could be blamed on the state of Italian historiography on the subject. As Perra observed:

Largely in keeping with established narratives on the Second World War, the press debates surrounding the broadcast failed to confront Italy’s role in the Holocaust—highlighting instead numerous episodes of rescue. Commentators stressed the country’s victimization at the hands of the Nazis or pointed to universalizing themes that blurred the historical specificity of the events. The net effect of the reaction of the miniseries was thus to perpetuate the ‘good Italian’ myth.”\(^{883}\)

Despite Perra’s argument that the miniseries did not generate the same type of self-reflection in Italy as it did in West Germany, one of the most prominent Holocaust educators today in Italy recalls it as a turning point in her interest in the subject. Laura Fontana (b. 1965) recounts that when she was in her third year of middle school, her Italian teacher distributed a list of books, from which pupils had to select one to read and then conduct research on the subject. One of these books was *The Diary of Anne Frank*. The fourteen-year-old Fontana resisted picking it, but it was the only one left on the list and she was made to select it.


\(^{883}\) Perra, *Conflicts of Memory* (2010), 118-19.
The year, however, was 1979 and Fontana’s assignment coincided with the broadcast of the miniseries Holocaust in Italy. This coincidence changed the reading The Diary of Anne Frank for her from an activity of obligation to one inspiring deep fascination. Fontana became deeply invested in learning more about the topic, even when her teacher rejected her proposed research topic, saying that it was too sad a topic for a girl of fourteen. Fontana pursued the topic of the Holocaust in university and eventually began to work for the commune of Rimini. She credits her experience with The Diary of Anne Frank and the Holocaust miniseries for sparking her professional interest in the Holocaust and her life’s work.884 She has directed the activities of “Educazione alla Memoria” [Upbringing for Memory], the commune of Rimini’s educational programming dedicated to memory of the Holocaust and deportations, since 1990. She also is Italy’s representative at Mémorial de la Shoah [The Shoah Memorial] in Paris.885

While East Germany had not sanctioned the broadcast of the series, there still were noticeable effects. The historian and member of the East German Jewish community Helmut Eschwege recalled:

More than any other declaration, work of literature, or play, the television series "Holocaust" (1978) served to awaken dormant public interest in the greatest crime in Germany's history. Many books and articles were published, both on the film and on the Nazi crimes against the Jewish people. These have led a number of young Germans to involve themselves in the study of Jewish history, religion and culture.886

884 Fontana, interview.


The Holocaust miniseries also set off grassroots educational and memorial efforts in West Germany. It greatly increased the number of visitors to sites of remembrance. For example, in 1979, the number of German school and youth groups visiting the site of Dachau increased by fifty-five percent and the number of foreign school and youth groups increased eighteen percent. It also prompted the increasing recognition of other persecuted groups at Dachau, such as homosexuals and the Sinti and Roma. Additionally, in the wake of the miniseries, new memorials and memory sites were created, as well. For example, as local history became popular in West Berlin the early 1980s, history workshops held exhibitions on Jewish life in Berlin.

However, unlike in Italy and East Germany, in West Germany, there was also sustained encouragement from above. For example, the “The Students’ Competition on Germany History for the President’s Award,” a history contest for young people created in 1973 by industrialist Kurt Körber and West German Federal President Gustav Heinemann, chose “Everyday Life under National Socialism. From the Weimar Republic to the Second World War” as the topic for 1980-1. This theme was followed in 1982-3 by “Everyday Life under National Socialism. The War Years in Germany.” and “From Collapse to Rebuilding: Life in Postwar Germany” for the 1983-4 contest.

The essay contest had not always focused on such controversial issues. Prior to the broadcast of Holocaust, topics had been less polarizing, including “The 1848/49 Revolution” (1974), “Living Accommodation in the Process of Change” (1978) and “After-work Hours and Leisure Time in the Process of Change” (1979). However, the shift in topics brought about much

---
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broader participation. The 1980-81 contest attracted three times the participants of prior years; the 1980-81 context on “Everyday Life under Nazi Germany” had 12,843 participants working on 2,172 projects, while the 1979 contest on leisure time had only attracted 3,995 participants on 756 projects. Participation, however, fell to 5,894 participants and 1,168 projects for the 1982-83 contest.889

Although the topics of the early 1980s contests were broadly defined, likely influenced by the Holocaust miniseries, one in four participants chose to work on issues related to Jewish persecution. Interestingly, topics related to resistance (at least for the 1980-1 contest) were underrepresented, with only 147 out of 2172 works devoted to the topic, as compared to 551 on “Childhood and Youth” and 413 on “Oppression and Persecution.”890 In one project, likely considered under the rubric of “Oppression and Persecution,” eleven pupils from the twelfth grade of Gymnasium in Sundern researched the history and “fate of the Jewish Klein family,” using documents form their local archives.891 While project discussed the Klein family’s wartime fates (most of the family members died in various concentration camps), it also discussed everyday aspects of the family’s pre-1933 lives, such as the fact that Rikka Klein, along with her sister-in-law (also named Rikka Klein), prepared twelve to fifteen portions of soup for sick


people in Sundern every Friday. This allowed students to see the victims of National Socialism in personal and local terms. It was not just older students who participated in this contest. Gregor Rüter and Rainer Westhoff from the 9th class of Realschule, for example, conducted twenty-five interviews and used documents from the city archives, as well as documents from postwar trials to study Kristallnacht in Telgte. Some of those who worked on these projects went on to become amateur (or professional) historians and educationalists on topics related to Jewish history and/or the Third Reich. One prominent figure who participated was Anna (Anja) Rosmus (b, 1960), whose story was told in the 1989 film The Nasty Girl. The historian of Jewish history, Michael Brenner (b. 1964), participated in the 1983-4 contest.

Students had various motivations for taking part in these contests. One participant Dirk Rumberg, who wrote on “Everyday Life in Dachau,” recalled in 1982, a year after he had finished his project:

I had already been preoccupied for some time with National Socialism. When they showed the movie ‘Holocaust,’ people in Dachau, where I go to school, proclaimed: Now it’s enough! One should leave it alone. They said the memorial (for the concentration camp victims) should be demolished and one should build something useful there instead, like a soccer field or a factory. One could hear things like this in Dachau more and more frequently, not only from the old people, also from the young… Then the essay contest came along and it was obvious to me that I wanted to examine what the average Dachau citizen would have known at the time.”

892 Ibid., 144-45.
893 Ibid., 166.
895 As cited and translated in: Beckert, "Quiet and Ashamed We Face the History of Our Town," in Remembering the Holocaust, 8-10. Originally printed in: Galinski, Herbert, and Lachauer, Nazis und Nachbarn: 283, 85.
For another student, Monika Müller, who worked on the topic of female resistance in Hamburg-Harburg, it was the concept of “everyday life” that she found most interesting.

When asked why she had chosen to participate in the contest, she said:

> What personally interested me was actually that in the theme the emphasis was on “everyday life.” We have gone through National Socialism in class and—I found—quite extensively. We had a “anti-fascist week” at school, where regular instruction was cancelled. We visited exhibits, we watched films and we formed working groups on various topics. In this respect, it is actually really progressive what took place at this school. Despite this, the handling for me was very “official,” that is, I couldn’t not really imagine what happened then. It was for me a phenomenon and I did not know what hid behind it on the human level. Therefore, I found the emphasis on everyday life very interesting.896

As attested by Monika Müller, the essay contest and its focus on the history of everyday life had the effect of changing how German students viewed the Holocaust and the Second World War. Sven Beckert, who wrote about the Hitler Youth in Offenbach for the 1980-1 contest, noted in 1995 that student independent research on the Nazis past was a “significant breach with other pedagogical trends in German schools concerning the subject of persecution of the European Jews during the Nazi years.” Textbooks had largely focused on antisemitism from above and for the most part had presumed the ignorance of the general population. For example, the 1983 Klett textbook described, “As the war against Russia broke out, five ‘Einsatzkommandos’ executed Jews and Gypsies through mass shootings. In the process unimaginable scenes play out; several times it comes to protests. Therefore the ghastly undertaking was kept secret also from one one’s people as far as possible.” A new generation of teachers who had come of age during the ’68 movement, perhaps in opposition to these textbook narratives, had adopted “shock-pedagogy,” suggesting that German citizens had been
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extraordinarily involved in the Nazi system and cognizant of its crimes. This teaching strategy did not always, however, engender the desired result. As one student in the 1980s, Stefanie (the granddaughter of one of the men executed during the Nuremberg tribunal) recalled of her history teacher, “For hours he’d talk about the Jews, the Communists, the Gypsies, the Russians—victims, nothing but victims….I never believed the things he told us. Who knows whether it really was so bad.”

The essay contest flew in the face of these two contradictory top-down pedagogical impulses by having students work on local projects and engage in archival research, they “looked at victims as well as perpetrators and fellow travelers,” remarked Beckert in 1995. Günther Rehme, another participant, who worked on a project on the persecution of Jews in Marburg and the surrounding areas for the 1980-1 contest, agreed. When interviewed in 1982, he attested, “In school only fascist theory was examined or National Socialism was generally dealt with. The six million Jews were indeed mentioned, but then left alone. In everyday life, I could not exactly…imagine the persecution of the Jews. One must give faces to the numbers.”

However, those who participated in the contest were clearly a small minority of West German students and a self-selecting group. The increased focus both in the media and in school could at times be overwhelming or counterproductive to other young people. This was illustrated in Peter Sichrovsky’s interview project, which was published in the late 1980s. Peter Sichrovsky (b. 1947), the child of an Austrian Jewish man who fled Vienna in the 1930s and returned after the war, interviewed the children and grandchildren of Nazi perpetrators. One of these was
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Stefanie, mentioned above. Stefanie, who attended school in the 1980s, asserted, “They executed all the guilty ones back then at Nuremberg. They had their show. My own grandfather was among them. What do they want from me? Every year the same business in school. Movies about concentration camps, pictures of concentration camps. I’m telling you I can’t stand it anymore.” While very disturbing, Stefanie’s angry reaction serves to illustrate how pervasive imagery and discussion of the Holocaust had become in West German schools over the course of the 1980s.

6.3 Textbook Representations of Jewish Suffering

Despite this wide resonance in the educational system and other broader media forms, the textbooks remained somewhat resistant to the “Holocaust-effect.” The American-created miniseries is widely credited for having brought the term “Holocaust” into public parlance. Prior to the series, the term had been used, but other terms had competed with it, including “catastrophe,” “disaster,” “shoah” “khurbn,” “Final Solution,” and “annihilation.” The term “Holocaust” was first widely used in the Israeli specialist press in the late 1950s; it then moved to American Jewish periodicals. Elie Wiesel was responsible for a great deal of its prominence in America, encouraging its diffusion into the popular press in the United States during the 1960s. However, it was the broadcast of the NBC miniseries prompted the use of the term “Holocaust” in European media.


900 Calimani, "A Name for Extermination."
Yet, the series had no such lexical effect on the textbooks; none of our three subject states’ textbooks uniformly adopted the term. Italian textbooks continued to use terms with Nazi origins—such as “Final Solution”—to refer to the killing of European Jews and largely did not adopt the term “Olocausto” [Holocaust]. For example, the 1985 *Storia e lavoro storico* by Carlo Cartiglia referred to “Lo sterminio degli ebrei” [the extermination of the Jews]. Cartiglia’s book also reprinted Nazi primary sources that referred to the “soluzione finale del problema ebraico” [Final Solution of the Jewish problem]. 901 The fourth edition of Silvio Paolucci’s *Storia* series (published in 1983) discussed “sterminio totale” [total annihilation] and also quoted Goering’s term “soluzione generale del problema ebraico” [general solution of the Jewish problem].902 Likewise, the 1984 East German textbook for grade 9 also used “Endlösung der Judenfrage” [Final Solution of the Jewish question] to refer to the annihilation of the Jews planned at the Wannsee Conference, for example. Another portion of the book used the term “Vernichtung von etwa sechs Millionen Juden” [annihilation of about six million Jews].903 West German textbooks similarly continued to use the term “Final Solution,” despite the resonance of the Holocaust miniseries. The 1980 edition of *Zeiten und Menschen* used the terms “Der Mord an den europäischen Juden” [the murder of European Jews] and “Endlösung” [Final Solution], just as they had since its 1967 first edition.904 Even in the 1988 edition created for the federal state of

901 Carlo Cartiglia, *Dal Congresso di Vienna a oggi, Storia e lavoro storico* (Torino: Loescher, 1985; repr., 1), 283-84.


Lower Saxony, used the same terminology.\textsuperscript{905} The 1982 edition of \textit{Die Reise in die Vergangenheit} used “Judenmord” [murder of Jews], “Vernichtung des europäischen Judentums” [annihilation of European Jewry] and reprinted Rudolf Höß’s writing on the “Endlösung der Judenfrage” [Final Solution of the Jewish Question].\textsuperscript{906}

If the textbooks in the 1980s did not adopt the new language and imagery of Holocaust miniseries to refer to Jewish suffering, how exactly did they represent it? The answer to that question is a complicated one. While the textbooks in all three subject states did increasingly focus on Jewish suffering and persecution, this focus continued to be filtered through older narratives or “lenses” that had long been utilized in the textbooks. Thus, while the textbooks, to a certain extent, converged in their narratives about the Holocaust over the 1980s, there were still some very definite differences between them.

\subsection*{6.3.1 Italy}

Italian textbooks in the 1980s paid increasing attention to the plight of European Jews. Yet this attention focused primarily on crimes against the Jews in Germany and in other occupied countries—almost never in Italy. This allowed Italian textbooks to externalize culpability to Hitler and the Germans.


These tendencies can be observed in the case study of Silvio Paolucci’s *Storia* series. Paolucci’s *Storia* had always included more information than most Italian middle school books on the persecution of the Jews of Europe, but the revisions of the book published during the 1980s (1983 and 1987) demonstrated an increasing attention to specific details with regards to the suffering of European Jews. For example, the 1983 edition of Paolucci’s *Storia* was the first time that that series had printed the number of Jewish victims of the Holocaust, although, strangely, the number seemed to disappear in the 1987 edition of the book.907

Comparing the 1974 edition to the 1983 edition, there were a couple of notable changes. There were some additional paragraphs added in 1983; for example, two paragraphs were added discussing the meaning of Hitler’s “new order” and giving the number of Jewish Holocaust victims. Some pictures were also substituted; for example, a large picture of Anne Frank writing at her desk, which was present in the 1974 edition, was substituted with two new pictures in the 1983 edition. The first picture was of political prisoners at the concentration camp Oranienburg. The second was a picture of daily life in a concentration camp, taken from the Polish film *The Last Stage* (1948). Interestingly, Paolucci’s *Storia* chose to show a picture from a movie in the 1940s and not from the more popular and recent *Holocaust* miniseries; however, this could have been a matter of copyright and practicality. Although, *The Last Stage* was from the 1940s, its inclusion in the 1983 edition of Paolucci’s book suggests the important role that film had come to play in constructing the memory of the Holocaust.908 A second set of new pictures, including the well-known picture of the boy with his hands up during a roundup in the Warsaw ghetto, as
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well as a map of the Jewish population of Europe in the year 1936, was substituted in the 1987 edition. However, overall, perhaps because of path dependency, the text of the chapter section that discusses the persecution and murder of the Jews of Europe stayed largely the same between the Paolucci 1974, 1983, and 1987 editions. There were many of the same omissions. None of the three versions discussed the Italian racial laws of 1938, nor did they discuss the roundup of Italian Jewish civilians during the Italian Social Republic era.

But how representative was Paolucci’s *Storia*? Did its 1983 and 1987 editions represent the larger Italian textbook market in the 1980s? One can begin to answer this question by looking at a sample of ten Italian middle school history textbooks published between 1982 and 2001. As seen in Figures 15, 16, and 17, there was an increasing attention to pre-war persecution of Jews in Germany and in Italy, as well as increasing attention to what the books usually termed “the Final Solution.”

---


910 There was an allusion in the text to the deportations of Italian Jews, but it was not at all clear. Paolucci, *Ottocento e novecento* (1980), 288-97; Paolucci, *Ottocento e novecento* (1987), 282-89; Paolucci, *Ottocento e novecento* (1984), 272-79.

Figure 15: Word Count of Text Addressing the Pre-War Persecution of Jews in Germany in Sample of Italian Middle School Textbooks Published between 1982 and 2001
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Figure 16: Word Count of Text Addressing the Pre-War Persecution of Jews in Italy in Sample of Italian Middle School Textbooks Published between 1982 and 2001
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The 1980s, however, represented only the very beginning of this trend, which would see full culmination in the 1990s. If one isolates just the books in the sample that were published in the 1980s (Figure 18), one sees that they devoted between 601 and 1227 words to the subject. Like Paolucci’s Storia, most attention was paid in these books to the Holocaust of the Jews in the occupied lands and their pre-war persecution in Germany than to the situation of the Jews in Italy.
Pre-war persecution of the Jews by Italian fascists, as most clearly demonstrated in the 1938 Italian racial laws, was only lightly treated in the 1980s textbooks. As seen in Figure 18, between 14 and 214 words were devoted to the topic, depending on the book. When the Italian racial laws were discussed, they were often represented in a way that minimized Italian complicity. For example, the 1982 textbook *La storia e i suoi problemi* presented them as thus: “In 1938, then, Italy aligned itself with the **racist politics** of Germany. A Jewish problem has never existed in our country: yet a series of laws modeled on Nazi ones deprived the Jews of many rights, kicked them out of school, out of official jobs, out of the armed forces. It is the
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beginning of a persecution that will become much harsher in the successive years.”913 In this textbook’s account, the Italian racial laws were simply modeled after the German examples. They did not arise out of any desire on the part of the Italian population. However, it should be noted that by the 1980s, the Italian racial laws were at least mentioned in most Italian schoolbooks in our sample, as seen in Table 19. This was a real contrast to the books created during the 1950s and early 1960s, which had ignored the topic entirely (Table 8).

Table 19: Italian Textbooks’ Depictions of Persecution and Genocide of Jews in Italy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Discuss the 1938 Italian Racial Laws</th>
<th>Discuss Deportations of Italian Jews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>La storia e i suoi problem</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Umanità e sviluppo</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>I giorni della storia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>La storia (Ballini and Cantini)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>La storia (Dellamonica and Nicolò)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, Italian textbooks in the 1980s represent the beginnings of a trend towards a more central Holocaust narrative. However, they continued to focus primarily on the persecution of Jews by Germans and omit, or at least severely underplay, Italian citizen’s own complicity in antisemitic actions during the fascist period, including the deportation of Italian Jews from the peninsula between 1943 and 1945 and the Italian Social Republic police force’s role in their capture and deportation. By the 1990s, textbooks would begin to show increasing attention to the deportations of Italian Jews, but this was a very slow-moving process.

913 di Tondo and Guadagni, La storia e i suoi problemi (1982), 313.
6.3.2 *East Germany*

In East Germany, too, there was an increasing focus on Jewish victims in the 1980s; however, it cannot truly be attributed to the *Holocaust* miniseries, but instead to grassroots commemoration efforts, as well as the state’s attempts to better its relations with the domestic and international Jewish population. As previously mentioned, the *Holocaust* miniseries was not shown on East Germany television, although there are indications that some GDR citizens saw the programming. Yet, the textbooks, which were composed by the state, increased their focus on the persecuted minority for very different reasons.

We can see indications of a changing East German narrative towards the Holocaust in the 1984 textbook. This 1984 edition provided a much greater focus on the Jews as an individual victim group, including a timeline of various acts of persecution and violence against the Jews. For the first time since editions from the 1960s, it also cited the number of European Jews killed by the Nazis—six million. 914 Additionally, the textbook discussed the Wannsee Conference, which had not been discussed in the 1970 edition. 915 Increased attention could also be observed in the 1988 edition of the East German 9th grade history textbook, which for example, included a detailed definition of the term “antisemitism.” The 1988 edition also featured a much-expanded depiction of *Kristallnacht*—223 words and two pictures—as compared to 48 words and one picture in the 1984 edition. 916
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914 Wolfgang Bleyer et al., *Geschichte, Lehrbuch für Klasse 9* (Berlin: Volk und Wissen Volkseigener Verlag, 1985; repr., 2), 133, 81.


916 Wolfgang Bleyer et al., *Geschichte, Lehrbuch für Klasse 9* (Berlin: Volk und Wissen Volkseigener Verlag, 1988; repr., 2), 105, 06, 42, 68.
The increasing focus on racial and religious persecution is also visible in some of the process documents. A reviewers’ comments on what would eventually become the 1984 edition of the East German textbook noted that students needed more background information about Nazi Germany’s the persecution of people on racial and religious grounds. The same reviewer maintained also that the term “Kristallnacht” had to be more clearly defined for students.\(^\text{917}\) This commentary reveals that the 1984 textbook’s increasing focus on Jewish victims was not accidental, nor did it “slip through” governmental officials’ notice. It was part of a real push to increase students’ understanding about Nazi persecution on racial grounds. Interestingly, this change was not reflected in the grade 9 history curricular plan; as late as 1987, the edition from 1970 was being reprinted and utilized.\(^\text{918}\)

This focus in the textbooks was accompanied by new forms of media in the classroom. Throughout the 1980s, among the East German educational agencies, there was an emphasis on developing emotional and personal connections between the students and the history through use of “authentic” photos and personal details.\(^\text{919}\) For example, a draft of the manuscript that would eventually become the 1984 textbook was criticized for being too anonymous in its discussion of the resistance moment. There was a clear push towards the use of personal biography.\(^\text{920}\) Educational film or television shows were utilized in this push to “liven-up” history education.\(^\text{921}\)
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\(^{918}\) Ministerrat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik Ministerium für Volksbildung, Lehrplan Geschichte, Klasse 9 (Berlin: Volk und Wissen Volkseigener Verlag, 1987).

\(^{919}\) See: APW 10586, BBF.


\(^{921}\) “Entscheidungsvorgeschläge zur Weiterentwicklung der Unterrichtssendungen des Fernsehen (USF) für den Geschichtsunderrichts” February 1986, APW 11604-2, BBF.
East Germany began the development of a series of *Unterrichtssendungen des Fernsehens* for history instruction in 1976; by February 1986, they were used by more than half of instructors and there were eight films specifically developed for Class 9 (the grade level that discussed fascism and the Second World War). A number of new educational films were in the process of being developed in the last years of the East German state, including one on the NKFD. Another film, referenced in the 1984 *Unterrichtshilfen Geschichte 9*, was suggested to teachers when they taught the topic “The International Balance of Power on the Eve of the Second World War.” The film included footage of various events from the Nazi’s rise to power in the 1930s, including “Crimes of the Nazis- Jewish pogrom, KZ.”

Textbook and educational media production in East Germany took place over a long period of time; priorities and goals were mapped out years before these textbooks and instructional films came to fruition. Documents from late 1982 indicate that the 9th grade book, that was used in schools beginning in September 1984 was in development before December 1981. Therefore, this shift in East German attitudes towards Nazi racial persecution and how to represent it should be dated to the late 1970s and early 1980s. And indeed, this shift in the textbooks can be fit into a pattern of increasing state attention to the East German Jewish minority, as well as grassroot interest in Jewish history and the Nazi crimes against the Jews.

922 Ibid.


925 “Protokoll der Beratung des Entwicklungskolletivs Lehrbuch und UH Geschichte Kl. 9 am 17.11.1982 im Verlag Volk und Wissen” 11 November 1982, DR 2/28347; BA Berlin.
Shifts in how East Germany discussed Jewish issues can be detected as early as the late 1970s. The state began to sponsor cultural events as part of the GDR’s new focus on “heritage and tradition.” On the fortieth anniversary of Kristallnacht in 1978, the GDR state sponsored its first exhibition on Jewish history. On the grass-roots level, as well, there was movement. In the late 1970s, church leaders in the GDR began to hold open conversations about Nazi persecution of the Jews. The Conference for Evangelical [Protestant] Leadership wrote in its call for open discussion on the fortieth anniversary of Kristallnacht, “We call to the attention of the churches the fortieth anniversary of Kristallnacht and remember it with shame. An enormous guilt lies on our people” Local restoration and dialogue projects were also carried out, encouraged by Protestant and some Catholic church leaders.

These changes were accelerated during the 1980s when SED General Secretary Erich Honecker attempted to gain “most favored nation” trading status with the United States. Honecker felt that he could curry American favor by bettering the state’s relations with the tiny East German Jewish population; Honecker envisioned that American Jews might lobby for the GDR in the American Congress. Consequently, an American rabbi was invited to take up a posting in East Germany. The fiftieth anniversary of Kristallnacht was also commemorated with far more attention than in previous years. Furthermore, in a high-profile project, the East
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928 For more on this process, see: Angelika Timm, Jewish Claims against East Germany: Moral Obligations and Pragmatic Policy (Budapest: Central European University Press (CEU), 1998).

929 See: Beware Lest the Nightmare Recur: Remembrance of the Nazi Pogrom in the Night of 9 November 1938 (Dresden: Association of Jewish Communities in the GDR, 1988). For secondary source material informing the previous paragraph: Peter Monteath, "Holocaust Remembrance in the German Democratic Republic-- and Beyond,"
Berlin Neue Synagoge was reconstructed at a cost of eighty-five million marks.\textsuperscript{930} The recognition of Jewish victimhood became increasingly important to East Germany in the 1980s, in a way that it was not in other Eastern Bloc countries, because both its status as heir to a perpetrator state and also its competitive relationship with West Germany, which had made Holocaust commemoration, by now, a cornerstone of public culture. \textsuperscript{931}

This, however, did not mean that East German students really internalized this increased discussion about the Holocaust, nor that it led to any real introspection about national complicity. As discussed in Chapters 3-5, it was a common tactic in East German schoolbooks to point to the Nazis still living free in West Germany, as a means of delegitimization. East Germany, in contrast, was presented as the heir to the antifascist resistance.\textsuperscript{932} In his speech at the 1988 commemoration of Kristallnacht, Honecker continued such a narrative, depicting the GDR (and its KPD predecessor) as long opposed to antisemitism and presenting the GDR as having “honestly and completely fulfilled its obligation to eradicate fascism and its evil creed once and for all…The Constitution the GDR provides that the dissemination of racial and national hatred and warmongering shall always be strictly punished.”\textsuperscript{933}

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Beware Lest the Nightmare Recur} (1988), 12.
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{930} Meng, "East Germany's Jewish Question," 632-33.

\textsuperscript{931} Monteath, "Holocaust Remembrance in the German Democratic Republic-- and Beyond," in \textit{Bringing the Dark Past to Light}, 223.


It is difficult to determine if this increased discussion of the Nazis’ persecution of the Jews led East German children to ask questions about their parents’ wartime activities. There are some indications that this was not the case. Jana Hensel (b. 1976) reflected in her memoir, “Here was one thing we never paused to consider, either before or immediately after the Wall: What came before the GDR. In the history lessons we got as children, everyone was part of the anti-fascist resistance movement. Grandparents, parents, neighbors, everyone.”

There were some efforts to problematize this issue, as seen in a 1982 process document on the creation of the Unterrichtshilfen Geschichte 9, which critiqued, “Resistance fight must be more personified, but also problematized, ex. How strong was the resistance movement? Why did it not succeed in winning the masse of the German people?” However, this impetus did not seem overly strong. Very similar to the Italian textbooks, East German textbooks’ increasing discussion about the Holocaust did not require any real increased attention to national complicity because the atrocities were rather seamlessly incorporated into a narrative that largely blamed the West German “other.”

6.3.3 West Germany

West German textbooks from the 1980s also stuck to many of the same trends that they had practiced for decades. There were some slight changes to the narrative—particularly when it came to depictions of the general complicity of ordinary Germans—but many of the base texts and ideas were the same. For example, our case study series Zeiten und Menschen, which was
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934 Hensel, After the Wall (2008), 114.

935 “Protokoll der Beratung des Entwicklungskolletivs Lehrbuch und UH Geschichte Kl. 9 am 17.11.1982 im Verlag Volk und Wissen” 11 November 1982, DR 2-28347, MiV, BA Berlin.

936 Argued in: Weiner, "Tendentious Texts."
first published in 1967, underwent two major revisions in the pre-1989 era; these revisions can be identified in the 1978 and 1984 editions. While these revisions were host to a number of changes to the text structure, the major ideas in the section on Jewish suffering changed very little.

The 1984 edition was marked by several changes in both form and style. First, the textbook was given an updated layout with substantially more readable font and text arrangement. Second, additional discussion questions were added to the section on “The Persecution of the Jews”—an increase from three discussion questions in the 1978 edition to seven in the 1984 edition. To allow for this greater number of discussion questions (as well as additional primary source documents), some of the narrative passages were condensed between the 1978s and 1984 editions. What is telling is which lines were eliminated.

Certain passages were eliminated from the 1984 edition, which in the prior 1978 edition had suggested the German population or certain figures’ reluctance to take part in the persecution against the Jews. For example, the line “Initially the National Socialists carried out the anti-Jewish measures with a certain restraint taking into account to their still insecure rule domestically and abroad” was eliminated.937 Another major deletion was a discussion of how certain individuals were exempted from laws that forced Jewish public employees to retire:

Also in this law Hitler had to accept a limitation: Hindenburg had asserted that Jewish combatants and the relatives of Jewish soldiers killed in action would be exempt from the regulations. Some National Socialists, who believed the primitive claim that all Jews were “cowards” were disabused of then notion as it became known that 96000 Jews had fought in the World War on the German side and 1200 of them had fallen.938

937This line referred to Nazi policies against the Jews soon after the Nazi rise to power in 1933. Tenbrock and Kluxen, Zeiten und Menschen (1978), 103.

938 Ibid., 104.
While both statements that were eliminated in the 1984 edition were basically true, they projected a certain ambivalence about the Nazis’ willingness to persecute Jews. This was clearly not a narrative that school officials wished to convey to children in the 1980s.

In the section on “The Murder of European Jews,” there was also a slight but telling revision when identifying the perpetrators of the Holocaust. In 1978, the line read, “Unchallenged by abroad and hidden away from most Germans, Hitler could carry out in the wide spaces of the East his ‘Final Solution of the Jewish Question.’” In the 1984 edition, “Hitler” was replaced with “the rulers of the Reich.” Thus, the circle of responsibility for the Holocaust was slightly broadened from just Hitler to various other people in power during the Third Reich. Clearly, there were some small, but deliberate moves to move away from language or explanations that vindicated the German people of involvement in the persecution of the Jews.

However, on the whole, the narratives in the 1978 and 1984 editions (reprinted through 1988) were remarkably consistent. The section on “The Murder of European Jews” experienced very few changes of note between the 1978 and 1984 revisions, for example. Both editions reflected on Germans’ actions as bystanders. For example, the question for students “How do you account for the little willingness of the Germans to stand up for the persecuted?” appeared in both versions of the textbook. Both textbooks also had the same inaccuracies; they puzzlingly refer to the number of Jewish victims as “over five million.” Thus, it is clear that the
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Holocaust miniseries that had so shaped West German public thought about the recent past had little to no effect on this particular textbook series.

What is particularly notable and surprising about the West German case is that despite the swirling media attention on the Holocaust, the increased use of film and photographs in schools, the increased likelihood of schooltime visit to memorials, and the President’s Prize contest, the textbooks stayed remarkably consistent to the narratives that had developed in the mid-1960s. This alone underlines how progressive the West German textbook narratives were by the late 1960s. Even when left almost completely alone, they matched the surrounding memory culture in values almost twenty years later. As early as the 1960s, West German textbooks had developed a “self-critical” lens, which even the Italian and East German textbooks of the 1980s lacked.

That said, it is clear that on the issue of the depiction of Jewish suffering, the Italian, East German, and West German textbooks, and educational cultures as a whole, were converging by the 1980s. West German narratives had been somewhat more self-critical before. The rising coverage of Jewish suffering in Italian and East German books began to meet the West German textbooks’ level of engagement with the subject. This meant that textbook depictions in the 1980s resembled each other in a way that they had not previously.

6.4 Textbook Representations of Resistance

Another area of commonality across the textbooks of our subject countries was the continued prominence of the resistance narrative, as well as the continuation of the trend of “broadening” of the resistance narrative to include individuals who would not have traditionally
featured. But there was also a certain stagnation. Many of the textbook depictions printed through the 1980s conveyed many of the same attitudes and tropes prevalent in textbooks created during the 1960s. In many cases this could be attributed to the fact that some of the series began in the 1960s and the base text just had not been revised that much since then. But even newer series echoed many of the same themes.

6.4.1 Italy

The resistance to the Nazi occupiers and the Italian Social Republic during the years 1943-1945 continued to be an important section of Italian middle school history textbooks created and printed during the 1980s. Some textbooks, however, devoted more space to this narrative than others. For example, the 1984 textbook *La storia* by Ballini and Cantini devoted more than 3550 words to the narrative, beginning with the Allied invasion of Sicily in 1943 and ending with the liberation of Italy. The 1988 textbook *La storia* by Dellamonica and Nicolò, in contrast, devoted only slightly over 1100. However, most of the textbooks produced during this period employed similar narrative tropes when discussing the issue.

Through the 1980s, a dominant paradigm by which to view the period of 1943-1945 was that of a “war of liberation”—with heroic Italian partisans joined together in the spirit of unity, fighting to free Italy from the German invader. One can see this in the 1984 textbook *I giorni della storia*: “In the countryside, on the mountains, on the streets of the city, **brigades of volunteers** fought the **War of Liberation**, which was also defined as the Risorgimento because the Italian people had to re-do that which they had already done in the preceding century to make
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themselves united and independent: drive out the foreigner, bring down absolutism, claim their liberty.”\(^{944}\)

The books of the 1980 increasingly spoke about civilian strikes and resistance on the part of working-class civilians. For example, the 1982 *La storia e i suoi problemi* described:

Between November and December 1943, the workers of the central-northern portion of Italy began to strike. In Breda di Sesto San Giovanni, near Milan, they presented ‘General Zimmerman who commands – Who does not work, leaves the factory and who leaves the factory is declared an enemy of Germany—All the workers leave the factory.’ The strike repeated in March 1944. A million and half workers participate: it is the largest demonstration of protest in occupied Europe.\(^{945}\)

The same textbook also discussed the partisan republics set up by the divisions of partisans representing the communist, Action, and socialist parties. Additionally, it asked students to answer the following question: “Which social classes participated in the Italian Resistance? Did the peasants, for example, participate in the *Risorgimento*? And after unity, in which fights did they take part? \(^{946}\) This representation of the Italian resistance here is particularly interesting because of its combination of several narratives. Referring to the Italian resistance as a “Second *Risorgimento*” was a longstanding interpretation, which was particularly prevalent in the 1950s and 1960s, but even repeated into the 1980s in some books (discussed in greater depth in Chapter 4).\(^{947}\) However, the authors of *La storia e i suoi problemi* combined this narrative with the narrative advocated for by Leftist academics like Claudio Dellavale, who had pushed for a more socially conscious narrative, focusing more on “the subaltern social class.” \(^{948}\)

\(^{944}\) Ortolani and Pagella, *I giorni della storia* (1984), 266.

\(^{945}\) di Tondo and Guadagni, *La storia e i suoi problemi* (1982), 358.

\(^{946}\) Ibid., 359-63.


\(^{948}\) Dellavalle, “La storia della resistenza nella scuola media unica,” in *Libri di testo e resistenza*, 74.
A more class-conscious narrative, which reflected the divisions between the various groups involved in the resistance, was also presented in the 1982 *Umanità e sviluppo*. The book narrated that while the CLN:

represented therefore the unity of the democratic forces against the fascism…naturally that was not enough to eliminate the contrast between the parties of the Left, which conceived of the fight against fascism as the beginning of a profound societal transformation, and the moderate parties, for which the fight should be pursued until the full achievement of democratic liberty without it undermining the fundamental structure of Italian society.949

Interestingly, this book made a point of explaining how the resistance was very different from the *Risorgimento* of the 19th century, noting that “By the vast popular participation the resistance is very different from the Risorgimento, which was mainly a movement of the *elite*.”950 That said, even this more class-differentiated narrative still presented Italian unified against a foreign foe. By using a “national lens” and representing the war from 1943-1945 in the guise of a national struggle for liberation, which culminated in the creation of the postwar Republic of Italy, the textbooks largely externalized complicity to the *cattivo tedesco* [*evil German*].951

6.4.2 *East Germany*

Like the partisan struggle in Italian books, the antifascist resistance struggle remained an essential part of East German narratives about the recent past. The continued importance of the
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950 Ibid., 320.

951 One notable exception to this trend, however, was the 1984 *La storia* book by Ballini and Cantini, which characterized the Italian Social Republic’s treatment of partisans and Jews as “crueler and bloodier” than even the Germans. Ballini and Cantini, *La Storia per la scuola media* (1984), 317. Filippo Focardi, *Il cattivo tedesco e il bravo italiano: la rimozione delle colpe della seconda guerra mondiale* (Bari: GLF editori Laterza, 2013); Weiner, "Tendentious Texts."
resistance was apparent even from just glancing at the 1988 textbook. Its back cover bore a large picture of the concentration camp memorial at Buchenwald. Internal discussions in 1987 about various possibilities for the front and back covers of the 1988 book, reveal that the memorial was meant to portray “the artistic coming to terms with the antifascist resistance struggle during fascism.”

Yet at the same time, the textbooks and their writers took a more expansive view of who constituted the resistance. The 1980s textbooks were marked by a broader conception of a resistance movement, which included various types of political, and ideological opposition to the Nazis, and was not just limited to resistance led by the KPD. For example, in a 1988 review of a draft of the Unterrichtshilfen [UH] Geschichte 9, the reviewer wrote:

> It lacks all together information for the teacher to communicate knowledge about all the forms of the German anti-fascist resistance fight. There is in the UH just the resistance groups and the NKFD. It must be communicated to the pupils that there was resistance in Germany in:
> a) In resistance groups
>   - Under the leadership of the KPD
>   - With the collaboration with communists
>   - That were led by other antifascist forces (Social Democrats, Christian circles)
>     - In middle-class and military circles (July 20\(^{th}\)) - single actions-
> b) In prisons, penitentiaries and concentration camps
> c) In emigration (SU and many other countries) - exile-
> d) In the troops of the countries of the AHC [Allied High Commission]
> e) In the partisan units of many countries
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952 The front cover, in contrast, had a portion of Arno Mohr’s “Wendepunkt Deutschland”. The painting itself was quite large and so the decision was made to focus on the portion of the painting which that Karl Marx in it. This was a new front and back cover composition; the 1984 front cover had had a picture of Lenin’s head and a socialist style building and the back cover showed two pictures of urban life, presumably representing urban life in 1918 when the book’s coverage started and the other a more modern urban scene. Steinbrück, “Aktennotiz, Betr. Entscheidungsvorschläge zum Außentitel Geschichte 9,” April 7, 1987, DR 200/2596, BA Berlin. Bleyer et al., Geschichte, Lehrbuch für Klasse 9(1984); Bleyer et al., Geschichte, Lehrbuch für Klasse 9(1988).
The teacher should absolutely illustrate this breadth and diversity of the fight of the German people against fascism.953

This broader conception of resistance coincided with the further rehabilitation of the July 20th conspirators in East German textbooks. In prior iterations, the July 20th conspirators had been compared unfavorably to communist resisters. For example, the 1970 edition of the textbook had clearly stated that “the chief cause of the failure of the July 20 conspirators was that they refused to draw upon the people. They stood above all as hostile to the working class and to the KPD.”954 But one begins to see the softening of this line in the 1980s. In a draft of the Unterrichtshilfen Geschichte 9 (that eventually became the 1984 edition), the typed sentence “The conspiracy of July 20th collapsed because the doctrine of the Goerdeler Group was hostile to the people and because these powers had done everything to disable the working class and the KPD. The putsch failed because it was dilettantish and prepared without connection to the antifascist resistance movement.” was crossed out in handwritten ink.955 The 1988 edition of the textbook embraced the broader conception of the resistance movement, advocated for by the UH reviewer above, which embraced both the July 20th conspirators and communist resisters. The textbook had students “classify how the July 20, 1944 attempt fits into the antifascist resistance fight in Germany” The amount of discussion devoted to the July 20th conspirators also increased sharply in the 1980s editions of the East German textbooks, as seen in Figure 19.


955 Document found in: DR 200/4291, MfV, BA Berlin
The figure of Stauffenberg also became increasingly central. As discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, East German textbooks since the 1960 edition had increasingly mentioned Stauffenberg; this trend became particularly pronounced as East German historiography and pedagogy turned increasingly to biography, as well as “heritage and tradition.” The 1984 and the 1988 textbooks are the most obvious exemplars of this trend. Using Voyant Tools, one can calculate the relative frequency of various words in the sections of the East German textbooks discussing the July 20, 1944 plot. As seen in Figure 20, the relative frequency of the term “Stauffenberg” increased sharply in the 1984 edition of the East German middle school textbook and stayed high in the 1988 edition. Other figures also joined Stauffenberg in being rehabilitated, with the 1988 text classifying not just Stauffenberg but also Frintz Lindemann, Friedrich Olbricht, Helmuth Stieff, Henning von Tresckow, Albrecht Mertz von Quinheim, Werner von Haeften “and others” as
“patriots.” Yet, the “socialist lens” of the East German narrative remained to a certain extent. Some of the July 20th conspirators were still described as wishing to “sustain capitalism after the war’s end and to hinder the development of socialism.”

**Figure 20: Relative Frequency of the term "Stauffenberg" in East German Middle School Textbooks' Sections on the July 20th Conspiracy**

Scholars have characterized the 1980s as a decade when educational reform (even educational reform coming out of the Soviet Union) was particularly opposed by the GDR Minister of National Education Margot Honecker, who pushed for continued ideological education. That said, one cannot ignore the very clear “broadening” of the resistance narrative
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957 Wolfgang Bleyer et al., *Geschichte, Lehrbuch für Klasse 9* (Berlin: Volk und Wissen Volkseigener Verlag, 1989; repr., 2), 189-90

958 The Ninth Pedagogical Conference of the GDR was held in June 1989. To prepare for the conference, the Ministry asked individuals and agencies for suggested improvements. While in the end, Margot Honecker blocked the discussion of these matters, the practice allowed parents and students to articulate their desires. Val Dean Rust and Diane Rust, *The Unification of German Education* (New York: Garland Pub., 1995), 98-110.
to include figures who would have been completely unpalatable to the East German textbooks in the 1950s and 1960s.

6.4.3 West Germany

A similar “broadening” was not as visible in the West German case. Like West German textbooks’ narratives about the Holocaust, narratives about resistance were relatively consistent from the late 1960s through the 1980s. Military resistance and the July 20th conspirators continued to play a fundamental and central role; they were not displaced by resisters of more Leftist orientations.

For example, in the case study of Zeiten und Menschen, the majority of changes in the 1980s textbook sections related to the resistance were related to form and style, rather than content. When comparing the 1978 and 1984 editions, the largest changes involved the addition of primary source documents, as well as more discussion questions. For example, the 1984 edition featured a page with selections from the last pamphlet of the resistance group White Rose, writing by the SPD leader Wilhelm Leuschner, and also a quote by Henning von Tresckow along with accompanying discussion questions.959 The Leuschner quote had appeared, however, in another part of the section in the 1978 edition, as had a part of the White Rose pamphlet.960

While Leuschner, a socialist, was quoted in the book, military resistance and the July 20th putsch continued to assume a dominant role in Zeiten und Menschen’s representation of the German resistance against Hitler. The 1967 edition of the textbook had devoted 53% of its
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959 Immisch, Zeitgeschichte (1982), 129.
section on the “The Resistance” to the July 20th conspirators and the conspiracy’s aftermath.\textsuperscript{961} The proportion was 59% in the 1978 edition.\textsuperscript{962} In the 1984 edition, the section “The Resistance” was divided into two sections: “Resistance” and “The Assassination Attempt.” Between these two sections, approximately 57% of the text was devoted to the July 20th attempt and its consequences. Thus, there was little appreciable difference in the amount of emphasis on the July 20th conspirators between the 1967 and 1984 editions.

That said, as mentioned in Chapter 5, Zeiten und Menschen actually emphasized military resistance far less than other textbooks printed in the 1980s. For example, the section on wartime resistance in the 1967 edition of Klett geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk Ausgabe B, which was reprinted identically through 1983, devoted 88% of its section on German wartime resistance to the officers’ conspiracy and aftermath.\textsuperscript{963} It is clear that West German textbooks from this period still very much favored the military resisters that had been the protagonists of their original “founding myths.”

\section*{6.5 The 1980s as a Whole}

The textbooks of the 1980s were marked stylistically by changes in format, the introduction of new primary sources, as well as the creation of additional discussion questions. Instruction was clearly supposed to become more interactive and engaging to students. Yet the

\footnote{Resistance section discussed above: Tenbrock, Kluxen, and Stier, Zeiten und Menschen: geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk (1967), 181-83.}

\footnote{Tenbrock and Kluxen, Zeiten und Menschen: geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk (1978), 146-48.}

\footnote{These percentages, however, does not include the timeline added to the end of the section in Ausgabe C Menzel and Textor, Staatensystem und Weltpolitik (1969), 131-33. Pinnow and Textor, Um Volksstaat und Völkergemeinschaft (1967), 191-93.}
same innovation that can be observed in textbook design did not extend to the textbook narratives, themselves. Despite the media attention on the Holocaust during the 1980s, as well as the building of numerous memorials [Gedenkstätten] during this period, narratives about the Holocaust and the resistance in the textbooks changed very little during the 1980s. There was the continuation of some trends, such as the increased focus on Jewish victims and a certain “broadening” of resistance participants in the Italian and East German cases, but by and large, the textbook narratives stayed roughly the same.

Part III Conclusion

The 1970s and the 1980s were times of seismic social and cultural shifts. The student revolts of 1968 and the Holocaust “memory boom” that began in the 1980s made sizable changes to how Italians, East Germans, and West Germans viewed their national pasts. But these events did not fully permeate the textbook, which were no longer playing a leading role in memory culture. Distinctive qualities remained in the textbook narratives of each of our subject states. Italian textbooks still largely did not reflect on Italy’s complicity in the persecution and deportation of its Jews. Marxism-Leninism still shaped East German textbooks’ discussion about the recent past, giving the narrative a particular tinge. West German textbooks still heavily emphasized military resistance downplayed the actions of socialists and communists. Thus, there were incremental changes to the textbooks in the 1970s and 1980s, but largely following preexisting trends.

Yet, especially in the textbooks of the 1980s, we see the seeds of a convergence of narratives, particularly in the case of narratives about the Holocaust, as well as how increasingly both East and West German textbooks lionized Stauffenberg and his fellow conspirators. These convergences appear not to have arisen from any duress, but out of the political and cultural needs of the individual subject states, as well as out of a transnational culture of remembrance. By studying the 1980s, it becomes clear that many of the changes to narratives about the Nazi/fascist past that we attribute to the end of the Cold War and the reunification of Germany were, in fact, percolating already in the 1980s before the Mauerfall. This will be addressed to a much fuller extent in the Epilogue.

Part II and Part III of this study illustrate that there was early integration of discussion about what we now know as the Holocaust and wartime resistance before the revolutions of 1968. By the mid-1960s, the narratives in the textbooks of all three subject countries were relatively set. What really changed after during the 1970s and 1980s was not the textbook narratives, but the methods of teaching about the past. Between the late 1960s and the 1980s, the three countries increasingly embraced a more active textbook model, which involved the inclusion of more pictures, more activities, and more primary sources. In Italy, while books as early as Silvio Paolucci’s 1965 Storia had included primary source excerpts, we see a greater embrace of a more active textbook culture by the 1980s in Italy. For example, Carlo Cartiglia’s textbooks, published by Loescher from the 1980s onward, included both narrative discussions of periods in question followed by worksheets, including primary source documents for analysis. The history workshop movement in Italy during the 1980s and 1990s also focused
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965 Paolucci, Ottocento e novecento (1965).
on developing critical historical thinking.⁹⁶⁶ The 1970 East German textbook and the editions of
the 1980s were also increasingly marked with color photographs, discussion questions, and
personal biography.⁹⁶⁷ Newly composed West German textbook manuscripts in West Germany
from the late 1960s through the 1980s (like the *Zeiten und Menschen* series) were similarly
marked by increasing use of photographs, discussion questions and primary source excerpts.⁹⁶⁸
The findings of Dieter Boßmann’s 1977 study also pushed West German pedagogues to abandon
the “broadcast-receiver” model and to push students to more actively engage with history
instruction.⁹⁶⁹

Additionally, there was a push for students to connect emotionally to the history narrative
being presented. This was accomplished through the use of memory trips, educational film, and
essay contests. Through both the textbooks and other media of history instructions, instructors
and governmental officials attempted to have students increasingly engage with complex
historical processes and relate emotionally and personally to the history they were being taught.
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⁹⁶⁶ Cajani, "Italian History Textbooks on the Brink of the Twenty-First Century," in *School History Textbooks
across Cultures*, 31-36.

Klasse 9,” DR 2-28347, MfV, BA Berlin


⁹⁶⁹ Meseth and Proske, "Mind the Gap," 204
EPILOGUE: THE COLD WAR TRANSITION, 1989 TO 2000

There is general agreement among historians that Western European public memory of the Holocaust and the Second World War dramatically shifted at the end of the Cold War. Communist-era narratives fell away and the Holocaust assumed a new prominent position in national and transnational memory in many countries throughout the world. In both Italy and Germany, the impact of the end of the Cold War was sharply pronounced. In Germany, the end of the Cold War meant political reunification and the subsuming of East German political and memory traditions to West German ones. Italy was also rocked by the great political changes of the late 1980s and early 1990s. As scholar Rozario Forlenza noted, “Outside Germany, the most direct impact of the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the end of communism was recorded in the crisis of the Italian political system in the first half of the 1990s. The foundation of the political legitimacy of the postwar Republic started to be questioned, leading to intense debates over what had actually happened during the war.”

The post-Cold War transition also brought with it new anxieties. Some scholars theorized about the “Europeanization,” “universalization” or “cosmopolitization” of the Holocaust. Especially in the reunified Germany, there were fears that memories of communism would
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supplant memories of the Holocaust.\textsuperscript{972} Reunification also brought with it a new wave of xenophobic violence that raised questions as to whether the lessons of the past had really been learned.\textsuperscript{973}

However, as discussed in Part III, it becomes clear that many of the changes to narratives about the Nazi/fascist past that some have attributed to 1989 and the end of the Cold War, at least in the context of Italy and Germany, were, in fact, percolating in the 1980s. Furthermore, particularly the Italian case, other major developments did not begin until well into the 1990s. This epilogue attempts to answer the following questions: How did politicized national narratives about the Holocaust and the Second World War, developed in a Cold War context, change with the fall of the Soviet Union and the reunification of Germany? What exactly changed after 1989 and were these changes already in motion before the fall of the wall? Did these new narratives reflect a “European” or “global” Holocaust memory?

**Ideological Transitions in Italy**

Scholar Emiliano Perra observed that the 1990s witnessed two major trends in Italian memory culture: the “consolidation” of a central Holocaust narrative that focused primarily on Jewish suffering and a “crisis” in the public memory of the partisan resistance.\textsuperscript{974} As seen in Chapter 6, Italian textbooks in the 1980s represented the beginnings of a trend towards a more

\textsuperscript{972} Jarausch, “Catharsis by Confronting the Past: Lessons of Germany's Double Burden of Dictatorship.”

\textsuperscript{973} The KMK put forth a resolution pushing for anti-racist multicultural education, in response. See the copy of the resolution in: On the Treatment of the Holocaust in School. For background on the xenophobic and antisemitic attacks, see: Herf, Divided Memory (1997), 266.

\textsuperscript{974} Perra, Conflicts of Memory (2010), 149.
thorough focus on the Holocaust. However, Italian memory focused on deportations, in general, of partisans and political prisoners, for example not on the specific deportation of Italian Jews.975 The textbooks of the 1980s, when they did discuss the special burden faced by Europe’s Jews, continued to focus primarily on the persecution of Jews by Germans and omit, or at least severely underplay, Italian citizen’s own complicity in antisemitic actions during the fascist period. One begins, however, to see some slight changes to this narrative in the textbooks of the later 1990s.

As discussed in Chapter 6, the Italian racial laws, although often mentioned in 1980s Italian textbooks, were presented in a way that minimized Italian complicity.976 This interpretation would begin to receive some push-back in 1987 and 1988 (during the fiftieth anniversary of the promulgation racial laws) when the Italian Parliament organized two conferences on the racial laws and a comparative study of the persecution of Jews in Europe, but this did not permeate into the textbooks at this time.977 In fact, this idea of the racial laws as foreign imports has continued on even into much more recent textbooks. The 2001 textbook Viaggio intorno al tempo stated:

In autumn of 1938, laws against Jews were issued, which copied the Nazi laws of 1935. On their basis, Jews could not work in public office and could not marry other non-Jews. Jewish pupils were expelled from their public schools. The laws were preceded by a scholarly manifesto, which claimed, without any scientific basis, that there existed a pure Italian race. These measures, despite press propaganda, raised more than a little doubt in a country where the Jewish community was not very numerous (around 50,000) and coexisted tranquilly with the rest of the population. The laws also opened a serious contrast with the Catholic Church, which would not accept a discrimination based on the motives of race.978

975 Fontana, interview.
976 di Tondo and Guadagni, La storia e i suoi problemi: dal 1815 a oggi (1982), 313.
977 Perra, Conflicts of Memory (2010), 152-53.
In Chapter 6, we used a sample of ten Italian middle school history textbooks published between 1982 and 2001 and held at the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research.

*Viaggio intorno al tempo* was one of the ten books analyzed and it should be noted that it was the textbook showed by far the most discussion of the Italian racial laws—actually reprinting a portion of them as a source for students to consider. But even it minimized Italians’ acceptance of them and suggested that they were met with doubt and opposition.\(^{979}\)

While this argument about the lack of widespread antisemitism in Italy is not an uncommon one among historians (such as Renzo De Felice and Robert Wistrich), it is clear that the textbook engaged in some distancing tactics. Firstly, it noticeably separated the vast majority of Italians from antisemitic acts. In this, the textbook ignored (or failed to take into account) influential research by Michele Sarfatti (his most influential work being published in 1994), which underlined both Italy’s autonomy in the introduction of its racial laws and the fact that during the brief period between September 1938 and November 1938, Italy’s racial laws were actually more discriminatory than Germany’s.\(^{980}\) While it is not fair to expect the textbook to engage in the same level of nuance as historiographical monographs, it could have delved, to a much greater degree, into ordinary Italians’ accommodation to the regime and the racial laws and not moved so quickly to exculpate them. When viewed in conjunction with the lack of attention in the textbooks to Italian Jews’ deportation from the peninsula and the RSI’s role in this, it is clear that that the textbooks’ increasing attention to the discriminatory and murderous crimes

\(^{979}\) Ibid.

committed against Europe’s Jews was not accompanied by any real reckoning with Italian
complicity in their fate. Furthermore, even as late as 1997, as survey of teachers in Milan
revealed that most teachers, especially at the secondary school level, contemporary history was
still only dealt with in very cursory ways, and the Holocaust was only rarely taught.\textsuperscript{981} Thus, a
picture emerges of continuity, with some gradual change over time—not of rupture.

*Table 20: Italian Textbooks' Discussion of Topics related to the Holocaust in Italy*\textsuperscript{982}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Discuss Italian Racial Laws, Y/N</th>
<th>Discuss Deportations of Italian Jews, Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td><em>La storia e i suoi problemi</em></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td><em>Umanità e sviluppo</em></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td><em>I giorni della storia</em></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td><em>La storia</em> (Ballini and Cantini)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td><em>La storia</em> (Dellamonica)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td><em>Nuova storia</em></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td><em>Tu e la storia</em></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y (Indirectly, includes Primo Levi as source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td><em>Uomini fatti storia</em></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td><em>Il nuovo viaggio nella storia</em></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y (Indirectly, includes Primo Levi as source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td><em>Viaggio intorno al tempo</em></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{981} Chiappano, "La didattica della Shoah in Italia"

However, not all books minimized Italians’ responsibility. Silvio Paolucci’s books, which were not included in the above sample of ten, proved an outlier in this regard. Paolucci’s *Storia*, which had been published in its fifth edition in 1987, was revised and rereleased by Paolucci and Giuseppina Signorini in the between 1995 and the early 2000s as *Il corso della storia* and then from the mid-2000s through present day as *L’ora della storia*. The 1995 edition of *Il corso della storia* was the first Paolucci book produced after the end of the Cold War.\(^{983}\) The second edition of *Il corso della storia* (1997) was, interestingly, the first of the Paolucci books that mentioned the Italian racial laws and Italian persecution of the Jews. However, it did so in great detail, featuring a special full-page section devoted to “Fascist Racism: The Jews and the Abyssians [Ethiopians].”\(^{984}\) Far from blaming the Germans entirely, Paolucci and Signorini isolated tendencies and roots in the Italian fascist party to explain fascist antisemitism as early as 1935:

> Things began to change with the conquest of the empire when the growing frequency of marriages and unions between Italians and Ethiopian women made the problem of mixing of races emerge. The alliance with Hitler’s Germany made more oppressive the anti-Jewish tendencies that already existed. The fascist party began to favor the publication and distribution of books that exhalated the superiority of the Italian race, that supported erroneously that Italian blood had remained pure for millenniums and should not, therefore, be contaminated by mixing with that of other races.\(^{985}\)

Paolucci and Signorini’s 1997 book also pointed out the RSI’s collaboration in the deportation of Italian Jews.\(^{986}\) However, most Italian history textbooks through the 1990s continued a narrative
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\(^{983}\) Marisaldi, Russo, and Giordani, interview. Notes created by Luciano Marisaldi for Daniela Weiner in preparation for interview.


\(^{985}\) Ibid.

\(^{986}\)Ibid.
which minimized Italian involvement in what Paolucci and Signorini’s book termed “the persecution of rights” and the “persecution of lives.”

A greater sense of rupture can be seen in Italian textbooks’ narratives about the resistance. Through the 1980s, the dominant paradigm by which to view the period of 1943-1945 was that of a “war of liberation”—with heroic Italian partisans fighting to free Italy from the German invader. One can see this in the 1984 textbook *I giorni della storia*: “In the countryside, on the mountains, on the streets of the city, brigades of volunteers fought the War of Liberation, which was also defined as the Risorgimento because the Italian people had to re-do that which they had already done in the preceding century to make themselves united and independent: drive out the foreigner, bring down absolutism, claim their liberty.” By using a “national lens” and presenting the war from 1943-1945 in the guise of a national struggle for liberation, which culminated in the creation of the postwar Republic of Italy, the textbook externalized complicity to the *cattivo tedesco* [evil German].

One can, however, see a large change in this narrative over the course of twenty years. If we turn again to the 2001 *Viaggio intorno al tempo*, it describes, “In recent years, a new historical and political consideration has developed in Italy of the Resistance, seen not only as a war of liberation from the Germans but also as a «civil war» that saw Italians and other Italians opposed to one another.” The contrast to the 1984 book is astounding. The 2001 text made clear that there were Italians who fought on both sides of the war; it was not simply a war against

987 Ibid.
989 Focardi, *Il cattivo tedesco e il bravo italiano* (2013); Weiner, "Tendentious Texts."
an invader. But even more surprising was the text that follows, in which the schoolbook discussed youths’ complicity for supporting the RSI regime:

We have asked ourselves, in particular, what motivations could have driven these youth to deploy on the Nazis’ side in a war that almost everyone knew was already lost. And it has been responded that at the base of this choice in favor of a collaborationist regime, which was among other things complicit in the persecution of Jews, could be also a misunderstood sense of honor…But on the other hand, recognizing the good faith and apathy of many combatants of the Social Republic… does not change the historical judgment of this experience, nor cancel out the differences between the different sides of the fight.991

Noticeably, the textbook began to weigh the general population’s support for Italian state-sponsored antisemitism.

What can be observed through close-reading analysis of these two textbooks, reflects also across a larger sample. Looking at again the same ten books considered previously and considering the relative frequency of the two terms “war of liberation” and “civil war,” a trend emerges. “Civil war” became much more prevalent beginning in the mid-1990s.

991 Ibid.
Once can see similar changes in our case study of the Paolucci and Signorini *Il corso della storia*. I interviewed members of the editorial staff at the Zanichelli publishing house in 2009, including Silvio Paolucci and Giuseppina Signorini’s long-time editor, Luciano Marisaldi. When I asked how the series had changed between the 1980s and the present day, editors at the Zanichelli publishing house remarked that there were new emphases: increasing attention was given to the civilian population; the Italian Social Republic, which had been “almost ignored” previously, was given more discussion; and the role of female partisans was also considered.
Thus, the “complexity of the discourse” increased, giving new attention to the idea of a “civil war.”

For example, the 1995 Il corso della storia stated:

In Italy the patriotic war of the soldiers and officials who refused to give themselves up to the Germans was accompanied by a civil war of Italians against Italians. On one side were the fascists, the other those who refused any form of collaboration with them and with the Germans: soldiers that escaped from enlistment in the army of the Social Republic; militants from antifascist parties that came back from exile; youth that made the choice, moral and political at the same time, to take up arms against the dictatorship.

This shift in the textbooks coincided with both developments in historiography and politics. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, a combination of factors, including the collapse of the Italian Communist Party [PCI] and the influence of new social history caused the consensus around the founding myth of the resistance to fall away. Thus in the late 1980s and early 1990s, new narratives emerged on both the left and the right—with some on the left pushing for a recognition of the Italian population’s wartime complicity and some on the right embracing a historical revisionism that attempted to normalize fascism and downplay its crimes. With the Tangentopoli scandal of the early 1990s, the political parties that had dominated postwar Italian life lost much of their power and new groups became more important. The resistance consensus that had fragiley held together the Italian political parties disintegrated. Another important factor was the 1991 publication of Claudio Pavone’s influential work on the resistance during the
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992 Marisaldi, Russo, and Giordani, interview.


995 Perra, Conflicts of Memory (2010), 151-52.
RSI Period, which introduced the idea of the war of 1943-1945 as a war of liberation, a civil war, and a class war.996

Other important push factors came out of the government. Luigi Berlinguer, a former member of the PCI, became Minister of Public Education in 1996 under the Prodi government.997 Berlinguer introduced a new focus on contemporary history in Ministry Decree n. 681 (often referred to as “the Berlinguer decree”). Berlinguer was an academic by training and spent his career at the University of Siena, where he worked in the area of political studies and legal history. Prior to becoming MPI, Berlinguer was rector of the university.998 Before Berlinguer’s decree, Italian students often had never made it past the First World War in history instruction, but the decree ensured that the third year of the scuola media be devoted to il Novecento [the twentieth century].999

The decree prompted a flurry of educational activity and research on themes including the racial laws and the expulsion of Jewish students and teachers from schools. Beginning in 1998, the Ministry for Public Education also sponsored the project “The Youth, the Twentieth Century, and Memory,” which, much like the 1980-1 President’s Prize context in West
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997 The Partito Comunista Italiano (PCI) became the Partito Democratico della Sinistra (Democratic Party of the Left), then the Democratici di Sinistra (DS) and then the Partito Democratico (Democratic Party, PD). Some more far left members of the PCI, however, created the Partito della Rifondazione Comunista (Communist Refoundation Party, PRC). Perra, Conflicts of Memory the Reception of Holocaust Films and TV Programmes in Italy, 1945 to the Present (2010), 151. Luigi Berlinguer, "Biografia Ufficiale Di Luigi Berlinguer," accessed March 16, 2020. https://www.luigiberlinguer.eu/biografia/.


999 Fontana, interview. Marisaldi, Russo, and Giordani, interview.
Germany, encouraged students to engage with the themes of racial discrimination, deportation, and extermination camps.\textsuperscript{1000} The decree also prompted textbook houses, such as Zanichelli, to create revised editions to reflect the new emphasis.\textsuperscript{1001}

Italian schoolbook narratives thus present a curious mix of continuity and rupture. Some changes in the narratives began their development long before 1989—the increasing attention to Jewish Holocaust victims, for example. Some only became apparent in the late 1990s, even if they had had roots in the time period before—such as the recognition of the “civil war” of 1943-1945 and the new push towards contemporary history stimulated by the Berlinguer decree. 1989 is an interesting focal point around which these narrative shifts turn, but looking at the data, it resists neat periodization.

\textbf{German Reunification and the Textbooks}

However, 1989 indisputably signified an abrupt rupture for the German states. In summer 1989, free travel over the newly opened Hungarian border allowed for mass flight of East Germans to the West. Protests in the fall of 1989 in East German cities galvanized newly audible calls for reform and change. When the Berlin Wall fell in November 1989, the SED regime could not ignore the “civic revolution” any longer.\textsuperscript{1002}

Changes in East German education were apparent as early as fall 1989, when \textit{Staatsbürgerkunde} (civics) and pre-military training were cancelled. East German history syllabi

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1000} Chiappano, "La didattica della Shoah in Italia."
\textsuperscript{1001} Marisaldi, Russo, and Giordani, interview. Also reflected in notes created by Luciano Marisaldi for Daniela Weiner.
\end{flushright}
were invalidated in November 1989 and, in December, the East German APW convened a working group of history educators and representatives of all political parties, as well as the churches, to discuss possible revisions. Initial revisions for the history curriculum for grades 5-10 were completed by February 1990. They were distributed to various individuals for review before being presented to the MfV in March 1990. Although the APW syllabi were never formally published, they were available to educators who began to do work on the federal state-level. History syllabus reform until summer 1990 was, thus, guided by the East Germans, themselves. West Germany only controlled the process beginning with the 1990-1990 school year.\textsuperscript{1003}

During this political upheaval, many East German history teachers retreated to what they perceived to be less politically fraught history—often the ancient or medieval period. As American scholar John Rodden observed, based on his visits to the eastern federal states of Germany in the years immediately following \textit{die Wende} [the “turn”], “Lower-level POS [\textit{Polytechnische Oberschule}] history of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was similarly replaced by a flight into a review of feudal or ancient history.”\textsuperscript{1004} Rodden has drawn parallels between the 1989-90 era and the educational reconstruction of 1945-46. He observed:

And for many older eastern Germans, especially the students and \textit{Neulehrer} of the early postwar era, the experience of their children and grandchildren evoked memories of the Soviet occupation and the educational reconstruction of 1945/46: chaos, mass firings or layoffs, no suitable textbooks, ideological “re-education,” and structural revamping


\textsuperscript{1004} Rodden, \textit{Repainting the Little Red Schoolhouse} (2002), 179.
largely determined from a foreign capital. Again they felt as if they were living in an occupied country.\footnote{Ibid.}


Former East German teachers had to adapt to a new style of instruction, as well. The new West German-style syllabi were far less prescriptive than the ones to which they had previously been accustomed. The process of syllabus adoption in the former East German federal states also
changed. Instead of being delivered from a centralized ministry, they were developed in a consultative manner with many more people involved, including parents, students, and the public. Teachers also underwent re-training, taking seminars on such topics as “The Third Reich in High School History Instruction.”

Some observers, such as John Rodden who visited the former-GDR frequently during the early 1990s, saw this as period of great change in how the East German federal states treated the Holocaust and the Second World War. Commenting on the 1993 history syllabus for grade 12 adopted by the eastern federal state of Thuringia, Rodden asserted that students learned “new lessons of history,” like that “the Holocaust was an inhuman consequence of racial hatred and the misuse of power;” the syllabus also encouraged teachers to “illustrate the Resistance in its entire breadth.” Rodden presented these as “new lessons.” However, as seen in Chapter 6, the GDR had already been moving in this direction on both issues already in the 1980.

East German textbooks were replaced by West German ones as early as winter 1989-1990. West German schoolbooks were provided to the eastern federal states through the Schulbuchaktion [Action for School Textbook Supply]. In this program, created by Eberhard Jobst at the Federal Ministry of Education and Science in Bonn, the ministry worked with the Association of School Textbook Publishers to send 2.46 million of their existing books to the new eastern federal states. The West German publishers perhaps hoped that the schools that


1011 Fuchs and Reuter, "Education and Schooling in East Germany," 533.

1012 Unlike the textbooks created in Germany during occupation in the 1940s, these textbooks had already existed. In many cases, they were older stock of which the publishers wished to be rid.
they freely gave textbooks to during the unification process would choose to buy from them in later years. A series of seminars was set up to help East Germans with the process of textbook selection. Faced with Western competition, *Volk und Wissen Verlag* suffered. As scholar Rosalind Pritchard described, “Classroom interest in the glossy new Western books was intense and the enthusiasm which they aroused eclipsed the dowdy Volk und Wissen publications.”

For the first time forced to compete on an open market, *Volk und Wissen Verlag* faced a number of problems—including that their history and civics books had to be pulled from distribution, because of their content. *Volk und Wissen Verlag* was privatized and became part of the West German Cornelsen Publishing group.

Two years after reunification, Dutch writer Ian Buruma interviewed two high school history teachers in former East Berlin, Mrs. Lein and Mrs. Nass. One of the topics he asked them about was what they thought of the new history textbooks, created in the West:

‘Well,’ said Mrs. Nass, ‘they look better, but the contents, well…’

‘Not good at all,’ said Mrs. Lein. ‘Very superficial.’

I asked them to be more specific.

‘There is not enough analysis about the war, why it happened, and so on. There is a lot of stuff about the Jews—but it’s all about superficial events, no framework, no background…’

I wondered what background they expected. Did they miss the Marxist explanations about monopoly capital being at the root of Hitler’s fascism?

‘Oh,’ said both women at once, ‘but we still believe that. People who profit from it wage wars. That is obvious. We still teach our pupils that. But you know that the problem is:'

---

1013 Pritchard, *Reconstructing Education* (1999), 63-64.

our pupils are very sensitive to the distinctions between old GDR sources and new FRG ones. The problem is, we have to leave it up to them to make up their minds.’

During this transitional period, it appears that Volk und Wissen Verlag paused their production of the Geschichte middle school history books; Mrs. Nass and Mrs. Lein, though they may have wanted to, could not assign them to students. But then in the early 2000s, the by now privatized Volk und Wissen Verlag once again began publishing a series—this time called Geschichte Plus. Featuring a new up-to-date look and a revised narrative, Geschichte Plus was published for the “new” federal states of Saxony-Anhalt, Saxony, Brandenburg, Thuringia and Mecklenburg-West Pomerania, as well as for Berlin.

The fact that the former East German publishing house began printing a very similarly named textbook series for the very same states that it had published history books for more than forty years raises many questions. Did this new Geschichte Plus series retain anything of the old Geschichte series? What legacy, if any, of the “socialist lens” remained in these post-reunification Volk und Wissen Verlag books? Were they any different in their representations of the Nazi past different from that of other middle school history textbooks published in unified Germany? One can examine these questions by looking at Geschichte Plus’s treatment of one particular hot-button issue—the resistance, and especially, the July 20th conspirators. To evaluate how Geschichte Plus’s treatment of this issue compared to other textbooks on the market at the time, one can turn to the textbooks published contemporaneously by the former West German publishing house, Ernst Klett Verlag.

As seen in Table 21, both the Klett and Volk und Wissen Verlag books published in the 1990s abandoned much of the polemical language that had accompanied descriptions of the

---

putsch in previous decades’ didactic materials. For the most part, these textbooks merely reported the facts and refrained from commentary that would either praise or criticize the July 20th plotters. The 2001 edition of Geschichte Plus textbooks abandoned the frequent references to the KPD that had so characterized the 1980s editions of Geschichte. The section addressing the July plot also shrunk in both the Klett and Volk and Wissen Verlag textbooks, as compared to their 1980s iterations. The Klett textbooks consideration of the topic shrunk from 665 words in 1983, to 321 words in 1988 and 1993, to 150 words in 1999. The Volk and Wissen Verlag textbooks showed a similar trend, dropping from 733 words in 1988 to 267 words in 2001. The reduction seems to suggest that with the end of the Cold War, the issue of the July 20th putsch had lost much of its symbolic value and East German and West German narratives on the topic had seemingly converged.

Table 21: Comparison of the Description of the July 20, 1944 Conspiracy in German Textbooks Before and After German Reunification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>“Stauffenberg” Relative Frequency</th>
<th>“KPD” Relative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983 Staatensystem und Weltpolitik</td>
<td>Ernst Klett Verlag</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984 Geschichte 9</td>
<td>Volk und Wissen Verlag</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


That is not to say, however, that both textbooks presented the July 20th conspirators and the resistance movement in the exact same way. In the subsection preceding the one addressing the July 20th putsch, Geschichte Plus discussed the national conservative resistance. In this section, one can still detect a socialist flavor, a criticism of the national conservatives’ support for Hitler as long as he was winning the war. The 2001 Geschichte Plus Ausgabe Berlin stated:

Many of these opposition members had first been positively disposed towards National Socialism and had also accepted the persecution of minorities. Their relationship to the state was basically shaped by duty. They could only decide upon resistance once defeat was conceivable and the criminal character of the regime during the war of annihilation of the East had become highly visible.1018

---

1018 Bayer et al., Geschichte Klasse 9 (2001), 166.
Klett’s Zeitreise 10, published in 1999 for Rhineland Palatinate, had also commented on the change of heart that many national conservatives faced, but painted a more sympathetic portrait. It stated, “It was harder for officials, soldiers and officers to decide on active resistance. They felt obliged to carry out their oath to ‘the Führer Adolf Hitler.’ After the beginning of the war they fell into a crisis of conscience, since they saw a putsch as a ‘betrayal of the German soldiers at the front.’”\textsuperscript{1019} The Geschichte Plus presented the officers as so blinded by duty that they had accepted criminal acts, while the Zeitreise portrayal depicted the officers as dedicated public servants who were torn by their allegiance to the brave soldiers at the front. Although subtle, there is a real distinction there.

***

The first two decades of German reunification were also marked by educational involvement with the great number of Gedenstätten [memorial sites] that had been set up or renovated since the 1980s.\textsuperscript{1020} In a 1997 report on the teaching of Holocaust in the Federal Republic of Germany, three federal states (Bavaria, North Rhine-Westphalia, and Saxony) submitted descriptions of how the Holocaust was taught in their schools. All three states’ contributions stressed experiential learning and tracing Jewish life in local communities; but they emphasized to various degrees visits to sites of remembrance.

Given its long engagement with educational trips to sites of remembrance, it is unsurprising that the federal state that most explicitly encouraged memorial visits was Bavaria. Bavaria noted in its contribution that “special significance is attached to ‘on-site learning’, i.e. the investigation of regional or local testimonies to the Jewish past and visits to concentration

\textsuperscript{1019} Flues et al., Zeitreise 10 (1999), 64.

\textsuperscript{1020} Jarausch, "Catharsis by Confronting the Past: Lessons of Germany's Double Burden of Dictatorship."
camp memorial sites.” In contrast, the submission by North Rhine-Westphalia emphasized visits to sites of remembrance to a lesser extent, only stating that teachers’ manuals utilized in the state often suggested student projects connected to local history, including “a visit to a memorial site or a former concentration camp” Saxony’s contribution mentioned a group of school pupils that visited Auschwitz, but stated no actual policy encouraging visits to sites of remembrance.

More formal instructions, however, have emerged recently on the national level. In 2014, the KMK put forth a resolution on “Remembering our past for our future: Recommendations for a culture of remembrance for form an object of historical and political education in schools,” which was published in both German and English. In the declaration, the KMK stated, “Memorial days, anniversaries and visits to places of remembrance offer a particular opportunity of elucidating to the younger generation the significance of the past for their own life and times.” In the resolution, the KMK encouraged schools to arrange trips to “commemorative and memorial sites, meeting places, archives, cemeteries and other places of remembrance” and specifically suggested “class trips to places of remembrance also outside Germany.” Previous KMK resolutions seem to have made no mention of visits to sites of remembrance, so the emergence of the 2014 declaration is particularly worthy of note.

1021 On the Treatment of the Holocaust in School, 18.
1022 Ibid., 32.
1023 Ibid., 46.
1024 "Remembering Our Past for Our Future Recommendation for a Culture of Remembrance to Form an Object of Historical and Political Education in Schools (Resolution Adopted by the KMK on 11 December 2014),” in Sammlung der Beschlüsse der ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, ed. Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Nieuwied: Luchterhand, 1964-).
How then have the textbooks engaged with these federal and national instructions? Have
the visits to the sites of remembrance come only at teachers’ and schools’ initiations or have the
textbook authors and editors begun to also take part? How do these most traditional educational
media deal with these new instructions and new methods of experiential learning? As one can
see in Table 22, out of the twenty-four surveyed history textbooks, published between 1992 and
2016, only fourteen suggested a visit to a Holocaust site of remembrance. Those books that did
not suggest a visit, for the most part, either provided a description of a Konzentrationslager [KZ]
or remembrance site or suggested that student readers research a Jewish synagogue in the local
area or a well-known KZ. 1025

1025 Many thanks to Michaela Wetzel at the GEI for the assistance locating and scanning some of the books. The
textbooks considered are as follows: Peter Alter et al., "Geschichte und Geschehen IV": geschichtliches
Unterrichtswerk für die Sekundarstufe I, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Klett, 1992); Immisch et al., Zeitgeschichte: von der
Oktoberrevolution bis zur Gegenwart (1996); Klaus Bergmann, Geschichte und Geschehen: geschichtliches
Unterrichtswerk für die Sekundarstufe I, Ausgabe D Sachsen, 1. Aufl., 1. Dr. ed., vol. 5 (Leipzig: Klett, 1997);
(Braunschweig: Westermann, 2000). Brigitte Bayer et al., Geschichte Klasse 9, Ausgabe Mecklenburg-Vorpommern
d., Geschichte Plus (Volk und Wissen Verlag, 2001); Heike Bodewald, Geschichte Plus 9 Arbeitshefte, Ausgabe
Berlin ed. (Berlin: Volk und Wissen Verlag, 2002); Brigitte Bayer et al., Geschichte Klasse 9, Ausgabe Sachsen
Gymnasium ed., Geschichte Plus, (Volk und Wissen Verlag, 2001); Bodewald, Geschichte Plus 9 Arbeitshefte
(2002); Brigitte Bayer, Geschichte Klasse 9, Ausgabe Brandenburg ed., Geschichte Plus (Volk und Wissen Verlag,
2001); Bodewald, Geschichte Plus 9 Arbeitshefte (2002); Brigitte Bayer et al., Geschichte Klasse 9, Ausgabe Berlin
ed., Geschichte Plus (Volk und Wissen Verlag, 2001); Bodewald, Geschichte Plus 9 Arbeitshefte (2002); Bayer,
Geschichte Klasse 9 (2001); Bodewald, Geschichte Plus 9 Arbeitshefte (2002); Lambert Austermann et al., Zeiten
und Menschen 4, vol. 4, 4 vols. (Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schönigh, 2002); Geschichte und Geschehen,
Ausgabe Bayern Gymnasium, 1. Aufl., 1. Dr. ed., vol. 4, 4 vols. (Leipzig: Klett, 2007); Lambert Austermann et al.,
Zeiten und Menschen 4, vol. 4, 4 vols. (Paderborn: Verlag Ferdinand Schönigh, 2007); Franz Hofmeier, Forum
Geschichte 9/10: vom Kaiserreich bis zur Gegenwart, Ausgabe Gymnasium Neubearb. 1. Aufl. ed. (Berlin:
Cornelsen, 2010); Dieter Buckard et al., Zeitreise 3, Ausgabe Niedersachsen ed. (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag,
2011); Markus Feundorfer et al., Zeitreise 4, Ausgabe Bayern ed. (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag, 2011); Annette
Adam et al., Die Reise in die Vergangenheit: ein geschichtliches Arbeitsbuch, Ausgabe Sachsen-Anhalt ed., vol. Band
9/10 (Braunschweig: Westermann, 2011); ibid.; ibid.; Franz Hofmeier, Forum Geschichte 9/10: Vom
Imperialismus Bis Zur Gegenwart, Ausgabe Gymnasium Neubearb. 1. Aufl. ed. (Berlin: Cornelsen, 2014); Johannes
Derichs, Die Reise in die Vergangenheit Ausgabe Nordrhein-Westphalen ed., vol. 3 (Braunschweig: Westermann,
2014); Anno 5, Ausgabe Sachsen ed. (Braunschweig: Westermann, 2015); Christopher Andres, Anno 3, Ausgabe
Gymnasium, Thüringen, Dr. A ed. (Braunschweig: Westermann, 2015); Sven Christoffer, Marcel Greisang, and
Maria Heiter, Zeitreise 3, [Ausgabe] C, [Neubearb. für Rheinland-Pfalz, Realschule+, Saarland, Erweiterte
Realschule], 1. Auflage ed. (Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag, 2016).
Table 22: German Textbooks’ Suggestions of Visits to Holocaust Sites of Resistance (bolded entries include particularly substantial discussion of visits to sites of remembrance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Publication Year</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Federal State</th>
<th>Visit suggested?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geschichte und Geschehen IV</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Klett</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeiten und Menschen 4</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Schöningh</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geschichte und Geschehen</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Klett</td>
<td>Saxony</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anno 4</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Westermann</td>
<td>Baden-Württemberg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anno 4</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Westermann</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anno 4</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Westermann</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geschichte Plus 9 2001 (Book)/2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Cornelsen/Volk und Wissen Verlag</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Yes (in student workbook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geschichte Plus 9 2001 (Book)/2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Cornelsen/Volk und Wissen Verlag</td>
<td>Brandenburg</td>
<td>Yes (in student workbook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geschichte Plus 9 2001 (Book)/2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Cornelsen/Volk und Wissen Verlag</td>
<td>Mecklenburg-West Pomerania</td>
<td>Yes (in student workbook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geschichte Plus 9 2001 (Book)/2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Cornelsen/Volk und Wissen Verlag</td>
<td>Saxony</td>
<td>Yes (in student workbook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geschichte Plus 9 2001 (Book)/20033</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Cornelsen/Volk und Wissen Verlag</td>
<td>Thuringia</td>
<td>Yes (in student workbook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeiten und Menschen 4</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Schöningh</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geschichte und Geschehen</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Klett</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeiten und Menschen 4</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Schöningh</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Geschichte 9/10</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Cornelsen/Volk und Wissen Verlag</td>
<td>Lower Saxony</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeitreise 3</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Klett</td>
<td>Lower Saxony</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeitreise 4</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Klett</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Reise in der Vergangenheit 9/10</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Westermann</td>
<td>Mecklenburg-West Pomerania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Reise in die Vergangenheit 9/10</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Westermann</td>
<td>Saxony-Anhalt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the fourteen books that suggested a visit to a site of remembrance, eight books (the selected 1997 and 2000 Anno editions, the 2014 Forum Geschichte 9/10 book for Thuringia and the 2001-2002 Geschichte Plus books for Berlin, Brandenburg, Mecklenburg-West Pomerania and Saxony) devoted only brief mentions of a visit. The Anno book published in 1997 for Baden-Württemberg, for example, instructed students to “Set up a visit to a KZ memorial” at the bottom of a page. No further instructions were given.1026

Only six books offered in-depth engagement with the idea of students visiting sites of remembrance— offering discussion questions before, during, and after the visit, as well as special suggestions as to where to go. These six books (representing three unique titles in various Land editions) were, for the most part, published in the last ten years, suggesting that while textbooks have been slow to engage with memorials, educational centers, and more experiential learning, they are increasingly beginning to do so.

It is unclear which factors correlate with increasing engagement with sites of remembrance in the textbooks. The six books identified as engaging most with educational tourism to sites of remembrance were targeted towards federal states from both the former East and West Germany. They were published by two major publishing houses: Cornelsen-Volk und Wissen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forum Geschichte 9/10</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Cornelsen/Volk und Wissen Verlag</td>
<td>Thuringia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Reise in die Vergangenheit 9</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Westermann</td>
<td>North Rhine-Westphalia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anno 3</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Westermann</td>
<td>Thuringia</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anno 5</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Westermann</td>
<td>Saxony</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeitreise 3</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Klett</td>
<td>Rhineland-Palatinate + Saarland</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wissen Verlag and Westermann Verlag. But not all textbooks published by these houses shared this characteristic of engaging with educational “dark tourism.” For example, while the 2014 Die Reise in die Vergangenheit published for North Rhine- Westphalia by Wesetermann devoted two pages to how students could participate get involved with the Stolpersteine [stumbling stones] project, the 2015 Anno 5 published for Saxony by Westermann failed to encourage visiting or engaging with sites of remembrance at all.\textsuperscript{1027} It would be fair to say that even though schoolbook publishers have been increasingly incorporating visits to sites of remembrance into their textbook and workbooks, adoption of this trend is still sporadic and may be a decision made on the author-level.

This then raises the question: in those textbooks that do attempt to mediate and guide students’ experiences of sites of memory, are there any particular trends? In most cases, the books that engaged with student visits to sites of remembrance were targeted not to Germany as a whole, but to specific federal states. The sites of remembrance featured also tend to be located within the targeted federal state. For example, the 2010 edition of Zeitreise used by Realschulen in Lower Saxony featured a short chapter on visiting Bergen-Belsen, while the Zeitreise published in the same year for Bayern has the same chapter, with almost identical wording, but for Dachau.\textsuperscript{1028} The 2011 edition of Die Reise in die Vergangenheit for Mecklenberg-West Pomerania took advantage of the federal state’s proximity to Berlin-Brandenburg—suggesting that students visit not only Ravensbrück, but also the Anne Frank Center in Berlin and the Jewish Museum Berlin.\textsuperscript{1029}


\textsuperscript{1029} Adam et al., Die Reise in die Vergangenheit: ein geschichtliches Arbeitsbuch (2011), 59, 61, 76-77.
These textbook chapters focusing on “dark tourism” or visits to sites of Holocaust remembrance tend to be structured in similar ways. Most of them provide some background information on the featured site of remembrance. They then provide three sections devoted to preparation for the visit, things to do and questions to consider while on site, and reflection and activities to conduct after the visit.\textsuperscript{1030}

The textbooks usually engage in very open-ended questioning. They ask students to reflect on their feelings about the visits and any overarching themes, but they usually give students no sense of what those themes might possibly be. For example, in the 2010 editions of \textit{Zeitreise}, students were asked to “note questions, that you have on the theme of the excursion” and “define which themes and which portions of the memorial interest you the most.”\textsuperscript{1031} While allowing students to explore and develop their own opinions can be seen as a pedagogical good, in this case, the textbooks were almost so open as to be opaque. Students were likely left with very little guidance as to how to properly engage with these sites of remembrance. In his 2016 article, Daniel Reynolds argues that tourists are “custodians of the memory work that the memorial sites have begun. For that memory work to have any meaning beyond the place of suffering, it must rely on the memory work of tourists to carry on that project”\textsuperscript{1032} Unfortunately, even the textbooks that currently do engage with visits to sites of remembrance seem almost afraid to suggest what students are meant to take away from the visit and what memory work in which they are meant to engage.


\textsuperscript{1031} Feundorfer et al., \textit{Zeitreise 4} (2011), 170-71; Buckard et al., \textit{Zeitreise 3} (2011), 62-63.

At times there are hints that the textbook might be attempting to push towards an argument or an overarching theme, but these are largely abandoned. For example, the 2011 Die Reise in die Vergangenheit textbook designed for Mecklenburg-West Pomerania listed several questions that should be answered “seriously and scrupulously” before a visit to the memorial site at Ravensbrück. Of these questions, two of them attract special note: “Are there in the class right-wing or right-wing-extremist orientated students?” and “Are there in the learning group students from different nationalities?” The special relevance that such a visit might have for these particular student groups is therefore raised, but then not addressed again. This is somewhat frustrating, not only for a historian attempting to draw conclusions, but also arguably for students and teachers attempting to use the book as a source of guidance in navigating the visit to this site of trauma.

While there are signs that German history textbooks have been increasingly incorporating visits to sites of remembrance in recent years, the textbooks and the Holocaust tourism remain largely apart. The textbooks, when they do incorporate “dark tourism” into their pages, seem hesitant to offer more guidance than some overarching questions in vague language. While pedagogically, the use of open-ended questioning has value in allowing students to learn and explore, it may also cause a certain amount of unease as both students and teachers are unsure as to what they are meant to take away from their trips to these sites of remembrance.

“European” or “Globalized” Holocaust Education?

---

1033 Adam et al., Die Reise in die Vergangenheit: ein geschichtliches Arbeitsbuch (2011), 77.
Historians, scholars, and educationalists have debated another notable characteristic of post-Cold War Holocaust education. A question of much debate has been whether a “European,” “universalist,” “globalized” or “cosmopolitan” model of Holocaust education has developed. While the terms used to describe it vary, the phenomenon interrogated remains similar. For example, scholar Wolfgang Meseth argued that after German reunification:

The fusion of the two Germanys’ interpretations of the Holocaust in the curriculum development of the eastern German states and later in textbooks resulted in a limited yet highly significant departure from the view of history in before reunification West Germany. Hence, West Germany’s sense of national responsibility to remember the past was joined by a universalist ethical perspective on crimes of the Nazi period.1034

But many have argued that a “universalist” perspective was not necessarily unique to the German case.

Scholars, such as Patricia Bromley and Susan Garnett Russell, have discussed the process by which Holocaust education has become “universalized” and used as a means to combat racism and xenophobia.1035 They found that in many countries’ textbooks, the Holocaust is now increasingly being written about in school texts as a one among many genocidal crimes, rather than as a unique historical event central to the narrative of the twentieth century. This may be linked to the development of comparative genocide studies and the concept of human rights as an academic discipline. However, in their study, Bromley and Russell noted that Italy and Germany, however, continue to explicitly teach about the Holocaust; Italian and German textbooks’ present the Holocaust as a unique historical event, going against this larger trend.1036

---

1035 Gross, "The Process of the Universalization of Holocaust Education."
1036 Bromley and Russell, "The Holocaust as History and Human Rights."
Discussions about a “universalized” Holocaust memory have not just stayed confined to the world of education. Other scholars have tackled the question in a much broader context. In a 2011 article, Jean-Marc Dreyfus and Marcel Stoetzler questioned, “Is there a globalised Holocaust memory, or at least a tendency towards one? Does the common reference to the Holocaust mean a coming to terms with, and a genuine understanding of the catastrophe, or is it a mere ritual?” Dreyfus and Stoetzler concluded that the local, the national and the communal are far more important than the globalized memory, but other scholars, such as Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider have put forth different views. Levy and Sznaider, studying the United States, Israel, and the USA, argued that a “cosmopolitan memory” of the Holocaust has emerged. Levy and Sznaider contended that “its meanings evolve from the encounter of global interpretations and local sensibilities. The cosmopolitanization of Holocaust memories thus involves the formation of nation-specific and nation-transcending commonalities.”

One of the instances that Levy and Snaider cited as contributing to the “deterriorialization and the institution of cosmopolitan memory” was the 2000 Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust. The Stockholm Forum originated out of internal events in Sweden in the last 1990s. After a June 1997 newspaper article in the Swedish newspaper Dagens Nyheter shared that only two-third of Swedish youth believed that the Holocaust had happened, the Prime Minister Göran Persson began a debate in the Swedish parliament, which eventually yielded the “Living History” campaign. Persson, however, felt that an international organization was needed to ensure proper


1038 Levy and Sznaider, "Memory Unbound," 100.
Holocaust education, thus resulting in the first meeting in May 1998 of the Task Force for the International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research (ITF, which became the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance of IHRA in 2013). In January 2000, the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust was attended by representatives from 46 countries. In the Stockholm Declaration, which came out of the forum, the signatories committed to “education about the Holocaust in our schools.” International Holocaust Remembrance Day was also introduced. 1039

Situating this study of the Italian, East German, and West German textbooks within these debates over the “universalization” of Holocaust education suggests a middle path. This dissertation’s findings point to both “nation-transcending” and “nation-specific” trends. The defascistization and denazification processes in occupied postwar Italy and German yielded a number of “nation-transcending” characteristics—including the occupiers themselves. Aside from using many of the same personnel in both occupation theaters, the American and British occupiers also applied similar processes and similar philosophies of textbook revision in their zones of Italy and Germany. Germany represented both a continuation and a more aggressive implementation of the process of educational restructuring and textbook revision that had begun in Italy. Arguably, some of the greater successes and more effective implementation demonstrated in Germany were owed to experiences that the American and British occupiers had had in Italy before the end of the Second World War.

However, there were some differences between the two cases—“nation-specific” characteristics. These stemmed from the political particularities of the postwar situations as well.

as from the Allies’ preconceived notions of the Italian and German peoples. Which Allied powers occupied each area also played a significant role; the Soviet occupiers in the SBZ of Germany increasingly went their own way in educational policy. These differences, coupled with the specificities of the national contexts, placed the three post fascist states of Italy, East Germany, and West Germany on very different paths when it came to educating their citizens about the Holocaust, complicity, and resistance in the Second World War.

Another example of a “nation-transcending” trend can be seen in the late 1950s, where this dissertation dates the first instances of increased attention to Holocaust education. The Holocaust emerged as a major topic of concern in West German and Italian textbooks during the late 1950s in response to a spate of neo-fascist and neo-Nazi youth activities. In East German books, in contrast, discussions of Nazi crimes had long been central. But under some of the same pressures as the Italian and West German textbooks, the 1960s East German textbooks devoted an increasing amount of space to the Third Reich.

These findings challenge scholarly narratives that argue that the 1961 Eichmann Trial and/or the 1968 student movements were central to focusing public attention on Holocaust memory and Holocaust education. This is an important distinction because it suggests that this new attention to education about Nazi crimes in secondary schools in West Germany, especially, during the late 1950s could have had a causative influence on the increased attention that the Nazi/fascist past received during the student revolts in the West; some of the students who were in middle school in 1960 were university students in 1968.

Often scholars cite “nation-transcending” or “big picture” events that when discussing development of Holocaust memory in the 1970s and 1980s. These transnational memory events—such as the 1968 student revolts of the 1978 broadcast of the American miniseries
Holocaust—supposedly shaped worldwide Holocaust memory. But this dissertation finds that these events had little or, at least, delayed effects on the textbooks, most of which had very well-established narratives by the early 1970s. Although scholar Carolina Sharples claims that in postwar Germany, “Holocaust education, as we understand it today, really only began to emerge during the late 1980s and 1990s,” this project shows that, at least in the context of the textbooks, that was assuredly not the case. Much of the narratives still prevalent in German education today emerged in West Germany in the 1960s.

The situation in Italy stands in stark contrast. After giving some attention to the matter since the 1950s, Italy’s educational establishment only began to place a large emphasis on education about the fascist crimes in the 1990s. As Cold War narratives about the resistance fell away and the political landscape reconfigured itself, Italian education increasingly focused on the Holocaust and began slowly to reckon with Italian complicity in supporting fascism. Impetus from the government only came in 2000, when Italy commemorated International Holocaust Remembrance Day, or as referred to in Italy, Il Giorno della Memoria [Day of Memory] for the first time on January 27. The institution of the Day of Memory in Italy precipitated a “boom” of trips to visit Auschwitz; previously these “memory trips” had focused on camps that had held Italian political detainees. Schools also organized events and activities.

Yet, even today in Italy teaching about the Holocaust is encouraged, but not mandated. The Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research has issued guidelines, the first of which were published in Italian in 2005. However,

---


1041 Chiappano, "La didattica della Shoah in Italia;" Fontana, interview.

1042 Fontana, interview.
Italian schools and teachers do not necessarily *have* to teach about fascism and the Holocaust. Thus, while there are areas of the country doing a great deal of educational programming on the topic, the portrait of Italy as a whole is highly variegated. Furthermore, as Holocaust educator Laura Fontana observes, a great deal of Holocaust memory and education in Italy in the present day is focused on Auschwitz. This “selective memory” avoids the responsibility of Italians “from the 1930s until the collaboration until the collaboration in the deportations after September 8 [the armistice].” 1043 In contrast, education about the Holocaust in Germany is mandatory and all federal states must abide by KMK binding resolutions, including the 1980 resolution which specifies that “It must be shown that capitulation to dictatorship frequently began not with spectacular defeats but with small, everyday acts of cowardice.” 1044

It is striking that from the very beginning, Italy was not forced to engage with the fascist past. To the Allied occupiers, “freedom” meant that Italy was free to put whatever it wished in its textbooks, as long as it was not fascism. This philosophy of academic and scholastic liberty has been carried through to the present day. When I interviewed Professor Carlo Cartiglia, author of the middle school history textbooks for the Loescher publishing house, he told me that he felt that guidelines from the MPI on how to teach the Holocaust would be “pressure on writers, a limitation of liberty.” 1045

---


1045 Cartiglia, interview. Follow up questions by email.
In Germany, during the occupation, the Allies applied more pressure and hands-on guidance as to how to teach the recent past. Even after the occupation, the German states were under more international oversight during the 1950s and 1960 as to how they taught the Nazi past. The result was that the issue was dealt with in textbooks quite a bit earlier than in Italy. Arguably, this made all the difference. While a great deal of progress has been made on this topic in Italy in the last twenty years, Germany has had a lot more time in which to develop a self-critical narrative.

Concluding Thoughts: The Narrative Arc

Overall, this study illustrates that there was early integration of discussion about what we now know as the Holocaust before the revolutions of 1968. During this time period, the textbooks were, at times, the drivers of change. Policy makers, teachers, and world organizations felt that by improving the textbooks, they could shape future society. Consequently, they pushed for the revision of textbooks in order to inculcate “democratic” and anti-fascist values in young students. However, the increasing discussion of crimes was accompanied by an increasing focus on resistance, which served as a counter-balance.

By the mid-1960s, the narratives in the textbooks of all three subject countries were relatively set. There were incremental changes to the textbooks in the 1970s and 1980s, but largely following preexisting trends. What changed during the 1970s and 1980s was not so much the narratives, but the methods of teaching about the past. The textbooks were no longer the main focus.
This study also sheds new light in the individual fields of research of how Italy, East Germany, and West Germany came to terms with the past. While most scholarly research in the Italian case has focused on textbooks and educational initiatives from the most recent years, this dissertation reveals that has been a history of grappling with fascists crimes and the legacy of the resistance in Italian schoolbooks since the early 1960s with the creation of a new generation of textbooks of the *scuola media statale*. That said, there was little systematic or centralized push towards dealing with Italian complicity until the 1990s and the end of the Cold War. The Italian trajectory, therefore, could be described as a slow rising line, which was catalyzed into much more rapid growth by the end of the ideological divisions of the Cold War.

The East vs. West German comparison could be described as a sort of “double reversal.” This study clearly illustrates that during a great part of the 1950s, East German textbooks were far ahead of West German textbooks in describing fascist crimes against the Jews. West German textbooks only began to discuss the genocide in greater depth during the late 1950s and early 1960s; East German textbooks had been including information about the Nuremberg race laws and the number of Jews killed during the Holocaust for almost a decade longer than the *Ernst Klett Verlag* textbooks, which were leading books in the West German publishing field. Yet, during the 1960s and 1970s, the discussion of Nazi crimes against the Jews became somewhat subsumed to the East German textbooks’ “socialist lens.” At the same time, West German textbooks spent this period beginning to adopt a “self-critical” lens that examined the general populations’ complicity in the Nazi regime. It was not until the 1980s that the unique racial dimension of Nazi persecution again became emphasized in East German textbooks and the Holocaust narratives of the two German states’ textbooks began to mirror one another, even before the process of reunification.
From the vantage point of the 21st century, it is clear that there have been marked improvements to both German and Italian textbooks over time. Yet, textbooks are only one factor in a plural landscape and represent only one dimension of intergenerational transition. While the children of the immediate postwar had recourse to little else about the Holocaust and the Second World War in the surrounding culture, today’s children have access to representations in museums, memorials, books, movies, television shows, social media, and the Internet. Textbooks in many ways have lost their primacy. No longer the drivers, they have become the driven.

Yet, as a medium that students are obligated to encounter as part of their educational life and a medium that some teachers are hesitant to contradict, textbooks very much still matter. We were reminded of this during the recent 2015 controversy about the Texas textbook that referred to enslaved African-Americans between the 1500s and the 1800s as “workers” rather than “slaves.” School textbooks continue to be contested ground in many countries into the present day. Thus, it is worth noting that the Italian and German textbooks no longer promote celebratory nationalist narratives and no longer stand in opposition to progress when it comes to a self-critical discussion of complicity in Second World War crimes. Even that slight progress was a hard-fought victory.
APPENDIX 1: TEXTBOOK SELECTION METHODOLOGY

Given that each of the subject countries of this dissertation developed a different school and schoolbook publishing system in the postwar era, there was no “one-size-fits-all” option for the methodology textbook selection for this project. In the section below, I will briefly sketch out the logic behind my textbook source selection for the three subject countries.

In Italy, the Ministry of Public Education put forth curricular guidelines; authors and editors collaborated to create textbooks and then committees of teachers, parents and students selected which books they wanted to use their schools.\textsuperscript{1046} Introducing even more variation into the process was the fact that many textbook series for the same subject could be used in the same school until recently.\textsuperscript{1047} Italian schoolbook series did not always have the publishing longevity that we will observe in West German textbook series, which made series selection for this project difficult. Moreover, books written by the same author and published by the same publishing house might be subsequently published under different titles if large enough revisions took place to the base text.\textsuperscript{1048}

In order to deal with these factors, I selected several series, which had relatively long print runs, on which to focus my case studies. These included the books written by Alfonso Manaresi and published under various names by Poseidonia (the first appearing after the First World War and continuing through the late 1960s), the books written by Oddone Ortolani and M. Pagella for Le Monnier (between the mid-1960s and the mid-1980s), the history textbooks

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1046} Cajani, "Italian History Textbooks on the Brink of the Twenty-First Century," in School History Textbooks across Cultures, 37.
\item \textsuperscript{1047} In the most recent years, each school meets to decide upon a textbook series that they will adopt for all classes of the same type in that school. Marisaldi, Russo, and Giordani, interview.
\item \textsuperscript{1048} Cartiglia, interview.
\end{itemize}
written by G. Zelasco and I. Michaud for the Principato publishing house (between the late-
1960s and the early-1980s), the books written by Carlo Cartiglia for Loescher (between the early
1980s and present), and the history books written by Silvio Paolucci (later assisted by
Giuseppina Signorini and Luciano Marisaldi) for Zanchelli publishing house (between 1964 and
present). The Cartiglia and Paolucci case studies were also bolstered by interviews conducted
with the authors and editors.\textsuperscript{1049}

These series are the narrative focuses of the analysis and serve as this dissertation’s case
studies. Uniform usage statistics were unfortunately not readily available, but I was able to locate
some usage information— for example, the middle school history books in use in and around
Turin during the school year 1969-1970. These rather sporadic usage statistic, along with
observations about which series had many editions and long publication runs, indicated on which
series this dissertation should focus.\textsuperscript{1050} For questions that required a broader view and in an
attempt to determine how representative these case study textbook series are of larger trends in
Holocaust and resistance representation in the textbook market, I have done less intensive
analysis of a greater number of textbooks, sometime with the assistance of Voyant Tools.

In East Germany, in contrast, there was a single publishing house that put forth school
materials. Founded in 1945 by SMAD, \textit{Volk und Wissen Verlag} was state-controlled and had a
monopoly over the production of instructional material (with the exception of Sorbian books,
which were printed by \textit{Domowina Verlag}). It worked in close collaboration with the DPZI and its
successor the APW. Textbooks and curricular plans were written by committees, which included
representatives of various organizations. For example, the 1952 8\textsuperscript{th} grade history textbook

\textsuperscript{1049}The Paolucci books are some of the most frequently adopted middle school history books in Italy. Marisaldi,
Russo, and Giordani, interview.

\textsuperscript{1050} Dellavalle, "La storia della resistenza nella scuola media unica," in \textit{Libri di testo e resistenza}, 58.
commission included representatives of the MfV, the Cultural Department of the Central Committee of the SED, the DPZI, and *Volk und Wissen Verlag*. Later publications were worked on by these organizations, as well as by scholars from various other pedagogical institutes, as well as a “Standing Subject Commission on History Instruction.”\(^{1051}\) This dissertation focuses primarily on the state textbook series for history, and particularly on the contemporary history volumes utilized in the “middle school” years (with students roughly of 14-16 years of age).

Over time, the periodization of the GDR’s schoolbooks and history curriculum shifted. Initially, for example, the Nazi period was considered in the 8th grade; later it was split between the 9th and the 10th grades and then beginning in the mid-1960s, it finally resided in the 9th grade book (although, based on various subject plans from the 1950s and 1960s, there appears to be some additional variation as to when it was taught based on school type). In some cases, students who continued on to university-preparatory coursework would encounter the topic at least one more time again after this cycle, in either the 11th or 12th grades.

This varying periodization of the curriculum likely had to do with the GDR’s attempts to replace the previous school structures with new socialist ones. Initially, in the SBZ and in the early GDR, there were attempts to replace the Weimar and Nazi-era era three-tiered school system (retained in the FRG) with a more standardized unitary system. The *Einheitsschule* (8-year school) was to be followed by either apprenticeship or the *Oberschule* (4-year school). By the 1960s, however, the GDR was attempting to replace that system with a new system: the ten-year comprehensive school (*Allgemeinbildende Polytechnische Oberschule*). After completing

\(^{1051}\) *Volk und Wissen Verlag* was the main responsible entity for the textbooks’ publication. Letter from Dr Hruschka to Herrn Siegfried Martin, 11 May 1952; “Lehrpläne für den Geschichtsunterricht,” DPZI 357, BBF. Christoph Links, *Das Schicksal der DDR-Verlage die Privatisierung und ihre Konsequenzen* (Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag, 2010), 98. The standing commission’s first meeting was in 1955. See documents in: “Tätigkeit der ständigen Fachkommission Geschichte (1954), 1955,” DPZI 1111, BBF; “Protokoll der Bresprechung über die Herausgabe der neuen Geschichtsbücher,” 21 November 1950, DR 2/2913, MfV, BA Berlin.
the 10-year school, students would then either take on vocational training or complete two more years of school in preparation for university. Although, according to a GDR publication produced for an English-speaking audience, this transition was intended to be completed in 1964, documentation from 1966 reveals that students were still receiving differentiated education.\textsuperscript{1052} Clearly, the transition to unitary socialist schooling was more difficult than the SED would have liked to admit.

There were approximately nine “generations” of indigenous East German middle school history textbooks. Before 1952, USSR history textbooks, which had originally been published by the Historical Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, were translated into German and then published by \textit{Volk und Wissen Verlag}; the translated contemporary history textbook only went up to the year 1918, however.\textsuperscript{1053} The first indigenous East German secondary school history texts were published in 1952 and these new texts did consider the Nazi period.\textsuperscript{1054} New editions of the contemporary middle school history textbook then followed in 1953, 1956, 1960, 1961, 1964, 1965, 1970, 1984, and 1988.\textsuperscript{1055} However, the 1953 and 1956 editions represent only slight modifications on the 1952 textbook; so slight that Michael Bröning, in his analysis of Jewish History in East German textbooks between 1948 and 1972, did not even acknowledge them.\textsuperscript{1056} The 1961 edition is also very similar to the 1960 edition. These textbooks had very


\textsuperscript{1053} Bröning, \textit{"Jewish Monopoly Capitalists"} (2003), 37-38, 81.


\textsuperscript{1056} Ibid.
utilitarian naming conventions, usually *Lehrbuch für Geschichte der ____ Klasse*. Beginning with the 1965 edition, they had a book cover bearing the word *Geschichte* and a colorful illustration themed to the content of the book. These textbooks were composed either by teams of GDR university professors or members of a socialist academy. After reunification, *Volk und Wissen Verlag* was privatized and stopped publishing contemporary history textbooks for a time. They later reappeared in the early 2000s as the *Geschichte Plus* series, which was discussed briefly in the Epilogue.

The Federal Republic of Germany ("West Germany" during the Cold War and “Germany” in present day) is, like Italy, marked by a multiplicity of published textbooks. While *Richtlinien* for textbook and curriculum composition were agreed upon by KMK, a federal committee for the Land Ministers of Education, and the KMK’s subsidiary school committee, there was no central textbook nor central textbook house. Instead, each Land generated its own guidelines based off of the KMK’s *Richtlinien* and textbook publishing houses then created their own books following these guidelines. The books had to be approved by the Land for use in its schools and then teachers could select from the approved list. Unfortunately, I was unable to locate approval lists for all the Länder since the creation of the FRG.

School type also presented a methodological issue. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the Western zones of Germany retained the tripartite school structure. Certain types of schools used certain textbooks. This was a difficult issue to overcome because at times several school levels utilized the same textbooks. In the end, I chose to focus primarily on books that were used in the *Gymnaisum* and *Realschule*, since these schools included the most specific history instruction.

1057 Ibid., 37.

also chose to focus on particular textbook series that were frequently republished (often in multiple editions, specific to each Land).

*Kletts geschichtliches Unterrichtswerk* (1951-1983) is the primary West German textbook series analyzed. This analysis is supplemented with consideration of the *Wege der Völker* series and its successor *Spiegel der Zeiten* (1948 to the early-1970) and *Zeiten und Menschen* (mid-1960s to late 2000s). Logically, if textbooks were frequently republished, they must have been quite popular; thus, I selected these series with particularly long print runs, so to be able to track change over time. To provide broader context, these case study series were supplemented with analysis of other middle school contemporary history textbooks, which were on the market on the time or that played a prominent role in controversies and issues throughout the years.
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