

12. Germany

Lisa Pine

Having been arrested on November 11, 1923, after the failure of the "beer hall putsch," Adolf Hitler was imprisoned at Landsberg Castle, in a "large, airy, and comfortably furnished" cell, where he dictated an account of his life and "worldview" (*Weltanschauung*) to Emile Maurice and Rudolf Hess in 1924. The manuscript he produced was published as *My Struggle* (*Mein Kampf*) in 1925. In it, Hitler firmly stated his beliefs on a wide variety of topics, including education. Even at this early date, education formed a key component in Hitler's designs for the future of the German nation. For example, he stated that "[f]rom all the innumerable great names in German history, the greatest must be picked out and introduced to the youth so persistently that they become pillars of an unshakeable national sentiment." Hitler's ideas on education came to underpin the Nazis' goals for transforming German society once they came to power. In a speech to representatives of the press on March 15, 1933, Josef Goebbels, Minister for Propaganda and Popular Enlightenment, asserted that "[i]t is not enough to reconcile people more or less to our regime, to move them towards a position of neutrality towards us, we would rather work on people until they are addicted to us."¹

This chapter explores the centrality of education to the Nazi regime, highlighting the social construction of ignorance in Germany during the period from 1933 to 1945. It examines both the perpetuation of ignorance by the Nazi administration through the use of censorship, propaganda, and disinformation, and the efforts of the Nazi leadership at various types of miseducation of German children in schools, which were designed to generate unquestioning faith and belief in the Nazi system. As such, it contributes to the study of ignorance and its social construction by examining the policies of the National Socialist government, which disinformed the German population in a variety of ways. Recent

scholarship has begun to explore the active engineering of ignorance, the kind of ignorance that can be "made, maintained and manipulated" as a "strategic ploy" or "active construct." This was undoubtedly the case on the part of the Nazi regime. The creation and preservation of ignorance by the Nazi government covered a wide range of aspects of German life, many of which were interrelated. It was purposefully orchestrated in order to deter any large-scale resistance or even non-conformity to the regime and its ideology.²

The focus of this chapter is on three key areas: the promotion of Nazi ideology and the perpetuation of myths; the censorship of artistic and cultural life; and the control of the content of school textbooks. The first part of the chapter illustrates how the Nazi regime utilized miseducation or disinformation in order to promote its ideological imperatives of "racial purity" and anti-Semitism. In addition, it shows how the Nazi administration employed disinformation to legitimate its racial hygiene policies to "improve" the quality and quantity of the German population and how it sought to promote the "national community" (*Volksgemeinschaft*) and nationalism more generally. It illustrates how the Nazi regime perpetuated (through the use of propaganda) all types of myths, which were accepted by the German population for much of the Third Reich--using the myth surrounding the "leader" (*Führer*) and his infallibility and the perpetuation of the myth of the omniscient and omnipresent secret state police, the Gestapo, as key examples. The next part of the chapter considers how the Nazi government clamped down upon and censored entire realms of artistic and cultural life that did not conform to its attitudes about German art and German literature. The last section of the chapter examines the Nazi censorship of school textbooks, in order to create homogeneity in what was taught. An analysis of these three broad areas illuminates the determined use of disinformation and miseducation by the Nazi government in Germany between 1933 and 1945.

The promotion of Nazi ideology and the perpetuation of myths

Nazi ideological imperatives lay at the heart of the regime's attempts both to construct its ideal society and to promote its worldview to the German "national comrades" (*Volksgenossen*). The regime disseminated its ideology, using film and other media to spread its message about anti-Semitism and the eradication of the "unfit." Similarly, it employed such channels of information and knowledge to advocate its nationalist ideology and to perpetuate myths to convince and instruct its population. Racial purity, the concept of the "master race" (*Herrenvolk*), and anti-Semitism were core aspects of Nazi ideology. The regime built upon and created popular mistrust towards the Jews by means of propaganda--in particular, through the use of posters, as well as *The Stormer (Der Stürmer)*, an anti-Semitic journal published under the aegis of Julius Streicher, the regional leader (*Gauleiter*) of Franconia. The front cover of the September 1943 issue, for example, featured a photograph of a Jew with the caption "Satan." In addition, a trilogy of films about the Jews was screened in 1940--*The Rothschilds (Die Rothschilds)*, *Jew Süß (Jud Süß)*, and *The Eternal Jew (Der ewige Jude)*. These films sought to instruct the German population about the "threat" posed by the Jews. The first of these, *Die Rothschilds*, was an attempt to explain the rise to power and wealth of the Rothschild family and the emergence of the "Jewish British plutocracy." It revealed the "historical fact" that Jewish financiers had profited from the death of German soldiers. In doing so, it rationalized the extermination of the Jews as expressed in Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and in his speeches. In *Die Rothschilds*, the Jews were portrayed as a racial and economic threat.³

Veit Harlan's *Jud Süß* showed the inherent rootlessness of the Jewish people and their ability to assimilate into any society. Süß, the elegant and fashionable Jewish lawyer, personified "the Jew in disguise." Eric Rentschler has shown that in "constructing a malevolent other, Nazi propagandists insisted that they were serving the public good by

revealing the Jew's true face." The rest of the Jews in the film were portrayed as dirty, hook nosed, and physically repellent. They represented "authentic Jewry." In contrast, the true "Aryan" prototypes were depicted--for example, Dorothea, the classic German maiden played by Christina Söderbaum. This film unquestionably contributed to the anti-Semitism already prevalent in Germany, for it brought together archetypes and themes that created the desired antipathy towards the Jews under the guise of entertainment that resulted in great box office success. Rentschler notes "it not only confirmed existing prejudices; it agitated, militated, and called for action." This was intentional engineering on the part of the National Socialist government and its propaganda machine.⁴

In its efforts to "educate" the German population, Fritz Hippler's *Der ewige Jude* covered the entire gamut of Nazi allegations against the Jews. It was one of the most virulent and effective propaganda films ever made. A large part of its strength lay in its pretence of documentary objectivity. Whereas *Jud Süß* was a period costume feature whose message was, nevertheless, crystal clear, *Der ewige Jude* claimed to be a documentary film about world Jewry. The substance and message of the film very much reflected the idea that the Jew had cunningly assimilated himself into European society. Furthermore, by associating Jews with rats, the audience was led to believe that they were disease bearers and subhuman. Next, statistics were produced to show that Jews figured predominantly in the world of crime, out of all proportion to their number in the population, but no source was given for the figures. The film showed images of Jews with beards, long hair, and skullcaps. Each shot faded into one of the same man "disguised" in European clothing. In this way, the Jews were portrayed as an almost invisible threat to the health of the "Aryan" race. By showing pictures of Jews in prominent positions of world power, for example, the financial houses of Jews such as the Rothschilds, the Warburgs and the Montefiores, the film played on the myth of the "international Jewish conspiracy." It also exacerbated sentiments of jealousy, indignation,

and resentment by showing the disproportionate number of Jews in the upper echelons of society during the Weimar Republic and their corresponding disproportionate absence from the more menial strata. Finally, after this great profusion of images and rhetoric, the viewer was confronted with the slaughterhouse scene--anti-Semitic propaganda at its most extreme. The inflammatory scenes were immediately followed by shots of Hitler's Reichstag speech of January 30, 1939, in which he prophesied that a forthcoming war would bring about "the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe." A sequence of blonde Aryan stereotypes concluded the film. These three films were intended to teach a particular message about the Jews to the German population at a time when the Nazi leadership sought increasingly drastic "solutions" to "the Jewish Question." They formed a central component of the efforts of the Nazi government to demonize the Jews and to assert a whole array of allegations against the Jews that misinformed the German populace.

In addition, the Nazi government employed disinformation to legitimate its racial hygiene policies to "improve" the quality and quantity of the German population. The regime introduced eugenic measures to this end, including compulsory sterilization. Policies directed against the physically and mentally ill, eventually culminated in their mass murder (Operation T4) during the war. Nazi educational and propaganda material showed the high costs of welfare for people the regime considered to be "inferior" or even "unworthy of life" that could be saved and spent instead on more "worthy" or "valuable" members of the German "national community." In October 1939, Viktor Brack, one of the creators of the T4 scheme, commissioned Hermann Schweninger to make propaganda films on the subject of "euthanasia." These too were educative in nature. The aim was to juxtapose the expense put into maintaining "ballast existences" with the limited therapeutic results achieved. In 1935, 21 million people watched these films that stigmatized the mentally ill and this number rose to 40 million in 1939. They contrasted the most shocking cases of children and adults with

physical disabilities and mental illnesses with the luxuriously appointed, expensive and modern asylums with attractive gardens and grounds, in order to appeal to the "healthy" instincts of the German nation and to convince ordinary Germans that this money could be better spent on more deserving causes. After 1940, a different approach was taken to achieve this end: the production of a feature film instead of documentaries. The feature film *I Accuse* (*Ich klage an*), on the subject of "euthanasia," was released in August 1941. Eighteen million people watched this film. Nazi reports compiled by the Security Service of the SS in January 1942 suggested that the film was "favourably received and discussed" and "enthusiastically received." The film showed a medical professor named Heyt, whose young wife had multiple sclerosis. He killed her with a morphine overdose and was subsequently tried for murder. The aim of the film was to show that the law should be changed in order to permit "mercy killings" and clearly audiences were encouraged to take this view. Goebbels was astute in his judgement that messages could be effectively taught through the medium of feature films, not just through overtly propagandistic films.⁵

Hitler's government wanted to instruct the population in other ways too, such as the Nazi propaganda effort that sought to promote the "national community" and nationalism, in line with another central aspect of Nazi ideology--the resurrection of the fortunes of the German nation. Educational and propaganda material emphasized the greatness of Germany as well as the need for people to put the national interest before their own interests. This manifested itself the use of nationalistic slogans captured in the poster "One People! One Reich! One Führer!" The concept of "the community before the individual" (*Gemeinnutz vor Eigennutz*) sought to encourage a sense of nationalism and pride of homeland. Another illustration of this was the way in which the Nazi government linked home economy to the national economy, and encouraged German housewives to think about their duties to the nation in their purchasing decisions. Historian Nancy Reagin has shown how the regime

"persistently linked women's frugal use of available resources to the national interest," especially after the introduction of the Four Year Plan and during the war. A further instance of this was the Nazi concept of health as a responsibility towards the "nation" (*Volk*), not just as the concern of the individual. The close relationship between "individual and collective physical health" was a central component of the state and society in the Third Reich. The "national community" was central to concepts of German society under National Socialism and a vast array of educational and propaganda material highlighted its importance to the German populace.⁶

The Nazi regime perpetuated a number of myths, which were accepted by the German population for much of the Nazi period. Prominent examples include the following: the "Hitler myth;" the myth of a "classless society," in which the working class could gain access to the privileges that were previously restricted to the middle and upper classes, and which convinced the workers that the regime benefited them; and the legend of the omniscient and omnipresent Gestapo, which created fear among the German population and thus inhibited criticism of the regime or its policies. Furthermore, the Nazi propaganda machine was used to conceal the nationwide impact of Allied bombing, to convince the Germans that they were winning the war and to persuade them to continue fighting until the bitter end. Propaganda was far removed from reality by this time.⁷

Propaganda, in particular the use of radio, posters, films, magazines, and newspapers, as well as education at all levels--both formal and informal--contributed to the continued belief in such myths. To this end, rallies, parades, posters, feature films, newsreels, the press, and the radio were all employed to generate consent for the regime and its aims. Nazi propaganda addressed itself to large masses of people in order to create uniformity of opinion and action and a re-education of society based upon National Socialist principles. David Welch has shown that Nazi propaganda was "as much about confirming as about converting

public opinion." In this sense, Nazi misinformation and disinformation was a way of perpetuating ignorance in the German population. Welch shows how Nazi propaganda reinforced "existing trends and beliefs, to sharpen and focus them" for its own ends.⁸

The "Hitler myth," as Ian Kershaw has argued, was "consciously devised as an integrating force by a regime acutely aware of the need to manufacture consensus." Hitler was portrayed as the great leader of Germany's destiny. Yet, this heroic leadership was "as much an image created by the masses as it was imposed on them." Pierre Ayçoberry states that "the construction of the Hitlerian myth resulted from a combination of autosuggestion, deliberate fabrication and a quasi-universal acceptance." After the Night of the Long Knives (June 30, 1934), for example, Hitler's reputation was elevated, despite the illegality of his actions. He was portrayed and regarded as the defender of the "little man" against the "big shots" and as the upholder of public morality. Curbing the excesses of the SA appealed to the desire of the public for law and order, while the murder of its openly homosexual leader, Ernst Röhm, accorded to "the healthy instincts of the people." In addition, the recovery of the nation's economy, the massive public works schemes, such as motorway construction, and the elimination of mass unemployment in the mid-1930s were regarded as the personal achievements of the *Führer*.⁹

Standing above and beyond the day-to-day realities of the regime, Hitler remained disassociated from unpopular decisions and from the avarice and hypocrisy of the Party functionaries. Hitler was popular as a leader among all social groups and was personally exempted from criticisms of the regime. Any blame was directed at other Nazi leaders or officials. The Hitler myth enabled people to voice their quotidian grumbles and concerns, and yet consent to the Nazi regime as a whole. This co-existence of complaint and compliance is significant to our understanding of the nature of popular opinion in the Third Reich. Much of the appeal of the Hitler myth was the yearning for security and leadership by a population in

disarray and despair. While the regime continued to make achievements and restore order, with its visionary leader at its center, popular acceptance persisted. It appeared to offer the German population a solution to its social, economic, and political problems and to this extent it succeeded in its capture of the popular mind and in its manufacture of consensus.¹⁰

Additionally, the Nazi government won people to the national cause by means of its foreign policy successes. A nation brought to its knees by the punitive Treaty of Versailles in 1919 could only rejoice in Hitler's wholesale revocation of its terms. The "bringing home" of the Saarland in 1935 and the march into the Rhineland on March 7, 1936 met with rapturous popular approval. These events signified success and recovery for the German nation under their great "leader." The *Anschluss* with Austria in 1938 was another massive triumph for the "national community" and its *Führer*. While Nazi foreign policy continued to succeed, the sense of "national community" was enhanced. Even a nation hesitant to go to war again in September 1939 accepted Hitler's decision and reaped the benefits during the initial *Blitzkrieg* successes of the Second World War. Popular support reached its high point after the Nazi occupation of Paris in 1940. Hitler was regarded throughout this period as a great wartime leader. Kershaw argues that even on "the eve of the invasion of the Soviet Union... Hitler's popular standing was undiminished, and confidence in his leadership among the great majority of the population unbroken." It was only after the tide of the war turned against Germany, and in particular after the Battle of Stalingrad in January 1943, that both Hitler's infallibility and the strength of the nation began to be called into question. Yet this disillusionment was not translated into any determined resistance or revolt. There were a number of reasons for this, namely: the Nazis' apparatus of terror remained intact until the end of the war; the burdens and strains of the war led people to a reaction of resignation rather than rebellion; and Nazism had created an "atomization of social relations" that stood in the way of a communal resistance effort. In addition, the manufacture of popular opinion

through a manipulation of both information and emotion contributed to this situation.¹¹

Before the Battle of Stalingrad, direct, personal criticism of Hitler was extremely rare, but after Stalingrad, the "Hitler myth" began to falter. The Allied bombing campaigns were another significant factor in the decline of the "Hitler myth," particularly from 1943 onwards. The bombing caused considerable demoralization and anger directed against the Nazi leadership for failing to prevent it, despite continued Nazi propaganda directed at the home front. In the months following the July 20, 1944 bomb plot on Hitler's life, the *Führer* retreated from public life. In the last phase of the war, the "Hitler myth" collapsed entirely. Hence, the "*Führer* myth," significant as it was, is not sufficient on its own as an explanation for the continuing acceptance of the Nazi regime, particularly after the tide of the war turned against Germany.¹²

As popular consensus broke down, the use of terror escalated simultaneously. Within Himmler's vast SS-SD-police complex, the Gestapo, headed by the ambitious Heinrich Müller, became the key link in the system of terror and surveillance in the Nazi state. The Gestapo was certainly an institution that instigated fear and terror among the German populace. Recent research has shown, however, that the popular image of the Gestapo as omniscient and omnipotent is a myth that was instigated by Gestapo leaders and perpetuated in the post-war period by historians who accepted the statements of Gestapo leaders at face value. Klaus-Michael Mallmann and Gerhard Paul have shown that the Gestapo simply did not have the necessary manpower resources available to be "omniscient and omnipotent." Its leaders carefully adopted the propaganda image of the ubiquitous Gestapo both to intimidate German society and to conceal its own deficiencies. But in reality, the Gestapo never achieved these mythical levels of repression. Instead, it was an under-staffed and over-bureaucratized organization, incapable of comprehensive surveillance. Nor did the Gestapo comprise ardent believers in Nazi ideology. Many career policemen from the Weimar era

who stayed on and adjusted to the new regime made up its ranks. In the Gestapo, as Robert Gellately notes, they "played the part of loyal enforcers of the dictatorship's will." Most joined the Nazi Party sooner or later, but in 1939, only 3,000 of the Gestapo's approximately 20,000 employees held an SS rank.¹³

In reality, there were remarkably few Gestapo agents on the ground and they relied on both amateur and professional helpers. For example, in 1937, the Dusseldorf Gestapo office manned by only 126 agents controlled a town of 500,000 inhabitants. The Essen Gestapo office comprised 43 agents for a town with 650,000 inhabitants. Gellately has shown the largely reactive nature of the Gestapo and has described the method developed by the Gestapo as "a kind of auto-policing, or at least an auto-surveillance system." With the co-operation of neighbours, friends, acquaintances, and family members, the Gestapo could infiltrate even the private realm of the home, in order to monitor compliance with the dictates of the regime. Without the help of informers, the Gestapo would have been virtually blind. Denunciations were the key link in the interactions between the police and the population. The Gestapo did not have adequate resources to generate its own cases, but relied heavily upon the supply of information from outside. Following denunciations, the Gestapo relentlessly pursued and interrogated individuals--often using torture--in order to extort statements that led to arrests. But on its own, that is, without the help of informers, the Gestapo was not in the position to engage in comprehensive surveillance or perfect repression. Hence, a variety of myths such as these played an important part in the Nazi disinformation and miseducation of the German populace. These myths comprised an integral aspect of the creation and perpetuation of ignorance in Nazi Germany.¹⁴

The censorship of art and literature

Another key Nazi strategy that contributed to ignorance-making was the use of censorship.

The Nazi regime banned many types of cultural expression, eclipsing opportunities for Germans to learn about and experience, for instance, jazz music and atonal music, as well as Expressionist art. Art forms were censored so that the population was left to believe in the existence of only a particular type of German culture. In particular this section examines Nazi policies towards art and literature. These two aspects of cultural life presented the Nazi government significant opportunities to educate and instruct the German population. The Nazis used the arts to legitimize their rule by posing as the guardians of true German culture. They purged "alien" influences from German artistic and cultural life, claiming that racial degeneration was the main cause of aesthetic deterioration. Alan Steinweis has argued that "the cultural policies of the Nazi regime were inextricably intertwined with the policies of persecution and marginalisation, driven by racist ideology, that were targeted at Jews, Roma and Sinti, homosexuals and other groups." Hence, cultural purification constituted a central component in the development of the "national community" throughout the duration of the Nazi dictatorship and in the broad educative process of the German populace. The Reich Chamber for the Visual Arts closely controlled the work of its 42,000 members. In addition, it strictly monitored membership so that politically unreliable or "racially inferior" artists were ineligible and therefore not allowed to continue to practice their profession. Nazi officials expelled prominent artists, such as Paul Klee and Otto Dix, from their positions. Many artists and painters whose work was disapproved of by the Nazi regime went into exile.¹⁵

The conveying of a particular type of art and culture played a critical part in Nazi educational imperatives. The desire of the Nazi regime to purify and cleanse society was reflected in its policy towards the arts, with its simultaneous process of encouraging pure and wholesome contemporary German art and purging decadent, "degenerate" or unwholesome art. The Nazi administration aimed to eliminate all forms of art that it regarded as "alien" or

"degenerate." It excoriated many of the artistic innovations that had flourished during the Weimar era, such as Dadaism and Expressionism. The modern section of the National Gallery in Berlin was closed down in 1934. In 1936-1937, the Reich Chamber of Culture initiated and carried out a purge of German art in galleries and museums across the country. Adolf Ziegler, the president of the Reich Chamber for the Visual Arts, was assigned the task of selecting and collecting works of "degenerate" German art, for the Degenerate Art Exhibition, which opened in Munich on July 19, 1937. Ziegler and his commission confiscated some 16,000 works of art. Among the most prominent of the artists whose works were seized were Max Beckmann, Ernst Barlach, Otto Dix, Georg Grosz, Paul Klee, Oskar Kokoschka and Emil Nolde, but in all, the campaign confiscated works by 1,400 artists. The commission selected works by 112 of these artists for the Degenerate Art Exhibition. Ziegler, in his opening speech described the works that had been produced by modern artists as "monstrosities," "the crippled products of madness, insolence, lack of ability and degeneration." The paintings were displayed in a purposefully poor manner, crammed into crowded galleries, many without frames, and accompanied by pejorative captions.¹⁶

The German Art Exhibition opened simultaneously in the House of German Art in Munich. This juxtaposition was designed to demonstrate the triumph of Nazi art over degenerate art and to inform (misinform) the German populace about what were acceptable or suitable expressions of German art. At the opening of the House of German Art, Hitler described how the "Dadaist sensationalists, Cubist plasterers and Futurist canvas smearers" had damaged the achievements of the arts. He stated that "degenerate" artists created "deformed cripples and cretins, women who inspire nothing but disgust, human beings that are more animal than human. . . . But in the name of the German people I mean to forbid these pitiable unfortunates, who clearly suffer from visual disorders, from attempting to force the results of their defective vision onto their fellow human beings as reality, or indeed, from

...serving it up as 'art.'" Hitler spoke about laying "the foundations for a new and genuine German art." Robert Wistrich argues that National Socialist art, cleansed of abnormality, decomposition and ugliness, aimed at the reconstruction of "a hierarchical, ordered society with a coherent vision of man, with a heroic ideal and the ability to totally reintegrate the individual into the community."¹⁷

The Nazi regime closely controlled German artistic life and the lessons derived from this life. It removed the influence of "undesirable" artists through the imposition of bans on the right to teach, to exhibit and to paint. It supervised artists, museums and academies, published magazines, organized exhibitions, undertook cultural exchanges with other nations, expropriated the artistic property of enemies, and engaged in large scale plundering campaigns. Art was used instrumentally in the Third Reich to express the Nazi *Weltanschauung*, "a moral force permeating the whole of German society." It was, as Peter Adam argues, "considered one of the most important elements in building the new Reich and the new man." Historian Jonathan Petropoulos concurs that culture in the Third Reich was "a defining feature of the regime;" it was regarded as "an expression of ideological tenets, as a vehicle for creating a group ethos, and as a means of self-definition."¹⁸

Furthermore, National Socialism was keen to promote a particular type of German writing and to remove the influence of Jewish and Bolshevik writers from German literature. The Nazi regime approved literature that was pure and wholesome, a racially based literature that would serve to underpin its political and educative aims. In place of the "literature of the city," which had made a great impact during the Weimar era, it called for the "literature of the peasant." Nazism rejected works it considered to be decadent or degenerate, as well as the writings of 'enemies' of the regime and the German "national community." The Reich Chamber of Literature excluded all Jewish writers from membership. Radical left-wing writers such as Carl von Ossietzky and Erich Mühsam were arrested within weeks of the Nazi

takeover of power. Ernst Toller, a German Jewish Socialist writer lived in exile between 1933 and 1939, when he committed suicide. Thomas Mann, who had won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1929, lived in exile in Switzerland from February 1933 onwards. Many other prominent writers, including Arnold Zweig, Alfred Döblin, Erich Maria Remarque and Lion Feuchtwanger went into exile. Heinrich Mann, author of *Blue Angel*, was forced to give up his presidency of the Prussian Academy of Poetry, a position taken over by the writer Hanns Johst. The Academy was purged of "racial aliens" and "degenerate" writers. Richard Grunberger estimates that 2,500 writers left Germany either voluntarily or under pressure from the Nazi state. Historian Richard Evans argues that by the end of 1933, "there was scarcely a writer of any talent or reputation left in Germany." It also meant that German literature became homogenized into a form that was acceptable to the Nazi government and provided the German populace with its view of what German literature should entail and encompass.¹⁹

Writers including Werner Beumelberg, Hans Grimm, Hans Friedrich Blunck, Agnes Miegel, Hermann Stehr, Erwin Guido Kolbenheyer, Emil Strauss and Börries von Münchhausen filled the gap left by this great exodus of German literary talent. Beumelberg wrote "stories about the war experience" (*Fronterlebnis*), such as *Gruppe Bosemüller*. The *Fronterlebnis* genre became a major category of literature under National Socialism. Grimm's most famous work was his 1,300-page novel *People Without Space* (*Volk ohne Raume*), published in 1926, which underlined the Nazi argument for "living space" (*Lebensraum*). Kolbenheyer was another advocate of German power. A Sudeten German, Kolbenheyer was fiercely nationalistic and anti-Slav. He opportunistically concurred with Nazi ideology, hoping this would help him to gain recognition for his work. Blunck, President of the Reich Chamber of Literature, wrote nationalist sagas, such as *Great Journey*, and advocated German racial supremacy. Miegel and Strauss wrote about the land and people.²⁰

"Blood and soil" (*Blut und Boden*) novels were immensely popular during the Nazi era. They described a rural idyll that appealed to the traditional sentiments of their readers. Such literature engendered a sense of security in the German countryside, away from the evils associated with urbanization. This type of literature, as well as being regressive, was as Ritchie points out "also extremely aggressive." There was a call for the peasant--like the soldier--to defend himself and his land. For example, Hermann Löns' *The Wehrwolf*, first published in 1910, had a significant message in the Third Reich. The book described the actions taken by peasants against invading soldiers and looters in the Thirty Years War. The novel showed that the task of the peasant was greater than simply to tend the land. It was to defend the land, with blood if necessary. Löns' novel suggested the exclusion of foreigners and demonstrated the importance of an undivided community working together industriously for the benefit of the whole. Hermann Burte, author of *Wiltfeber, the Eternal German: The Story of a Man Seeking his Homeland*, published in 1912, was another writer assured of success in Nazi Germany, as his work too was steeped in nationalist ideology and represented a particular, ideal type of German writing.²¹

Anti-Semitic works were promoted by the regime too. Artur Dinter's *The Sin against the Blood* (1922) became one of the most acclaimed novels of the Nazi era. It told the story of Johanna, a German maiden seduced by a Jewish officer, who when she later married a German man, Hermann, gave birth to a "Jewish child." Dinter's novel explained how "racial miscegenation" ruined the German girl for good and concluded with a moral that stated: "Now consider the damage which year in, year out, is inflicted upon the German race by Jewish youths who every year seduce thousands upon thousands of German maidens!" Hence, German literature played its part in the promotion of particular values and ideas. The Nazi government employed the censorship of art and literature to deny a broad cultural "public" education to the German population. It replicated this type of policy in the case of

textbooks in schools.²²

The censorship of school textbooks

Education policy was underpinned by the desire to disseminate Nazi ideology as widely as possible, and in this context, other educational aims were subordinated. The curriculum was transformed, in order to emphasize certain subject areas in which "nation" and "race" could be expounded, and to decrease the significance of other subject areas. This effort by the Nazi administration to educate the German people was in line with its ideology and amounted to a direct form of "miseducation." For example, a Nazi directive for elementary education from 1940 stated that "[i]t is not the task of the elementary school to impart a multiplicity of knowledge for the personal use of the individual. It has to develop and harness all physical and mental powers of youth for the service of the people and the state. Therefore, the only subject that has any place in the school curriculum is that which is necessary to achieve this aim. All other subjects, springing from obsolete educational ideas, must be discarded." In secondary education, Nazi educationalists believed that "German, history, geography and biology require a deeper treatment." This skewed the balance of the curriculum at all levels. Control over the content of school textbooks created homogeneity and uniformity in what was taught and what was omitted from the curriculum.²³

Bernhard Rust, the Minister for Education, believed that the purpose of school textbooks was to achieve the ideological education of young German people. Strict censorship was imposed upon the publishers of school textbooks. This censoring was the particular responsibility of Philipp Bouhler, the Director of the National Socialist Party's Censorship Office, who worked in conjunction with Rust on this task. However, such was its extent and its complexity, that for the first four years of Nazi rule, control was sporadic. Many textbooks of the Weimar era were reprinted with only slight amendments, such as the

insertion of photographs of Hitler, swastika flags and Nazi slogans. By the late 1930s, as new writing and illustrations became available in greater quantities, the older textbooks were removed from circulation and replaced with new, standardized textbooks that incorporated the central tenets of Nazi ideology. The Ministry of Education approved the authors, and over time, removed "blacklisted" works and replaced them with "whitelisted" works.²⁴

The introduction and use of new school textbooks further assisted Nazi pedagogues in their aim of inculcating pupils with Nazi ideology. Bouhler examined all the textbooks in use for their ideological content. His work demonstrated the need for a process that entailed more than a simple "weeding out," and worked towards the creation of a uniform "Reich Reader" for the entire nation. The Ministry of Education began to actively implement this idea, removing old readers from the curriculum and replacing them with new ones. Ernst Krieck, a prominent Nazi educational theorist and professor at the University of Heidelberg, was involved in the educational theory behind the introduction of these readers. New editions were to include the themes of "blood and soil;" leadership; honour and loyalty; service and sacrifice; struggle and work. Between 1935 and 1940, Rust introduced new Reich Readers at different age levels. Editors selected specific reading material for them, based on the key themes of "blood and soil" and the *Volk*. They had to conform to Nazi Party censorship requirements. They included extracts from German and Nordic folklore and sagas, tailoring the selections to the ideological values of National Socialism. Rust defined the purpose of the readers to "serve the ideological education of young German people, so as to develop them into fit members of the national community--members who are ready to serve and to sacrifice." The Nazi regime utilized school textbooks and controlled classroom practice more widely to spread its *Weltanschauung*. Many subjects within the school curriculum were used to expound Nazi ideology--especially history and geography, arithmetic, biology and physics, as well as the German language itself.²⁵

History lessons were used as an opportunity to demonstrate to pupils the greatness of Germany and to inculcate nationalism in children. History was interpreted as a struggle for existence between nations. It was further employed to highlight the leadership principle, emphasizing the role of Germany's "great leaders" and their "world-historical" achievements. In history textbooks such as *Nation and Leader: German History for Schools* (1943), priority was given to periods when Germany had been a dominant power in Europe and especially to the triumph of Nazism. Defense history and frontier studies were added to the history curriculum. There was a flurry of activity in writing a new history curriculum in the Third Reich. Publishers, teachers, professors and school administrators became involved in this process, sometimes as a way of seeking professional advancement. While the Hitler regime was not the first to use nationalistic ideas in history instruction, it was, according to Gregory Wegner, "the first and only regime to fully institutionalize a racist and anti-Semitic history curriculum."²⁶

Geography teaching was expanded to include and indeed even to justify *Lebensraum* and racial expansion. Geography educators also exploited traditional and new forms of anti-Semitism in their publications. For example, the image of the eternally wandering Jew was a favorite theme. Walter Jantzen was one of the most prominent geography educators in the Third Reich. In his book *Geography in the Service of National Political Education* (1936), he integrated Nazi ideology into the geography curriculum, particularly racial concerns about Jews, Blacks and Gypsies, but also issues of "living space," "blood and soil," and the decline in the birth rate since the end of the First World War. In the geography textbook *Germany as a Whole* (1938), Konrad Olbricht and Hermann Kärger highlighted the ideological distinctions between National Socialism and "Jewish Bolshevism." Hence, geography was taught with a particular National Socialist slant, with specific kinds of occlusion and ignorance production, and was designed to convey Nazi ideology to German pupils in this

way.²⁷

Arithmetic lessons dealt with "national political problems." Calculations of sums were presented in terms of bullet trajectories, aircraft, bombs and so on. Numerical problems based on state expenditure on "hereditarily ill" and "inferior" people also exemplified the way in which Nazi ideology pervaded the curriculum. The Nazi regime used arithmetic exercises to convey their racial and political ideas. In a typical exercise, pupils were presented with this information: "Every day, the state spends RM. 6 on one cripple; RM. $4 \frac{1}{4}$ on one mentally-ill person; RM. $5 \frac{1}{2}$ on one deaf and dumb person; RM. $5 \frac{3}{5}$ on one feeble-minded person; RM. $3 \frac{1}{2}$ on one alcoholic; RM. $4 \frac{4}{5}$ on one pupil in care; RM. $2 \frac{1}{20}$ on one pupil at a special school; and RM. $\frac{9}{20}$ on one pupil at an ordinary school." They were asked a series of questions relating to this data, such as: "What total cost do one cripple and one feeble-minded person create, if one takes a lifespan of 45 years for each?" and "Calculate the expenditure of the state for one pupil in a special school and one pupil in an ordinary school over eight years, and state the amount of higher cost engendered by the special school pupil." These questions had clear implications for how "inferior" people were to be viewed by their compatriots and children were exposed to such ideas at a particularly impressionable age.²⁸

Biology teaching was of great significance in the Third Reich and was energetically promoted by the regime as a whole and the National Socialist Teachers' Association (*NS-Lehrerbund*) in particular. In no other subject area were the Nazi themes of "blood and soil," "race" and "living space" so directly linked to the subject matter. Biology had the task of instructing pupils about the essential nature of German "living space" for the German *Volk*. Laws of heredity, fertility, selection, and blood purity were central to the teaching of the subject. Paul Brohmer was one of the leading writers of a new biology curriculum under the National Socialist regime. In 1938, after the new curriculum was introduced, new textbooks appeared that took into account the changes. Brohmer utilized "race biology" as a means of

encouraging German children to struggle to maintain racial purity. He underlined the dangers of "racial miscegenation" and justified the regime's racial, population and eugenics policies in his writings. Biology lessons became vehicles for Nazi racial doctrine, emphasizing themes such as race, heredity and the "selection of the fittest." Pupils were instructed in the classification of racial types and craniology. Films and slides were produced as teaching aids. Visual presentations were deemed to be particularly useful in showing the distinctions between examples of "racially pure" and "inferior" or "hereditarily ill" individuals. "Hereditary biology" formed a significant part of "biological thinking" under National Socialism. The realization of the hereditary health of the German people was to be "drummed into" children in school education so that it became "second nature to them." Lore of the family, race, genetics, eugenics, and population policy formed the core of "hereditary biology." This subject purported to demonstrate that "racial mixing" and an increase in the number of the "hereditarily ill" damaged the integrity and value of the German population. The "hereditary health" of the nation was central to all work in this area. The promotion of "valuable" hereditary lines and the concurrent prevention of the reproduction of the "hereditarily ill" were emphasized. Pupils were given an understanding of the need for sterilization and of Nazi eugenic laws. They were shown the power of genetic transmission from one generation to the next. The preservation of the "Nordic character" and an understanding of racial differences were the central aims of "hereditary biology" lessons.²⁹

Nazi pedagogues, as well as Nazi leaders, regarded "racial miscegenation" and "bastardization" as serious threats to the German nation. In 1938, Alfred Vogel, a biology curriculum writer and primary school headmaster in Baden produced a series of anti-Semitic teaching charts to be used as teaching aids to the new curriculum. These charts accompanied a teachers' book designed for the instruction of "biology" to primary school children. Vogel encouraged teachers to instruct children about the laws of nature and heredity, as well as

racial consciousness and the "blood community" of the German nation. He drew parallels between cross breeding in plant biology and "racial mixing" in society. Vogel advocated a "race corner" in the school grounds that could be used to carry out experiments on plants and allow pupils to see the strength of the "pure bred" plant over the mixed bred one. The inferences from this were applied to human society. Vogel examined "hidden" inherited tendencies in biology, claiming that it was not correct to judge a living thing from its outwardly visible characteristics. The implication of this was that heredity was the only important signifier of race, so that a Jew posed a danger to the German nation even if he did not look like a Jew or did not practice his religion, in line with Nazi racial anti-Semitic ideology.³⁰

Topics for biology instruction included "the heredity of physical characteristics," "the heredity of mental and spiritual characteristics," "the heredity of frailties and illnesses," "the heredity of physical and spiritual characteristics of the German race," "the care of racial inheritance," "the law of selection," and "the Jews and the German people." Vogel advocated the need to educate young Germans about "the racial value of our people and the tireless struggle over the preservation of our racial character" and about "the complete rejection of the Jews." His illustrated charts, including *The Racial Composition of the Jews and German Ways--Jewish Ways*, were used to show the perils presented to the German nation by the "parasitic," "wandering Jew." His charts stereotyped the Jews, both as stateless intruders and as financial and political dominators. He also linked Jews with Freemasons and suggested that they were engaged together in a conspiracy for world domination. While biology teaching did not propose overtly the policy of the genocide of the Jews, it did provide a legitimization for this policy, as well as for the Nazi "euthanasia" campaign.³¹

Physics was used to teach pupils the achievements of German physicists and the contributions of German research to scientific knowledge. This was intended to enhance

national pride and underline the significance of the National Socialist "Aryan" worldview. The work of Jewish physicists was excluded in line with Nazi racial ideology. As the "racial heredity" of a person directly influenced his work, only the "Aryan" scientist could be seen to truly achieve and create. Most significantly, this meant that Albert Einstein's name was erased in the physics textbooks of the Nazi era. Einstein's theory of relativity was rejected on the grounds that it was "theoretical magic" and a "great worldwide Jewish bluff." "Aryan" physicists, in contrast, such as Philipp Lenard and Johannes Stark, flourished under the political system of National Socialism. Their "Aryan" physics aimed to preserve the "national community" and to express the life of the nation. Stark, in particular, called for there to be "no Jewish propaganda" in German physics textbooks.³²

Physics teaching under National Socialism had "to contribute its part to national political instruction and forming willpower." Furthermore, "knowledge of the natural conditions and requirements of the national community in the German living space, the ability and the will to do further work on the questions of physics research and technology in this connection, and also teaching to think realistically, which is so important for forming National Socialist willpower, can only be fostered organically on the basis of the pupils' horizon which schools should help to expand gradually." Although topics such as classical mechanics and electromagnetism continued to be taught, much of the practical emphasis took the form of instruction in physics related to military topics for boys and domestic topics for girls. In particular, the significance of physics for warfare was emphasized, as physics teachers tried to justify their subject by relating it to military objectives. A new branch of physics teaching under National Socialism, "the physics of weapons," was designed to awaken the ability to bear arms. Military physics increased in significance from 1936 onwards. Pupils were instructed in orientation, measurement, communications, ballistics and military engineering. A new handbook was provided for teachers on this subject. Physics

under National Socialism, according to its author, Erich Günther had the purpose "of awakening not only the ability to bear arms but the will to do so, and beyond that, to show the ways and technical means to carry out the decision to bear arms."³³

Lessons in German were designed to foster a "consciousness of being German" and to encourage national pride and unity among pupils. Teachers of German language and literature were urged to emphasize the nation as "a community of blood," "a community of fate and struggle," "a community of work," and "a community of mind." Traditional German tales and sagas were supplemented with Nazi myths, war stories and "blood and soil" literature. Indeed, as Christa Kamenetsky has pointed out, many classics were adjusted to the requirements of the National Socialist state, by means of "slanted abridgements or reinterpretations," whilst others that did not fit into the Nazi *Weltanschauung* were banned. National Socialist heroes such as Horst Wessel found their way into school textbooks. Political socialization in readers took the form of stories about "helping the *Führer*" and the "national community," for example by taking part in the regime's Winter Relief Agency (*Winterhilfswerk*) and "one-pot dish" (*Eintopf*) campaigns. Such stories were designed to foster a sense of togetherness, unity, and belonging to the "national community." Stories depicting "the enemies of Germany," in particular, Bolsheviks, Slavs, and Jews, exemplified the more negative side of political socialization. Such negative stereotypes were used to underline the differences between "national comrades," who belonged to the "national community," and "community aliens," who did not.³⁴

In addition, a new subject, racial science (*Rassenkunde*) formed an integral part of the school curriculum under National Socialism. This was formalized in a Nazi curriculum policy directive from the Ministry of Education on September 13, 1933. Racial science gave instruction about race and heredity, using books such as *The ABC of Race*. "Aryan" and Jewish "racial types," often in the form of caricatures, were juxtaposed so that German

children would identify with the former and reject the latter as "enemies." Anti-Semitic textbooks and teachers' manuals were produced by a number of writers, such as Fritz Fink, whose *The Jewish Question in Instruction* (1937) integrated pictorial distinctions between Jews and "Aryans" for teachers' use. Fink called for anti-Semitism to pervade the entire curriculum as the most effective way of getting the message across in the classroom and at all age levels. Much use was also made in schools of *Der Stürmer*, as well as various publications under its aegis, such as Elvira Bauer's *Trust no Fox on Green Heath! And no Jew on his Oath!* (1936), which depicted vulgar stereotypes of Jews. Ernst Hiemer's *The Poisonous Mushroom* (1938) employed a whole array of anti-Semitic imagery, with caricatures, graphic illustrations and vivid descriptions of Jews as hideous, hook-nosed seducers of "Aryan" women, Christ-slayers and money-grabbing usurers. Such subject matter brought anti-Semitism blatantly into the classroom. It was used to underline and provide legitimization for anti-Semitic ideology and policies and to misinform the German populace about the Jews.³⁵

Conclusion

This chapter advances our understanding of agnotology by examining miseducation, disinformation, and occlusion in a dictatorial regime. The Nazi government certainly intended to keep the German populace ignorant of the mass murder of the Jews and the "Gypsies," as well as that of the asylum population, although all of these became "open secrets" eventually. However, by analyzing a variety of different aspects of agnotology under National Socialism, we can see the pervasiveness of the regime in everyday life and how these together add up to create a larger portrait of disinformation and miseducation in the Third Reich. The Nazi administration actively constructed and preserved ignorance among the German population by not only banning and censoring information, but also replacing

and obscuring knowledge. The Nazi government attempted to "re-educate" German "national comrades" by promoting its ideology through propaganda and the creation of a variety of myths, by banning and censoring entire areas of artistic life and by controlling the content of school textbooks. Its policies in these areas were purposeful and pervasive. At times, however, the regime chose not to use blatant political propaganda to get its message across to the German population and could successfully manipulate the popular mind by using feature films or literary narratives that conveyed their purport without being overtly ideological. Words and symbols could be powerful in denoting meaning. Strong and emotive messages were conveyed. Propaganda on its own was not enough to persuade the populace--this was a brutal dictatorship that underpinned its message with fear and terror.

The speedy transformation and "co-ordination" of German society was partly achieved as a result of these policies, yet there was also a considerable extent to which the population assented to the regime and desired to accept what it conveyed. As we have seen, for instance, the Hitler myth was as much a self-imposed phenomenon as one imposed from above. The manipulation of the popular mind was subtle at times, but the control of information was critical to the Nazi regime at all times. The National Socialists were motivated by their ideological imperatives to keep the German population in ignorance. They were not alone in this by any means. There are many historical and contemporaneous examples in which information is controlled by governments or organizations, in which cultural and literary output are limited and censored, as well as regimes (not solely dictatorial ones) persuading their populations in different ways, keeping them in ignorance and subjecting them to political propaganda. Power and ideology allow regimes to get particular messages across to the people they rule--including messages that are distortions of truth. The Nazi state used its education policy to socially construct ignorance, using normative socialization devices. The pervasion of the school curriculum with ideology was not

exclusive to the Nazi administration, but the Third Reich clearly exemplified the ways in which governments can maneuver the popular mind and distort knowledge and truth through the tools of myth-making and miseducation.

Notes

¹ Richard Evans, *The Coming of the Third Reich* (New York: Penguin, 2004), 196; Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, translated by Ralph Manheim, with an introduction by Donald C. Watt (London: Pimlico, 1992), 387; David Welch, *The Third Reich: Politics and Propaganda* (Rev. ed., London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 24.

² On the study of ignorance, see Robert Proctor and Londa Schiebinger, eds., *Agnology: The Making and Unmaking of Ignorance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008); Proctor, in *ibid.*, 9.

³ See Randall Bytwerk, *Julius Streicher: Nazi Editor of the Notorious Anti-Semitic Newspaper Der Stürmer* (New York: First Cooper Square Press, 2001); Randall Bytwerk, *Bending Spines: The Propagandas of Nazi Germany and the German Democratic Republic* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2004), 26.

⁴ Eric Rentschler, "The Legacy of Nazi Cinema: *Triumph of the Will* and *Jew Süß* Revisited," in Jonathan Huener and Francis Nicosia, eds., *The Arts in Nazi Germany: Continuity, Conformity, Change* (Oxford, and New York: Berghahn, 2006), 72, 74.

⁵ Michael Burleigh and Wolfgang Wippermann, *The Racial State: Germany, 1933-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 154, 155, 157.

⁶ On national renewal and rebirth, see Roger Griffin, *The Nature of Fascism* (London: Pinter Publishers Limited, 1991), 98-99; Welch, *The Third Reich*, 53; Nancy Reagin, "Comparing Apples and Oranges: Housewives and the Politics of Consumption in Interwar Germany," in

Susan Strasser, Charles McGovern, and Matthias Judd, eds., *Getting and Spending: European and American Societies in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 241-61; Nancy Reagin, *Sweeping the German Nation: Domesticity and National Identity in Germany, 1870-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 145-146; Geoffrey Cocks, *The State of Health: Illness in Nazi Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 46. On the "national community," see Lisa Pine, *Hitler's "National Community": Society and Culture in Nazi Germany* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2007). See also Martina Steber and Bernhard Gotto, eds., *Visions of Community in Nazi Germany: Social Engineering and Private Lives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

⁷ On this, see Ian Kershaw, *The End: Germany 1944-45* (London: Penguin, 2012).

⁸ Welch, *The Third Reich*, 9, 5.

⁹ Ian Kershaw, *The "Hitler Myth": Image and Reality in the Third Reich* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 3; Joseph Stern, *Hitler: The Führer and the People* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), 111; Pierre Ayçoberry, *The Social History of the Third Reich, 1933-1945* (New York: New Press, 1999), 68; Kershaw, *The "Hitler Myth,"* 91-92.

¹⁰ Detlev Peukert, *Inside Nazi Germany: Conformity, Opposition and Resistance in Everyday Life* (London: Batsford, 1987), 73.

¹¹ Kershaw, *The "Hitler Myth,"* 160; Peukert, *Inside Nazi Germany*, 63.

¹² Kershaw, *The "Hitler Myth,"* 193; Gerald Kirwan, "Allied Bombing and Nazi Domestic Propaganda," *European History Quarterly* 15 (1985): 341-362. See also, Gerald Kirwan, "Waiting for Retaliation--A Study in Nazi Propaganda Behaviour and German Civilian Morale," *Journal of Contemporary History* 16 (1981): 565-583; Kershaw, *The "Hitler Myth,"* 219.

¹³ Klaus-Michael Mallmann and Gerhard Paul, "Omniscient, Omnipotent, Omnipresent? Gestapo, Society and Resistance," in David Crew, ed., *Nazism and German Society* (London: Routledge, 1994), 166-96. See also Gerhard Paul and Klaus-Michael Mallmann, eds., *Die Gestapo. Mythos und Realität* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995); Robert Gellately, *The Gestapo and German Society: Enforcing Racial Policy, 1933-1945* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 254.

¹⁴ Ayçoberry, *The Social History of the Third Reich, 1933-1945*, p. 31; Gellately, *The Gestapo and German Society*, 258, 75.

¹⁵ Alan Steinweis, "The Nazi Purge of German Artistic and Cultural Life," in Robert Gellately and Nathan Stoltzfus, eds., *Social Outsiders in Nazi Germany* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), 99.

¹⁶ Stephanie Barron, ed., *Degenerate Art: The Fate of the Avant-Garde in Nazi Germany* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1991); Peter-Klaus Schuster, ed., *Die 'Kunststadt' München 1937: Nationalsozialismus und 'entartete Kunst'* (Munich: Prestel-Verlag, 1988); Karl Arndt, *Nationalsozialismus und 'Entartete Kunst': Die 'Kunststadt München 1937* (Munich: Prestel-Verlag, 1988); Berthold Hinz, *Art in the Third Reich* (New

York: Pantheon Books, 1979), 39-40; Robert Wistrich, *Weekend in Munich: Art, Propaganda and Terror in the Third Reich* (London: Pavilion, 1995), 57.

¹⁷ Cited in Hinz, *Art in the Third Reich*, 42; Wistrich, *Weekend in Munich*, 61.

¹⁸ Brandon Taylor and Wilfried van der Will, "Aesthetics and National Socialism," in Brandon Taylor and Wilifried van der Will, eds., *The Nazification of Art: Art, Design, Music, Architecture and Film in the Third Reich* (Winchester: Winchester Press, 1990), 4; Peter Adam, *Art of the Third Reich* (New York: H. N. Abrams, 1992), 9; Jonathan Petropoulos, "The Art World in Nazi Germany: Choices, Rationalization, and Justice," in Huener and Nicosia, eds., *The Arts in Nazi Germany*, 149. See also, Jonathan Petropoulos, *Art as Politics in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

¹⁹ Richard Grunberger, *The 12-Year Reich: A Social History of the Third Reich, 1933-1945* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), 431; Evans, *Third Reich*, 412.

²⁰ On Blunck, see W. Scott Hoerle, *Hans Friedrich Blunck: Poet and Nazi Collaborator, 1888-1961* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2003).

²¹ James Ritchie, *German Literature under National Socialism* (London: C. Helm, 1983), 13.

²² Cited in *ibid.*, 20.

²³ Richard Samuel and Richard Hinton Thomas, *Education and Society in Modern Germany* (London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1949), 83; Bundesarchiv Berlin (hereafter BA) R 4901/1 4620/1, "Betrifft: Neuordnung des höheren Schulwesens," 5.

²⁴ On this, see Lisa Pine, "The Dissemination of Nazi Ideology and Family Values through School Textbooks," *History of Education* 25 (1996): 91-109.

²⁵ Christa Kamenetsky, *Children's Literature in Hitler's Germany: The Cultural Policy of National Socialism* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1984), 187-188.

²⁶ See Gilmer Blackburn, *Education in the Third Reich: A Study of Race and History in Nazi Textbooks* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985); Hans J. Hahn, *Education and Society in Germany* (Oxford: Berg, 1998), 82; Gregory Wegner, *Anti-Semitism and Schooling under the Third Reich* (New York and London: Routledge, 2002), 126.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 153.

²⁸ Pine, "The Dissemination of Nazi Ideology," 105.

²⁹ See, for example, Paul Brohmer, *Biologischer Unterricht und völkischer Erziehung* (Frankfurt am Main, 1933); Änne Bäumer-Schleinkofer, *NS-Biologie und Schule* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1990), 152-154; BA NS 12/41, "Erbbiologie in der Praxis des biologischen Unterrichts," 1, 2, 5.

³⁰ Alfred Vogel, *Erblehre und Rassenkunde für die Grund- und Hauptschule* (Baden: Konkordia, 1937); Gregory Wegner, "Schooling for a New Mythos: Race, Anti-Semitism and the Curriculum Materials of a Nazi Race Educator," *Paedagogica Historica* 27 (1992): 197.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 198, 200.

³² Johannes Stark, "Zur Neuordnung des physikalischen Unterrichts," *Unterrichtsblätter für Mathematik und Naturwissenschaften* 45 (1939): 82.

³³ O. Brandt, "Die neuen Lehrbücher," *Unterrichtsblätter für Mathematik und Naturwissenschaften* 46 (1940), 152; Erich Günther, ed., *Wehrphysik – Ein Handbuch für Lehrer* (Frankfurt am Main: Disterweg, 1936).

³⁴ Kamenetsky, *Children's Literature in Hitler's Germany*, 149.

³⁵ Wegner, *Anti-Semitism and Schooling under the Third Reich*, 54-55.