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INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Scope

Until recently, detailed historical studies regarding Germanistik were uncommon. When in 1977 and 1980, respectively, Susan Pentlin and Richard Spuler wrote dissertations on the history of American Germanistik, they deemed it necessary to defend the scholarly principle and pragmatic value of such a historical approach to the profession.\(^1\) American Germanists were not inclined to delve into the past. In 1983, Walter Lohnes noted: "Historical awareness has been in the air in recent years, beginning with the Bicentennial of the United States in 1976; in 1983, much is being made of the Tricentennial of the first German settlement in Germantown. . . . The foreign language disciplines, however, have not recently undertaken any major review of their history."\(^2\) Neither did American historians pay much attention to the heritage of institutionalized German language education, as Steven Schlossman remarks: "In actuality, historians know little about these subjects. . . . Even in the context of broader considerations of political, economic, social, and cultural assimilation, historians of immigration have rarely found language issues particularly interesting or problematic."\(^3\) But in the last three years the
situation has changed. Not only have monographs been published by individual scholars, the professional organizations and language periodicals themselves have begun to encourage and direct research into the history of German studies. (A survey of these activities appears at the end of this chapter.) Discussing the rationales for a historiography of Germanistik, Victor Lange believes that retrospection is an important dimension of our vision, and retrospection is merely the complement of introspection. . . . Having for more than a century and a half operated as American transmitters of a foreign language and a foreign culture, we are invited to ask ourselves if we have learned from the history of our profession, if at any given time the degree and kind of introspection has been adequate, and whether we should not now take a fresh and critical look at our goals and the assumptions of our practices.4

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the influence of Nazism and World War II on German studies in the United States. Specifically, I will discuss the reaction of American Germanists to events within the Third Reich and to the ensuing war between Germany and the United States as expressed in professional journals. By investigating a small segment of institutionalized German studies, I hope to contribute to an overall history of the Germanistic profession in this country.

Several factors have led to my choice of the Third Reich era as a subject of study. In the first place, it is of importance to determine how American Germanists, many of them native Germans, reacted publicly to the radical political
changes that took place in Germany. That question becomes all the more provocative when we remember that less than twenty years earlier, at the outbreak of World War I, many Germanists had openly and fanatically taken sides with the German Kaiser, admired Germany's militarism, rejoiced in its victories, and vilified England, France, and their allies. When the United States declared war on Germany in 1917, the American public brutally and indiscriminately turned against all things German, including the teaching and speaking of the German language. One of the immediate consequences was that the majority of teachers lost their jobs. Historical accounts of the World War I events, while condemning the anti-German hysteria, agree that the vociferous chauvinism of certain German-Americans, German teachers among them, and their authoritarian zeal in propagandizing the superiority of German culture were contributing factors to the outbreak of the furor: "To be sure, these elements [immigrant German] superpatriots comprised only a minority of German-Americans, but they made themselves heard before all others. It is not surprising that they became associated, in the simple thinking patterns of the masses, with everything G., including German L. instruction [sic]." By 1933, Germanists had not yet recovered from the calamity of 1917. Would it be at all surprising, then, if German teachers should hesitate to comment publicly on German politics for fear of being identified with it? The question posed in 1939 by an outsider, Dean Henry Grattan Doyle, "Shall History repeat
Itself? The Fate of German if Another War Comes" must have been asked years earlier by every member of the German profession.  

Besides the Germanists' reaction to the policies of Nazism, we must consider their reception of the literary works produced within the Third Reich. Did they take the safe way out and abstain from judging them? Or if they did evaluate them, by what standards—ethical, aesthetic, or socio-cultural—did they do so?

Third, in 1977, Susan Pentlin's historical dissertation on the effect of the Third Reich on German studies in the United States concentrated on the teaching of German in secondary schools and undergraduate classes. An examination of another aspect of Germanistik during that same period will bring us closer to an overall picture of the activities, goals, and philosophy of the profession during the thirties and forties. Moreover, the period between 1933-46 presents us with many issues and tendencies which either mirror present-day conditions or are directly related to them. Pentlin has pointed out that the oral-aural method, which was one of the distinctive features of the ASTP language classes, contributed to the postwar popularity of foreign language study. Although it is more difficult to trace attitudes and philosophies to a specific origin, one can certainly compare and contrast the present time and the Hitler era. For instance, of late, German departments in universities, colleges, and high schools have suffered from severe financial
cutbacks. At the same time the profession has confessed to doubts and uncertainties of a more philosophical nature in attempting to define its function and responsibilities. The year 1933 also saw great reductions in enrollment, which endangered the already precarious position of German teachers. In addition, Nazism and World War II gave rise to grave doubts about the psychological or ethical value of mediating German language and literature. What has been called "the—until recently—nearly unshakeable American faith in the 'liberalizing' effect of studying foreign languages and literatures" may have begun to tremble as early as the late thirties.8 Another example: present-day teaching of German includes the literature and culture of the German Democratic Republic. Victor Lange expresses the related difficulties as follows:

We are, for instance, rightly asked to speak about life and letters not merely in one part of Germany but in the DDR as well; but the presentation and study of that literature will be meaningless if it is undertaken as though it were merely a body of experience and writings that happens, like Austrian or Swiss literature, to be written and published in an adjoining geographical area. We must make clear, with due critical respect for its legitimacy and its merit, that that literature depends upon a social vision which is only in its most abstract consequences seriously shared by the West German establishment and which if properly understood, is barely compatible with the political faith professed by a large number of Americans, and, by inference, of American teachers and students of German.9
Although the East German system and the Third Reich are not to be compared, the dilemma of present-day American teachers of German bears resemblance to the one faced by the scholars of the Nazi era. For the first time, they had to teach the literature of a country whose social and political ideology was diametrically opposed to that of their own. Further, in *English in America: A Radical View of the Profession*, Richard Ohmann describes the often ambiguous relationship between leadership and members of the language associations (MLA) in recent years, specifically in regard to political involvement. The sensitivity of that relationship became apparent in the late 1930s also, when the AATG had to decide on the viability and validity of a political referendum among its members. Finally, in literary criticism, both the periodic popularity of the *werkimmanente Methode*, so strongly attacked during the sixties, and the demand for comparative literature study must be understood within the context of the Third Reich period, as will be shown later. Many more examples of sensibilities which were common to the 1933-46 era and the present will emerge in the course of this study.

There exists as well the urgent task of consulting those who were either faculty members or graduate students during the Nazi era for their knowledge might soon be lost. They can provide unique insights and personal memories or evoke the authentic background atmosphere to complement the printed material of that time.
An additional impetus for concentrating on the 1933-46 era is the current resurgence of popular interest in the Nazi years. Much of it is sensationalism. The commemorations of D-Day (1944), laudable in intent, have often testified to militarism and nationalistic prejudice. Perhaps today's teachers of German who have to present the Nazi era to their students can learn from the scholars of 1933-46 which factors bear on a critical view and true insight into the Nazi philosophy and the literature it inspired. To read Blut und Boden literature now, with knowledge of the excesses to which the racial theories have led, becomes even more relevant when we compare our attitude with that of the American scholars to whom it was current. They were of necessity less informed, less emotionally detached, and without the benefit of historical perspective.

Finally, the history of Germanistik during the period of the Third Reich should be recorded for its own sake. The interaction of the study of language and literature with philosophical, social, and political tendencies between 1933-46 is an authentic component of American cultural history.

From the vast amount of sources available to approach the history of German studies, I have chosen the professional language journals. But focusing on journals necessarily entails restrictions. In the first place, this dissertation does not intend to render a comprehensive judgment on any Germanist or on the profession in general during 1930-46. (Above all, it is not within the scope of this study to
investigate the private political inclinations of American Germanists.) Articles constituted only one part of the work of many Germanists; others, although lecturing or publishing books on the subjects of Nazism and World War II or simply talking to their students, may not have contributed to periodicals at all. To gain a more complete picture of the profession as a whole or of individual Germanists of that era, many other sources besides periodicals would need to be consulted in full, such as books, departmental records, AATG and MLA archives, memoirs, correspondence, etc. (At the end of this chapter appear bibliographical references to the resources and methodology for the history of German studies in the U.S.) Why, then, limit the vehicle of information mainly to periodicals? Since the source material is so abundant, a quantitative limitation was imperative. But more important reasons justify my choice. I have selected the professional journals because of their immediacy and public character. Periodicals, much more than books, express direct reactions to events—whether social, political, or literary. They display emotional involvement, launch debates, or engage in correspondence. Periodicals not only speak for individuals but, to a certain extent, represent the life of organizations by publishing the programs and minutes of meetings, reporting policy decisions, and sponsoring organizational activities. While scholarly books are meant for specialists, periodicals serve as a public forum. Moreover, publication of an article indicates that the editor thought it to be in some measure
representative of the views or at least the interest held by a considerable number of Germanists. Or else the editor may have deemed an original viewpoint to be of such pertinence that he hoped it would elicit a response from the readers, whether in agreement or opposition. Thus editors in their decisions on what and what not to publish affect the awareness of a great many Germanists regarding the prevailing currents of literary and cultural research.

A second difficulty resulting from the use of periodicals was establishing criteria for my selection of articles. Here I was guided by the subject matter, not by the professional or social standing of the author. This is not to say that the writer's prestige was of no significance. Most likely, articles written by a famous Germanist or by someone teaching at a major university were more readily noticed or more eagerly read than those from the hand of a relatively obscure assistant professor at a little-known college. For that reason I have provided biographical information about each author cited. In addition, I have frequently referred to the duty and responsibilities of those Germanists who held positions of power. The obligations of leadership extended in particular to heads of German departments or foreign language divisions, editors of journals, and presidents of language associations. Chairs of German departments, especially at major universities or institutions with a tradition of close relationship to the surrounding German-American community, had ample opportunities to exert influence on those under and
around them. This high visibility obligated them, in my opinion, to a knowledge of matters involving the interest and integrity of the Germanistic profession in general, and to a morally responsible position regarding those matters. Earlier I have discussed the function of editors of professional journals. Indeed, to a certain extent, publication of an article means editorial acquiescence. Furthermore, editors have numerous other options to make their ideological preferences known: for instance, they can devote whole issues of a periodical to certain problems, privately or publicly solicit articles, consult outside specialists, organize opinion polls, initiate symposia, stimulate correspondence, etc. And not least of all, editors can directly state their position in editorials. Similarly, one may expect leadership and initiative from the professional organizations for teachers and scholars, because some actions can be more effectively undertaken by groups than by individuals. This, of course, assumes that the organizations be aware of the opinion of their members in matters essential to the entire profession.

I have attempted to include nearly all articles dealing with the subject of Nazism and World War II under the various headings of my study. A claim to completeness can of course not be made, but the large number of articles cited should indicate that they indeed do present a reliable picture of the opinions expressed in periodicals.
Finally, the concentration on professional journals requires delimitation of the terms Germanistik and German studies for the purposes of this dissertation. Although theoretically synonyms, each term has its own connotations. "German studies" usually refers to the entire complex of institutionalized teaching and scholarly study of German (language, literature, culture) in high schools, colleges, and universities. Germanistik mostly designates scholarly research and its expression on the higher levels of teaching German, thus excluding high school and lower undergraduate teaching. However, in this study I have used both terms interchangeably because the Germanistic and other language periodicals published articles by high school teachers as well as by university professors, although the latter were by far in the majority. Also, my extensive use of factual information, such as minutes of meetings, travel reports, program announcements, referenda, etc., further warranted using both terms in the widest common meaning.

At the basis of this study, then, are the academic periodicals of the Nazi era which dealt exclusively with German: Monatshefte and German Quarterly. Until 1928, Monatshefte was the official journal of the Nationaler Deutschamerikanischer Lehrerbund; in 1928, after the Milwaukee Lehrerseminar ceased to exist, it was edited under the auspices of the German Department of the University of Wisconsin, although still under the same editor, Max Griebsch; in 1941, it became the "Official Organ of the German Section
of the Modern Language Association of the Central West and South." German Quarterly, founded in 1928, represented the American Association of Teachers of German. Both of these periodicals published articles on language, literature, culture, education, and items of general interest to the language teacher. Germanic Review was used to a lesser degree in this dissertation because it was dedicated to pure research. Although most contributors to these journals were Germanists, articles by outsiders were equally considered since neither Monatshefte nor German Quarterly made distinctions between the two. I also consulted non-Germanistic language journals, mainly for articles written by American Germanists. In that respect, Modern Language Journal and PMLA offered the widest choice. Also relevant were Modern Language Forum, Modern Language Quarterly, Books Abroad, Journal of English and Germanic Philology, Modern Language Notes, Modern Philology, and Philological Quarterly. Among academic and scholarly journals of extra-literary scope, School and Society, Science and Society, and Theater Arts Monthly proved the most comprehensive, but a few others were occasionally utilized. One non-academic periodical, American-German Review, was researched extensively as an indicator of the profession's involvement with the German-American community. Occasionally, I have quoted rare articles written by Germanists for other non-academic journals. All other primary sources, such as literary histories in book format, articles by outsiders published in
non-Germanistic periodicals, foreign Germanistic periodicals, letters from and interviews with Germanists of the thirties and forties, were used as collateral material to the findings in the main periodicals. In this regard, a thorough examination of the periodical *Aufbau* reveals how a particularly interested group of outsiders, the German-Jewish community of New York City, reacted to the attitude of American teachers of German.

Officially, the period of the Third Reich was contained between precise dates: January 30, 1933 (Hitler appointed chancellor) and May 8, 1945 (the surrender of Germany). However, I have examined the periodicals from 1930 through 1946. The beginning date was inspired by the need to discover whether American Germanists before 1933, like their colleagues in Germany, already showed any interest in Nazi ideas or even a Third Reich empathy avant-la-lettre. And more interesting: did American scholars recognize such tendencies either in the German literature they were discussing or in the non-literary events on which they occasionally reported? The year 1946 has been included because many articles published in 1946 may have been completed before the end of the war while others, written in the shadow of the recently ended war, functioned as an epilogue.

This study necessarily concentrates on some aspects of the profession's role during the Third Reich era. In the first part I will analyze writings which commented on subjects of a non-literary nature, like political events, social changes, or
educational policies in Germany. Did those comments, beyond their impulsive character, represent a hiatus in or a continuation of the professional philosophy? Did they directly relate to the opinions of the German-American community? Were they in harmony with the rest of the academic world and with American society at large?

These questions must be considered in light of the conditions in which the profession functioned during the thirties. Ever since the 1917 debacle, survival had become an overriding worry. By 1930, Germanists still had to deal with a legally enforced ban of German classes in certain school districts and dramatically decreased enrollments. Their difficulties were compounded by a nativist movement against alien influences, new educational proposals that rejected foreign language courses, increasing competition from Spanish and French, and distrust of German culture, even within the academic world. In 1935, Camillo von Klenze testified: "We should . . . destroy the absurd feeling occasionally met with that by [acquainting Americans with German civilization] we are paving the way for the entry of something alien to American ideas and ideals and that in consequence we harm American culture."13 To prove the desirability of assimilating German culture in America, Germanists therefore had to stress its similarity and the innocuous character of its differences. This complemented another characteristic, traditionalism, of a large segment of Germanists who preferred to present an idyllic picture of Germany. For instance, when
von Klenze suggested a more realistic approach to Germany for American students, and enumerated fifteen towns with which American students should be acquainted, the largest of them was Nuremberg.\textsuperscript{14} For German-born Germanists conservatism blended with a common tendency among immigrants to want to retain the image of their country exactly as it was when they left it, or as they idealized it, a tendency which Ernst Feise called "colonial petrification."	extsuperscript{15} There was little room for leftist philosophies or radical views. Like in other departments at most American universities, anti-Semitism never surfaced in public, although private documents and outside comments attested that it was rampant.\textsuperscript{16} Women were theoretically considered equal and respected members of the profession, but few taught at the university level; occasionally they were the object of patronizing remarks.\textsuperscript{17} Elitism was another vestige of the late nineteenth century. University education was in general less democratic than now and some Germanists were not averse to stating their feelings of superiority openly. As late as 1936, James Taft Hatfield (Northwestern U) spoke of "die grobe Volksmasse, die einverstandenerweise dummies Vieh ist" when referring to his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{18} In their own students they hoped to develop appreciation of German literature and culture, often via educational methods that engendered admiration rather than critical judgment. Finally, we must mention the dependence of German studies on Germany. American Germanists revered the scholarship of their German counterparts and desired their
recognition. For a large number of Germanists in the thirties, then, German politics might not have seemed a fit subject for discussion: it was either too dangerous an area or too mundane a matter for scholars, unsuited for youthful minds, a potential offense to German Germanists, or simply not within the scope of knowledge of a profession dedicated to literary and linguistic scholarship.

Yet the situation of American Germanistik allowed for the public statement of opinions on extra-literary matters, including politics. Some of the pre-World War I tradition which saw the Germanist as an arbiter in all fields of life still persisted in the book review sections of the 1930s. Here Germanists voiced their beliefs on every subject from economics and geography to religion and politics. And the few articles on the political situation in Germany which did appear around 1930 did not elicit negative reactions from the American public. In addition, the 1930s generated what is now called "the first wave of culture studies." One group of Germanists opposed the teaching of culture in its broadest sense (including economy, politics, etc.) for fear it would lead to a complete take-over of these sections by other departments. Others, however, defended this approach, though often more as a broad background for literature than as a discipline in and of itself. Such were the parameters of the public professional sphere. While it was no longer important to discuss the political situation, and defending a political theory that ran counter to traditionally accepted
Americanism was simply unthinkable, the periodicals still proved to be a viable forum for the expression of interest in extra-literary subjects that stayed within public consensus.

In the second part, I will consider the profession's attitude toward contemporary German literature. Initially (in Chapter IV), I will discuss the American scholars' reception of contemporary, Nazi-approved literature—what would eventually be termed "inner-German." Were they unrestrained and eager to comment upon it? Which methodological and ideological criteria did they apply? Here we must take into account the prevailing mode of literary criticism in the thirties. Edwin H. Zeydel mentions that between 1918 and 1926 the productivity of German scholarship was low, due to the war. Even the few works that deserve mentioning, he says, suffered from a lack of direction in their methodology:

"Während sie [die Forschungsarbeit] dunkel ahnt, dass so etwas wie ein Umsturz in der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft vor sich geht [probably a reference to Geistesgeschichte] mangelt es ihr zuweilen an der erforderlichen Schulung und an philosophisch-wissenschaftlicher Vertiefung, um in jeder Hinsicht begreifen und folgen zu können." 20 Ernst Rose calls American criticism of that time "pragmatisch wenn nicht gar positivistisch" and complains about its lack of historical sense. 21 Certainly, a sociological or socio-political approach to literature was uncommon. A great portion of the material in periodicals was work-oriented and dealt with such concerns as factual information, form analysis, genre
examination, and interpretation of themes. History served mainly as a background. Teachers often withheld judgment of contemporary literature from the student and many textbooks did not even contain contemporary authors. Therefore, while one may be critical of those scholars who lacked a sense of history, we must recognize the merits of those who were historically and politically aware.

The next chapter (Pt. II, Ch. V) will analyze the profession's attitude toward contemporary, Nazi-inspired criticism. Did the Germanists' approach to Nazi methodology attest to political sophistication? Did they pronounce judgment on their colleagues? Was the encounter an impetus to self-assessment? Regarding an era when American Germanistik was rarely critical of German scholarship, these are not simple questions. There existed no precedent for confrontation with an ideology which they could ignore but not emulate.

The periodicals show that American Germanists gave attention to many more aspects of the interaction between Nazism and literature. A survey of these issues is presented at the end of this study. They are significant for overall evaluation of the profession's attitude and role during the Third Reich and deserve study in their own right. They are not addressed here, since this dissertation centers on reactions to contemporary literary and political events.

In the long run, the findings from the primary sources have to be weighed against a wider political, sociological,
and cultural background. The prolegomenous articles that form part of the 1983 "History of German Studies" issue of *Monatshefte* all emphasize this. The role of the profession vis-à-vis Nazism and the second World War can be fully understood only within the context of the historical development of American Germanistik since the turn of the century, especially since 1914, of its relationship with German Germanistik, and of its position within American academia. Equally important are the cultural and political climate in the United States in the thirties and forties, the pro- and anti-German feelings of the American public after 1933, the social shifts that took place after the Depression, and the practical demands posed by America's military involvement in 1941. When analyzing and interpreting its sources this study takes these factors into account. However, a full appreciation of American Germanistik and its contribution to American society will require interdisciplinary studies.

Finally, we must confront the question that every student of the past, especially one as sensitive as the era of the Third Reich, has to face: Is it my task to sit in judgment of mistakes that were made? Any history, however objective, is bound to point out shortcomings and highlight accomplishments. This study, however, is not written in a spirit of contentiousness. Its main purpose is to bring into focus the political, philosophical, and literary problems with which Germanistik was confronted due to the rise of Nazism and
the outbreak of World War II, and to interpret the different approaches that American Germanists took to solve them. For those answers formed part of Germanistik's contribution to American culture.

State of the Research

In his 1980 dissertation, Richard Spuler, the first to write an extensive monograph on a segment of German literary criticism in America, commented:

Since the late sixties, the primarily practical problems of the German-teaching profession have in fact received widespread attention. At the same time, its ideological problems, presumably secondary, have been obscured by an apparent indifference toward the profession's history. For the most part these issues have been submerged beneath contemporary pragmatic concerns. Where they have surfaced, they are formulated largely as questions wanting answers.

Historical studies of institutionalized German studies in the United States had been scarce to that moment. But, as mentioned, in the five years since Spuler wrote his dissertation many changes have taken place. At this writing, the history of Germanistik is no longer "one individual's hobbyhorse," but has become a fundamental concern shared by Germanists of most different backgrounds.

Edwin Zeydel's "Die Germanistische Tätigkeit in Amerika 1918-26" (1928) was the first Forschungsbericht to appear. Published in Euphorion, Zeydel's report was obviously aimed at a German public. Two aspects are
particularly relevant to our purposes. First, Zeydel's
description of the enduring effect of the 1917 anti-German
hysteria, and second, his complaint about American Germanists' lack of recognition from their German counterparts.
"Amerika," he asserts, "[spielte] beim Ausbruch des
Weltkrieges eine bescheidene, in Deutschland nicht immer
richtig eingeschätzte Rolle in der Forschung."24 This modest
expression of pride and autonomy is followed by an admission
of the continuing dependency on German Germanistik: Zeydel
calls for instruction of new American professors not for its own merit but because "die Nachfrage nach guten eingeborenen Deutschlehrern schon jetzt das Angebot weit übertrifft und
immer grösser zu werden verspricht."25

Walter A. Reichart's "Die Germanistik in Amerika" (1938)
was also meant for an audience abroad. His Forschungsbericht
offered a survey of the scholarly foreign language journals in the United States. It is noteworthy that ten years after Zeydel's work Reichart complains about German indifference toward American publications as well. But he excuses the Germans more than Zeydel:

Jeder Deutsche ist stolz auf die hervorragenden Leistungen der Anglistik . . . die von allen Fachmännern geschätzt und anerkannt werden. . . . Es ist daher umso bedauernswerter, dass in Deutschland, trotz der vielseitigen Verbindungen deutscher und amerikanischer Germanisten, amerikanische Veröffentlichungen auf dem Gebiet der Germanistik meistens unbeachtet und sogar unbekannt bleiben. . . . Nun sind wohl die Leistungen der amerikanischen Germanistik ein ganz bescheidener Teil des gesamten Schaffens auf diesem Gebiet, was
Richard Reichart does not review the research work itself so that his article informs us more about the conditions in which American Germanists functioned than about their actual output.

Although Sol Liptzin's "Early History of the A.A.T.G. 1926-31" was not a Forschungsbericht, it should also be mentioned in this context. Liptzin discusses the resistance of numerous college and university professors to the launching of a new organization, the AATG, because they feared that the American public might react negatively to a national institution committed to German culture.

Twenty years after Zeydel and another World War later, Henry C. Hatfield and Joan Merrick wrote "Studies of German Literature in the United States 1939-1946" (1948). It encompasses most areas of scholarship in Germanistik. And, being directed at an American readership, it mentions not only lacunae but imparts suggestions as well. Contrary to Zeydel and Reichart, Hatfield and Merrick call for a more independent research climate in American Germanistik. Although offering a historical explanation for the dependence on German Germanistik, they nevertheless think that it is time for an indigenous scholarship with "an American, rather than a colonial point of view." That demand was not new; it had
been formulated in various articles during the mid-forties. As to the Nazi era, the authors congratulate their colleagues on their scholarly activity, but they also launch some very serious accusations at their lack of social responsibility. The validity of those reproaches will be discussed both in Parts I and II.

Ernst Rose partially covered the same period in "Die Leistungen der amerikanischen Germanistik während des letzten Jahrzehnts (1939-1951)" (1952). He too lauded the high quality of German scholarship in America during a difficult period. Speaking of literary criticism, Rose laments its lack of historical sense: "Wo anders als in Amerika wäre die Schule des 'Literary Criticism' möglich, die den ernstlichen Versuch macht, Literaturforschung ohne geschichtliche Grundlagen zu treiben?" However, he admits that this same attitude has led to "eindringliche Stilanalysen." According to Rose, the pervasiveness of pragmatism was responsible for the lack of "zusammenhängende Gesamtdarstellungen." 29 In Part II of this study we shall see that American Germanistik's reception of Nazi literature substantiated some of these opinions.


In "Die Germanistik in den Vereinigten Staaten: Studium und Forschung" (1969), Horst Daemmrich surveyed the period 1945-68. Many of his observations are also valid for the
closing years of the war. He perceives the years 1945-46 as a period of failed opportunities in literary scholarship. For during that period, according to Daemmrich, three outstanding lectures calling for renewal, respectively by Karl Viętor, Leo Spitzer, and Werner Richter, went unheeded. Americans could have become leaders in the field because it was a time when European scholars, especially Germans, expected leadership and inspiration from their colleagues in the United States:

Man ... erwartete Anregungen und sah nach den Vereinigten Staaten wo viele deutsche Wissenschaftler eine neue Heimat gefunden hatten. Und Amerika war in einer starken Ausgangsposition, um auf Deutschland zu wirken. ... Wie reagierten die amerikanischen Germanisten? Unbegreiflicherweise ging man einer wirklich eingehenden theoretischen Erörterung versöhnllich aus dem Weg.31

Instead, American Germanists assumed a role that was more socially minded and at the same time more modest: "Sie sahen das Hauptanliegen der amerikanischen Germanistik darin, die deutsche Literatur einem kaum informierten amerikanischen Leserkreis vorzustellen und näherzubringen."32 Yet Daemmrich acknowledges the positive results of that attitude:

Es kann heute kein Zweifel darüber bestehen, dass Arbeiten in dieser Richtung das allgemeine Interesse an der deutschen Literatur förderten. Zu berücksichtigen sind nicht nur die vielen wirklich guten Übersetzungen ... oder Literaturgeschichten in englischer Sprache ... sondern auch kritische Arbeiten, die Wesentliches zum Verständnis einzelner Dichter oder Perioden beitrugen.33

After 1970, some critics would take exception to Daemmrich's deprecating outlook on the years 1945-46, as will be mentioned later.
In the 1970s, historical consciousness became more obvious. Partly inspired by the process of self-assessment that took place in German Germanistik during the sixties, and directly spurred on by the precarious financial position in which foreign language departments now found themselves after the prosperous sixties, American Germanistik began to take a comprehensive look at itself.\(^3\) One of the most visible expressions of this attitude was the publication of the volume German Studies in the United States: Assessment and Outlook (1976), a collection of essays by members of the profession. They had first met in 1973 with the specific purpose "to assess the German-teaching profession in the United States in its full context— from primary to graduate school: its structures, programs, and aims; and the people through whom and for whom it functions."\(^3\) Richard Spuler criticizes the study for its almost exclusive concentration on the present and its disregard for the lessons of history:

That a major work like German Studies does not explore the history of Germanistik in more detail is indicative of the profession's failure to promote a historical self-awareness. Its publication presupposes self-assessment but almost all of the contributors take the part of either the troubleshooter or the prognosticator and only seldom that of the historian.\(^3\)

The past was given consideration only in Lange's opening article "Thoughts in Season." One of the aspects of the history of German studies to which Lange draws attention is its "dependence upon the impulses and perspectives of German literary and historical scholarship." In regard to the Third
Reich era, Lange praises the contribution of refugee scholars who, with few exceptions, "moved to examine and broaden the range of their interest and their methodology in order to become partners in that far-reaching critical discourse which so strikingly enlivened American humanistic scholarship in the years after the Second World War."37

During the next year, Jeffrey L. Sammons gave a lecture at the international symposium on Germanistik im Ausland in Tübingen (1977) entitled "Die amerikanische Germanistik: Historische Betrachtungen zur gegenwärtigen Situation." Sammons brings to notice that it was World War I and not World War II that struck the drastic blow to American Germanistik. Much of the present crisis in German studies must be traced historically to "das tiefer liegende Problem vom Schwund der deutschen Kultur im amerikanischen Bewusstsein."38 Among the effects of World War II, he asserts, was the desire of American Germanists to exceed nationalistic limitations, hence leading to an interest in comparative literature. However, contradicting Daemmrich and in agreement with Hatfield-Merrick, Sammons thinks that at the end of the war "wahrscheinlich diejenigen recht [hatten] die 'das Hauptanliegen der amerikanischen Germanistik darin [sahen], die deutsche Literatur einem kaum informierten amerikanischen Leserkreis vorzustellen und näherzubringen.'"39 This, Sammons says, was more important than developing a new methodology.

A milestone was reached in 1982, when Richard Spuler published "Germanistik" in America: The Reception of German
Classicism, 1870-1905. It was the first study in book format of a particular segment of German literary scholarship in the United States. This vanguard position accounted for Spuler's intensive discussion of core concepts of Germanistik and his apologia for writing a history of the profession in the first place. Through an analysis of the reception of German classicism and specifically of Schiller's Wilhelm Tell, Spuler characterizes German literary scholarship between 1870 and 1905, and defines the role which American Germanists assigned to themselves in American society. Some tendencies of eras like the early thirties can be better understood in the light of the late nineteenth-century climate and tradition he describes.

In 1982, at the MLA convention in Los Angeles, a special session of the German Literature section was devoted to "Prolegomena to a History of the Study of German in the United States." Pursuant to that session, a conference took place at the University of Wisconsin in Madison in April 1983, on the subject "Teaching German in America: The Historical Perspective." Several papers were presented on diverse aspects and periods of the history of the profession, including the Nazi era. In 1983, Monatshefte dedicated its Fall issue to the history of German Studies. The articles presented a legitimation and methodological variations for the writing of such a history. In December 1983, a session of the MLA convention in New York moved one step further toward realization of the plans. A program arranged by ADPL
discussed the German Oral History Project. This project has direct bearing on the topic of this dissertation since only few scholars of the 1930-46 era are still alive.

That same year Monatshefte also announced the publication of a volume "Teaching German in America: The Historical Perspective" (tentative title), to be published jointly by Monatshefte and the Max Kade Institute for German-American Studies. (At this writing the volume is not yet available.) Another article by Jeffrey Sammons, "The Tragical Historie of German in the United States: Some Scenes from Past and Present" (1983), reiterated the thought that the 1917 debacle in German education was partly due to the social attitude of German-Americans. This disruption of the scholarly tradition eventually necessitated the recruiting of scholars from overseas before and after World War II, which has profoundly affected the character of the profession.

The history of the teaching of German (language, literature, culture) has been more thoroughly documented. This is probably because studies of foreign language instruction have occasionally been commissioned by federal agencies or funded by private foundations. Pentlin observed the recent growing interest in historical studies such as the establishment in 1959 of a Division of History and Historiography by the American Educational Research Association, but she also regretted that "to date there are no sections on the history of German language study and teaching at convention meetings and articles on these topics rarely, if ever, appear
in journals for teachers of German." If Pentlin's complaint was slightly exaggerated—a few articles, like Zeydel's, were published in teaching periodicals—a systematic approach had not in fact been encouraged by the departments or the professional associations.

A major work on the teaching of German appeared in 1902: Louis Viereck's "German Instruction in American Schools," U.S. Bureau of Education. Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1900-1901. It covered the teaching of German from Colonial times through the nineteenth century. Sections on the history of German instruction were also included in Charles H. Handschin's "The Teaching of the Modern Languages in the United States" (1913), and E. W. Bagster-Collins's "History of Modern Language Teaching in the United States" (1930) documented teaching from Colonial times through the 1920s. In 1936, John A. Walz participated in a Round Table on American-German Relations organized by the Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia. His lecture, German Influence in American Education and Culture, offered a detailed account of German language instruction through the nineteenth century. But in spite of the topic of the conference, the two controversial periods, World War I and the Hitler years, were treated in only a few sentences. In 1948, Maxim Newmark edited a collection of documents and reports on foreign language teaching from the sixteenth century through 1947. To be sure, all the papers included can be found elsewhere, but the collection is relevant for the importance
the author attaches to the history of foreign language teaching: "[It] should fortify the foreign language teacher's professional background and sense of the dignity and justification of his calling."51

The most frequently quoted overall historical account of German instruction in this country is Edwin H. Zeydel's "The Teaching of German in the United States from Colonial Times to the Present" (1961).52 As in his 1928 report, Zeydel vividly describes the calamity that struck German Studies in 1917, its repercussions during the twenties, and the decline of German culture consciousness in the United States ever since. As to the period 1933-45 proper, Zeydel concentrates on the AST programs and does not mention the drop in enrollment after 1933, nor the uneasiness in the German departments caused by the political hostilities.

L.G. Kelly's 25 Centuries of Language Teaching (1969) mentions the institution of the ASTP language courses as an aspect of the public's attitude to foreign language teaching. However, it does not allude to the hostile reactions in 1917.53

In 1970, Hugo Schmidt wrote the opening article for The Teaching of German: Problems and Methods entitled "A Historical Survey of the Teaching of German in America." The author, who draws his facts from Zeydel, thus defines the value of the historical approach: "It shall remind us of the energy and dedication that has been afforded to the advancement of our profession, and it shall underscore the need for a continued effort."54
The first comprehensive work to deal with the teaching of German during the Nazi era was Susan L. Pentlin's 1977 dissertation "Effect of the Third Reich on the Teaching of German in the United States: A Historical Study," which I mentioned above. While obviously focusing on language instruction, Pentlin's work is also relevant for the student of literary scholarship. It evokes the atmosphere in the German departments during 1933-45 and describes the fate of the teaching profession, factors which were bound to affect the scholarly output. Moreover, in treating the issue of "culture studies" in the curriculum, she indirectly sheds light on the German scholars' concept of culture and the place of literature within it. The lacuna in American Third Reich research stands in marked contrast to the plethora of studies done in Germany. But although German Germanistik had more compelling reasons to examine the relationship between Nazism and language education, nonetheless, systematic investigations did not start until the sixties.

Current debates in government and educational circles about teaching Spanish as a first language have given a fresh impetus to the research into the history of German language teaching. For instance, in 1983, Steven L. Schlossman, Staff Historian of the Rand Corporation, did a study entitled "Is There an American Tradition of Bilingual Education? German in the Public Elementary Schools, 1840-1919" for that purpose.55

On the whole, in recent years a historical dimension has been added to the process of self-assessment and realignment
for the future in foreign language studies, specifically in German. Henry J. Schmidt wrote: "The study of the development of Germanistik seeks primarily to ascertain the profession's sense of function within a particular institutional and social environment at a specific moment in history." This dissertation hopes to contribute to that goal by assessing the role the members of the Germanistic profession thought was theirs to fulfill during a period of great tension, 1930-46.
During the period of 1930-46, Germanistic periodicals displayed a considerable interest in Nazism as a political, cultural, and social system. The content, volume, and intensity of this interest were affected by political realities to the degree that one can discern marked shifts corresponding to major political events: the onset of the Hitler regime in 1933; Germany's attack on Poland in 1939; America's entry into the war in 1941; and, to a lesser degree, the invasion of Germany by the Allies in 1945.

Between 1930 and 1932, there appeared no articles entirely devoted to the developing Nazi movement. However, several essays on literary or pedagogical subjects published in Germanistic periodicals made brief references to Nazism, or dealt with German phenomena which, although not yet recognized as expressions of Nazism, would definitely be labeled as such after 1933, among them anti-Semitism and pan-Germanism. From 1933 to 1939, Germanists expressed a variety of opinions on German politics, ranging from enthusiastic support to neutrality and fierce attacks. After 1939, sides had definitely been chosen: although the Third Reich remained the
subject of attention, no more defenses of Nazi-Germany appeared. Following Pearl Harbor and the German Declaration of War on the U.S. in December 1941, the interest in Nazism became linked to participation in the war effort. In addition, scholars almost immediately began to speculate about the re-education of Germany after the war and the role the U.S. should play in that process.

In Part I, I intend to examine to what degree Germanists were interested in the non-literary aspects of Nazism, in what form they expressed this interest, and what their concern reveals about the character and role of the profession. Following the historical substratum delineated above, this part is divided into three chapters: I: 1930-1932; II: 1933-1939; III: 1940-1946.
Before Hitler's rise to power in 1933, the question, "Was there any interest in the first manifestations of Nazism?" can be transposed to: "Was there any interest in subjects other than German literature or language education?" Did American Germanists express any curiosity or opinions about conditions in the German-speaking countries since World War I? The answer is barely affirmative, but this is not surprising. As noted in the Introduction, after Monatshefte's heavy and one-sided involvement with German politics before and during World War I, the Germanistic periodicals had withdrawn during the late twenties from the political arena and isolated themselves in the safe haven of pure scholarship and educational methodology. "Literary scholarship steered clear of political issues, and German culture was converted into an inoffensive commodity."57 Besides, the American public at large barely took notice of the election results of the German Nazi party or the antics of Hitler during the late 20s and early 30s.

Two articles in this period concentrated exclusively on the German political and social situation; occasional comments on the rise of Nazism appeared within essays on literature;
book reviews discussed works of a political nature; and concise, unannotated reports of extra-literary events in Germany were also published. Political attention was aimed only at Germany; although Germanists sometimes included Austria and Switzerland in the theoretical definition of their field of interest, they received no individual treatment whatsoever.

In general, the periodicals themselves maintained a non-committal, unprogrammatic attitude, and any political opinions voiced in the articles were those of the individual authors. Monatshefte made a noticeable exception when in an introductory note it explicitly backed Alexander R. Hohlfeld's 1931 address to the German-Americans in Milwaukee. It did so most likely because Hohlfeld (U of Wisconsin) was highly respected in the profession and because the political aspect of the speech was so well integrated into its main purpose: to promote mediation on the cultural and psychological level and to stress the American identity of German-Americans.58

Most articles concerned with politics saw a role for the American Germanist in the political evolution of Germany, and this on two levels: first of all, to promote Germany's integration into a peaceful world, and second, to extend German influence in America and gain wider acceptance of Germany's political course. In these discussions of political issues, the two most conspicuous names were Hohlfeld and George H. Danton (Oberlin Coll.).59
1. References to World War I and Its Aftermath

World War I remained a salient topic during this period. The discussions did not deal with the war as such but with its effect on Germany's place in the world. The Treaty of Versailles was repeatedly denounced as unjust. George H. Danton, in a very political paper, claimed that the policies of France, an outgrowth of Versailles, "are aimed at driving Germany either to destruction or to permanent invalidism," and Hohlfeld talked in no less forceful terms about "die Folgen eines widersinnigen und unmöglichen Friedens." P.W. Kaltenborn (a journalist) called the treaty "harsh and unfair ... utterly beyond the bounds of reason and fair play" and exposed it in detail. Even a simple book review became emotional and forceful in tone when the reviewer mentioned the peace treaty, so that his identification with the worries and indignation of the book's author was obvious. These writings shared an outspoken anger about what they considered the treaty's grossly inequitable terms. Such an attitude was not exceptional; many politicians as well as newspapers had frequently decried the treaty. Revisionism regarding the war had become popular since the early twenties: "A veritable avalanche of literature appeared, to reverse the earlier verdict of exclusive German guilt."

One wonders whether Germanists, when reflecting upon the Great War and its aftermath, also practiced self-examination: did they ponder their own past attitude to the war, and thus contribute some insights into a history of their profession?
Very few did, and then only in passing. So A. Busse (Hunter Coll.), on the occasion of Kuno Francke's death: "Hat Kuno Francke damals geirrt . . . in jenen Jahren [WWI] gingen wir alle in die Irre." Speaking more strongly and with greater frankness George H. Danton wrote: "We professors of German completely failed, in 1914, and in the immediately succeeding years. We did not sense what was coming and we had nothing to build up, in spite of a remarkable opportunity which we then had, a sales resistance to the illegitimate war hysteria which for years swept our profession off its feet." Apparently Danton's candor was not so much directed at the profession's lack of insight into international relations as at its inability to gauge the reaction of the general population during and after the war toward the German language.

The desire to elicit sympathy for the former enemy became manifest in the image of contemporary Germany that the scholars tried to project: a pacifist country both in its psychological and political make-up. Yet the old inclination to portray the Germans as a heroic people remained alive, but in a much more tempered version. Actually, the heroism was radically redefined: whereas fifteen years earlier Germany's military prowess was presented as exemplary, now the very absence of a military force became a source of pride. Hohlfeld evoked "ein schwer um seine Existenz ringendes Deutschland," and Kaltenborn described Germany's phoenix-like rebirth:
Out of the utter humiliation of a people there has come a new spirit—a determination to go forward, leaving past mistakes and going towards new achievements. . . . Young Germany is shorn of military power. But she stands before the world as living proof that in our disillusioned post-war world armies and navies are neither the true nor the only symbols of national greatness.  

Kaltenborn's article stood out because it focused entirely on contemporary Germany, providing concrete examples of Germany's rejuvenation from the world of international politics, government, industry, sports, etc. It was originally addressed to a high school German club, which accounted for its display of one-sided enthusiasm. (For instance, he mentioned the German public's acclaim of an English tennis player as an example of the Germans' sense of fair play. And he favorably described the Young Plan for war reparations without mentioning the vicious NS campaign against it which, incidentally, enabled Hitler's comeback in 1929). It is regrettable that the only extensive contribution about the peace-loving Weimar Republic in Germanistic periodicals did not aim at analysis and sophisticated judgment. Clifford Gates (Colgate U) complained that Germany had been stereotyped as a warmonger and that Americans were unaware of its commitment to peace, so prominent in the latest German novels.  

In a study of Franco-German relations, Danton called attention to the psychological side of international affairs: he claimed that the French did not recognize Germany's goodwill and desire for peace because—economic and
war-related reasons aside—they found the Germans greatly lacking in Lebenskunst.70

Some Germanists sought to offer concrete assistance to Germany in its task of maintaining peace. They defined their traditional role of mediators between German and American culture in terms of establishing a rapprochement between two former enemies. Their reasoning was straightforward: political peace can only be maintained if it is based on understanding; but to understand the Germans one must know them. The Germanists felt they could contribute to this knowledge through such concrete means as travel, the study of Volkskunde, exchange fellowships with Germany, and reports on contemporary events. L.V.T. Simmons, (Pennsylvania State Coll.), for instance, proudly related a trip of American educators to Germany and the reception they received from officials who "seemed to feel that for ten years they had been held at a distance and had been distrusted. We were the first official group to come in a purely friendly spirit."71

Although the references to peace may sound naive and clichéd, the writings emanated from a sincere respect for the German people and a strong belief in the value of personal contact, especially in an age of growing political isolationism. From the pedagogical viewpoint, they applied what the Committee on Modern Foreign Languages would define as the purpose of language study in its 1933 Final Report: "the breaking down of the barriers of provincialism and the building up of the spirit of international understanding and friendliness, leading toward world peace."72
Only one article went beyond the "sympathy" level and called for the American Germanists to play a political role. In his 1932 programmatic address, Alexander Hohlfeld exhorted his audience of German-Americans and particularly German teachers to put pressure on American politicians:

Das Ziel das ich hier aufstelle und das die gegenwärtige Weltlage mehr als je von uns fordert, es entspricht den besten Interessen Amerikas, sowohl in seinen eignen inneren Problemen, wie auch in seiner schicksalbestimmten Aufgabe, im Dienste der Erhaltung des Weltrfriedens, ein schwer um seine Existenz ringendes Deutschland zu schützen und zu stützen, das auf diesen Schutz und diese Unterstützung ein hohes Anrecht hat. Und je mehr sich in den nichtdeutschen Teilen unseres Volkes eine gründliche Kenntnis deutscher Verhältnisse vor und nach dem Kriege verbreitet, je mehr Interesse an deutscher Kultur und Sympathie für deutsches Leben und Streben wieder Boden gewinnen in Amerika ohne durch die Betonung eines Gegensatzes gegen England und englische Interessen beeinträchtigt zu werden, um so klarer und deutlicher wird sich Amerikas Stimme hören lassen und seinen Forderungen Nachdruck verleihen können.\textsuperscript{73}

A plea to act as a pressure group on the government, but still a far cry from the pro-Wilhelminian propaganda of the 1900-17 era!

2. Nazism as a Subject Matter

During the years 1930-32, the character of German Nazism, which first appeared during the 1920s, became more and more obvious as the National Socialist party made its first significant showing in the national elections of 1930 (18.3%), and Hitler only narrowly lost to Hindenburg in the
presidential elections of 1932. At this time the American Germanistic periodicals carried no articles entirely devoted to the study of the NS movement. The short, explicit references to Nazism that did occur were not so much attacks as warnings. The scholars' concept of Nazism was blurry and self-contradictory: an author might sound an alarm against Nazism in one article, yet not recognize its expressions in another; or he might even attack Nazism and display Nazi-style racism in one and the same article.

The first person to call Hitlerism by name and to warn against its danger was Danton. As early as 1931, he called Hitlerism "a real menace" and "dangerous" to the peaceful interaction between Germany and other countries. Yet in the very same article he belittled it and even feared that those who attached too much importance to it were endangering peace themselves. He cited as an example a French writer in Les Nouvelles Littéraires whose attitude was "unfortunate": "He is greatly excited over Hitlerism and urges his German colleagues to do something about it." Only once more was Hitlerism mentioned explicitly: John Whyte (Brooklyn Coll.) lamented what he viewed as "hate literature" in an Alsatian newspaper which proclaimed that there was more of "the true Goethean spirit" to be found in some French authors than in "the members of the Stahlhelm and the Hitler party."

Although identification of Nazism occurred only sporadically, it was often referred to indirectly. Scholars noticed certain "new" phenomena, which we now recognize as
precursors or even expressions of the not yet consolidated NS movement. Some criticized these as individual, one-time flaws in the fabric of German society, hardly disquieting, whereas others tended to praise them as refreshing signs of Germany's rebirth. The most conspicuous of these phenomena were nationalism and racism. J.S. Ward (Alabama Coll.), reporting on the German school system, pointed out that many Germans feared that the new stress on *Heimatkunde* might lead to exaggerated nationalism "as we find some outcroppings in America in what we call jingoism."77 The author clearly did not find the situation alarming but saw it as a contained phenomenon. Danton lamented that both in France and in Germany "the things of the spirit . . . are constantly being forced out of their proper place by considerations of national pride."78 Yet, a year earlier, this same critic advised teachers to favor German authors who were "addicti glebae" (faithful to the soil) rather than international in character, and naively acknowledged that he himself used Josef Nadler's *Geschichte der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften*, a popular text at the time, as the basis for his literature classes.79 Even if his referral to the Czechs "and some other of the lesser breeds before the law who play the part of dog in the manger" was meant ironically, he displayed a carelessness that under the Nazi regime would become contempt for the so-called "inferior" nations.80 He also argued that the Orient should be left to the Germans for colonization since they succeeded there as no others did. Granted, Danton's opinion was part of
a nineteenth-century legacy, when all European nations deemed themselves entitled to colonial possessions—he generously allotted France the "natural" right to Africa—but in 1932 such nonchalance in discussing acquisition and ownership of other countries also underwrote the "mehr Raum" policy of the Nazis. Edwin Roedder (Coll. of the City of New York) lamented the effects of fascism in Italy: "Gemeint ist das Liktorenbeil des Faschismus. . . . Beim Lesen zittert in jedem deutschen Herzen jedes Tröpfchen Blut mit," without suspecting the ironic foreboding of his comments.81

An unmistakable protest against blind nationalism and racism resounded from Hohlfeld's extensive review of a book by the infamous German critic Adolf Bartels. After enumerating several qualities of Bartels's literary history, Hohlfeld proceeded: "Und doch muss ebenso offen gesagt werden, dass bei so massloser Voreingenommenheit gegen alles was mit dem Judentum zu tun hat und so bedenklicher Überheblichkeit in allen völkisch-nationalen Bewertungen eine irgendwie gedeihlich 'wissenschaftliche' Behandlung ausgeschlossen erscheinen muss."82 This condemnation was repeated twice in different wording and illustrated with pertinent examples. But Hohlfeld's optimism and wishful thinking led him to a wrong conclusion regarding the reaction of German society, and particularly of the intelligentsia, toward anti-Semitism: "Ich kann mir schwer vorstellen, dass diese grosse Ausgabe der Bartel'schen Literaturgeschichte selbst in Deutschland einen weiten Kreis von Lesern und Bewunderern wird finden
können." Hohlfeld seemed to believe that his respected German colleagues were above such base and perverse instincts. He was heir to the Aristotelian ideal of kaloskagathos, the unity between aesthetic and moral integrity; therefore, in his eyes, Bartels had to be the exception, the black sheep in an otherwise noble profession. This reaction was paralleled in 1933 by the popular belief among the American people that Hitler and his party would soon be pushed aside by common sense and decency.

Hohlfeld himself harbored a grand dream of world peace based on racial superiority, hoping to see the three Germanic nations (the U.S., Germany, and England) band together politically in some kind of pan-Germanic alliance:

Denn, wo auf Basis von Verständnis und wahrer Interessengemeinschaft, und zugleich bei gutem Willen auch allen anders eingestellten Ländern gegenüber, Amerika, England und Deutschland als die drei mächtigsten Vertreter vorwiegend germanischen Volkstums gemeinsam auftreten könnten, da würde man sich auf die Dauer der Wucht ihres Einflusses nicht entziehen können.

Hohlfeld's lecture revealed an interesting Umfunktionierung of the earlier interpretation of Volkstum. He substituted "Germanisches Volkstum" for Deutsches Volkstum and extended it to England and the U.S., a politically safe viewpoint after World War I. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, American Germanists saw themselves as representatives of Germany in all its aspects, including its politics and government. In 1917, this came to a halt. Suddenly
American teachers of German projected themselves not as representatives but as mediators of German culture. (For instance, when Hohlfeld mentioned "unser Volk," he was referring to the American people.) Yet, to a degree, Hohlfeld was still holding on to the old ideal of "Am deutschen Wesen soll die Welt genesen." While he no longer propagated the politics of Germany, he now lobbied for the politics of Germanic countries which, superior as they supposedly were, should be spread to the rest of the world. Once again, the teacher as missionary! Although Hohlfeld did not give a definition of Germanisches Volkstum, the context lent the term biological and political connotations. It was ironic that Hohlfeld who in 1930 so unequivocally attacked Bartels for his anti-Semitic writings, should himself foster the concept of Germanic superiority. Most likely he was less sensitive to the racist implications of his political proposal than to racial prejudice within his own profession because the latter was an infraction upon academic freedom and integrity.

The ambivalence of American Germanists toward the Nazi philosophy thus manifested itself in contradictory combinations of awareness and disregard, condemnation and enthusiasm. How is this ambivalence to be explained? In the first place, the contrasting attitudes of the Germanists must be seen against the general atmosphere in the U.S. during the late twenties and early thirties. Those were the Depression years and, much more than foreign politics, economic and financial woes constituted the country's great concern. The
historian William E. Leuchtenburg talks about the "fathomless pessimism" of the American people. Sander A. Diamond likewise emphasizes the preponderance of economic worries over political ones: "By the middle of the decade and into the 1930's most Americans were too greatly preoccupied with the economic dislocations of the period to be concerned about either the Reds or the Black Shirts." Moreover, the dominant mood was isolationist, as World War I had generated intense opposition to any foreign involvement. Only little attention was, therefore, paid to the ventures of Hitler and his party. In the late thirties the American public would strongly react to the presence of the German-American Bund, a Nazi party on its own soil, but it seemed totally unaware of or indifferent to the existence of its Nazi precursors, Teutonia and The Friends of the New Germany, both founded in 1924. If anything, there was a certain amount of benevolence toward fascist tendencies: "Ironically, until the advent of the Führer endowed Fascism with a demonic image, many Americans had been deeply impressed with the experimental, pragmatic nature of Benito Mussolini's corporate state. This flirtation ceased during the mid-1930's." Whether the majority of Germanists actually shared this indifference to foreign politics is hard to say, but there appeared to be no demand for interpretations of Nazism before 1933. Thus the absence of public statements was very much in harmony with the prevailing atmosphere in the country.
Second, it had taken the Germanistic profession ten years to achieve at least a partial recovery from the disastrous experience of WWI; hence they now strained to sustain an image of noninvolvement with foreign politics and tended to isolate themselves in the realm of "pure research." In addition, because enrollment in German courses recuperated much faster in colleges and universities than in high schools, university professors now became the principal leaders of the profession. This, in turn, increased the quantity of articles on literary criticism and philology in the Germanistic periodicals. Survival tactics and matters of prestige went hand in hand.

It is true that the very Germanists who on other occasions fiercely attacked Hitlerism also lapsed into what, in retrospect, can be called Nazi ideas. But odious as history may have rendered these theories between 1933 and 1945, and offensive as they are to democratic sensitivities, in the 20s and early 30s they had not yet become part of a political ideology clearly perceived as such in America. American Germanists were, therefore, able to concentrate on the cultural aspects of ethnological relationships and more or less ignore the racist and political connotations. It must now be examined whether after 1933, when the Nazi philosophy and its political system were plainly established, American Germanists felt the need to take a firmer position.
CHAPTER II
1933-1939

1. 1933-1934: First Reactions to the Nazi Government

It is ironic that in an article appearing in the April 1933 issue of Monatshefte, entitled "Das Alte und das Neue Deutschland," "Neue" should refer not to the newly born Third Reich, but to the Weimar Republic, whereas "Alte" still stood for the Wilhelminian Empire. Although written by a visiting German scholar (U of Indiana), the article was also symptomatic of the reaction of many American scholars (and of most of the American public). The appointment of Hitler as Chancellor on January 30, 1933, caught most people by surprise, and even more so the establishment of a dictatorship called "National Government of the Third Reich" on March 23 of that same year. The author stressed the anti-military spirit of the post-World War I generation and the democratization of society, specifically in the areas of education, housing and entertainment. He saw the NSDAP as an extension of that democratization process, believing that the quintessential component of the party was socialism, not nationalism. In spite of his emphasis on renewal and his focus on the future, the author lacked a certain historical vision, in that he perceived traditional class distinctions and Wilhelminian
aristocracy as the only enemies of freedom and democracy and did not conceive of any other form of tyranny. Although he ended on a less enthusiastic note by saying that the next four years would tell how the "newest" Germany would turn out, this remark assumed that after four years the NS government would hold elections, and step down if rejected.

The first article fully devoted to an analysis of NS politics was written by Anthony Sokol (Stanford U), who in November 1933 read a paper about the trends in foreign language teaching in Germany. He traced the historical background of the NS educational ideas and showed that much of their so-called "innovative" method was not new, but was taken from the Youth Movement and the Republic. What he identified as new, though, was the goal of foreign language teaching, which had turned away from the humanistic interest in the language and culture of other nations and concentrated on the political education of the German youth. Although no official regulations had been issued at this time, Sokol lucidly deducted and predicted that oral fluency would be discredited in favor of translation into German because foreign languages would become merely a phase in the teaching of German, a means to build up nationalistic pride. Sokol did not explicitly condemn this approach; as a matter of fact, after defining the goals of National Socialism as anti-humanistic and anti-international, he still appeared optimistic and benevolent toward the regime by presenting it as a viable alternative: "It becomes evident that the great question
standing forever before the minds of the Germans is, whether the ideals of Humanity and Internationalism can be achieved directly and individually or whether they can only be attained by the detour over nationalism and socialism. The present movement in Germany answers the question in favor of the latter alternative." 94

The first outright attacks on the established NS regime appeared in December 1933, but they were only parts of articles on other subjects. Hohlfeld stressed the increased value of his own objective overview of German literary history at a time when such objectivity was nonexistent in Germany. 95 Hohlfeld was indignant and very resolute in his judgment of the Nazi manipulation of literary scholarship: "Eine[r] objektive[n] Einstellung [ist] zur Zeit in irgend welchen deutschen Veröffentlichungen durchaus ausgeschlossen . . . ein einwandfreier Überblick . . . [ist gegeben] von der die herrschende Richtung . . . mit so schneidendem und leidenschaftlichem Nachdruck abrückt." 96 Equally outspoken and illuminating was H.S. Bluhm (U of Wisconsin), who exposed the Nazification of the German Evangelical Church. 97 In a review of the Goethe celebrations of 1932, Feise (Johns Hopkins U), who would in time become one of the most vocal anti-Nazis, denounced the practices of the Nazi regime: "[Hohlfeld's address] is in retrospect overcast with a tragic hue . . . [Goethe's] message . . . threatens to be drowned in a hostile atmosphere of so much selfishness and dishonesty, intolerance and violence. . . ." 98
The absence of direct and open reactions to Hitler's regime stood in contrast to the frankness of other, i.e., non-Germanistic, scholarly periodicals which had already spoken out on the situation in Germany. *School and Society*, for instance, did not only report events, but as early as July 15, 1933, it announced the formation of an Emergency Committee to aid displaced German scholars and published a protest against the abandonment of academic freedom in Germany. At this time the new German government was still trying to make a favorable impression on the American government, the American people, and the German-Americans in particular. Strong protests from German-American institutions and cultural associations against the denial of basic freedoms might not have tempered the Nazis' attitude, but silence on the part of those groups must have been welcomed.

After the initial reactions in 1933, the new order was mentioned even less by Germanists during 1934, in spite of the dramatic events that occurred in Germany. During that year, heavy infighting took place among members of the NS party, culminating in the June murders of Hitler's old S.A. comrades and other, non-party people. In August President Hindenburg died, whereupon Hitler assumed the title of "Führer" and absorbed absolute power in his own person. Why were the political events continually ignored in the Germanistic periodicals? Had the attention for purely literary subjects become dominant? Was the old desire to appear uninvolved with German politics still prevalent? Or did scholars refrain from
comment out of disbelief and false hope? Fear certainly played a role, as an article by Joel Hatheway (Chief Examiner, School Committee of Boston) illustrated: he advised teachers to give neither "indiscriminate praise" nor "unlimited condemnation" to the new regime, not so much out of a sense of probity but because it was the safest way to protect the place of German in the curriculum. Besides, he thought that the wrongs caused by the "great revolution" would soon be righted.¹⁰¹ Those who still believed that the Nazis would voluntarily alter their posture found an ally in Thomas Mann, who announced: "At the present time, the Nazis are too intoxicated with their newly acquired strength to realize what they are doing. But eventually it will dawn on them that they cannot hope to succeed with an entire world hostile to them."¹⁰² Yet in the academic world there were also examples of insight and candor, such as the refusal of Harvard's president, James Conant, to accept a cash gift from the special envoy of Rudolf Hess because "Harvard could not take a donation from a man who represented a nation bent on destroying scholarship and academic freedom."¹⁰³

A pro-Nazi voice was heard from C.H. Handschin (Miami U, Ohio), who during the World War I era came forth as a rather biased defender of the Germanic heritage.¹⁰⁴ In "The Germans as They Are and Will Be," his pro-Nazi stand stemmed from his contempt for the Republic and his underestimation of the power of Nazism. This contribution was unique among Germanists, even daring: he took the side of the Russian revolution and
regretted that the German revolution did not succeed. He
ascribed the failure of nationalization and state-planning,
which were written into the constitution, to the influence of
capitalism on the Social-Democratic government and to the
burden of the war reparations. After declaring that no party
whatsoever could achieve economic recovery because of the
harshness of the Versailles Treaty, he accused the Weimar
Republic of not achieving anything in the way of economic
amelioration. For the near future he predicted that a
considerable part of the population would starve to death.
For the survivors, fascism would bring the solution since it
would provide "a living for all." However, he saw Nazism
itself as only a stepping stone to a new regime, some type of
communism "which will distribute the national income so that
all can live and none may live in luxury, as a very small
class at the financial top is now doing." (Handschin
carefully avoided using the word "communism" although he was
actually describing the official policy of the Communist Party
vis-à-vis Nazism at that time.) Handschin's pro-Nazism was
obviously not based on an analysis of what a fascist regime
entails, let alone the Nazi version that was in the making in
Germany. Not unlike Stegmann in 1933, he believed that the
socialist element would supersede the nationalistic one, and
that NS was only a passing phase. In Handschin's defense it
must be acknowledged that his blind welcoming of National
Socialism was not based on racism or anti-intellectualism but
on genuine compassion for the impoverished. Whether or not
one agrees with his assault on the Republic, his frankness is to be commended, but it is regrettable that, as a scholar, he advertised Nazism without the benefit of a discussion.

In 1934, Modern Language Forum started a new rubric called "Political Reviews," which supplied impartial but analytical information about events in France, Germany, and Spain. Monatshefte in its "Umschau der Schriftleitung" limited itself, as before, to reports on educational and scholarly matters in Germany. German Quarterly did not offer a news section. Neither did the Reports of the Annual Meetings of the AATG in 1933 and 1934 contain any direct references to the conditions in Germany. About a 1934 William Gaede lecture on post-war conditions in modern language instruction in Germany, German Quarterly, in a euphemistic understatement, commented: "His words left no doubt that Germany, too, has its serious problems." 108 The program of the Hudson Valley Chapter of the AATG Fall Meeting of 1934 included two lectures with a political scope: "Die Nazis und die Deutschen Schulen" and "The Present Religious Changes in Germany," a visible sign of the Germanists' inquisitiveness about the German political situation. 109 Unfortunately, this inquisitiveness was not echoed by the AATG hierarchy or by the editors of German Quarterly or Monatshefte.

In conclusion, while a few scholars cautioned against National Socialism, their warnings were infrequent. It is also noteworthy and ironic that the two scholars who applauded the arrival of Nazism should do so out of what may be called
leftist leanings: Stegmann welcomed it as opposition to the remnants of Wilhelminian class distinctions, Handschin as a reaction against what he saw as the capitalist corruption of the Republic.

2. 1935-1939: Reactions to the Established Regime

Susan Pentlin notes a rise in the amount of articles on the question "Why study German?" starting in 1935. She links this to the acceleration of disturbing events in Germany (such as the Enactment of the Nuremberg Laws in 1935) together with an increasing hope that language learning might contribute to the preservation of democracy and peace. A parallel increase can be observed in articles concerning the Nazi regime. Sundry pleas requested interpretation of the German political situation. They called attention to three requirements: we should enlighten ourselves, our students and the general public. But there were also voices against discussing the contemporary situation. The underlying problem concerned not only the desirability of the political involvement of the academic world but also the social responsibility of the scholar. However, the National Socialist issue prompted no in-depth philosophical discussions about the nature of the Germanistic profession or its role in history.

a. Discussions For and Against the Study of Nazism

Those who supported the study of Nazism both in writings and in the classroom considered it part of their scholarly and
pedagogical duty. They also used the topic as an opportunity to stress the scientific character of Germanistik.

The same Handschin who, in 1932, so enthusiastically hailed Fascism as a new chance for Germany after the incompetent Republic, in 1935 demanded an objective, scientific approach to the New Germany, free of partisanship and emotionalism. No doubt he remembered the one-sided leanings of the Germanists in the first two decades: "It is pleasant to record that teachers of German have not been partisans since the war." He would restate his position in 1938, asking that information be provided for the students, lashing out against partiality, but now going one step further: "Free and careful discussion as we propose to foster it, can't help but bring out anti-German reactions [emphasis added]. We should not repress these; much more, we should welcome them and meet them honestly." Most likely, this insight was influenced by the hostile outcries in the press which the actions of the Nazi government had by now generated. Handschin's attitude gave evidence of courage and demonstrated the insight of an educator who knew that a straightforward revelation of an unpleasant truth would be better received than an unsuccessful attempt to cover it up. Werner Neuse (Dean, German School, Middlebury Coll.) thought that the American teachers of German had no choice but to take a position toward the political changes abroad. They should do this in a scholarly way, without emotionalism, aiming at "wenigstens eine Erklärung, wenn nicht ein Verstehen." It
is unclear how he distinguished between Erklärung and Verstehen, since the first normally leads to the second. He complained that most non-academic periodicals lacked a scientific approach and that the language journals had avoided taking a stand. (Hence, in the short space of two pages he praised Otto Koischwitz's book three times for the mere fact that he had the courage to talk about the New Germany, regardless of how he did it.) Unfortunately, Neuse's opinion was formulated in a book review and therefore probably did not attract much attention. Ernst Koch (New York U) recommended a book about the Third Reich combining scholarly use of sources with interpretation not only to German scholars but also to the public in general. Ansten Anstensen (U of Saskatchewan) talked about "our recently enlivened interest in all manifestations of nationalism" and expressed the desire to see German nationalism analyzed on "a broader basis of contemporary and intellectual history." All articles on the subject advocated the exclusion of emotionalism, but some believed that subjectivity was unavoidable. Wilton W. Blancke (South Philadelphia High School for Boys), for instance, maintained that objectivity was impossible. Desirable as it is that the teacher speak about the present, it is only human that he take sides and become polemic: "If the past is to be vitalized by a liaison with living problems, can we escape classroom discussion of what are commonly called controversial issues? Can any sentient man or woman avoid taking sides in the burning political and economic issues that are seething in.
the Europe of today?" Since he felt the teacher was bound to be partisan, Blancké allowed propaganda of democratic principles but not of any other ideology: "If we uphold the banner of democracy against the flamboyant 'isms' well and good. But is there not an insidious danger that those of us whose sympathies lean toward alien doctrines of government may become, perhaps knowingly, perhaps unwittingly, first apologists, then propagandists for the fallacies of fascism or national socialism?" He also accused his colleagues of NS proselytizing: "Hasn't it already happened here?"\footnote{117}

Several scholars opposed focusing on the contemporary situation, especially in the classroom. Some feared a repetition of World War I anti-Germanism, while others felt that political events could not be studied objectively unless chronological distance had been established, an opinion paralleling the conviction—widely held until the fifties—that contemporary literature could not be appreciated until sufficient time had elapsed. A few examples will show that a variety of reasons put forward by different scholars expressed a common concern.

During the Annual AATG Meeting of 1935, the outgoing President, Albert W. Aron (U of Illinois), "made a plea for the dispassionate and intensified study of German cultural history as the most effective antidote against the myopic partisanship into which a too exclusive preoccupation with contemporary and immediate circumstance may all too easily lead."\footnote{118} Study the past, not the present! At the AATG
Meeting of 1936, the president, Theodore Huebener (Assistant-Director of Foreign Languages in the City of New York) had the same basic message:

Because of certain trends in the field of professional education and the repercussions here of the general state of political agitation in Europe, language study is more or less under fire in certain quarters; it therefore behooves those interested in this vital study, leaving aside more or less transient controversies, to stress more than ever in their studies and discussions, fundamental and abiding values.

Study of the present situation was only considered a part of a preemptive tactic that would clear the path for those "abiding values": "specifically among other things, it should be emphasized for the benefit of the general public, that 'Nazi' and 'German' are not necessarily to be considered as synonymous." Although Aron and Huebener strove for the same goal, i.e., to avoid discussion of the new Germany, they presented a different rationale and different means to reach that goal. While Aron suggested studying the past and Huebener resorted to "fundamental values" as subjects for German classes, both attested to an underlying fear of the public's reaction: "myopic partisanship" and "repercussions of the general state of political agitation in Europe" were reminders of the 1914-18 era; "trends in the field of professional education" referred to a growing opposition to the compulsory study of foreign languages by educators who favored "a course in general language" instead. Both therefore recommended subjects that would not offend the
American public and that sustained the illusion of an unchanged and untroubled Germany. The recollections of Ludwig Kahn, professor at Vassar and Bryn Mawr during the 1930s, support these speculations: "Some departments labored under the impression that their task was to offer a kind of tourist-picture of Germany. . . . Obviously, some of these departments were uneasy with colleagues who might have a less rosy picture of the German reality."121

Carl Wittke (Oberlin Coll.) and A.B. Faust (Cornell U) expressed their fear even more explicitly: in a review of a book about the relations between Germany and the U.S., Wittke deemed it "prudent" of the author merely to allude to the "misunderstandings" among the American public caused by the Hitler revolution and to avoid all discussions.122 Faust simulated a dialogue between an old and a young professor about the treatment of contemporary politics in the classroom. The emeritus advised his young colleague not to mention politics at all because no matter how he approached the subject, he would be accused of propagandizing. The younger generation would survive the crisis, he suggested, only by imitating the tactics adopted by the older generation after World War I.123

Similarly, the Editor of Books Abroad in 1935, responding to accusations of not taking a position toward the German situation, maintained: "We do not feel ourselves called on to meddle in Germany's settlement of her domestic problems."124 By deliberately misrepresenting the statement of an opinion as
interference with local politics, he was able to avoid an ethical judgment.

Werner F. Leopold's (Northwestern U) rationale was more complicated. He concealed his fear of being confronted by the present under an appearance of progressiveness. He took great pains to distinguish between making nationalistic propaganda and explaining a nation's mentality, the latter being a means of building understanding between nations, the ideal of any language teacher. His application to the present situation showed a healthy appreciation of students' needs: "The students have a right to ask for a dispassionate introduction to the principles which make many perfectly sane people embrace communism, fascism or Nazism." But in an about-face he continued: "But the German class is hardly the place for such an introduction. We have better values to give. . . . The wisest course to my mind is to postpone judgment and meanwhile abstain from classroom utterances concerning it. The truth can more easily be established about matters of a somewhat remote past."125 Like Blancké, Leopold equated "communism, fascism or Nazism," assuming a middle-of-the-road position from which extremes, whether to the right or to the left, are categorized under the same heading regardless of historical context. He too supported the study of the past and "better values" as the only appropriate subjects for German courses.

Yet Leopold did not want to draw an exclusively idyllic picture of Germany. Presenting "better values" meant "to give
our students a glimpse into the Germans' own special way of thinking and feeling, into typical German characters, into the distinctive way in which the German looks at life and the world." Why then did Leopold so adamantly refuse to make a connection between the German "way of thinking" and the contemporary situation? It would appear that his refusal was rooted in a pedagogical principle: Leopold wanted the German scholar to teach "established" truths only, that is, truths considered to be established by consensus among Germanists. Neither the teacher nor the student should become part of an ongoing discussion, participants in a process whose outcome is not yet foreseen. Instead of teaching the students how to take a critical view of Germany, he wanted them to criticize only those elements which society and tradition before him had defined as wrong: "The truth can more easily be established about matters of a somewhat remote past." In the 1930s this attitude was, of course, very common among educators in all disciplines. Moreover, although Leopold did not mention the World War I misjudgments of German teachers in the U.S., he did seem to fear a repeat of that unbridled partisanship. The risk of propaganda in the classroom provided him with one more reason to avoid analysis and judgment of the present:

That, however, is just what the teacher must aim at: to present the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. This is very hard to do for issues of the present moment, on which we have our pet convictions and where we find it difficult for ourselves to rise to a lofty, detached judgment, which in all human affairs amounts to a weighing of pro and con. That
Leopold's strategy showed a conscientious Germanist whose philosophical foundation was threatened by events in Germany in 1933. To safeguard a secure position in academia, avoiding potentially offensive attitudes became as important as maintaining high academic standards.

During this period, then, the opponents of involvement in political discussions appeared to outnumber the supporters. Several of the protesters, such as Aron, Huebener, Faust and Wittke were survivors of the turbulent 1914-20 years. The reasons brought forward for this opposition were, as we have seen, fear that the public hostilities of 1917 might reoccur, a desire to avoid propaganda, and the belief that in matters of contemporary politics the necessary detachment could not be attained. Underlying this reasoning was an uneasiness about the position of the profession, a wish to picture Germany as a tranquil country unaltered by the present regime, a reluctance to confront ethical questions, and an adherence to conservative educational patterns.

b. Conspicuous Absence of Comment on Nazism

Most American scholars indeed chose to ignore the evidence of a growing destruction of individual freedom, peace, and many of the values that they, as Germanists, liked to emphasize in German literature and culture. The absence of comment was particularly noticeable when they addressed
subjects directly related to contemporary Germany or used terminology that in light of the political developments had become suggestive of Nazi theories.

In his campaign for increased language teaching, B.Q. Morgan, Head of the German department at Stanford, cited "the natural appeal of the German language and literature to the American, based on racial consanguinity." The broader context of this phrase ran counter to any designation of Morgan as a Nazi sympathizer, but by 1935, the term "race and blood" had already acquired such a repulsive meaning to anti-Nazi observers in Germany that, due to his visibility and position of influence, a department chair at a major university should have been sensitive to the connotations.

Camillo von Klenze (Stanford U), a noted scholar, seemed peculiarly oblivious to the political situation when, in 1936, he noted that "latterly our attitude towards Germany has, not only from the political but even from the cultural point of view, markedly changed for the worse." He was not here referring to the Nazi regime but to the lingering echoes of anti-German propaganda after World War I.

Of two reports of study tours through Germany published in 1935, one did not even mention the political situation. The other, W.F. Leopold's, brushed it off with: "Die Urteile über das neue Deutschland waren nicht gleich. Aber jeder Teilnehmer fühlte besseres Verständnis für das Ringen des deutschen Volkes." Leopold seemed to adhere to the belief that to keep up the image of the old, romantic Germany was
more essential than to relate first-hand experiences and impressions of the new and unpleasant reality. He did, in fact, phrase this as a pedagogical theory a few years later. 131

In its "Berichte und Mitteilungen," Monatshefte occasionally published accounts of educational events in Germany, almost always without comment. The section "At Random from Current Periodicals" also avoided political commentary. More conspicuous was the absence of critique on a report of the German delegation to the Fourth International Conference on Public Instruction in Geneva (July 1935), entitled "The Development of German Education, 1934-35," a verbatim copy of the original propagandist text. 132 Granted, it was not Monatshefte's policy at this time to comment on political matters, and the publication of the report is to be commended. However, since they had never before printed a political Nazi document verbatim and in its entirety, the editors should at least have provided an introduction to distinguish it from their own neutral reports.

Such aloofness in the face of obvious expressions of Nazism became rare after 1935-36. The notion that the initial, blatant Nazi policies were temporary and that they would eventually evolve into a moderate compromise was not unusual among Germanists—and many other Americans for that matter—during the year of the Berlin Olympics. To impress foreign tourists, the Nazis were underplaying their anti-Semitism and dazzled visitors with their technical and architectural accomplishments. A similar note of optimism was
sounded by *Modern Language Forum*: the author of the regular rubric "Current World Problems" concluded that the dictatorial governments of Germany, Italy, and Russia no longer constituted a threat to world peace.¹³³

c. Pro-Nazi Comments

Among the articles that discussed National Socialism during this period, only a few could be termed pro-Nazi. They defended the regime straightforwardly, at least in certain aspects. Both the content and the proud, decisive tone of an article by Gerhard Graefe (Instructor, German Academic Student Exchange Service) on the NS educational system put him on the side of the sympathizers:

> Both the spirit and form of previous [during the Weimar Republic] educational methods became of questionable value, with the very moment in which the vague, liberalistic theories of teaching and of research gave way to a conception of education as a truly political science . . . This new type of school does away with the former distorted relationship between city and country, and hence becomes an organically representative part of the nation and people as a whole. This educational structure is nurtured by the blood of the race and puts its trust not in the civilization of the big city, but in the vitality springing from the land, the country, home life, and the peasant . . . . Educating young men and women as political entities calls for special attention to German history and geography, through instruction in race ethnology and heredity, according to the concepts of national-socialism."¹³⁴

Under the pretense of objective portrayal, Graefe was singing the praises of the system and what is more, the Nazi jargon
which punctuated his text referred to some of the most dangerous Nazi theories. Expressions such as "nurtured by the blood of the race," "transform each individual into an active and intelligent member of his race," "education as a truly political science," "young men and women as political entities," distrust of "the civilization of the big city" unmistakably stood for racism, militaristic nationalism, and anti-cosmopolitanism.

E. P. Appelt (U of Rochester) applauded the theory that the basis of all Volksforschung was the "Rassenfrage," the aim of which was "der Staatspolitik Unterlagen für die nationale Schutzarbeit zu liefern." Appelt presented the Rassenfrage as if it were merely a scientific concept, disregarding the fact that the politicization of that concept (by means of the "Staatspolitik") had prompted the persecution of racial minorities.

Lydia Roesch (West Virginia U) supported the idea of writers being on the Nazi Government's payroll:

Heute übernimmt ein grossherziges Volk die Pflichten der grossherzigen Fürsten und nimmt seinen Dichtern die Arbeit ab, die andere auch verrichten können. Nur wenige unter den lebenden völkischen Dichtern üben neben dem Dichterberuf noch einen Nebenberuf aus, denn die Zeit hat sich endlich dankbar erwiesen an den Dichtern, die sich zu ihr bekannt haben.

Roesch's article unleashed protest from other Germanists, which will be dealt with later in this chapter.
Most surprising was a commendation of the New Germany by Edwin Zeydel (U of Cincinnati), a preeminent scholar, as late as 1938, in an article about Stefan George. His reference to "that spiritual revolution which is now going on in Germany and which all true friends of the German people hope will bring them spiritual and moral regeneration" suggested an enthusiastic recognition of the political regime as both the generator and the expression of a moral renewal. One must keep in mind that the article appeared in a periodical that was not solely for Germanists, nor even solely for academics, but in one aimed at the general educated public which would be inclined to understand the statement as an outright tribute to the Third Reich. Surprisingly, Zeydel's opinion was criticized only once.

On the whole, outright acclaim of the Third Reich remained infrequent. The basis for the enthusiasm that did manifest itself ranged from unconditional approval of the regime to naivete and willingness to overlook the crimes of the Nazis for the sake of certain accomplishments. Ernst A. Philippson, a refugee who taught at the University of Michigan in the 1930s, recalls: "The first years of the Nazi regime did not seem to be so terrible when seen from over here. Since notable figures like Gerhart Hauptmann, Guido Kolbenheyer, Wilhelm Schäfer, Josef Ponten, Agnes Miegel took a pro-Nazi stance and since some well-known anti-Nazis were pacifists, socialists, and/or communists, naive American observers tried to 'understand.'" Zeydel's enthusiasm for
the conservative aspects of the New Germany, for instance, seemed to fall into that category. It is also noteworthy that three of the above articles appeared in Monatshefte, which since about 1900 was the most nationalistic of the language journals, whereas German Quarterly did not publish any direct Nazi justification.

d. Anti-Nazi Comments

The most extensive and aggressive criticism of Nazism appeared in German Quarterly. This periodical had also been the first to carry a warning against the danger of Hitlerism.\textsuperscript{139} It must be noted, however, that the criticisms were all contributions of individuals, not editorial opinions. For its part, Monatshefte, true to its more nationalistic tradition, presented only one article containing an extensive condemnation.

The majority of anti-Nazi articles concerned the NS policies of education. Reviewing the publications at the present time, one discerns an honest desire to enlighten the readers. They criticized the system from a democratic viewpoint, but their condemnation was modified by praise, hope, or anticipation that the regime would change in the near future. All the authors in this group raised questions about the future of the German schools and universities, but, except for Gaede, they answered their questions positively, in spite of the pessimistic picture of the present they painted in their articles.
In his account of the 550th anniversary celebration of the University of Heidelberg, Edwin Roedder spent several pages denouncing Nazi educational policies. He thoroughly criticized minister Rust's address about the so-called independence of scholars, seizing the opportunity to defend the educational policies of the Weimar Republic. And to Professor Krieck's lecture on the problem of objective science, he responded with a lengthy refutation. Yet, the strength of his political criticism was diminished by three recurring tendencies. In the first place, the article was characterized by a sentimentality and nostalgia for the past which at times clouded Roedder's political and critical viewpoint. For instance, impressed by the splendor of the sixteenth-century style reception in the castle, Roedder exclaimed: "Kein Misston störte die einträchtige Stimmung des Abends," in spite of the fact that Reichsminister Goebbels, Rust, and Seldte played hosts. And in his final sentence the powerful condemnation of the NS educational practices was reduced to an elegiac regret about the loss of old customs, a change no graver than any other occasioned by the lapse of time: "Alt Heidelberg war dies nicht mehr und wenn wir auch hoffen und wünschen, dass neues Leben aus den Ruinen blühe, so seufzte doch so mancher im Gedenken unverlierbar schöner Zeiten O Quae mutatio rerum!" This tone was typical of many friends of Germany who wanted to believe that the changes could still be grasped in terms of feeling and sentimentality. Such an approach transformed a distasteful
political experience into a poetic, melancholic moment. Second, this nostalgia was combined with a reverence for authority figures. Roedder seemed almost relieved that he could approve of Goebbels's speech: "Von der kurzen Ansprache des Propagandaministers Goebbels, eines glänzenden Redners, konnte man jedes Wort unterschreiben." Similarly, his description of the religious ceremonies ended on a respectful note: "Rektor Groh erschien hier in S.A. Uniform und legte mit andern am Steinsarkophag Kränze nieder." There was also a hint of self-interest in Roedder's critical stand: what apparently aroused Roedder—and many Germanists with him—about National Socialism was its infringement on academic freedom. Nazism seems not to have particularly alarmed him until it challenged the authority of his profession; at least, he had never before spoken out against it. Actually, the mere fact that the author attended the celebration was controversial and could be construed as support of the Nazis, who were in charge of the festivities. Many nations, institutions, and individuals had refused to participate because they saw the event as a glorification of Nazism.

In 1937, German Quarterly presented two analyses of contemporary education in Germany: J.W. Eaton's (U of Michigan) "Education in Present-Day Germany" and Wm. R. Gaede's (Brooklyn Coll.) "Die Neuorganisation der Höheren Schulen in Deutschland" (first in a series of four articles). Eaton's article typified an ambivalent attitude toward National Socialism. He complained that American educators had
treated the NS educational system unfairly, partly as a reaction to pre-World War I admiration for the German methods. He therefore set out to look for the positive aspects of the system. Yet, confusingly, he found little to praise and much to criticize. How can this inconsistency be explained? It would appear that Eaton's initial position was inspired by the genuine hope of finding a satisfactory situation and by the desire to present German education (and German culture) as sound and acceptable to Americans. However, in examining the facts he could not but criticize them, thus counteracting his original intent. After his denunciation of the universities, Eaton attempted once more to generate optimism by quoting extensively from the Nazi philosopher Krieck, concluding with the comment: "It will be interesting to see whether the remedies proposed by Dr. Krieck will result in a revived aristocracy of learning or in universities which will be just as much forcing grounds for party ideas as the Adolf Hitler schools." What made Eaton so trustful toward Krieck, and so uncritical of his words? It may have been due in part to his respect for the "distinguished Nazi professor." At the same time, it expressed once again the need to project a favorable image of Germany and the desire to end the article on a hopeful note. In a 1938 three-page review of a British book on NS education, Eaton clearly presented the long-term evil effects of the system, but he again found it hard to believe that conditions could be that catastrophic, as was shown by his skeptical interjection: "if it is as bad as Mr. Hartshorne indicates."
Gaede's articles stood out from all the others. Thorough and systematic, meticulously using statistics, curricula and facts, all very up-to-date, he described the factual changes and analyzed the dangerous principles at their base. Most noticeable was Gaede's cosmopolitan viewpoint, expressed in various instances: he regretted the substitution of English for French because he felt that people should know the language of their neighbors; he pointed at the lowered standard of female education; and he feared that students would become parochial in outlook: "Der nach den neuen Lehrplänen ausgebildete junge Deutsche wird nicht nur weniger gelernt haben, sein Wissen und Denken wird ausserdem so eigenartig gefärbt sein, dass es ihm schwer fallen muss sich ausserhalb der deutschen Geistesautarkie zu bewegen."  

Gaede was particularly perceptive in discerning the NS negation of historic development in the teaching of literature. Here he touched on one of the axioms of NS ideology, which, although not widely known at that time, was one of the key elements in the establishment of the changeless, timeless character of the ideal NS personality, unaffected by foreign elements:

Hier wird ein wichtiger Teil der nationalsozialistischen Ideologie deutlich: die Verneinung der Persönlichkeitswerte, des individuellen Menschentums, das die vergangenen Jahrhunderte entwickelt haben. Der deutsche Mensch von heute soll vom germanischen Altertum her in seinem Wesentlichen unverändert sein.
In the same vein, the author explained the absence of Goethe in the first three years of high school, namely as one more exponent of the negation of "der Begriff des Menschen als eines durch Erkenntnis zu seiner Vollendung gelangenden Wesens." This aspect of the Nazi educational doctrine, i.e., the fostering of the antihistorical, antirational principle of an absolute Germanic personality, has received much attention in studies of Nazism after 1960. It is to Gaede's credit that he recognized the importance of these factors at an early stage. His cosmopolitanism was part of the profession's attempts to integrate the study of German literature and culture into a wider, European context. Mediation of a culture that was parochial and that did not display similarities to other European cultures to offset its autonomous characteristics would not have been welcomed by Americans. Henry J. Schmidt calls the tendency represented by Gaede "integrationist" and contrasts it with the segregationist, nationalistic approach of Monatshefte between 1900 and 1925. He sees both tendencies as endeavors "to acquire recognition and status." Finally, Gaede did not end on a note of optimism, the customary expression of hope that the situation would change soon, but he acknowledged the impossibility of predicting the depth and durability of the NS educational transformations. Thus he contributed to the integrity of American Germanistik.

In another article of note on German education, which appeared in Modern Language Journal, Hermann Barnstorff (U of
Wisconsin) described the rise of the German universities as a historical process in ten episodes. A single paragraph denounced the current period for its disproportionate attention to physical development and political awareness, and its abolishment of independence. Strangely enough, he answered the question "Will this retard the universities?" in the negative: "Regrettable as [it] may seem, one ought to hope that the present interlude will make for a greater significance and a higher development of the German universities."147

All in all, the most conspicuous feature of the publications on National Socialist education was their optimism in spite of any negative characteristics which they had described. This attitude may be attributed to wishful thinking or naivete, but it was also a matter of professional self-preservation: American Germanists had to put the best face on the situation because if Germany had become truly alien to U.S. perceptions, the legitimacy of Germanistik would be undermined. Gaede was a notable exception. His approach represented an attitude that would become general after 1939, when Germanists, like the majority of Americans, would unequivocally reject all Nazi institutions.

At a time when many German teachers had never been in Germany or no longer dared to enter that country, the articles about NS education were probably read eagerly. German Quarterly responded with the announcement that Gaede's articles would be followed by semi-annual reports on the
development of the German school system. The reports never materialized, but a new section, "Neues aus Deutschland," offering "einige kleine Mitteilungen" about educational matters based on the German daily and specialized press, was started in November 1938. They appeared through 1939, with interesting particulars that revealed the infusion of Nazism through every phase of education in its widest sense.

Despite pleas by some members of the profession for enlightenment and interpretation regarding all aspects of Nazism, very few papers about Nazi policy other than in education appeared in the journals. The only articles directly describing and interpreting the political situation stemmed from John A. Hess (Athens Coll., Ohio). In 1938, he wrote "Volk und Führer," an informative and interesting essay in which he explored and exposed the new political meaning of the words Volk and Führer and its impact on government in the New Germany. Hess contended that the Nazis with their deification of the Volk did not essentially differ from the imperialists of the Bismarck era who glorified the Hegelian state. He dramatically quoted from recent Nazi publications to illuminate the totalitarian definitions of both Volk and Führer and came to the logical conclusion that "such an interpretation ... would seem to serve notice to Austria, Switzerland, and to the Germans on the Volga and in Bohemia that they are to be incorporated into the Third Reich." Published in January 1938, this diagnosis was a grim prediction of the annexations of Austria and Czechoslovakia
which would take place only a few months later. Hess then examined the spread of the Volk-ideology in the U.S. He did not restrict himself to general trends but gave specific examples, citing Fritz Kuhn, Nazi camps and publications by Germanistic scholars. The latter will be dealt with later in this chapter. Hess's scornful and polemic tone and sense of urgency were expressions of his conviction that the corruption of historical concepts was not to be taken lightly and that his colleagues and countrymen must be warned against the Nazi infiltration of their own culture. (Although he did not mention any colleagues by name—a matter of professional decorum—the description of their works left no doubt as to whom he was referring.) It was a courageous approach at a time when only a few Germanists ventured to state their opinions about the Nazi regime.

As a philological study, "Volk und Führer" was representative of a whole series of articles generated by Nazism that examined the influence of the regime on the German language. These studies were based on a close correlation between Wortgeschichte and Kulturgeschichte.

In "Free Speech and the Nazi Press," Hess saw the absence of a free press in Germany as the gauge for the Germans' loss of freedom in many other areas. Taking as his point of departure statements made by the German delegate at the International Student Council in Geneva, and quoting Hitler and Goebbels, he showed the opposition between their words and the idea of intellectual freedom. After juxtaposing the
American and the German systems of public information, Hess remarked somewhat enigmatically: "To Americans who since colonial days have looked on free speech as the mainstay of democracy, Dr. Six's [the German delegate's] arguments appear not only ridiculous but ominous, presaging what might happen here." And he detected several government attempts to control the press in America too, not only in the past but also in the present. But he was unclear whether the threats to the American free press stemmed from direct Nazi influence or whether they sprang up independently as a local phenomenon.

The two Hess articles on German politics and its reverberations in the U.S. certainly were in agreement with the outcry which the German-American Bund had generated all over the country. Diamond summarized the reaction as follows:

By 1937, Kuhn accomplished what [the politicians ]Samuel Dickstein, Samuel Untermeyer, John McCormack, New York Jewry and a host of other Americans had failed to do in the years immediately following Hitler's consolidation of power: he made numerous Americans aware of the fascist challenge. However, nearly all articles centered on education because it was the sphere with which Germanists were most familiar; any transgression by the Nazis into that domain meant a violation of academic freedom and therefore Germanists appeared more attentive to it than to Nazi intrusion upon other human rights.
e. Book Reviews as Expressions of Diversified Interest in Nazism

While, aside from Hess's essays, articles on extra-literary subjects were limited to education, book reviews betrayed a much greater variety of interest. They dealt with all aspects of the Third Reich, such as the causes of Nazism, government structure, the economy, industry, the judicial system, geographical expansion, the relation between church and state, racism, and entertainment. Racism, of course, was a frequent subject, and all reviewers spoke out against it. Noticeable also were a few brief defenses of the Weimar Republic: Werner Neuse drew attention to the fact that Volkskunde became popular long before 1933, and Herman Salinger (U of Wisconsin) reminded the reader that the Hitlerjugend did not have a monopoly on youth care. Yet these references to diverse aspects of Nazism remained mostly superficial. In the 1930s it was still traditional for Germanistic periodicals to review German books from all fields. But with a few exceptions, reviewers limited themselves to little more than summaries and did not take the opportunity to expand the reviews into analysis.

f. Criticizing Colleagues

Although Nazi influence in the U.S. was an explosive subject in the daily press, the language and literary periodicals scrupulously avoided sensationalism. Whenever accusations of Nazi sympathies were issued, they were never
directed at the persons, only at their publications or teaching. The authors most visibly attacked were Emil Jordan (New Jersey Coll. for Women), Werner P. Friederich (U of North Carolina), Lydia Roesch, Jane Goodloe (Goucher Coll.), and Otto Koischwitz (Hunter Coll.). The assessments, however, were not unanimous. Emil Jordan's Deutsche Kulturgeschichte was the object of John Hess's scorn and served as his prime example of the proliferation of Nazi ideology in America. Indignantly he proclaimed:

> Just off the press of a leading book firm in this country and intended for use in our high schools and colleges the book Deutsche Kulturgeschichte sets forth the leader principle (Führerprinzip) in government as being characteristically German and as having the same governmental status as democracy. This idea, we are told, goes back to the Aetheling, an office resting not on laws but on tradition.\(^{158}\)

All other reviewers praised the book, recommending it strongly for college use. The conservative Edmund K. Heller (U of California, Berkeley), regular reviewer for the section "New German Textbooks" in German Quarterly, called it "well-balanced."\(^{159}\) Harold Lenz (New York U), who occasionally pointed at NS tendencies in other authors, declared: "Die heikle Aufgabe in politisch schwieriger Zeit eine unpar-teiische und doch gründliche Kulturgeschichte für amerikanischen Schulgebrauch zu schreiben, hat der Verfasser dieses Buches glänzend gelöst."\(^{160}\) Wayland D. Hand (U of California, Los Angeles) also recommended the book. Although he expressed regret about the scanty treatment
of Humanism, he apparently did not see this as an expression of NS mentality, since he mentioned in the same breath Jordan's complete disregard for folkloric values in German culture (a cherished topic with Nazi scholars). He called both the regrettable but unavoidable shortcomings of a compressed handbook. What does this divergence of judgments tell about Germanistic critics? Not that they were indifferent to or favorably inclined toward Nazi ideology (as was corroborated by some of their other criticisms), but that they were not sufficiently attuned to Nazi ideology to detect its more subtle infiltrations. Indeed, for the greater part Jordan's book was "unparteiisch." Suspect, however, were his glorification of the Germanic era and his uncritical portrayal of Bismarck. Moreover, the statement of the Führerprinzip chided by Hess appeared twice. In his description of Hitler's reign, Jordan mentioned only his legal appointment, not his establishment of a dictatorship nor his regime of terror. By linking the Führerprinzip to Germanic customs, he tried to excuse the Germans for allowing Hitler to come to power. And under the pretext "es fehlt der historische Abstand," he refrained from pronouncing judgments. The critics Heller, Lenz, and Hand failed to bring these ambiguities to the reader's attention.

Werner P. Friederich's *Kurze Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* also received contrasting reviews. Wayland D. Hand talked about the "fair objectivity" with which Friederich presented the Hitler revolution. Heinrich Meyer called the
book "a mature survey of political history." One of the examples which he cited was "the just appreciation of the Republic after 1918 and the continual awareness of the international situation." 

A completely opposite verdict, however, was pronounced by Walter A. Reichart:

The author's plea of impartiality and objectivity . . . is not very convincing . . . and the author will be accused of strong chauvinistic leanings because of his unrestrained enthusiasm for the Third Reich. We quote from the introduction: 'Der Engländer kennt nur ein England; der Italiener brüstet sich eines ewigen Roms; der Deutsche aber versucht jetzt zum dritten Male, in den ungeschützten zentraleuropäischen Ebenen ein einiges und ewiges Deutsches Reich zu begründen. Diesmal soll und muss es gelingen, diesmal will man es endlich den anderen Europäischen Großstaaten gleich tun; und der Glaube an dieses neue Dritte Reich wird noch bestärkt durch die mystische Kraft die seit Menschengedenken der Zahl Drei innewohnt.'

Reichart's opinion held true for the book as a whole. Hand and Meyer seemed to overlook the propagandistic aspect, for Friederich enthusiastically cited numerous accomplishments of the Third Reich but very few of its aberrations. The book mentioned two negative features, but it did so in such a qualified way that they appeared rather insignificant:

"Die Bürger . . . sind in erster Linie Deutsche, Bürger eines einigen und stolzen neuen Reiches, Männer und Frauen, die in mystischem Glauben an ihr Vaterland gern . . . viele Bequemlichkeiten und Freiheiten einbüßen. . . . Die deutsche Jugend scheint die Freiheit individuellen Denkens und individuellen Schaffens gar nicht zu schätzen, scheint in ihrem Enthusiasmus gar nicht zu erkennen, was für einen ungeheuer grossen Preis sie für die beneidenswerte
Like Jordan, Friederich was attempting to make his readers appreciate Germany, the new as well as the old, and therefore he exalted the positive aspects, while subduing the negative ones. Thus Friederich showed less than the minimum of critical distance that one should expect from a teacher. Perhaps some reviewers failed to notice his lapse or ignored it because they shared his desire to protect Germany's image in the academic world.

Appraised from a distance, Lydia Roesch's article in which she supported the idea of poets on the Nazi government's payroll seems rather inconsequential, but in 1937, it must have looked as if the Trojan horse had entered the city. Ernst Feise responded vehemently to it, in the very next issue of Monatshefte, expressing his anger in an uninterrupted series of rhetorical questions. And John Hess cited Roesch's essay as a blatant example of Nazi expansion in the U.S. The two detractors approached her very differently. Feise condemned the article mainly as a one-time Nazist attack on the values and validity of the German classics and nineteenth-century literature; whereas Hess looked upon her as an exponent of a larger, wicked scheme to draw Americans, especially German-Americans, into the orbit of the Volk und Führer ideology.
In Dichters Lande by Jane F. Goodloe, founder of the Paul Ernst-Society, aroused a critical response from William Gaede. He insinuated that she had been somewhat brainwashed by NS propaganda: "Sie ist bei ihrem Besuch in Deutschland in Kontakt gekommen mit der Denkungsweise bestimmter Kreise, der gegenüber sie ihre kritische Selbständigkeit nicht bewahrt hat." Of greater interest was Gaede's complaint about the confusion created by Goodloe's use of terms which she seemed to regard as static, but which under the dynamism of history, in this case the Hitler revolution, had changed their content: "In den Widmungsworten ihres Bandes spricht Miss Goodloe vom 'geistigen und seelischen deutschen Erbe.' Welches ist dieses Erbe und wo findet man es in der Literatur von heute?"169 Gaede was aware that even so-called eternal values are not handed over to the next generation as a finished product, a once-and-for-all Erbe. Goodloe's phrase had affinities with a Nazi concept of Germanic continuity, which Gaede had already assailed in his articles on the current school system in Germany.170 Gaede's question also summarized the doubts which beset many American Germanists at that time about the Germany they loved and thought they knew from its literature. The cliché "Is this the land of Goethe, Schiller and Lessing?" occurred again and again. In the realm of literature, Gaede's question evoked the problem-of-the-day: Is the literature inside or outside Germany the more representative?

The case of Otto Koischwitz, a well-known, highly regarded professor at Hunter College and author of creative foreign
language textbooks, seems clear-cut. His *Reise in die Literatur* was completely rejected by Harold Lenz for its political tendencies, although he called the book genial in structure and presentation. Lenz claimed that the NS ideology was obvious throughout the entire book and he proceeded to prove this with manifold examples: Koischwitz's favoritism toward certain authors and critics, his "misunderstanding" of others, his disproportionately short or long treatments of some movements, etc., all to a degree that rendered the book unscientific in Lenz's eyes. Moreover, charged Lenz, the long philosophical, religious, and political discussions "no longer appear occasions for thinking, but indoctrination." Lenz's many examples leave no doubt that we are dealing with flagrant Nazi propaganda here.171 Surprisingly, the book did not receive any other unfavorable reviews. Edmund Heller lauded the qualities of the book, and made no mention whatsoever of its tendentiousness.172

When judging their colleagues' writings, American Germanists took three different approaches toward manifestations of Nazi ideology: some ignored the issue completely; others were on the alert but either did not recognize the more subtle expressions of Nazism or deemed them to be acceptable concessions to a fair and balanced picture of the new Germany; still others were perceptive in detecting the propagandistic subtext and frank enough to state it. All three attitudes probably arose from the same motive: to preserve the validity and prestige of *Germanistik*'s task of
mediating German culture. But only those Germanists who were willing to point out the weaknesses of this task also protected its integrity. The alertness with which some scholars examined publications about things German was paralleled by a more informal vigilance within the individual German departments in the universities: "Colleagues were quick to alert each other about propagandists. An avowed supporter of the Nazi system was quickly labeled a 'Hitlermann'".

q. Attitude of the Professional Organizations

In 1926, Germanists were afraid of founding "a national body" (eventually the AATG) because it "might be regarded as a group of interested outsiders engaged in German propaganda;" so it is not surprising that in 1933 that same body still wanted to stay aloof from German politics. Both the AATG and MLA remained silent through most of the thirties as did the Germanistic periodicals *German Quarterly* and *Monatshefte*. After 1934, however, with a great deal of the media being anti-Nazi and clamoring for explanations, condemnations, and even action, a declaration of disagreement with Hitlerism would have been in harmony with the general tendency in the country and would hardly have provoked hostilities toward German departments. One can surmise a diversity of reasons for the reluctance to speak out: a pledge not to engage in any political comment whatsoever, so as not to repeat the 1917 hysteria; difficulty in predicting the reaction of the membership to political candor; fear of
hurting relations with colleagues in Germany, an attitude paralleling the "appeasement" approach of some politicians; perhaps even worry about Nazi retribution against the American teachers' relatives in Germany; the notion that they were called (berufen) to present the loftier sides of Germany; the belief that the present conditions in Germany were transient; finally, elitism as a traditional attitude of Germanistic scholarship.

A similar attitude of noninvolvement was taken by Ferdinand Thun, President of the Carl Schurz Foundation. In 1935, when pressed to break cultural relations with Germany, he declared that a positive, optimistic attitude of "forebearance, tolerance, friendship, recognition of what is good" toward Germany would improve the situation. Likewise in 1935, a reader wrote to the Editor of Books Abroad, admonishing him to "explain and defend the cause of the refugee authors and take openly a stand against the . . . injustice." Such action, it was argued, was within the province of Books Abroad, since "literature . . . is so often interwoven with political ideas that it is difficult to draw an exact line." The Editor, however, responded to many such requests that "issues have two sides . . . there is a place for the permanently open-minded." But unlike American-German Review and Books Abroad, the Germanistic periodicals did not issue any statements about their hands-off policy.
It was this absence of comment that offended a segment of the public particularly sensitive to American-German relations, the Jewish community in the U.S. In 1937, the German-Jewish Club of New York published an open letter to Theodore Huebener, President of the AATG in 1936, blaming him because in an article on decreasing German enrollment, Huebener had failed to mention the anti-Semitic terror in Germany as one of the reasons. The Club also accused the German-American associations (and the teachers' organizations) of not helping the German refugees:

"Während die U.S.A. und andere Staaten den vertriebenen Großes deutscher Kunst und Wissenschaft bereitwillig die Tore öffneten . . . bleibt das hiesige Deutschtum ablehnend und stumm. Zu keiner Stunde hat es sich gegen die Vernichtung kultureller Werte wie sie aus politischen Gründen durch die heutige Reichsregierung betrieben wird aufgelehnt."

In his response Huebener argued: "Ich halte es für taktisch falsch, die ohnehin schon so aufgeregt Gemüter noch weiter aufzuregen. Meine Tätigkeit als Schulbeamter muss in erster Linie volkserzieherisch und kulturell sein."178 Huebener did not identify the "Gemüter." By conjuring up a vague, unspecified scene of agitation and disorder, he tried to deflect the accusation. The text also revealed Huebener's interpretation of volkserzieherisch and kulturell: even in times of crisis and world tragedy, educators should not take a stand on political events. (In fairness to Huebener, it must be said that as a private citizen he headed the "American-Christian Committee for German Refugees."
In 1938, the German situation took a dramatic turn for the worse. In March, Austria was forced into the Anschluss; in September, the Sudetenland was annexed; and on November 9, an organized pogrom, the Kristallnacht, occurred, followed by a series of savage anti-Semitic laws. Americans protested in great numbers and Roosevelt held a press conference to announce his recall of the American ambassador to Berlin. Six American university presidents, joined by individual professors, went before NBC radio and condemned the German government in most extreme terms, an action duly reported in School and Society, but not in German Quarterly or Monatshefte. Even the Steuben Society, "after years of wavering," denounced the Nazi dictatorship within two weeks. Yet not until 1939 did a Germanistic periodical register any kind of public stand. German Quarterly reported that the New York City Metropolitan Chapter of the AATG in its Annual Meeting of December 10, 1938, voted "not to reconsider its previous passage of a Resolution on Nazi Persecutions and Open Letter to Adolf Hitler." However, it also voted "to request the editor of The German Quarterly to withhold publication of the Open Letter in the January number pending discussion of the matter with the Editorial Board." No reason was given for this delay, nor was the letter ever published.

During the Annual General Meeting of the AATG on December 27, 1938, a resolution was presented by the Committee on Resolutions stating the belief of the AATG in the values of
German culture and offering its sympathy to those Germans who were suffering from intolerance. The resolution was voted down by the attending members, but there was no record of this action in the Secretary's Report in the January 1939 issue of *German Quarterly*. The reason for this became evident in the November 1939 issue. There Ernst Feise, President of the AATG, reviewed the 1938 meeting and repeated verbatim the rejected resolution. He added that "the Executive Council felt that the preceding short but tense discussion had not clarified but further confused the issues and therefore decided to submit the four chief points of the resolution to a general referendum in order to ascertain the opinion of the entire membership." Eight hundred fifty questionnaires were sent out and 501 replies received, a number Feise called high when compared with the usual 150 to 175 answers. Was the original defeat of the resolution not mentioned in the January 1939 report so as not to influence the votes of the general membership, or was the Executive Council embarrassed by the rejection? In any case, Ernst Feise appeared relieved that the second vote turned out positively, judging from an unofficial, preliminary disclosure of the results which he made at the March 1939 meeting of the New York City Metropolitan Chapter.

Were time for reflection and clarity of presentation the determining factors in the acceptance of the resolution, as Feise claimed, or did the second version convey a different message? After comparing the two versions, I disagree with
Susan Pentlin, who calls the second version much weaker, and therefore acceptable to all. 185

The original text:

Be it Resolved: That the American Association of Teachers of German assembled in its Annual Meeting declares anew its faith in the continuing value of the many elements in German culture which have enriched the spiritual life of this country. We pledge ourselves to maintain and defend the ideals of tolerance, humanity, and individual freedom as represented in the works of Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller. Our sympathy goes out to those teachers in Germany who have suffered or are suffering from intolerance and fanaticism. In this difficult time we believe it to be our patriotic duty to cultivate such common elements of our spiritual heritage as make for peace and understanding.

The accepted text:

I. We believe that there are traditional and enduring values in German culture which we, as teachers of German, should help to preserve.

II. We pledge ourselves to maintain and defend the ideals of tolerance, humanity, and individual freedom.

III. We sympathize with the oppressed minorities in Germany.

IV. We believe in defending and promoting those principles of American democracy which make for peace and understanding.

In the first version, the opening sentence contained a qualifier, "which have enriched the spiritual life of this country," which, although restrictive, was at the same time flattering to Germany and German-Americans and stressed the common bonds between the two countries. The second sentence was vague. The third was a firm statement condemning a shameful situation in Germany. The fourth sentence was
weakened by the euphemistic, almost apologetic "In this difficult time." This sentence echoed the first ("patriotic duty," "common elements") in that it tied teachers of German and German-Americans to mainstream America and projected their mediating role between the U.S. and Germany as part of the democratic process. The resolution was as much an apologia for the Germanist's role as a disavowal of Nazi actions.

The second version sounded firmer because the impersonal constructions "declares its faith in" and "Our sympathy goes out to" of the first version were changed to the more active "we believe" and "we sympathize." In the second sentence the literary references were left out, which made it less vague and more accessible to the outsider. In the third sentence, "oppressed" sounded more forceful than "suffering" as it implied a deliberate action by the authorities, and the statement as a whole was more encompassing since it did not only denote teachers but all persecuted persons, with an oblique reference to the Jews. One obvious component, "common elements," was deleted from the last sentence. Apparently Germanists wanted to be perceived as independent from Germany and loyal to America. In 1939, might the idea of "cultivating common elements" between Germany and the U.S. have hinted at fifth-column activities?

Actually, both versions were quite tame. Too little, too late. At whom was the resolution directed? Certainly not at Hitler--the phraseology was too mild--but at the American public. The AATG felt obliged to add its voice to the already
extensive chorus of American protests against Nazi horrors, a moral gesture. Equally clearly, it wanted to affirm the patriotic beliefs of the teachers of German. The mildness and vagueness of the statement revealed a cautious group caught between their allegiance to German culture and their aversion to Nazi intolerance. To a lesser degree, they were also caught between the desire to demonstrate the value of German studies and the awareness that all things German might, at any moment, attract the wrath of the masses.

It is regrettable that the AATG did not take a stand earlier, both to affect public opinion in this country and to register a complaint with the German government and their German colleagues. Henry Grattan Doyle, professor of Spanish and former Editor of Modern Language Journal, arguing that political opinions should not be allowed in the classroom, quoted the AATG resolution as an example and interpreted it as an indication "that many German teachers realize that they must watch their step." He added in a footnote that the resolution was not passed, expressing his opinion that the opposition was not to the contents of the text itself, but it issued from "the belief that the Association should not even remotely take cognizance of a political question." As it turned out, the referendum proved Doyle wrong, but the mere fact that he invoked political know-nothingism as the most obvious explanation showed that the Germanists' fear of involvement was well-known.

Yet there had been precedents of academic engagement long
before 1938. For instance, in 1936, during the debate about American participation in the Olympic Games in Berlin, forty-one college and university presidents had urged the U.S. to withdraw from the games because of German discrimination against Jews, Catholics, Protestants, Masons and Labor.\textsuperscript{187} Diamond even contends that partly because some members of the German-American community took a stand and spoke out against Nazism, American hostility toward Nazi Germany was never directed at the German-Americans (nor at German studies).\textsuperscript{188}

Did the membership ever exert any pressure for a more aggressive stand? An examination of the AATG archives might uncover why and when the Executive Council decided to put together a resolution, whether any protests were received, and whether the resolution was publicized in the American press.

The thesis that caution was the main motive for the AATG's reluctance to take a public stand at an earlier time is supported by the private correspondence contained in the A.R. Hohlfeld Correspondence in the University of Wisconsin Archives. A 1933 debate in the New York Chapter about the possible publication of a statement against the Nazi regime drew letters from all over the country. The National President, Hohlfeld, wrote to the members in New York: "It must be considered at least doubtful whether a resolution of protest . . . will prove helpful or detrimental to the cause we wish to serve. Even though a protest . . . would be based solely on humanitarian and cultural considerations . . . it would of necessity assume a political aspect and in the
ultimate interest of our work as American teachers of German
everything belonging to the sphere of politics and appearing
to take sides should be avoided by our association." 189
However, several of the letters addressed to Hohlfeld support
the speculation that anti-Semitism also contributed to the
final decision not to adopt the resolution.

In conclusion, between 1933 and 1939 two contributors
stood out, William R. Gaede for his objective analysis and
logical denunciation of the NS educational system and John A.
Hess for his intense, but not irrational, indictments of the
denial of basic freedoms in Germany and its reverberations in
the U.S. Our examination of the foreign language periodicals
shows that the great majority of Germanists could definitely
not be accused of sympathizing with the Nazi regime. Rather,
their weakness lay in lack of opposition. If A.B. Faust's
simulated dialogue had been written in 1930, the young
professor who refused to talk about politics would have
sounded noble and openminded:

I am too young to have been in 'the war to
end war', too critical to believe my native
country was not guilty in bringing about
the present mess along with the other
victors, too tolerant toward other people
who have different ideologies derived from
bitter, historical experiences. Therefore,
I feel no hostility toward other nations
whatsoever. 190

But in 1939, his attitude signified a desire for
noninvolvement.

The dramatic events failed to trigger a decision to shed
light on the political situation from the unique vantage point
of the American Germanist: what were the ramifications of the new system for their German colleagues, and which role did they play in the formation and strengthening of the Third Reich? Did American Germanists have a moral obligation to take a public stand toward Germany's genocidal policies? Was there a need to redefine Deutschtum and Germanistik in light of their perversion by the Nazis? How could German departments integrate German academic refugees in view of the precarious situation of native Germanists? What was the best way to interpret the Nazi phenomenon for American students? These questions were undoubtedly raised, but they did not find a forum in national meetings and journals.

As to the legitimate worry about the preservation and continuation of German studies: from the two courses available for safeguarding the teaching of German, namely to be apolitical or to be outspokenly anti-Nazi, the institutionalized profession chose the first. This widened the rift between academic concerns and credibility with the general public.
Even a cursory glance at the 1914 issue of *Monatshefte* reveals at least five articles commenting on the rightness of the German imperial war, the braveness of its soldiers and the baseness of England, France, Russia, and their allies. In contrast, any Germanist inclined to justify Germany's attack on Poland in 1939 or to applaud its *Blitzkrieg* in northern and western Europe in the spring of 1940 did not dare to do so publicly. Privately, political Germanophiles could rally for politics of isolationism, join "America First" groups, or campaign against Roosevelt. But no matter what they declared in the voting booths or manifested in their private lives, they could not use language periodicals as a forum. Neither did these periodicals lend themselves to the expression of pro-Allied justification. Yet to say that World War II did not change the face of the Germanistic periodicals or that it affected them only in terms of enrollment figures and protection of language teaching would be untrue and unfair. First of all, contrary to 1933-39, during this period various manifestations of the Nazi ethos were no longer openly praised or defended. Second, teachers reflected on their role as mediators between two inimical cultures, a reflection that was
tied to the question "Why study German?" Next, in their quest to understand the phenomenon of the New Germany, Germanists wrote more diversified articles than they had previously. In doing so they did not only describe the structure of the system, but also tried to define its historical origin, to study the philosophy behind it, and to broach the burning question of Germany's guilt. Racism was a prevalent point of contention, but the most interesting papers did not examine that aspect directly, they researched it in connection with literature or philology. It was a particular merit of certain Germanists to have tackled that problem bravely. After Pearl Harbor, the periodicals made concrete contributions to the war efforts. In addition, intellectuals deliberated almost immediately over the problem "After the War," both in respect to the future of German language teaching and to the fate of Germany and German culture. This demonstrated a genuine interest in the German situation as well as a concern to preserve the institutionalized discipline of Germanistik.

1. New Approaches to Understanding Germany

In accordance with the trend of the 1933-39 period, Germanists continued to examine the field of education in Germany. After 1941, there appeared no more lengthy articles about this subject, presumably for want of direct information on the latest developments. For its part, School and Society kept publishing short educational news items, gathered via Radio Moscow and Switzerland.
Several articles between 1940 and 1946 tried to explain Nazism and German aggressiveness. To do so they searched for the causes of Nazi success. Two authors in particular, Erich Kahler (New School for Social Research, New York) and Fritz Neumann (Northwestern U), devoted substantial papers to this subject. At the time, the myth of an unchangeable national German character, particularly suited to develop and support dictatorial regimes, was widespread in the U.S. and elsewhere. Neither scholar subscribed to it; each took a historical viewpoint. Neumann even explicitly—and a little onesidedly—rejected such so-called psychological foundations. His view was comparable to Karl Jaspers' answer to Sigrid Undset, who argued that there exists a timeless, unchanging, suprahistorical German character, and that this character expressed itself most clearly in National Socialism. Jaspers pointed out that this denial of history and individuality was precisely the method used by the Nazis. Kahler traced the origins of the Nazi government to military and governmental principles derived from the old Prussian State combined with modern industrial development and the politicization of the masses. Fritz Neumann stressed that the aggressiveness and militarism displayed by the Germans under the Nazi regime were not based on the national character, but were a reassertion of Prussian governmental attitudes, prompted by the Germans' desperate fear of communism. Neumann went one step beyond Kahler as he looked into the future and proposed a counterweight to the Prussian
tradition: he suggested studying those German thinkers who could be the source of a tradition of pacifism, such as Frederick W. Poerster and Max Scheler, who were farsighted and courageous enough to denounce the popular Bismarckian philosophy during the First World War.194

In a Chapel Address at the Middlebury College Summer School, Oskar Seidlin (Smith Coll.) exposed the rationale of dictatorship in a speech that radiated philippic ardor. Held in 1942, in the midst of the war, with many American casualties reported and no end in sight, the lecture was imbued with a sense of drama, an awareness that both speaker and audience were participants in a tragedy of vast proportions. Despite its title, "Thomas Mann und die Demokratie," the address was essentially a defense of democracy versus dictatorship, not on the basis of its mechanics, but on the basis of its philosophy and even its metaphysics. Seidlin did this by describing Thomas Mann's evolution from an "unpolitical" person into an ardent champion of democracy. Seidlin saw power as the core of dictatorship, whereas democracy is built on respect for Geist; democracy views political form as means, not end, and maintains a dialectical relationship between individual and society: "In wahrhaft humaner Ironie rettet die Demokratie die Gemeinschaft im Einzelnen und den Einzelnen in der Gemeinschaft."195 Through the solemnity and reverence of his tone, Seidlin elevated Mann to a model and implicitly accused those Germans who, unlike Mann, in spite of their good will
remained passive in matters of politics, thus allowing Hitler to triumph. (Karl Jaspers would later state: "That we are alive is our guilt." In his long last paragraph, Seidlin gradually progressed from Thomas Mann and democracy to "we" and the here-and-now. Without ever mentioning the war by name, he was talking about it in the climactic final sentences:

Um Lebens und Geistes willen müssen wir zu ihr [der Demokratie] halten, um Lebens und Geistes willen müssen wir bereit sein, für sie zu sterben. Eins ist dies und dasselbe: denn nur für das ist der Mensch zu leben bereit, wofür zu sterben er sich bereit finden würde, in jenem tief paradoxen Sinn der uns entgegenklingt aus Schillers leichtherzigem und doch tiefsinnigem Reiterlied: 'Und setzet ihr nicht das Leben ein, / nie wird euch das Leben gewonnen sein!'

In view of the circumstances, what Seidlin's message really conveyed was: "Go and enlist!"

Kahler, Neumann, and Seidlin demonstrated a shift in the approach to Germany and in the way they wanted it to be perceived. They were no longer afraid of exposing the true face of the Nazi regime but at the same time they pointed a way to save Germany. If, as several outsiders maintained, the source of Nazism's success lay in innate psychological and biological features of the Germans, then there was little hope for the future, and Americans might rightfully reject any further assimilation of their culture. By refuting this notion and stressing the role of historical circumstances, Kahler and Neumann paved the way to understanding and to the belief that a change in the configuration of events would once
again lead to a viable Germany. This approach added a new
dimension to the profession's ongoing struggle to preserve its
acceptance as mediator of German culture. Seidlin's article
also denoted a new direction, or at least a rejuvenation of an
all but abandoned method. Not since Hohlfeld's 1932 address
had any Germanist so directly appealed for active involvement
in politics. The nationalistic element, however, whether
pro-German or pro-American, entirely disappeared in his
proposition. Instead, Seidlin substituted the idea of
democracy. The study of German literature (and Germanistik)
was integrated into the defense of democracy and thus became a
way of cooperating with the United States which was fighting
to preserve it.

When discussing the determinants of the successful new
regime, scholars unavoidably encountered the question of
"collective guilt." No long articles were devoted solely to
the issue, but it was frequently talked about in other
contexts. Some apologized for the Germans. They emphasized
that Germany was not the only country to be indicted for
Nazism and war, but that all Western countries, including the
U.S., must share the blame. So Ernst Feise reasoned in his
Chapel Address at Middlebury in 1943. Once again we are
dealing with an orator who masterfully played on his
audience's awareness of the specialness of the moment. The
opening sentence, "You have had before your eyes during the
last six weeks in Middlebury College the astonishing spectacle
of young men and women of our nation devoting their time to an
extensive study of the language and civilization of our enemies—and of nobody finding it astonishing," intended to make the listeners feel part of a unique event in history and hence more receptive to what was partly a political speech. In claiming America's share of fault in the conflict—for not knowing Germany and Hitler well enough and not putting enough pressure on Hitler before it was too late—he implicitly diminished Germany's responsibility. And by invoking President Wilson's dictum about the importance of national autonomy, he extenuated Germany's extreme nationalism. Other (American) scholars sought to alleviate the "collective guilt" of Germany by mentioning "our" mistakes in World War I and "our" ignorance after Versailles, or by claiming that "we are all partly responsible for the failures of the hopes fostered by the terrible experiences of 1914-1918." Therefore, the argument went, Americans should not be too harsh on the Germans. In contrast with those of the 1930s, these apologists for the Germans did not try to picture Nazism in a favorable light. They shifted their appeal for acceptance of Germany to a different angle: they condemned the new regime but by diffusing the responsibility for its existence to the U.S. and its allies, they emphasized the common bond between Americans and Germans. The most visible of them, Ernst Feise, had been an outspoken denouncer of Nazism in the thirties. (Two of his colleagues recently remembered him as "an opponent of the profession's anti-Semitic trend . . . a noble personality" and "publicly
opposed [to] any racial discrimination." Interestingly, Feise integrated his argument into a speech in support of German language study, thus making his plea for understanding of Germany also a plea for continuing the study of its culture.

A second way of coming to terms with Germany's guilt was to claim that not all Germans were Nazis. It was the most frequently used argument and it surfaced in many an article about the validity of studying German in wartime. Similarly, Harry Slochower (Brooklyn Coll.) pointed out the danger of interpreting all forms of collectivism in Germany as fascism. The historical context must be examined first, he said. At the end of the war the efforts to deflect the old phrase "All Germans are Nazis!" gained momentum as American scholars could now safely resort to the generosity of the victors for the defeated. Monatshefte worked this tactic by publishing addresses and articles of ir reproachable German scholars; these displayed exactly what was traditionally expected from the defeated enemy: humility combined with dignity, self-accusation combined with an identification of a bigger culprit, hope for the future combined with an indirect appeal to the magnanimity of the victors. Karl Bosel's speech "Das Wesen des wahren Deutschtums," delivered before an assembly of German teachers in October 1945, exhibited many of these traits. The title itself already suggested that Hitler's Germany was a falsification. In classic oratorical style Bosel first sobered his audience by using such terms as "Schuldbekenntnis," "Irregehen," "Grundirrtümer," and then
lifted them up again with the positively oriented question, "was das eigentliche Wesen unsres Deutschtums ist." This alternating approach occurred throughout the whole address. Bosel still used the ambiguous term Deutschtum which had become imbued with Nazist ideology. He struggled to find a new definition but did not question the principle itself. He was emphatic in his assertion of what Deutschtum should not encompass, namely, racial factors and political-military world dominance. For a positive redefinition, he enumerated elements from Germany's history that should be integrated into the future, such as acceptance of foreign culture and universalism. However, he did not arrive at an interpretation relevant for 1945.

A much more stringent attitude was taken by a third group of academicians who did believe in "collective guilt." This complex and controversial concept could, of course, not be explored comprehensively in the language and literary journals, but some authors expressed the gist of it. Karl Jaspers, first President of the University of Heidelberg after the war, dealt with it in his answer to Sigrid Undset, who in 1945 published an article in the American press charging all Germans with full responsibility for the crimes of the Third Reich. Jaspers felt that this accusation must be answered on two levels. In the political sense, he agreed, all Germans were guilty. But what about in the moral sense? Yes, in so far as they allowed such an order to come about: "Wir haben nicht unser Leben im Kampf gegen dieses Regime eingesetzt, und
daher ist, dass wir noch leben, unsere Schuld." But not in so far as many of them inwardly disagreed and did not externally participate: "Haftbar machen heisst nicht Als-schuldige erkennen."

It is a thin line, however, between responsibility and guilt, and it is unfortunate that Jaspers did not expand on his answer. Rabbi Leo Baeck, one of the few Jewish clergymen who survived the Third Reich, accused German intellectuals as a group, and more specifically university professors (with two exceptions), for not demonstrating any disapproval of the terror against Jews and anti-Nazis: "Aber ich wartete vergebens auf ein solches Wort besonders von seiten der Universitätsprofessoren, von denen sich im Gegenteil eine ganze Reihe dazu hergab, gewissermassen das philosophische Mäntelchen für die blutigen, Ausrottungsmethoden der herrschenden Gangsterklique zu liefern."

On the subject of collective guilt Thomas Mann had already opined: "I regard it as absurd, but also as unworthy, to differentiate between the German people and Nazism in such a degree as to look upon Germany as Hitler's first victim, as the first nation to be subjugated by National Socialism." Interestingly, the two most prominent articles unhesitatingly to assign guilt to all Germans were written by Germans who resided in Germany through 1945. They were strong accusations indeed, and no American Germanist seemed to feel entitled to pronounce them. It is to Monatshefte's credit that it published more extreme views such as Baeck's as well as mitigating ones like Bosel's. The reason for this relative
openness may have been the ultimately optimistic tendency of these articles, for they expressed a belief in a positive evolution of German society and compared favorably with some of the fatalistic theories expounded in the commercial press.

Several scholars discovered contributions to the rise of Nazism in Germany's literary heritage. These opinions—and the controversy they generated—will be discussed in the next chapter.

2. Fight against Nazi Principles

Since after 1939 no more pro-Nazi articles appeared in the language journals, the fight against Nazi influence took the shape of warnings. Three addresses stood out during this period, each of them responding to the political climate of the year in which they were given, in 1940, 1941, and 1944.

Oskar Seidlin, in a Sunday Address at Middlebury in 1940, joined battle with three of the most infamous Nazi axioms: worship of the race, anti-intellectualism, and collectivism. Already the title of his speech, "Das Humane und der Dichter," posed a challenge to the spirit of NS. Seidlin looked at German literature as an ongoing struggle to find das Humane in the sense of the Aristotelian metotes between two extremes, especially between the extremes of instinct and intellect. Only once had this goal been reached, he said, namely in the Klassik, especially in Goethe. Seidlin used Goethe's warning against the extremes of the Romanticists as the connecting link to his time: "Dieses Wehe hat Goethe den Romantikern
zugerufen, aber könnte, jetzt und hier, eine Mahnung aktueller und nötiger sein als dieses Goethe-Wort?" He became very emotional in his actualization of Goethe in the light of the Nazi regime:

Although his warning was based on rational explanations, the triple repetition of "Glaubt nicht," a verb describing an act of the will rather than a function of the mind, gave it the character of an incantation. In truth, the whole address was suffused with a pious atmosphere, moving from reverence in the beginning to outright religiosity at the end, and the speaker took on a priestly role. Into this atmosphere he drew
Klassik, Goethe, and Romanticism, instruments in the battle against Nazism, creating a configuration which pitted Nazism as the antagonist against both the divine and Klassik, while Romanticism was presented as ambivalent and served as a caveat. In his speech Seidlin continued in the tradition of Edwin Roedder's article (1935) by using Goethe in the fight against Nazism, a practice that would often be repeated. However, it is conspicuous that at no time did Seidlin mention Nazism by name. Except for his referral to racism and militaristic world dominance, his charge could have been understood as an attack against any collectivist movement or government.

The Annual MLA Convention of 1941 took place in December, in Indianapolis, only three weeks after Pearl Harbor and the German declaration of war on the U.S. As coincidence would have it, the presidential address was to be delivered by the Germanist, John A. Walz (Harvard U). Well aware of his special, even precarious position, he candidly admitted the difficulty right at the start:

In the present state of the world it is not easy for one representing the German side of the work of our Association to find a suitable subject for the presidential address. . . . The German people, or at least their Government, is held responsible for most of the turmoil which is rocking the world, including our own country. One may well ask what is the use of talking about German literature or things German while a large part of the world, including our own government, is demanding the destruction of this government and the curbing of this people.
Walz answered his own question with the response that had by now become a cliché: in spite of Germany's responsibility for the world tragedy, the great values of that same nation, its music, science, philosophy, literature and art will remain. One of the values is Goethe, who can serve as a guide in these troubled times. It was a typical response of an academician, and while certainly true, it also demonstrated the limitations which Germanists had established regarding their own role within American society. They would fight Nazism by teaching culture. The premises of Goethe's Weltanschauung which Walz admired, such as reverence for the divine in man, cosmopolitanism, cultural patriotism, and cooperation with the community, also received rhetorical support from the Nazis, but at the same time the Nazi regime assailed the logical application of these principles. It was Walz's particular merit to present Goethe's premises in their historical context (and to include tolerance among them), indirectly contrasting their contextual significance with the Nazis' assimilation of Goethe into the service of their doctrine.

Two more timely aspects of this address stood out. First, Walz's adroitness in tackling Goethe's political aloofness (during the war of liberation against Napoleon): he explained and excused it with the same argument that Germanists had used in the last years to justify their own noncommitment: "In every war it must be the duty of someone to preserve the pure feeling of humanity free from hatred and strife. During the Napoleonic wars it was Goethe who felt it his mission to
uphold the spirit of humanity." He quoted Goethe's own words: "How could I to whom only culture and barbarism are things of importance, how could I have hated a nation which is among the most cultured in the world and to which I owe so large a part of my own culture?" Second, his uncharacteristic departure from the historical into the practical and immediate: "If, for instance, state control of industry should become a permanent institution, as many fear, it would not mean the destruction of intellectual and cultural values, provided the individuals are willing to maintain and to fight for these values." In December 1941, this was understood as a reference to Roosevelt's "rumored" plans to nationalize industries in order to prevent strikes in sections deemed essential to the war effort. Apparently, many scholars felt this to be a (leftist) threat to the creativity and cultural autonomy of the universities.

Walz's lecture reminds one of the presidential address by the Germanist Marion Dexter Learned at the 30th congress of the Nationaler Deutschamerikanischer Lehrerbund in 1900. Learned too depended on Goethe to develop the topic of world literature and national enmity, quoting the same passage from Goethe's comments to Eckermann. But whereas Learned manipulated his--and Goethe's--premise of Weltbürgerstum to advocate imperialism and militarism, Walz praised those who love their own culture while respecting and appreciating that of others. He also differed from the Germanists of forty years earlier by avoiding references to individual political
events and speaking only on a theoretical and nonspecific level. Thus he adhered to the tradition of humanistic rhetoric that generalized rather than coming to terms with specific issues in the contemporary situation.

In 1944, Robert Herndon Fife (Columbia U), also a Germanist, was President of the MLA. His speech to the annual convention in New York, entitled "Nationalism and Scholarship," denoted a subject determined by the political circumstances. Fife placed some of the responsibility for the rise of Nazism and the war on German scholars because, he argued, they had been planting the seeds of nationalism since the eighteenth century: "For the fading of the dream of eternal peace scholars have certainly a large share of responsibility. The German philosopher Herder gave the impulse. . . . No class has felt this national urge more strongly than scholars and none has contributed more to its cultivation." He thought, however, that the propensity to extol one's nationality was universal and expressed the hope that scholars of the future would approach foreign cultures with greater understanding, even while concentrating primarily on national literature. Continuing in the same vein, he urged Americans to be aware of their national culture and at the same time to become cosmopolitan by studying several foreign languages and literatures, not just one. Fife thus encouraged pride in one's cultural identity integrated with a dynamic appreciation of foreign cultures.

The lectures of Seidlin, Walz, and Fife illustrated an
evolution in the Germanists' concept of their role. They also contributed to the continuous effort of the profession to protect its position and enhance its prestige. Seidlin spoke at a time when Germany was not yet America's official enemy and the ideological exchange between the two countries was not completely cut off. In spite of the prevailing anti-Hitler mood, principles fostered by the Nazis, such as anti-Semitism and even pan-Germanism, were common; hence Seidlin did not indict racism, anti-intellectualism, and imperialism in Germany but warned against their proliferation in the United States. This connection between the two countries, although regrettable, lent authority to the Germanist, who was familiar with both. Nevertheless, within the profession Seidlin's was a courageous stand because anti-Semitism still existed in many German departments, at least behind the scenes, and in periodicals, silence and noninvolvement were the norm.

Walz gave his address at the very moment when Germany and German nationalism were clashing with the United States. This may explain why he chose to talk about Goethe's cosmopolitanism and why he preferred to remain on a theoretical level. While Seidlin still saw Goethe as a tool in the fight against Nazi ideology (and the prevention of war), Walz saw him more as an inspiration for a time beyond and after the war, the standard for a better future. For Walz, Germanistik's value existed in spite of Nazism, and those whose profession it was to interpret literature were keepers of the fire, not soldiers at the front.
At the time of Fife's lecture (December 1944), America's victory was assured. Germanistik had made it through the war with an increased enrollment and heightened prestige due to its proficiency in war-related assignments. As an American and a Germanist, Fife stood in a secure position and could afford to be critical of the profession. Hence he felt equally free to assail what he considered the responsibility of language and literary scholars in Germany for the rise of nationalism. He too recommended cosmopolitanism as the cure for the future, which in terms of methodology he defined as comparative literature study. It would appear that since Germanists had proved their "Americanism" by contributing to the war effort in their profession, the time had come to emphasize a special aspect of integrationism: Germanists (and other foreign language specialists) should adapt to the tendencies in American academia and cooperate with other humanistic disciplines instead of competing.

A valid contribution to the fight against proliferation of Nazi ideas was the endeavor to write an objective history about German-Americanism. Beginning in the 1920s, the Nazis had attempted to influence and infiltrate the community of so-called Volksdeutsche in the U.S. Although institutionalized Germanistic scholarship was no longer very involved with the interest of ethnic groups as such, in the report of the Germanic section of the MLA meeting in 1942 (which was never held), American scholars were encouraged to engage in dispassionate studies of German settlers in America to
counterbalance the spirit of Nazism which permeated the research done by Germans.216 Ironically, the Nazis' prejudiced depreciation of the Forty-Eighters provided an impetus for the American scholars to reappraise the legacy of all German settlers to American intellectual life, not just that of the Forty-Eighters.217

3. Contribution to the War Effort

During the years 1942-45, when the struggle against Nazism crystallized into an armed conflict, American Germanists continued to play a part in the war effort. In the first place, a considerable number of individuals enlisted in the armed forces, some of them remaining productive as scholars while doing duty.218 Second, German departments in colleges and universities responded to the call-to-arms by adapting their curricula to the needs of the hour: institution of courses in military German, courses for translators, and an increased number of courses about German culture in order to familiarize the students with the character and background of the enemy they were going to combat.219 Starting in 1944, several German departments voluntarily cooperated with the Armed Forces in the re-education program for German POWs in America.220 The periodicals did not record this program, probably because of the relative secrecy surrounding it. Third, as Susan Pentlin has described extensively, America's entry into the war sparked methodological studies and debates in educational journals as well as in German Quarterly and
To give a few examples of the variety of articles in Germanistic periodicals: "Curricular Modifications and Additions in Our Field to Meet War Emergency Needs," "Training Needs on the College Level for Enlisted Men in the Armed Forces," "Acceleration-Intensification (due to wartime)," "Training Government Translators at Vassar College," "Immediate Military Applications of a Knowledge of German," "Die Deutsche Sommerschule von Middlebury College in Bristol, Vermont 1943" (about participation of military officers), "Radio - Deutsch" (about psychological warfare through messages to the enemy). Thus, although there was little ideological debate, a mood of goodwill prevailed and a vast amount of technical help was provided, both by individuals and institutions.

The professional organizations and the periodicals, however, did not establish specific programs in response to the war. Twice during the war years the presidential address at the Annual MLA Convention was delivered by a Germanist (1941 and 1944), and in both instances the addresses were inspired by the circumstances of Nazism and war. Within the German section, however, the programs show that only twice were discussions influenced by the political tragedy. The 1941 general session of the AATG, held in Indianapolis, did not mention the war with Germany, which had started only three weeks earlier. As it happened, the after-dinner speaker, R. O. Röseler, was unable to attend. The available time, however, was not used for a discussion of the new problems and
duties created by the political situation, as one might expect, but filled with the singing of German folk songs. From 1942 through 1945, the reverberations of war showed mainly in two ways. First, the journals published government appeals connected with the needs of war. Both German Quarterly and Monatshefte, for instance, announced requests from the government for translators and interpreters. The Metropolitan Chapter of the AATG even took the unusual step of distributing a leaflet, The Study of German in This War and After, which enumerated seven reasons for studying German, the first two related to the war. It was supported by such divergent underwriters as the U.S. Army, the U.S. Navy, the State Department, Thomas Mann, Walter Damrosch, the New York Times, a Lutheran pastor, and a rabbi. German Quarterly published it in full together with a request to teachers and students to pass it on. The President of the AATG, G.H. Danton, announced in 1943 that a committee had been appointed at the request of the U.S. Department of Education to consider what German departments were doing in the war effort. In 1944, Monatshefte published a request from the National Lutheran Council for contributions of German cultural material for the prisoners of war.

Second, the professional organizations, such as MLA and AATG, adapted their activities to alleviate the country's wartime plight. Since the government requested that civilians voluntarily restrict their travel during Christmas time so as to leave room for the military, both the MLA and AATG
cancelled their 1942 and 1943 conventions. \(^{236}\) German Quarterly also stepped forward with a resolve to use a lightweight paper "to conserve on the dwindling supply of staples used in binding. This or any other voluntary contribution to the war effort, we shall naturally be most glad to make."\(^{237}\) There was, however, no sign of any further provisions of a practical nature.

Finally, one cannot but wonder whether the professional associations in German played any part in the accommodation of the refugees from Germany—authors, scholars, and others. The extent to which professional organizations as well as individual members supported or opposed the appointment of German scholars within German or Foreign Language departments during a period of retrenchment for foreign language teaching, would, of course, be a chapter by itself. The problem started in 1933 and continued all through the war with the new emigrés arriving via England, Canada, and neutral countries. Ernst A. Philippson, a refugee from Germany who received an appointment at the University of Michigan, remembers: "The Chairman of the German Department of Michigan tried to help other emigrants although there were obvious financial limitations. Not all members may have been of the same opinion. At least one colleague said after the collapse of the Third Reich that now was the time for the refugees to go back and to make room for young Americans."\(^{238}\) In 1935, School and Society published an article by the Germanist Karl Arndt (Hartwick Coll.) which provided a glimpse of the mixed feelings toward refugees. He
accused them of working for smaller wages than American professors and of abusing the exchange programs, thus discouraging American high school students from becoming German majors in college. These complaints undoubtedly contained some truth, although many positions for refugees were funded by private foundations.\(^{239}\) A more objectionable side of his complaint was his generalizing, prejudiced portrayal of the refugees, including an opportunistic reference to Communism:

American universities have become asylums for political irreconcilables and social misfits of Europe. . . . Most of the foreigners who have recently been appointed to positions in this country were exiled from their native land for political, usually Communistic, activities or opinions. . . . Germans claim that Jewish professors were dismissed from German universities because they were getting too many of the better positions. Human nature is no different in Europe than it is in America, and we have no guarantee that our institutions of higher learning will be safe from similar reactions against foreigners if the pro-European attitude is going to continue at the expense of Americans. Why not place some of our own American Jews before we establish professorships for Jews exiled from Europe?\(^{240}\)

Arndt thus claimed that he was not inspired by anti-Semitism. His worries about American PhDs not finding jobs were justified but in his picture of the refugees he himself seems to have fallen prey to the nationalistic narrowmindedness which he feared might overtake the American schools. In view of his unfair designation of the majority of foreign appointees as
"social misfits" and his reliance on the typical Nazi claim that Jewish professors in Germany "were getting too many of the better positions," one cannot but wonder whether his fear of a reaction against foreigners in American schools was perhaps a subterfuge for his own xenophobia. In some cases, however, anti-Semitism appears to have been a decisive factor. Naturally, it was never stated in public but it emerged in many private documents. Sol Liptzin, then Chair of the German Department at City College of New York, recalls: "Even when refugee graduate students completed their doctorates at the most influential American universities, including Wisconsin, the recommendation they received, while full of praise, also hinted at their non-Aryan origin."\(^{241}\) Arndt's article attested to the complicated nature of the matter, but the painful subject was never mentioned in the Germanistic periodicals. The only acknowledgment of the refugees' presence appeared in very sporadic announcements of lectures, such as a course by distinguished emigré Germans arranged by the Verein Deutscher Lehrer of New York City.\(^{242}\) There were also articles on exile literature, especially of the more famous authors, but overall the periodicals reported little on the emigrés, writers or critics, their current activities, or their plight. We catch a glimpse of their difficulties in Books Abroad of 1938: Emil Lengyel reported that German emigré authors had planned a guild to
make Americans aware that the exiles had no direct access to an audience in the U.S. However, no mention was made of cooperation by German departments or professional organizations.243

4. "After the War"

Germanists were well aware of the problems that would begin when the war was over. Specifically, two areas of difficulty were foreseen: the future of foreign language teaching in this country once pressing military demands no longer obtained, and the responsibility of the U.S. toward a conquered Germany. Susan Pentlin provides an extensive description of the predictions and plans made by language teachers regarding the future teaching of German.244

Regarding the status of post-war Germany, as early as 1942, Germanists talked about the international, mediatory role the U.S. would have to play after the war: "No one of us knows what part Americans will be called upon to take in the rebuilding of the world when this war is over."245 Ernst Feise foresaw a role of intermediary for the U.S. between East and West, a task which it must take over from Germany: "Whether we like it or not, we shall have to shoulder this responsibility, that of mediating between Europe and Asia, and on a much larger scale in order to forestall an explosion resulting from the constant friction which will develop between the European and the Asiatic world."246 Granted, these observations did not constitute the main subject of the
articles; they only served as arguments toward a more specific goal, namely to prove the usefulness of studying foreign languages. In his hope for a renewed mission of American Germanists, Feise even magnified their future role, making them almost into diplomats:

We must develop our intellectual instruments, must know the history, the economics, the cultures of the world, and this knowledge may only be gained through an effective mastery of the foreign languages, so that we may become . . . 'honest brokers.' If we recognize and realize this role, a great future will be ours. It is a glory of work and achievement, but also a task which almost surpasseth understanding. For it encompasses the eternal dream of a world peace, and you, in the words of scripture, are called to undertake it.\textsuperscript{247}

Part of America's duty toward Germany would be to obtain a just peace. It was a thorny topic, prompted by the memories of an inequitable treaty at Versailles, and decried by some as a veiled request for a so-called "soft peace."\textsuperscript{248} Thomas Mann, for instance, was accused of having written an essay in Atlantic Monthly to obtain such a soft peace for the Germans, an intention he later strongly denied.\textsuperscript{249} In Deutschtum and America, John L. Brown even warned that the German professors in exile might try to induce their students—the future occupiers of Germany—to keep the social and economic structure of Nazism intact after the war.\textsuperscript{250} Werner Richter (Elmhurst Coll.) argued that peace should reflect the Christian idea of reconciliation.\textsuperscript{251} Ernst Feise indirectly pleaded for a lenient treatment when he identified America's
future task of mediating between East and West with that of Germany in the past. By underlining the difficulty of Germany's historical role, he suggested mitigating circumstances for the Germans. He also made a sentimental appeal to the charity of the Americans:

And just as a family or a society cannot allow one of its children, which is maladjusted, to develop into a rebel, the family of nations is responsible for all of its children. It has the duty to intercede when one of its members shows signs of developing criminal leanings and it cannot afford to wait until the unfortunate is ready for a house of correction or the gallows. In education we have learned this lesson and nobody in that field would advocate superannuated medieval methods of treatment. We are now on the threshold of comprehending this problem in international politics. It is a new development in the history of mankind, that our government during the war is beginning to work for reconstruction.²⁵²

Quite a strong plea for interference against "criminal leanings" from a member of a profession which barely protested against Nazi policies in the thirties!

In discussing actual methods of reconstruction, Germanists restricted their comments mainly to education. Werner Peiser admitted that the teaching of foreign languages had not achieved much for the sake of peace in fascist countries. But he still believed that if the objectives were changed, it could contribute to a better world. Foreign languages and literature should be put in the service of high moral principles: "If we do not give up hope of educating the youth of the Fascist countries, then the ethical way of teaching a
language is the only one which may contribute to a real reconstruction and to the reeducation of a youth which, for decades, has been taught in the spirit of the worst enemy of mankind: in the spirit of national hatred."253 Harold von Hofe (U of Southern California) quoted Thomas Mann's view that future leadership in Germany should come from Germany itself, namely from the underground and from the concentration camps.254 The most concrete and extensive plan was brought forward by Werner Richter in his book *Re-educating Germany*. According to a review by Carl Wittke, Richter based his proposals on an analysis of the failure of the Weimar Republic and arrived at rather pessimistic conclusions. For instance, his plans dealt mainly with the young because he professed not to know what method might appeal to those over twenty-five. Richter was severe in his judgment of Germany and could not be said to advocate a soft peace. Yet he believed that, given the opportunity, the German people would atone for existing wrongs.255 Richter's opinions were in agreement with the views of two Germans who had remained in Germany through 1945, Karl Jaspers and Rabbi Leo Baeck. Jaspers wanted well defined regulations for Germany's re-education, which, he argued, must be self-education. He did not offer concrete suggestions, but described what should be the guiding attitude in this process: honesty and historical insight.256 Baeck believed that the nefarious part of the German population must be banned from positions of responsibility to give the liberals a chance to build a real democracy. But he did not agree with France's
opposition to all centralization. Different from other Germanists, Harry Slochower took a leftist viewpoint, discussing the socio-economic context of cultural problems. For example, when analyzing the historical determinants of Nazism (which he opposed to the concept of a "native fascism"), he stressed "the crucial role of German monopoly and its tieup with the international system of cartels." He lauded "the international and humanitarian thinking" of Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller, but regretted that they "expressed the idea of freedom in aesthetic and philosophical prayers rather than in social demands and institutions." For the future he proposed: "The other Germanys, those of Goethe, Marx, Heine and others have spoken up for . . . the European Man and for a universal culture. The primary condition for such a culture is a cooperative economy." Not surprisingly, Slochower's article did not appear in a Germanistic periodical.

As the Allied armies advanced through Germany in 1945, Monatshefte resumed its habit of publishing brief reports about life in Germany under the title "News and Notes." True to its policy, it related only news associated with "culture": the physical condition of schools, libraries, museums and theaters; the reorganization of cultural activities, newspaper circulation, publishing companies, and church functioning, always without comment. Only once did it deviate from its usual neutrality when publishing war-related proposals: after a list of "Deutsche Dichter die um Hilfe bitten: (thirty in
all, the names supplied by the former Nazi author Blunck), followed the request: "Die Monatshefte veröffentlichen diese Liste in der Annahme und der Hoffnung, dass der eine oder der andere der Leser diesen deutschen Dichtern ... durch die Übersendung eines Weihnachtspakets eine Weihnachtsfreude zu machen wünscht." As if to underscore the validity of its appeal, it accompanied this with letters of gratitude sent by German authors to the New York Quakers. 260 The AATG in its General Session of 1945 passed a resolution to be sent to the Secretary of State asking that ways "be found to make it possible for citizens of this country to communicate directly with friends and relatives in German speaking countries and to send relief as clothing, food, money." 261 Both initiatives were commendable, but one cannot fail to notice that Monatshefte and the AATG seemed definitely more united and quicker to forgive a defeated Germany than they were to condemn an aggressive one in 1938. Their more enterprising attitude of 1945 attested to a greater feeling of security about their own position in American society.

"Re-education" and "Self-education" were the concepts dominating articles concerned with the status of Germany after the war. All called for structured discipline, but whatever condescension that attitude might imply was erased by their advocacy of "self-education." Ironically, except for those by Slochower, all the articles which I examined took it for granted that this would happen in the spirit of Western (American) democracy. In the United States the Third Reich
had gradually become the antipode of American democracy. To help restore Germany's dignity, therefore, meant to assist Germans to establish the political system of their victors. Like most Americans, Germanists believed that doing so was to be part of the Pax Americana which the United States would bring to all of Germany.

In all, between 1940 and 1946, and especially after 1941, the Germanistic periodicals became more involved with extra-literary events. In this respect, America's entry into the war did more to change the face of Monatshefte than did the retirement of its editor of thirty-five years, Max Griebsch, in 1934. The most notable articles were those originally presented as speeches, because their immediacy reflected the urgency and heightened emotions created by the war. They suggested an awareness of the scholar's duty to respond, directly or indirectly, to political realities, albeit only with society's approval. The depoliticization process that started after World War I apparently slowed during 1940-46. Did this growing political interest continue after 1946? An experience related by Ludwig Kahn pointed in a different direction. His 1945 article for the Vassar Alumnae Magazine, which referred to Hitler's Mein Kampf, was badly received: "The reaction of my colleagues in the German department was: Hitler is dead, why mention him, let's forget about him—in 1945!!!" It is also clear that because it forced Germanists to prove the merits of studying German, the war represented an important step in the Americanization of
the profession. Whether this Americanization also extended to methods of literary criticism and teaching of literature must still be studied.
SUMMARY

Nazism and World War II put their mark on the publications in Germanistic periodicals. But no matter how illuminating and substantial some of the contributions, they remained expressions of individual interest—in frequent and piecemeal. Neither the editors of Monatshefte nor of German Quarterly, for example, devoted a whole issue to a coordinated exploration of Nazism, nor did they solicit articles about the subject. It is, of course, open to debate whether articles discussing a political system and its ramifications lie within the scope of knowledge and duty of Germanists. During the thirties and forties the periodicals avoided philosophical discussions of this aspect of their task; the debates mostly circled around the appropriateness of political allusions in the classroom. The answer to the question of appropriateness appears to be historically relative. During the late nineteenth and twentieth century, Germanists had incorporated political and other extra-literary discussions into their professional writings. In 1917, this came to a halt, and, aside from a revival of Monatshefte's political partisanship between 1920-25, Germanists shied away from political and social involvement during the twenties. Yet between 1930-33 a few articles did appear that spoke out on the political situation. Overall, however, the trend was one of silence in
social and political matters and concentration on literary and language issues. Moreover, in the area of literary criticism, it was not customary to interpret literature in the context of social, economical, or political currents. Yet I would point out that after 1933, Nazism invaded all spheres of life, including literature, and that the German government actively attempted to influence American universities, specifically German departments. In addition, the American public demanded explanations for Germany's actions, and numerous cultural associations delivered frank commentaries. Hence I would maintain that American Germanists were in the position to address the political phenomenon, at least for their students and colleagues. And since most teachers during 1930-46 increasingly agreed that the teaching of language and literature could only be effective against a wider horizon of cultural enlightenment, it would appear logical that politics, including contemporary politics, formed part of their scholarly horizon and of their students' curriculum.

Henry Hatfield and Joan Merrick have taken the issue one step further. In their otherwise laudatory overview of studies in German literature in the U.S. between 1939-45, they maintain: "A major criticism can be levelled against the profession: that it failed, on the whole, to make what might have been its greatest contribution in a period of crisis: the interpretation of the German mind to a puzzled nation. This task was left, in large part, to amateurs and journalists." Here Hatfield and Merrick touch upon the
problem of the scholar's role in the community. They seem to demand that "in a period of crisis"—this term is crucial—the scholar write not only for other academicians, but also for the general public, even though that would necessarily imply diffusion. The problem remains: how to reach that public? Then, as now, it was no easy feat to break into the network of newspapers, magazines and radio. Whether Germanistic scholars tried in vain to expose their opinions to a more general audience can probably only be determined through the study of personal archives.

We want to re-emphasize the outspokenness of some individuals. During the period 1933–39 two tendencies were evident. Those who thought it outside the role of Germanists to voice opinions on Nazism were in the majority. They relied on conventional beliefs about the autonomy of literature and thought that the answer to Nazism was to build up moral strength through the study of literature. Among those who did speak out, the Nazi sympathizers apparently did not hurt the reputation of the profession, probably because they formed a small minority and were quickly chastised by their colleagues. The scholars who criticized Nazism displayed courage in going against the prevalent professional trends. By openly discussing the Nazi system and calling attention to its proliferation in the United States, they manifested, to a degree, the independence of the profession vis-à-vis Germany; and by presenting the regime as transient, they stressed the continuing validity of the discipline dedicated to the study
of German literature. Between 1940 and 1946, individual scholars applauded the virtues of (American) democracy and tried to secure a dignified reeducation of Germany after the war. In their candor they worked—knowingly or unknowingly—toward the same goal which others tried to reach through remaining silent, i.e., the preservation of the profession.

In further defense of individual Germanists, it must be said that although a comprehensive or activist approach to the political events was lacking, they did investigate the new order from a particular angle, namely in their studies of the relation between Nazism and literature. Questions such as whether Herder's writing promoted the rise of (Nazi-style) nationalism, debates about the relevance of Lessing's message of tolerance for the contemporary world, or a profile of a Nazi scholar cannot be cast aside as immaterial to the understanding of the Third Reich.  

The role of the professional organizations was altogether less commendable. Especially during the years 1933–38, they remained puzzlingly silent. At a time when newspapers and magazines were reporting on official Nazi atrocities, when the country was rife with rumors about Fifth Columnists and American Nazi camps, and when refugees were knocking at America's doors, the editors of Monatshefte and German Quarterly, the German divisions of the MLA conventions and the AATG meetings appeared undisturbed. During such a crucial time one expects from organized Germanists an involvement one
level beyond that of individuals, namely in terms of guidance and aggressiveness. Yet not until 1939, did the AATG feel obliged to alter its apolitical stance and denounce the Nazi terror. The MLA never spoke out at all.

This silence was clearly prompted by the profession's fear of a recurrent attack on the teaching of German. I would also surmise that the profession felt protective toward Germany (the pre-Hitler Germany, that is), and that it believed that criticism of the bad automatically entailed vilifying the good. A sharp contrast with other scholarly journals! For instance, American religious (protestant) journals did not hesitate to criticize their beleaguered fellow-clergymen in Germany: although extolling the courageous resistance of Barth, Niemöller, and others to Nazi policies, they regretted that the theology of Barth and German Lutheranism "lent itself readily to reactionary policies and that nationalism ... was joining issue with Christianity." Political silence may also have been maintained out of a reactionary belief that the old ways would be restored. Moreover, promulgating such an optimistic outlook on Germany was deemed necessary, it seems, to the survival of German studies. (The enrollment in French went down after France's military collapse in 1940.) Fear of angering German colleagues may also have played a role.

Finally, many American Germanists felt themselves to be the guardians of a cultural patrimony above and beyond the political events. Edwin Zeydel phrased this in an editorial: "Language and great literature live independently of current
events and . . . it is our duty never to lose our perspective and calm."267 This principle lent moral legitimization to the institutional aloofness and the dedication to pure research.

Looking once more at the 1939 resolution of the AATG: despite its modest wording, the overwhelming support by the members suggests that earlier and stronger action might have been welcome. It is unfortunate, then, that in the matter of interpreting the German phenomenon the organizations and periodicals failed to provide leadership and initiative.

Between 1940 and 1946, one notices a change in attitude, as the associations ventured to acknowledge political realities, at least to a modest degree. Clearly, the depoliticization process had slowed down. The institutional offers to help with the war effort were forms of cooperation with the body politic. This, in turn, secured the public consensus needed for the attempts to acquire assistance for needy Germans after the war. But on burning political questions, such as the division of Germany into East and West, the associations' "no-comment" policy of the thirties was repeated.

Our examination of the periodicals between 1930 and 1946 demonstrated that the break between American patriotism and German nationalism, which Henry J. Schmidt sees within Germanistics after 1917, was definite.268 What is more, in spite of some strong individual manifestations, the Germanistic associations perpetuated the subsequent divorce of scholarship from politics. The affiliation with American patriotism, however, was renewed.
PART II:
AMERICAN GERMANISTS AND THE INTERACTION BETWEEN LITERATURE AND NAZISM

In the preface to his 1936 Historical Survey of German Literature, the Germanist Sol Liptzin vowed "not to pass judgment upon the literary phenomena of the Third Reich, since these could as yet hardly be called historic. . . . " However, he followed up this statement with the promise "to lay bare the philosophic and literary antecedents of the new Germany." Liptzin's dual attitude was characteristic for the position of many Germanists between 1933 and 1946, and especially in the early years of the Nazi order. The periodicals of that time reveal that the majority of scholars were reluctant to express a comprehensive opinion but did evince a genuine interest in the relation between Nazism and literature. Besides, unwillingness to assess contemporary literature was customary until the 1950s, since the belief reigned that chronological distance was essential to obtain an objective viewpoint. For instance, Detlev W. Schumann, when probing the conservative tendencies of twentieth-century German literature, declared, "Ein Halt ist geboten," when reaching 1933. As the main reason for
this attitude he cited closeness in time, a reason which he saw intensified by the contemporary impingement of politics upon literature.

Two aspects of the association of Nazism and contemporary literature seemed to invite discussion: 1. Did 1933 constitute a quantitative and qualitative break in the literary output of Germany? 2. Did contemporary literary scholarship in Germany contribute to the genesis and proliferation of the Nazi movement?

Chapter IV will examine the first question in its wider context, namely, the interest of American Germanists in contemporary literature within Germany, the so-called "inner-German" literature, as it interacted with Nazism. Germanists published both overviews of inner-German literature and discussions of individual Nazi-approved authors. However, our study will focus on literary surveys rather than on any particular author. Chapter V will deal with the second question and consider whether American Germanists displayed a critical attitude toward their colleagues in Germany. In both chapters I will also attempt to compare the position of the profession toward German literary phenomena with their attitude toward German politics as described in Part I.
CHAPTER IV
AMERICAN GERMANISTS AND INNER-GERMAN LITERATURE

In Part I it was possible to distinguish well-defined chronological divisions in the focus and content of articles dealing with Nazi politics. The contributions on literature did not disclose such well-defined parameters because, unlike the political articles, most of them did not originate in direct response to outside events. Yet the evolution in opinion, although partly due to reflection and in-depth reconsideration, also mirrored the changing atmosphere of the period. Therefore, like Part I, this chapter will also be divided into three parts: 1. 1930-1932; 2. 1933-1939; 3. 1940-1946.

1. 1930-1932

Next to economic woes, the factors which created the greatest susceptibility to Nazi rhetoric in the Germany of 1919-32 were suffering caused by the war, bitterness over the Treaty of Versailles, fear of communism and anti-republican feelings. Were American Germanists interested in the literary expressions of these sentiments, and did they think the message of such writings to be relevant to the Weltanschauung, present and future, of the German people? Two issues, the war
and the Weimar Republic, attracted the attention of the critics.

Paralleling the studies which expressed concern with the political situation during 1930-32 (examined in Part I), articles investigating German literature occasionally referred to the impact of the Great War on Germany. Commentaries on the war literature appeared mainly in *Books Abroad*, possibly because war books were popular with a larger public and because most of them were not considered to be of great literary value. In any case, the reviews did not attach much weight to the books' formal elements; they mainly addressed the message. In this respect Germanists concentrated on one issue: the author's belief in, or refutation of, the legitimacy and nobility of warfare. In *Nationalismus in Germanistik und Dichtung* (1967), Winfried Pielow distinguishes three tendencies in German novels about World War II which are relics of a nationalistic ideology: *Idyllisierung*, *Mythisierung* and *Heroisierung*. The same criterion can be applied to literature dealing with the first World War. While such idealization cannot be viewed as an expression of pre-Hitler fascism, it did reflect receptiveness toward the idea of nationalistic militarism. For instance, in 1930, Henrietta von Klenze talked about "the manly acceptance—almost unquestioning—of [Ludwig] Renn, who takes war and revolution as part of the day's work." Manliness was equated with unthinking approval of whatever course officialdom decided to take. From the five war novels which she reviewed, she
preferred Schlump's because "his account leaves of them all, the pleasantest taste in the mouth, though without glossing the truth." A touch of Idyllisierung, indeed. That such approbation was not the standard may be illustrated by two other 1930 views of the same books. Arpad Steiner (Hunter Coll.) concluded that in Renn's Krieg the "German Babbit ... by and by awoke to the sad fact that modern war is no chivalric adventure." In a review of Erich Maria Remarque's Im Westen nichts Neues, John N. Mueller (Indiana U) "failed to find much of 'the elegant and ennobling' in warfare," contrary to what another critic of Remarque maintained. Probably the most topical German novel of the late twenties and thirties was Hans Grimm's Volk ohne Raum (1926), the popularity of which surpassed even that of Im Westen nichts Neues. The Great War was a central subject and, akin to it, the theme that the Germans had the God-given right to acquire more Lebensraum simply by taking it from others. This very premise, of course, functioned very prominently in the rationale of the Nazis in order to justify the start of World War II. The book did not attract critical attention from American Germanists, most likely because of its weakness as an epic novel and its reputation as an agitatory political treatise. Not until 1935 did this socio-political slant inspire some Germanists to devote full-length articles to it. Only Heinrich Meyer (Rice Institute) found it necessary to defend the book's basic tenet and called it "politische Voreingenommenheit da von Traktatenstil zu
sprechen. Wer dies ernste Buch unparteiisch liest, wird von der Liebe des Dichters zu seinem Volk tief aufgerührt werden.

. . ."276 His stand is conspicuous for the irritation with outside attackers as well as for the underlying approval of the megalomaniac, nationalistic tendencies of the book.

Irrational condemnation of the Weimar Republic by its opponents made the German people more receptive to the idea of the Third Reich. Allen W. Porterfield's "The Frantic German Pegasus" (1931) reflected that prejudice.277 Porterfield (West Virginia U) blamed what he described as the poor quality of contemporary literature on the confused state of political affairs:

It is only what can be expected with Germany herself floating around over an uncharted sea. Literature reflects and visualizes contemporary life. Never in the history of civilization, not even at the very beginning of the present Era, when occidental mankind turned, under duress, from a Pagan to a Christian civilization, has a people gone through such religious changes as the Germans have witnessed in the last two decades. . . . When the Germans come to believe in the permanency of the Republic it will be possible to divide their writers off into a few great and well-demarcated groups.278

In his low esteem for modern literature Porterfield represented a conservative, ultratraditional wing: he rejected even the poems of Rilke and George, "which become clear to me only after repeated readings. This in itself . . . is proof that the poems are not the creation of men who knew precisely where they came from, why they were here, and where they were going."279 Thus he not only spurned the new poetic language
but had no understanding of contemporary complexity, insecurity, and alienation. Not surprisingly, modern poets were admonished to follow the classical authority figure: "Germany needs a few lyric poets who can write as clearly as Goethe at his obscurest." In the tradition of nineteenth-century, paternalistic Germanistik, Porterfield believed that literature must be prescriptive and moralizing: "They [the Germans] need a Soll und Haben more than a Zauberberg." But this legitimate personal preference for traditional forms of literature turned into lack of tolerance when he perceived pluralism itself as an evil: "There is no end of labels: Impressionism, Expressionism, Idealism, Neo-Romanticism, Realism, but what do they mean?" His criticism became petty, if not downright ugly: "All of this social and political confusion in the Republic is revealed in the theological and philosophical writings of Scheler and Weber and Koehler and Heiler and a mighty host of others whose names end in something else than a syllable that generally denotes agency." Porterfield's arguments were of a kind that would later be used by the Nazis, not only to denounce but to forbid much contemporary literature. His article even resembled the Nazi style in its superficial, slogan-like pronouncements and name-calling. He also subscribed to a particular trend of German nationalism of the thirties which—in reaction to the revolution and the Republic—regarded urbanism and internationalism as enemies of patriotism: "Germany needs a Schiller, who can write a
sensible drama, that would make people see the virtue embedded in the idea of 'Volk.'"284 It would be erroneous to call Porterfield's article Nazist since two main components of Nazism, i.e., racism and totalitarianism, were missing. But Porterfield foreshadowed Nazi ideology by correlating his demand for certain virtues in literature with attacks on the Republic and an intolerance of new literary styles. The Nazis would later use precisely this same combination as a basis for their nationalist, totalitarian and racist Deutschwissenschaft. Present-day scholars agree that NS Literaturwissenschaft consisted of an exploitation and radicalization of existing beliefs.285 Karl Otto Conrady mentions the reluctance to accept modern development, incomprehension of analytical-pessimistic works, and disdain for leftist authors as one of the "allgemeine Voraussetzungen . . . deren Zusammenspiel für den Weg der deutschen Germanistik ins Dritte Reich verantwortlich sein dürfte."286 Porterfield's article, in its popularizing aggressiveness, demonstrated these tendencies.

Obviously, Porterfield empathized with certain pre-Nazi tendencies current in Germany during the late twenties and early thirties. But the main question is: Was he representative of American Germanists around 1930-32? In the periodicals, his article was the only one of its kind. At the same time, however, we may speculate that his was not an isolated stance, as it seemed in harmony with a reactionary mentality prevalent in some factions of the profession. Like
Porterfield, other Germanists may have longed for the central authority and apparent unity of the Empire, while not necessarily sharing his dislike of all aspects of modern literature. Actually, most scholars must have thought it imprudent to present Germany and its literature in such a negative light. (Porterfield's vigorous disdain for the Republic is reminiscent of Handschin's political article [discussed in Part I], but Handschin's criticism stemmed from a leftist viewpoint, uncommon among Germanists at that time.)287 In any case, since almost no scholars expressed an opinion on the relation between politics and current literature, Porterfield's commentary must have attracted considerable attention.

All in all, the periodicals of 1930-32 did not display much interest in the Nazi ideology which was slowly infiltrating German literature: very little comment, and certainly none of analytical nature, was made about books that expressed such pre-Nazi tendencies as glorification of the war, nationalistic militarism, or racist Volkstum. Ironically, one article of note which discussed the reflection of politics in literature, Porterfield's, condemned contemporary writing on the basis of what could be called pre-Nazi standards. Much of the general reserve was due to the spirit of the times. Since only few scholars--Germanists or others--took cognizance of the Nazi menace inherent in pre-1933 political events, it is not surprising that even less attention was paid to the adumbrations existent in
literature. And even if they did realize the threat, Germanists were no longer inclined to discuss political affairs, or interpret present-day literature in terms of political reality. Also, such studies would have required a methodological approach different from what was customary. Literatursoziologie, although theoretically acclaimed, had not yet been put to extensive use by American Germanists, and many considered literature as a category beyond and above daily life. Thus, very little was said about political issues, movements, and events in Germany as they were reflected in its literature. The periodicals of 1930-32 continued in the spirit of the late twenties.288

2. 1933-1939

On May 11, 1933, the front page of the New York Times carried an article: "Nazi Book-burning Fails to Stir Berlin: 40,000 watch Students Fire Volumes in a Drizzle, but Show Little Enthusiasm."289 In great detail the Times and other American newspapers reported on the official book burnings in the university cities of Germany on the previous day, one of them in the presence of Goebbels, Reichsminister für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda. Four months later Goebbels created the Reichsschrifttumskammer, a subdivision of the Reichskulturkammer, with the purpose of administering Gleichschaltung in all matters of literature. The new credo required literature to express the feelings of the race, not the individual, to sing the praise of the soil and the land,
not the city, and to view the past only as a preface to the future glory of the heroic German people. It automatically excluded all books written by Jews, as well as those with individualistic, urban, international, and pacifist overtones.

Germanistic periodicals made no mention of the book burnings, but as early as the summer of 1933, Hohlfeld reacted to the recently imposed restrictions by organizing a workshop for evaluation of German literary criticism in the last five decades because he deemed objectivity in literary matters "zur Zeit in irgend welchen deutschen Veröffentlichungen durchaus ausgeschlossen." The first comments on the literature itself appeared in 1934. Obviously, Germanists were cautious in approaching the literary situation in Germany. To judge from the official Nazi policy in 1933, drastic changes were in the making, and outside observers—scholars and journalists—were eagerly describing and analyzing the phenomena. But American Germanists were not exactly outsiders and reacted differently. Institutional tradition, academic work, professional security, friendship, and family ties formed the substratum of their interest in German literature. They were reluctant to report adversely on a discipline that had received their loyalty for so long. Seventeen years earlier, American Germanists had been cut off from German literature by outside political circumstances; now German literature itself threatened to become part of the political process. In view of the neutrality and silence which many colleagues advised in all matters political (see Part I), merely to broach the
subject of Nazi-protected literature required a certain amount of courage. Edwin Zeydel probably expressed a not uncommon sentiment of apprehension when he only reluctantly agreed to a yearly survey of German literature for *Modern Language Journal*, because he realized that "Germany's literature must, by and large, be of a certain ilk and pattern which might become irksome to the reader and reviewer alike."\(^{291}\)

One of the issues debated was the question whether or not 1933 represented a distinct break in the tendencies, volume, and overall quality of German literature. To us this may appear a topic of literary, sociological, or political significance. To some Germanists of that time, as we shall see, it meant more. To them it represented a principle of loyalty to German culture and they became emotional when discussing it. The answers to this question were also indicative of the standards by which the essence of good literature was defined. At the same time, the differences in opinion were tempered by the common belief that contemporary works should or could not be judged. Frank Mankiewicz (City Coll., New York), Editor of *German Quarterly*, testified:

> Not sufficient time separates us from the poetic works of the present period to obtain a clarified view of it. We are directly in front of the overflowing plethora of poetical—and presumably poetical—creations which history and criticism of literature can sift and evaluate only in a very moderate measure, just because the picture of present day literature does not offer as yet any well definable outline; it has not yet achieved permanent form and is subject to constant change and inner growth. Thus it seems just and prudent for us not to attempt to
Among those who thought that a break had occurred in 1933, disagreement existed about why and under what guise, as well as about the value of this new literature. At first, only moderate disapproval was registered. For instance, after his initial condemnation, Zeydel restricted himself to descriptive, non-judgmental one-liners. The new tendency which struck him most was the importance attached to race and heroic nationalism, but he did not call this a deformation or a distortion; he portrayed it as a mere emphasis: "The keynotes are 'Kampf, Volk, Volkstum, Rasse.' . . . The favorite topic is the spiritual and psychic struggle for a rejuvenation of national sentiment by means of a great Teutonic renaissance." This mild approach was understandable for the early year of 1934, when academic observers and politicians alike thought that after the initial outburst of destruction the National Socialists would pursue a more tolerant and compromising course. Zeydel may have wanted to view the fundamentals of NS ("Kampf," "Volk," "Volkstum," "Rasse") in a positive light, as steps toward a vague but seemingly commendable goal ("Teutonic renaissance").

Forceful indictments of the new literature did not appear until a few years later. We shall first analyze the most notable opinions of scholars who perceived a discontinuity in German literature after 1933 and then elaborate on one text which united all these features and can be considered representative.
The strongest objections were directed at the theater. The reasons are easy to surmise: the Nazis more blatantly manipulated the theater for propaganda purposes than any other form of culture; American critics could compare dramatic performances in Germany with those of previous years or with productions in other countries; and, not least of all, as part of the social life, theater was a cultural genre with which not only Germanists, but all educated visitors to Germany might come in contact. Marian Whitney (Vassar Coll.), well aware of the histrionic tradition and its strong influence in Germany, was not deceived by the official cultural manifestations: "It is not encouraging for the rise of the 'National Theater' so eagerly awaited by press and people to learn that the control of all theaters in Germany had been taken from the Ministry of Culture and given to the Ministry of Propaganda."295 While admitting that Hitler had quantitatively improved on the Republic's theatrical record, she reminded her readers that already "during the Republic a system was developed that brought the best plays of the day to remote villages," and what is more, by the use of detailed examples she unmasked the theatrical realizations of the Nazis as a medium for totalitarian indoctrination.296

Sometimes the analysis and denunciation of Nazi-inspired works generated questions of literary theory. After a survey of individual plays, Whitney concluded that the New Germany had not yet produced a first-rate drama. This observation led her to wonder whether real drama was even possible under
National Socialism: "Can there be drama where all conflicts have been solved, where only one side of any question can be fairly presented and where the same set of opinions must always triumph in the end?" The answer to Whitney's question is, of course, more complicated than her rhetorical phrasing suggested, but the question indeed needed to be asked, and it is to Whitney's credit that the concrete situation in Germany prompted her to formulate a problem of theoretical nature. Similarly, Lyman Bradley (Yale U) expanded his thesis about the discontinuity in German literature since 1933 into a broader, more fundamental question: "Is first-class literature possible in a land so closely regimented?" While Whitney hinted at a theoretical discussion, Bradley answered from an empirical angle only: judging from the literary productions of another fascist country, Italy, and from the literature in Nazi Germany to date, he decided that "no great art has emerged" and believed that a few more years were needed for a definitive answer.

Frank Mankiewicz too questioned the possibility of artistic creativity without freedom, but he did not give a conclusive answer: "The claim that there cannot be true literature where freedom of thought and of expression is lacking may be disputed."

The greatest merit of the scholars who distinguished a rift between pre- and post-1933 literature was that they went one step beyond the critics who perceived the literary trends imposed by NS as mere predilections for certain subjects.
(race, homeland, Führer, and war) which still allowed for alternative and opposing tendencies. The former saw that these articles served absolutes, extreme forces, which not only ignored but disdained and destroyed "peace, humanitarianism, internationalism and . . . individual life." In this respect Whitney's severe judgment of the theater was corroborated by outside scholars such as Ashley Dukes, editor of *Theatre Arts Monthly*. Frank Mankiewicz was especially struck by the denial of individualism and internationalism. Lyman Bradley stated that the new literary Weltanschauung was anti-democratic, supported the racial myth of Nordic superiority, fostered ultra-nationalism (pan-Germanism, territorial expansion), and forbade internationalism, cosmopolitanism, and foreign modernism. And, in an essay on poetry, Werner Neuse discerned the essence of contemporary poetry as "Understanding of the affairs of the nation" and "Submersion of the lyrical ego."

Although the scholars of this group concluded that the new literature was inferior, they approached it with a desire to be unprejudiced: "It is fair to evaluate contemporary German literature according to the principles under which it is being written; it is also fair and necessary to understand these principles." Werner Neuse dispelled the idea that all German poets were expected to praise the Führer—probably a rebuttal of a notion popularized in the commercial press. And, as shall presently be seen, Mankiewicz's whole article was pervaded by a scrupulous desire to be fair.
The comparisons between pre- and post-1933 literature tended to focus on content and quantitative information. In a few instances, socio-political parameters played a role as well, but the literary product as a total work of art was neglected. In this respect, Neuse's attention to form set him apart from the others and allowed him to qualify his own opinion: "One may question the possibility of a radically new poetry in the Third Reich. What will develop after the tumult and shouting has died is likely to be a poetry which in form continues many of the traits of preceding movements; in content it will reflect the ideals of the New Germany. . . ."308

An article by Mankiewicz, "German Literature 1933-1938" (1939), originally presented as a lecture, deserves special attention for several reasons.309 Judging from the controversial content and from a report in German Quarterly, it must have stirred quite a debate among the listeners: "Rarely has a speaker at one of our meetings been rewarded by such spontaneous, sincere and interesting discussion from the floor."310 Second, as Editor of German Quarterly, Mankiewicz was highly visible and not without influence on institutionalized German studies. Finally, his lecture integrated and expanded many of the features which were mentioned earlier as characteristic for those scholars who saw Hitler's advent as a decisive and harmful interruption in German letters.

Mankiewicz devoted his lengthy and engaged article to the purpose of discerning "whether and why 1933 ushered in an important division of German literary activity."311 The
criteria which Mankiewicz applied to classify the writers of the preceding period (1900-1933) into three categories were not of a literary but of a socio-political nature: a conservative group, a bourgeois group, and an "intellectually revolutionary" group. He decided that, regardless of which group authors belonged to, before 1933 they all respected the individual's right to create his own ideals. And it is precisely the change of this aspect that, he found, transformed the inner-German literature after 1933 into a different entity altogether. Those who associated with the conservative group ("with feudal, agrarian and patrician tendencies and reactionary leanings") gave up individualism and remained in Germany after 1933, as did about half of the bourgeois group (who believed "in humanism, progress and a middle-class conciliatory attitude"). The other half of the second group and those belonging to the "intellectually revolutionary group" refused to comply and left.312 Mankiewicz's theory became controversial when he declared without qualification that those who adhered to reactionary social conservatism before 1933 "willingly gave allegiance to the new doctrine," especially since he classified authors like Stefan George and Paul Ernst in that group. Like Whitney and Bradley before him, he did not perceive the NS requirements as a mere emphasis but as destructive to any ideas that did not conform with them: "a defiant pride in all things German and a commensurate disdain of the achievements of all other peoples."313 Yet, categorical though his initial opinion
sounded, in the course of his expose he tended more and more to a compromise. For instance, he admitted that "one is not justified in identifying them [authors who wrote already before 1933 and remained in Germany] by this fact with all the tendencies and all the slogans of contemporary German literature." In addition, his conclusion took exception to, if not contradicted, his initial thesis about the fundamentally contrasting character of the literature before and after 1933:

Within the Reich [we find] a considerable remnant of older writers who even before the advent of the Third Reich had stressed certain German characteristics which fit into its new ideology, who continue in the old tenor of their ways [emphasis added] and who--for this reason--do not run counter to present German censorship.

Regarding the quality of the young, genuine blood-and-soil writers, he deferred judgment because "they are too young and too present. . . . They have not yet given sufficient proof of their political genius to justify an important rank in German literature." This opinion was consistent with his general (previously cited) disinclination to judge contemporary literature. But whereas the initial reluctance was based on the peculiarities inherent in the nature of writing and critiquing, his conclusion added a third dimension, a sociological element, namely the reception by the public and the impact on civilization: "Lasting influence upon the 'Geistesleben' within and without Germany does and will determine the rank and standing of the writers."
As mentioned earlier, Mankiewicz raised the problem of art and totalitarianism. However, in formulating the issue, he seemed to distinguish between what he called "true" literature and what I believe he thought of as "great" literature. "True" literature, which he acknowledged might exist, would lack one element, universal appeal:

We still treasure, and I think the world will always treasure, products of German literature which give us new approaches to or increase our understanding of cultural ideals which Germany had in common with the world at large. . . . When a literature becomes openly and avowedly a propaganda medium for definite nationalistic ideals it must be prepared to lose its influence among the great cultural factors of the world.320

In this judgment the same requirement appeared that he set forth earlier ("lasting influence upon the 'Geistesleben' within and without Germany"), this time with the emphasis on the worldwide element rather than on permanence. Surprisingly, he narrowed this cosmopolitanism by demanding literature in the service of democracy: "From our American viewpoint at least we can welcome as cultural influences only those agencies which help in the achievement of our democratic ideals."321 It would appear to us that here Mankiewicz was not merely expressing a current opinion about literature but seized the opportunity to emphasize Germanistik's loyalty to the cause of mainstream America.

Two more features of Mankiewicz's article attract attention: In the first place, his eagerness to be unprejudiced toward outer- and inner-German literature alike:
"To attempt a comparison of the value and significance of literary works produced within and without the Reich seems valueless and unfair."³²² Second, he carried this openmindedness toward literature over to the authors themselves as he automatically assumed the moral integrity of those who remained in Germany: "Many stayed and only in a very few cases have we a right to presume that they adopted the new ideology with any mental reservation."³²³ Later on he paralleled this belief in the honesty of those who stayed behind with his benevolence toward the emigrés: "I know fully well that many of them did not become emigrés on account of their convictions but that racial and political reasons damned them to exile. But when we concede intellectual honesty to the conformers within the Reich, we must by the same token make an equal concession to the others."³²⁴ It is rather puzzling that Mankiewicz should bestow such nobility of intention on the authors who wrote in Nazi fashion, thereby overlooking such motives as fear and struggle for survival—motives acceptable even to us—not to mention greed and ambition. Indeed, he viewed the situation from an idealistic position. Or might ulterior intentions have played a role, such as the desire to portray the Germans--those who stayed in Germany and those who left--as honorable in the eyes of his fellow Americans?³²⁵ On the whole, Mankiewicz's article was relevant at a time when confusion and lack of knowledge about the German situation prevailed and only a few were able to go and learn in person.
Although Lydia Roesch too belonged to those who juxtaposed pre- and post-1933 literature, she imputed a dramatically different meaning to that thesis. She addressed literature in terms of the author's purpose and mission, which in her opinion were to be a prophet, high priest, and philosopher for and above his people. Roesch apparently assigned to writers the same missionary task as some Germanists of the late nineteenth century, such as Kuno Francke and M.D. Learned, prescribed for teachers of German. Only the inner-German poets lived up to this ideal, she said, in contrast with previous generations of elitist authors who regarded writing as a mere hobby. Roesch's uncritical enumeration of ringing Nazi slogans was harshly berated by other scholars (see Part I), and her extremist stand remained an exception in Germanistic periodicals.

Looking back at the Germanists of this group (excluding Roesch), we find that the most notable of their accomplishments was to recognize that any form of literature encouraged by the Nazis, no matter how seemingly harmless, contained the potential of being turned into a vehicle for propaganda. They showed insight into a phenomenon which Rainer Stollmann would later describe in a dramatic way: "Next to terror, the principle of beauty is a chief element of the political praxis of NS."

Opposed to the thesis of discontinuity, the concept of a post-1933 literature unscathed by political events, maintaining its high quality as well as its main orientation, also found
its defenders. Actually, the zeal displayed by the proponents of this theory tended to create an opposing camp rather than merely an alternative point of view. We shall, again, first call attention to the most prominent and common characteristics of the scholars in this group and then concentrate on the articles of one well-known and representative Germanist.

The advocates of a literary continuum in Germany took a noticeably defensive position. In the first place, they were on guard against their own uneasiness. Inspired by Hohlfeld's statistical evaluation of literary criticism during the last fifty years, Rudolf Syring (Western Coll.), for instance, set out to rate the literature of the New Germany to "allay his own and others' fears." As the immediate impetus for starting the inquiry, he quoted the question often raised by his colleagues and students: "Can there be any real literature in Germany?" And even before the start of his expose he answered: "Decidedly yes!" In order to appraise the primary literature, he relied on secondary works: he proposed to examine which authors were held in high esteem by the Nazis, and if many of them had already acquired standing before 1933, there would be no need to fear for the future of German letters. But his interpretation of the statistics, and therefore his conclusion, were questionable: after comparing the list of "best authors" as designated by the organs of the new regime with the frequency of their appearance on the "best authors" list published by Hohlfeld, he was forced to admit to
major discrepancies between the two. Yet he decided that
"the great majority of authors favored by the Nazis was well
recognized by authoritative critics before 1933. Undue fear
concerning the future of German literature is, therefore,
not well founded." Syring's overanxious and premature
conclusion illustrated, once again, the eagerness of some
American scholars to believe that nothing was wrong with
German culture, that the old ways would persist.

Second, Germanists were troubled and annoyed by what they
felt to be discrimination against inner-German literature.
In this vein, concern to appear unprejudiced and avoid
discrimination on political grounds of the kind the Nazis had
been exerting came to the fore in M. F. Lawson's (Swarthmore
Coll.) article "Trends in Recent German Literature":

The work of emigrants figures most
prominently in the foreign language
collections of German book stores,
monopolizes criticism in American literary
columns, predominates in translations and
even penetrates the New York stage. But
if Americans are the ones to condemn
discrimination on political grounds, they
must themselves transcend it in this
matter of German literature.

In this remark we can also detect a slight tone of bitterness,
the old feeling that "the real Germany" was not given its due
recognition, together with a glimpse of the friction between
the academic and commercial worlds in their respective claims
of authoritative criticism. Surely, not since World War I had
German literature received so much attention in the U.S. A
defensiveness of the same kind, i.e., against political
discrimination, against professional competition, and against an uninformed public figured prominently in Zeydel's writings too, as a later analysis of his articles will show. Otto Koischwitz also was on guard against generalizations and slogans circulated by ignorance or political partisanship. He decried the notion that "authors must glorify the nation, army and superrace," thus directly contradicting Whitney and Bradley. Those who explained the German public's predilection for foreign and prewar literature as escapism from the present regime or as ersatz for nonexisting good contemporary literature, he accused of political propaganda. Those who took a detached view, he said, recognized that "German authors living in the Third Reich are writing not only acceptable books, but have created works of literary distinction and public appeal. . . ."334

Often the aggressive insistence on literary continuity revealed a conservative philosophy. When Matthias Schmitz (Smith Coll.) declared that "once more the German theater has its fixed position in the circle of national life" and that "the German theater [is] once again conscious of its great tradition [emphasis added]," he was not referring to the Weimar Republic—actually he slighted theatrical life during that period—but to a continuation of the Wilhelminian tradition. As to the quality of the plays offered, he measured it by the degree to which traditional presentation of the German classics had been restored: "[The theater] has become an institution which serves, once more, as guardian to
an immortal classical inheritance." Similarly, Syring based the crux of his argument about the high quality of inner-German literature on the presence of previously known authors, ignoring the young generation of Nazi writers: continuance was equated with quality. His uncritical confidence in the ideological steadfastness of formerly established authors also led to a fallacy in his premise, for he overlooked that they themselves might have adapted to the NS requirements and now write in an entirely different vein.

The argument for uninterrupted literary tradition was built on the idea that after 1933 there was merely an expansion and encouragement of certain pre-1933 trends of literature, independent of and unrelated to the Nazi coercion or the Nazi ban of other tendencies. Therein lay the biggest difference from the scholars of the previous group. Schmitz, for instance, brushed off the obligatory adherence to the Nazi credo as a mere matter of accent: "As to the tendencies in the repertory of the Modern German Theater, it may be said that the individual destiny and private experience are less emphasized than the folk as a vehicle of national and dramatic life." M.F. Lawson thought that the literature now being published in Germany was of that make-up by choice. Whether the current outlook was enforced or not, "recent German literature transcends the boundary line 1933." According to her, the difference between inner- and outer-German literature was based on a duality of philosophy that occurred throughout the world: she called one attitude "On to progress
and enlightenment!" and the other "Back to nature and belief!" Those writers who happened to have faith in the second motto before 1933 now enjoyed the approval of the Nazi government; those who adhered to the first had to leave. Lawson's reasoning implied that the concern with freedom of expression was irrelevant in this case because the characteristics of inner-German literature—whether imposed or not—fulfilled an essential need of both authors and readers. She too did not pay attention to the radicalization and exploitation of those existing trends; she portrayed them as merely emphasized: "It is, then, the exclusive emphasis of certain existing trends, to the exclusion of others, not a new literary program, which characterizes recent literature." To Otto Koischwitz, even racism appeared only as a matter of priorities: "The racial program of the German government emphasizes the community of all Germans throughout the world," something he deemed propitious to literature.

In order to maintain an unperturbed outlook on post-1933 literature, Germanists of this group had to make several concessions, often on essential matters. Some scholars overlooked quality, focusing instead on quantity; or they disguised the authors' lack of freedom as voluntary cooperation for the sake of the community and the manipulation by the government as benevolent encouragement. Schmitz proved with figures and statistics that the quantity of theaters, performances, and attendance had grown enormously since 1933. Yet he did not seem disturbed by the numerous restrictions
imposed on the choice of dramas, even of the classics, or by the total boycott of many modern authors; he simply ignored them. His sweeping conclusion, "The German theater, once again conscious of its great tradition, now offers . . . a spiritual bond between the peoples of different nations in the troubled world," overlooked the militaristic-nationalistic purposes for which the NS government exploited the theater.342 Was it naivete or partisanship on Schmitz's part? It would appear that his belief in the timeless qualities of the classics blinded him to the fact that they too could be manipulated. Obviously, he was inclined to dehistoricize literature. Koischwitz noted that considerable foreign literature was being published and that theater repertoires were equally international. By enumerating a plethora of foreign writers and books published in Germany to prove the openmindedness of the new government, he hid the fact that in spite of the performance of foreign dramas many foreign plays were forbidden and that those allowed were often divested of their "foreign" characteristics.343 To cite Nazi attention to Germans living abroad and the Deutsches Auslandsinstitut in Stuttgart as an example of cultural internationalism denoted either naivete or a clever stratagem on Koischwitz's part. For it was through that very institute that the NS organization tried to gain control over the Auslandsdeutsche, specifically the German-Americans, in order to persuade them to return to Germany or to manipulate them as a pressure group on the U.S. government.344 As it turned out,
Koischwitz's Nazi sympathies took him back to Germany in 1939, where he became an active party member. While his case proved atypical among Germanists, his compromising attitude toward literature and his desire to present inner-German culture as cosmopolitan were representative of other Germanists of this group.

Even Lawson was tempted to accommodate the totalitarian factor: her thesis that the one-sided, conservative tendencies dominant in inner-German literature coincided with the desires and needs of both authors and public made the question of government pressure appear immaterial. However, an interesting evolution took place within her article. While reflecting on the political significance of certain favored motives, she recognized that the so-called "emphasis" had been manipulated:

Regionalism perhaps always implies more than the purely artistic aim; the political implications of these last regionalistic works are largely intentional in fulfillment of literature's oft proclaimed political responsibility. Re-creations of North, South, West or East Germany fit into present German ideology inasmuch as they too turn away from world-wide metropolitanism back to specific provinces of the land.346

Lawson deserves praise for unmasking the Nazi manipulation of Heimatkunst, an aspect of the NS strategy to instill cultural and racial nationalism, in which, as Beate Pinkerneil makes clear, literature and literary criticism were assigned a major role.347 A similar evolution took place in an article by Erika Meyer (Mount Holyoke Coll.), "Reevaluation of the
Individual in the Modern German Novel." From a favorable judgment of the old, conservative trends which persisted into the post-1933 literature, she evolved toward a keen recognition of their manipulation by the Nazis:

Certainly the best of the literary exponents of this [collectivistic] philosophy of life have made a real contribution to German culture. . . . It is equally certain however that such a collective philosophy will lead and has already led to extremes fully as dangerous as those which it seeks to replace. Its militant nature causes the rest of the world to tremble and its inherent intolerance will lead to continued suppression of minorities.348

For our purposes, the articles written by Zeydel between 1933 and 1939 merit special attention. A prominent scholar, he was also the author of the yearly "Survey of German Literature" for Modern Language Journal from 1935-38. In 1939, he became the editor of that same periodical. Because of his reputation and position, his articles were sure to attract the attention of his colleagues. In addition, they integrated various arguments used by the other scholars who saw inner-German literature as the natural extension of the pre-1933 direction. Zeydel's assessment of inner-German literature went through a remarkable evolution. From an initial disapproval in 1935, when he declared himself "irked" by the new literature,349 he evolved to his 1936 position, in which he was able to recommend at least part of the new literary production: "Most striking to this recorder of the vicissitudes of German literature during the past year are the
many works which do not seem to fit into the National Socialist scheme of things, or at least but poorly coordinated with the ideas preached by some of its leading advocates." 350

So far, so good. In 1937, however, his survey became an indirect tribute to the political system itself:

German writers, now more than ever before, are revealing an interest in the achievements and failures pointed by German history as a means of promoting the new German renascence. They are strongly emphasizing, or at least implying, ethnic pride, 'Volksverbundenheit,' and honorable self-respect of German blood, its traditions and its future as instruments to that end. 351

It was not the content but the phraseology ("German renascence," "Volksverbundenheit," "German blood") that was dangerous, as it evoked echoes of NS rhetoric and a historic context of racist totalitarianism. Especially since Zeydel did not balance his statement by pointing to the negative implications of this attitude, his description sounded like propaganda. Finally, in 1938, Zeydel's contention that the continuity of German literature was never disrupted, proved no longer a marginal remark but became the very subject of his article "Stefan George as a Prophet of the New Germany": "It is the purpose of this little paper to point out earnestly and emphatically that the dominant trend of German literature today is still essentially the same as has been noticeable ever since the short-lived and abortive naturalistic movement came to a halt." 352 He called that ongoing trend "Mystic-Idealistic Realism" and claimed it united writers as different
as Thomas Mann and Edwin Kolbenheyer. To prove his initial theory, Zeydel used a peculiar method: instead of relating pre- and post-1933 literary trends, he compared the poetry of only one pre-Hitler poet, Stefan George, with the political realizations of the Third Reich. Zeydel saw the "spiritual revolution that is now going on," "the German renascence," "the new cause," "the New Germany," "the Third Reich," as an embodiment of that Mystic-Idealistic Realism, a realization of the spirit, the visions and prophecies expressed in George's poetry.353 Regarding the quality of literary products between 1933 and 1938, he avoided judgment through an ambiguous appraisal: "Personally we believe, too, that this literature has distinct possibilities of developing true greatness, if it has not done so already."354

Aside from Zeydel's admiration for the New Germany— and maybe the key to understanding that admiration— three more characteristics of the article stood out. First of all, Zeydel was very defensive, as his opening sentence revealed:

No country is more misunderstood at the present time, whether deliberately or unwittingly, than Germany. These misconceptions apply also to German literature of the last few years. Americans have been led to believe, and even the more intelligent readers in this country are now convinced, that a distinct and detrimental break occurred in that literature in 1933.355

The tone of this introduction was not unlike that of M. F. Lawson's which we described earlier. The vexation surfaced even more in Zeydel's 1938 "Survey of German Literature during 1937":
If one were to attach great importance to such articles on recent German literature as the shallow diatribe of Otto Tolischus in . . . The New York Times of August 22 last or to the impassioned notices of Klaus Mann in the Saturday Review (issue of July 17) there would hardly be any need of writing this survey at all.

Actually, he contended that the Nazis were less biased than American critics: "The fact is that these attempts at enlightening the American public, like most present-day criticism, no matter what its source, suffer from the same chauvinistic one-sidedness, to put it mildly, which they attribute to the adversary." Once again, the Germanist felt that circumstances had called on him to act as the champion of an unjustly maligned German culture. That professional rivalry was not entirely absent from Zeydel's ardor appeared from a further paragraph: "Our apology for the brevity of this account of a literature [of the emigrés] which is unique and interesting withal, must be based on the fact that others are zealously informing American readers on the subject. (See for instance Liepmann in The New York Times, Book Review Section, January 23, 1938)."

To return to Zeydel's New Germany article: a second outstanding characteristic was his great aversion to Naturalism. He referred to it as "the short-lived and abortive naturalistic movement" and seemed to agree with George's contempt: "First of all, George despises naturalism and all the ugliness, the pragmatism, the
positivism which were so rife during the nineteenth century. . . . And to the ugly snapshots of Holz and Hauptmann, Kretzer and Conrad, George opposes lyrics of exquisite form and utterance. . . ."358 His dislike made him join sides with others who rejected Naturalism, such as the Nazi sympathizers, no matter what their main motives.

The third point to be noted is the influence of the Volkstum-ideology, so prominent on all levels of German academia during the thirties, on Zeydel himself. He advanced the disputable theory that

anything of real value that a Mann or a Werfel may yet produce, be it ever so scathing and bitter on the political side, will still be much more closely related to anything of genuine significance which a, Beumelburg or a Blunck, or any apostle of the Third Reich may produce, than to any conceivable work of any imaginable American or English or French artist. If there be a lesson in this, it is that there are bonds which transcend all convictions.359

Whether his assertion is true or not, the important point is that Zeydel deemed it necessary to single out the bonds of language, culture, Volk and blood, with no immediate relation to his text. On the whole, his attitude was an exponent of his conservatism, which led him to admire and applaud the "conservative revolution" in Germany.360 At first he distinguished this clearly from the NS program, but gradually he overlooked the reality, i.e., the inseparable entanglement of the ideas of Volk and Volkstum with Nazi ideology and Nazi order. This disregard prompted him to formulate a climactic
pronouncement (cited in Part I) which, in 1938, was bound to be understood in a political sense, even if its author was talking about an inner attitude: "the spiritual revolution which is now going on in Germany and which all true friends of the German people hope will bring them spiritual and moral regeneration."361

Mixed with this conservatism was a desire to protect his profession. His aggressiveness toward American critics and his willingness to overlook racist and totalitarian concepts— as late as 1938!— indicate how far some Germanists were willing to go to protect their subject. In Part I we noticed the same position in the subtext of articles which expressed optimism regarding the political situation: lest the profession lose its legitimacy as mediator of outstanding values, the belief had to be kept alive that German society had basically not changed or was changing for the better. Practical and self-serving considerations aside, precisely because the attacks against inner-German literature came from outsiders, Zeydel and others of this group felt summoned to rescue a besieged German literature.362 Their attitude was not unlike that of Germanists of the early twenties, such as Kuno Francke, who had tried to portray the defeated Germany as a martyr.363

To summarize the attitude of the scholars who declared that 1933 did not signify a break in the literary tradition of Germany: at the basis of their belief lay a conservative bent which equated continuance with quality and which longed for
the restoration of traditional values after the liberal, experimental Republic years. Even a moderate critic like Erika Meyer felt that "the best of the literary exponents of this [National Socialist] philosophy of life have helped to raise Germany out of the depths of the mental and moral depression in which she found herself after the war and have produced a literature which is decidedly refreshing after a large dose of hyperanalytical treatment of abnormalities." 

Impressed by the resurgence of a conservative philosophy in the Nazi-protected literature, some were willing to overlook (or too naive to notice) the NS infractions upon the freedom of the authors and the manipulation of the favored genres, such as Heimatliteratur, historical drama, and lyric poetry. But although they applauded the disappearance of naturalistic, Expressionist, pessimistic, psychoanalytical, communist, and experimental directions, it must be said that they never approved—at least not openly—of their enforced exclusion by the NS regime. Neither did any of the scholars, except for Lydia Roesch, express direct sympathy for the Nazi government, which encouraged the rebirth of the old values. Rather, they considered the post-1933 emphasis on certain trends the expression of a conservative philosophy which had flourished long before and independently of the Nazi ideology, even if the NS movement drew on it too. In 1939, Detlev W. Schumann, although not dealing with Nazi literature, explicitly pointed out this presumed independence: "Nur dies sei noch aufs nachdrücklichste hervorgehoben: dass das männlich-heldische
Element zwar als wesentlicher Bestandteil in die neue Ideologie einging, dass es sich aber unabhängig von ihr entwickelt hatte und an sich keineswegs auf eine bestimmte politische Richtung beschränkt war.  

When comparing the articles of both sides, we note that in spite of their opposite viewpoints, they had certain features in common. Neither side tried to delineate a comprehensive picture of inner-German literature or to construe it as a completely new program. Instead, they concentrated on the continuation or exclusion of certain pre-1933 trends. Therefore, those who saw continuity in the literary tradition called this an emphasis, expansion, encouragement of the old values, unrelated to the Nazi ban of other trends. Those who saw 1933 as a definite hiatus called the emphasis arbitrary, distorted, perverted, unnatural, and inherently responsible for the boycott and destruction of essential values. This difference in interpretation was exemplified by the contraposition of Lawson's and Neuse's definitions of inner-German literature. For Lawson it meant "Back to nature and belief!"; Neuse saw it as "Immersion in the affairs of the state" and "Suppression of the lyrical ego."  

Approaching the two sides from a different angle, we may ask how Germanists arrived at such widely disparate views, and which of them were more representative of the profession? It would appear that a polarization of opinions took place in certain articles of both sides (e.g., Whitney, Bradley versus Schmitz, Zeydel, Koischwitz). As Germanists struggled to
determine what was happening in German literature, as they wondered and worried about the future and sought to cope with a rival, highly critical, and sometimes prejudiced commercial press, each side seemed to converge on one particular aspect with which it was familiar and generalize its observations. Above all, one side judged inner-German literature with purist standards whereas the other tried to protect and preserve the image of the old Germany. The attempts to present German literature as unchanged must be seen against the background of professional uncertainty that gradually pervaded German departments after 1933. Just as in the field of language teaching Germanists broadened the curriculum, devised new methods, and expounded rationales to prove the usefulness of studying the language of an alien regime, similarly some literary scholars attempted to present German literature as unaltered by politics and therefore a worthwhile study object for Americans. In contrast, the Germanists who perceived a complete break in the literary tradition spoke from utter disappointment and a crusading desire to make the truth about Nazism known to all the world. Still others tended toward a conciliatory stand (Mankiewicz, Lawson, Meyer), pointing out negative features while overlooking others. It is noteworthy that the most combative articles (those of Whitney, Bradley, Schmitz, Koischwitz, Zeydel's New Germany article) did not appear in Germanistic periodicals but in Books Abroad and American-German Review. One may therefore speculate that Germanists became more assertive when confronting what they thought was a less sophisticated general public.
Judging from the searching nature of many articles, we may suppose that initially all positions were fairly representative of large segments of the profession trying to come to terms with the new phenomenon. But as time went on, the less aggressive articles probably spoke for the majority. This speculation is supported by the fact that after 1939, inner-German literature was no longer defended at all costs, nor was it totally berated. The growing awareness of Nazi terror and the threat of war with Germany made unconditional defense of Nazi-protected literature impossible. At the same time, since the Nazi regime was now rejected by most Americans, there was less need to assail its literature so emotionally or contradict its defenders.

3. 1940-1946

By 1940, the study of inner-German literature no longer revolved around the question "Did 1933 signify a detrimental break in the development of German literature?" This question, often fueled by speculations in the commercial press, had revealed not only a scholarly interest in and concern about what was happening in German letters but also the Germanists' insecurity and uneasiness about their own position as critics of literature. Eventually they became less anxious, more self-confident, possibly because they realized that this time the American public would not direct its patriotic feelings against them or against German culture per se. This composure paralleled the greater confidence
which they, as educators, regained in the teaching of the German language. (Following 1933, a substantial decrease in German enrollment took place, but in 1941, as German was added to the war curriculum, it regained prestige and increased through 1945. A Gallup poll conducted in 1940 showed that 88% of the public wanted the teaching of German to continue.) Moreover, practical circumstances of German scholars underwent a drastic change. After England and France declared war on Germany in 1939, their access to what was called "inner-German" literature strongly diminished, and in 1941 contact stopped altogether. The latest inner-German books reviewed in Germanistic periodicals dated from 1939. (Books Abroad acquired books from Germany through 1941.) Travel to Germany became all but impossible, which put an end to first-hand reports on theatre performances and interviews with authors. Hence no new materials were available to confirm or contradict previous theories. All this may have contributed to a less strident, more sophisticated approach to the literature of the Nazi regime. By this time too, a few literary histories had appeared which included inner-German literature—be it ever so briefly—thereby lessening the novelty of the subject.

While the surveys of contemporary literature became less frequent and less newsy than previously, some timely and interesting issues were brought to the fore. For example: can literature be politically neutral in a highly politicized time and environment? Especially the categories Heimatkunst and escapist literature were treated from this angle. Another
question, ever more intriguing as Germany increasingly isolated itself: was any literature of opposition being published in the Third Reich? At the same time, the young, genuine Blut und Boden writers who had formerly been a center of interest, either acclaimed as promising or ridiculed as too indoctrinated, now hardly attracted any attention at all. When dealing with some of the more substantial articles, we shall ask which aspects of these questions interested the Germanists, how their insight into these questions demonstrated an evolution in their understanding of the relation between politics and literature, and what underlying attitude the evolution suggested.

Heimatkunst, long regarded as a harmless, rather unimportant genre, was now scrutinized by some keen observers. The title of Ernst Waldinger's essay "Von der Heimatkunst zur Blut und Bodendichtung" already assigned Heimatkunst a place within the National Socialist machinery.369 His assessment went beyond the first, tentative connections made by M. F. Lawson in 1936. What made Waldinger's article so noteworthy is that he combined his attack on Heimatkunst for its servility to Nazism with an exposure of its artificiality. He showed that the very characteristics for which the Nazis appreciated Heimatkunst, such as sentimental attachment to nature, mysticism, and description of the peasant's feelings, had been artificially induced. Peasants live by a possessive and practical relationship to nature, he said, but in the latest literature
the city dweller's Schwärmerei for the countryside was superimposed on them by writers writing for an urban public. Yet the Nazis fostered the idea that this literature was superior because it grew organically, aus der Scholle, as opposed to literature from the big cities. Waldinger thus established Heimatkunst as one more weapon in their struggle: "In der Nachkriegzeit und je mehr die Heimatkunst zur Blut und Bodendichtung wurde, wird die nationalistische Absicht deutlicher. Die Heimatdichter liefern dem Kampt des Nationalismus gegen das, was er die Auswüchse des städtischen Literaturbetriebes nennt, bereitwillig die Schlagwörter."370

This insight would be further developed by several literary critics of the 1960s who placed the Nazi use of the polarity, "einfach, primitiv, gesund" versus "entartet, ungesund, krankhaft," as Beate Pinkerneil phrases it, within the framework of racist nationalism.371 After his analysis, Waldinger became sarcastic and indignant when talking about racial theories, sounding a warning against hidden Nazi propaganda reminiscent of Oskar Seidlin's passionate admonition against Blut und Boden rhetoric.372 Although Waldinger did not try to give explicit instructions for his readers' conduct as had Seidlin and other authors of political articles, his moralizing tone also sought to influence behavior.

In 1944, Lyman R. Bradley reiterated his 1939 theory about the new direction of post-1933 literature.373 But while in 1939 he had declared himself as yet unable to pronounce
judgment on its quality, he now expressed a decisive opinion. Also in contrast to his 1939 article, he no longer relied on what had been viewed as the most important Nazi products, such as lyric poetry, cantatas, folksongs, and Thingspiele, but on the seemingly innocent genre of Heimatkunst. He pointed out that those elements of the literary past which the Nazis claimed to leave unaltered became the tools for change. The Nazis distorted the literary heritage, he contended, by sanctioning only parts of it, such as Heimatkunst, and by making it subservient to racism and propaganda:

Confronted with many types of literature and several schools of expression the Nazis chose one direction from what they characterized as chaos and gave it the official sanction. This new movement was basically the extension of the Heimatkunst of the previous generations, decorated with the swastika and inflated with the racial philosophy of the Nazis. While it had some of the background of the literature of the countryside and small town it was cleverly designed to deceive a nation defeated in war and bedridden through a decade of crisis.374

In a stab at Edwin Zeydel, he labeled contemporary writing "uniformly undistinguished since it falls under the pattern of mystic-idealistic realism." (Zeydel had praised inner-German literature as "Mystic-Idealistic Realism" in his New Germany article.)375 This opinion was supported by several scholars writing in the same year, 1944.376 Like Waldinger, Bradley contrasted the realistic Heimatkunst of the nineteenth century with the current mysticized version encouraged by Goebbels,
which he called "divorced from life." He condemned the latest
brand as one more means to cultivate the Blut und Boden myth
amongst the German people:

As the Nazis saw the danger to their
authority in the expression of the problems
posed by the life in the cities and sought
to direct the attention of the Germans away
from the metropolis, they used this
back-to-the-soil movement for their own
demagogical ends... One instrument for
this demagogy is the literature of the day,
that 'mystic-idealistic realism' which
depicts Germany as a quiet countryside with
near-feudalistic relationship of
pure-blooded heroes and heroines bound
together by mystic bonds of brotherhood,
happy in turning the soil, safe under the
guidance of the Führer.377

Again, like Waldinger, Bradley ascribed the success of this
literature to the nostalgia of the Germans, especially the
urbanites. Both scholars' overall assessment of
Heimatliteratur would frequently be restated by students of
Nazi culture in the 1960s.

The subject of "escapist" or so-called "neutral"
literature in Nazi Germany was broached by Helmut Rehder (U of
Wisconsin) in a series of lectures for an AST program at
the University of Wisconsin, titled "German Literature, a
Physiognomy."378 Rehder called Hermann Stehr, Josef Ponten,
Erwin Kolbenheyer and Hans Grimm "eminent" authors, who, "in
their attempts to see the 'essential' (das Wesentliche) of the
German character in the mystic, unwavering searching of the past . . . represent an outlet and an escape for many readers
who find it impossible to associate themselves with the
political current."379 Rehder obviously took the terms
"mystic" and "searching of the past" at their face value, without probing into the underlying Nazi propaganda. His evaluation also conflicted with that of Waldinger, who explicitly denounced Stehr and Grimm as adherents of the Blut und Boden theory. Neither did Rehder describe Hans Carossa's or Ernst Wiechert's withdrawal into "metaphysical wanderings" and "delicate sensitiveness" as mere escapism, but declared these authors to be the very antipode of Nazism: "the genuine representatives of the dignity of the individual in the traditional sense, writers who insist on the nobility of 'Geist' instead of 'blood and soil.' More than any other poets they have adopted the task of the physician ... for the many readers who are suffering from existence." Articles on Wiechert suggested that in spite of his internment in a concentration camp his "escapism" was often viewed negatively, but to Rehder neutral literature was a form of resistance. When we compare Waldinger's and Rehder's contrasting positions with some of the main histories of literature during 1933-45 (those by Sol Liptzin, Ernst Rose, Victor Lange (Cornell U), Jethro Bithell (England), we must conclude that Waldinger and Rehder were much more outspoken. Except for Lange, who mentioned Grimm's political motives, none of these scholars viewed Stehr, Grimm, Carossa, or Wiechert in terms of their contribution or resistance to National Socialism. Only after the war were so-called neutral works widely examined for their connection with politics.
Rehder's opinion about escapist literature was shared by Karl Paetel (author and journalist). To Paetel, literature which was "eskapistisch zum grossen Teil in Stil und Stoffwahl" was not a weakness but a manifestation of a free spirit because it expressed "ein Element des Nonkonformismus," an "Ausdruck der deutschen Sehnsucht, aus dem zutiefst verwundeten Körper die Seele deutscher Wesensart zu retten." As the title of his essay "Oppositionelle Literatur in Deutschland" suggested, Paetel regarded escapist literature as an indirect form of resistance to Nazism.

Paetel also dealt with a more direct form of opposition literature to which he seemed to have gained access via Switzerland and liberated France, no easy feat in the middle of 1944. Apparently the first to write about this subject in a language periodical, he examined the nature of that opposition, the psychological disposition from which it originated, the Weltanschauung behind it, and its impact on the German people. Paetel distinguished between opposition generated by disappointment after the first defeats of the German army and opposition which had been present all along, which sprang from a spirit of liberty at a time when many Germans still believed in Hitler. To him the value of opposition literature lay in its moral support for those who were silently suffering under the political yoke:

Die . . . Dichter sollen hier deutlich als Beispiel dafür dienen, dass im Reiche heute noch die Fahne des unabhängigen Geistes und der Freiheit an mehr als einer Stelle hochgehalten und damit Tausenden und
Beyond this immediate effect, Paetel detected in what he perceived as the highest form of opposition literature (Ernst Jünger's) a signal of the future rebirth of Germany: "Der Genius Deutschlands hat begonnen, sich selber wiederzufinden." Thus Paetel's article was optimistic; he interpreted passive opposition literature as the nucleus of what other Germanists, talking about the political situation, called "Education and Reeducation of Germany" (see Part I). Paetel's optimism and belief in the latent good forces of Germany were also evident from his interpretation of the concept "Oppositionelle Literatur," under which he categorized only passive, spiritual resistance. He apparently deemed this type as essential as the activist type which calls for insurgence and visible acts of opposition. In addition, Paetel was the only one explicitly to equate the "konservative Fronde" with anti-Nazism, a judgment based on its element of "Nonkomformismus." In fact, the konservative Revolution had often been interpreted as a contributing factor to Nazism or at least as a movement which had much in common with it. However, his confidence must be called naivete and self-delusion when he designated Ernst Bertram as a poet of resistance. Clearly, his faith in the "konservative Fronde" led him to overlook the fact that the idea of "Geist" had been usurped by the Nazis just as much as other, more mundane elements of the German Weltanschauung. Was Paetel
representative of the Germanistic profession? It seems fair to say that his belief in a latent "better Germany" was common, as was his zeal to find signs of it in German literature. He was the only one to include Ernst Bertram into the front of resistance, but his belief in the beneficial effect of conservative forces and his eagerness to include as many examples as possible were not unusual.

Relevant to the attitude of Germanists toward the relation between the Third Reich and contemporary literature was a series of scattered but unanimously favorable reviews of *War and the German Mind* (1941) by William K. Pfeiler (U of Nebraska), which analyzed novels written during and after World War I by men who fought at the front. What attracted the critics so much was Pfeiler's categorization of the war novels into egocentric and ethnocentric, instead of the usual division into pacifist and bellicose. This appreciation showed the desire of Germanists to picture the German people as struggling for recognition and collective identity rather than for military superiority and world dominance. These scholars also agreed with Pfeiler's theory that World War I was the progenitor of the Third Reich and that the war novels of the time evidenced this causality. In concurring with Pfeiler's thesis, Germanistic scholars subscribed to the belief that novels can present an original and valid concept of history. Finally, all reviewers heaped high praise on Pfeiler's impartiality in recognizing the merits of the ethnocentric writers—who were acclaimed by the Nazis—as well
as of the egocentric ones—mostly denounced by the regime. Ernst Rose (New York U) repeatedly used the occasion to pay tribute to American scholarship, and he considered the book a milestone in that respect. He touted the most outstanding quality of the book, i.e., its balance between extremes, as a typically American virtue: "The author strikes a truly American medium between exaggerated nationalism and irresponsible individualism." His opinion was a faint intimation of the resounding appeal for an independent American scholarship that Robert Herndon Fife would make three years later in his address to the MLA convention of 1944: "What is really important is that we should believe in ourselves and our mission for the creation of a national scholarship; that we should listen more attentively to what goes on in our own souls and be less sensitive to the opinion of other peoples." A controversial interpretation of the interaction between literature and Nazism was offered by Helmut Rehder, who advanced a socio-philosophical explanation. He took as his point of departure the theory that what he called "the treasury of living literature," i.e., "the cumulative product of the last two hundred years" with the "classics" at its core, views "reality and life, not as they are, but as they should be." This treasury is "the medium in which many leading concepts and ideologies of the Germans have been formulated and preserved." He then examined how the Nazis successfully applied that theory in their establishment of the Third Reich. For, according to
Rehder, the Nazis exploited the classic belief in finality, unity, and completion "dormant in the idealistic literature of Germany" and translated "what was meant as an abstract, intangible symbol into the calculated promise of tangible reality." Thus, he claimed, they presented the Third Reich as the fulfillment and climax of an age-old longing for the perfection of Das Dritte Reich, which ran through literature long before the eighteenth century portrayed it as a metaphysical idea of evolution. Rehder may have been affected by the success of Julius Petersen's Die Sehnsucht nach dem dritten Reich: he covered, in summary, the same evolution of the idea of Das Dritte Reich throughout the ages, but whereas Petersen maneuvered his sources in such a way that they seemed to culminate in the apotheosis of Hitler's Reich, Rehder pointed out the deceitfulness of the Nazi interpretation.

More daring was his contention that "through [the] tradition of tragedy [started by Schiller], almost more than through political reality itself, the Germans have become prone to accept the notion of the precedence of the state over the individual." Other scholars who had established a link between Nazism and literature of the past had concentrated on Herder, Romanticism, and the early twentieth century, but Rehder was the first--at least in the periodicals--to insist on a connection with the classic tradition of tragedy. He offered a geistesgeschichtliche explanation for the disputed question of German accountability, in contrast to the psychological school which saw the German character as
inherently prone to embrace dictatorships. Rehder's solution originated from an anti-deterministic conviction similar to that expressed a year later in Monatshefte by Karl Jaspers when he refuted Sigrid Undset's accusation that Nazism and World War II were innate expressions of the German psychology (see Part I). It is telling that Rehder should have pursued this problem at this particular time: political articles too—at least by Germanists—did not inquire into the issues of German responsibility, "collective guilt," or atonement until after 1940, i.e., after the start of the war. Moreover, compared to many articles that appeared before 1940, Rehder's lecture was devoid of militancy; he struck a balance between unconditional defense of Nazi-approved literature like Zeydel's and unqualified attacks like Whitney's. His initial approach was defensible, as I see it, because at that time (1944) it was no longer necessary to focus on Blut und Boden literature, which had received considerable attention in the thirties. Instead, Rehder examined the reasons why certain authors were tolerated by the regime even when their work was not Nazi-inspired. Unfortunately, in regard to contemporary authors, he failed to bring out that at least part of their writing was in agreement with NS theories. For instance, he did not substantiate his praise of controversial authors like Kolbenheyer and Hans Grimm. Even though the nature of his lecture, a comprehensive overview of German literature, prohibited detailed excursions, one might expect a succinct amount of discussion. Especially for an audience of outsiders,
it seemed imperative that the authors' negative political reputation be mentioned and discussed. Why did Rehder, so perceptive throughout his articles, show a lack of critical judgment in this matter? Perhaps it was a deliberate tactic for the sake of portraying contemporary literature in a more positive light. Or possibly the reason was more personal: Rehder and many of his colleagues were scholars of certain conservative authors before the latter became associated with Nazism. He may have found it difficult to admit to the Nazi implications in their work and feared that pointing them out would detract from the rest of their oeuvre. I would speculate that such feelings played a role in the attitude of some other American scholars toward older Nazi-approved authors as well.

Similar to those done between 1933 and 1939, surveys of inner-German literature published in 1940-46 showed little concern with formal elements or with the literary work as an organic aesthetic realization. Identifying the content and message was the almost exclusive purpose of these studies. This reduced attention is understandable. For those who had the courage to study inner-German literature--often against the advice of colleagues--became more and more aware that to examine the literature was unavoidably interwoven with a cognizance of Nazi politics and influence on German society. Ernst Rose, for instance, in the 1960 edition of his 1936 *History of German Literature*, stated that only then was he applying aesthetic criteria, whereas in 1936 he aimed at "a cultural survey seen through the medium of literature." In addition, the
paramount concern with content (and neglect of the "form" in its widest sense) was a legacy of the geistesgeschichtliche tendency in literary criticism, about which some Germanists already complained in the thirties.398

Parallel to the desire to enlighten colleagues and students about the new literature, as exemplified in the articles to which we have referred, was the tendency among Germanists to ignore or not to pass judgment on inner-German authors. This inclination was evident in the thirties and persisted after 1940 as well. One reviewer of an American literary history, for instance, grudgingly admitted that "there had to be included some of the Gleichgeschaltete, poets of considerable merit . . . who lately have sold or have had to sell their souls. Through careful selection, however, not more than the faintest echo of that deplorable fact can be detected."399 Another critic would have preferred fewer books on the market that echoed the politics of the time: "American publishing houses seem to have a marked preference for books whose authors are either at irreconcilable odds with the present German Government . . . or enthusiastic defenders of this same regime."400 Others did not mention the exodus of many of Germany's better authors, or else they finished their description of "present-day" German writers with the year 1932.401 It may also be noted that on several occasions scholars alluded to the "courage" of those who published books on contemporary German literature.402 Ignoring the effects of Nazism was an attitude analogous to that of defending
Nazi-literature at all costs, as both stemmed from the same desire to protect the German literary heritage and therefore present it as virtually unchanged. The attacks on this patrimony were in the first place perceived as coming from the outside. For some Germanists this meant the bad memories of World War I still fostered by part of the American public; for others it signified the current derogatory remarks by the American press: "For some time a popular impression prevailed in this country that no worthwhile literature has come out of Germany since 1914."\textsuperscript{403} In 1935, the \textit{American-German Review} had complained about what it perceived as an unfair and inflammatory presentation of Germany in the commercial papers:

Sad to say, there is more really intelligent and informative news about America in German papers, even in the smaller cities, than there is about Germany in the average American newspaper. What can be done to improve cultural relations between the United States and Germany through the daily press? What can be done to exterminate the virus of sensationalism?\textsuperscript{404}

A similar accusation was voiced by Clement Vollmer (Duke U) in 1940, and he too contrasted the negative American criticism to the positive attitude of the Germans: "This [the German appreciation of Mark Twain in 1935] at a time when scarcely a kind word was appearing in the American press about Germany."\textsuperscript{405} However, compared to the numerous voices that warned against discussing Nazi politics, the objections against involvement with Nazi-inspired literature were fewer and much weaker.

Overall, it seems fair to say that the articles referred to in this section (1940-46) were not isolated, individual
statements, but opinions representative of certain segments of institutionalized German studies. Indeed, we frequently noted that several authors shared the same underlying philosophy. Just as during 1933-39, the period 1940-45 was characterized by a dual tendency. During 1933-39, we found that the point of contention was whether or not 1933 signaled a break in German literary tradition. After 1939, it seemed to be accepted that inner-German literature was manipulated by Nazism; now the dilemma became whether or not to ignore it. For those scholars who did examine inner-German literature, the crucial point was to detect the degree and process of Nazi infiltration. Typical for the period after 1939 was that some Germanists struggled with the concepts of partisanship and objectivity vis-à-vis inner-German literature. Before 1939, it seemed simple to attack the most visible part of the new literature, Blut und Boden. Or else the government's interference with theater, publishing, and other literary events of a public nature made good target for criticism. Now, as Germanists dealt with so-called neutral literature, judging responsibly became more difficult. For "neutral" works often carried NS propaganda. Germanists wanted to attack these elements, but at the same time they felt they had to be fair and point out the qualities of the work. In their opinion, militancy and activism seemed less necessary.

On several occasions we drew attention to the analogy between the basic attitudes in literary and political articles
written by Germanists. But we have also noticed a marked difference between the two: whereas during 1940-46 many plans were drawn and predictions made for the political regeneration of Germany "after the war," Germanists did not speculate about postwar German literature. Neither did leftist sympathies, which on rare occasions had shimmered through political articles, surface in literary surveys. Studying inner-German literature unavoidably led to sharpened awareness of the interaction between politics and literature. Thus observations of a socio-political nature were made, but they remained brief and did not constitute the subject of articles. In the same vein, the reception of Nazi literature by the public was mentioned, but no articles specifically examined the process of reception.

4. Summary

Judging by the articles written during 1930-46, a large segment of American Germanists demonstrated a lively interest in the subject of inner-German literature. At the same time, a faction preferred to ignore the reality of a literature regulated by politics. To obtain a broader base for my evaluation of American Germanists during 1933-46, I compared the contributions to Germanistic periodicals in the U.S. with those in the British academic journal German Life and Letters. It appears that American scholars showed the same endeavor as their British colleagues to reach beyond the identification of straightforward Nazi works and detect the
more sophisticated infiltration of Nazi ideas into mainstream German letters. Both seem to have reached the same level of recognition (a more complete insight was not obtained until the 1960s). In 1960, Ernst Rose testified to the difficulty of pinpointing hidden Nazi manipulation, even long after the war:

Much of this German culture is regional, and it is therefore not always easy to decide whether an author should be grouped with the representatives of the Third Humanism or with the writers allying themselves with the forces of soil and climate, national history, and the continuity of the generations. A critical decision is especially difficult in the field of poetry, where a preoccupation with classical form often hides a mystic belief in the powers of blood and tradition.

American and British scholars also shared the desire to be fair and openminded toward the new literature. However, when we compare the number of American articles devoted to inner-German literature with that in German Life and Letters and Modern Language Review, the total output in American periodicals was much smaller. This observation remains true even when we take into account that besides the surveys of inner-German literature the American periodicals also published quite a few studies of Nazi-approved individual authors, as well as essays about the literary precursors of National Socialism and the impact of Nazism on philology.

Overall, the attitude of American scholars toward inner-German literature was reminiscent of their position toward German politics: some thought the profession should
assume leadership in knowledge and communication of the political reality in Nazi Germany, while others professed that such impartation either did not harmonize with the task of the language teacher or would do irreparable damage to the image of Germany. It is also noteworthy that, in general, Germanists were less severe in their judgment of Nazi-protected literature than were their American colleagues from other departments, an attitude also analogous to their stance on the political situation.

Restating a question posed in regard to the political articles, we may ask: at whom were the articles on literature under the Nazi yoke directed? In the first place, no doubt, at colleagues and students, but many scholars may have hoped to reach a wider public, as they published their articles in journals other than language periodicals (e.g., Books Abroad, Science and Society, American-German Review); some also held lectures for a non-Germanistic public (ASTP, MLA conventions). In view of this desire to reach a wider public, we should again confront the accusation of Hatfield and Merrick (quoted in the previous part) that American Germanists failed in the task of clarifying to the American public the character and behavior of the German people. 408 Although by necessity limited to a smaller public, many of the articles to which we refer in this chapter could have attracted the attention of any educated reader and would definitely have fitted into the literary sections of the big city newspapers. That they did not reach a larger audience may have been due
more to the infrastructure of the media than to lack of enthusiasm on the part of at least some Germanists.
CHAPTER V
AMERICAN GERMANISTS AND NAZI LITERARY CRITICISM

Since the mid-sixties, especially since the Munich Germanistentag of 1966, German literary methodologies and individual scholars of the twenties, thirties, and early forties have been subjected to increased scrutiny both in Germany and here. The creation of an official forum to discuss the correlation between Germanistik and National Socialism was a catalyst to such studies. In 1969, Fritz Ringer summarized the role of German academicians in the rise of the totalitarian regime:

There was less and less tolerance for the eternal tension between knowledge achieved and wisdom desired. Synthesis somehow became more than seeing a connection. In a desperate rush, the powers of geist were expanded, so that it might master life and cure the age. The standards of scholarship became less important than this colossal aim of total mastery. The distinction between geist and 'mere intellect' became even more emphatic. Unwittingly, the mandarins prepared the ground for the anti-intellectualism that finally overwhelmed them.409

In 1973, talking specifically about German Geistesgeschichte during the twenties and thirties, Gunter Reiss reflected:

Das 'Grundverhältnis zwischen Leben und Dichtung' ist also geprägt von der 'subjektivistischen Willkür' des Dichters und seiner Interpreten. Jede vom
Leo Spitzer (Johns Hopkins U) made similar observations much earlier, at the end of World War II. Criticizing the ability of German scholars to conjure up speculative interpretations and to subject Geistesgeschichte to the National Socialist system, he wrote:

Sollen wir leugnen, dass diese in manchen deutschen Seminaren geläufig gewordene Fixfingrigkeit im Spekulativen, die bedenkenlose Taschenspielerkunst, mit der geistige Augenblicksgebäude in der Luft aufgerichtet werden konnten, die einfühlsame, aber amoralische Interpretationsvirtuosität, zu einer Aushölung des Wahrheitsfundaments aller wahren Wissenschaft geführt haben? Sind uns nicht jene gar nicht vereinzelten, jene geistig begabten, aber sittlich bedenklichen jungen Menschen in lebhafter Erinnerung? ... Der Geist als Spiel, nicht als Verpflichtung, schien ihr Lebensgesetz— und spielend mit dem Alsob gerieten sie in das Hitlertum hinein das sie so gut 'geistgeschichtlich' verstanden. ... Wahr und Falsch, Unrecht und Recht erweichten sich im Nebel des mythologisierenden Gefühlsenthusiasmus.411

If not the first, his was definitely the strongest American condemnation of Geistesgeschichte as a trailblazer for Hitlerism. Underlying Spitzer's condemnation of Nazi-inspired Geistesgeschichte was the conviction that moral integrity is the basis of all scholarship, the quest for truth its goal, and rationality a necessity for the method. His accusation was reminiscent of Robert Herndon Fife's description of German
scholarly methods as the building of "an inverted pyramid of theory on a pinpoint base of reality." But whereas Fife found this approach academically acceptable, Spitzer, taking note of the historical reality to which these methods contributed, perceived them as transgressions.

While it would be unfair to expect the same level of insight from American Germanists in the thirties and early forties as from those who wrote toward the end of the war or from postwar observers, one may rightfully ask whether they were willing to discuss the Nazist philosophy of their German colleagues and, second, whether they were aware of its role in the rise and proliferation of Nazism. Was Spitzer's charge unique and isolated? Or was it the climax to a series of similar statements of disapproval, phrased more cautiously and tentatively perhaps? These questions are considered throughout this chapter. Because no comprehensive Forschungsberichte that included National Socialist literary theory appeared in periodicals between 1933 and 1945, our study will rely mainly on assessments of individual critics and their works. Subsequently we will try to determine whether the politicization of Literaturwissenschaft in Germany led American Germanists to a heightened awareness of their own role and duty.

Between 1930 and 1932, two articles in particular provided a critical overview of German literary criticism and its methods: "A Critical Bibliography of Recent Methods in German Research" by Theodore Geissendoerfer (U of Illinois) and
"Basic Principles in Literary Criticism" by Kurt F. Reinhardt (Stanford U). For our purposes, Geissendoerfer's presentation of the Ethnological School of criticism is of special interest. He described it objectively, pointing out the inner contradictions, but did not advise of its dangerous excesses. Reinhardt was critical of Friedrich Gundolf, Ernst Bertram, Herbert Cysarz, Oswald Spengler, and Egon Friedell because

they forget that conscientious scientific research will always remain the cornerstone of any scientific accomplishment and that there can be no synthesis without the painstaking analytical accuracy of the genuine scientist. . . . They all substitute an ingenious personal imagination for scientific exactitude.

Literary History as a series of legends, Science as Mythology.

Reinhardt's rejection of a "speculative" approach would be echoed in the mid-forties, when some Germanists (as we shall analyze) perceived the "speculative" methods of Geistesgeschichte as subservience to Nazism. Occasionally, reviews of individual critics alluded to "pre-Nazi tendencies." As mentioned in Part I, already in 1930, one of the grand old men in German studies, Alexander Hohlfeld, strongly attacked Adolf Bartels, an adherent of the ethnological school, who based literary appreciation on biological-racial criteria and became a rabid anti-Semite. At that time, however, Hohlfeld conceived of Bartels's anti-Semitism as an isolated occurrence and predicted that German readers would reject it. From his side, Ernst Feise
explicitly praised the moderation and containment of a "Volkstum und Heimat" chapter in Werner Marholz's literary history: "Er schreibt Nationalliteratur ohne Chauvinismus für den Deutschen als verantwortlichen Bürger und Weltbürger." By congratulating the critic on his restraint, and by presenting patriotism and internationalism as complementary feelings, Feise hinted that he was well aware that literary criticism could be used to arouse nationalism. Whatever demonstrations of pre-Nazi tendencies were discovered in German literary criticism between 1930 and 1932, American Germanists regarded them as exceptions, and they certainly did not relate them to the political establishment of National Socialism.

After Hitler's ascent, Hohlfeld stood once again at the forefront; he had no more illusions about the independence of German academicians. As early as the summer of 1933—the first book burnings occurred on May 10, 1933—he took action by organizing a workshop at the University of Wisconsin in order to put together an overview of literary criticism ("Literaturbewertung") in Germany during the last twelve years. His argument: independent judgment was no longer possible in the Germany of Hitler. Hohlfeld's survey, based on literary histories and scholarly journals, dealt with quantities, not with ideology, and each author was ranked according to the frequency of his appearance. Hohlfeld's main goal was to provide a service that German colleagues could or would no longer render, and thus he indirectly suggested that
American Germanists must now take over the critical task of their German colleagues. Interesting though his findings may have been, they appeared as only the first step in a bigger enterprise, asking for conclusions and especially for comparisons with the Hitler years. Unfortunately, Hohlfeld never pursued his initial study. As a matter of fact, during the immediately following years, the only assessments of German literary criticism consisted of oneliners such as, for instance, Zeydel's "Ideas of nationalism and ethnology are playing a paramount role in German literary criticism."  

In the late thirties and early forties, the periodicals did not publish any systematic research into the literary ideology of the Nazi regime. This is not to say that American Germanists completely overlooked that aspect of the Nazi intrusion upon German culture but that their observations remained occasional, not systematic or comprehensive, often part of book reviews. This lacuna was illustrated by Elise Dexter's (Hunter Coll.) article "On the Re-evaluation of German Literature," in which she set out to examine a typical example of "Gleichschaltung" in literary criticism. Comparing 1930 and 1935 editions of Röhl's Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, she noted both minor and vital changes effected by the nationalistic revision. Her very detailed article proved her initial thesis, namely, that the NS literary revaluation was not a matter of individual authors only but extended throughout all of the literature. Dexter demonstrated precise, philological scholarship combined with
an understanding of underlying philosophical principles. But the essay called for background work with a broader scope, namely a study of NS Literaturwissenschaft and its interaction with the philosophical and political beliefs of the Germans.

Sometimes scholars felt it necessary to explain the reasons for reviewing a Nazi work, citing their scholarly duty to become acquainted with the tendencies of Nazi criticism even when they deemed the book otherwise inappropriate. Or they used the justification that the one-sided NS theories were provocative and stimulated new perspectives. To us, such explanations may seem superfluous, but, once again, they reveal the caution with which the topic of Nazi criticism was approached.

Among the individual theoreticians who at one time or another promulgated Nazi principles and were reviewed by American Germanists were such men as Adolf Bartels, Paul Fechter, Christian Jenssen, Paul Kluckhohn, Heinz Kindermann, Helmut Langenbücher, Walther Linden, Arno Mulot, Hans Naumann, Julius Petersen, Karl Viëtor, Fritz von der Leyen, and Hermann Wanderscheck. It has recently been argued that these academicians could have side-stepped pressure to disseminate Nazi ideology by writing on more neutral themes, and yet most of them chose to publish in a nationalistic and even racist vein. Cornelius Schnauber contends that they did so not simply out of personal opportunism but because they felt flattered by the Nazi movement which raised their profession to a "Gralswissenschaft," and because they saw Nazism as a
means to realize their value system, even when that implied the perversion of these values.421

To rephrase the first question raised on page 197: Did American Germanists bring to light the duplicity of their colleagues? Regarding such well-known and blatant anti-Semites as Bartels and Kindermann, they had no qualms. But when it came to scholars who became Nazi followers after Hitler's advent, they were very discreet. Although drawing attention to obvious distortions of the historical truth, such as omissions, they never brought into question the reasons why so many scholars in Germany waved the flag of Nazism. This implicitly suggested to the reader that German professors had no choice but to write as they did. This reticence has several explanations. What Ernst Philippson writes about the relationship of some American Germanists to German authors-turned-Nazi, was also true of their relationship to their scholarly colleagues, their former mentors, and even their friends: "A scholar who had dedicated his research for years to Gerhart Hauptmann [for example] had to reconcile the poet's sudden political turnabout with his veneration for the man."422 In addition, just as they were reluctant to speak about political events in Germany, they may have felt uneasy searching for political motivations behind their colleagues' writings. Even if they did not sympathize with the NS philosophy as a whole, some may have identified with what they perceived as positive, conservative trends in German Germanistik, such as the normative categories with which
National Socialist Literaturwissenschaft operated. But if any American Germanists agreed with the anti-Semitic positions which permeated the works of their German colleagues, they never expressed such sentiments in their writings.

More important than American opinion about the personal motivation of German critics is the second question posed on page 197: Did American Germanists discern the contribution of their colleagues' Literaturwissenschaft to the growth and establishment of the Nazi ideology? Did they, for instance, recognize the dangerous influence exerted by their emphasis on völkische, nationale, and irrationale elements as the essential qualities of good literature? Writing within the confines of short articles and book reviews, only a few American Germanists realized that after 1933 it was no longer possible to view the glorification of völkische Kräfte as an innocent predilection of German critics, attributable to the neo-conservative mood then present throughout the Western world. These few scholars had sufficient insight to acknowledge that this cultural bias was unavoidably entangled with a political-racist one. Hohlfeld, for instance, described in 1936 the adapted edition of Reclams Deutsche Literatur (1935) as "die Neuordnung deutscher Literaturdarstellung und -bewertung nach den Grundsätzen nationalsozialistischer Weltanschauung mit ihrer stark erhöhten Betonung der mittelalterlichen, volkhaften, irrationalen, nationalpolitischen Dingen und Richtungen und der entsprechend . . . direkten Übergehung alles Gegensätzlichen." In his evaluation of the chapter
"Deutsche Dichtung im Weltkrieg," which did not report on any of the anti-war writers, Hohlfeld discerned anti-Semitism as the deeper motive behind the cultural bias. Against the author's excuse "dass es heute nicht angebracht wäre, auch die Gruppe . . . der Kriegsgegner . . . zu Worte kommen zu lassen," he pitted: "So finden wir, dass die Vertreter dieser [kriegsgegnerischen und revolutionären] Dichtung, unter denen jüdische Stimmen verhältnismässig zahlreich waren, [emphasis added] grundsätzlich ausgeschlossen sind." E. P. Appelt, too, admitted that Kindermann's *Literaturwissenschaft* tried to promote racism in daily life as well as in literature:

> Für den Literaturwissenschaftler stellt der V. [Kindermann] die Bedingung dass er seelisch, charakterlich und rassisch [emphasis added] dazu befähigt sei, dass er nicht zum mindesten auch von dem Wunsche beseelt sei, durch seine Forschertätigkeit der Erhaltung und Förderung des Volksganzen zu dienen. Damit spricht er es klar aus dass die Literaturwissenschaft über die Deutung und Erklärung des Dichtwerkes hinausgehen und aktiv in das Leben der Mitmenschen eingreifen soll.427

To us, these detections of racist propaganda may seem rudimentary, but in the mid-thirties they were not all that prevalent. Examples to the contrary were commonplace. For instance, in 1939, R.O.R. [R.O. Rösseler, Editor of *Monatshefte*] called Nazi critic Jenssen's *Deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart* "eine lebendige, volkstümliche Literaturgeschichte, die dem Leser helfen soll, dies dichterische Schaffen der jungen und jüngsten Zeit mit neuen Augen zu
sehen." The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies thought the book "wholly biased and untrustworthy," and Adolf Busse rejected it for the artificiality of its tribal distinctions and the arbitrariness in classifying writers under "Überrealismus" and "Scheindichtung." Yet Röseler discerned no ambiguity in Jenssen's section "'Vorboten der Erneuerung' gekennzeichnet durch die Namen Lagarde, Nietzsche, Chamberlain, George." Only naivete or utter determination to ignore political reality could maintain in 1938 that

Landschaft, Stammestum und bäuerliche Kultur sind [den volkhaften Dichtern] nicht Selbstzweck; ihr Werk ist in diesen drei Lebensmächten verwurzelt, um aus der Kraft dieser Verwurzelung sich an das ganze Volk und an die menschliche Seele zu wenden und eine gläubige Bejahung von Schicksal und menschlichem Willen, von Grösse und Alltäglichkeit, Leid und Lust des Lebens zu künden,

without at least referring to the negative connotations which these ideas—and especially the terminology—had acquired in the context of nationalsozialistische Literaturwissenschaft. Eberhard Lämmert's observation that German Germanists, who by virtue of their profession should have been acquainted with the semantic evolution of words, seemed unaware of the radicalization and politicization of the vocabulary in the field of deutsche Art during the Nazi period, applied to many American Germanists as well. The same lack of critical attitude was demonstrated by Hermann Barnstorff who reported sympathetically on the poets presented by Albert Soergel:

"Von . . . deutscher Liebe zu Frau und Blut und Boden wissen
diese Elf [Dichter] zu erzählen. 434 When used in vacuo, Barnstorff's expressions sounded innocuous, but in their historical context they were loaded with a racist and political message. In his 1938 survey of literary criticism in Germany, Edwin Zeydel cited only favorable characteristics, thus giving the false impression that NS Literaturwissenschaft had mellowed. 435 A reviewer of Hans Naumann ascribed his newly found Nazi ideology to a mere evolution of generations: "This view has, of course, as much justification as the older one, each generation creates its own picture of the past." 436 Obviously, none of these or similar examples amounted to total sympathy with Nazi theories, but they demonstrated that the sensitivity to Nazi propaganda was not highly developed.

The individual Nazi critics who received more attention than mere book reviews—although not always of a scholarly nature—were Adolf Bartels, Heinz Kindermann, and Julius Petersen. Bartels and Kindermann because of their radical Nazi convictions, Petersen because of his long-time stature within Germanistik. As mentioned earlier, Bartels's anti-Semitism had already been fiercely attacked by Hohlfeld in 1930. In October 1937, Monatshefte published an article by Kindermann in honor of Bartels's seventy-fifth birthday, complimenting him on such realizations as "Seelengewinnung für die kommende nationalsozialistische Bewegung" and his deep concern "um die Grundfrage Rasse und Volksstum." 437 This prompted an irate reaction from Ernst Feise in the December issue. In the same emotional style as he would later display
against Lydia Roesch's pro-Nazi comments, he lashed out at both Bartels and Kindermann. The whole article consisted of five rhetorical questions, demanding a massive negative response. Feise also indirectly scolded *Monatshefte* for publishing the article:


Indeed, we must admit that in publishing the congratulatory article—we are not dealing with an objective analysis of Bartels's work—*Monatshefte* put Bartels on a par with the few eminent American Germanists who on special occasions were the subject of a eulogy, and thus it practically asked the readers to partake in Kindermann's unabashed praise. *Monatshefte's* puzzling behavior can be explained in two ways: as I have already mentioned, *Monatshefte* had traditionally been the most nationalistic periodical, and its editors may have sympathized with part of Bartels's and Kindermann's philosophy; or else, in their desire to maintain the image of being above politics, they ignored the critics' political ideology to focus on their literary merits. But, if political knownothingism was their motivation, it backfired because both Bartels and Kindermann
had so aggressively and publicly committed their scholarship to the service of the Reich that acceptance of their work implied approval of their political credo. After Feise's charge, no Germanistic periodical ever again complimented a Nazi propagandist.

In 1936, Hohlfeld assailed Heinz Kindermann for his edition of *Reclams Deutsche Literatur*. Hohlfeld's indignation was directed at the ideological foundation of the work:


Hohlfeld energetically and systematically assumed what he regarded as his task, namely to expose the misrepresentation in the new edition, supporting his charges with precise numbers and names and showing how the new version reflected a partisan, unscholarly prejudice in favor of Nazi followers. Yet at the same time he felt obliged to apologize for Reclam and acquit the editors of their responsibility: "Eine andere Lösung konnte es im heutigen Deutschland zweifellos nicht geben für ein so grosses Unternehmen."440 Hohlfeld's apology probably expressed the feelings of most Germanists, who,
understandably, did not expect heroic resistance from every German editor or literary critic. What is astonishing, though, is Hohlfeld's attempt to defend the slanted direction of the series for its own sake:

Andrerseits ist auch Folgendes zu bedenken. Eine so umfassende und dabei grundsätzlich geistesgeschichtlich eingestellte Literatur muss, ebenso wie eine grosse Enzyklopädie das Antlitz der zur Zeit herrschenden Weltanschauung tragen. Absolute Gültigkeit hat es in solchen Dingen nie gegeben; kann es nie geben. Die Aufklärung sah und wertete die Dinge ganz anders als die Romantik und diese wieder ganz anders als der Naturalismus.41

Even granting every era its political-philosophical impact on individual writers, to compare the influence of the Romantic movement with that of the Nazi Kulturkammer was incongruous because the latter involved official indoctrination and denied scholars the freedom to discuss that influence. Maybe the explanation for Hohlfeld's contradictory attempt to exculpate the work—after the incriminating first pages—ought to be sought in the previous sentence: "Ich glaube ausserdem, wir dürfen uns auch weiterhin auf die hervorragenden Gelehrten verlassen, die nach wie vor der Welt gegenüber mit ihrem Ruf und Ansehen hinter dem Werke stehen."442 In his respect for his German colleagues, he equated their scholarly authority with moral integrity. As in Hohlfeld's critique of Bartels (1930), the German professor was once again presented as authority figure and pillar of morality.
In his 1937 report on Kindermann's series, Hohlfeld criticized its dishonest treatment of modern literature: "Unter den gegenwärtigen Verhältnissen kommen hierzu noch die durch die nationalsozialistische Einstellung gebotenen grundsätzlichen Auslassungen und Unterdrückungen die sich in der Literatur der jüngsten Vergangenheit am verheerendsten auswirken müssen. Schon dieser erste Band gibt zu solchen Bedenken Anlass." But here too he tried to exonerate the contributors. By using the ambiguous term "gebotenen"—does it mean "presented" or "ordered"?—he left open whether they concurred with the Zeitgeist or whether the government forced a policy on them. It is also worth noting that Hohlfeld linked his objections against the arbitrary treatment of contemporary literature with the traditional belief that one should not try to classify literature from the immediate past anyway:

Der ursprüngliche Plan war gewesen, mit den Hauptvertretern des künstlerischen Realismus zu schließen, also etwa mit Storm, Fontane, Anzengruber, und es möchte scheinen, es wäre ratsam gewesen, dabei zu bleiben. Auch Kürschner hatte ja etwa 50 Jahre vor der Zeit seines Erscheinens Halt gemacht: Schon die Bestimmungen des Urheberrechts müssen beschränkend, mitunter sogar verhindern auf die freie, rein sachlich wünschenswerte Auswahl des Stoffes einwirken.

No doubt this opinion was representative for the majority of American Germanists. However, by invoking it, Hohlfeld pushed the question of dishonest authorial intent to the background.
On the whole, Hohlfeld's reports, though weakened by his protective attitude toward German scholars, identified the essence of National Socialist criticism. But he restricted himself to flagrant theories, exaggerations, and omissions and did not discuss the subtler components of the ideology which National Socialism tried to disseminate through its Literaturwissenschaft.

Among the German scholars admired by American Germanists, Julius Petersen loomed the largest. His visit to Stanford University in the summer of 1933 was announced both in German Quarterly and Monatshefte. Already before Hitler's ascent, he had been an extreme cultural nationalist. Pinkerneil describes his Deutschkunde-Bewegung of the pre-Hitler years as a step toward an absolutized Kulturnation in which the individual is part of the Volksgemeinschaft to such a degree that a kollektive Bewusstseinsidentität takes command. But she hastens to add that his Deutschtumsforschung was not based on biological-racial maxims. Ringer considers him as one of those prominent academicians who temporarily deluded themselves about Hitler's regime and who "should probably be described as willing collaborators rather than enthusiastic supporters of National Socialism." We can hardly blame American Germanists for not perceiving before 1933 that Petersen's "nationalisierte Geistesgeschichte" would eventually intertwine with a "Rassenseelenforschung" and become a "faschistische Literaturwissenschaft" during the Third Reich. But when Petersen published "Die Sehnsucht
nach dem Dritten Reich in deutscher Sage und Dichtung" (1934), suspicion should have arisen. In 1935, The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies took a swipe at it: "Professor Petersen has not refrained from contributing his share to the persuasion of the German people that National Socialist ideas have been inherent in their literature for two thousand years." Yet the two American scholars who reviewed the book, Hermann J. Weigand (Yale U) and Hugh W. Puckett (Barnard Coll.), did not seem to perceive any danger in this manipulative scholarship. Weigand assumed an amused position toward the famous seventh chapter (devoted to Hitler's Reich), which he called a "geistgeschichtliches Ballett," that managed to portray NS as the apotheosis of all previous strivings. Weigand's irony indicated an underestimation of Petersen's contribution to the Nazi myth, as did his remark: "Man sieht hier jedenfalls in vorbildlicher Weise das seltene Schauspiel, wie Geistesgeschichte und Politik sich die Hände reichen." It is puzzling that he should call the cooperation of Geistesgeschichte and politics unusual ("selten") whereas in fact it was part of a pattern, indeed a strategy, on the part of the Nazis. Puckett too was more amused by Petersen's skill at juggling facts than indignant about his willingness to conform. It was precisely this impulse of Geistesgeschichte to engage in speculative virtuosity that Spitzer—and many after him—would denounce in 1945 as playing into the hands of Hitlerism. After Petersen's death in 1941, biographies appeared in German
Quarterly and Monatshefte. Monatshefte's Reinhardt presented Petersen's collaboration with NS merely as an inner-scholarly evolution, not as a political accommodation: "His emphasis on the interrelation of life and literature and his conviction that historiography as much as literary and artistic expression are deeply rooted in the life, thought, and culture of the people, made it possible for him to adjust his ways of thinking and feeling to some extent to the current German dogmas of 'blood and soil.'"453 Richard Alewyn (Queens Coll.) was more willing to admit Petersen's mistake: "Keinem Tätigen bleiben Irrtümer und Enttäuschungen erspart. . . . Er hatte mit dem Irrtum vieler Konservativen geglaubt, die nationalsozialistische Revolution begrüssen zu können."454 Even a year after Petersen's death, John Walz went out of his way to prove his integrity. He stated repeatedly that the scholar, although devoting a substantial part of his book to racial consideration, was skeptical of the results of genealogical investigations "so far" and only believed in "eventual" explanations through racial strains. Walz's awareness of Petersen's heresy became clear in his conclusion: five out of eight descriptions of his method actually referred to his moral character, as if to forestall any accusation of corruption: "He presents to us facts and theories calmly, clearly, objectively, impartially, comprehensively, methodically, with sincerity and earnestness."455 This benevolent mood toward Petersen was, of course, partially due to the personal factor. Many must have felt it would be base
to expose the mistake of a man who was not only an eminent scholar but also one who had on many occasions shown great nobility of character: "Als Mensch hat er auch in dieser Zeit nicht versagt. Viele seiner verfolgten Freunde und Schüler wissen von seiner unveränderten Hilfsbereitschaft zu zeugen." Altogether, the attitude toward Petersen was apologetic. The question of his responsibility was not even raised but was circumvented by marginal remarks. This position paralleled some Germanists' approach to another famous personality, Gerhart Hauptmann. At the occasion of his death in 1946, several articles either apologized for his ambivalent position toward the regime or tried to prove his anti-Hitlerism. Only Oskar Seidlin openly accused him.

In this context we should make mention of Karl Viëtor. During the early Nazi years in Germany, he wrote in an anti-Semitic, nationalistic vein. Eventually he emigrated to the U.S., and in 1937 he was installed as Kuno Francke Professor at Harvard. Viëtor's past mistake was never mentioned in Germanistic periodicals. Only once did a language journal refer to it and then to contrast favorably Viëtor's present openmindedness with his former opinions.

It must also be noted that the author was a British Germanist. Whatever criticism might have been voiced in private, it was inconceivable that a Germanistic periodical should blame a man of his scholarly repute.

We now want to examine whether the failure of German academicians to safeguard their independence inspired American
Germanists to a renewed consciousness of their own task. Whereas the rise of Nazism and the threat of war provided new goals, increased responsibility, and vigorous impetus for the Germanists as teachers of language and culture, these events did not spur them to immediate, independent action in the field of literary scholarship. Fife alluded to that lacuna in his presidential address at the MLA meeting of 1944:

> When a colleague has one of his studies accepted for a European periodical or as a volume in a European series, we still are apt to feel that it is an accolade of unusual honor. This is especially the case if his work appears in a foreign language. I am afraid that the scholarly character of the work, which may indeed be high, is less important in our minds than the idea that the contribution shows careful schooling in a foreign technique and the successful adaptation of a foreign pattern. Whatever its value as a work of scholarship, objectively considered, it is a pendant to foreign craftsmanship.

A year later Leo Spitzer voiced the same complaint: "Viëtor scheint die zukünftige Gestaltung der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft vor allem von der des deutschen Nationalschicksals abhängig zu machen—aber wäre es nicht denkbar, dass die deutsch-amerikanischen Lehrer jene massgeblich beeinflussen könnten?" Things might have been different if the war had completely cut off America from the indigenous sources of German literary ideology. As it was, numerous German scholars had taken refuge in this country and many German traditions were reinforced.

It is true, however, that the acquaintance with German scholarship under the Nazi regime seems to have rekindled the
appreciation for the benefits of democracy. Hohlfeld, for instance, juxtaposed his own liberty to conduct an independent workshop to the loss of free speech in Germany. Feise, when attacking Bartels and Kindermann, emphasized again and again that in America nobody felt obliged to agree with their suggestions. A.M. Wagner, rejoicing in the "conversion" of Viëtor, now living in the U.S., added: "The spirit of Karl Follen has come over the author. We are, therefore, justified in assuming that in America where, more than fifty years ago, the first single edition of Danton was published, the first irrefragable biography of Büchner will also appear." And Leo Spitzer attributed the sobering influence of American scholarship on German visitors to the "kühlskeptische Luft Amerikas."

What neither the Nazi dominance over the German intelligentsia nor the threat of war were able to complete, America's victorious involvement in the war did: consolidate the awareness that an independent American Literaturwissenschaft was needed. This awareness was fostered by the growing feeling all over the country that the United States was about to assume political, economical, and cultural leadership in the postwar world. Thus, by the end of the war some strong voices were heard in that direction. Fife alluded to the outcome of the war in his call for a national scholarship in 1944:

We often hear it said that America is to become the center of scholarly research in postwar years, that a bankrupt and
intellectually wasted Europe will send its sons to our universities for higher training, that American libraries will have to fill the gaps in source materials caused by bombs and fires in Europe, and that American scholarship will have to show the way in a humanistic endeavor as well as in the natural sciences. The members of this Association will be the last to believe in such a development or to wish for it. In the post-war world all the varieties of humanistic learning will be as essential as ever before. But even if we do not aspire to the impossible role of leadership in the humanities, we at least want to play our full part in these studies.

And he proclaimed to have witnessed the dawn of a new American scholarship:

There are signs that the Modern Language Association is making ready for this with a broadened vision and self-confidence. A dozen years ago there were many who felt that we were in danger of stagnation. Our research interest followed in the old grooves or sought to imitate foreign patterns; too many of us seemed to be comfortable in the ivory tower. Everyone who examines the programs that were prepared for the two annual meetings that could not be held and especially the program of the present meeting will be struck by the vigorous way in which research groups are seeking new interests.465

Three other prominent critics issued memorable appeals for a renewal of Germanistik, all of them influenced by the events of the time: Karl Viétor (1945), Leo Spitzer (1945), and Werner Richter (1946). Viétor proclaimed the end of the geistesgeschichtliche Literaturbetrachtung and mentioned Nazism as one of the causes for the demise. "Der politische Terror hat die Zersetzung der philosophischen Position beschleunigt und zudem eine tiefgehende Korruption der
intellektuellen Redlichkeit hervorgerufen.\textsuperscript{466} Although still viewing the future development of German studies mainly as a function of Germany, he protested against the narrow nationalism of recent German \textit{Literaturwissenschaft}. Werner Richter (Elmhurst Coll.), who still believed in \textit{Geistesgeschichte} as the main goal of literary criticism, based his demand for a renewed, more internationally geared \textit{Literaturwissenschaft} on the tragic experience of the war: "Der Sinn des zweiten Weltkrieges würde verfälscht, wenn sein Ende und der kommende Friede nicht ein Abflauen und Absterben des nationalistischen Geistes auch in der Forschung gewährleistete." He also stressed the importance of American Germanists to achieve this goal: "Eine Klärung der Lage wird von Amerika mit größerer Zuversicht erwartet werden dürfen als vom verstörten und gelähmten Europa.\textsuperscript{467} The strongest and most direct appeal for a more independent American \textit{Germanistik} stemmed from Leo Spitzer (1945).\textsuperscript{468} He drew his inspiration directly from the corruption of German scholarship, specifically \textit{Geistesgeschichte}, from his appreciation of American democracy as well as from his vision of America's postwar role. In later years, all through the sixties, the three articles would be referred to for their challenging but optimistic positions.\textsuperscript{469}

In conclusion then, we see that between 1930 and 1933 German \textit{Literaturwissenschaft} was evaluated in several articles. During the period 1933-45, extensive articles dealt with problems of interest to \textit{Germanistik} as a whole but did
not address Nazi methodology specifically. Analyses of individual works of Nazi literary criticism were done, but with a few exceptions they were limited to book reviews. From this sparse source material we can conclude that American Germanists did not hesitate to denounce the negative treatment of certain tendencies and authors, above all the unfairness toward Jewish writers. But only seldom were they apprehensive or critical of philosophical one-sidedness, because they did not perceive the connection with NS perversions and hence they presented it as a positive feature of the NS literary platform. For instance, they did not associate extreme nationalism, Volkstum, and exalted irrationalism with categories which the political system eventually forced upon daily life, such as blind obedience to the Führer, racism, and Blut und Boden mysticism. To discern this interaction was, admittedly, not easy because American Germanists, like Anglists or scholars of other foreign literatures, thought of Literaturforschung in terms of philosophy and abstraction rather than as a reflection of reality. The same tradition that had blinded some Germanistic scholars in Germany to their own involuntary contribution to Nazism also hindered Americans in perceiving it: "Eben infolge der zäh wurzelnden Tradition von der geistig-seelischen Begründung des Deutschtums wurden [die deutschen Germanisten ]der radikalen und pragmatischen Materialisierung der Blut-und Rassemetaphern in der NS-Politik kaum oder erst spät gewahr. Also, in their courtesy and loyalty, Americans tended to ascribe the reasons for the
pro-Nazi position of their German colleagues to the rightist Zeitgeist rather than to political partisanship or opportunism, or else they portrayed them as victims. To them, pointing out the facts must have appeared as total and automatic condemnation of the person. And Germanists definitely did not join scholars of other departments who demanded that Nazi literary theorists be punished after the war.

Finally, toward the end of the war, German Geistesgeschichte was assailed for its involvement with Nazism. But the call for an independent American Germanistik seems to have originated not only from the disillusion with the corrupted literary criticism in Germany but equally from the general feeling in this country—both in academic and non-academic circles—that due to its decisive and victorious role in the war, America was destined to play a leadership role in the world of the future.
CONCLUSION

When remembering the years 1930-46, Sol Liptzin remarks that "the picture [of the profession] was much more complex than written records show . . ." and that the periodicals did not adequately reflect the "hornet's nest" of the professional background.\(^72\) Indeed, the journals present us only with the image that Germanists wanted to project into the outside world, to their students, and to their colleagues in academia. That aspect in itself, however, is an intrinsic part of the history (and myth) of American Germanistik. In addition, despite the restraint of the authors and the censorship exerted by editors and presidents of associations, the periodicals do reveal the underlying complexity of the Germanistic profession at that time.

Undeniably, Nazism and World War II put their mark on the profession. Not only did they affect the subjects of writings, but they also forced the members of the profession to reflect on their task in a time of crisis: define the responsibility of the teacher and scholar in the mediation of a culture which suddenly was no longer in harmony with their own. Regrettably, this problem was not extensively debated; moreover, the discussions centered on
classroom communication only, they did not lead to assessments of the overall function of Germanistik.

By 1930, American Germanists no longer thought of German literature (and culture) as superior; rather they wanted to be mediators of a culture that complemented the American. At whom was their mediation directed? Because of what has been called "[der] Schwund der deutschen Kultur im amerikanischen Bewusstsein" after 1917, Germanistik could no longer automatically rely on the German-American segment of the population either as an audience or as a community from which to draw students. Hence integration into mainstream America was more vital than ever. Germanistik's response to Nazism, therefore, can to an extent be seen as part of the profession's striving for acceptance and survival.

As I have stated earlier, the profession's attitude toward Nazism evolved over broadly three periods, corresponding with events in Germany and aligned with the prevailing political mood in the country. Henry J. Schmidt has defined the history of Germanistik as "the history of [its] Americanization." During 1930-46, then, the path to integration implied dealing with the question of how to present assimilation of the culture of an alien regime as a desirable goal for American students. In each period this question was approached in several ways. Throughout 1930-46, a majority of Germanists, including the professional associations and the editors of the periodicals, preferred to ignore the political realities. I have on different occasions explored the reasons for this
attitude. In the early and mid-thirties this silence vis-à-vis Nazism was in concordance with the non-involvement and appeasement approach of many politicians. There were, however, also numerous Germanists—but still a minority—who stated their opinion about the Nazi regime. For this group, too, I have attempted to determine the reasons which prompted them either to defend or to attack the New Germany. In some scholars on either side, the atmosphere of political crisis kindled emotional involvement and missionary zeal. To protect their subject, they both attempted to portray Germany as an estimable object of study: one side maintained that the New Germany was merely the natural continuation of the old; the other side, while condemning the regime, presented it as a challenge to the observer, and built its hopes on "the other Germany," the one of the future. In their study of German literature, the same juxtapositions were manifest. One side resorted to dehistoricizing literature in order to prove its innocent nature, while the other tended to range all inner-German literature under the Blut und Boden category.

After 1939, as the American public overwhelmingly rejected the Third Reich and no American Germanists defended it anymore, there existed also less need to attack it. The professional involvement with subjects other than language and literature regenerated, but it took the form of patriotism and support of democracy. Even the professional organizations ventured to acknowledge political realities, albeit to a modest degree. The theoretical support for democracy was
complemented by an active participation in the war effort. This increased student enrollment and added legitimacy to the profession's existence in the public view. It also enabled Germanists to come to Germany's aid—i.e., the Germany of the future—at the end of the war. In literature, several specific issues of inner-German literature were explored, such as e.g., Heimatkunst and literature of opposition. Finally, in alignment with the optimistic and self-confident mood of the country in 1944, the demand for an independent American scholarship grew. To counteract the dangers of nationalism, comparative literature and werkimmanente Methode seemed appropriate. They were also thought to bring German studies in closer contact with other faculties of American academia. At the same time, however, this would mean a return to the study of literature, not a continuation of the culture studies begun in the thirties.

All through 1930-46, Germanists also struggled considerably with two ideological problems, resulting from the confrontation with Nazism. They are enduring problems that stimulate today's Germanist as well. The first concerned the "objectivity" of the teacher. Germanists worried whether politics could or should be discussed in the classroom. Many ignored or opposed the issue. For those who did favor classroom discussions, many questions remained. These Germanists were convinced that teachers should present all sides of an issue, but they also realized that in so pervasive and burning an issue as Hitler's regime it would be
unavoidable to take sides. Therefore some deemed it wiser not to broach political subjects at all. A few recognized historical circumstances as inherent determinants of their task and encouraged partisanship. However, they put one restriction on it by allowing the teacher to propagandize only the democratic viewpoint. Regrettably, it was never discussed to what extent differing political opinions could be exposed.

A second problem concerned literary criticism. The Nazi era demonstrated the value of two entirely different concepts of literary criticism: one that is polemic and primarily aimed at fighting what is considered evil, and one that seeks in literature that which is common to all people. 1933-46 was a time of crisis and therefore a time of extreme positions, especially between 1933 and 1939. Precisely because many scholars ignored the perversion of Blut und Boden literature and some even acclaimed it, others rightly deemed it necessary to dramatize its aberrations. In order to highlight the physiognomy of evil they exaggerated the extent of its influence, thereby including all inner-German literature into their condemnation. But after 1940, when blood and soil literature no longer drew attention, more sophistication was required vis-à-vis the so-called "neutral" literature. We must underscore anew the perceptiveness of the scholars who detected the infiltration of Nazism into such seemingly innocent genres as Heimatkunst or colonial novels. But it was equally important to weigh the neutral authors' positive features against their negative ones—without minimizing the
latter—and judge the writers on the merit of their total work (this balance being different from objectivity that seeks to avoid commitment). It is only regrettable that in their desire to reach such balance, Rehder and the reviewers of War and the German Mind for instance, overlooked the negative sides of the authors, and thus defeated the purpose of their approach.

Further, we want to bring into question again the attitude underlying the indirect defenses of the Third Reich by such prestigious Germanists as Edwin Zeydel and by some less known scholars as well. It would appear that their sympathy for the New Germany was part of their justifiable, conservative pride in the "old Germany" which, in their opinion, after years of war, humiliation, and economic depression, was finally being resurrected in the form of the "New Germany." It is telling that the apologists for Nazi Germany spoke out during 1933-39, i.e., before the concept "collective guilt" originated. However, since by 1935 the infractions upon basic human rights and the terror against minorities had become so ingrained in the pattern of German society, one must reproach Zeydel and others for not counterbalancing the open support for the achievements of the system with a rejection of its aberrations.

Finally, we should confront once more the Hatfield-Merrick contention that in a time of crisis Germanists failed to "interpret the German mind to a puzzled nation." Indeed, most individuals were not willing to commit themselves to public statements. And one must certainly deplore the absence
of comment, initiative, or guidance from the side of the professional associations and the editors of journals. But we must also repeat our reservations to the Hatfield-Merrick accusation because a great many Germanists did exhibit an interest in the political situation. Only private and departmental archives might reveal to what extent these Germanists perhaps tried to reach a public beyond the academic world. Some explained their position in non-academic periodicals. In addition, besides the subjects mentioned throughout this dissertation, Germanists considered other issues directly related to Nazism, such as: the literary precursors of Nazism (Especially Herder, the Romanticists, late nineteenth and early twentieth century authors like Nietzsche, Wagner, or George had been accused of giving rise to Nazism, and Germanists examined whether they deserved this reputation); traditional German authors who became Nazi favorites (e.g., Kolbenheyer, Ernst, Binding, Hans Grimm); the relevance of classic authors in the fight against Nazism; philological-historical articles about the origin of the German language and the German people. These articles too should be examined for their relevance to the study of German scholarship in the Nazi era. We can only guess whether a more systematic, comprehensive approach to Nazism, or one that aimed at a broader public, would also have strengthened the bonds between Germanistik and the American people.
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