

Dalibor JOVANOVSKI

UDK: 37.014.3(=112.2):355.02(73:410)
Original research paper**THE POST-WAR RE-EDUCATION OF THE GERMANS –
AMERICAN AND BRITISH REFLECTIONS****Abstract:**

The military actions, the loss of human lives and especially the cruelty of the Nazi and Fascist regimes and armies caused a reaction among the allied governments, the public and intellectuals. The Nazi regime in Germany and its actions, in general, even before the beginning of WWII caused an initially mild and later a sharp reaction and criticism in the democratic world. However, the behaviour and fanaticism of the German armed forces and their atrocities during the war could not but cause reflections about how the allied countries, especially the larger ones, should deal with the defeated Germany. The experience of WWI had shown that German Nazism had, as its basis, the militarism which was present everywhere, including in the educational process. That is why many in the United States and Great Britain began to think aloud about a complete change of the German educational system and the re-education of the Germans after the military victory. There was a great dilemma over the questions of how to carry out that re-education, whether to include only the younger population that was exposed to Nazi indoctrination, and whether Germans who were opponents of Nazism should be included in that process. The debates were conducted among politicians, in the public, among scholars and scientists. The view that gradually prevailed was that the issue was complex and that some Germans should be involved in the re-education process after the War.

Keywords: *Germany, re-education, Nazism, USA, Great Britain*

When I became a member of the Macedonian-Greek Joint Interdisciplinary Committee of Experts on historical, archaeological and educational issues, I started researching the beginnings and development of the joint/bilateral historical committees. The process began in the interwar period in order to reduce prejudices in history textbooks, geography textbooks, and mother tongue textbooks. Namely, the intellectuals believed that one of the reasons for WWI was precisely the state of the texts in the textbooks. However, despite the noble intention, WWII broke out in 1939, far bloodier than the previous one, followed by the racist extermination of Slavs, Jews and Roma by the Nazi German soldiers. It was these developments that contributed to the emergence of thoughts and ideas in the countries that belonged to the Anti-Fascist Coalition for a complete change in the educational system, curricula and textbooks of the Axis powers. The purpose of this contribution is to present the thoughts and ideas on changing the German educational system, curricula and textbooks after the end of the War, which appeared in the United States and Great Britain. During my research, I came across a study by the Centre for Public Opinion Research at the University of Denver, which during the War was also engaged in researching the American public opinion on the military situation and the opportunities after the War. In a study of the aforementioned centre concerning post-war Germany, I encountered questions related to the way a defeated Germany should be treated. One of the issues concerns the re-education of the Germans after the end of the hostilities. According to the authors of the survey attached to the study, the majority of those surveyed believed that the Germans should have been given a chance through education to erase the thinking imposed on them by the 12-year Nazi dictatorship. In that direction, 65% of those polled responded positively to the question of re-education of the German population, the percentage of which was dominated by those who believed that Germans could be good citizens compared to those who believed that they always wanted to wage wars (Germany and the post-war, 1945: 4). These questions concerning re-education, posed to the public or to those interested, were not new. In a small study on the stake of man in peace, actually based on a report of the Commission for the Study of the Organization for Peace, we encounter a piece of information and a question on re-education after the War. In the part of the study that refers to post-war education, several questions for reflection are asked, referring to the re-education of the citizens of the countries that fought on the side of the Axis. Among other things, the authors enquire how the process of re-education should be put into practice and what means it should be done with. (Your stake in the peace, 1943: 26). These reflections, as well a number of articles and books I came across in my research, gave me the idea to address the question of the re-education of the Germans and the discussions that took place in this regard in the USA and the UK during WWII, because after the victory of the Allies, a process of re-education and denazification was carried out in occupied Germany for real. Here I will refer to the discussions of scientists and intellectuals that were published in journals,

brochures, books and in newspapers, which carried out the promotion and propaganda of the topic.

The importance of German re-education went so far that some considered it more than necessary for future peace. Walter Kotching noted in one of his books that the success or failure of the new peace agreement, and, thus, the future of humanity, would depend on the success or failure of the re-education of Germany (Kotching, 1943: 185)

In the flurry of ideas about how and who should carry out the re-education of the German population after the war, Joseph Katz's article regarding the mentioned topic is rather interesting. He explains in detail the reason for the wartime behaviour of the Germans and the way the Nazis managed to influence the education of the Germans in a relatively short period of time. He notes that the process of reorientation of the Germans is more than necessary because of everything that happened during the war, noting that the debate is open as to how that process, together with the re-education, would be carried out (Katz, 1943: 318). According to him, after more than eight years of Nazi propaganda, it would be difficult to expect the Germans to locate their real problems on their own, and, therefore, he believes that the process should be led from the outside. Katz thinks that foreign participation in the process of re-education of the Germans is justified, while noting that diversity in tradition and customs should be taken into account (idem: 319). He suggests that the process of the re-education of the Germans should be led by experienced people who would know how to deal with the problem. The author of the article also notes that a problem in the re-education process will be the German teachers, who were fed National Socialist ideas (idem: 320). In that direction, it is interesting to note that Katz warns about the caution with which re-education should be carried out, in order not to hurt German feelings, and, thus, not producing results.

The American psychiatrist Lowrey, referring to the idea of the re-education of the Germans, believed that according to certain proposals it was possible to achieve a significant re-education of a large part of the German people through being taught by their own teachers. However, he notes that these proposals were conspicuously missing the basic fact of the German mind and thinking: "everyone in Germany is indoctrinated with the theory of German superiority," and "the idea of the nation as a whole had been persecuted in this war, as in past wars" (Fritz, 2019: 34). Therefore, he felt that it was unlikely that German teachers could carry out the process of re-educating the population, proposing that the Americans stand at the head of that process instead.

In the course of my research, I encountered several radical ideas regarding the way in which the re-education of the Germans should be carried out after the end of the War. Here, for the sake of space, we will refer to just one. Gregor Ziemer, who wrote about the infatuation of German youth with Nazi ideology, noted that one of the ways of re-education was increased bombing of Germany by the Allied air forces (Ziemer, 1943: 586). Despite this radical proposal for a kind of re-education, which is a normal part of any war, Ziemer

proposed to include in the process those German teachers who had been fired by the Nazis, as well as American personnel who had visited Germany before the start of the War and had some insight into the educational process in the country (idem: 588). According to him, the textbooks that would be printed had to be under strict supervision, and the staff that would be sent to occupy Germany should apply American educational methods. He proposes that the experts should compile the new curricula according to American experiences (idem: 590).

In her study of the treatment of Germans after the War, Laura Morgan also refers to re-education. She raises the question of whether education would be imposed from the outside or would be left to the Germans themselves, especially among proven anti-Nazis (Morgan, 1944: 89). For her, before starting with the application of re-education, it is necessary to conduct a real study of the problem surrounding the whole process, and, therefore, she refers to several studies and reflections on this issue. Based on what was quoted, she was seemingly of the opinion that the re-education of the Germans, after a certain period of occupation and foreign management of the educational system there, should still be the work of the Germans themselves (idem: 98)

The Association of American Historians has had several debates over the re-education process in Germany. In one of the brochures issued by this association, intended for the needs of the American army, we notice interesting considerations concerning the education in post-war occupied Germany. According to the compilers of the brochure, although American control over German education was the prevailing stance, it was an idea that had to face two difficulties. The first, according to them, was the possibility of strong resistance to the control and management of education by foreigners, who were also former enemies. The second difficulty was the unfeasibility of the permanent occupation of the country. Therefore, they proposed that, after a certain period of time, education should be returned to the Germans, who had to fight for democracy in their country on their own. (What shall be done, 1944, 18-19)

Great Britain was part of the wide anti-fascist and anti-Nazi coalition and an important partner of the United States not only in the military field, but also in non-military activities, including the issue of education and re-education of the defeated Germans. It is logical that Great Britain started thinking about this topic very early, considering that this great power had been at war with the Third Reich from the very beginning of WWII, that is, from September 1939, and it had been fighting with the forces of the Axis immediately after the French defeat and capitulation in June of the following year. British intellectuals and scholars had the experience of the previous War, after which Germany was not subjected to the process of re-education and change of the educational system with the aim of extinguishing militarism, which was the basis for the emergence of National Socialism; very early, in the very initial phase of military actions, they began considering options for changes in German education. Kurt Jürgensen noted that, from the very beginning of WWII, there was talk in Great

Britain of educating the Germans after the defeat of the Nazis. He refers to Lord Halifax's speech of November 3, 1939, where, among other things, the British Foreign Secretary emphasized that this fight is also a fight for the liberation of the German people, who should be educated in the direction of tolerance and compromise. (Jürgensen, 1983: 226). Here we would like to mention Steed, well known in Balkan and Macedonian affairs. In 1940, he notes in one of his books: "A longer process of re-education under certain forms of supervision will be necessary to erase these notions and replace them with others, which enlightened Germans in the past struggled to instil in their countrymen." (Liddell, 1948:35) The causes of the War, as well as the consequences after the decisions of the Versailles Peace Conference and Hitler's coming to power in Germany, caused an interesting discussion in Great Britain. Lord Vansittart published a book in which he blamed all Germans for the actions of the Nazis, both in Germany and abroad (Vansittart, 1941:8). His position did not meet with the approval of the British government, which through Harrison, a senior advisor in the Foreign Office, emphasized that the goal was justice for the German people, not condemnation (Jürgensen, 1983: 227). A debate also developed in the British Parliament regarding Vansittart's views. Most members, such as Lord Nathan and the Earl of Mansfield, did not support Vansittart's radical views, but there were some, such as the Marquess of Donegal, who sided with him. It is interesting to note that Vansittart does not mention the term "re-education of the Germans" in the 1941 edition of his book. However, in the American edition of the same book, he defines four pillars for the future with Germany, including re-education. For him, four steps were needed for future security from German aggression: military defeat, demilitarization, occupation, and re-education (Vansittart, 1944: 5). He believed that the Germans could be re-educated, in time, although he had little faith in the then-German generation which had caused the War with enormous human suffering (Goldman, 1979: 181). Commissioned by the Rockefeller Research Committee of the London School of Economics and Political Science, Professor Wolff made a detailed analysis of the Nazi influence on higher education in Germany after 1933. It is interesting to note that in his analysis Wolff noted how successful the Nazis were in turning German higher education into a tool of evil, from which the world suffered and will continue to suffer. He noted that his work showed how serious of a problem German re-education will be, connecting it with the character of the Germans (Wolf, 1944: 99). In that direction, he calls for caution in future reforms and de-Nazification of German higher education, calling for a strict selection of teaching staff and future students (idem: 100-101). Shortly before the end of the War, Major Evans of the British Army wrote a text dedicated to the re-education of the Germans. For him, the basic pre-requisite for the beginning of any process related to German education was the complete defeat of the Nazi army (Evans, 1945: 24). Probably as a result of the discussions that took place in Great Britain, Evans advocated the inclusion of Germans in the re-education process after a certain period of foreign interference. Of course, for him, the participation

of the teaching staff who were part of the Nazi party was out of the question (idem: 27). In his text, there is a rather interesting proposal, which would be very relevant today in the Macedonian situation. Namely, Evans believed that one of the goals of German education should be good neighbourly relations, not only within the future world community, but also outside it (idem: 28). It shows that one of the shortcomings of German education, and not only in the Nazi period, was precisely the representation of the neighbours, that is, the emphasis on German superiority.

In 1940, Professor Dodds produced a memorandum in which he referred to the possibility of re-education of the Germans in the event of a British military victory. He believed from the very beginning that the re-education process would be very complex, because without the domestic support of a future German government, there would not be any tangible results in that regard. According to him, there can be no results if the process of re-education is done only by the foreign factor (Phillips, 1986: 196). Dodds kept his opinion the following year, as well. According to him, Erika Mann's idea of the dominance of British and American teachers and staff in that process was a serious utopia. For him, it was almost impossible to carry out a complete re-education without the participation of the Germans (idem: 199). As a recognized authority, Dodds participated in the conference in Sutton in March 1942, where he again spoke about re-education, arguing that the purge of the Nazis from the educational process was necessary, but that it should be carried out by the Germans themselves (idem: 200). Three months later he warned that the idea of returning education to the principles of Weimar Germany would be suicide and an opportunity to create a new Hitler. Dodds admitted that he did not like the term re-education, but still offered his own ideas on how to implement it. In 1944, when the fate of the Reich was already clear, he referred to this process again. Dodds believed that the textbooks had to be controlled, but not the spirit of teaching, advising the preparation of local teachers with the occupation authorities, who should create conditions for the re-education of the Germans. He suggested that the process be made legal not by coercion and imposition of democracy, but by meeting the professional grievances of German teachers that mean more to the common man than any political thesis (idem: 202). Dodds would later lecture on the importance of German universities in the process of rebuilding German education. He was also the first chairman of the Textbook Committee, where a discussion was held on the purification of texts that contained strong Nazi propaganda, as well as the preparation of new curricula and textbooks where the process of re-education would be visible. (Phillips, 2019: 254)

Gilbert Murray promoted his activity on the issue of the re-education of Germans in the post-war period in influential newspapers in the United States. In the *New York Times*, he discussed the issue, raising some questions about how this would be done. Without any detour, he believed that re-education itself could not be carried out if it consisted only of imposing the beliefs held by the opponents of Germany. However, he felt there was room for optimism,

reasoning that perhaps the Germans, freed from Hitlerism, would want to teach their own children's different doctrines from the Nazis ones. Murray supports this hope of his with the memory of the middle generation of Germans who had a different education compared to that of the Nazis, who based their education on racial biology, which is unacceptable. According to him, they also had a bad experience with the system of the Gestapo. For the English professor of classical studies, there was hope that this part of the German population, as he observed traditional Germany, still remembered that their country was a place where artists and thinkers thrived. (*The Re-educating Germany*, 1943: 5)

Even during the War, the British were analysing the German textbooks from the time of the Weimar Republic as a possible temporary replacement for the Nazi ones during the process of the re-education of the Germans. During the German air raids on London, Terence Leonard was instructed by the later Director of the Education Department of the Control Commission for Germany to examine textbooks from the Weimar Republic to see if they would be good for use by teachers after the country had been defeated. The results were more or less negative. (*Schüddekopf*, 1967: 24)

The well-known Henry Noel Brailsford, an influential and experienced British scholar, joined the discussions about the need and the ways to re-educate the Germans after the War. In an interesting way, he offered ways in which the Germans would be re-educated, which were not always related to the educational process. So Brailsford believed that it was the duty of the victors to take over the Germans from the Nazis and give them over to humanity – but this must ultimately be carried out by the Germans themselves. For him, the return to rational Western civilization should not be imposed with new dogmas but should stimulate free discussions and objective opinion – and that would be the re-education of the Germans (*Brailsford*, 1944: 95-96). As one of the ways to re-educate the German population, Brailsford suggested involving the population in the reconstruction of the devastated country. But also, as a way for the Germans to return to where they belonged and to be re-educated, he proposed an increased participation of young people in the exchange of pupils, students and teaching staff after the end of the War in order for the Germans to get to know others better. (*idem*: 102)

In the introductory text of a joint Proceedings of the London Peace Council and the Council for the Education of World Citizenship, the aforementioned Gilbert Murray noted that the drafters of the Versailles Peace Treaty were interested in political solutions, at the same time devoting little space to economic solutions and no proposals for education (*Education and United Nations*, 1943: 5). Therefore, it is not at all surprising that in the joint report of these two British organizations, great attention is paid to the issue of re-education of post-Nazi Germany and its allies, primarily Japan and Italy; Bulgaria is also mentioned, for which additional studies were meant to be carried out. This extensive report shows that, in order to erase the traces of Nazism and the German militarism that preceded it, a complete re-education and

recomposing of the German education system was required. In that direction, the destruction of the entire Nazi organization in Germany was proposed as a pre-requisite for the new education (idem: 49). The authors of the joint report believed that, in the process of re-education, the Germans should not be placed in a position of complete inferiority, because this would hamper the whole process. However, they proposed the appointment of a High Commissioner for Education by the Allies whose work would begin immediately after the occupation of Germany (idem: 51). For a better implementation of the whole process, it was necessary to dissolve and destroy the Nazi Party, to close the Party schools, and to conduct a vetting process of all employees of the Ministry of Education, universities, secondary and primary schools, as well as other educational institutions. All those associated with the Nazi government were to be removed from the educational process of new Germany (idem). Regarding the issue of teachers in the educational process, it was perceived that this would be a serious problem, considering the connection of a significant segment of the educational staff with the Nazi government in the country. This is why it was proposed that, if some of them were to be retained, then they should be subject to more frequent inspections by the new authorities, as well as allied controls. Regarding the teaching materials, in addition to the complete withdrawal and ban on the use of textbooks and additional resources from the Nazi era, it was proposed to use materials from the time of the Weimar Republic until new editions could be printed (idem: 55). It is interesting to note that with regard to history as part of the educational process, the authors of the report proposed the printing of appropriate books that would point out the falsification of history by the Nazis, the false racial theories, as well as the false ethics and political philosophy that were served to the masses as an ultimate result of science (idem: 63). The opening of summer schools, as well as trips abroad in order to learn and become familiar with the teaching methods, were proposed as a significant tool in the re-education of the Germans.

The activity of the aforementioned London Peace Council continued unabated. This is not at all surprising, considering that its membership included influential British public and scientific figures, who pledged their authority in the direction of explaining the need for re-education of the Germans after the end of the War. In 1944, this Council published a booklet devoted to the conditions for a constructive peace. Here we again encounter the idea of the re-education of the Germans after the War, with a proposal that it should not be violent, but that it should be promoted through cooperation with the defeated and the restoration of contacts with them (The conditions, 1944: 6). In the brochure, we also find an interesting piece of information: the idea of world citizenship education in each of the countries after the War as a factor in world politics and in the mutual understanding of peoples, followed by internationalism through the study of foreign languages, cultures and world history, travel schemes and exchange students. (The conditions, 1944: 7). This would not be the last instance of such thinking.

The considerations of the London Peace Council are not the only ones we came across in our research. In his article dedicated to education for world citizenship, James Quillen noted that being a world citizen meant, among other things, being a citizen of a world government (Quillen, 1944: 122). This idealistic notion of his is not surprising considering the whirlwind of war he witnessed, followed by a huge loss of human life in the fight against an ideology or ideologies, such as Nazism and Fascism, which posed a danger to humanity and civilization, in general. That is why we are not surprised by his proposals to eliminate materials in curricula and textbooks that encourage intolerance, prejudice and wars among the nations of the world (*idem*). Instead, he believed that a wider study of the humanities should be provided as a means of developing human relations and international understanding, as well as stabilizing basic human values. In that context, Quillen also addressed history and the need to study it, but from another aspect. According to him, history could be a strong force that would lead to international cooperation. Thus, the victories of peace could be described in history textbooks that would be used in civic education, as had been done in Swiss textbooks (*idem*: 124). For him, textbooks would develop an understanding of other cultures and nations in the world, and special attention would be given to the study of neighbouring nations. These considerations were not without foundation. At a higher level, talks were already held and there was an exchange of ideas about the future of education in the post-war world, which would run together with the re-education of the Germans and other defeated nations. In 1943 the International Assembly at Harper's Ferry offered some suggestions as to how the United Nations should continue to function after the end of the War. These suggestions foresaw the exchange of ideas, cultural and scientific materials, as well as of students, teachers and scientists. Attention was meant to be paid to the interdependence of nations and citizenship in the global community, eliminating educational and cultural activities that threatened peaceful relations among nations (Brown, 1943: 232). In this regard, we ought to mention that in the joint report from 1943, the two British councils indicated the promotion of education for world citizenship as urgently necessary for building a better world after the War (Education and the United Nations, 1943:104). Otherwise, on the issue of organizing some kind of a global government in order to avoid WWII and the chaos that would arise, Arnold Toynbee, one of the leading British historians of that period, offers interesting insights. Toynbee worked for the British Ministry of Foreign Affairs where, under his leadership, prominent intellectuals made analyses on how to organize things after the end of the War, certainly in the British interest. He received permission to visit Washington on the condition that he would not make a statement to the media there. The visit was organized by the Rockefeller Foundation. On October 7, 1942, at Princeton University, the British historian met with a group of American intellectuals to whom he clearly expressed his vision of establishing some kind of a global government as a solution to the problems. He also mentioned the need for the creation of a World Association

of Nations, which would later include the defeated Axis powers (McNeill, 1989, 183).

The president of the American Peace Society, Philip Marshall Brown, held similar thoughts as Murray. In one of his articles devoted to the question of how to deal with the Germans after the end of the War, Brown concluded that the re-education or psychological disarmament of the Germans was primarily their problem, which the victors could only help with appropriate methods, with the aim of fundamentally changing the German mentality (Brown, 1943: 232). For him, this process in some way represented a war for the liberation of the Germans themselves, as they were the first victims of their warlords and Nazi fanatics. (idem: 234)

In the debate on the re-education of the Germans after the end of the War, we can find interesting differing opinions that offered thought-provoking ideas and views on the whole problem and indicated where ideas for the whole process could be found at the local German level. American journalist Dorothy Thompson does this in one of her articles. According to her, it is not only education in the Reich and fascist Italy that generated unacceptable ideas that made humanity suffer; these ideologies can flourish in any part of the world. Thompson, therefore, recalls the shortcomings of the American educational system, but expresses doubt that those dealing with the problem of re-education had any prior knowledge of the German educational system during the time of Hitler and his rise to power. As such, she suggests that they study the attempt of the educational commission during the Weimar Republic (or the German Republic, as she calls it) to reform the educational system in order to conform to the idea of the liberal state as a good neighbour of the states that surrounded it. According to her, the report of the Commission contained interesting things that would be useful for both the Germans and the Americans (Thompson, 1943: 8). These thoughts of Thompson's, who had lived in Germany before the War and had criticized the Hitler regime, show us that there were different ways of thought about the way the re-education of the Germans should be carried out. Before the very end of the War, Thompson clearly advocated the inclusion of anti-Nazi Germans in the process of re-education of their compatriots (Thompson, 1945: 4). In that context, Robert Ergang noted in 1943 that there were two camps in the discussions surrounding the issue of re-education. One was the most radical, where they believed that a strict educational policy had to be followed because the Germans were brutal and militaristic, stressing that it would be a mistake to treat them too leniently with the Versailles Peace Treaty of 1919. Others thought that not all Germans had accepted Hitler and Nazism and, therefore, believed that with the elimination of the Nazi cancer, peace would be possible with Germany, which should be re-admitted to the community of nations. (Ergang, 1943: 469-470).

In our contribution, we would also dwell on some thoughts of Germans who lived in the USA and had intriguing insights about the possibility of success of the re-education of their compatriots after the end of the War. Thus, Ulich

noted that, after the initial euphoria about the process of radical re-education of the Germans, more understandable and calmer ideas began to be discussed. He noted in the course of the whole process that the behaviour of the Soviets after the War should also be taken into account. Delving into an analysis of the future post-war situation in defeated Germany, he noted that foreigners there would face a population full of anger, eager for revenge and ignorant of the outside world. Ulich warned that even those Germans who had not been Nazi sympathizers would not have wanted to enter into open cooperation with the occupation authorities, fearing that they would be branded as collaborators (Ulich, 1943: 154). Commenting on some ideas about controlling German education through a High Commissioner for that purpose, he noted that there was a danger of resistance to such control, but on the other hand, without it, there was opportunity for extremist teachers to take control again and offer young Germans a new nationalist myth (idem: 157). He proposed a softer, long-term approach to the process of returning to the normality of German education, referring to the tradition in the country that was longer as compared to other nations. It is interesting to note that Ulich also pointed to a problem that was related to the so-called German character. He believed that the confusion in the minds of the Germans was partly caused by the tolerance of the democratic states towards Hitler in the time before the start of the War and, therefore, called for caution in the assessment of the German character (idem: 164). In his article devoted to the thoughts and ideas on German re-education, Foerster raised compelling topics for all those concerned with the future of the mentioned process. Namely, unlike the others, he held a different attitude regarding the question of which age group should be a priority for re-education. According to him, the German youth was so enamoured with National Socialism that it was not possible to quickly convince them of Hitler's insanity. That is why he believed that re-education should initially cover the older generation, while history teachers, in order to reduce the feeling of specialness and self-sufficiency, should turn to the question what Germany owes to the East, Rome, France, the Mediterranean, and the Anglo-Saxons. (Foerster, 1945: 499). Towards the stated goal of re-education, Foerster proposed publishing and distributing copious literature centred on the facts and the responsibility for what had happened, in order to disinfect the Germans from Nazi indoctrination. Otherwise, as he emphasized, the desire to change the consciousness of the Germans would bear no results. (idem: 501). Ergang believed that, in order to achieve permanent peace after the end of the War, the German minds had to be instilled with the idea that their army was not invincible, but defeated, and that this should be a part of the re-education (Ergang, 1943: 326). He also listed a second factor in the process - that the Germans had to be instilled with a sense of guilt for the wars that were caused by their leadership. Concerning the issue on how to carry out the entire re-education process, Ergang is very clear and firm. According to him, if the Germans did not accept re-education on a voluntary basis, then it should be imposed by force. Another German, Werner Riechter, wrote a

fascinating book dedicated precisely to the re-education of his compatriots after the end of the War. According to him, Germany had to be cleansed of militarism and blind obedience to authority, and for this purpose it had to start from primary education. If this were not done, then there would be no future for the re-education of the Germans (Riechter, 1945: 190). Riechter believed that the re-education of the Germans could be implemented as a kind of colonial policy, although it was a big question whose colony the country would be. That is why he proposed the establishment of an educational system that would be a mixture of Anglo-Saxon and Soviet approaches. (idem: 212-213)

The topic of the re-education of the Germans did not cease to be present in American daily newspapers. In November 1944, a thought-provoking analysis appeared, which touched upon the problem of the almost impossible re-education of the Germans after the end of the War. In fact, this analysis was reprinted from the Bulletin of the Department of State; its author was the specialist for Central Europe, Leon Fuller. Fuller believed that after the end of the War, the occupation authorities would face a huge problem in their attempt to re-educate the German population. According to him, this was due to the strong Nazi propaganda, led by Joseph Goebbels. Fuller believed that the Nazis succeeded in instilling an evil spirit in the population through complete control of education. In that direction, he noted, the issue of cultural and intellectual values had been neglected in German education, there had been misinformation through twisted teaching of history, science and the racial concept, insertion of falsified and unethical ideas, subordination of education to total war (Re-education of Germans, 1944: 2). However, despite his pessimism, he believed that ultimately there would be a complete collapse of the German educational system due to a lack of ethical values. Statements and thoughts of foreign politicians regarding education in the Third Reich and its allies appeared in the newspapers. Thus, in one of his speeches in 1943, Carl Hambro, the president of the Norwegian Assembly in exile, referred to the need to overhaul the educational system in the Axis countries after their defeat in the War. He believed that the Germans had to be re-educated in the direction of peace, and in order to achieve that, the 100-year-old educational system based on an evil philosophy, present in the universities and other educational institutions, had to be removed (Must Re-educate Axis after war, 1943: 20).

These ideas for the re-education of the Germans after the end of the War were not made only on the basis of personal attitudes, formed by emotional responses to the Nazi crimes. In Great Britain and the United States, certain circles dealing with the arrangement of post-war Germany were well acquainted with the educational system there and the influence of the Nazis on it. A guide to the civil affairs of the American War Department shows that German education had been studied in detail. Thus, it was noted that the number of German students, which was 9,000,000, and the number of teachers, which was about 222,000, would be a serious problem for the future occupation authorities, taking into account their Nazi indoctrination. (Civil affairs guide, 1944: 1). According to

the compilers of this guide, there was a clear difference in the German primary education during the period of the Weimar Republic, and later, during the Third Reich. They note that, on paper, there was little difference in the curricula between the US and Germany, but differences became very visible when it came to Environmental Studies, Natural Sciences and History, dominated by themes of war, German superiority and heroism. The teacher who led the students, responsible to his supervisors and the Party, had to emphasize and explain these topics in detail (idem: 4). This guide also explained in detail the role of the National Socialist Party in primary education and the conditions under which the teachers worked, and a significant number of them were members of the Party.

In fact, the topic of re-education and change of the German education system, curricula and textbooks was imposed by itself. The Nazi crimes and the support of the German government were not accidental and without reason. That is why such a process with a purpose was needed. At least, that is what was thought during the War, so that Nazism, Fascism and their crimes would not be repeated. The process of re-education began immediately after the War in all occupation zones – American, British, French and Soviet, bearing some, but not complete results.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Brailsford, H., N., 1944, our settlement with Germany, The John Day company, New York
2. Brown, Ph., M., 1943, The Psychological disarmament of the German people, *World Affairs*, v. 106/4, p. 229-234
3. Fritz, K., 2019, Shock Treatment: American Wartime Psychology and the Re-education of Germany, MA Thesis, Emory University,
4. Germany and the post-war world, 1945, NORC, Denver
5. Civil affairs guide, 1944, German elementary school, War Department, Washington
6. Education and the United Nations, 1943. A Report of a Joint Commission of the Council for Education in World Citizenship and the London International Assembly, American Council on Public Affairs, Washington
7. Ergang, R., 1943, Subjugate or Conciliate Germany? *Current History*, v. 3/18, p. 469-473
8. Ergang, R., 1943, Re-educating the Germans, *Current History*, Vol. 4, No., pp. 326-330
9. Evans, F., 1945, The Re-education of Germany, *The political quarterly*, v.16/1, pp. 21-30
10. Foerster, F., 1945, Some Statements in Regard to German Political Re-Education, *the Journal of Educational Sociology*, v. 18/8, 497 - 501
11. Goldman, A., 1979, Germans and Nazis: The Controversy over 'Vansittartism' in Britain during the Second World War, : *Journal of Contemporary History* , Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 155-191
12. Jürgensen, K., 1983, British occupation policy after 1945 and the problem of "Re-educating Germany", *History*, Vol. 68, No. 223, pp. 225-244
13. Katz, J., 1944, Germany Can Be Re-educated, *the American Scholar*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 309-321
14. Kotchnig, W., M., 1943, *Slaves Need No Leaders*. New York. Oxford University Press
15. Liddell, H., 1948, Education in Occupied Germany: A Field Study, *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944)*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 30-62
16. McNeill, W., H., 1989, *Arnold J. Toynbee. A biography*, Oxford University Press
17. Morgan, P., L., 1944, *Treatment of Germany after the war*, Washington
18. Must Re-educate Axis after war, 1943, *The Deseret News*, February, 12

19. Phillips, D., 1986, War-Time Planning for the 'Re-Education' of Germany: Professor E. R. Dodds and the German Universities, *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 195-208
20. Phillips, D., 2019, Dodds and educational policy for a defeated Germany, in: Stray, C., Pelling, C., and Harrison, S. (ed.), *Rediscovering E. R. Dodds. Scholarship, education, poetry and the paranormal*, Oxford University Press, 244-263
21. Quillen, I. J., 1944, Education for World Citizenship, *The Annals of the American Academy of political and social science*, v. 235, p. 122-127
22. Re-education of Germans held hopeless, 1944, *The Deseret News*, November 16
23. Riechter, W., 1945, *Re-educating Germany*, University of Chicago Press
24. Schüddekopf, O., 1967, *History teaching and history textbook revision*, Council of Europe, Strasbourg
25. *The conditions of constructive peace*, 1944, National Peace Council, London
26. *The Re-educating Germany*, 1943, *Lewiston Morning Tribune*, June 6
27. Thompson, D., 1943, Irony in the proposals to educate the Axis, *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, April 13
28. Thompson, D., 1945, on the record, *The Windsor daily star*, February 7
29. Ulich, R., 1944, the problem of German re-education, *Social Research*, v. 11/2, Johns Hopkins University Press, 152-167
30. Vansittart, R., 1941, *Black Record: Germans Past and Present*, Times of India, Bombay, Hamish Hamilton, London
31. Vansittart, R., 1944, *Black Record: Germans Past, Present and Future*, Avon Best Company, New York
32. What shall be done about Germany after the war, 1944, EM 10, Roundtable?
33. Wolf, A., 1944, *Higher education in Nazi Germany or education for World – conquest*, Methuen and Co. Ltd, London
34. *Your steak in the Peace*, 1943, Commission to study the Organization of Peace, New York
35. Ziemer, G., 1943, *Rehabilitating Fascist Youth*, *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 583-591