

CARNIVAL

Journal
of
International Students of History Association

XV





CARNIVAL

XV/2013

Journal of International Students of
History Association

ISSN 1457-1226

Internationa Students of History Association

ISHA International Secretariat
c/o Historia vzw.
Blijde Inkomststraat 11
3000 Leuven
Belgium

www.isha-international.org

Facebook: Carnival – Journal of the International Students of History Association

INTERNATIONAL BOARD 2013/2014

Mišo Petrović, *President*
Dario Prati, *Vice-President*
Oana Peiu, *Secretary*
Max Boguslaw, *Treasurer*

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Simona Barbu

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Flavia Tudini

REVIEW AND PROOFREADING

ISHA Bucharest 2012/13

DESIGN

Maja Lukanc

COVER

Antonino Mario La Commare

Facts and opinions published in the papers express solely the opinions of the respective authors. Authors are responsible for their citing of sources and the accuracy of their references and bibliographies. ISHA cannot be held responsible for any omissions or possible violations of third parties' rights.

Contents

- 4 A word from the President
- 5 CĂTĂLIN PARFENE
Between Romania and Hungary: Migration and Remigration in the Life of
an Ethnic Hungarian
- 13 LISBETH MATZER
Education as means of indoctrination: The case of Styrian teachers’
training, 1938-1945
- 24 CHRISTOS ALIPRANTIS
Between Radicalism, Autocracy and Revolution: Censorship and
Intellectual Emancipation in Biedermeier Austria (1815-1848)
- 43 ROBERTO TUCCINI
“Go for broke”; the role of Japanese-Americans during World War II
- 52 FLAVIA TUDINI
Italian Mafia in the United States: an import-export history

A word from the President

Mišo Petrović

Dear reader,

It is a pleasure for us to present to you the volume 15 of *Carnival*, the journal of the International Students of History Association. *Carnival* is an annual journal in which students, both the ones actively participating in ISHA, and everybody else that wishes to present their work, can contribute.

ISHA is an organization that has slowly matured over the years, and I am glad to see the level of enthusiasm invested in making this edition. The topics cover various previously held seminars, which made for numerous interesting articles this year. Many history students and students of related sciences participated in making this year's number come to life.

We leave behind a very productive year, full of good and worthy seminars. Many activities were held, where countless students were brought together from across the Europe to participate in a number of events: The road started in September 2013 in Vilnius, continued with the New Year's Seminar in Helsinki, and had a crown jewel in the 25th Annual Conference in Budapest in April 2014, where the old and new ISHA members gathered to celebrate long and prosperous development. Followed by a weekend seminar in Sofia, the year ended with a style with the Summer Seminar 2014 in Ljubljana.

I would like to congratulate all the participants of these seminars, all the supporters that could not join us but were eager and helpful in running this organization and all contributors in submitting valuable and interesting works. This is what makes this organization the way it is today.

It is, after all, the essence of being a historian (or member of the humanities and social sciences) to write. Writing is the key of our expression and core of our craft. While historians can no longer claim exclusive access to the past and interpretation of it – since, thanks to the technological improvements of the modern era, countless people are enabled to access to old books and sources, and empowered to emerge into history by themselves – the historians still have a moral obligation. As the ones specialized in historiography our task is not to demand special rights to interpretation of the past, but to guide the reader in his or her interpretation. As students, you are now on the crossroad of choosing your future carriers: whether in academics, in education or the numerous other fields and sciences. Yet, one thing will remain present: the need to express yourself, both in written and oral form.

On behalf of ISHA International I invite you to take a short journey to another chapter of ISHA history and think – how can I participate in it, and how can I contribute to it?

I would like to thank these years *Carnival* editors, Simona Barbu and Flavia Tudini, for their productive and professional work. Also I thank the members of the International Board, Max Boguslaw, Oana Letizia and Dario Prati, for their support and the good work all year around.

Viva ISHA!

Between Romania and Hungary: Migration and Remigration in the Life of an Ethnic Hungarian

Cătălin Parfene
ISHA Budapest

This paper discusses the oral interview made in Budapest with Károly Oroszhegyi, writer, journalist and former Romanian international football player of Hungarian ethnicity in the 1950s, whose life can be seen as part of larger migration and remigration processes between Romania and Hungary during the 20th century. The paper emphasizes what the interview revealed starting from the interviewee's oral narratives about the political implications of his life as an ethnic Hungarian intellectual and high-profile football player in both Romania and Hungary: the ethnic Hungarians' difficult condition following the instauration of the Romanian National Legionary State, their subsequent problems within the Hungarian state after settling there following the 1940 Vienna Dictate, the strange and ambiguous relationship between an ethnic Hungarian intellectual, who was never a member of the Romanian Communist Party but represented Romania on the international level through his selection in the national football team, and the Communist regime until the interviewee's final settlement in Hungary. In this respect, the paper underlines several new ways of negotiating and new modes of avoiding conflicts, and proposes the term "reversed collaboration".

INTRODUCTION

My attempt in this paper is to discuss the oral interview I made in 2012, in Budapest, with Károly Oroszhegyi, a former Romanian international football player in the 1950s and writer of Hungarian ethnicity who eventually settled down in Hungary after balancing throughout his life between the country he was born in and the country which he felt more attached to. After a biographical sketch of Károly Oroszhegyi, I will describe the methodology of the interview. Then I will make an evaluation of the interview, emphasizing what it revealed to me mainly in relation to the ethnic Hungarians' contacts with the Communist regime in Romania.

THE INTERVIEWEE: KÁROLY OROSZHEGYI

The following biographical sketch of Károly Oroszhegyi contains the information I managed to collect through various sources *before* doing the interview (Adalék, 2009; Erdélyi magyar, 2000: 504; Gyula, 2002; Ki Kicsoda, 1995: 408-409). He was born in 1937 in the multicultural environment of the Transylvanian city of Braşov (Brassó in Hungarian, Kronstadt in German, renamed by the Communist regime as Oraşul Stalin, that is 'Stalin City', between 1950 and 1960). He played football as a striker between 1949 and 1963 for the Transylvanian club teams of Universitatea Cluj and UTA Arad in the Romanian top division (*Divizia A*), winning twice the title of top scorer of the Romanian youth championship. In the

mid 1950s, Károly Oroszhegyi was drafted for the Romanian youth national teams. At the same time he studied Hungarian Language and Literature, and Psychology at Bolyai University in Cluj, working afterwards in Arad first as a teacher and then as a sports journalist, while constantly writing poetry and literary critique in various cultural publications of Hungarian language like *A Hét* ('The Week'), *Igazság* ('The Truth'), *Szabad Szó* ('The Free Word'), and *Művelődés* ('The Culture') as a member of the Árpád Tóth literary circle in Arad. In 1989 he was dismissed from his job of sports journalist for Arad's *Vörös Lobogó* ('The Red Flag') and sent to work as an unskilled worker. Soon after the December 1989 Romanian Revolution, Károly Oroszhegyi moved to Hungary, where he has continued to work as a sports journalist for Budapest's *Nemzeti Sport* ('National Sport') until today. In 2000, he published a book about the renowned Romanian football player Iosif Petschovsky (1921-1968), written in Hungarian and entitled *Csala, a Szőke Csoda* ('Csala, the Blonde Wonder') (Oroszhegyi, 2000).

THE METHODOLOGY OF THE INTERVIEW

Regarding the methodology, I followed the biographical-narrative interview method of Gabriele Rosenthal (Kind-Kovacs, 2012; Siefert, 2012). After a small talk about football and sports press in general, I asked mister Oroszhegyi to tell me his life story, explaining to him that I will make some notes during the narration in order to ask him several questions only later:

I want you to tell me about your life, about your career in Romania – but not only your football career – and this interview, actually, won't be an interview like in a sports newspaper, as the both of us are used to, because you will do almost all the talking...

The interview was made in Romanian. The main narration was put in a chronological framework by my interviewee and was mostly a listening period for me as the interviewer, only interrupted by mister Oroszhegyi's questions about some Romanian words or expressions that he could not remember at the time. I took notes during his main narration and I used them in the second interview phase for asking him several "open-end" and "follow-up" questions, always writing down my interviewee's gestures and non-verbal responses, sometimes used by him due to the fact that I was constantly practicing eye-contact.

For example, I asked mister Oroszhegyi to tell me about Iosif Petschovsky, the hero of my interviewee's book, and also one of his best friends, mainly about his supposed "hyphenated identity", which is characteristic to the representatives of the Hungarian minority in Romania (Corduneanu, 2000: 184-199), a minority to which Petschovsky surprisingly chose to belong despite being an ethnic Slovakian from his father's side and an ethnic German from his mother's side, and despite playing for the Romanian national football team:

I think that Petschovsky's case was the most interesting one among all these players who played for both Romanian and Hungary and whom we talked about before... He was in fact half-Slovakian, half-German. Since you knew him very well, could you tell me more about his choice for what you described as Hungarian identity?

I also used “open-end” questions for other topics, asking mister Oroszhegyi to detail how he managed to handle a high-profile football career concomitantly with his university studies at the three faculties that we talked about, to tell me about his relationship with the Communist authorities and about his decision to leave Romania and settle in Hungary in 1989-1990, or to detail me how did he write the book about Iosif Petschovsky. I finished the interview with a question about whether there was anything else he wanted to be asked, while mister Oroszhegyi showed me his availability for future conversations. At the end of my interview with mister Oroszhegyi, who is now seventy-seven years old, I could very easily agree with the conclusion – already emphasized by oral historians – that “most older people are just like everyone else, except that they have been around longer” (Wenger, 2003: 128).

THE EVALUATION OF THE INTERVIEW

The interview with Károly Oroszhegyi revealed to me if not some surprises, at least some unknown issues in light to my scholarly expectations. Each of these “findings” into my interviewee’s oral narratives can be the starting point for larger projects, where interviews with other persons would be needed for a more representative framework. These “findings” deal with:

a) The ethnic Hungarians’ status following the instauration of the Romanian National Legionary State (September 1940 – January 1941):

So, my father left an entire fortune there (in Braşov], but he really wanted to live in Hungary. His decision was also influenced by the fact that back then *Gardiştii* (‘the Guardists’] – well, you know what *Garda de Fier* (the Iron Guard, the most powerful extreme-right organization in interwar Romania and early 1940s] was – were very dangerous. Once, it happened on the street – and I was present, I was walking with him –, and some young persons, aged around 20, took him, my father, by his – how do you say – collar, and these guys told my father: “Say *brânză* (‘cheese’]!”. My father knew Romanian and he said correctly: “*Brânză!*”, not like a Hungarian would pronounce it. So, those guys let us pass, but in that very moment my father decided to leave for a country where he could speak Hungarian. Of course, today, after so many years, there are no more such problems, but back then, that was it...

b) These ethnic Magyars’ subsequent problems within the Hungarian state when settling in Budapest or in the Hungarian part of Transylvania following the 1940 Vienna Dictate, and Lady Horthy’s sympathetic interventions in their favour:

After we left Braşov, my father remade his career in Cluj, despite a lot of difficulties, because the ones who ruled the city of Cluj after 1940 were from here (Budapest] and sent from here, and helped their friends, not the newcomers. Thus, the reality was not too much changed. (...) So he had a cousin who was the Director of the Opera here (in Budapest], doctor Pal Imre, and he, being a great artist, introduced my father to Lady Horthy. She was dealing with this kind of delicate business, because she knew what was like to live as a minority representative, since she was born near Arad... And she phoned immediately to Cluj for the mayor of the city, and when my father arrived in Cluj, he found all the things arranged: “Why didn’t you tell us?”

Furthermore, the “findings” deal with the strange and ambiguous relationship between an ethnic Hungarian who was never a member of the Romanian Communist Party and the Communist authorities, who oscillated between c) dismissing Károly Oroszhegyi from his jobs and d) almost warmly warning him, these adding to e) mister Oroszhegyi’s own strategies to avoid mainly the problems with the *Securitate* (the popular term for the Department of State Security). The following dimensions can be integrated into a “reversed collaboration” pattern, in which the negotiations made in order to avoid new conflicts atypically came from the part of the Communist authorities or were tacitly accepted by the same representatives of the regime:

c) On the one hand, the Communist authorities dismissed mister Oroszhegyi from the jobs of football player for Universitatea Cluj and sports journalist in Arad following his use of certain “sensitive” words:

Near us (he was with his colleague Victor Ivanovici in a restaurant, during the training camp with the team of Universitatea Cluj] there were two girls at one table, two women, they were nice. And I said: “Look, Victor, what beautiful women”, and he answered: “Screw them, they are *bozgoroaice* (Romanian pejorative term for Hungarian women]”, because the women were wearing badges with the Hungarian flag. “Don’t you see they are *bozgoroaice*?” – “So what if they are *bozgoroaice*?”, I replied like a great specialist in the matter, “they are also from a socialist country (that is Hungary]” – “F... their socialist country!”, he said – “Victor”, I said, “what if I would say the same, that I f... your Romanian country?” – “You can’t say this, ‘cause you’re eating Romanian bread” – “I don’t know what kind of bread I eat, but I am paying for this”. (...) This Ivanovici denounced me to the police, sued me at the tribunal, and also wrote to the Students Association in Bucharest. An enquiry followed and all my colleagues stood by me and said that I was provoked. (...) I received a minor punishment: two weeks without playing. (...]

Actually, I was dismissed twice from the newspaper. Once, it was because I talked to Bucharest after thirteen football pitches in Arad were destroyed and nothing was built in their place, despite the law, and following this, the president of the Sports National Council immediately phoned to Arad and asked the first secretary: “Who is this comrade, who is such an enemy of the Republic?”, so when I arrived at home I was dismissed, actually I was demoted to a press corrector. Afterwards, I wrote once more some troublesome things (in the match programs distributed to the public before the football matches] (...) So I wrote about the players from Jiul (Petroșani], the guest team, that some of them are a kind of legionnaires, coming from Bucharest and being employed in Petroșani, like Muțescu and others. And I was denounced by an acquaintance who was doing these match programs before me, he denounced me to the Party, and I was summoned...

CP: Because you used the word “legionnaires”...

KO: Yes, a kind of – between quotation marks – legionnaires. And the party secretary responsible with propaganda asked me: “How could you use such word, you don’t know its meaning?”. I brought with me the Romanian Encyclopedic Dictionary, where the first written sense was the fighter for money, the mercenary, and only the second was the member of the (Romanian extreme-right organization] Iron Guard. And the secretary told me: “I can’t give the encyclopedic dictionary to every reader (of the match program]”. I

replied: “But do you have it?”, thus I wanted then to tell him that he is the first idiot. But I finally managed to escape from prison. Of course, I was dismissed from the newspaper.

d) On the other hand, the same Communist authorities were almost warmly warning Károly Oroszhegyi, like it happened in 1956, following the Hungarian Revolution:

We gathered there, in the big cemetery in Cluj, to do some sympathy actions for the revolutionaries. I was coming from the trainings, in autumn 1956 it was, I wanted to enter the cemetery, and a man came – I never saw him before or after, he was quite young, around 30 years old – and he said to me: “Mister Oroszhegyi, don’t go! Don’t go there, it’s better to go home! And take the young lady – I was with the future wife then – with you, take her home, things won’t be good here”. Indeed, the people (from the manifestation] received a lot of years (of prison], a lot of years... More people were arrested in Romania than in Hungary in 1956. And many of them were terminated (*he is also making the sign for “terminated”*). This is what I wanted to say, that he (Ivanovici] also said this (to the authorities], I don’t know where from he knew it, that I sympathized with the revolutionaries.

e) This kind of warnings added to mister Oroszhegyi’s own strategies to avoid mainly the problems with the feared *Securitate*, either through the help of his friends involved in the Communist structures or by sharing a certain level of sincerity through “unofficial” channels like the tapped phone conversations. Thus, in 1989 he obtained from the Communist authorities the approval for his emigration request, only to finally leave Romania in 1990:

I had a colleague, Isac Ioan, from Bucharest, but he was a law student in Cluj, he was doing his practice at the tribunal. And he told me: “Corci, my man, Corci-baci, I stole your file” – “What file?”, I asked – “Well, you don’t know that Ivanovici sued you?”. And I saw my file there. And I read it and told him (Isac]: “This is something very dangerous, I haven’t even heard of it” – “And you won’t hear of it”, he said and continued: “I put it firstly down below, and then took it from there”.

(...]

I always managed to escape because every time when I was called on the phone I knew that my phone was (*he is making the sign for “tapped”*)...

CP: Tapped.

KO: I knew it, I was sure. I was always saying on the phone that those from the Party were stupid, while the boys from the *Securitate* were intelligent and knew that I never said something against the State or against the Party. I knew that they were listening and recording, I was convinced, this is the truth. I was never summoned by the *Securitate*. I never had any problem with them, even when I left the country I just had to sign some act that I never had bad intentions. They had to justify that the case was closed. This is how I escaped. (...) I was a Hungarian citizen in the 1940s, so I immediately received back the citizenship.

f) Finally, these “findings” also deal with what at least some of the Hungarians from Hungary were mistakenly thinking in the years 1989-1990 about the level of the Romanianization of the Magyar population in Romania:

Here (in Budapest], when I arrived, it was very interesting when the former chief-editor Borbely Pal – he is still living today – recognized me, he knew me as a player. I wasn't a great player, I didn't play for the A national team (of Romania], only for the youth teams, but he remembered my name. And he told me: "We can take you here (at the newspaper], but we don't have a translator". And I laughed: "Pali, my man, what kind of translator do you think I need? I finished the (faculty of] Hungarian Language and Literature, I am a Hungarian!". So that was their knowledge about the minorities in Romania...

Another topic of the interview was sport, more precisely the ethnic Hungarians' role in the Romanian football. For example, the hero of my interviewee's book, Iosif Petschovsky, despite living almost his entire life in Romania, playing for the Romanian national football team and being half-Slovakian, half-German, chose for himself what mister Oroszhegyi called "a Magyar identity" after marrying a half-Hungarian, quarter-French and quarter-German woman:

Actually, I asked him: "Why did you want to be a Hungarian?", and he answered: "If I could say why, I would write a book about it, about what being a Hungarian is. My father was a Slovakian, my mother was a German, I am a Hungarian, that's enough".

Moreover, mister Oroszhegyi started his football career with Știința (later Universitatea) Cluj, called by my interviewee "a Romanian team", one of the few in Transylvania, where he was the only Hungarian in the team. From his narration, I discovered that during the Communist regime there was a tradition in some Transylvanian clubs to maintain a quota of only one player of Hungarian origin. This quota can be connected to what happened in the Romanian football during the Communist regime, that is, the process of Romanianization, as it was only in the mid 1950s when the Romanian national team began to be composed mainly of ethnic Romanian players, after three decades in which the presence in the squad was basically the prerogative of minorities such as Magyars and Germans (*sași* or Transylvanian Saxons) coming from Transylvanian clubs (Parfene, 2012):

"Știința Cluj was a pure Romanian team. That means that only one Hungarian was usually playing in the team: before me was Szeke, before him was Szoboszlai Nicolae, a goalkeeper. Always there was one. You had to wait and you knew it: after me followed Kromely, Gheorghe Kromely, he was the representative of the minorities, and so on. Before this, in the national team it happened often (*laughing*) that there was only one Romanian!"

In general, the interview went very well and my interviewee did not avoid answering any of my questions. The idea most emphasized by my interviewee was his almost permanent conflict with the Communist regime, as I showed above, a dimension "officially" recognized during and after the 1989 Revolution in Romania, when he was elected in the local *Front al Salvării Naționale* ('National Salvation Front'), the first post-Communist government. Not surprisingly, mister Oroszhegyi told me at the end of our meeting: "Well (*laughing*), write that I am against the former regime, don't forget!". However, the interview lasted for a rather short time, that is only an hour and a half, so I still have several "open-end" and "follow-up" questions to ask and some issues to insist on during a possible future meeting with mister

Oroszhegyi: his own interpretation of the fact that he as an ethnic Hungarian was a representative of the Romanian national football team, his literary career as a poet and critic, his eventual knowledge of other persons involved in similar problems with the Communist authorities and their subsequent solutions.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, using this biographical perspective and emphasizing such an ambiguous relationship between the Communist authorities and an ethnic Hungarian, who was never a member of the Romanian Communist Party but represented Romania on the international level through his selection in the national football team, my paper underlines several new ways of negotiating and new modes of avoiding conflicts through what I called “reversed collaboration”. On the one hand, the Communist authorities dismissed mister Oroszhegyi from several jobs, basically for ideological reasons. On the other hand, the same Communist authorities warmly warned him in order to avoid the further escalation of the conflict, and this cooperation added to mister Oroszhegyi’s other strategies to avoid problems, either through the interventions of his acquaintances who were working for the Communist regime or by developing a “sincere” relationship with the *Securitate* through “unofficial” channels like the tapped phone conversations, as I highlighted above.

Károly Oroszhegyi’s life can be seen as representative for the ethnic Hungarians’ larger migration processes from Romania to Hungary firstly in 1940-1941, following the Second Vienna Award, when, according to the official registrations, as many as 100,000 Hungarian refugees had arrived in Hungary from Southern Transylvania, and secondly in the late 1980s and early 1990s, when around 100,000 people of Magyar origin left Romania (Nicoară, 2005: 42; Varga, 1996). Moreover, he belongs to a certain category of Romanian intellectual football players of Hungarian ethnicity who eventually left Romania and settled in Hungary or elsewhere abroad while continuing their previous activities, like university professor and diplomat Béla Borsi-Kálmán, or physician and professional football coach László Bölöni. At the same time, Károly Oroszhegyi wrote the biography of Iosif Petschovsky (József Pecsovszky), one of the numerous representatives of ethnic minorities who composed almost the entire Romanian national football team from its establishment in the early interwar period until the mid 1950s.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adalék a romániai magyar irodalmi lexikon, V. Kötetéhez (2009) (Addenda to Romanian Hungarians’ Literary Encyclopedia, Vol. V), Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesüle, Kolozsvár [Cluj-Napoca], accessed March 20, 2012, <http://lexikon.kriterion.ro/szavak/3321/>.

Corduneanu, Victoria-Isabela (2000) *State Socialism and Hungarian Minority: Official History and Historical Narratives*, from: Daniela Koleva (ed.), *Talking History: International Oral History Conference*, first edition, LIK, Kiten, Bulgaria, pg. 184-199.

Erdélyi magyar ki kicsoda 2000 (2000) (Transylvanian Hungarians’ Who’s Who in the 2000s), RMDSZ–Scripta Kiadó, Nagyvárad (Oradea).

- Gyula, Dávid (ed.) (2002) *Romániai magyar irodalmi lexikon: Szépirodalom, közírás, tudományos irodalom, művelődés, IV (N–R)* (Romanian Hungarians' Literary Encyclopedia: Literature, Public Writing, Scientific Literature, Culture), Kriterion, Bukarest, Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, Kolozsvár (Cluj-Napoca], accessed March 20, 2012, <http://mek.niif.hu/03600/03628/html/index.htm>.
- Ki kicsoda a magyar sportéletben? , II. kötet (I–R)* (1995) (Who's Who of Hungarian Sport Life?, Vol. II), Babits Kiadó, Szekszárd.
- Kind-Kovacs, Friederike (2012) *The Biographical-Narrative Interview Method after Gabriele Rosenthal*, lecture given at Central European University, Budapest, January 23, 2012.
- Nicoară, Toader (2005) *Istoria și tradițiile minorităților din România* (History and Traditions of Minorities in Romania) Ministerul Educației și Cercetării, București.
- Oroszhegyi, Károly (2000) *Csala, a Szőke Csoda* (Csala, the Blonde Wonder) Concord Media - Jelen 2000 Kiadó, Arad.
- Parfene, Cătălin (2012) *Between 'Foreigners' and Romanianization: The Romanian National Football Team in the Interwar Period*, M.A. thesis, Central European University, Budapest.
- Siefert, Marsha (2012) *Questioning and Listening*, lecture given at Central European University, Budapest, February 13, 2012.
- Varga, Árpád E. (1996) *Despre numărul maghiarilor din Transilvania: Poate fi autentic ceea ce nu e exact? Poate fi exact ceea ce nu e lipsit de echivoc?* (About the Number of Hungarians in Transylvania: Can It Be Authentic What Is Not Exact? Can It Be Exact What Is Not Equivocal?) from: *Fizionomia etnică și confesională fluctuantă a regiunii Carpato-balcanice și a Transilvaniei* (The Fluctuant Ethnical and Confessional Physiognomy in the Carpathian-Balkan Region and Transylvania), Asociația Culturală Haáz Rezső, Odorheiu Secuiesc, pg. 45-81.
- Wenger, G. Clare (2003) *Interviewing Older People* from: James A. Holstein and Jaber F. Gubrium (eds), *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks (California, USA], pg.111-130.

Education as means of indoctrination: The case of Styrian teachers' training, 1938–1945

Lisbeth Matzer
ISHA Graz

Based on the analysis of archival sources, party literature and an Oral History interview conducted by the author, this paper shows how the NSDAP (National Socialist German Workers' Party) together with its affiliated organization NSLB (National Socialist Teachers League) tried to entrench the NS ideology not only in the minds of the young students attending the so-called LehrerInnenbildungsanstalten (teachers' training colleges) and the pedagogical seminar at the University of Graz, but also in those of already practicing teachers. In order to do so, this study focuses on the case of the Austrian province of Styria, where especially teachers had already played an important part in the coming to power of the National Socialists.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history the term “education” has again and again been linked with the ideal of intellectual emancipation. During the time of National Socialism, this ideal gave way to the purpose of shaping the so-called *Volksgemeinschaft* (people's community). In this respect education was particularly seen as one of the most important instruments to achieve an overall indoctrination of the population in Germany and Austria which is, for example, portrayed by Ortmeier (1996). Teachers held a key position to ensure the success of this National Socialist apparatus of indoctrination (cf. Karner, 1994: 115).

In Austria the reign of the NSDAP and its control over the educational system lasted from the so-called “Anschluss” (“annexation”) in 1938 to the end of World War II in 1945. Although this party was prohibited in Austria from June 1933 onwards, many teachers were in favor of the National Socialist ideology long before 1938, which was especially the case in the province of Styria (cf. Karner, 1994: 115). Of course, neither every single teacher nor every teacher candidate in this province was part of the illegal and secret NSDAP network before 1938 and therefore, once in power, the National Socialists had to take action in order to ensure the loyalty to the regime of this crucial group of people.

Taking into account the outlined significant importance of this professional group for the regime as well as the relatively high number of Styrian teachers engaged in the illegal Party organization and/or having participated in the attempted National Socialist coup of 1934 (cf. Matzer, Knopper 2013: 236), it is surprising that no detailed research about the Styrian case of teachers' indoctrination during the reign of the NSDAP has been conducted so far.

This article is a step forward to closing this gap by shedding light on the various strategies employed by the National Socialists in order to indoctrinate compulsory school teachers as well as teachers of academic secondary schools in a way that would ensure their ability and willingness to serve as facilitators of the Nazi-ideology in the province of Styria between 1938 and 1945. However, the total effectiveness of these measures of indoctrination

can neither be determined by literature nor by the private and archival sources analyzed for this study.

In which ways did the regime try to educate a new generation of teachers in the regional teacher's training colleges (*Lehrerbildungsanstalten* for boys and *Lehrerinnenbildungsanstalten* for girls) and at the pedagogical seminar of the University of Graz? What kind of measures did the respective protagonists employ to (re-)indoctrinate those teachers who were already working in schools in 1938? What were the main contents propagated in the respective educative actions? These core questions of the article are to be answered by dealing with three different axes of research which are all based on the qualitative content analysis of archival sources in combination with information taken from secondary literature. The two main fields of research supposed to foster the understanding of the indoctrination of Styrian teachers between 1938 and 1945 emerge from dealing with the organization of learning and of the day to day life in Styrian teachers' training colleges as well as from taking into account the ideological elements of the continuing education of Styrian teachers. The third axis of research is concerned with the institutional framework and the individual networks that regulated and influenced the two interlinked fields mentioned above in the Styrian region.

As the third research field provides basic information about the organization of teacher education in Styria and about the organizational structures of the teacher education system in the region, it will be the first to be outlined in this paper. Following this, I will secondly focus on the indoctrination of teacher candidates during their training. Afterwards I will deal with the National Socialist system of continuing teacher education aiming at the ideological alignment of already employed teachers before I answer the stated questions in a short conclusion.

INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The "annexation" of Austria to Nazi-Germany in 1938 led to major changes in administrative and legislative areas. The so-called "Ostmarkgesetz" of April 19th 1939, a law restructuring every single administrative unit in the territory of the former Federal State of Austria, led to a complete reorganization of the regional government of Styria by the end of March 1940 (cf. Engelbrecht, 1980: 117-118; Karner, 1994: 102). The same year also saw the establishment of the *Abteilung II für Erziehung, Volksbildung, Kultur-und Gemeinschaftspflege* (Department II for Education, National Education, Fostering of Culture and Community) which was henceforward in charge of the educational system in the province (cf. Traby, 1998: 150) and replaced the former state education authority (*Landesschulrat*), who's main occupation since the "annexation" had been to cleanse the group of Styrian teachers of persons that had a questionable attitude towards the new regime, meaning that certain high-ranking teachers were removed from their posts (cf. Mittelbach 1950: 17; StLA, LSchR neu, Gruppe 2, Karton 1439, A-Z, 1938). This department was headed by Josef Papesch, a secondary school teacher, writer and party member who was eager to link what he considered "Styrian culture" with the NS-ideology (cf. Karner, 1988: 412-413; Karner, 1994: 194, 473, 504).

Subsequently, the Department II took care of the training and continuing education of Styrian teachers and shared its competences in this field with the party organization *Gauamt für Erzieher* (District Authority for Educators) as well as with the NSLB (National Socialist Teachers League), an organization affiliated with the NSDAP (cf. Karner, 1994: 100-101; Feiten, 1981: 137-142). The District Authority and the NSLB were in charge of the personnel administration of the Styrian school system as well as responsible for the ideological training of the educators (cf. Finger, 2007: 174) whereas the latter was usually conducted by the NSLB, which was operative in Austria from 1938 to 1943, the year of its general dissolution.

Although we are theoretically dealing with two separate organizations here, the persons in charge were usually the same (cf. Feiten, 1981: 137-142, 187, 192). In case of Styria both institutions were led by Karl Urragg who was also the responsible employee for primary and secondary schools of the already mentioned Department II (cf. Karner, 1988: 430). Similar multiple engagements of Department II officials with, for example, the NSLB were quite common (cf. *Der Erzieher in der Südmark* No. 11, 1939: 11-12; Karner, 1994: 106).

The vocational education system these institutions controlled consisted of three fields of competence. The one concerning the ideological formation of already employed teachers through continuing education measures conducted by the NSLB was already mentioned above. The two different strands of vocational formation add to that as follows.

Already before 1938, the training of teachers for primary and secondary schools was conducted at the teachers' training colleges where candidates were schooled starting at ages 14 or 15 after having graduated from secondary school (cf. Schnorbach, 1983: 30-31). Future teachers of academic secondary schools, however, were educated at the pedagogical seminar of the University of Graz which was led by Otto Tumlirz, a glowing advocate of the "Volksgemeinschaft"-idea (cf. Miedl, 2013). This system prevailed during the NS-period and the concept of teachers' training colleges was even adopted for Germany in 1941/42 (cf. Schillinger, 2003: 304) by emphasizing that these institutions serve the primary goal of ideological indoctrination of future teachers (cf. *Der Deutsche Erzieher* No. 12, 1941: 360).

While between 1938 and 1945 only the University of Graz provided pedagogical formation for academic secondary school teachers (*Gymnasiallehrer*) in Styria, all in all 8 teachers' training colleges educated teachers for primary and lower secondary schools. Two in Graz, one in Knittelfeld and one in Maribor trained only female candidates whereas the remaining other four institutions in Graz (between 1941 and 1942 located in Wagna and then transferred to Maribor), in Oberschützen, in Maribor and in Kainbach were exclusively for men (cf. Schillinger, 1999: 287; StLA, ZGS, Karton 42, Personalstand).

Similar to the multiple engagements of Department II and NSLB officials, some teachers as well as leaders of the teachers' training colleges also held official positions in the Styrian NSLB organization or the *Gauamt für Erzieher* (cf. StLA, ZGS, Karton 42, Personalstand; *Der Erzieher in der Südmark* No. 11, 1939: 11-12; *Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauverwaltung Steiermark* No. 3, 1942: 12). This already shows that the agents of teacher education in Styria were – at least partly – linked through the network of the NSDAP or its affiliated organizations which naturally had its influence on the contexts and preconditions of the whole system of teacher training in the province as outlined below.

PROPAGATION OF NS-IDEOLOGY IN THE TRAINING OF STYRIAN TEACHER CANDIDATES

After the National Socialists had come into power in Austria, one of their main concerns was the ideological reorientation of the vocational teacher training (cf. Engelbrecht, 1980: 128) which becomes especially obvious in the case of the teachers' training colleges for primary and lower secondary school teachers.

In order to ensure that the next generation of these teachers would be in line with the NS-ideology, a strong emphasis was put on the propagation of the "Volksgemeinschaft" (cf. Stettner, 1950: 40). This was especially reinforced by accommodating the students in boarding schools so that their education and training encompassed all aspects of their day-to-day lives (cf. *Schule und Gemeinschaft* No. 3, 1941: 46; *Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauverwaltung Steiermark* No. 4, 1942: 14).

This spatial isolation of teacher candidates already started with the selection process in which the young boys and girls were examined in special camps, where the Hitler Youth also played an important role in assessing the character and ideological qualification of potential future teachers (cf. Benze, 1943: 134). Besides these two crucial elements, the "Aryan" descent, a health certificate, a good performance at school, as well as their "physical and athletic qualification" also played a role in these camps, which were held annually with a duration of up to two weeks from school year 1939/40 on. (cf. StLA, LSchR neu, Gruppe 3, Karton 1444, L, 1938; *Verordnungsblatt für das Schulwesen in Steiermark* No. 5, 1939: Decree No. 64; Interview with R. E. Kramberger 2013; Engelbrecht, 1980: 129). In the case of the teachers' training college in Graz, the young candidates were examined in German, Maths and Musical Education before they were even sent to the selection camps, where the adequateness of their character was foremost inspected (cf. Interview with R. E. Kramberger, 2013).

Based on the National Socialist ideal of the "Volk" functioning as an "all-encompassing educational community" (Stettner, 1950: 42) the Hitler Youth as well as the Band of German Maidens did not lose their influence on the candidates once they had been selected for teachers' training and admitted into the respective colleges. For example, if someone did show disobedience during or outside of class, it were the leaders of this party youth that were responsible for the sanctions (cf. Interview with R. E. Kramberger, 2013). For boys, the pre-military education ("vormilitärische Wehrerziehung") at the training colleges was also held and led by the Hitler Youth, and outside of the regular timetable the organization controlled and structured a big part of the students "free time" as well, by overseeing and arranging marching and shooting exercises, sports competitions and other physical activities (cf. Interview with R. E. Kramberger, 2013). This strong involvement of the Hitler Youth in the physical training (cf. Benze, 1943: 8) of the next generation of Styrian teachers already gives a hint on the dominant position of this aspect of education in the teachers' training colleges altogether. The students themselves were well aware that the purpose of these many hours of sports-like engagement was to prepare them for their enrollment into the German Armed Forces (*Deutsche Wehrmacht*. Cf. Interview with R. E. Kramberger, 2013; Schmidt-Bodenstedt, 1942: 31-33).

Besides the training of the body, the system expected the students to internalize the National Socialist race and genetics theory (cf. *Der Erzieher in der Südmark* No. 6, 1939: 6).

These contents were represented in the mere pedagogical schooling of the students which included the principles of the “Volksgemeinschaft” on the one hand and general educational principles of the time on the other (cf. Stettner, 1950: 36-42). Their teaching experience was enhanced by practical units that had to be completed in special training schools (Übungsschulen. Cf. Interview with R. E. Kramberger, 2013; StLA, ZGS, Karton 42, Personalstand).

The superiority of the German race as well as the German history was taken for granted and repeatedly stated on occasion in all the classes held. Openly Anti-Semitic bias were mainly transported through side comments and curses made by the educators, although one of the former students of the teachers’ training college Graz/Wagna/Maribor states that not every educator was fiercely propagating the NS-ideology in the open and some even refrained from making such statements at all (cf. Interview with R. E. Kramberger, 2013). As an example, he recalls an incident during study time where he was reading a book by the Jewish poet Heinrich Heine. Knowing that he must not read this kind of literature he wrapped the book in the cover of an oeuvre about the German Armed Forces. As the teacher noticed that he was so absorbed reading this book, he approached him, took the book, read some pages and instead of punishing him he smilingly handed it back and commented on the good quality of his reading choice (cf. Interview with R. E. Kramberger, 2013).

Rural life and culture was another important content of the teachers’ training colleges as their graduates would to a high percentage become employed on the countryside and take up the role of intellectual authorities in the rural villages and therefore held or would hold an important position when it came to the propagation of the National Socialist thinking among the peasantry in general (cf. Stiefel, 1981: 162). In the NS-ideology farmers were considered to be the fundamental cornerstone of the “Volksgemeinschaft” (cf. Schule und Gemeinschaft No. 3, 1941: 46). To give the future teachers a better understanding of their rural life and an insight in its functioning, the students – among others – were forced to render harvest service (“Erntedienst”. Cf. Interview with R. E. Kramberger, 2013).

Compared with the education of future primary and lower secondary school teachers, the ideological indoctrination of teacher candidates for academic secondary schools was less practical and physically exhaustive. The mediated contents however were quite similar.

Otto Tumlirz, who led the pedagogical seminar at the University of Graz from 1930 to 1945, made quite an effort in order to back his theoretical teachings up with NS-ideology (cf. Brezinka, 2003: 187). In the winter term of 1938-39 he had already taught, for example, “the pedagogical thoughts of the Führer and their realization in the Third Reich” (Universitätsarchiv Graz, Vorlesungsverzeichnis 1938/39). Throughout his teachings during the period of 1938 to 1945, Tumlirz focused on the characteristics of “German education” and personally preferred topics relating psychological with racial theories (cf. Brezinka, 2003: 188-190; Universitätsarchiv Graz, Vorlesungsverzeichnisse 1938-1945).

Tumlirz’ book “Grundfragen der Charakterkunde” (Fundamental Questions of Character Studies) was published in 1940 with the purpose of helping future teachers to understand this supposedly complex field of racist National Socialist sciences as well as the concept of the *Volksgemeinschaft* (cf. Tumlirz, 1940: preface, 47-57). This book meant for teachers was also strongly recommended by the NSLB as a reading for those already teaching in schools and therefore links this chapter directly with the next one dealing with the indoctrination of

Styrian teachers through continuing education (cf. *Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauwaltungen Steiermark und Kärnten* No. 1, 1941: 8).

CONTINUING EDUCATION MEASURES AS INSTRUMENTS OF INDOCTRINATION

As already mentioned in the first section, the state education authority of the province of Styria was in charge of removing those teachers that might pose a threat to the ideological alignment of the pupils in Styrian schools. But to make sure that the school system would not suffer by a lack of educators, only high-ranking persons with a politically “questionable” attitude lost their positions. The loyalty to the regime of the remaining teachers should be guaranteed by indoctrinating them in regional assemblies and manifestations as well as during camp-like seminars organized by the NSLB (cf. Traby, 1998: 151).

For this purpose the Styrian subdivision of the NSLB organized 106 regional assemblies, 375 working groups for active teachers and five camps in 1940 alone (cf. *Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauwaltung Steiermark* No. 4, 1941: 25). The already mentioned head of the *Gauamt für Erzieher* and the NSLB in Styria, Karl Urragg, was a regular guest at these events and in this context held speeches informing the teachers simply about the National Socialist teacher organizations and their purposes. At least, this is what can be said for sure based on the event reports printed in the monthly newspaper of the NSLB in Styria (cf. *Der Erzieher in der Südmark* all issues, 1939; *Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauwaltung/en Steiermark/und Kärnten* all issues, 1939–1943).

Urragg’s superior in the Department II, Josef Papesch, also made appearances at continuing education assemblies and camps for Styrian teachers. For example, he held a lecture on culture during a seminar for female supply teachers in 1942 (cf. *Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauwaltung Steiermark* No. 8, 1942: 32). The contents of these gatherings serving the ideological indoctrination are summarized in an annual report of the NSLB assessing its educational activities of 1940 in Styria. Hence the teachers were informed about “teacher’s character, race and clan sciences, the relation of peasantry, family and school, the NSDAP., its divisions and affiliated organizations, and fundamental questions of National Socialist ideology” (*Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauwaltung Steiermark* No. 4, 1941: 31).

Race theory was one of the most frequent issues addressed in the NSLB’s continuing education measures in Styria (cf. *Der Erzieher in der Südmark* No. 3/No. 7/No. 15/16, 1939) and contrary to the training of teacher candidates in the respective colleges outlined above, propagandistic Anti-Semitic contents were transported explicitly through the speeches held by various functionaries (cf. *Der Erzieher in der Südmark* No. 7 and No. 10, 1939) as was the National Socialist idea of the role of women in the German society (cf. *Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauwaltung Steiermark* No. 2, 1942).

Although their number decreased relating to the duration of the war, the NSLB considered training camps to be the most effective measures for ideological indoctrination (cf. *Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauwaltung Steiermark* No. 4, 1941: 31). In these camps the teachers should experience a sense of community similar to the one aimed at in the teachers training colleges and thus become more in favor of the National Socialist regime and the “*Volksgemeinschaft*” it promoted. In a report about a camp held in 1939, an unknown author describes this effect of the camps like this: “the collective commitment (...) evolves into an

inextinguishable experience that retains its binding forces for all eternity” (Der Erzieher in der Südmark No. 13, 1939: 14).

The Department II took up the NSLB measure of short-time camps for the professional and methodological continuing education of Styrian teachers. These professional training camps as well as the “Bezirksseminare”, special camp-like trainings for secondary school teachers, also emphasized the importance of building a sense of community among the participants through adding joint activities like hiking tours or else to the formal program (cf. Schule und Gemeinschaft No. 9, 1943: 295-297; Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauwaltungen Steiermark und Kärnten No. 21, 1939: 17).

The contents of the professional continuing education camps organized by the Department II did not differ significantly from those of the NSLB measures, apart from their propagated claim to enrich the participants’ professional horizon. This similarity might be due to the involvement of NSLB officials in those trainings or could be interpreted as a sign that the attempts to indoctrinate the Styrian teachers were ubiquitous. The latter argument is confirmed by taking a look at the mere titles and short summaries of the lectures held at a continuing education camp for secondary school teachers in 1943. Ideological standpoints concerning race, the superiority of “Aryans”, as well as various Anti-Semitic bias were transported under the veil of professional inputs on teaching, for example, Art, German and History. Among the lecturers were notable professors from the University of Graz as for example the historian Mathilde Uhlirz or the biologist Rudolf Scharfetter (cf. Schule und Gemeinschaft No. 9, 1943).

The latter is another example of the multiple functions fulfilled by some people in the Styrian system of teacher education, linking its various fields of action to each other. Besides committing himself to scientific research at university and lecturing at training camps for teachers, Scharfetter also held a position in the Department II where he was the responsible officer for the teachers’ training colleges of Styria and the occupied Slovene territories of the so-called *Untersteiermark* (Lower Styria, today part of Slovenia) from 1941 to 1945 (cf. Universitätsarchiv Graz, Personalakt Dr. Rudolf Scharfetter; Dzimirsky, 1950: 112). Karl Hermann, another frequent lecturer at these kinds of continuing education camps for teachers was not employed with the Department II, but held multiple positions in the NSLB related to party literature and media communication (cf. Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauwaltung Steiermark No. 3, 1942: 12; Schule und Gemeinschaft No. 7, 1942: 186-198/No. 9, 1943: 290-297).

In this respect Hermann was also responsible for the editing of the Styrian NSLB’s regional periodical which was released as an enclosure to the general NSLB journal “Der Deutsche Erzieher” under the following titles: “Der Erzieher in der Südmark” (from January to September 1939), “Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauwaltung Steiermark und Kärnten” (from October 1939 to March 1941) and “Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauwaltung Steiermark” (from April 1941 to March 1943). The periodical was another means to disseminate National Socialist ideology among the professional group of teachers. This purpose is especially obvious in the general journal which appeared throughout the Third Reich. Reports about, for example, the situation in England or France as well as “general information” about recent events were presented as useful resources for the teachers and

packed with ideological standpoints and National Socialist propaganda (cf. *Der Deutsche Erzieher* 1939–1941).

The main objective of the periodical was to help teachers structure their classes in conformity with the NS-ideology by giving examples of how they could integrate, for example, current war-related “information” in various subjects (cf. *Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauverwaltung Steiermark* No 1, 1942: 1; *Der Erzieher in der Südmark* No. 6, 1939: 8/No. 8, 1939: 11-12). Apparently, in addition to the ideological trainings the teachers had to attend, basic principles of National Socialist thinking were also outlined in the regional journal (cf. *Der Erzieher in der Südmark* No. 3, 1939: 1-3/No. 4, 1939: 2-4/No. 5, 1939: 9-10).

The actual influence the periodical had on the Styrian teacher population very likely did not meet the organization’s expectations as many teachers simply did not subscribe to it despite several calls and advertising by the NSLB (cf. *Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauverwaltungen Steiermark und Kärnten* No. 3, 1941: 22; StLA, ZGS, Karton 201, NS-Lehrerbund 1938-1944).

CONCLUSION

The National Socialist regime in the province of Styria employed various measures in order to achieve and retain the ideological conformity of the teaching staff. The attempted indoctrination through party literature – as provided by the NSLB periodical mentioned above – and the continuing education measures in short-time camps or regional assemblies were primarily aimed at those teachers that were already employed and had been trained before the “annexation” of Austria to Nazi-Germany.

Young Styrians that wanted to take up a teaching profession between 1938 and 1945 in primary or lower secondary schools first had to pass a selection process which was strongly influenced by the Hitler Youth and once admitted to the teachers’ training colleges were educated in line with the NS-ideology and prepared for future military service. The physical training again took place under the surveillance and strong influence of the party youth, whose potential influence was reinforced by the accommodation of all students in camp-like boarding schools.

Those teacher candidates that aimed at becoming employed at academic secondary schools had to pursue their formation at the University of Graz, where their ideological formation was part of the teachings of Otto Tumlirz, the leader of the pedagogical seminar. The latter especially propagated the “Volksgemeinschaft”, which was amongst the ideological core contents that were communicated in all areas of teacher education in Styria.

The camp-like character of most continuing education measures and of the teacher’s training colleges was meant to contribute together with the organization of joint activities to create a feeling of community that would enable the teachers to take their place in this envisioned “Volksgemeinschaft”. Besides this basic concept of NS-ideology, race theory and genetics were also part of both the basic training of teacher candidates and of the continuing education measures. These contents were communicated mainly in lectures and therefore had their official place in the curriculum. Anti-Semitism, on the contrary, was mainly propagated openly in educative measures planned for working teachers, where these certain bias were

transported in specialist lectures. The periodical of the NSLB addressed every single one of these issues and presented those ideological standpoints to its group of readers in the guise of reports and of proposals for structuring various classes.

The role the Hitler Youth played in the process of indoctrinating future teachers outlined above was also desired by the NSLB in the area of educating those that were already in service. Together with the Department II, the administrative unit of the provincial government responsible for various fields of education, as well as in cooperation with the respective party organization, the *Gauamt für Erzieher*, the NSLB aimed at incorporating the teachers in the NS-apparatus. As shown in this article, the protagonists of this field of teacher indoctrination were connected to each other through either membership in the provincial NSLB organization or through their employment in either the Department II or one of the teachers' training colleges. Linked through this political network they took action in the field of teacher indoctrination as writers for the NSLB periodical, teaching staff, lecturers and scientific authorities at continuing education measures at regional teachers' assemblies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Literature and published sources

- Benze, Rudolf (1943) *Erziehung im Großdeutschen Reich. Eine Übersicht über ihre Ziele, Wege und Einrichtungen*, Diesterweg, Frankfurt am Main.
- Brezinka, Wolfgang (2003) *Pädagogik in Österreich. Die Geschichte des Faches an den Universitäten vom 18. bis zum Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts vol. 2*, Prag, Graz, Innsbruck. Verl. d. ÖAW, Wien.
- C. Schillinger (2003) *Niedereres und mittleres Schulwesen*, from: Brunner, Walter (ed.), *Geschichte der Stadt Graz, Bd. 3. Kirche-Bildung-Kultur*, Eingeverlag der Stadt Graz, Graz, pg. 253–326.
- C. Schillinger (1999) „Von der Nazifizierung der Schule bis zur Kinderlandverschickung.“ *Die Grazer Schulen und Bildungseinrichtungen in der NS-Zeit*, from: Karner Stefan (ed.), *Graz in der NS-Zeit. 1938-1945*, Verein zur Förderung d. Forschung von Folgen nach Konflikten u. Kriegen, Graz, Wien, Klagenfurt, pg. 281–292.
- Dzimirsky, Erhard (1950) *Festschrift zur Feier des 80jährigen Bestandes der Bundes-Lehrerbildungsanstalt Graz. 1869-1949*, Selbstverlag der Bundes-Lehrerbildungsanstalt, Graz.
- Feiten, Willi (1981) *Der Nationalsozialistische Lehrerbund. Entwicklung und Organisation. Ein Beitrag zum Aufbau und zur Organisationsstruktur des nationalsozialistischen Herrschaftssystems*, Beltz Verlag, Weinheim, Basel.
- G. Mittelbach (1950) *Die Lehrerbildungsanstalt in Graz seit 1869*, from: Dzimirsky, Erhard (ed.), *Festschrift zur Feier des 80jährigen Bestandes der Bundes-Lehrerbildungsanstalt Graz. 1869-1949*, Selbstverlag der Bundes-Lehrerbildungsanstalt, Graz, pg. 13–19.

- H. Engelbrecht (1980) Die Eingriffe des Dritten Reiches in das österreichische Schulwesen, from: Heinemann, Manfred (ed.), *Erziehung und Schulung im Dritten Reich. Teil 1: Kindergarten, Schule, Jugend, Berufserziehung*, Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart, pg. 113–159.
- J. Finger (2007) Gaue und Länder als Akteure der nationalsozialistischen Schulpolitik. Württemberg als Sonderfall und Musterbeispiel im Altreich, from: John, Möller, Schaarschmidt (eds.), *Die NS-Gaue. Regionale Mittelinstanzen im zentralistischen „Führerstaat“*, R. Oldenburg Verlag, München, pg. 159–176.
- J. Miedl (2013) „[...] dann wird die Erziehung zur Volksgemeinschaft die erste und dringlichste Aufgabe jeder deutschen Erziehung.“ „Volksgemeinschafts-“ Konzeptionen im Werk des Grazer Pädagogen Otto Tumlriz, from: Österreichische HochschülerInnenschaft (ed.), *Österreichische Hochschulen im 20. Jahrhundert. Austrofaschismus, Nationalsozialismus und die Folgen*, Facultas, Wien, pg. 286–299.
- Karner, Stefan (1994) *Die Steiermark im Dritten Reich 1938–1945. Aspekte ihrer politischen, wirtschaftlich-sozialen und kulturellen Entwicklung*, Leykam, Graz.
- L. Matzer, F. Knopper (2013) Die Verankerung der NS-Ideologie in der steirischen Lehrerschaft, from: Österreichische HochschülerInnenschaft (ed.), *Österreichische Hochschulen im 20. Jahrhundert. Austrofaschismus, Nationalsozialismus und die Folgen*, Facultas, Wien, pg. 236–245.
- M. Stettner (1950) Randbemerkungen zum Pädagogik-Unterricht, from: Dzimirsky, Erhard (ed.), *Festschrift zur Feier des 80jährigen Bestandes der Bundes-Lehrerbildungsanstalt Graz. 1869-1949*, Selbstverlag der Bundes-Lehrerbildungsanstalt, Graz, pg. 24–111.
- Ortmeyer, Benjamin (1996) *Schulzeit unterm Hitlerbild. Analysen, Berichte, Dokumente*, Fischer Taschenbuchverlag, Frankfurt am Main.
- Schmidt-Bodenstedt, Adolf (1942) *Neuordnung der Lehrerbildung. Amtliche Bestimmungen*, Diesterweg, Frankfurt am Main.
- Schnorbach, Hermann (1983) *Lehrer und Schule unterm Hakenkreuz. Dokumente des Widerstands von 1930 bis 1945*, Athenäum Verlag GmbH, Königsstein.
- S. Karner (1988) *Maßgebende Persönlichkeiten 1938 in Graz*, Historisches Jahrbuch der Stadt Graz, vol. 18/19, Graz, pg. 381–438.
- Stiefel, Dieter (1981) *Entnazifizierung in Österreich*, Europaverlag, Wien.
- Tumlriz, Otto (1940) *Abriß der Jugend- und Charakterkunde*, Klinkhardt, Leipzig.

Archival Sources and unpublished works

- Der deutsche Erzieher, 1939-1941, all issues.
- Der Erzieher in der Südmark, 1939, all issues.
- Kramberger, Robert Erich, Interview conducted by author on 14th of January 2013.
- Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauverwaltungen Steiermark und Kärnten, 1939-1941, all issues.
- Mitteilungsblatt des NSLB. Gauverwaltung Steiermark, 1941-1943, all issues.
- Schule und Gemeinschaft, 1st September 1941, No. 3, year I.

Schule und Gemeinschaft, 1st September 1942, No. 7, year II.
Schule und Gemeinschaft, 1st December 1943, No. 9, year III.
StLA, LSchR neu, Gruppe 2, Karton 1439, A-Z, 1938.
StLA, LSchR neu, Gruppe 3, Karton 1444, L, 1938.
StLA, ZGS, Karton 42, Personalstand.
StLA, ZGS, Karton 201, NS-Lehrerbund 1938-1944.
Traby, Petra (1998) Der Steiermärkische Landesschulrat und seine Organisation 1869 bis 1967. Phd Thesis, Graz.
Universitätsarchiv Graz, Vorlesungsverzeichnis 1938-1945.
Universitätsarchiv Graz, Personalakt Dr. Rudolf Scharfetter.
Verordnungsblatt für das Schulwesen in Steiermark No. 5, 1939: Decree No. 64.

Between Radicalism, Autocracy and Revolution: Censorship and Intellectual Emancipation in Biedermeier Austria (1815-1848)¹

Christos Aliprantis
ISHA Vienna

During the second half of the 18th and the first decades of the 19th century, the leading circles of the Habsburg Empire set as their goal to establish a modern censorial machine, targeting to the control of information spread in their lands. Their motives were initially well-meant and the first measures reached a novel degree of radicalism. Later though, the imperial government, threatened by revolutionary France, withdrew and tried to enforce a policy of sheer censorial oppression, narrowly controlling and confiscating potentially dangerous material. That autocratic structure began to tremble in the Biedermeier era (1815-1848), when a new generation of Austrian intellectuals (Charles Sealsfield, Anastasius Grün, Eduard Bauernfeld, Adolph Wiesner, A.J. Groß-Hoffingerm, etc.) claimed mostly individually but also collectively their right to free expression within and beyond the borders of the Monarchy. This emancipative procedure, characterized by the gradual rise of the 'Bürgerliche Öffentlichkeit', found the stagnated Habsburg authority unable to react decisively and it was finally highlighted in the 1848 Revolution, when Vienna experienced an extensive yet short-lived freedom of the press.

INTRODUCTION

“[...] A censor is a human-formed pencil or a man in the form of a pencil, a line incarnated for the products of the intellect, a crocodile which resides at the bank of the river of ideas and cuts down with his teeth the heads of the writers who swim around there. [...] Censorship is the younger of two wicked sisters and the older is called Inquisition. Censorship is the living confession of the powerful, that they are capable of ruling only disillusioned slaves, whereas they are unable to govern free peoples. Censorship is something that lies far behind the executioner, because its path of educative emancipation, which sixty years ago

¹ I would like to thank Dr. Maria Efthymiou (University of Athens), who first brought me in touch with ISHA. Secondly, I owe deep gratitude to Dr. Anna Karakatsouli (University of Athens), who kindly supervised an earlier form of the current paper and pointed out important errors and Dr. Thomas Winkelbauer (University of Vienna), who also read the manuscript and helped me improve it. Moreover, the completion of the present study would have been impossible without access to the e-resources of Harvard University, granted most generously to me by the Harvard Center of Hellenic Studies in Nafplio, Greece, its program coordinator Ms. Marina Cheilitsi and -above all- its vice director Dr. Anna Staura-kopoulou (University of Thessalonika). Finally, it should be mentioned that the preparation of this article was feasible through a number of fellowships granted by the State Scholarships Foundation of Greece (European Educational Funds Program (ESPA) 2007-2013), the “Alexander S. Onassis” Public Beneficial Foundation and the Foundation for Education and European Culture (GR).

helped open the way towards honesty, had (nonetheless] censorship of our most recent era, depicted the sign of despise.”

In the above quoted extremely fierce comments of the Austrian playwright Johann Nestroy (1801-1862) in his work *Freiheit in Krähwinkel*, which was published amidst the Revolution of 1848 in Vienna, it is possible to concentrate the most significant evolutionary stages of the Habsburg censorship machine in the late 18th and the first half of the 19th century, as well as the main points of criticism that the *literati* posed against it (Quoted in Herles, 1973: 130, McKenzie, 1980: 327. See also Yates, 1996: 42, Olechowski, 2013: 139-140). The moment of publication was of course not accidental. The revolutionary wrath that captured the Austrian capital in March, making the predominant, reactionary regime of Prince Metternich tremble to the ground, allowed the expression of, until then, prohibited attitudes and contributed to the abolishment, albeit temporary, of the notorious censorial mechanism of the Habsburgs and the creation of an ephemeral freedom of thought and press (Jaszi, 1961: 86-99, Taylor, 1965: 57-82, Kann, 1974: 299-318, Hobsbawm, 1992: 416-431, Brion, 1994: 323-351, Vocelka, 2000: 198f). But how did the Viennese end up with such a negative impression of the institutional servants of the common interests, or at least of a part of them? Secondly, how exactly and under which circumstances did the system of the imperial censorship machine form and which was its face and basic components in the century preceding the Revolution? It is this last question that the introductory part of the present paper is going to focus on. Taking advantage of the particularly suitable for our intentions academic style of the *Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte*, we will attempt a preliminary investigation of the most influential institutional instruments of the State and the most substantial legal foundations that gave birth to the Austrian mechanism of censorship.

The comprehension of the official development of censorship is of outstanding importance, in order to successfully proceed to the second, more analytical and perhaps more interesting part. There our research field is transported and focuses on these very intellectuals that the regime tried to control or to keep silent, i.e. the Austrian scholars and writers of the Biedermeier era. Additionally, this investigation is narrowly connected to the description of the procedure of the gradual rise of the urban, middle class in Austria during the first fifty years of the 19th century, which is also interrelated with the progressive formation of oppositional public word against the conservative Habsburg regime, initially on a literary level and later on an openly political one. The presentation of the gradual rise of the *bürgerliche Öffentlichkeit* in the pre-revolutionary Habsburg Empire is going to be undertaken, with an emphasis on its German-speaking part, via the discussion of the work of leading personalities of the Austrian intellectual life (Charles Sealsfield, Anastasius Grün, Edward von Bauernfeld, Adolph Wiesner, Anton Johann Groß-Hoffinger). The most meaningful aspects of their lives will be examined in combination with their most significant works, through which they clashed with the established practices of censorship within and beyond the borders of the Austrian Empire from the 1810s until 1848, as well as the subsequent reactions of the regimental officers supporting the Habsburg cause. Through the above described analysis, the aim is to establish the fact that Austria was not an intellectually stagnated country before the Revolution as possibly its governing elite would have wished to keep it, but on the contrary, that it had an active intellectual life -at least as some social strata are concerned- that strove to get liberated from the narrow boundaries that the government

had posed. Finally, taking under consideration these data, it will be possible to approach Nestroy's views with a critical eye and to judge the degree of their validity.

ADMINISTRATIVE EVOLUTION AND INSTITUTIONAL COMPLETION OF THE HABSBURG CENSORSHIP (c.1750-1848)²

Enlightened Despotism and Censorship from Maria Theresa to Leopold II (c.1750-1792)

The Austrian censorial mechanism of the post-Napoleonic times can be comprehended only through the lens of the continuity of the institutional framework that was initially created by Maria Theresa (1740-1780) and especially by Joseph II (1780-1790) (Olechowski, 2013: 140-143)³. First of all, the formation of a state-controlled secular censorship service constituted of an inseparable part in the formative procedure of a modern public bureaucracy, so as to achieve the administrative centralism and rationalization (sic), a permanent goal of the imperial authorities in Vienna during the late 18th century (Jaszi, 1961: 66-73, Vocelka, 2000: 154-166, Höbelt, 2000: 212-213)⁴. This policy favored in particular the middle, non-noble strata, which via public service found a unique until then way of social advancement and financial rise. The first censorship service (*Zensurkommission*), established in 1751, followed shortly after by the *Studien- und Bücher-Zensur-Hofkommission* (1760) and the keeping of an index for prohibited books from 1754, formed part of the Theresian educational reforms and had a liberal and progressive character since they targeted to reduce the ecclesiastical control of the education and intellectual production, and at the same time to protect the public from possibly inappropriate and detrimental readings - always according to the judgment of the State⁵. Simultaneously, this relative mental liberty was not boundless because many novels, or political and philosophical studies like the works of Voltaire and Rousseau were banned (Bachleitner, 2012: 257-258).

The measures of Joseph II were distinguished for their radical and daring nature that no later government approached and went far over the limits of his mother's reforms⁶. The prohibitions became milder, whilst the control was further centralized and the criteria which the censorial procedure followed were also systematized. The expression of common opinion, then in its earlier developmental stages, was encouraged by the formation of a more open-

² A longer and more detailed version of the current subchapter has been published recently in Greek under the title: Christos Aliprantis, "From Enlightened Despotism to Reactionary Absolutism: Administrative Evolution and Institutional Complement of Censorship in the Habsburg Monarchy (c.1750-1848)", *Ανιστόρητον/Anistoriton*, Vol.10, No.40 (Dec. 2013), pg. 1-15.

³ Ernst Wangermann, (1991), "Lockerungen und Verschärfungen der Zensur unter Joseph II. und Leopold II.", in: Erika Weinzierl, Rudolf Ardel (eds.), *Justiz und Zeitgeschichte VIII*, Vienna/Salzburg, Geyer-Editio Verlag, pg. 1-5.

⁴ Waltraud Heindl, (2006), "Bureaucracy, Officials and the State in the Austrian Monarchy: Stages of Change since the Eighteenth Century", *Austrian History Yearbook*, Vol. 36, pg. 35-57.

⁵ Grete Klingenstein, (1970), *Staatsverwaltung und kirchliche Autorität im 18. Jahrhundert. Das Problem der Zensur in der thesesianischen Reform*, Vienna, Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Österreichkunde.

⁶ Derek Beales, (1987), *Joseph II vol 1: In the shadow of Maria Theresa, 1741-1780*, New York, Cambridge Univ. Press, idem, *Joseph II, (2009), vol 2: Against the World, 1780-1790*, New York, Cambridge Univ. Press, T.C.W. Blanning, (1995), *Joseph II*, London, Longman, Roger Bauer, (1978), "Kaiser Joseph und die literarischen-Folgen", in: Wien und Europa zwischen den Revolutionen (1789-1848), Vienna/Munich, Wiener Schriften, Helmut Reinalter, (1982) "Josephinismus, Geheimgesellschaften und Jakobinismus. Zur radikalen Spätaufklärung in der Habsburger-Monarchie", in: Anna Drabek et al. (eds.), *Ungarn und Österreich unter Maria Theresa und Joseph II. Neue Aspekte Verhältnisse beider Länder*, Vienna, Böhlau Verlag, pg. 55-70.

mind environment. It was additionally depicted in a plethora of political pamphlets, which appeared in the 1780s and hold a generally positive attitude towards the reformatory work of the Emperor and therefore were not an object of prohibition (Marx, 1959: 11, Brion, 1994: 33-35, Höbelt, 2000: 215, Olechowski, 2013: 141). In February 1787, the enlightened radicalism reached its highlight with the abolition of 'preliminary censorship' in Vienna (*Vorzensur*), the most crucial component of censorship in all the earlier and later regimes. Nevertheless, this revolutionary law was withdrawn by the Emperor himself a little time before his death, due to the strong domestic reactions it caused. Joseph's brother and heir, Leopold II (1790-1792)⁷ inherited an Empire in turmoil -especially at that moment when clouds of war against revolutionary France were thickening- and tried to make the conflicting sides reach a compromise by withdrawing the most provocative measures of his predecessor, in order to save the fragile unity of the Monarchy. At the same time, he proceeded in the decentralization of censorship, handling much of the responsibilities, belonging once to Vienna, to the universities, the provincial diets and the Court Chancellery (*Hofkanzlei*). However, the liberal Josephinian spirit had not totally vanished, but in early 1792, the Emperor suddenly passed away and his heir Francis II/1 (1792-1835), affected by the climate of the Napoleonic wars and the revolutionary threat, pushed the censorship system towards a much more conservative direction.

Censorship as a Defender of the Regime against Revolutionary France (1792-1815)

In 1793 the Police Service (Polizeihofstelle) was established, where the censorial responsibilities were transported in 1801, and were destined to remain there until 1848. War difficulties reinforced the will of the government to control the flow of information, especially if it had a radical context. In the final years of the 18th century, amidst the political unrest that followed the trial of the Jacobins in Vienna and their death sentence (1794-95), the decree of 22nd February 1795 was published (*General-Zensur-Verordnung*), which gave censorship a character of draconian strictness: checks for prohibited books and journals were intensified whereas the censorial criteria became even more austere, and high penalties or even imprisonment were imposed to those who carried banned material (#3-8). Additional instructions for the accomplishment of their work were handed over to censors via the Censorial Preconditions (*Zensurvorschrift*) of the 12th September 1803 (Marx, 1959: 12, Heindl, 1994: 55, Höbelt, 2000: 217, Olechowski, 2013: 143-144). The character of censorship tended, as can be understood, to change drastically: the main opponents were no more the clergy that manipulated the masses through ignorance, prejudice and superstition, but the novel, perilous ideas that came from abroad and threatened the very stability of the Monarchy. The connection of censorship to the police represented the tendency towards the militarization of society and its unification under the ruling dynasty in a war that the Habsburgs were obviously losing, a fact that became apparent when, in 1809, the French army captured the imperial capital (Kann, 1974: 218-242, Taylor, 1965: 33f, Vocelka, 2000: 167-171).

⁷ Adam Wandruszka, (1963-65), *Leopold II., Erzherzog von Österreich, Grossherzog von Toskana, König von Ungarn und Böhmen, römischer Kaiser*, Vienna, Herold Verlag.

During the short break of Napoleonic rule in Vienna an extended but short-lived freedom of expression was set up in Vienna (Bachleitner, 1997: 102, Höbelt, 2000: 217-218). It was an occasion that was never to be repeated in the future since, in 1810, the comeback of the Habsburg authorities in power reestablished the censorship regime, albeit in a somewhat milder form with a new censorial decree, that of 14th September 1810 (*Zensuredikt, Vorschrift für die Leitung des Censurwesens und für das Benehmen der Censoren*), whose composer was the head of the police, Baron Francis von Haager. The sentences were moderated and the Authorities began to show greater tolerance, while the operation of lending libraries was allowed under certain circumstances, something which had been prohibited in 1798 (#7-11, Marx, 1959: 13, Bachleitner, 2012: 258-262, Olechowski, 2013: 144-145)⁸. Nevertheless, one should not proceed to exaggerated conclusions regarding the degree of the regime's liberalization. Austria still tended to evolve into a police state with its preconditions of censorship and its legal framework acquiring in 1810 their basic form that were to be kept until 1848 (#13-17). The censors, after studying the material assigned to them, classified it in four different categories: the works under the stamp "*Admittur*" could be reproduced without limitation ("*Imprimatur*"). The category "*Transeat*" was attributed to works that could be sold freely, but could not be advertised in the periodical Press (that was the most common distribution for imported foreign books). The logotype "*Erga schedam*" concerned works available only to a limited number of scholars and governmental officials that were judged as trustworthy and were not in danger of being affected by their fearsome context ("*Geschäftsmännern und den Wissenschaften geweihten Menschen*") (Bachleitner, 1996: 111-113, 2012: 259, Marx, 1959: 75). Eventually, if the censor characterized a written work as "*Dam-natur*" or "*Non Admittur*" for political, moral or religious reasons, it meant that this material was strictly prohibited to everyone and its reprint was banned ("*Typum non meretur*"). (#15, Obermeier, 1991: 7-9, Heindl, 1994: 55, Lindengrun, 2003: 5-7). Finally, particularly strict was the censorship of university books, over which the state acclaimed total control, as becomes visible from the 1803 decrees (*Hofkanzleidekrete*).

The Era of Established Authority: Censorship after the Congress of Vienna (1815-1848)

The above described mentality and practices tended to prevail in the leading circles of Austrian policy, also after the Congress of Vienna: preservation of the established circumstances in a political, social and intellectual level, faith and devotion to the dynasty and the traditional moral values, quasi-hidden clericalism, embarrassment towards the progressive Josephinian past and, deep down, a desire for its suppression. In the post-war age, the administrative organization of the Austrian censorship had been clarified as follows: the provincial censorial services (*Revisionsämter in den Provinzen*) had relatively limited responsibilities, classifying the works under examination (which were usually of small size) up to the category *Erga schedam*. Appeal against their decision was feasible in the Court Chancellery or even to the Emperor himself, though on rare occasions. The central censorial service in Vienna (*Wiener Zentralrevisionsamt*) had authority over every kind of document. The censors were not obliged to justify their decisions (Marx, 1959: 17-18 and Olechowski,

⁸ The decrees of 1810 remained unpublished and secret until 1848. Thereupon, writers and publishers could not exactly be sure about the prohibitive criteria by which their work had been examined.

2013: 145). The transition to the post-Napoleonic era was further reassured administratively, also with the appointment of Count Joseph von Sedlinsky as head of the relevant service (1816-1848) in order to cover the gap that had been created after Haager's death (Emerson, 1968: 137-138, Kann, 1974: 282-283).

In 1819, the Austrian government under Prince Metternich, taking advantage of the murder of famous poet August von Kotzebue by some radical German students during a celebration in Wartburg, seized the opportunity to further strengthen the Habsburg influence over the members of the German Confederation by dictating the Decrees of Carlsbad (*Karlsbader Beschlüsse*), leading in this way to an unprecedented silence of freedom of thought and the press in the entire German speaking world (*Karlsbader Beschlüsse - Pressgesetz*, #1-10). For the processing of censorship all over Germany, the imperial Authorities cooperated with the General Consulate of Leipzig (*Leipziger Generalkonsulat*) as well as the General Information Bureau in Mainz (*Zentralinfor-mationsbureaux*) (Marx, 1959: 21, Hoefler, 1983: 76f). The unified censorship that the Decrees secured in the Confederation guaranteed an effectiveness which was becoming more and more superficial (especially after the 1830s), since the smuggling of banned material in the Habsburg lands had been a well-known practice for a couple of decades before the Revolution, a fact that the Austrian authorities were incapable of stopping completely albeit their systematic efforts (Bachleitner, 1996: 109-110). The comparatively more lenient censorship of other states within the Confederation, for instance Saxony, allowed many Austrian authors (often in self-exile themselves) to publish their works abroad and then import them illegally in their homeland, a generally more successful strategy than publishing within the Empire from the beginning (Marx, 1959: 15-16, Höbelt, 2000: 219-220)⁹. However, for the period that the two greatest Germanic powers, namely Austria and Prussia, continued to harmoniously follow a conservative policy, and revolutionary movements were under control in the Continent, the government of Vienna could remain unalarmed as opposition forces did not pose a serious threat to the loyalty of the masses.

During the Metternichian epoch, censorship within university boundaries reached its golden age. Intellectuals with more progressive views than the average were treated with open hostility or, as in the case of Bolzano, professor of religious philosophy in the University of Prague, were even fired (Jaszi, 1961: 73, Kann, 1974: 370-371). In Hungary the movement of liberal ideas, obtaining a more cultural than political context, was crushed by the firm opposition of the Magyar aristocracy, who responded to the challenge with persecutions, imprisonments and executions of prominent radical personalities (Revesz, 1993: 93-94). The centralized administration of Vienna did not have authority over the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen yet, and the Hungarian censorial agencies (organized according to the Austrian prototype) cooperated with their western colleagues, but zealously kept their ancient privileged autonomy while their actions were being directed by the Chancellery of Budapest (Marx, 1959: 18-19, Revesz, 1993: 95-96)¹⁰. In Lombardy and in Venice the most substantial works to be censored were sent to Vienna and in the Italian speaking territories that belonged

⁹ It is useful to mention as an example that in the mid-1840s out of the approximately 10.000 titles permitted in German states, only a quarter was also approved in Austria.

¹⁰ R. J. W. Evans, (2006), *Austria, Hungary and the Habsburgs: Central Europe c.1683-1867*, New York, Oxford Univ. Press, pg. 173-207, 228-242.

to the Confederation (Trento, Trieste) the Carlsbad Decrees were in force. In these borderline provinces, oppression was ruthless, as it is proven by the imprisonment of many Italian liberals like Count Falconieri and Silvio Pellico (Marx, 1959: 19-20, Jaszi, 1961: 83, Vocelka, 2000: 197). The Austrian Index, as has been sarcastically argued, could comprise a fine list of the most significant names in European literature and sciences, since in its columns personalities such as Rousseau, Spinoza, Heine, Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, Walter Scott, Johannes Müller, Herder, Jean Paul, Gibbon, Robertson, Hume and Ranke found their place. At least 5.000 titles were characterized inappropriate only during the reign of Ferdinand I (1835-1848) (Jaszi, 1961: 78, Obermeier, 1991: 12, Höbelt, 2000: 218), while it has been calculated that in the 1840s almost a fifth of the books submitted for censorial control were under some kind of prohibition. In the period of Francis' weak son on the throne, the system of reactionary absolutism reached its peak of intellectual darkness with visible signs of erosion though, as we will observe in the next subchapter.

During the 1840s, the '*Chinese Wall*' of Austrian censorship, as the willing intellectual isolation of the Empire from the rest of the world has been successfully described by a contemporary writer, started to tremble at a level that could not be ignored anymore due to the smuggling of illegal books from abroad. The decision-making circles were faced with a situation of rapid social de-establishment and unable to respond to its contemporary challenges, decided to impose (limited) reforms on the censorial mechanism. In 1847/48 the State Council (*Staatskonferenz*) prepared and published the decree of 11th January 1848 (*Hofkanzleidekret*), which after almost forty years separated censorship from the police, creating a new institution, the Supreme Censorship Directory (*Censur-Ober-Direktion*), allowing the interested writer or publisher to object to its decisions at the Supreme Censorship College (*Oberst-Censur-Collegium*). Nevertheless, these measures lacked a real innovative spirit, while the fact that Count Sedlinsky was reappointed as Head of the College was nothing but a discouraging element for the image of true change. The new agencies assumed their duties in February 1848 but their effectiveness could not be tested, since in March, Pandora's Box of the Revolution opened in most parts of the Monarchy, forcing the once mighty system of Chancellor Metternich to collapse (Olechowski, 2013: 152). On 14th March, the government officially announced the abolition of censorship. Indeed, for a few months Vienna enjoyed the fruits of free movement of ideas and within this framework Nestoy's play found its way to the stage. Nonetheless, this liberal regime was destined to be short-lived because the reestablishment of the conservative forces from October 1848 onwards brought an even more totalitarian and oppressive form of censorship during the decade of Neo absolutism (up to 1860) (Marx, 1959: 16, Emerson, 1968: 136, Obermeier, 1991: 17-20, Höbelt, 2000: 223).

“DESPOTISM HAS DESTROYED MY WHOLE LITERARY LIFE”: AUSTRIAN INTELLECTUALS AND THE QUESTION OF HABSBURG CENSORSHIP DURING THE BIEDERMEIER ERA (1815-1848)¹¹

The first half of the 19th century is characterized by the stable and continuous rise of the middle class either via the access to public offices or via the integration into the entrepreneurial elite of the Empire (Kann, 1974: 370-379, Düriegl (ed.), 1988: 302-331, Brion, 1994: 296-322)¹². The constant peace after 1815 and the relative economic stability encouraged urban emancipation and its educational and financial rise. Besides, the urban character of the Biedermeier culture is also arguing towards that direction¹³. Nonetheless, apart from the superficial welfare, the regime remained unfree and paternalistic. State-autocracy, whose basic component was censorship, and the shortage of political representation, was nothing but a hindrance towards the full appearance of the middle-classes' productive forces in every field.

The goals of the central authority and the ambitions of the middle class became divided in a more clear way, since from the late 1820s, it gradually began to rise in the Monarchy the so-called “*bürgerliche Öffentlichkeit*” as defined by Jürgen Habermas¹⁴. Isolated samples of that had made their appearance from the Josephinian times, when they still saw things eye to eye with the progressive government, and also in 1809, but only after the second quarter of the 19th century would it be made visible and clearly comprehensible¹⁵. In this procedure, a crucial role was played (at least in the more developed western part of the empire) by the Austrian university system which opened its gates to the middle class and produced an entire new generation of educated judges and civil employees, a substantial percentage of whom became active in the field of literature, arts and sciences (Heindl, 1994: 45-46). Furthermore, the contribution of reading clubs, a serious component of the intellectual life in the 1840s, to the enlargement of interest in literature should not be neglected, despite the visible suspicion of the government (Heindl, 1994: 58-59, Vocelka, 2000: 181,198, Linden-grün, 2003: 8)¹⁶.

¹¹ The phrase quoted is attributed to the eminent Austrian playwright Francis Grillparzer (1791-1872) who had experienced in the most traumatic way the repercussions of the imperial censorship in his work and one could hit the nail on the head arguing that this desperate cry compounded the perspective of a whole generation of colleagues of his towards the absolutistic regime (Jaszi, 1961: 78). Grillparzer had also claimed that: “*censorship forced invisible chains binding hands and legs*” of the writers and their only freedom was “*to keep their thoughts to themselves*” (Kann, 1974: 374-375, Höbelt, 2000: 218). But while Grillparzer himself followed the latter way, many other intellectuals chose to risk and express openly their opinion against the regime, as we are going to observe in the following pages.

¹² Ernst Bruckmüller, (2001), *Sozialgeschichte Österreichs*, Vienna, Böhlau, pg. 196-265, Hannes Stekl, (2004), *Adel und Bürgertum in der Habsburgermonarchie 18. Bis 20. Jahrhundert*, Vienna/Munich, Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, pg. 87f, Vera Bäcskai (ed., 1986), *Bürgertum und bürgerliche Entwicklung in Mittel- und Osteuropa* (2 vols.), Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, David Good, (1984), *The Economic Rise of the Habsburg Empire, 1750-1914*, Berkeley, California Univ. Press, pg. 38-92.

¹³ The word itself originated from Herr Biedermeier, a product of the fertile imagination of the playwright Ludwig Pfau and attributed the typically honest, unalarmed and comfortable middle-class man.

¹⁴ Jürgen Habermas, (1962), *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*, Darmstadt, K. G. Hofstaller Verlag

¹⁵ Hubert Lengauer, (1989), *Asthetik und liberale Opposition. Zur Rotlenproblematik des Schriftstellers in der österreichischen Literatur um 1848*, Vienna, Böhlau Verlag.

¹⁶ Efforts for the establishment of literary-political clubs with basically a conspiratory character had taken place since 1819 when the playwright Francis Ignatius Castelli founded the club “*Ludlams-höhle*”. Its goals and existence were nonetheless discovered and that movement was banned. A few decades later, the function of reading clubs of political nature, (*juristisch-politische Lesevereine*) as an imitation of the English clubs where

Subsequently, we are going to focus on the main stages of maturation and emancipation of the middle class and the intellectuals in Austria, turning mostly to representative cases of scholars who dared to defy the prerevolutionary Habsburg censorial machine.

The profile of the Biedermeier Austrian writer

First of all, it is of outstanding importance to mention that the Austrian writers before 1848 had very rarely the chance of making for a living only through the profits of their intellectual production. Apart from the privileged few who belonged to the wealthy hereditary land-owning aristocracy, the majority of the scholars had to look for a more secure major profession. Given that at the time the state constituted the main employer for people with a university education in the country, it is to be expected that the vast majority of the non-noble intellectual community was working in public offices, which means that they themselves should impose on their writings a kind of preliminary self-censorship (*Selbstzensur*) before the official censor received them, in order to avoid negative consequences in their professional life. Thus, in the 1820s, only a very small ratio of writers declared that they relied exclusively on the sales of their books (Bachleitner, 1997: 101). The line of writers/civil servants from 1780 until 1848 included among others Aloys Blumauer, Joseph Heinrich and Matthäus Collin, Joseph Hormayr, Friedrich Gentz, Franz Grillparzer, Josef Hammer-Purgstall, Anton Prokesch-Osten, Eduard Bauernfeld, Ignaz Castelli, Joseph Christian von Zedlitz, Johann Nepomuk Vogl, Johann Gabriel Seidl, Johann Mayrhofer, Franz Schlechta, Friedrich Halm, Adalbert Stifter, Hermann Gilm and Adolf von Tschabuschnigg (Heindl, 1994: 46-47). Nonetheless, as Hubert Lengauer notes, from the 1830s onwards, a third kind of intellectuals began to appear next to aristocrats and civil servants: the kind of professional writer that attracted his income from publications under his name, targeting of course the Austrian market, but always having in mind the wider German one (*Brottschriftsteller*) (Macho, 2011: 161)¹⁷. Belonging to the third category did not mean that being part of the other two groups was impossible -in fact that was the most common case, and above all the case of the daring writers, discussed in the following pages.

Charles Sealsfield, *Austria as it is/Österreich wie es ist* (1828)

Chronologically, first in the series of hymnists of literary freedom was the Austrian émigré in the United States, Charles Sealsfield (pseudonym of Moravian-born Karl Postl), who had summarized the situation of his colleagues in their homeland as: “no man (...) is a greater slave than the Austrian writer” (Sealsfield, 1828: 83, Obermeier, 1991: 15)¹⁸. In

political discussions took place, was unofficially permitted and by 1844 they counted 248 members in Vienna. They were of course functioning under strict police supervision and they were allowed to discuss books up to the category “*Erga schedam*”.

¹⁷ Hubert Lengauer, (1989), *Asthetik und liberale Opposition. Zur Rotlenproblematik des Schriftstellers in der österreichischen Literatur um 1848*, Vienna, Böhlau Verlag, pg. 61.

¹⁸ Charles Sealsfield was born in Brünn in 1793. Although he began his career as a clergyman, in 1822 he emigrated to the United States -where he took his pseudonym- and there worked as a journalist. In 1826 he returned to Germany and published a book on the United States (*Die Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika*). Nevertheless, the work that established him was *Austria as it is*. In the following years he lived in New York,

1828, he published first in London and a bit later in Zürich (in English and in German language respectively) his most important work *Austria as it is* (or alternatively *Österreich wie es ist*), which in the future acquired a great deal of respect and was read widely. Naturally, his work was strictly prohibited in Austria and the Authorities tried to arrest him, something virtually impossible since he lived neither in Austria nor in Germany –never to return there for the rest of his life. In the book the author followed his own steps travelling from Germany to the Austrian capital, observed the social and political circumstances of the Empire and exercised harsh criticism towards its organization and police methods in a way that constituted a predecessor of the polemic pamphlets of the 1840s. (Frimmel, 2011: 142, Macho, 2011: 164-168). For example, he describes the feeling of suspicion and the autocratic control which was predominant in the Empire during and just after the Napoleonic years (Sealsfield, 1828: 85-88, Jaszi, 1961: 77):

“Since the year 1811 ten thousand *Naderer* or secret policemen are at work. They are recruited from the lower classes of merchants, domestic servants, workers, even prostitutes, and they form a coalition which traverses the entire Viennese society like red silk thread runs through the loops of the English navy uniform. You can scarcely pronounce a word in Vienna which would escape them. You have no defense against them and if you take with you your own servants, within fourteen days they become, even against their own will, your traitors. (...)]”

The fiercely regulated intellectual environment of the Monarchy that was moving against all kinds of scholarly innovation, accepted not only his direct arrows but also his bitter humor: “*A more fettered being than an Austrian author surely never existed, A writer in Austria must not offend against any government, nor against any minister, nor against any hierarchy, if its members be influential, nor against the aristocracy. He must not be liberal -nor philosophical- nor humorous -in short, must he be nothing at all. (...] What have become of Shakespeare had he been doomed to live or to write in Austria?*” Next, he dealt with the eventuality of active defiance against the government by some ambitious and brave scholar: “*Should an Austrian author dare to write contrary to the views of the Government, his writings would be not only muti-lated but he himself regarded as a contagious person, with whom no faithful subject should have any intercourse.*” Subsequently, he examined the possibility of public-shing not in Austria but in Germany, but he quickly abandoned also that prospect ad-mitting the then firm influence of the Habsburg on the Confederation, a situation that, nonetheless, was not bound to last for many more years (Sealsfield, 1828: 209-211).

Anastasius Grün, *Spaziergänge eines Wiener Poeten* (1831)

A correspondent of the radical for contemporary standards work of Sealsfield was to be found only three years later in the face of young aristocrat Anastasius Grün (literary pseudonym of the Count Anton Alexander von Auersperg, 1806-1876, Kann, 1974: 375). In

Paris and London and died in 1864 in self-exile in Switzerland. His work holds an important position in the German-speaking literary production of the early 19th century (*Der Legitime und die Republikaner*, 1838, *Der Virey und die Aristokraten oder Mexiko im Jahre 1812*, 1835 etc.). Between 1843 and 1846 his complete works (*Gesammelte Werke*) were published in 18 volumes. See also Nanette M. Ashby, (1980), *Charles Sealsfield: The greatest American author: a study of literary piracy and promotion in the 19th century*, New York, Viking Press.

1831 he published the work for which he later became mainly well-known, i.e. *Spaziergänge eines Wiener Poeten* (*Walks of a Viennese Poet*), to which the beginnings of the liberal political emancipation of Austrian writers are conventionally attributed. That movement was expressed through a line of later political studies, openly hostile to the reactionary regime of Metternich, following the spirit of Grün (Beicken, 1985: 194-195, Obermeier, 1991: 14-15, Macho, 2011: 160-161)¹⁹. From his youth he travelled to Western Europe, particularly to London and Paris and developed friendly relations with other significant Austrian and German scholars such as Nikolaus Lenau, Eduard von Bauernfeld and Heinrich Heine (it is evident that his advanced political views were also a result of his cosmopolitan and versatile experiences that few people in the Empire had obtained). In 1830 affected by romanticism he published the poetry collection *Der letzte Ritter* (*The last Knight*), in which he looked for a worthy ruler for Austria, criticizing thus the insufficiency of Francis I (Beicken, 1985: 196, 200).

Thanks to the Revolution of July 1830 in Paris, he was inspired to write the *Spaziergänge*, which he published anonymously in Hamburg next year and was naturally banned by censorship. This collection attracted particular attention due to the clear and straightforward nature of his political attacks that were far more daring than Sealsfield's: he even addressed the Emperor directly: "*Sire, liberate us from captivity: our thoughts and word!*". Thus it can be understood that the memories from the Josephinian past were still alive when Metternich was in office (Grün, 1831: 103, Beicken, 1985: 201, Macho, 2011: 162). The variety of his experiences allowed him to condemn absolutism as obsolete and provocatively incompatible with the law of nature which forces equality of all men and where the source of individual dignity originates. The all-mighty Chancellor became the object of ironical comments: "*You don't have to fear him; the people of Austria are honest, open-hearted, with good manners and elegant*". The religious and political stagnation, the system of spies, the slow moving, conservative bureaucracy and above all censorship that executed every kind of mental originality were criticized with admirable honesty (Grün, 1831: 13, Beicken, 1985: 203). On the other hand, the liberalism of *Spaziergänge* had visible limits and did not go above Josephinian radicalism. The young poet targeted the improvement and the reform of the system and not its abolition. In his way of thinking, the Emperor was legal and was supported by the Grace of God and the love of his subjects and only via him change might come in the future (Grün, 1831: 100-102, Beicken, 1985: 204). *Spaziergänge* is still considered Grün's most valuable work and the one which exercised the greatest deal of influence on his contemporary and later thinkers.

¹⁹ Grün was born in Laibach and was an offspring of one of the most important noble families of the Empire. He studied law in Graz and in Vienna and served in high court offices, as was destined by his family origin, albeit he subsequently exercised merciless criticism towards the imperial regime. *Spaziergänge* was the first literary work after Sealsfield's *Austria* that expressed without hesitation political attitudes, becoming one of the pillars of realism in literature. In the earlier stages of his political career (he obtained by law a hereditary position in the *Herrenhaus* -the House of Lords), he supported the rights of the Slovenes in his homeland Carniola, but he changed his attitude when their national claims threatened the position of the privileged German minority there. Despite his criticism of Metternich, he remained to the end of his life an advocate for the Germanic centralized state, decisively rejecting the suggestions of Magyars and Slavs for regional autonomy. Other important works of his were: *Schutt* (1835), *Gedichte* (1837), *Nibelungen im Frack* (1843), *Pfaff vom Kahlenberg* (1850).

Eduard von Bauernfeld, *Pia desideria eines österreichischen Schriftstellers* (1842)...

We are going to deal with the case of Bauernfeld's work in a more detailed way because of the grave influence it exercised on his contemporaries. In particular his work *Pia desideria eines österreichischen Schriftstellers* (*Pious desires of an Austrian writer*, 1842) is going to attract our attention because criticism towards censorship was the very core of this piece. Samples of his liberal thought had also been revealed in his earlier works exhibiting a satirical mood towards central authority style (*Der literarische Salon*, 1836), but also in the later ones (*Größjährig* (1846), where the Chancellor himself was the target of criticism. Needless to say, all his books were prohibited and confiscated by the Austrian police. At the same time, he had developed some purely political activity, having organized before 1848 private gatherings with anti-governmental context, whilst during the Revolution he was one of the warmest advocates of freedom of the press and subsequently he took part as a delegate of Austria in the German National Assembly of Frankfurt. The limits of Bauernfeld's radicalism were not different from those of Grün: he wished the correction of some drawbacks of the Monarchy and not the collapse of the established order. His faith to the Emperor and love for the fatherland are visible in his work (Lindengrün, 2003: 3-4, 8)²⁰.

Pia desideria was published anonymously in Leipzig six years before the Revolution. In this brief work (93 pages) the author examined initially the social and intellectual developments in France and in Germany -which he regarded as superior to the Austrian ones- and then he turned to the Monarchy, pointing out the contribution of the middle class to the intellectual modernization of the country (Bauernfeld, 1842: 3-17). He complained that the Austrians were considered abroad as careless and mindless people because their achievements in the Arts were not widely known due to censorship. At this point though, Bauernfeld was exaggerating because, as we have observed, there were ways of bypassing censorship (Obermeier, 1991: 14, Linden-grün, 2003: 9-11). Bauernfeld believed that the modern and morally mature state did not need censorship. The immoral and meaningless messages could be rejected by the social body per se, which is capable of separating the Ideal from the Pointless. The Austrian people had not yet of course reached this supreme state and thereupon censorship should not be abolished but reformed, becoming milder and more protective in favor of the still immature Public against the truly detrimental readings. For Bauernfeld, the return to the legal framework of Joseph II would be ideal (19-32, Lindengrün, 2003: 18-19).

Censorship had never prevented any Revolution from happening, which only timely reforms could stop: "*free press never provoked any rebellion (but] was always the expression of an already born revolutionary thought*", as it is proven by the examples of England and America (Bauernfeld, 1842: 58-59). Censorship had contributed so that Austrian creations were regarded as indifferent and untrustworthy: "*the uncovered existence of censorship causes criticism in our country and abroad of the books being published in Austria and additionally, according to the opinion of booksellers, it reduces their profits and the*

²⁰ Bauernfeld (1802-1890) is considered one of the most significant German-speaking playwrights of the 19th century and towards the end of his life, he was ennobled for his contribution to Austrian literature. He was born in Vienna, studied law and subsequently joined the civil service. A trip of his in England in 1845 played a decisive role in further liberalization of his view on his homeland. His works were very popular in his time and were published as a whole by Francis von Saar as *Gesammelte Schriften* in 12 volumes in Vienna between 1871 and 1873.

possibilities of commercial success, particularly in the case of scientific books” (Bauernfeld, 1842: 82, Lindengrün, 2003: 11-14). Concluding his work, the essayist begged again for relaxation of censorship. As a final compromise he suggested the decree of 1810 that was characterized partly by liberal elements, which by then were systematically ignored (Bauernfeld, 1842: 87-92). Finally, he signed it claiming that he represented middle class as a whole (Lindengrün, 2003: 15).

...and its influences and repercussions

As was the case with the *Spaziergänge, Pia desideria*, although censored, was also met with the friendly response of the public in Austria and abroad, but Bauernfeld’s advice did not find willing ears within the circles of the imperial government. In the subsequent years, *Pia desideria* was discussed extensively by revolutionary minds that found Bauernfeld’s suggestions overly restrained (Grillparzer on the other hand had found them provocatively progressive!). After the publication of this short book, the voices that called for drastic reform and re-rationalization of censorship, were intensified through political pamphlets, brochures, petitions to the government and studies of political and scientific context like *Österreich über alles, wenn es nur will* (Austria above all, only if it is desirable, 1842) by Franz Schuselka, *Sibyllinische Bücher aus Österreich* (Sibyllic books from Austria, 1842) by Karl Moering and mainly *Österreich und dessen Zukunft* (Austria and its future, 1843) by Viktor von Adrian-Werburg, as well as the journal *Die Grenzboten* with Ingaz Kuranda as its publisher (1841) (Vocelka, 2000: 196). The police authorities faced the above mentioned works as a tremendous threat and strove to prevent their circulation in Austria using every possible measure (Obermeier, 1991: 17, Lindengrün, 2003: 7, Liedtke, 2011: 122-124, Macho, 2011: 163). The result was not however very successful for them because these ‘dangerous readings’ were embraced by the public, and censorship must have unintentionally played a role towards that, since the books of the Index always attracted the strongest interest of readers. Two other significant facts towards the same direction before 1848 that illuminate the rise of the *bürgerliche Öffentlichkeit* in the 1840s, are the public memorandum of the Viennese intellectuals to the government (1845), and the historical study of Dr. Adolph Wiesner about censorship in Austria (1847).

The Public Memorandum to the Government arguing for Reforms in Censorship (1845) and its Aftermath

The memorandum of the Austrian intellectuals to the government of Prince Metternich holds an outstanding position in the struggle against censorship because it was essentially the only well-organized, collective reaction of that social group against the censorial regime before 1848. On 11th May 1845, ninety-nine of the most distinguished personalities of Viennese literature co-signed a document titled *Denkschrift über die gegenwärtigen Zustände der Zensur in Österreich* (Memorandum about the current circumstances of censorship in Austria), whose editor was the preeminent Austrian orientalist Josef von Hammer-Purgstall. The disadvantages and the malfunctions of the censorial agencies were analyzed, and above all the secret character of the basic criteria of censorship, so the publisher and text-writers

never to be absolutely sure whether the material they were going to publish had serious possibilities to be banned or not. From the final receiver of the memorandum, namely the Minister of Interior, Count Anton Francis von Kolowrat, the petitioners were asking the publication of a new censorial decree based on that of 1810 and the configuration of new, impartial and objective preconditions, according to which censorship should be imposed. At the bottom of the document, one could find inter alia the signatures of: Franz Grillparzer, Edward von Bauernfeld, Ernst Feuchtersleben, Ladislaus Pyrker, Ludwig August Frankl, Friedrich Halm, Ignaz Franz Castelli, Anastasius Grün, Adalbert Stifter, Josef von Hammer-Purgstall, Stephan Endlicher, Friedrich Kaiser and Gottfried Moritz Saphir. The signers were not only writer but also painters, musicians and doctors that felt suffocated within the extremely narrow intellectual boundaries of Austrian absolutism. Finally, in the memorandum it was stated that: “[...] where there is no law but only the individual perspective of each censor, what can easily happen is that even something acceptable or harmless or even useful may be prohibited [...] and the author is judged according to norms which he is not familiar with, and condemned without being able to be heard or having the chance to defend himself” (Hammer-Purgstall, 1845: 22-23, Höbelt, 2000: 222, Olechowski, 2013: 151).

The Chancellor underestimated the meaning of the memorandum, hardened his position against the ‘revolutionary elements’ and ordered his secretary Klemens Hügel to write a text, in which he would defend the principles of censorship. The latter eventually assumed that: “All over Europe the demand for freedom of the Press is being spread like an infectious disease”, concluding that: “censorship is essential for the state as is the police [...] as is the discreet power of the father at home.” Immediately Bauernfeld, Grillparzer and the playwright Heinrich Landemann published sarcastic answers to Hügel’s response, who, under the burden of general outcry against a system which seemed outdated and lacked popular support, was forced to withdraw his text. The reluctant and hesitant decision of the Foreign Minister to proceed to a limited reform in 1847, relied virtually on the experiences of the past two years, particularly if one takes into consideration the negative financial circumstances owing to a series of poor harvests after 1846 (Jaszi, 1961: 78, Obermeier, 1991: 16-17).

Dr. Adolph Wiesner, *Denkwürdigkeiten der Österreichischen Zensur vom Zeitalter der Reformation bis auf die Gegenwart* (1847)

Almost simultaneously with the administrative reorganization of the censorial machine, one of the most significant until today theoretical studies on the evolution of censorship in the Habsburg lands from the 16th until the 19th century was published in Stuttgart. Its title was *Denkwürdigkeiten der Österreichischen Zensur vom Zeitalter der Reformation bis auf die Gegenwart* (Worth-mentioning Information about Austrian Censorship from Reformation until present, 1847) and the author was called Adolph Wiesner. He was born in 1807 in Prague and studied law while he was also interested in writing. The patronage of Count Kolowrat, one of the most powerful contemporary statesmen, secured him not only a position in the public sector, in order to make a living and at the same time focus on literature freely, but also the opening of one of his plays on the extremely demanding Burgtheater of Vienna.

Nonetheless, Wiesner added his name to the 1845 memorandum and next year he fled from his country and applied himself to the writing of a study on the history of censorship “*as only an extremely close associate of the Authorities could write*”. The book followed the destiny of all the previous cases we examined: it enjoyed substantial commercial success and was banned by the police as most detrimental. Eventually, Metternich could not ignore its existence and ordered Hügel to publish a counter-text bearing the title *Über Denk-, Rede-, Schrift- und Preßfreiheit* (About the freedom of thought, speech, writing and the Press, 1847), which tampered with the real historical evolution of censorship in a manner beneficial to the government, contrary to Wiesner’s work. The surprising accuracy and completeness of the latter, have cast suspicions in the past that the author had help from within the state machine in writing his book, but nothing was ever proved. Nevertheless, the very high quality of the study is founded by the fact that even today, scholars consider it as an excellent introduction to the history of Austrian censorship and it is often quoted in relevant texts of secondary sources (Wiesner, 1847: 255f, Olechowski, 2013: 151-152).

“Freedom abroad”: Circles of self-exiled Austrian writers in Leipzig (1840s)

Before ending our word on censorship and the struggle for emancipation of the Austrian intellectuals, it is necessary to comment, even briefly, on the profile and the activities of a group of Austrian writers and publishers who preferred to abandon their homeland in order to be free to express their ideas. We have already mentioned the case of Charles Sealsfield and we are going to discuss the activity of the radical literary political circle of Austrian émigrés in Leipzig, where thanks to the more lenient character of Saxon censorship, many intellectuals from the Empire had found refuge in the 1840s, like Alfred Meissner, Ignaz Kuranda, Moritz Hartmann and Eduard Mautner, whose feelings are easily comprehensible: “*those who have once enjoyed the sweetness of freedom and those who at least once have managed to obey only their own genius, do not appreciate the finger of the police interfering with their writing any more*” (Obermeier, 1991: 15-16)²¹. The circle of the Leipzig writers was regarded as especially perilous for the domestic stability of the Monarchy by the authorities, and was thereupon constantly persecuted, given the proximity of Leipzig to the Bohemian borders and thus the easiness of book-smuggling. Nonetheless, the inability to arrest them shows clearly the limits of the Austrian influence abroad in the decade preceding the Revolution. As the superior censorship official Francis von Hartig put it bluntly: “*all foreign literary production is acquired so easily on a private level, that a man with literary interests would have been socially embarrassed if he confessed that he was not familiar with a forbidden book or journal, which had attracted attention. For instance, even at presence of superior officials in public, it was ordinary for someone to speak freely about the worst articles in the magazine Die Grenzboten*” (Höbelt, 2000: 222). However, domestically censorial authority remained still strong enough to push ambitious Austrian writers to publish their works abroad in the 1840s, preferably in Germany, something that brought the book market of the Monarchy into decline and as a result, from the beginning until the middle of the century, the loss of Vienna’s position as the publishing center of the German-speaking world and was substituted

²¹ R. Wittmann, (1991), *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels. Ein Überblick*, Munich, Beck, pg. 224.

by Leipzig and Stuttgart: “From Leipzig, the center of the entire German book-production, book-smuggling to the Monarchy was easily feasible” (Bachleitner, 1997: 105, Höbelt, 2000: 222 Macho, 2011: 156, 162-163).

The case of Anton Johann Groß-Hoffinger and his work

In order for the case of Leipzig to be deeply comprehended, it is useful to examine closely a representative case of an Austrian self-exiled scholar, namely Anton Johann Groß-Hoffinger. He was born in Vienna in 1808 and grew up in a lower -middle class family. In 1824 he enrolled in the University and after some years he became a doctor of philosophy. From the early 1830s, he started to publish travel novels, following the steps of Sealsfield and Grün. In 1832 he moved to Leipzig and published under a pseudonym the poetry collection *Das Reich der Finsternis* (The State of Darkness), which he dedicated to Grün: it was a description of the contemporary Habsburg Monarchy and the methods that Groß-Hoffinger used in his narration were not different from those of the *Spaziergänge* poet: censorship, the all-mighty clergy and its corruption along with the autocratic nature of the regime were openly criticized by the young scholar (Macho, 2011: 158-160). The disclosure, however, of his real identity the following year rendered his return to Austria impossible. As a kind of reaction, Groß-Hoffinger responded with an inundation of political pamphlets with clear anti-Habsburg context: *Austria. Zeitschrift für Österreich und Teutschland* (1833), *Mémoires d'un émigré autrichien sur son pays natal et son époque, ou l'histoire de la liberté en 1833* (1834). His *Die Poesie und die Poeten in Österreich im Jahre 1836* was accompanied by great commercial success, although critics pointed out serious defects in his prose. It was nonetheless a sign of how thirsty the Austrian and the German public were for critical information about the Empire. After the death of Francis I, Groß-Hoffinger quite strangely, denounced his liberal past and turned into a faithful advocate of the Habsburg authority (!) via a necrology of the dead Emperor and a historical study on Joseph II. The amelioration of his relations with the imperial authorities was also accompanied by state funding of his work and permission to return to Vienna (Macho, 2011: 170-171). A new dramatic change came in 1845, when he fled again to Germany, where he published two aggressive pamphlets against the government. The Revolution of 1848 alarmed him, but did not bring him again in the frontline of political confrontation (Wurzbach, 1859: 358-360). He lived in Germany for his last years and passed away in Berlin in 1873.

CONCLUSIONS

Taking into consideration the degree of ideological and political de-legitimization of the regime in the late 1840s among the middle (and partly the superior) educated social strata, the rapid spread of the revolutionary message from France should not cause any surprise, nor the weakness of the regime to react effectively, at least initially. Bauernfeld had prophesized that no police regime based on censorship was ever capable of preventing the path to the Revolution. Probably, in 1842, not even he himself could have imagined how soon his predictions were to come true. The liberal Josephinian reality was not possible to be erased by

the tactics of sheer oppression and stagnation that the empire's leading group chose after the enlightened despot's death. A seemingly omnipotent censorial police system was formed in the Napoleonic era which aimed to exist forever, putting an end to every hazardous innovation. Actu-ally, the system functioned quite satisfactorily until the 1830s, when the paralysis of the imperial authority, the aging of its leaders and the shortage of a new vision created the first cracks. Subsequently, the appearance of a young generation of intellectuals that were not eager to give up their rights for freedom and strove for reform within though the existing framework, having the Josephinian radicalism as their horizon, gave Metternich a formidable novel enemy that could not be manipulated by 1848, and when the first revolutionary flame arose in Paris, it found support in the German and the Danubian lands. Nestroy was not wrong after all when he stated that censor-ship devoured every intellectual innovation -although there were ways of escaping- and fifty years of stubborn suppression had brought only anger and mutual mistrust between the government and its subjects, feelings that were going to be unleashed in March 1848. However, the new realities of the Revolution in Vienna (and also in Budapest, Prague and Italy) and the subsequent, dynamic reaction of the *Kaisertreu* elements of society and the administration do not belong to the topic of the present paper. The completely different situation formed from 1849 onwards included also a new version of censorship which could compose the content of a future, surely particularly useful study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Legal Texts

Zensurvorschrift vom 22. Februar 1795, in: www.univie.ac.at/medienrechtsgeschichte/Zensurordnung1795.pdf (accessed 24/04/2014).

Zensurvorschrift vom 14. September 1810, in: [www.univie.ac.at/.../Zensurvorschrift 1810.pdf](http://www.univie.ac.at/.../Zensurvorschrift%201810.pdf) (accessed 24/04/2014).

Karlsbader Beschlüsse – Pressgesetz vom 20. September 1819, “Provisorische Bestimmungen hinsichtlich der Freiheit der Presse”, in: <http://www.heinrich-heine-denkmal.de/dokumente/karlsbad2.shtml> (accessed 24/04/2014).

Literat Works

Bauernfeld Eduard v., (1842), *Pia desideria eines österreichischen Schriftstellers*, Leipzig, Otto Wigand Verlag.

Hammer-Purgstahl Joseph v. et al., (1845), “Denkschrift über die gegenwärtigen Zu-stände der Zensur in Österreich”, in: Stefan Hock (ed.), (1905), *Eduard v. Bauernfeld: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Vienna, Verlag des Literarischen Vereins in Wien (= Schriften des Literarischen Vereins in Wien, No. 4.), pg. 1-27.

- Grün Anastasius, (1831), *Spaziergänge eines Wiener Poeten*, Hamburg, Hoffmann & Campe Verlag.
- Sealsfield Charles, (1828), *Austria as it is: or Sketches of Continental Courts. By an Eye-witness*, London, Hurst, Chance & Co. Press.
- Wiesner Adolph, (1847), *Denkwürdigkeiten der Oesterreichischen Zensur vom Zeitalter der Reformazion bis auf die Gegenwart*, Stuttgart, A. Krabbe Verlag.
- Wurzbach Constant v., (1859), “Gross-Hoffinger, Anton Johann”, in: *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, Vol. 5, Vienna, Verlag der k.k. Druckerei, pg. 368–370.

Secondary Literature

- Bachleitner Norbelt, (1996), “Lesen wie ein Zensor. Zur österreichischen Zensur englischer und französischer Erzählliteratur im Vormärz”, in: Peter Brochmeier (ed.), *Zensur und Selbstzensur in der Literatur*, Würzburg, Königshäuser & Neumann, pg.107-126.
- _____, (1997), “The Politics of the Book Trade in Nineteenth-Century Austria”, *Austrian History Yearbook*, Vol. 27, pg. 95-111.
- _____, (2012), “Die Zensur der Habsburger. Zur Datenbank der in Österreich zwischen 1750 und 1848 verbotenen Bücher”, in: Kortlander Bernd, Stahl Enno (eds.), *Zensur im 19. Jahrhundert*, Magdeburg: Aisthesis Verlag, pg. 255-268.
- Beicken Peter, (1985), “Anastasius Grün und der Österreichische Vormärz“, *The German Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No. 2, pg. 194-207.
- Brion Marcel, (1959), *La vie quotidienne a Vienne au temps de Mozart et de Schubert*, Paris, Hachette, (Greek trans by A. Sakellariou (1994) Athens, Papadimas Press).
- Duriegl Gunter (ed.), (1988), *Burgersinn und Aufbegehren. Biedermeier und Vormärz in Wien, 1815-1848*, Vienna-Munich, Jugend und Volk, Katalog der 109. Sonderausstellung des Historischen Museums.
- Emerson Donald, (1968), *Metternich and the Political Police: Security and Subversion in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1815-1830*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff.
- Frimmel Johannes, (2011), “Wiener Verlage im Vormärz. Ein Überblick”, in: Christian Liedtke (ed.), *Literaturbetrieb und Verlagswesen im Vormärz: Jahrbuch Forum Vormärz Forschung 2010*, Magdeburg, Aisthesis Vlg, pg. 139-154.
- Heindl Waltraud, (1994), “Der 'Mitautor'. Überlegungen zur literarischen Zensur und staatsbürgerlichen Mentalität im Habsburgischen Biedermeier und Vormärz”, in: Peter Hanak et al. (eds.), *Kultur und Politik in Österreich und Ungarn*, Vienna, Böhlau Verlag, pg. 38-60.
- Herles Helmut, (1973), “Nestroy und die Zensur”, στο: Jürgen Hein (επιμ.), *Theater und Gesellschaft: Das Volksstück im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Düsseldorf, Bertelsmann Universitätsverlag, pg. 121-132.
- Hobsbawm E. J., (1962), *The Age of Revolution 1789-1848*, New York, Vintage Books, (Greek trans by M. Oikonomopoulou, (1992), Athens, MIET Press).

- Hobelt Lothar, (2000) "The Austrian Empire", in: R. J. Goldstein (ed.), *The War for the Public Mind: Political Censorship in the Nineteenth-Century Europe*, London, Praeger, pg. 211-238.
- Hoefler Frank Thomas, (1983), *Pressepolitik und Polizeistaat Metternichs. Die Überwachung von Presse und politischer Öffentlichkeit in Deutschland und den Nachbarstaaten durch das Mainzer Informationsbüro (1833-1848)*, München, K. G. Saur Verlag, Dortmunder Beiträge zur Zeitungsforschung, Vol. 37.
- Jaszi Oscar, (1961), *The Dissolution of the Habsburg Monarchy*, Chicago, Chicago Univ. Press.
- Kann Robert, *A History of the Habsburg Empire, 1526-1918*, Berkeley: California Univ. Press, 1974.
- Lindengrün Christine, (2003), *Zensur im Vormärz aus der Sicht eines Autors: Eduard von Bauernfelds Pia Desideria*, Norderstedt, Grin Verlag.
- Macho Andreas, (2011), "Die antihabsburgische Ideenschmiede Leipzig. Exil und Agitation des Österreichischen Schriftstellers A. J. Groß-Hoffinger", in: Christian Liedtke (ed.), *Literaturbetrieb und Verlagswesen im Vormärz: Jahrbuch Forum Vormärz Forschung 2010*, Magdeburg: Aisthesis Vlg, pg. 155-174.
- Marx Julius, (1959), *Die Österreichische Zensur im Vormärz*, Vienna, Verlag für Geschichte und Politik.
- McKenzie John, (1980), "Political Satire in Nestroy's 'Freiheit in Krahwinkel'", *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 75, pg. 322-332.
- Obermaier Walter, (1991), "Zensur im Vormärz und im Jahr 1848", in: Erika Weinzierl, Rudolf Ardel (eds.), *Justiz und Zeitgeschichte VIII*, Vienna-Salzburg, Geyer-Edition Verlag, 1991, pg. 7-29.
- Olechowski Thomas, (2013), "Die Österreichische Zensur im Vormärz", in: Gabriele Clemens (ed.), *Zensur im Vormärz: Pressefreiheit und Informationskontrolle in Europa*, Stuttgart, Jan Thorbecke Verlag, pg. 139-152.
- Revesz Thomas, (1993), "Freedom of the Press: Its Idea and Realization in Pre-1914 Hungary", *Hungarian Studies Review*, Vol. 20, pg. 93-101.
- Rumpler Helmut, *Eine Chance für Mitteleuropa: bürgerliche Emanzipation und Staatsverfall in der Habsburgermonarchie, 1804-1914*, Vienna: Ueberreuter, 1997.
- Vocelka Karl, (2000), *Geschichte Österreichs: Kultur-Gesellschaft-Politik*, Vienna, Styria Premium.
- Yates W. E., (1996), *Theater in Vienna: A Critical History, 1776-1995*, New York, Cambridge Univ. Press.

“Go for broke”.

The role of Japanese-Americans during World War II.

Roberto Tuccini
ISHA Roma

18.143 individual decorations, eight Presidential citations and the Congressional Gold medal.

These are the military honors awarded to the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, a military unit of the US Army in which the Japanese Americans had their chance to fight to prove their honor and fidelity to the American flag, making their unit the mostly decorated one in the entire American armed forces.

This paper focuses on the particular status of Japanese-Americans in the USA during World War II and on their role in the American armed forces, with particular attention to their deployment on the Italian front.

After a necessary yet brief analysis of the Japanese migration to the US from the second half of the nineteenth century to 1924, I have focused on the dynamics of the many different Japanese-American communities in the USA, and on the way these communities related to each other.

The second part of my paper deals with the delicate subject of the internment of Japanese-Americans in relocation centers after the attack on Pearl Harbor: from that day the Japanese-Americans started to be called enemy aliens, considered as potential espionage or sabotage cells on the American ground.

Japanese-Americans had their ransom shortly thereafter, when the US government gave them the chance to fight in two different military units, who proved great honor on the battlefields of WWII.

The 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team fought in Africa, Italy and France, gathering respect from the troops as from the supreme commands. This part of my paper, which is the widest part of my work, focuses on the operative employments of those units between 1943 and 1945, with particular attention to the goals they achieved in Italy.

As a conclusion, I shortly analyzed the integration issues they had to face when they got back to the US.

THE JAPANESE MIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES. ISSEI AND NISEI

Commodore Perry's expedition to Japan is usually considered the starting point for that particular stage of Japanese history named *Meiji Restoration*. The decision to cease the secular isolation brought Japan to undertake a huge renovation process under the social, economical and cultural point of view: the main reason for the start of Japanese migration to the United States has to be looked for in this process of renewal.

The first Japanese immigrants came to Hawaii and California already in the 1860's and, apart from working in agriculture and fishing, they even created import-export companies who mainly traded Japanese products to the United States. It shall be noted, though, that if in

California the Japanese ethnic group had always represented a minority of the whole population, the Hawaiian total population soon ended up including a good forty-percent of Japanese people (Sue Inui 1925).

The immigration of the Japanese to the west coast United States withstood a huge growth after the *Chinese Exclusion Act* of 1882: the law, made in order to contain the arrival of low-paid labor from China, had nothing to do with the Japanese, who substituted the Chinese as railroad workers shortly thereafter. Worth saying that, at the time, the United States were in its *Gilded Age*, and heavy industries such as the railroad one where withstanding a great development.

Even though they were not involved in the *Chinese Exclusion Act*, Japanese immigrants to the United States had no easy life: political lobbies, local authorities and even citizens started a huge protest against them, which lasted until 1924 and produced an extremely high number of treatises, pamphlets and essays from both sides of the controversy (Coryn 1909, Goto 1921, Gulick 1921) . Even the Federal institutions tried to ban the Japanese from the United States: in 1919 senator Phelan wrote a vehement pamphlet against the so-called “Japanese Evil”, in which he strongly wished for a Japanese exclusion law (Phelan 1919). During this period, many laws had been made in order to make life hard for the Japanese-Americans. For instance, the *Naturalization Act* of 1906 allowed all the immigrants to the United States to obtain the naturalization after proving the knowledge of English. The law itself had no limitation related to the provenience of the immigrant, but the responsible courts followed the praxis of naturalizing only “white” and “black” men, thus excluding the “yellow” Asians. This led to a trial started by Takao Ozawa, who in 1922 had his citizenship file refused, thus deciding to apply to the Supreme Court (case 260 U.S. 178), who eventually judged him according to the praxis: Ozawa was declared ineligible for naturalization.

The *Immigration act of 1924*, or *Johnson-Reed Act*, definitively stopped the Japanese migration to the United States until 1965, when a new *Immigration Act* again made possible for the Rising Sun people to get in the United States. Moreover, in the same 1924 the *Oriental exclusion act*, an addition to the Johnson-Reed Act, made impossible to get the American citizenship to all the Asian immigrants that did not already have it.

The laws of 1924 acted as a rupture for the Japanese community in the United States: the immigrants who already were in America in that year started to be called *issei* –roughly *first-generation immigrants*, while all the people with Japanese origins and parents born in the United States starting from 1924 were instead called *nisei*, or *second-generation immigrants*.

Many were the differences between *issei* and *nisei*: while the former considered themselves as Japanese, both for being born in Japan and for having Japanese as their mother-tongue, the latter –as many second-generation immigrants- considered themselves as Americans, because they were born in America and even because their first language was English, but nonetheless, as already said, they could not obtain the American citizenship.

The social discrimination was added to the institutional one: as all immigrants, the cultural differences between the Japanese and the rest of the American people brought them to social exclusion yet in the nineteenth century, and they started to be in the aims of the wide-spreading anti-Japanese feeling, who had its basis, among others, in the competition gave by the Japanese in the agricultural labor (Phelan 1919).

The Japanese communities, in the United States were thus discriminated from the outside and divided on the inside between *issei* and *nisei*. Furthermore: due to the relatively small size of the Japanese communities, they did not adopt the same aggregation and cooperation features that the Chinese communities had adopted, which led to the creation of the so-called *Chinatowns*. On the contrary, the Japanese always had –with some exception- a haphazard spread in the west side of the United States.

These were the circumstances who had been taking place until the infamous date of December 7th, 1941.

WORLD WAR II. PEARL HARBOR AND RESTRAINT

It was dawn when the Japanese navy started *Operation Ai*, the surprise attack to the American naval base of Pearl Harbor, in the Hawaii islands, who officially started the Japanese entrance to World War II, sided with the Axis (Liddel Hart 2012). The following day the American Army found a secret dossier in the Japanese consulate of Honolulu, containing all the information on the American vehicles and troops located in the Pearl Harbor base. On December 15th, during a press conference, the Navy Secretary Frank Knox said that a Japanese-American espionage fifth-column had been operating in the United States (Giannasi 2010).

In California, the State which had the largest count of Japanese-Americans, soon started a violent persecution towards the Japanese-Americans. Anyhow, that did not happen in the Hawaii islands, where the Japanese community was much larger and more solid: many Hawaiian *nisei* were even serving both in the armed forces and in the National Guard. It was a *nisei* serving in the latter organization that made the first Japanese prisoner-of-war: private David Akui caught the Japanese sergeant Kazuo Sakamaki, who was commanding a so-called *pocket submarine* who accidentally drove aground on a Hawaiian beach during the attack on Pearl Harbor (Crost 1994).

Anyhow, the Japanese-Americans started to be considered as a serious threat to the American safety, thus leading the government to adopt measures in order to stop this presumed menace: the following February president Roosevelt signed the *Executive Order 9066*, in which he authorized the Armed Forces to create some conviction camps, subject to military authority, inaccessible by civilians (Sheperd 1993). This measure was considered as a foresign to the internment of the Japanese-Americans, though this operation would have inevitably led to huge problems, especially concerning the Hawaii-based Japanese-Americans. In fact, moving thousands of Japanese to the mainland would have been a long and costly process. Moreover, both the military and civilian Japanese-Americans of the Hawaii islands were providing a huge contribution to the reconstruction of the military facilities of the archipelago destroyed by the Japanese attack.

These issues led to a compromise: only the Japanese-Americans living in the mainland would have been relocated, while only the Japanese-Americans believed to be the most dangerous who lived on the Hawaii islands would have been imprisoned. Among those were businessmen, believed to make business with the Japanese empire, politicians and shintoistic monks, as the complete obedience to the *tenno*, the Japanese Emperor –who was the leader of an enemy state- was one of the main principles of Shintoism (Giannasi 2010).

Suddenly after the issue of Order 9066, a law forbid all the “Japanese or Japanese-descendants” to live freely in the western United States, aside from the militarized areas. The Japanese-Americans could nothing to prove their political and institutional rights: the large communities of Hawaii could not prove their disappointment by voting –as Hawaii were not yet a state- while the Californian communities, who actually had the right to vote, were numerically too small to count in an election. There is another issue to consider: the fact that the Japanese-Americans had no lobby or political party who sided with them; while on the other hand there were many lobbies that attacked them demagogically.

On April 1942, under the basis of illations who were never proved by any source, the military authorities started the mass-deportation of 110.000 to 120.000 Japanese-americans to the *relocation centers*, who in fact were real concentration camps (Shepherd 1993).

The aforementioned “military authority” mainly consisted in General DeWitt, commander in charge of the *Western Defense Command* and spokesman of the anti-Japanese-American feeling: while speaking in the House of Representatives in April, 1943 he said:

“I don't want any of them (persons of Japanese ancestry] here. They are a dangerous element. There is no way to determine their loyalty. The west coast contains too many vital installations essential to the defense of the country to allow any Japanese on this coast. (...)It makes no difference whether he is an American citizen, he is still a Japanese. American citizenship does not necessarily determine loyalty. But we must worry about the Japanese all the time until he is wiped off the map. Sabotage and espionage will make problems as long as he is allowed in this area. (Commission of Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, 1982-1984).

While General DeWitt made an effort to find out where to build the camps, these were under the control of an *ad-hoc* created civilian authority, the *War Relocation Authority*, who had its headquarter in Tula Lake camp, the biggest relocation center. The authority worked together with the Army and the Bureau of Census in order to locate and remove all the Japanese-American people who were living in the area mentioned by Order 9066.

Milton Eisenhower, brother of the better-known general (later President of the United States) Dwight, was the chief of the War Relocation Authority. The camps were mainly located in the semi-desert area of the American far-- in California, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas- but there were even some camps in Arkansas or Louisiana.

The mass deportation of the Japanese immigrants made huge gaps among the agricultural and industrial labor in California, who started to be gradually filled by the increasing arrival of Mexican workers.

The camps were built in extreme hurry, and were made of wood or aluminum-made military-like buildings, surrounded by barbed-wire fences and controlled by military police and by federal agents, helped by the sheriffs and deputies of the counties in which the camps were located.

The relocation centers had a somewhat free economy: in opposition to the “standard” concentration camps –where the very few goods were provided by the administration- the convicted Japanese-Americans had to work in order to earn the money to pay for what they needed. The wages, though, were extremely low -twelve to nineteen dollars per month- and jobs were few, thus forcing the WRA to give the internees the chance to exit the camps in

order to work and study in the nearby towns (Commission of wartime relocation and internment of civilians 1982-1984). Moreover, at the end of 1943 the federal government allowed the Japanese families to live outside of the camps, proven there was a family who could host them and guarantee for their good behavior. It has to be said that the hosting families had the chance to use the underpaid labor provided by the Japanese-Americans. These families had a great power on the *nisei*, and could almost blackmail them with the threat of reporting their misbehavior to the Relocation Authority. World-famous photographer Ansel Adams documented the situation of the relocation camps in his photographic book *Born free and equal*, in which he sided –as little white Americans did- with the Japanese (Adams 1944).

The history of relocation camps came to an end in December, 1944, when the Supreme Court proved them to be anti-constitutional. Starting from the following January, the Japanese-Americans could leave the camps or the hosting families and return to their previous lives. They were all provided a train ticket and twenty-five dollars from the Government.

NISEI AND WAR: THE 100TH INFANTRY BATTALION

In February 1942, the American military authorities classified the Japanese-Americans as *alien enemies*, thus preventing them from being enrolled in the Armed Forces, but the enrolling law who was in force back in the days –the *Selective Service Act*, or *Draft Act*, issued in 1917- prevented the discharge of the Japanese-American soldiers who, as already said, were serving in the National Guard on the Hawaii Islands. These men considered themselves as real Americans, and showed great devotion to the American flag, but they were deemed as an institutional problem by the Army Commanders, especially when the Pacific front of World War II got complicated. This led to their secret reassignment to Camp McCoy, the biggest military base of the whole United States, who was located in Wisconsin. There the Japanese-American soldiers were put together in the “100th infantry battalion”, and started their training. The men of *one-puka-puka* (one-zero-zero in the Hawaiian slang) were put under the command of white Hawaiian officers, chosen for their linguistic and cultural affinity with their troops (Giannasi 2010).

Few months later, the Hawaiian-Japanese soldiers were joined by many Japanese-Americans formerly convicted in the relocation centers of the mainland, who merged into the “442nd Regimental Combat Team”. This had been made possible when the Government decided to ask all the male internees which had a suitable age for recruitment if they wanted to fight for the United States.

The decision to make two military units made by Japanese-Americans had both a propagandistic and tactical aim: until then, the population of the Pacific islands had preferred to cooperate with the Japanese troops rather than the Americans, as Japanese had more cultural affinity with them. It is clear that the deployment of Japanese-Americans would have –at least according to the commanders- limited this issue. It has to be said, though, that in opposition to these intents the Japanese-American troops never had a first-line deployment in the Pacific front, where they were instead used in the intelligence, with the task of deciphering and translating the Japanese messages intercepted by the American troops.

On January 1943, when the 442nd Regimental Combat Team was formed, president Roosevelt said these famous words:

"No loyal citizen of the United States should be denied the democratic right to exercise the responsibilities of his citizenship, regardless of his ancestry. The principle on which this country was founded and by which it has always been governed is that Americanism is a matter of the mind and heart; Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race or ancestry. ("Origins of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team")

It's worth noting that only one year had passed since the issue of the infamous Executive Order 9066: in wartime principles and morality are easy to change.

The chance to enlist had an incredible effect on the Japanese-American population of the Hawaii islands: the enrolment centers were literally submerged by enlisting files submitted by people who finally had the chance to prove their valor and devotion to their country right on the battlefield. Diffidence towards them did not go away though: general Eisenhower firmly refused to deploy the 100th battalion, who was finally accepted by general Clark and sent to the Italian front as part of his 5th Army (Giannasi 2010).

After more training in Algeria, the *one-puka-puka* battalion landed in Salerno in September 1943. Starting from there, they would have had to fight their way north against general Kesselring's German troops.

In one month, the battalion had one casualty, two high decorations and a curious episode of desertion: sergeant Tsukuyama, badly injured, escaped from the military hospital to fight again (Giannasi 2010). It has to be said that both the Japanese-American made units never had an episode of desertion *strictu sensu*.

Between 1944 and 1945, the 100th Infantry Battalion took part to the several assaults to the Gustav line, who reached their apex in the four battles of Montecassino, where the German *Fallschirmjäger*n (airborne troops) made a glorious stand until they were forced to flee northwards (Keegan 2010).

The battles for Montecassino blew a hard strike to the 100th Battalion: at the end of February 1944 the unit was sent to the backlines as it had lost more than 50% of its members.

During the American advance towards Rome, the Battalion was one of the first units to reach Rome, but general Clark decided to stop them, as war propaganda would not have allowed Rome to be set free by Japanese-Americans.

THE 442ND REGIMENTAL COMBAT TEAM

Following the capture of Rome, the 100th Infantry Battalion was located near Civitavecchia, the biggest harbor near Rome. The battalion was decimated, thus it merged with the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, who at the time had just ended its training in Camp McCoy and had been assigned to Italy in March. It was originally made by two different units: 442nd itself and the 522nd Field Artillery Battalion, but the latter had soon been divided by the infantry team and considered as a separate unit. The 552nd Artillery Battalion is remembered as one of the very first military units to arrive to the Dachau lager, early 1945 ("Central Europe Campaign – 522nd Field Infantry Battalion").

For the very first time, *nisei* from both the mainland and the Hawaii islands were fighting side by side, though the merging brought more of a contrast between the units: first of all, the men from the 442nd, in the effort of proving their valor towards the American people, considered themselves superior to the men of the 100th Battalion, as the latter came from a territory who was not yet a state. Needless to be said, this did not merge well with the experience that the 100th battalion got on the battlefield; in addition to that, the difference of culture and traditions between the men of the two units was very intense, but nonetheless the new joint unit, named 100th/442nd, was sent to Tuscany, where it gave its contribution in the liberation of both Pisa and the harbor of Livorno (Giannasi 2010).

At the end of 1944 the unit was sent to France, and it was substituted by the 92nd Buffalo division, mainly composed by African-Americans, who proved to be one of the most problematic units in the whole American army. Only the return of the *nisei* troops could break the stalemate in which the allied forces found themselves on the slopes of the Apuan Alps, between Tuscany and Liguria.

Both general Clark and the Tuscan partisans were extremely happy of the return of the Japanese-Americans to the Italian front; the latter knowing them from the great help provided during the liberation of Tuscany from the Axis troops.

The expectations towards the *nisei* soldiers proved to be well-put: in April 1945, together with the partisans and the rest of the Allied forces, they attacked the western end of the Gothic Line on the Apuan Alps. They fought with great determination, and the occidental sector of the German defense line fell after a week of harsh fighting.

BACK HOME. NISEI IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONQUEST OF CIVIL RIGHTS

The Japanese-American soldiers came back home between 1945 and 1946, and along them 21 Medals of Honor, fifty-two *Distinguished Service Crosses*, one *Distinguished Service Medal*, 560 *Silver Stars*, two *Legion of Merit Medals*, fifteen *Soldier's Medals*, 4000 *Bronze Stars* and almost ten-thousand *Purple Hearts*, together with eight *Presidential Unit Citation*, for a total amount of 18.143 decorations, thus making the 100th/442nd the most decorated military unit in the whole American Army history (Giannasi 2010).

But this was not enough to stop discriminations against Japanese-Americans: even though they proved to be among the most valid soldiers of the American army, when they came back to their homeland they had were welcomed by the same anti-Japanese feeling they left when they went to fight in Europe: same insults, same “*No Japs*” signs that forbidden them to enter the stores, same segregations that kept them from integrating in the society.

In 1944 the Supreme Court had abolished the relocation camps, and in 1947 president Truman freed from jail the *nisei* who had protested against Order 9066. But complete integration and rehabilitation of the Japanese-Americans only came in 1963, the year when Daniel Inouye was elected as Senator of the Hawaii Islands, who became the 50th State in 1959. Late senator Inouye, a Japanese-American veteran from the 442nd Regimental Combat Team who lost an arm during the war, soon started a strong campaign in order to inform public opinion on the Japanese-American situation.

During the Seventies, apart from senator Inouye's work, many lawsuits were started by associations who defended the rights of Japanese-Americans. These files brought the

Congress to the institution of the *Commission of wartime relocation and internment of civilians* in 1980; the Commission decreed that the internment of *issei* and *nisei* decreed by the Roosevelt Administration during World War II had been illegal and racist.

The following step in the rehabilitation of Japanese-Americans came in 1988, when president Reagan signed the *Civil Liberties Act*, which contained formal apologies to the former internees and the refunding of twenty-thousand dollars to all the Japanese-Americans who had undergone internment and confiscation of private goods during World War II. Up to 1999 the American government had refunded 82.210 Japanese-Americans with 1.600.000.000 dollars (“*WWII Reparations: Japanese-American internees*”).

CONCLUSION. THE LEGACY OF 442ND REGIMENTAL COMBAT TEAM

Nowadays, the military legacy of the two Japanese-American units who fought during World War II is perpetuated by the 100th Infantry Battalion. This unit, still made of fifth or sixth-generation Japanese-Americans, is kept as a reserve, and distinguished by serving in Iraq between 2005 and 2006.

The cultural legacy of the two former units, and of all the Japanese-Americans who lived the deprivation of all rights, is perpetuated by many veterans associations, among which is worth to mention the *Go for broke national education center*, whose name is inspired by the motto of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team. The Center’s main issues are the study and the divulgation of the activities of the two military units, with particular attention to oral history of their former members.

Finally, it has to be mentioned the effort put by the American institutions in recognizing and celebrating Japanese-American’s valor and sacrifice: starting from Reagan and arriving to Obama, no American president has lacked to decorate –sometimes posthumously- the brave *nisei* who fought for their motherland.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams A., *Born free and equal*, U.S. Camera, New York 1944.

Commission of Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, *Personal Justice Denied*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington DC 1982-1984.

Coryn S. G. P., *The Japanese Problem in California*, in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 34, No. 2, *Chinese and Japanese in America* (Sep., 1909).

Crost L, *Honor by Fire*, Presidio Press, Novato (CA) 1994.

Giannasi A., *I Nisei in guerra*, Prospettiva Editrice, Civitavecchia 2010

Goto S., *The Anti-Japanese Question in California*, in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 93, *Present-Day Immigration with Special Reference to the Japanese* (Jan., 1921).

Gulick S. L., *Japanese in California: A Critical Examination of (1) Report of the California State Board of Control; (2) Letter by Governor Stephens to Secretary Colby; (3) Hearings in California by the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization*, in

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 93, *Present-Day Immigration with Special Reference to the Japanese* (Jan., 1921).

Keegan J., *La seconda guerra mondiale*, Rizzoli, Milano 2010 (original title *The second world war*, 1989).

Liddel Hart B., *Storia militare della seconda guerra mondiale*, Mondadori, Milano 2012 (original title *History of the Second World War*, 1970).

Phelan J. D., *The Japanese evil in California*, in *The North American Review*, Vol. 210, No. 766 (Sep., 1919)

Shepherd E., *Executive Order 9066: The Internment of 110,000 Japanese Americans*, in *The public historian*, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Winter, 1993).

Sue Inui K., *The Gentlemen's Agreement. How it has functioned*, in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 122, The Far East (Nov., 1925)

World War II reparations: Japanese-American Internees,
http://www.democracynow.org/1999/2/18/wwii_reparations_japanese_american_internees

Origins of 442nd Regimental Combat Team, <http://www.the442.org/activation.html>.

Italian Mafia in the United States: An Important-Export History

Flavia Tudini

ISHA Roma

Is the italo-american Mafia an ethnical product? Are the italian immigrants guilty for this kind of crime? What are the connections between the italo-american Mafia and the Husky Operation in 1943? This essay explores the relationship between the italian immigration and the birth of Mafia Mob in the USA during the XXth century, from the early years to the Fourties. So the main theme is not only “american social history” but it is also an history of the influence of italian migrations on the other side of the Ocean. This analysis try to point out why the Mafia history is an import-export history thought the two sides of the Ocean, which is not even died.

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between the Mafia and the United States has been debated by many, using a variety of sources, from books, articles and interviews to film production. All of this material showed in both an authentic way (through the use of sources and archival material) and a stereotypical one the contribution given by the Italians newcomers to the formation and development of gangsterism and in general to the development of the Mafia. The history and studies on the Mafia in America are connected with the history and biography of the single characters, the big bosses like Al Capone or Lucky Luciano (to name just the two most well-known), and with all of those involved without being aware, who left no traces. Of course, not all Italian immigrants were mobsters, as not all organized crime in the United States came from Italy. What is taken into consideration in these pages is only a very small part of the phenomenon; it will not describe the whole development of the Mafia in the United States, nor the story of all the characters who took part in this evolution. Here, the aim is to show how Italian immigration has influenced the birth and development of the Mafia associations in the New World and how the Allied landing in Sicily in 1943 has re-exported in the Old World the Mafia model, enhanced and modified in its structure. The presence of the Mafia in the United States and its contacts with Italy developed further after the end of World War II, when the implementation of cooperation programs between the two countries made possible a common fight against crime.

THE ITALIAN IMMIGRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The Italian immigration features

Between 1860 and the Twenties of the XXth century, the U.S. received the first wave of Italian immigrants. Most of them came from Southern Italy, especially Sicily, and were going to settle in North America, where they hoped to find a job in the factories as unskilled workers (Petrelli, 2011: 36-39). The massive emigration from Italy was caused by social and economic factors (Colarizi, 2009: 9-16) namely:

- ~ Recurrent crises in the agricultural sector, which affected especially Southern Italy;
- ~ An economic crisis, caused by the old and traditional production system and the collapse of the wheat price in the international market;

- ~ Strong demographic increase, which during an economic crisis emphasises the migration phenomenon;
- ~ The riots called “Fasci siciliani” in Sicily between 1892 and 1894, which caused the emigration of those who were considered rebels.

The newcomers were unskilled farmers, lacking in instruction and quite young, usually between 14 and 45 years old; they left alone and they were reached by the rest of the family after some months (for those coming from Sicily it was different: the first departure involved whole families). They sold their few possessions to pay for the trip and get the fifty lire needed to ask for the “Red Passport” (enabling them to reach the U.S.) and the residency permit. Until the First World War the Italians didn’t settle permanently, but rather returned to Italy to buy a small farm once they had earned enough: this kind of migrants were known as “birds of passage”. Only after the War the migrants tried to integrate into the American society. To persuade Italians to leave their country, the naval and railway companies used men called “reclutatori” who spread the American dream and paid in advance the ticket and the trip price, being paid back with a percentage of their future job income (Bergamini, 2006: 119-120). At their arrival in the harbours, the immigrants found men (called boss or intermediari), mainly racketeers, who provided them with housing and work in exchange for a fee (the bossatura) (Petrelli, 2011: 40-47). The immigrants could also rely on social networks formed by the Italians who reached the States in the previous years, sometimes even from their same country or city. This community helped the newcomers and wanted to preserve the Italian culture and traditions through journals and cultural associations (Idem: 57-60).

The criminal immigration

The features of criminal immigration in the United States were quite different from the above mentioned. The mafia men left Italy to escape from the charge of brigandage (Lupo, 2008: p. 14-15; Lupo, 2004). It’s difficult to point out the main characteristics of this second group of immigrants, because it was highly heterogeneous: there were professional criminals, but also middle class men who intermediated between the organized crime and the local politicians. In the Thirties of the XIX th century the middle class in Southern Italy, and especially in Sicily, made profits from the citrus export; very important to this commercial activity was the Palermo Harbour which was directly connected with New Orleans (Petrelli; 2011: 39). This commercial relationship was so strong that the middle class mafia men and their employees legitimately emigrated to have more control over their business and their profits in the States. The legal business also helped in spreading the illegal one, which in a few years reached cities as New Orleans, New York and Philadelphia. In the last decades of 1800 other criminals, with a lower living standard, moved in the States for other reasons. Many others Italian criminals, using connections with some politicians, managed to get the “Red passport” to escape the charges and the arrest warrants issued by the Kingdom of Italy. In fact in the same period the Italian police was conducting actions against the underworld to bring back law and order, especially in Sicily. Finally, among the criminals who sought refuge in the United States there were also ones trying to avoid the mafia revenges (Lupo, 2008: p. 17-20).

Little Italies

To understand the development of the Black Hand (in Italian “Mano Nera”) and the Mafia, it’s necessary to describe the living conditions of the newcomers and, above all, the places where they were forced to live. It is the isolation of the ghetto and its social (and criminal) networks that can help us to explain the development and the enforcement of organized crime.

With the beginning of the great Italian emigration (1880-90) entire areas inhabited exclusively by Italians were created in the American cities, and these were further divided into sub-areas based on the different provinces of origin. The ethnic neighborhood called “Little Italy” was born; it developed in every major city where there was a substantial Italian community (the most famous were in New York and New Orleans). The development of this ethnic neighborhood was caused by several intertwining factors: the proximity to the workplace (production sites or harbours), the low cost of housing, and the presence of other Italians (the ones who emigrated wanted to follow their family or friends: there was a real migratory chain) (Petrelli; 2011: 54). The newcomers lived in crumbling tenements, containing multiple family groups. The sanitary conditions were deplorable: water and light were not available, the waste was dumped into the streets, the health service was inefficient. For all these reasons the level of infant mortality was very high and epidemics were recurrent. Also an efficient police service was lacking, since the police didn’t mind what happening in the Italian ghettos. This lack and the poverty increased the degree of crime, which was already widespread, mostly with robbery and prostitution. The spoken language was mainly Italian, if not the regional dialects; this situation was further exacerbated by the presence of places of Italian sociability, as cultural associations, restaurants or patronal celebrations (Tarozzi, 1973: 12-13). Italians failed to integrate into the American society (which seemed to dismiss them) and so they looked for protection and help from those who seemed the strongest and better integrated into society. They trusted those who would later become the exponents of organized crime.

THE BLACK HAND AND THE FIRST OPPOSITION TO ORGANIZED CRIME

The Black Hand

Between 1880 and 1920 a new gangster phenomenon developed in the Italian neighborhood; it was profoundly different from the one offering assistance and protection to newly arrived immigrants: the Black Hand was born.

Until the end of 1800 there was no mention of the Mafia, which developed only at the beginning of 1900. Between 1900 and 1920 the Black Hand and Mafia operated at the same level and it was only with the advent of Prohibitionism and the subsequent alcohol smuggling that the interests of organized crime widened, leading to a more efficient organization of the Mafia and the disappearance of the Black Hand. There was a substantial difference between the two organizations, not only in the definition, but also in the structure. The term Mafia referred to a sense of order and protection; the internal organization was complex and highly structured, characterized by a rigid hierarchy of its members. The term Black Hand, instead, had a strong connection with the idea of violence. It was an association with a certain degree of organization, but that would be defined only in the early 1900s (Lupo, 2008: p.36). The New Yorker judge Train in his work "Courts, Criminals and the Camorra" (1912) expresses very clearly the difference between the two criminal organizations: "The real mobster was offended when he was called Black Hand, (...) his was an ancient and honorable profession: it was not a common criminal, but a man who was particularly sensitive in matters of honor" (Idem: p. 39). It would be only later in the Twenties that the need for a more solid structure led to the ultimate demise of the Black Hand, which was absorbed by the

Mafia.

Social characteristics of the members

The Black Hand could be defined as the first Italian criminal association in the United States, which was founded and operated exclusively within the Italian community; it took advantage of the situation of lawlessness, isolation and brutalization in which immigrants lived within the ethnic neighborhoods in order to impose not order, but the survival of the fittest at the expense of those who only obtained a minimum gain from their work (Tarozzi, 1973: 14). The social characteristics of the members were different from those of the typical immigrants and reflected the peculiarities of criminal immigration. Many of them came from Sicily; had a criminal record, mostly related to Mafia; had a certain economic well-being, being men of business or petty bourgeoisie. In most cases these individuals entered the United States legally but, in order to increase their business and maintain ties with their homeland, they often used fake passports and illegal networks (Lupo, 2008: p. 36-37). Being first-generation immigrants, mostly without economic needs and with interests in both sides of the Ocean, they maintained a direct contact with the Motherland and with the Mafia gangs present there. This highlights how the Black Hand was directly linked to the Italian Mafia, and how members of both organizations moved easily between the two continents. Relevant members of this organization were Motisi, Lupo and Morello, Sicilian Mobsters who, in order to escape the Italian justice, took refuge in America, also following some of their commercial interests.

Purpose and mode of operation

The Black Hand was a criminal organization dedicated to blackmailing, kidnapping and general violent actions against those Italian immigrants who were able to reach a decent economic situation through their activities, or against the major exponents of the community. The victims were mostly honest workers, but even "men of honor" (those who devoted themselves to illicit affairs) had suffered some form of extortion (Tarozzi, 1976). The "Black Handers" way of working followed a simple yet precise pattern. The victims were delivered anonymous letters containing death threats directed at them and their family if a disproportionate amount of money was not paid; the image of a black hand and symbols of death sealed the request. The intervention of a protector and a broker, who showed compassion towards the victim, but who actually collaborated with the mob, reduced to be paid a more reasonable amount, and thus payable. In this way it would seem that everyone had achieved his goal but the threatened person would not realize that he was grateful to the very same members of the Black Hand which were at the same time earning money from the extortion and gaining the victim's trust (Tenti, 2006). Here is a quote from a letter sent by the Black Hand to a member of the Italian community in Chicago:

"Dear Mr. Silvani, hoping not to startle you too much, I would be grateful if you would send me \$ 2,000 if you care for your life. You will put them out the door in four days. I'll wait until the end of the week, after which nothing will remain of your family, not even dust. Believe me, your friend." (Tenti, 2006: 49).

The cities in which the violence and extortions of the Black Hand occurred were: New Orleans, St. Louis, Chicago, Kansas City and New York; all cities in which the Italian community was very large. Between 1907 and 1912 some of the more influential members of the Italian community created

in Chicago an organization called "White Hand" (Lupo, 2008 p. 23), which had the aim to defend and provide money to those who wanted to react to the extortion, and also to defend the good name of Italian people, proving not to be predisposed to crime. This organization had some success for a short period of time and also led to some arrests, but this action was made ineffective by the corrupt policemen and politicians who protected the worst criminals against prosecution. For that reason the "White Hand" failed and ultimately disappeared.

Joe Petrosino (1860-1909)

This paragraph will not only regard the first opposition to organized crime but also some biographical information about Joe Petrosino. The latter is included in this analysis to better understand the detective's actions, which in some cases seem to be incentivated by personal motivations: the newcomer desire for redemption and the desire to be accepted into the upper class, on top of the will to demonstrate that not all Italians are gangsters.

Born in the province of Salerno, in Padula, on August 30, 1860, Giuseppe (Joe) Petrosino was thirteen when he emigrated with his family to America. He arrived in New York as one of the many poor Italian immigrants looking for a chance (Tarozzi 1973). In his early youth he worked as a shoeshine and newspaper seller; when he was eighteen he became an employee at the City of New York, first as a scavenger and then as a controller for the barges of waste. Only with the increased flow of Italian immigration his career, and his life, underwent a radical change; American policemen were unprepared for these thousands of Italians coming, of whom they did neither speak the language nor understand the customs. Petrosino seemed to be the ideal solution: first he was appointed as informant and eventually he obtained the police uniform. In 1890, Theodore Roosevelt, New York City Police Commissioner, asked Petrosino to deal with the Italian Mob, creating an "Italian Team". In this way he started the first large-scale action against the Black Hand and its affiliates, which led to many arrests and expulsions involving also top exponents of the organization, for instance Morello (considered the head of the Black Hand) and Lupo (his lieutenant). Some considerations on the Black Hand and the method needed to defeat it were expressed by Petrosino in a interview for the "New York Herald" (February 20, 1903): "The gangsters who keep Little Italy under a pall of terror are the country bumpkins robbers transplanted into town (...). The crimes that take place here between Italians are the same perpetrated by the time campaign robbers in Italy and the victims, as the killers, belong to the same ignorant people" (Tarozzi, 1973: 16). He also believed that this type of crime could be eliminated once Italians would realize the benefits of American law. However, the arrests and expulsions were not enough to bottle up this phenomenon, increased by new arrivals of immigrants. It was common belief that the Italian authorities granted the "Red Passport" with abuse and ease to get rid of Mob men. Even Petrosino agreed with this feeling and so began to make cross-checks on the police records of the arrested Black Handers; in this operation he was helped by the Italian authorities. He discovered that many of them were still wanted in Italy and so most of them were extradited in their Mothercountry. This challenge to the Black Hand could not be conducted only in America: it was necessary to also involve the Italian authorities, and travel to Sicily to continue monitoring the work on the suspected criminals' background. Therefore, Petrosino organized an operation whose aim was the control of italian criminal records and the creation of a network of secret agents who would send information on the suspected new Mob members (Tenti, 2006: 61). Anonymity was essential during the mission, but in the end the information was revealed by the "New York Herald". In any case Petrosino

arrived in Palermo and started working without taking direct contacts with the Italian police nor the superintendent Baldassarre Creole. The Mafia, informed of his presence, could not tolerate such a direct attack to its organization and its members now moved to America. On the evening of March 12, 1909 Petrosino was killed. Because of his death, the attempt to hit the American underworld, even in its contacts in Italy, and the creation of a network of informants failed. What were the results of Petrosino action in the United States? The positive aspects relate to the continuous and strong fight against organized crime, while the negative ones were indirect: the Black Hand began to fall apart without being definitively eradicated, so its need for greater structure stimulated the creation of the Mafia. Thus the death of Petrosino coincides with the Mafia expansion to the United States.

THE MAFIA IN THE UNITED STATES

Since the late Eighties of the XIXth century, the term Mafia was linked to the Italian mob in ethnic ghettos, mostly as a folkloristic color given by the American newspapers. However, it was only after the lynching of New Orleans and the failed mission of Petrosino that the American Mafia developed in parallel and independently from the Italian one (even if the two would always maintain contacts).

From the late 1800s Eighties to World War I

At the end of 1800s the Italian crime was widespread in New Orleans, because of the large Italian community and the direct link between the Palermo harbour and the American city. There were various Mafia gangs emigrated from Sicily which monopolized the fruit trade and kept the dock workers under control. At the time, the families Provenzano and Matranga were fighting over the control of the fruit and vegetables market, where it was easy and quick to make significant profits. To impose their own interests, the two families used violence and an impressive number of murders. Local authorities did not intervene directly: the crimes were committed between Italians, not involving American citizens, so they were considered feuds with no interest for the public authorities. The dagos (derogatory term for Italians) were not integrated into the American society, in which they occupied the lowest rank; they were considered criminals, subversives and in general undesirables. This underestimation of the Italian crime ended with the first and tragic involvement of the American society. The Provenzano family, to gain a position of strength and privileges, corrupted the Police Chief D. Hennessey, who then started receiving anonymous letters and threats from the Matrangas. The tense situation gave rise to the murder of the Police Chief (October 18, 1890), who said on his deathbed: "Dagos did it". Immediately, all the eighteen Matranga members were arrested, but in March 13, 1891 the Grand Jury had to acquit all the accused because of lack of evidence. Following this decision there was a large-scale uprising, which brought together workers and the upper class (the leader was a lawyer), and even the mayor instigated the crowd to take the matter into its own hands. The prison where the Sicilians were still held was stormed and though the accused tried to escape, the assailants massacred eleven of them (Tarozzi, 1973: 24-25; Lupo, 2008:11). The international consequences of this act were complex, such that the Italian Government broke diplomatic relations and serious reprisals became a concrete fear. However, the following year President Harrison would offer a compensation for each of the victims, in order to resume normal diplomatic relations with Italy (Nelli, 1969: 375).

From the tragic events of New Orleans until the first decade of the 1900s, the Italian underworld was no longer classified as Mafia and the police used other terms, or even it was not more involved in crimes among Italians. In the first decade of the 1900s, as a reaction to a new wave of Italian immigration in the United States, racist and xenophobic sentiments grew against the Italians, considered inferior to the Anglo-Saxon race, criminals, subversives and too closely linked to the Catholic Church. This contempt damaged especially those who were looking for work, and did not touch the Mafia, which instead began its process of strengthening and expansion. The Mafia men continued to manage their own affairs undisturbed, changing their names into an "American" style, integrating themselves even better into the American society. They tried to let their business grow no longer in the poor ethnic neighborhoods, but where the dollars were: among the Americans. The first one who could be called a Mafia boss was F. Uale, that reorganized the underworld after Petrosino's arrests. He modified the methods and goals of the organization. The Mafia, leaving the boundaries of Little Italy, kept contacts with U.S. merchants by providing "protection", eliminating rival gangs, expanding its interests to smuggling, prostitution, gambling. The organization was now structured and hierarchical, violence was used only in case of absolute necessity (Tarozzi, 1973: 19).

Twenties and Prohibition

The Twenties were characterized by a seeking of uniformity in the American society and by the reduction of crime; this the result of the "Quota Acts" (1921-1925) which decreased the number of immigrants from South Europe. Also, in January 1920 the Government enacted the "Volstead Act", establishing all beverages containing more than five degrees of alcohol to be intoxicating and consequently prohibiting their manufacture, importation, distribution and sale (Bergamini, 2006: 160). This law had a moralistic aim, but this had to collide with reality: the citizens expressed their discontent looking for alcoholic drinks in illegal locals, mostly managed by the underworld. Prohibitionism had some negative effects, which helped the Mafia to spread in big cities like New York and Chicago. First, the offer decreased but demand remained high and consequently illegal trade and sales flourished, handled by bootleggers belonging to Mafia. The second was the attenuation of the border between what was commonly perceived as illegal and what was felt to be legal: this actually gave smugglers a chance to show themselves as legitimate market participants. Finally, the corruption level of police and political officials increased considerably. Smugglers, and consequently the Mafia clans, obtained the consensus of the populations and so they were able to address the electoral vote (especially in the ethnic neighborhoods they came from) (Lupo, 2008: p. 49-50). For organized crime, the prohibition to sell and produce alcohol became in a short time a huge source of income and a mean to extend its other interests (prostitution and gambling) (Tenti, 2006: 71). The smugglers came from the ranks of the Italian Mafia, were born in Italy and emigrated as children, grew up in ethnic neighborhoods and firstly participated in the youth gangs, then entered into the Mafia organization. The protagonists of this period were Johnny Torrio and Al Capone, prominent members of the Italian Mob in Chicago (Tarozzi, 1973). It was in the Twenties that Al Capone accumulated prestige and fortune inside the Mafia, which was pivotal to become the undisputed boss in the subsequent years. Prohibitionism was abolished by F.D. Roosevelt in 1933, with the twentieth amendment; organized crime lost a significant portion of its earnings, but its end was still far away. Now it had spread a different pattern of crime with properly American characteristic, whose followers continued to belong to Italian ethnic group. The word

"Mafia" slowly fell into disuse in favor of the more generic "crime" and the same mobsters came together in what they defined "Unione Siciliana" ("Sicilian Union") (Tarozzi, 1973).

The Thirties

In the process of development of the Mafia the Thirties are characterized by different events and situations: the Castellammarese war, the internal reorganization ordered by Lucky Luciano and finally the repression by the State.

The Castellammarese war took place between 1930 and 1931, initially on a local scale in New York, and then involving other large American cities. The beginning of hostilities was due to the rivalry between two families in the business: Masseria and Maranzano. Although the war lasted a very short time both parties suffered about five hundred deaths and peace itself is marked by violence, with the assassination of the leader of the Masseria family. In this climate the police did not intervene, following the belief that its presence was not necessary to solve the Italian internal feuds (Tarozzi, 1973: 71-73). The end of the war was marked by the rise of a new player: Lucky Luciano, who later gained great influence in the organization and eventually became one of the leaders. Following his thirst of power and ambition he murdered Maranzano and took his place, reorganizing the Mafia structure and incorporating Italian (but not Sicilian) new elements. The "Unione Siciliana" (as the organization continued to be called) would be divided into families whose members would gather in a collegial body, eliminating both the office of the "Chief of Chiefs" ("Capo dei Capi") and all the old structure derived directly from the Sicilian Mafia. The "Unione Siciliana", decided to form an alliance with another ethnic group which was very active in the underworld since the Twenties: the Jews. With them Luciano developed the full potentials of the "labor racket" (in Italian "caporalato"): on the one hand the bosses exploited and monitored the workers and on the other hand they imposed a sort of protection to the industrial, often keeping in contact with the political spheres (Lupo, 2008: p. 113-114). Using these plots and alliances, the mobster became to be conceived no longer as just an unpretentious criminal but as a manager who sought to better control his own business, even away from his ethnic roots. However, in the Thirties the State adopted a new attitude towards the underworld and became interested in what was becoming a common phenomenon also on the political level. Thanks to the new Attorney T. Dewey and the new Mayor La Guardia, Lucky Luciano and Al Capone would soon be arrested (Lupo, 2008: 107).

EXPORTING THE AMERICAN MAFIA IN SICILY: OPERATION HUSKY

Brief notes on the action of Cesare Mori in Sicily: as Fascism fight the Mafia

Between 1925 and 1928, Fascism was effectively implementing some measures against the Mafia in Sicily through the work of Prefect Cesare Mori (Petacco, 1975). It seems that the interest of Mussolini in limiting this phenomenon raised from a visit to Sicily in 1924, in which the mayor – and boss – of a small town proposed to provide himself protection to the Duce (Lupo, 2008: p. 45). Getting the cooperation of the local prefectures and using hard methods (in some cases at the borderline of legality), Mori was able to clean up the island from Mafia (Lupo, 1997: 22). Initially the action was focused on the lower steps of the hierarchy and the search for the fugitives and then on restoring the fascist order in the Island, reinforcing the fascist Regime (Tenti, 2006: 131-135). These actions led to effective results in a short time, but the prefect was still not satisfied: the Mafia

was also linked to the local notables and therefore to politics. The action towards the Mafia hierarchy scared the sicilian fascist politicians who obtained the removal of Mori. In 1928, Mussolini appointed him Senator of the Kingdom for his services to the State, and by this time the great action against Mafia could be considered closed. Although the men at the highest levels of the Mafia were not arrested, we can say that during Fascism Sicily would not experience any other trouble because of the Mafia system. Many criminals emigrated illegally in the United States, others were arrested, and others were banished (even without evidence) (Lupo, 2008: p. 47).

Operation Husky

The collaboration between the Mafia and the U.S. Secret Service is a debatable topic, for which sources are not always available or reliable. Some events are documented (such as the transfer of Lucky Luciano to a jail with a lower degree of security) and of some others it is only possible to make hypotheses (the presence of flags with a large black L, as in Lucky Luciano, on the Allied trucks).

The first contact between the Secret Services Intelligence and the Mafia took place in 1942 during the preparations for the intervention of the U.S. in the war. It was necessary to reorganize the Navy after the Pearl Harbour attack (December 1941) and to manage the supply and transport of troops to Europe; the focus of these operations was in the major ports of the Atlantic. Because of the high percentage of immigrants who worked there and came from enemy Nations, there was a high risk of sabotage. For this reason the "Project Underworld", prepared by the Commander of the Naval Intelligence (Haffenden), came to life: this was a deal with the Mafia to ensure control and security in the harbours and to avoid strikes and the unrest of the workforce (Lupo, 2008: p. 127-131). The contact with the underworld took place initially through small local bosses and later through direct contact with Lucky Luciano, who had maintained his position as head of the Mafia although held in a maximum security prison; thus he was transferred to a prison with a lower degree of security and was allowed to maintain direct relations with the outside world. This collaboration would continue until the end of the war (Tarozzi, 1973: 95-97). The year 1943 was a turning point for the military operations in Europe and the American Military Commands were organising the landing on the coast of Sicily. For this reason the Army needed informants, interpreters, maps and any kind of information useful to penetrate into the territory of the enemy and according to some sources this contribution was given by the American Mafia (Lupo, 1997). On July 9, 1943 the Allied landed in Sicily and their advance was rapid; the population did not make any kind of resistance, some fascist soldiers alerted by "friends of friends" deserted and the "men of honor" approached the management of AMG (Allied Military Government). Most of the cities notables were Mafia men that promised to restore order in the region; taking advantage of the situation, jailed mafia men asked to be freed because they were as anti-fascists dissidents, ready to support the Allies (Marino, 2012: 148). Once they defeated the Nazi-fascist troops, the AMGOT relied on these notables (one example is Calogero Vizzini in Villalba, notable and mob boss who became mayor of the city (Lupo, 1997: 24-25)) and on the Church for the political reconstruction of Sicily (Tranfaglia, 2004). It's necessary to highlight that not all anti-fascists and not all local notables were mobsters. AMGOT had also asked for the names of the major Italian criminals and gangsters, who would be dismissed and with which they interrupted any kind of relationship. The Allies Commands used the Mafia network, without realizing that in this way the organized crime would revive, even though it had been repressed by Mori, with serious damage to the future of Italy. At the

end of the war and after the retreat of the Allied troops, the Mafia decided to support the Separatist Movement, providing it not only with means but also with candidates. In this way the Mafia was hoping to maintain the privileges and positions obtained during the Allied administration (Lupo, 2008: p. 144-147; also Marino p. 149).

CONCLUSIONS

The arrival of Italian immigrants in the United States since the mid-1800s led not only to a great cultural wealth, but also to the creation of a particular type of crime. Nowadays the relationship between Italians and Mafia is shown in great movies, books and stereotypes, which present a "romantic" model of it. In 1943, with the landing in Sicily, Allied Army re-exported a mob model that seemed to have been defeated by Mori and strengthened its structure. This analysis tries to highlight how Italian immigration has exported a model of Underworld, and how the Mafia history is an import-export history with connections through the Ocean that have never been interrupted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bergamini, Oliviero (2006) *La storia degli Stati Uniti*, Laterza, Bari.
- Colarizi, Simona (2009) *Storia del Novecento italiano*, BUR, Milano.
- Lupo, Salvatore (1997) *The Allies and the Mafia*, *The journal of modern italian studies* 2:1, p. 21-33.
- Lupo, Salvatore (2004) *Storia della Mafia*, Donzelli Roma.
- Lupo, Salvatore (2008) *Quando la Mafia trovò l'America*, Einaudi, Torino.
- Marino Giuseppe C. (2012) *Storia della Mafia*, Newton compton editori, Roma 2012.
- Nelli Humbert S. (1969) *Italians and crime in Chicago, the formative years 1890-1920*, *American Journal of Sociology*, vol 74 n 4, Chicago, p. 373-391.
- Petacco, Arrigo (1975) *Il prefetto di ferro*, Mondadori, Milano.
- Petrelli, Marco (2011), *L'emigrazione Italiana negli Stati Uniti*, Il Mulino, Bolgna.
- Tarozzi, Giuseppe (1973) *Made in Italy, storia della Mafia in America*, Bompiani, Milano.
- Tenti, Gianluca (2006), *Mafia americana, fatti e misfatti dei grandi padrini da Al Capone a John Gotti*, Olimpia, Firenze.
- Tranfaglia, Nicola (2004) *Come nasce la Repubblica; la mafia, il Vaticano e il neofascismo nei documenti americani e italiani 1943-1947*, Bompiani, Milano.