Including while Excluding – the Hitler Youth from a History of Education Perspective

Includere escludendo – la Gioventù Hitleriana da una prospettiva storico-educativa

Jakob Benecke

Professor of Educational science | Alanus Hochschule, Mannheim Privatdozent| Faculty of Philosophy and Social sciences| Augsburg University (Germany) | jakob.benecke@alanus.edu

abstract

The internal contradictions of the Nazi's policies on population engineering led to the creation of specific patterns of social inequality. The ambivalent ambitions of pursuing social selection according to racist criteria and simultaneously pushing forward the totalitarian assimilation of as many population groups as possible in order to stabilize their power base led to ambiguous grey areas with regard to the question of which individuals should or should not be integrated. This extended to the Nazi's youth policy. Inclusionary overtures were therefore permanently entangled with the threat of exclusion for those positioned within this zone of ambiguity. This article discusses the resulting phenomena and individuals' experiences using the example of "Special Brigades" (Sonderbanne) in the Hitler Youth.

Keywords: national socialism, history of education, youth organizations, Hitler Youth, Sonderbanne, inclusion and exclusion

Le contraddizioni interne alle politiche naziste riguardanti l'ingegneria della popolazione condussero alla creazione di specifici modelli di disparità sociale. Le contrastanti ambizioni di perseguire la selezione sociale attraverso criteri razzisti e di portare avanti, contemporaneamente, l'assimilazione totalitaristica del maggior numero possibile di gruppi di popolazione allo scopo di rendere stabili le basi del proprio potere condussero verso ambigue zone grigie la questione di quali individui dovessero o non dovessero essere integrati. Ciò si estese alle politiche giovanili naziste. Le aperture inclusive perciò restarono definitivamente imbrigliate dalla minaccia di esclusione verso coloro che si trovavano collocati in questa zona di ambiguità. Questo articolo tratta dei fenomeni sociali e delle esperienze individuali che ne risultarono, utilizzando l'esempio delle "Brigate Speciali" (Sonderbanne) nella Gioventù Hitleriana.

Parole Chiave: nazionalsocialismo, storia dell'educazione, organizzazioni giovanili, Gioventù Hitleriana, Sonderbanne, inclusione ed esclusione

Note: All instances in which direct quotations have been translated by the author from the German-language source cited are denoted by the symbol †. General terms have been translated according to accepted conventions or using a descriptive equivalent in reference to the original term.

Pedagogia Oggi / Rivista SIPED /anno XVIII / n. 2 / 2020
ISSN 2611-6561 online • ISSN 1827-0824 stampa
DOI: 10.7346/PO-022020-02 © Pensa MultiMedia, Lecce-Brescia

1. Introduction

The Nazi Party's utopian concept of *Volksgemeinschaft* (people's community, sometimes translated as national community) was meant to bring about a society that emphasized ideological homogeneity, social conformity, efficiency and hierarchical structure (Peukert, 1982, p. 295)[1]. In service of this goal, education was redefined and expanded in scope to become the dictatorship's instrument for securing power and authority for itself (Stellrecht, 1942) by "constructing all of society as an gargantuan educational environment" (Tenorth, 2008, p. 267†). Conversely, a negative assessment of an individual as "incorrigible", characterizing them as being incapable of adjusting to the Nazi's ideal society, would often lead to a spiral of exclusion that could even end in permanent social isolation in a "Youth Concentration Camp" (Tetzlaff, 1944, p. 34†). The racist framing contained within this concept provided a nationalist identity outline for distinguishing between affiliation or belonging and Otherness. The propagandistic promise of a community built on belonging was that it would form the social basis of a future *Volksgemeinschaft*. This goal could be achieved only through the Nazi's population engineering policies – an argument that was also used to legitimize their violent interventions. Stepping back from these aspirational concepts, German society *de facto* still featured numerous traditional and newly introduced patterns of social inequality throughout the entire Nazi regime (Bajohr, Wildt, 2009). An inequality-generating aspect particular to Nazism that I wish to discuss in this contribution arises from the contradictions between its ideological claims and the practical realities of securing its power base. A lesser-known example of ambivalence within these nominally straightforward population engineering policies is the racial reclassification of individual Jewish citizens that were found to be useful to the regime (Cornberg, Steiner, 1998). In these exceedingly rare cases – Hitler approved only 260 of 9636 applications – the persons concerned were nonetheless appointed

1 Whether or not this "community", as promulgated by Nazi propaganda, is to be regarded in hindsight as a mere myth, as an effective social promise, or even as a (partial) social reality during the Nazi regime (Schmiechen-Ackermann, 2012) remains a matter of spirited discussion or even outright controversy among historians (Steuwer, 2013). These debates have consistently included international perspectives outside of German historical science, especially but not limited to English-speaking historians (cf. Kershaw, 2011 as well as the contributions in Steber, Gotto, 2014).

as so-called "honorary Aryans" (ibid., p. 149†). The combination of both assertions – instituting racial ideology and securing power, the former excluding broad swaths of the population while the latter tried to harness as much serviceable human activity as possible – led to the constitution of an intermediary population category (cf. for a further example regarding the Hitler Youth: Benecke, 2015, pp. 119-126).

This category is intended to activate the potential of persons who would otherwise be excluded *a priori* according to Nazi racial ideology. However, nominal acceptance into the *Volksgemeinschaft* did not mean that this decision regarding their status was in any way permanent. Instead, the dynamic order of inequality fostered by the Nazi's population engineering was continually expanded upon to exclude further segments of the populace during the Nazi's time in power and especially during the Second World War (Süß, 2003). The fundamental assessment criteria applied to any form of social positioning within the *Volksgemeinschaft* were internal motivation, i.e., an attitude of allegiance, and external conformity, i.e., outward appearance, in accordance with Nazi ideology and its political goals. The degree to which these criteria could be ascribed to individuals and groups was a matter of continuous monitoring and re-assessment.

The Hitler Youth Law of 1936 outlined how young adolescents were to be made to comply with Nazi ideology. Regarding expectations of inclusion, this law formalized the following expectations:

> Their parents' household and schools notwithstanding, the entirety of the German youth shall be educated to serve the people and the people's community in body, mind, and moral conduct in keeping with spirit of National Socialism (*Reichsgesetzblatt,* National Law Gazette, *RGB*) 1936, Part I, p. 993, §2†).

The language used in this legal code combines two ambivalent concepts – "entirety" as a reference to complete inclusion as well as "German youth" as a nationalistic and racist criterion for selection – which sets the stage for potential internal contradictions in applying this precept.

Nominally, the HY's principle for inclusion regarding its target group was simply reaching the age of admittance at 10 years old. Quite in line with the basic format of all of the Nazi regime's social control mechanisms – a combination of seduction and instruction tailored to the requirements

of the situation – this biographical element was seen as positive by the National Youth Leadership (*Reichsjugendführung):*

> 'Children' is a designation for the non-uniformed creatures of lower ages who have never participated in a meeting or a march. […] Other parents may speak of their child, parents of *Pimpfe* [the first level of membership for male inductees into the Hitler Youth, 'rascals'], however, speak of their son. 'My son, the *Pimpf*!' This sentence describes deep-seated transformation of our youth (Schirach, 1934, p. 87†).

On the other hand, in the context of Nazi rule, no integration should be offered without requiring a concomitant commitment. Only by combining the two did the youth policy officials expect to acquire their target group for their cause efficiently. Accordingly, the HY's disciplinary code levied responsibility according to age and, therefore, status:

"Disciplinary maturity begins with admission of the 10-year-olds into the Hitler Youth, *Pimpfe* [('rascals')] and *Jungmädel* [('junior girls')] are already no longer purely children and therefore no longer purely objects to be educated by the family and the school" (Tetzlaff, 1944, p. 26†).

2. Grey areas regarding induction into the Hitler Youth

After the Nazis came into power, the regime's youth policy steadily expanded to cover a greater number of people. Accordingly, membership in the HY rose from an average of 30% (1933 to 1936) up to 60% (1936 to 1939) and ultimately reached a fairly stable peak of around 85% (1939 to 1945)[2]. Regarding its induction practices, the HY also established supposedly clear-cut racial criteria for all questions of inclusion. In its own definition of their target group, the HY always emphasized "race" or "blood" to be their fundamental categories for selection (Dietze, 1939, pp. 74-75†). Beginning in the mid-1930s, having a so-called "Aryan cer-

2 Regarding the contradictory figures given for HY membership and how they were calculated, including the sometimes cited, exaggerated figure of 98.1% for the year 1939, cf. Benecke, 2015, pp. 28-29. In German history of education, only the *Freie Deutsche Jugend* youth organization in authoritarian East Germany reached a similar degree of coverage.

tificate" (*Ariernachweis*) was necessary for becoming a member or taking on a leadership role in the HY. From the summer of 1936 onwards, members had to prove that they did not have any "ancestors of coloured or Jewish blood" dating back to January 1st, 1800 (VHB. HJ, Bd. II, 1942, S. 796-801†). At an organizational level, so-called *Volljuden* ("full Jews") were completely excluded from serving in the HY.[3] This also applied to anyone whose appearance was seen to openly contradict the propagated racial ideology. Youths of both genders who deviated from the "Aryan" ideal due to a darker skin colour or supposedly "Jewish" attributes were especially susceptible to this treatment (see for example: Kollmeier, 2007, pp. 201-202; Tent, 2007, pp. 93-96). The vague terminology employed left the criteria for deciding who was "fit" to serve very open to interpretation (e.g., "appearance" or "character"), which made the process highly arbitrary and placed enormous strain stemming from the experience of inequality on individuals whose status was called into question (Benecke, 2015, pp. 134-146). For example, in one case, brothers from the same family were treated completely differently due to their "phenotypical" assessment – one was brusquely excluded from the HY, the other pursued a HY career that advanced him into an elite unit of the organization (ibid., pp. 146-147).

This is indicative of more than just the arbitrary nature of the ideological concepts and how they were applied to population engineering policy. It also shows that even in questions of youth policy, the goals of racism and securing power led to contradictory stimuli and created grey zones in their application. As is typical for Nazi rule, permeating through to the level of the HY's practices, the previously mentioned motives engaged in an almost cyclical relationship. The racial ideology served as the legitimation of authoritarian practices that were simultaneously a necessary condition and the active execution of its ideological premise. In the following, I will present a few examples of the grey areas between ideological selectivity and totalitarian ambitions that emerged as a necessary consequence of their inherent incompatibility in regard to the Hitler

3 Accordingly, retroactive exclusions from the youth organization are recorded and justified in the HY's own blacklist (*Warnkartei*): "The boy is a full-Jew" (BArch NS W B0002†); "M. is a Gypsy girl" (ibid.†). This significant source, which lists a total of 4779 exclusion orders and their justifications, has seen little use by history of education research thus far (cf. Benecke, 2015, pp. 42-51).

Youth. These seemingly self-contradictory practices of inducting youths into the organization were applied in three distinct circumstances (Benecke, 2015, pp. 144-171). Within this article, I will discuss two of these grey areas only briefly, while affording more consideration to the experiences of adolescents classified as "disabled" at the time. They may all be seen as areas requiring further research in the context of the history of education during the Nazi regime.

The first grey area of membership coverage became apparent with the HY's participation in the occupation of Eastern Europe, especially in Poland. In the context of Himmler's repatriation initiative of German citizens and "ethnic Germans" (*Volksdeutsche*), the youth organization was responsible for performing racial distinctions and creating its own organizational structures for "Germanizing" (*Eindeutschung*) those adolescent candidates that were judged to be suitable. The youths selected for this purpose found themselves – solely based on the characteristics attributed to them – in a grey area between an inclusionary summons and the persistent threat of violent exclusion (Benecke, 2015, pp. 151-161). The second grey area within the purview of the HY was related to their seemingly arbitrary policies regarding adolescent members belonging to "foreign ethnic" groups (ibid., pp. 161-168). Contradictions arose especially when applying the newly created "mixed-race" categories to individuals. The final decision whether or not the youth in question was to be aggressively excluded or instead drafted into service was often the sole result of the subjective assessment of Nazi officials, even regarding very pejoratively classified groups such as "Gypsies" (usually Romanian) and so-called "mixed-race Jews". The general framework for the HY's membership practice resulted adopting at least three characteristics from the racist Nazi population engineering policies (Benecke, 2015, pp. 162-163). First, a fundamental identification of "German" portions of a population group took place, determined putatively through expert assessments, reclassifying individuals who were suddenly eligible for compulsory service. Second, a subsequent differentiation was applied according to the degree which adolescents' behavior was seen to be "socially adequate". Third was the exclusion of all members of these groups who explicitly did not meet these criteria for exception-status or did not meet them in desired combination. The individuals themselves had barely any opportunity to influence their categorization, and, therefore, their further fate, in any meaningful active or self-determined way.

The third grey area of assimilation through the HY was the procedure applied to members of the *Volksgemeinschaft* distinguished according to criteria of "biological heredity" (*erbbiologisch*), which will be discussed more expansively in the following. Even during the first phase of Nazi rule (1933-1936), several different "special brigades" (*Sonderbanne*) on the basis of a deviant "biological heredity" were founded within the HY (VHB. HJ, Bd. II, 1942, pp. 55, 60-61).[4] In March of 1934, the National Youth Leadership approved the creation of B-Brigade for blind youths (*Bann Blinde*), G-Brigade for deaf youths (*Bann Gehörlose*) in December of 1934 (later renamed to include all hearing-impaired members), and K-Brigade for the "physically disabled" (*Bann Körperbehinderte*) in July 1935.[5] However, K-Brigade was dissolved only a few months after its creation in 1936/37 because its mere existence, and the possible public perception of people with disabilities as equal members of the HY, apparently contradicted the Nazi's racial ideology (VHB. HJ, Bd. II, 1942, p. 60).[6] In February 1937, the Leadership set out the following outline of internal HY organization:

> Effective immediately and repealing all previous orders and provisions, the organizational form of the three Brigades for the physically disabled (K), the hearing-impaired (G), and the blind (B) is determined as follows:

4 "Brigade" was chosen as the translation for "*Bann*" in this article to reflect the hierarchical role and size of these formations (usually about 5000 members) within the Hitler Youth, which is roughly equal to that of a military brigade. However, *Bann* itself is not a strictly military term and is often instead translated as "banner" or "banner-group".

5 Cf. the order given by the Department of Higher Education of the Province of Brandenburg on October 19th, 1935 to conduct a search within eligible special-needs institutions for eligible "physically disabled" students and to pass on their names (BBF/DIPF/Archiv: GUT SAMML 199†).

6 The relevant research has not concerned itself extensively with the expedited dissolution of K-Brigade (Brill, 2011, p. 175). However, a note regarding a meeting on November 11th, 1936 held by the responsible member of the National Youth Leadership Heyl supports this hypothesis. The dissolution of K-Brigade was decided upon and explained with the argument: "Because the physically disabled are generally not a benefit to the image of the HY units due to their outward appearance" (BArch NS 12/1357†).

1. K-Brigade (physically disabled)
Since the appearance of members of K-Brigade has led to legitimate grievances in all districts, K-Brigade is hereby disbanded. It is explicitly stressed that this dissolution is not a value judgement of the work of the Brigade nor of the individual officers. How and if former members of K-Brigade may remain in the Hitler Youth and new physically disabled members may be accepted shall be determined by the guidelines of the health authority, yet to be disclosed. The then-remaining members of the disbanded K-Brigade will be transferred to local units to perform their duties according to the degree of their physical disability as determined of the Brigade doctor. […].

2. G-Brigade (hearing-impaired)
G-Brigade will continue in its present organizational composition. Merely the yellow arm disk with three black dots as carried to date by members of G-Brigade will no longer be necessary. The members of G-Brigade will hence be distinguished only by the black G on their epaulettes and the black piping [on their uniforms].

3. B-Brigade (blind)
B-Brigade will also remain in its present form. However, it is so ordered that the work of the Brigade be strictly confined to institutions for the blind. The members of B-Brigade may wear their service dress inside or outside the institutions only if they present themselves as a complete unit. Individuals may therefore not wear service dress alone. Public rallies of any kind are also forbidden for B-Brigade" (VHB. HJ, Bd. II, 1942, pp. 60-61†).

Integrating "the disabled" into regular HY service was ultimately rejected, regardless of which of the "special" subcategories they were assigned to. The individuals concerned were therefore permanently stranded in a zone between compulsory service on the one hand and the constant threat of exclusion on the other. Consequently, they were subjected to extreme stresses that most certainly impacted their socialization and ability to form a stable identity. This experience of ambivalence applies to nearly all adolescents who were relegated to one of these grey areas under the HY's authority. For example, biographical research to the lives of adolescents classified as "mixed-race Jews" indicates that feelings of inner conflict or "rupture" weighed heavy on the personal development

of individuals and continued to have an effect long after the end of the Nazi regime (Benecke, 2015, pp. 167-168).

After the introduction of the special brigades, many special-needs schools and institutions saw the formation of their own HY groups (see e.g. Büttner, 2005, pp. 80-87; Brill, 2011, pp. 166-171). Though implementation varied due to specific institutional features and planned operations often differed wildly from reality, the overall aim was indeed for service in these units to match service in the regular HY (Büttner, 2005, pp. 92-96; Brill, 2001, pp. 172-177). Ultimately, the existence of the HY's special brigades serves as an example of the Nazi's all-encompassing assimilation ambitions regarding youth policy. The lack of research afforded to the *Sonderbanne* thus far, conversely, corresponds with the National Youth Leaderships desire to avoid any public perception of their existence and the acceptance of "disabled" persons (Büttner, 2005, pp. 92-96; Brill, 2011, pp. 172-177). The grey areas regarding induction into the HY also show the analytical relevance of the previously outlined structural ambivalence. In youth policy as in other areas, the ideological elements that were propagandistically used to legitimize political action were hollowed out to serve the ambition of totalitarian assimilation. This, in turn, was a practice that could only be upheld until the contradiction it created between both goals became too apparent. The regime feared that the obvious discrepancy could endanger the credibility of the ideology and the stability of their rule.

How was this simultaneity of in – and exclusion – i.e., compulsory service versus internal selection processes and the constant threat of exclusion – experienced subjectively by those affected? For all of the grey areas mentioned, we know little about this aspect thus far. Some initial findings come from reports by individuals about how they experienced "corrective education" (*Fürsorgeerziehung*) in practice under the Nazi Regime. Adolescents were purposefully isolated from other parts of the *Volksgemeinschaft* for being "incorrigible" (social justification of selection) or an alleged "inferiority of biological heredity" (justification for mental/physical reasons). The Nazi's regularly combined these perjorative criteria, social and "biological", to a single defamatory diagnosis. The subsequent "treatment" usually entailed some form of imprisonment and regular abuse, and not uncommonly led to the targeted murder of the individuals (Berger, Rieger, 2007). At the same time, the adolescents could still be pressed into service for the HY, even within these institu-

tions. Whether or not they had a duty to serve was dependent on two contradictory criteria: the totalitarian ambitions of the youth organization and their individually certified Hitler Youth "worthiness" according to the aforementioned social and "biological heredity" criteria (Kuhlmann, 1989, pp. 112-116). The later assessment remained subject to largely arbitrary decisions made from case to case. After the HY decreed the inclusion of the wards of special-needs institutions in their circular of July 7th, 1934, a number of HY Units were formed at various locations administered by different organizations.

Examples of what adolescents experienced in these units were recorded in several interviews with "corrective education wards" (*Fürsorgezöglinge*) at Cloister Markt Indersdorf (Benecke, 2015, pp. 90-91). Eyewitness accounts reported how the Nazism's organizations took possession of the cloister in 1938. Previously run by nuns, which the wards had liked and regarded as sympathetic, these were initially replaced by representatives of the Nazi welfare association NSV (*Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt*). In their wake, the HY also entered into the institution and immediately pressed the youths into service. Within a week, the wards wore HY uniforms and were confronted with the routines of active duty that imposed drills and demanded discipline during pseudo-military field exercises. At the same time, they were offered hitherto unknown opportunities to experience field trips, to encounter the population of the village and assist in agricultural work (ibid., interview with Lammer and Mosholzer). They were also called to participate in public HY rallies, where one of them took the opportunity to shake National Youth Leader Baldur von Schirach's hand, which he regards as a particularly significant biographical moment (ibid., interview with Holler). Similarly to other partially isolated contexts of Nazi rule, these individuals described mixed feeling about the HY experience. Membership in the HY lessened the impact of older social inequalities and introduced new strains and pressures. All witnesses reported that insignia of inclusion were very popular (e.g., the uniform (ibid., interview with Lammer and Mosholzner) or HY outdoor knife (ibid., interview with Holler). They also valued the newfound possibilities for escaping their prior social isolation as well as the stigmatizing classifications previously applied to their person. However, the HY's invasion of their world was often experienced as a form of coercion, accompanied by physical assault (ibid., interview with Holler). This was seen as a striking and emotionally as well as physical painful break with the warmth

they experienced with the care provided by the nuns (ibid., interview with Lammer and Mosholzer). Additionally, the Nazi youth organization takeover of responsibility for the wards brought with it further typical contradictions. On the one hand, technically excluded adolescents, like Holler, a Yenish "gypsy", were now putatively equal members in the HY. On the other hand, interactions with the village youths or the integration in the regular HY there never reached a level of self-evidence or unchallenged normality. These were restricted to noticeably rare occasions when the youth organization carried out tasks assigned by the regime – e.g., smaller as well as larger rallies and marches or the trips to the Party's National Conventions (ibid., interview with Holler).

3. Relation to current academic debates on inclusion

In closing, I would like to briefly discuss some implications of this topic for current academic debates on inclusion. Inclusion is presently linked with a call for encouraging participation by people with disabilities (Budde, 2018, p. 45). Though they have been rather hesitant so far, some steps in this direction have been taken regarding the German education system. The development of German-language debates surrounding disability within the last few decades ultimately shows a path with some common ground with the historical analysis of HY Special Brigades under the Nazi Regime. For example, this discussion was long dominated by a medical model that regarded disability as an individual deviation from a variably defined notion of "normality" (Tervooren, Pfaff, 2018, pp. 32-33). After people with disabilities and their families as well as educational professionals began to criticize this conception in the 1970s, the focus shifted from a medical to a social model of disability. The latter no longer centers on individual impairment, but instead emphasizes the social process of discrimination and the societal barriers linked to it. This model had the analytical advantage of being able to grasp the construction of disability and thereby underscore a society's responsibility for the how and why of "making disabled" some of its members. Nonetheless, legitimate criticism remained – from disability studies in the US context, among others – that indicated that the complexity of the phenomenon had not yet been sufficiently considered. Since around the turn of the millennium, helped along by an increased reception of disability studies

in German research contexts, it can now be said that "in addition to social and institutional mechanisms of constructing the category", it is precisely "the relations of authority and power in which disability is produced as a deviation from the norm of not-being-disabled" (ibid, p. 33†) that have now been brought to the forefront of academic attention. This expansion of perspective can also provide valuable impulses for the analysis of Nazi youth policy. For example, the conditions that led to the grey areas of HY coverage can only be explained by incorporating the external prerequisites located in the superordinate level of general structural elements of Nazi population engineering policies (cf. Chapter 1). The HY example described in Chapter 2, conversely, places this kind of ambivalence at the forefront of inclusion-related analysis, an element often disregarded in the current debates focused solely on the aspect of an "ethics-based call for a more inclusive society" (ibid., p. 39†). Interestingly, the Latin root term *includere* directly refers to the ambivalence displayed in this historical example of education policy. It equally describes the notion of "enveloping" as well as "disciplining". This double meaning provides a terminological basis for the important distinction that inclusionary programs may be dependent on "involvement […] as well as discipline" (ibid.†). Understanding the HY's Special Brigades can serve as an (extreme) case of a historic realization of inclusion to show how its ambivalent aspects were balanced against each other. Differentiated analysis might provide possible insight, lessons, or warning for current debates. One such aspect might be the importance of regarding actual implementation of policies after inclusion has nominally taken place or announced. Here, the historical education perspective shows that some similarities existed that can also be seen within the contemporary phenomenon of "inclusionism" or "ablenationalism" (Mitchell, Snyder, 2015), which often emphasizes the compulsory aspect of belonging, proving one's utility, and subjecting oneself to processes of normalization. Critical authors have shown, e.g., using the example of university education, "which instruments and mechanisms regulate the agency of disabled persons and disallow difference" (Tervooren, Pfaff, 2018, p. 40†). In this case, the authors found that "while those whose Otherness can be assimilated are admitted, others, whose Otherness disturbs the base consensus of the University, are excluded" (ibid.†). This line of argumentation points directly towards the structures that implemented inclusion and exclusion in Nazi youth policy. As discussed, motivated by the expansive ambitions by the HY to cover as many

youths as possible, officially designated and certified Otherness was allowed even in this most hostile of environments as long as the ideological premises of the dominant power structure and the propagandistic proclamation of these premises were not noticeably challenged. When they were challenged, the regime saw it as a destabilization of its own position of power and moved to suppress it. The creation and expedited dissolution of K-Brigade is probably the most pertinent example for this phenomenon. With remarkable parallels to "inclusionism", the historical case of HY Special Brigades shows the importance of examining concrete inclusion programs to see if they introduce their own selection mechanisms. It is almost to be expected that they are only open to integrating the Other to the extent their own structures and institutionalized interpretive patterns allow, without creating the internal or public perception of a problem with a program's legitimacy or consistency in regard to its fundamental principles. This proposal, reevaluating inclusion programs post-implementation, can be applied generally and points to a constellation of phenomena that exist independently of the actual motivations for inclusion. The motivating principles of the past are certainly different or even completely incompatible from current contexts and goals, but their analysis shows us where inclusion is in danger of being co-opted as a tool for existing power structures.

Sources and bibliography

Archival sources

Bibliothek für Bildungsgeschichtliche Forschung des Deutschen Instituts für internationale pädagogische Forschung/Archiv (BBF/DIPF/Archiv)

Bundesarchiv Berlin Lichterfelde (BArch)

Contemporary historical sources

Dietze H.-H. (1939). *Die Rechtsgestalt der Hitler-Jugend. Eine verfassungsrechtliche Studie*. Berlin: Deutscher Rechtsverlag.

Reichsjugendführung (ed.) (1942). *Vorschriftenhandbuch der Hitler-Jugend* (VHB. HJ). Bd. II. Berlin.

Schirach B. v. (1934). *Die Hitlerjugend. Idee und Gestalt*. Berlin: Zeitgeschichte.

Stellrecht H. (1942). *Neue Erziehung*. Berlin: Wilhelm Limpert.

Tetzlaff W. (1944). *Das Disziplinarrecht der Hitler-Jugend. Entwicklung, gegenwärtiger Stand, Ausgestaltung*. Berlin: Deutscher Rechtsverlag.

References

Bajohr F., Wildt M. (eds.) (2009). *Volksgemeinschaft. Neu Forschungen zur Gesellschaft des Nationalsozialismus*. Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer.

Benecke J. (2015). *Soziale Ungleichheit und Hitler-Jugend. Zur Systematisierung sozialer Differenz in der nationalsozialistischen Jugendorganisation*. Weinheim and Basel: Beltz Juventa.

Benecke J. (2020). *Außerschulische Jugendorganisationen. Eine sozialisationstheoretische und bildungshistorische Analyse*. Weinheim and Basel: Beltz Juventa.

Berger E., Rieger E. (eds.) (2007). *Verfolgte Kindheit. Kinder und Jugendliche als Opfer der NS-Sozialverwaltung*. Wien: Böhlau.

Brill W. (2011). *Pädagogik der Abgrenzung. Die Implementierung der Rassenhygiene im Nationalsozialismus durch die Sonderpädagogik*. Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.

Budde J. (2018). Erziehungswissenschaftliche Perspektiven auf Inklusion und Intersektionalität. In T. Sturm, M. Wagner-Willi (eds.). *Handbuch schulische Inklusion* (pp. 45-59). Opladen: Barbara Budrich.

Büttner M. (2005). *Nicht minderwertig, sondern mindersinnig…: Der Bann G für Gehörgeschädigte in der Hitler-Jugend*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.

Cornberg J.F. v., Steiner J.M. (1998). Willkür in der Willkür. Befreiungen von den antisemitischen Nürnberger Gesetzen. *Vierteljahrsheft für Zeitgeschichte*, *2*, 143-187.

Kershaw I. (2011). "Volksgemeinschaft". Potential und Grenzen eines neuen Forschungskonzepts. *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, Band 59, Heft 1*, 1-17.

Kollmeier K. (2007). *Ordnung und Ausgrenzung. Die Disziplinarpolitik der Hitler- Jugend*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kuhlmann C. (1989). *Erbkrank oder erziehbar? Jugendhilfe als Vorsorge und Aussonderung in der Fürsorgeerziehung in Westfalen von 1933–1945*. Weinheim: Juventa.

Schmiechen-Ackermann D. (2012). 'Volksgemeinschaft': Mythos, wirkungsmächtige soziale Verheißung oder soziale Realität im 'Dritten Reich'? InSchmiechen-Ackermann et al. (ed.), *'Volksgemeinschaft': Mythos, wirkungsmächtige soziale Verheißung oder soziale Realität im 'Dritten Reich'* (pp. 13-53). Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh.

Snyder S.L., Mitchell D.T. (2015). *The Biopolitics of Disability: Neoliberalism, Ablenationalism, and Peripheral Embodiment.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Steber M., Gotto B. (2014) (eds.). *Visions of Community in Nazi Germany. Social Engineering and Private Lives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steuwer, J. (2013). Was meint und nützt das Sprechen von der ›Volksgemeinschaft‹? Neuere Literatur zur Gesellschaftsgeschichte des Nationalsozialismus. *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte, Band 53*, 487-534.

Tent J. F. (2007). *Im Schatten des Holocausts. Schicksale deutsch-jüdischer „Mischlinge" im Dritten Reich*. Köln: Böhlau.
Tenorth H.-E. (2008). *Geschichte der Erziehung. Einführung in die Grundzüge ihrer neuzeitlichen Entwicklung*. 4th edition. Weinheim: Juventa.
Tervooren A., Pfaff N. (2018). Inklusion und Differenz. In T. Sturm, M. Wagner-Willi (eds.), *Handbuch schulische Inklusion* (pp. 31-44). Opladen: Barbara Budrich.
Peukert D. (1982). *Volksgemeinschaft und Gemeinschaftsfremde. Anpassung, Ausmerze und Aufbegehren unter dem Nationalsozialismus*. Köln: Bund.
Süß W. (2003). *Der "Volkskörper" im Krieg: Gesundheitspolitik, Gesundheitsverhältnisse und Krankenmord im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland 1939-1945*. Berlin: De Gruyter.