

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

University Libraries: Staff Scholarship

University Libraries

2022

Intellectual Freedom, Cultural Exchange, and Nazi Germany: The Relationship Between the Deutsch-Ausländischer Buchtausch, University of Denver, and Other Cultural Heritage Institutions

David Fasman
University of Denver

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.du.edu/libraries_staff



Part of the [Archival Science Commons](#), and the [Cultural History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fasman, David, "Intellectual Freedom, Cultural Exchange, and Nazi Germany: The Relationship Between the Deutsch-Ausländischer Buchtausch, University of Denver, and Other Cultural Heritage Institutions" (2022). *University Libraries: Staff Scholarship*. 5.
https://digitalcommons.du.edu/libraries_staff/5

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Libraries: Staff Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

Intellectual Freedom, Cultural Exchange, and Nazi Germany: The Relationship Between the Deutsch-Ausländischer Buchtausch, University of Denver, and Other Cultural Heritage Institutions

Publication Statement

This manuscript has been accepted for publication by Edinburgh University Press in Library and Information History at <https://www.eupublishing.com/loi/lih>.

Copyright is held by Edinburgh University Press. User is responsible for all copyright compliance.

**Intellectual Freedom, Cultural Exchange, and Nazi Germany: The Relationship Between
the Deutsch-Ausländischer Buchtausch, University of Denver, and Other Cultural Heritage
Institutions**

David Fasman

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE JOURNAL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION HISTORY

A JOURNAL OF EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY PRESS

VOLUME 39, NUMBER 2 – SUMMER 2022

[JOURNAL WEBSITE](#)

Abstract

Shortly after Hitler's rise to power, the Prussian State Library was restructured, birthing a new entity – the *Deutsch-Ausländischer Buchtausch* (German Foreign Book Exchange, DAB). The DAB was responsible for exchanging books and serials with scholarly institutions worldwide. In 1936, the University of Denver (DU) received a gift of books from the DAB. Nearly fifty percent of the books would be categorized as Nazi propaganda or eugenics literature by current standards. Upon further research, it was discovered that the DAB's relationships included Stanford, Yale, the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, the Royal Historical Society, the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, the Institut d'Égypte, the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, the University of Bombay, and the countries of Spain and Portugal. This paper provides a detailed review of the DAB-DU case, an examination of the DAB, and reviews of DAB exchanges.

Keywords

Nazi, Libraries, World War II, University of Denver, Cultural Exchange, Propaganda, Intellectual Freedom, Provenance

Introduction

Intellectual freedom, academic freedom, and cultural exchange are concepts that bridge the fields of library and information science (LIS), political science, and museum sciences. Frequently, these concepts are viewed together and support one another, as the exchange of information between free and democratic societies is typically hailed as a method of supporting and facilitating both academic and intellectual freedom. As an archivist and librarian, this paper is framed within the context and nomenclature of the library and information science (LIS) field.

Intellectual freedom is a core value among national and international LIS organizations.^{1,2} Frequently, library organizations discuss intellectual freedom in the contexts of censorship, banned books, and the freedom to read. While these aspects are vital to examine, there is a lack of literature related to the impact of cultural exchange on intellectual freedom – specifically, how cultural exchange and intellectual freedom can, and have, historically been at odds.³ The forthcoming discussion will begin by rectifying this scarcity through a detailed examination of the activities of the *Deutsch-Ausländischer Buchtausch* (DAB, German Foreign Book Exchange) between 1933-45, with a specific focus on gifts and exchange with the University of Denver (DU) in the mid-late 1930s.

On 23 November 1936, the University of Denver (DU) held a German Evening celebrating a gift of books from the German government. The gift had been arranged by the local German consul, Wilhelm F. Godel, by way of the DAB. The program for the evening contained several performances of music by German composers such as Wagner, Schubert, and Brahms, as well as a formal presentation of the books by Consul Godel and a response by Dr. D. Shaw Duncan – chancellor of the University.⁴

The gift of books included invaluable texts such as a twenty-volume set of the complete works of Nietzsche.⁵ Additionally, works by prominent German authors and artists such as Johann Wolfgang Van Goethe, Erwin Panofsky, and Leopold von Ranke were present.⁶ Also provided with the gift was *Blut und Ehre* (Blood and Honor) by Alfred Rosenberg, *Signale der Neuen Zeit* (Signals of the New Times), by Joseph Goebbels, and *Mein Kampf* (My Battle), by Adolph Hitler.⁷ An inventory of propaganda books created shortly after the gift included thirteen texts that would by current cataloging terminology fit into the subject headings of Nazi Propaganda or National Socialism--Germany.⁸

Over three years prior, on 10 May 1933, the infamous government-sanctioned and student-led book-burnings took place across Germany. While many are familiar with the libricide⁹ that took place in front of the Berlin Opera House featuring Joseph Goebbels as the primary speaker, there were in fact a total of ninety three book burnings that took place across the country that evening.¹⁰ These burnings not only targeted the work of Jewish authors, but any author or work which was seen as an affront to the rise of national socialism or had obtained national or international success during the Weimar Republic.¹¹ As Heinrich Heine wrote in his play *Almansor*, 'Where they burn books, they will also ultimately burn people'.¹²

As Germany systematically stripped its citizens of their intellectual freedom through banning and burning books, a new arm of the state was growing – the DAB. Although there is little mention of the DAB in English language sources, scholars such as Cornelia Briel, have examined aspects of the DAB over the course of their research. Additionally, there are mentions of the DAB in institutional acquisition records, as well as books by Jan-Pieter Barbian and Fernando Clara and Claudia Ninhos.

The DU case and other DAB exchanges are of paramount importance in beginning to answer several questions related to the propagandistic activities of the Third Reich, intellectual freedom, and cultural exchange. First, was the Third Reich attempting to propagandise support through the gifting and exchange of books and serial publications? Second, is it acceptable to exchange or accept materials from governments who actively suppress the intellectual and academic freedom of their own citizens? Third, is it defensible to accept books and other materials whose provenance is unknown prior to the disseminating organization? Fourth and finally, should an institution with these types of materials maintain the collection and, if so, how should such a collection be maintained? In an attempt to answer these questions, this paper provides an in-depth review of the DAB gift to DU, including surrounding media and events, a cursory discussion of other institutional exchanges with the DAB, and a brief history of the DAB.

The University of Denver Case

In the October 1934 *Bulletin of the American Library Association*, Esther Hall Dixon wrote an article entitled 'Friends of the Library'. She provided an exposé of the DU library – paying special attention to foreign gifts. She interviews Joe Hare, secretary of Friends of the University of Denver Library, and coincidentally the librarian who was in contact with German consul Godel. She quotes Hare as saying:

In the case of the German, French, Spanish, and Italian groups, we asked the consuls representing those countries to be chairmen of their respective groups...For example, the Italian consul supplied us with a list of many Italians in the city who read their literature in the original or in translation. He invited the executives of the Friends of the Library to the several Italian clubs in the city,

where we described our plan to collect a good library of Italian literature...Then we had an Italian 'party' at the library, to which we invited all of the Italians. We showed a film supplied by the Italian government, and had addresses on 'The Italian Renaissance,' 'Dante,' et cetera...The German, Spanish and French groups are formed on a similar plan, although not yet quite as fully developed as the Italian.¹³

Evidently, DU had set the stage for foreign gifts and created an environment promoting cultural exchange.

On 6 November 1936, German consul Godel wrote Joe Hare regarding the upcoming German Evening. Consul Godel provided the University with names of prominent Denver citizens of German descent who were to be invited to the event. Additionally, he offered to have his office post the invitations if the library would prepare them.¹⁴ The donation file for the gift provides no reply correspondence from Hare and no copies of invitations. However, it does contain a program for the German Evening.¹⁵

Prior to the German Evening, *The Denver Clarion* – DU's student-run newspaper – ran an article on 12 November 1936 outlining the gift. The short article noted an 'unusual gift of books' from the German government.¹⁶ 'The books, approximately four hundred in number...are chosen from different fields and periods. Among the...books are many dealing with present-day Germany and its leaders, and works of fiction by outstanding contemporary authors.'¹⁷ The article also interviewed Joe Hare, who stated, 'The most interesting fact about this collection is the absence of any Nazi propaganda. About ninety-five percent of the books are copies of classics of German literature'.¹⁸ Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, the article notes

that the German books are in addition to 400 *previously acquired* German books, though the source of their acquisition is not noted.¹⁹

Four days prior to the German Evening, *The Denver Clarion* published an official event announcement.²⁰ Unlike the previous *Clarion* article, which noted 400 books in the gift, this article raised the number to 450.²¹ Additionally, the article raised the number of books from a previous gift by the German government to 450.²² The article notes that the books were coming from the same source, although the source is not mentioned by name.²³ The previous gift was not mentioned in other news, articles, or correspondence.

It is important to stop here and provide some information on the DU book lists and the preceding German exchange organization. The University of Denver Special Collections and Archives holds eight bibliographies related to German gifts and/or exchanges.²⁴ Of the eight bibliographies, it appears that one of them is documenting books provided by the DAB's predecessor, the *Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft* (NDW, Emergency Association of German Science). Locating the books listed demonstrates that the first accession from the German government was in fact not from the DAB, but the NDW. This is clear due to the gift stamps, which were placed near the beginning of each book.

In 1934 the DAB took the place of the NDW with regard to the exchange of books and serials.²⁵ This is important, as it provides evidence that DU established a relationship of cultural exchange with the German government prior to the DAB accession, and perhaps before the rise of the Nazi party in Germany. All the books or serials in the NDW list have a publication date of 1932 or earlier.²⁶ Also important to note is the similarity of stamps of the NDW and DAB, as it is plausible that DU and other organizations mistook the stamps to be the same and therefore assumed the disseminating organization was also the same.²⁷

Returning to the DU case, as scheduled, the German Evening took place on 23 November 1936. It was reported that two hundred individuals were present at the occasion.²⁸ The next day, the *Rocky Mountain News* (RMN) ran three articles related to the gift – all asserting that the acceptance of books was problematic at best. The first article claimed that DU accepted a propaganda gift of 500 books from the German government.²⁹ Moreover, the article criticized DU for accepting the gift when, ‘Some of the best-known universities in the country [had] adopted an “arms-length” policy in regard to other overtures from the present Berlin government’.³⁰

The second article voiced a disapproving opinion by an anonymous reader.³¹ The criticism was pointed and firm, but perhaps most interesting was an observation made in the editor’s introduction to the letter:

Harvard University not so long ago refused a thousand-dollar gift from Hitler.

Oxford and Cambridge Universities refused to participate in the Heidelberg tercentenary celebrations. It is significant therefore that just at the moment when the Nazis publish a decree prohibiting the free choice of reading matter in

Germany, Denver University should accept a gift of books from the Nazi consul.³²

The anonymous author goes on to denounce Chancellor Duncan for his part in accepting the gift and essentially describes the donation as intellectual colonization.³³

The third, and final, piece run by the RMN that day was an editorial. Titled, ‘An Error for D.U.’, the piece lambastes the University for establishing relations with the German government in addition to holding a formal presentation of the books. The final part of the editorial succinctly displays the RMN’s opinion of the gift and why it should not have been accepted.

The Hitler government stands openly for a tyranny that suppresses the freedom of thought which is necessary for the development of true learning...We consider it the duty of free institutions to condemn, rather than condone, the intellectual despotism and the race hatred which are the chief characteristics of the Hitler government. We therefore regret that the authorities of the University of Denver have permitted themselves to establish friendly relations with Europe's principal foe of personal liberty, true culture and free education.³⁴

This candid statement points to two problems with the gift. First, the reprehensible nature of establishing relationships with an intellectually repressive government, and second, the obligation of free institutions to denounce those governments that censor information.

Responding to the RMN, *The Denver Clarion* ran another article the next day. The article provided an opportunity for the University, and specifically Joe Hare, to respond to accusations made by the RMN the day prior. Contradicting Hare's previous statement that no Nazi propaganda was contained in the gift,³⁵ DU confirmed that Nazi propaganda was, in fact, included in the gift. The article reads:

While fine arts, literature, and other cultural topics made up the largest part of the collection, certain of the books were on history and current events, written from the 'Nazi' point of view, and were recognized as propaganda. It was also noted that Jewish authors were not included in the set.³⁶

The University goes on to assert that simply accepting books into the collection did not mean the University was putting its stamp of approval on the content, noting that the policy of the library was to, 'Make available both sides of every question'.³⁷ Two DU professors made statements in defense of the gifts acceptance, noting that, '...Data on every subject should find a place [within

a university library]’.³⁸ While Hare simply remarked, ‘We would be wrong in rejecting these books...Our duty is to provide students with material on all aspects of questions’.³⁹ Only one day after the official gift acceptance, the Associated Press had picked up the story, which was subsequently published in the *Seattle Daily Times*.⁴⁰

Although the *Seattle Daily Times* article was short and a rehashing of other coverage, its presence alone is a statement. The fact the Associated Press and a non-local newspaper had picked up the story demonstrates how important the discussion of intellectual freedom was at that time in the United States. A Google Books Ngram search for ‘Intellectual freedom’ in the American English corpus, limited to 1800-2008, reveals that the highest usage of the term intellectual freedom existed between 1937-1938.⁴¹ While national media coverage regarding the gift is fascinating, it is important and necessary to contextualize the gift within the perspective of the Denver Jewish community.

On 27 November 1936, the *Intermountain Jewish News* (IJN) published a multi-authored response to the gift of books.⁴² The piece notes that, ‘A cursory examination [of the books] revealed sentences such as: “Talmud religion is legalized falsehood,” and “Jews lust for the good things of life, going from country to country to satisfy their appetites with the minimum of constructive effort and by business trickery”’.⁴³ Additionally, the authors found that the modern (post-1933) books contained a large number of endearing pictures of Hitler and, ‘Swastikas blooming like dandelions’.⁴⁴

Simon Heller, the B’nai Brith Anti-Defamation League chairman at the time, made a poignant statement regarding the gift. He was not against the acquisition of the books as such, but rather he took issue with their provenance. Heller is quoted as saying, ‘There would be no objection on the part of any intelligent American if the school brought [sic] the books, merely to

find out the other side of the Nazi question. But to accept them from the Nazi government places the University under an obligation'.⁴⁵ The article added that, 'Prominent Jewish alumni of Denver University have expressed surprise that their alma mater should accept such a gift from a government that is notorious for suppressing academic freedom'.⁴⁶ The previous statements highlight two core issues with the gift. First, while the content was problematic, the relationship was even more so. Second, the notion of cultural exchange with governments who do not permit academic or intellectual freedom in their own countries is troublesome.

Following publication of the first IJN article, a second piece was published on 4 December the same year. The editorial, written by Carl Mandel, placed sole blame for the gift of books on Joe Hare.⁴⁷ 'The blame rests, not on Germany for trying to sneak propaganda within the precincts of the school, but on the inept action of the librarian in asking the representative of a country notorious for its suppression of academic freedom for a gift of books'.⁴⁸ Despite the condemnatory tone of the previous statement, the overall opinion of the piece was not to remove the books from the collection. Instead, Mandel suggests that the books will sit in the stacks and remain unused by most of the university community. He states, 'We have nothing to fear if they did read the volumes. The Hitlerist philosophy is one that is inculcated by force: mere reading of its tenets would affect the normal student of a liberal school such as the University of Denver with a feeling of wonder and a tinge of nausea'.⁴⁹ Another Jewish newspaper based in Philadelphia, *The Jewish Exponent*, picked up the story and ran a short piece on 11 December expressing solidarity with the Denver Jewish community.⁵⁰

Although press related to the DAB gift had subsided, one more article was published on 18 February 1937 in *The Denver Clarion*.⁵¹ The article outlines a gift of art given by the German government to the University of Denver. It was a set of six colored prints of Matthias

Grünewald's paintings on the Isenheim Altarpiece.⁵² After review of the DU Art Collections accession records the current location of the art remains unknown.

A final note on the relationship between DU and the DAB/German government is that dates on correspondence and accession records are not limited to the fall of 1936. There is correspondence from John VanMale (DU librarian in 1939) to Consul Godel dated 13 April 1939 thanking Godel for the works of Hans-Friedrich-Blunck and assuring him that a list of books will be provided for exchange purposes with the DAB.⁵³ This correspondence is nearly three years after the initial accession and confirms two important things. First, the relationship between DU and the DAB/German government lasted for two and a half years at minimum. Second, while the November 1936 gift may have been exactly that – a gift – a relationship of exchange had formed between DU and the DAB.

A notable bibliography, not collocated with the rest of the DAB bibliographies, exists in a separate folder within the same box.⁵⁴ The list, titled, 'Gift--Deutsch-auslandischer Buchtausch through the Smithsonian Institute', is dated December 1936, and contains three additional bibliographic records. While the records are of little consequence, the title of the list implicates the Smithsonian as an entity associated with the DAB-DU exchanges. There are no other documents present in the folder that mention the Smithsonian. As such, more research is required to determine the relationship between the Smithsonian Institute, the DAB, and DU.

No additional correspondence has been found in the University of Denver Archives that would suggest exchanges continued after 1939. In fact, it seems the entire matter was forgotten until 1975, when two DU doctoral candidates, Paul M. Priebe and Michael W. Rubinoff, submitted a manuscript to *Western States Jewish Historical Quarterly* outlining the gift and

some surrounding news coverage. The manuscript was published in the October 1976 issue with the title, 'Hitler's Gift to the University of Denver'.

While, 'Hitler's Gift to the University of Denver', was a vital first piece of documentation regarding the gift of books, there are several problems with the article that are worth noting. First, there is no mention of the DAB. This is surprising considering every book provided in the November 1936 accession was stamped within the first few pages with an owl standing on top of the letters, 'DAB', and surrounded by the text, '*Gabe des Deutsch-Ausländischen Buchtausches*', translated as, 'Gift of the German Foreign Book Exchange'.⁵⁵ Additionally, even if they had missed every stamp, correspondence cited in their article⁵⁶ stated the name of the entity.⁵⁷

Second, the title of the article sets a hyperbolic tone for the paper as there is no evidence that Hitler was directly involved in the DU case, or any case discussed in this paper. Third, Priebe and Rubinoff assert that German consulates were approaching academic institutions in an attempt to, 'Bolster Germany's tarnished image while at the same time propagandising support for the Nazi cause'.⁵⁸ While this paper will make clear that there were other gifts and/or exchanges that took place in both America and abroad, there is no apparent evidence that these gifts were all procured through German consulate intervention or that they all contained propaganda. As Priebe and Rubinoff provide no citation for either consulate intervention or other gifts/exchanges, the claims come off as mere speculation. Although it is possible that consulates were involved in other exchanges, as was noted previously, it was DU reaching out to consulates in an attempt to diversify their collection, not the other way around.⁵⁹ With all of its faults, at least the Priebe and Rubinoff piece acted as a scholarly place-holder for the DU-DAB case.

The Deutsch-Ausländischer Buchtausch and Other Institutional Gifts or Exchanges

While information related to the *Deutsch-Ausländischer Buchtausch* is sparse, there are several notable manuscripts and articles worth referencing. Additionally, before discussing the work of the DAB it is important to understand their place within the German government. As Jan-Pieter Barbian notes in *The Politics of Literature in Nazi Germany*, ‘The Prussian State Library’s hand was also strengthened when, in 1934, it took over responsibility from the Emergency Association of German Science for the national exchange center, the Central Procurement Office for German Libraries, and the foreign book exchange center’.⁶⁰ The restructuring of the of Prussian State Library proved to be a powerful combination, assisting both in the subversive distribution of propaganda to foreign institutions as well as the dissemination of looted books to various German libraries.

As a side note, it is worth mentioning that current news sources are beginning to discuss the existence of Nazi looted books in European libraries.⁶¹ Primarily, they focus on the *Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg* task force and the meticulous records kept regarding looted libraries and archives. The articles provide two important pieces of information. First, the scope of Nazi library and archives looting was extensive and organized. Second, the records kept of stolen records (and books) are so meticulous that provenance can be determined. Articles published in *The Forward*, *The Toronto Star*, *The New York Times*, and *Haaretz* demonstrate there were millions of books looted by the Nazis. And while efforts have, and are being made, to retribute and repatriate the books to their rightful owners, the endeavor is still in relative infancy when compared to the repatriation efforts for Nazi-looted art.⁶²

Now, with a cursory understanding of the place of the DAB within the German government and the extent to which Nazi book looting was occurring, the function of the DAB

can be examined further. Barbian succinctly describes the most important functions of the three new Prussian State Library divisions:

Headed by Adolf Jürgens, the three new divisions subsequently supplied the Prussian State Library and many other research libraries across the Reich not only with purchased or exchanged items, but also with books from the confiscated property of Jewish communities and individuals, political opponents of the regime, and Masonic lodges.⁶³

The implications of this statement are profound and corroborated by the research of Dr. Cornelia Briel.

In her book chapter, ‘Reichstauschstelle und Preußische Staatsbibliothek – Legitime Erwerbungen und Erwerbungen aus Raubgut,’ (translated as ‘The Reich Exchange Office and Prussian State Library - Legitimate Acquisitions and Acquisitions of Looted Property’) Briel notes that it was the intention of the *Kulturabteilung des Auswärtigen Amtes* (Cultural Department of the Foreign Office) to use the DAB to subtly disseminate propaganda to foreign nations.⁶⁴ Additionally, Briel believes that at least some of the materials were stolen, however the extent to which the DAB disseminated stolen copies is largely unknown.⁶⁵

What becomes clear through research into institutional accession records is that the University of Denver was only one of many institutions that had established relationships with the DAB. Annual reports of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts and the Metropolitan Museum of Art list the DAB as a donor.^{66,67} Notable American universities who have records of exchange with the DAB include Stanford and Yale.⁶⁸ Both the reports from Yale and Stanford provide proof of not only gifts, but exchange as well.^{69,70,71}

DAB exchanges were not limited to American institutions. In fact, more documented exchanges were discovered outside of the United States. Learned societies, universities, and national research bodies are among some who had relationships with the DAB. The *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* lists the DAB as an exchange partner from 1934-1945.⁷² From 1935-1942 (excluding 1938, for which no publication was found) the Royal Historical Society in the United Kingdom lists the DAB as an exchange partner in their annually published *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*.⁷³ In France, the *Institut d'Égypte* (Egyptian Scientific Institute) also has records of exchange with the DAB in their annual reports from 1934-1937.⁷⁴ Additionally, the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* references the DAB in their 1938 publication.⁷⁵ Finally, the University of Bombay lists the DAB as an exchange partner in the 1938 *Journal of The University of Bombay*.⁷⁶

Furthermore, evidence of exchanges with two national organizations of Spain and Portugal also exist. These exchanges are well documented in *Nazi Germany and Southern Europe, 1933-45: Science, Culture and Politics* by Fernando Clara and Cláudia Ninhos. The first references to the DAB come from reports of Spain's *Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas* (CSIC, High Council of Scientific Research). Clara and Ninhos cite the CSIC Annual Report, which notes the helpfulness of the German Institute of Culture. The Report states that the CSIC was able to overcome obstacles that hindered the acquisition of foreign publications through the DAB.⁷⁷ Additionally, the report sheds some light on the logistics of exchange:

With respect to German works, we can take advantage of the fact that we should not pay with Marks, but only through a reciprocal service whereby Spanish works can be exchanged on request by the Deutsch-Ausländischer Buchtausch from us.⁷⁸

While this exchange with the CSIC provides some insight into the coordination of DAB exchanges, Portugal's case provides an even more comprehensive perspective.

Noting the relationship between the *Instituto para a Alta Cultura* (IAC, Institute for High Culture) and the DAB, Clara and Ninhos provide another revealing narrative. They note that an exchange of books and journals was set up in late 1930s. 'Books received in Portugal through this service were later sent to Portuguese universities and institutes. [The] DAB also organized a yearly list of German scientific literature and published a selection of books on mathematics, physics, chemistry and art entitled "German Technical Literature. A Selection"'.⁷⁹ While the method and extent to which DAB books and journals were spread throughout Portugal is telling, even more interesting is a brief discussion regarding the general secretary of the IAC, Leite Pinto:

According to Leite Pinto, this exchange was 'important for German cultural expansion'. At the end of 1937, or at the beginning of 1938, Portugal received some books, which were immediately sent to academic institutions. Apparently, only one book remained in Leite Pinto's office, as he stated in a letter to [the] DAB. This was Hitler's *Mein Kampf*: 'I will keep Hitler's *Mein Kampf* here in my office at the Ministry of Education'.⁸⁰

This statement highlights three significant points. First is the notion that exchange was important for German cultural expansion. This lends credence to the concept of intellectual colonization that was discussed in conjunction with the DAB-DU case. Second, the centralization of a disseminating organization greatly facilitated the accrual of DAB linked books by institutions across Portugal. Finally, the evidence that *Mein Kampf* was sent to the IAC demonstrates that DU was not the sole target of Nazi propaganda.

This analysis of DAB exchanges in the United States and abroad has provided irrefutable proof that the DAB was at work in multiple countries and continents. It is remarkable that the DAB was capable of forming and maintaining relationships before and during World War II with the number of institutions discussed throughout this paper. What becomes troubling after reviewing information related to the DAB is that, to at least some extent, the DAB was likely responsible for the dissemination of books stolen from individuals, libraries, and cultural heritage institutions across Europe. And so begs the question, how many stolen books were spread across the globe under the guise of cultural exchange? This question must be addressed in future research regarding the DAB.

Finally, understanding the DAB in parallel to similar Nazi organizations is important for context. Multiple organizations existed whose intent was to control propaganda and literature within Nazi borders.⁸¹ These include the Ministry for Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda, headed by Joseph Goebbels, the Reich Office for the Encouragement of German Literature, conceived and controlled by Alfred Rosenberg, and the Schutzstaffel (SS), led by Heinrich Himmler, which eventually grew into the Reich Main Security Office, whose Section VII was dedicated to ideological research and evaluation.⁸² Each of these organizations vied for control over literature and propaganda within the regime.⁸³ Goebbels and Rosenberg had a particularly contentious relationship, with both seeking absolute control over German literature and propaganda.⁸⁴ Guenter Lewy's *Harmful and Undesirable* expands on the notion of a 'turf-war', and Lewy remarks, 'A country claiming to be a pillar of strength and unity in fact operated as a system of feuding fiefdoms'.⁸⁵ Additionally, Mark Glickman demonstrates the tension between Himmler's Section VII and Rosenberg's Einsatzstab Reichseleiter Rosenberg (ERR) in his book, *Stolen Words: The Nazi Plunder of Jewish Books*. 'The most prominent competitor [to the ERR]

was the Reichssicherheitshauptamt (Reich Security Main Office, RSHA)...composed of agencies from both the Nazi Party and the Nazi army...and, as it happens, the RSHA also stole a lot of books'.⁸⁶ However, Goebbels, Rosenberg, and Himmler were all struggling for control of internal collections of books, and books that had been seized. None of the previously noted bodies have a clear association with the foreign exchange of books or the acquisition of books through diplomatic means.

As such, the DAB becomes even more mysterious. How could an entity of the Prussian State Library operate without interference from Goebbels, Rosenberg, or Himmler? Also, no mention of the DAB exists in Welch, Rydell, Lewy, or Glickman's texts, indicating the possibility that that Goebbels, Rosenberg, or Himmler had no idea what was happening within the Prussian State Library. Regarding the DAB's outgoing materials, specifically propaganda, the books could have been easily acquired due to prolific publishing of propaganda. 850,000 copies of *Mein Kampf* were printed in 1933 alone.⁸⁷ But where the non-propaganda books came from is curious. As noted previously, Briel believes that at least some of the texts were looted, but by whom? Incoming exchange texts, if they were disseminated within German borders, would have been difficult for Goebbels, Rosenberg, or Himmler to miss. But, if the texts were kept internal to the Prussian State Library, and used for subsequent exchanges, it is possible they flew under the radar. This notion of insular exchange, though not currently verifiable, is not so easily dismissed.

Analysis of the DAB-DU Case

Now, with a general understanding of the DAB and their other exchange relationships, an analysis of the DU case can be completed. The questions this analysis will address are as follows. First, was DU justified in accepting the November 1936 gift? Second, should DU have

continued their relationship with the DAB/German government? Third, how would the LIS perception of intellectual and academic freedom at the time have applied to the DAB-DU case? Fourth, should books from the DAB/German government be permanently collocated or retain their current places in the DU collection?

The first question is at the core of all resulting media coverage on the DAB gift. Was DU right in accepting the November 1936 gift? This question does not have a definitive answer, and as such both answers to the question will be defended and criticized. A strong case can be made that DU should not have accepted the gift. The discussion of intellectual colonization posited by an anonymous reader in the RMN provides the most support. It is important to pause for a moment and clarify what intellectual colonization is. This author defines intellectual colonization as the activity of intentionally disseminating information, in an effort to undermine, influence, garner support, and/or cause unrest in a target country or group of individuals.

So, is it possible that the German government viewed cultural exchange as a form of intellectual colonization? As was stated in a RMN article, ‘The dean of Berlin University, an “authority” on America, writes in one of his books that Americans are fools who can be easily led into adopting Nazism’.⁸⁸ The notion that Nazism could be spread through the dissemination of information is supported by a variety of sources. In fact, the dissemination of pamphlets, leaflets, books, and film were among primary tactics employed by the German American Bund. In ‘The Failure of Nazism in America: The German American Bund, 1936-1941’, Leland V. Bell notes, ‘This message [glorifying Hitler and National Socialist Germany] was promoted through such propaganda vehicles as the Bund newspaper, Nazi films – notably *The Triumph of the Will* – Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, and numerous Bund pamphlets’.⁸⁹ Jefferey Herf notes, ‘Articles in periodicals could reach foreign audiences if they were shared with professional colleagues,

friends, and family members or included in letters from Germany to recipients abroad. The credibility of such “intimate propaganda” was considerable...Such opinions can make their way into the foreign press and foster anti-Semitism there’.⁹⁰ Perhaps the proliferation of Nazi propaganda was in fact as significant a threat as suggested by the anonymous RMN author.

However, the *Intermountain Jewish News* (IJN) would provide a contrary opinion to the same end. Mandel’s 4 December 1936 editorial expressed that the Nazi philosophy was one ‘inculcated by force’ and ‘Mere reading of its tenets would affect the normal student of a liberal school such as the University of Denver with a feeling of wonder and a tinge of nausea’.⁹¹ He dismissed the notion that propaganda would have any significant effect on students at DU, yet took issue with the books’ provenance.

The final perspective on whether DU should have accepted the books is well-presented in *The Denver Clarion* articles. At their core lies a vital discussion of intellectual freedom and the hypocrisy of not including the views of a government that censors information available to its own citizens. Though he was placed in the sights of nearly every critique of the DAB gift, Joe Hare spoke well regarding the aforementioned concepts. In the 25 November 1936 *Denver Clarion* article, Hare is quoted as saying, ‘To reject the German government’s offer of these books would have been to assume the very attitude for which some criticize Hitler – namely, excluding literature just because we personally don’t like it’.⁹²

Distilling the previous perspectives generates three opinions, two against and one for, whether DU should have accepted the gift. First, intellectual colonization was a threat, and accepting the books only heightened that threat. Second, establishing a relationship with the German government through acceptance of the gift was problematic due to provenance. And

third, rejecting the books would have been akin to following the same dogma to which the Nazi government subscribed.

The second question to answer regarding the DAB-DU gift/exchanges is: Should DU have continued their relationship with the DAB/German government after the resulting media coverage? To be sure, the prior narrative of the DAB-DU gift/exchanges proves that a relationship was maintained, and that aside from the February 1937 *Clarion* article, media coverage surrounding the gifts ceased at the end of 1936. Apparently, the uproar was contained to those few months of press in 1936 and 1937 and any future exchange or gift was not reported on. While this absence of future press provided DU with an unimpeded path for exchange with the DAB, it did not justify it. Additionally, exchange of books with Germany could have contributed to the cultural satiation of Goering and Goebbels, who both had voracious appetites for art and literature. As was reported in 1943, by Engene Tillinger, in the *The Atlanta Constitution*, ‘Hermann Goering’s cultural soul was pouring itself out in rapture. It was his first visit to the Louvre in Paris, and he stood spellbound before the Nike of Samothrace...[which] now graces Hermann Goering’s Castle Karinhall at Schorfheide, near Berlin.’⁹³ While both a lack of press and cultural satiation were valid reasons to stop the exchanges, it is unlikely that DU was aware of the intensity of cultural theft and looting by the Nazis.

To hold that DU should have maintained a relationship with the DAB/German government requires the fulfillment of three prerequisites. First, that DU was unaware of the pre-DAB provenance of German gifts. Second, DU must have assumed exchange materials were finding homes in German public or academic libraries and not the private libraries or personal museums of Nazi officials. Third, the materials received as gifts or exchanges needed to be so

valuable to the DU Libraries collection that they outweighed the potential for another media backlash.

While one can argue that the first two prerequisites were fulfilled, it is difficult to believe that the third was. Even Joe Hare was quoted as saying, ‘American students are not linguists, and the books are in German. That means that not more than 25 people can read the books with ease, and how many of those will read the ones dealing with propaganda’.⁹⁴ If that statement was true, then there was no immediate reason to continue exchange with the DAB/Germany. This is especially true at the time of the final recorded correspondence between DU librarian John VanMale and Consul Godel in 1939. By that point, the invasion of Poland was only five months away, and to believe that DU librarians were unaware of the impending war in Europe seems unlikely.

The third question for analysis of the DAB-DU case is: How would the LIS perception of intellectual and academic freedom at the time have applied? In 1933, ‘The ALA’s [American Library Association] Executive Board took no stance regarding a letter requesting that they “take some action in regard to the burning of books in Germany by the Hitler regime.” The Board considered the matter, “but it was the sense of the meeting that no action should be taken”’.⁹⁵ At that point in time, censorship and intellectual freedom were still contentious issues, and it would be another six years before the ALA’s adoption of the *Library’s Bill of Rights*, precursor to the *Library Bill of Rights*.⁹⁶ Between 1933 and adoption of the 1939 *Library’s Bill of Rights*, several strides were taken on the part of LIS professionals and the ALA to ensure the place of intellectual freedom with the field.⁹⁷

Two resolutions by the ALA’s Staff Organization Round Table (SORT) passed in 1938 – one on Fascist Book Burnings and another on Censorship^{98,99} – provide conflicting perspectives

on the acceptance and retention of books from or related to fascism. The Resolution on Fascist Book Burnings explicitly urges the ALA to, ‘Seek the cooperation of all library associations and book groups in the world to make common protest to the fascist governments against the practice of book burning’.¹⁰⁰ On the other hand, the Resolution on Censorship condemns, ‘The exercise of bias in the selection of books’.¹⁰¹ The Resolution on Fascist book burnings supports the condemnation of the German government for its censorship and destruction of books, while the Resolution on Censorship supports the acceptance of books no matter their content. Lacking from resolutions passed at that point in time are any statements on the exchange of materials between nations – especially between a nation which permits intellectual freedom and one which restricts it. In the end, the ALA’s support of intellectual freedom above all else suggests that the acceptance of books, even from a regime that censors its own citizens, is acceptable.¹⁰²

The fourth, and final, question to address in analysis of the DAB-DU case is: Should books from the DAB/German government be permanently collocated, retain their current places in the DU collection, or be arranged in a different manner? The books are currently held in multiple locations, including the on and off-site circulating collection, and non-circulating special collections. Answering the question of collection maintenance with relation to the DAB-DU materials requires an understanding of the ALA-Office of Intellectual Freedom perspective.

In the ninth edition of the *Intellectual Freedom Manual*, several concepts are noted as key to collection development and management. These include statements like, ‘The presence of books, digital content, and other resources in the library does not indicate endorsement of their contents by the library’, and, ‘[libraries should] guard against using the excuse of “unscholarly” to avoid the purchase of controversial content. Academic libraries often include holdings that are considered “unscholarly”, “pseudoscience”, or offensive to groups...for the purpose of studying

the controversy or for the historical record'.¹⁰³ These two statements provide reason for the retention of the DAB-DU books; however, they shed no light on *how* they should be retained. And considering the possibility that DAB books may have consisted of stolen property complicates the question. It is this author's belief that if even a small fraction of the DAB gifted books were in fact looted, it is prudent that all the books be examined for signs of previous ownership, such as bookplates or marginalia.

For the most part, propagandistic books acquired by DU through the DAB are held in special collections. However, there are certainly books which could be considered propagandistic (or at minimum, written from the Nazi point of view) that are in open circulation. These include works by Alfred Rosenberg, Karl Aloys Schenzinger's *Der Hitlerjunger Quex* (The Hitler Youth Quex) which was, 'Obligatory reading for Germany's youth',¹⁰⁴ and several works by Hans F. K. Günther, a prolific author and race theorist who believed in 'superiority of the Nordic race'.¹⁰⁵ And so the question remains: where do these authors and books belong?

Focusing solely on content (as many of the books are increasingly rare and valuable), the answer to where the DAB-DU books belong narrows. Do propaganda and hate-speech have a place in the open stacks? As the ALA notes, 'There is no "hate speech" exception to the First Amendment'.¹⁰⁶ Also, as discussed in, 'Equity, Diversity, Inclusion: An Interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights', the ALA clearly states, 'Libraries should provide materials and information presenting all points of view on current and historical issues. Materials should not be proscribed or removed because of partisan or doctrinal disapproval'.¹⁰⁷ Regarding content, it is clear the ALA would support the maintenance of DAB books within the DU collection.

However, with respect to provenance, the ALA's position is far less clear.

Rare book and manuscript catalogers have the most thorough standards for documenting provenance through MARC records. MARC fields 541, 561, and 590, among others, allow for the documentation of acquisition, marginalia, and some amount of provenance history.¹⁰⁸ While it is possible to document provenance, Lundy also highlights that many librarians do not adhere to the standard conventions of rare book cataloging.¹⁰⁹ It is this author's opinion that while catalogers can provide some amount of provenance documentation, the description is not as rich as what could be found in archival records. To understand the place of provenance within the maintenance of the DAB collection, we must turn to the Society of American Archivists (SAA).

Provenance is a fundamental principle of archival theory.¹¹⁰ The SAA notes that, 'The principle of provenance or the *respect des fonds* dictates that records of different origins be kept separate to preserve their context.'¹¹¹ If we are to consider the books gifted by the DAB as a set of records with the same provenance, they should be kept together, regardless of their content. The notion that the books themselves are records is not a stretch, as they all contain the unique stamp of the DAB, differentiating them from other copies of the same texts. In this light, the books take on the identity of physical records of the DAB-DU exchange, and when seen this way, it becomes clear that all of the DAB gifted books should be collocated and held as a single collection.

Conclusion

At the intersection of ethics and cultural exchange lies provenance. Ensuring proper provenance is a necessary component in guaranteeing intellectual freedom. The ideas and information contained within personal or institutional collections are expressions of an individual's intellectual freedom or a guarantee of the freedom to read. The Nazi government stripped their citizens of these freedoms beginning with the book burnings of 10 May 1933. And

yet, a wide variety of cultural heritage institutions and national bodies maintained or began to exchange materials with the DAB in the mid to late 1930s, even continuing exchanges throughout the war.

The first lesson gleaned from the DAB-DU case is that the problem was not the materials themselves, but the relationship that was formed in order to acquire those materials – a relationship that potentially opened the door to intellectual colonization. While the world of today possesses far more informational interconnectivity, the notion that intellectual colonization still poses a threat is valid. The threat simply inhabits alternate forms at the current time. These include the proliferation of ‘fake news’ through social media and click-bait articles, the subversive manipulation of information by national bodies, and the increased potential for the spread of hate speech and propaganda through the dark web.

The second conclusion reached about whether DU should have accepted the gift is related to questionable provenance. While the recent discussion of provenance and cultural exchange may shed some light on how the LIS profession should approach provenance regarding gifts and exchanges, it is difficult to say definitively whether institutions should or should not accept gifts or establish relationships with countries who do not guarantee intellectual freedom for their own citizens. This problem is not unique to the DAB cases and will be one the LIS field continues to face in the future.

Finally, the third conclusion reached in relation to the DAB-DU case was that it would have been hypocritical to refuse the gift on the basis that we did not agree with the ideas held within the books. A refusal would have mimicked the same policies of censorship for which news sources were demanding DU’s condemnation of the German government. Instead, DU should have shelved most of the books in open stacks, and kept only those which were truly

propaganda, not available for open circulation. This is where the organizational structure of libraries can shine. There are libraries with open stacks that are free for everyone to use, and there are special collections and archives which possess restrictions on the use of books, but do not disallow or limit their use altogether. Through utilization of these already existent entities, libraries, special collections, and archives can provide equitable access to information while simultaneously guaranteeing diverse and inclusive spaces.

In reviewing the agency and activities of the DAB, the extensive scope of exchanges was revealed – through the DAB, Germany targeted institutions from Asia to North America. DU was not the sole target of Nazi propaganda during these exchanges. It almost appears as if no institution was out of reach for the DAB. Prominent museums, universities, and national cultural organizations had formed relationships with the DAB. To at least some extent the DAB was shown to disseminate stolen property and propaganda for the Nazi government. Whether this was the primary purpose of the organization, or only an ancillary benefit remains to be known.

Perhaps most importantly, this author suggests the creation of a bibliography of DAB-DU books to be shared with restitution and repatriation organizations. This notion must be extended beyond DU and is already at work in Germany vis a vis extensive provenance research at several state libraries.¹¹² If cultural heritage institutions were exchanging materials with the DAB, it is vital that records of those exchanges be provided to organizations who are responsible for piecing together the massive puzzle of provenance and rightful ownership left by DAB relationships. In addition, individual libraries and archives must take it upon themselves to assist in restitution and repatriation efforts as there are currently few organizations whose sole purpose is the repatriation and restitution of Nazi looted literature. As librarians and archivists, we must not remain idle while DAB associated books remain on our shelves. We need to expend our

resources, financially and otherwise, to ensure we are doing our best to rectify what may possibly be the most extensive dissemination of looted books in modern history.

Appendix A: Stamps of the NDW and DAB



Stamp of the *Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft*, which translated reads, “Gift of the Emergency Association of German Science.” Found on the title page verso of *Die Städte Deutschösterreichs: Band VIII Salzburg*, edited by Erwin Stein.



Stamp of the *Deutsch-Ausländischer Buchtausch*, found on the title page verso of *Signale der Neuen Zeit*, by Joseph Goebbels.

Appendix B: Google Books Ngram for Intellectual Freedom



Graph these comma-separated phrases: "intellectual freedom " case-insensitive
between 1800 and 2008 from the corpus American English with smoothing of 3 [Search lots of books](#)



¹ American Library Association, 'Library Bill of Rights', 30 June 2006,

<http://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/librarybill>; The International Federation of Library Associations, 'IFLA Statement on Libraries and Intellectual Freedom', 25 March 1999, <https://www.ifla.org/publications/ifla-statement-on-libraries-and-intellectual-freedom>.

² IFLA and FAIFE, 'IFLA Statement on Libraries and Intellectual Freedom', <https://www.ifla.org/publications/ifla-statement-on-libraries-and-intellectual-freedom> (last modified 18 August 2019).

³ The Oxford English Dictionary defines cultural exchange as, 'A temporary reciprocal exchange of representatives, students, or artists between countries, with the aim of fostering goodwill and mutual understanding'. For the purposes of this paper, the definition will be broadened to include the exchange of recorded information such as manuscripts, serial publications, and reports.; Oxford English Dictionary, 'Cultural, Adj. and N.', *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, <https://www.oed.com/view/Entry/45742?redirectedFrom=%22cultural+exchange%22&> (accessed 1 October 2019).

⁴ 'German Evening Program', University of Denver Special Collections and Archives (DUSCA), U171.05.0013.0009.

⁵ The texts were invaluable not only due to their cost, but also accessibility. As Joe Hare noted to the *Denver Clarion* on 12 November 1936, 'We were given at one time a collection of books which we couldn't have gathered in ten years'; 'Books from the German Government through the German Council'. 1936. DUSCA, U171.05.0013.0009.

⁶ 'Books from the German Government through the German Council'. DUSCA.

⁷ Untitled List of Propaganda Books. DUSCA, U171.05.0013.0009.

⁸ ‘List of Books Given to the University of Denver by the German Government’. 1936. DUSCA, U171.05.0013.0009; Upon closer examination of the bibliography, it is evident that upwards of fifty percent of the books were Nazi propaganda, race ‘science,’ or eugenics literature.

⁹ The Oxford English Dictionary defines libricide as, ‘The ‘killing’ of a book’; Oxford English Dictionary, ‘Libricide, N.’ *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. <https://www-oed-com.du.idm.oclc.org/view/Entry/107932?redirectedFrom=libricide> (accessed 8 October 2019).

¹⁰ Jan-Pieter Barbian, *The Politics of Literature in Nazi Germany* (New York, USA: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), Translated by Kate Sturge, 25.

¹¹ *Ibid*, 23-25.

¹² United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, ‘Book Burning’, *Holocaust Encyclopedia*, <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/book-burning> (accessed 8 April 2021).

¹³ Esther Hall Dixon, ‘Friends of the Library’, *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 28, no. 10, (1934), 801, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25688294>.

¹⁴ Correspondence and List of German Evening Invitees, sent to Joe Hare by Wilhelm F. Godel. 1936. DUSCA, U171.05.0013.0009.

¹⁵ ‘German Evening Program’. DUSCA, U171.05.0013.0009.

¹⁶ The Denver Clarion, ‘Beneficent Foreigner Sees that Library Gets Gift: German Consul Presents Classical Literature’, *The Denver Clarion* (Denver, CO), 12 November 1936, 1.

¹⁷ *Ibid*.

¹⁸ *Ibid*.

¹⁹ *Ibid*.

²⁰ The Denver Clarion, ‘450 German Books Given to Library,’ *The Denver Clarion* (Denver, CO), 19 November 1936, 7.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ The book lists are held in the DUSCA University of Denver Libraries Records collection.

Seven bibliographies can be found in U171.05.0013.0009 and one bibliography in

U171.05.0013.0006.

²⁵ Jan-Pieter Barbian, *The Politics of Literature in Nazi Germany*, (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), Translated by Kate Sturge, 351.

²⁶ ‘Books and Magazines Donated by the German Government’. DUSCA, U171.05.0013.0009.

²⁷ Refer to Appendix A for images of the NDW and DAB stamps.

²⁸ Rocky Mountain News, ‘D.U. Accepts Hitler’s Books of Propaganda: Institution Long Noted for Liberal Outlook Takes Gift from Government,’ *Rocky Mountain News* (Denver, CO), 24 November 1936, 1.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Anonymous, ‘D.U. Criticized for Accepting Gift of Nazi Books’, *Rocky Mountain News* (Denver, CO), 24 November 1936, 8.

³² Ibid

³³ Ibid; For the purposes of this paper, the concept of intellectual colonization shall be defined as the activity of intentionally disseminating information in an effort to undermine, influence, garner support, and/or cause unrest in a target country or group of individuals.

³⁴ Rocky Mountain News, ‘An Error for D.U.’, *Rocky Mountain News* (Denver, CO), 24 November 1936, 8.

³⁵ The Denver Clarion, 'Beneficent Foreigner Sees that Library Gets Gift.'

³⁶ Don Weber, 'Faculty Contradict German Gift Charges - R.M. News Answered - University Leaders Deny Condoning Hitler Government by Accepting Books', *The Denver Clarion* (Denver, CO), 25 November 1936, 1.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Associated Press, 'U. of Denver Given 500 Books on Hitler', *Seattle Daily Times*, 24 November 1936, 4.

⁴¹ See Appendix B for chart.

⁴² Intermountain Jewish News, 'Library of Nazi Propaganda Given to Denver University: Chancellor Accepts Gift of Five Hundred Books from German Consul in Denver', *Intermountain Jewish News* (Denver, CO), 27 November 1936, p. 1.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Carl Mandel, 'Editorial', *Intermountain Jewish News* (Denver, CO), 4 December 1936.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ The Jewish Exponent, 'Nazi Propaganda at Denver University', *The Jewish Exponent* (Philadelphia, PA), 11 December 1936.

⁵¹ The Denver Clarion, 'Pictures Given to Library - German Government Donates Reproductions of Monastery - Six Colored Prints of Altar of the Monastery of St. Anthony Will Hang in the Renaissance Room', *The Denver Clarion* (Denver, CO), 18 February 1937.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Correspondence from John VanMale to Consul Godel. 13 April 1939. DUSCA, U171.05.0013.0009.

⁵⁴ 'Gift--Deutsch-auslandischer Buchtausch through the Smithsonian Institute'. 1936. DUSCA, U171.05.0013.0006.

⁵⁵ See Appendix A for an image of the stamp.

⁵⁶ Correspondence from John VanMale to Consul Godel, DUSCA.

⁵⁷ Paul M. Priebe and Michael W. Rubinoff, 'Hitler's Gift to the University of Denver,' *Western States Jewish Historical Quarterly* 9, no. 1 (1976), 61.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Esther Hall Dixon, 'Friends of the Library.'

⁶⁰ Barbian, *Politics of Literature in Nazi Germany*, 351.

⁶¹ Ofer Aderet, 'Were Your Family's Books Stolen by the Nazis', *Haaretz*, 22 January 2019;

Milton Esterow, 'The Nazi Loot on the Shelves', *The Toronto Star*, 9 February 2019; Milton

Esterow, 'There's Nazi Loot on the Shelves, Too', *New York Times*, 15 January 2019; P. J.

Grisar, 'Librarians and Researchers are Finally Making Strides Returning Nazi-Looted Books',

The Forward, 15 January 2019.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Barbian, *Politics of Literature in Nazi Germany*, 351.

⁶⁴ Cornelia Briel, 'Reichstauschstelle und Preußische Staatsbibliothek – legitime Erwerbungen und Erwerbungen aus Raubgut', in Ira Kasperowski, and Claudia Martin-Konle eds., *NS-Raubgut in hessischen Bibliotheken* (Gießen: Univ.-Bibl., 2014), 28.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Library of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (LMFAB), 'Donors to the Library of the Museum during 1936', *Annual Report for the Year 61*, (1936), 113-115, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43478873>; LMFAB, 'Donors to the Library of the Museum during 1937', *Annual Report for the Year 62*, (1937), 106-109, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43473817>; LMFAB, 'Donors to the Library of the Museum during 1938', *Annual Report for the Year 63*, (1938), 113-116, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43478898>; LMFAB, 'Donors to the Library of the Museum during 1939', *Annual Report for the Year 64*, (1939), 109-112, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43478923>; LMFAB, 'Donors to the Library of the Museum during 1940', *Annual Report for the Year 65*, (1940), 110-113, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43480398>; LMFAB, 'Donors to the Library of the Museum during 1941', *Annual Report for the Year 66*, (1941), 115-117, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43480425>.

⁶⁷ The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 'Bequests, Donors, and Lenders', *Annual Report of the Trustees of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* 72, (1941) 40-46, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40297190>.

⁶⁸ National Federation of Modern Language Teachers, 'Notes and News', *The Modern Language Journal* 23, no. 1 (1938), 66-69, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/316145> 1938; Andrew Keogh, 'Report of the Librarian - July 1, 1934 - June 30, 1935', *Bulletin of Yale University* 32, no. 7 (1935), <https://archive.org/details/reportoflibraria1934yaleuoft>; Andrew Keogh, 'Report of the

Librarian - July 1, 1935 - June 30, 1936', *Bulletin of Yale University* 33, no. 7 (1936),

<https://archive.org/details/reportoflibraria1935yaleuoft>.

⁶⁹ Keogh, 'Report of the Librarian,' 1935.

⁷⁰ Keogh, 'Report of the Librarian,' 1936.

⁷¹ National Federation of Modern Language Teachers, 'Notes and News.'

⁷² Society of the Antiquaries of Scotland (SAS), 'Societies, Institutions, & Exchanging Publications', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 69, (1935), xlv,

<https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.104934/>; SAS, 'Societies, Institutions, & Exchanging Publications', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 70, (1936), xlv,

<https://archive.org/details/in.gov.ignca.15294/>; SAS, 'Societies, Institutions, & Exchanging Publications', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 71, (1937), xlv,

<https://archive.org/details/in.gov.ignca.15295/>; SAS, 'Societies, Institutions, & Exchanging Publications', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 72, (1938), xlv,

<https://archive.org/details/in.gov.ignca.15296/>; SAS, 'Societies, Institutions, & Exchanging Publications', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 73, (1939), xxxv,

<https://archive.org/details/in.gov.ignca.15297/>; SAS, 'Societies, Institutions, & Exchanging Publications', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 74, (1940), xxxv,

<https://archive.org/details/in.gov.ignca.15298/>; SAS, 'Societies, Institutions, & Exchanging Publications', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 75, (1941), xxxv,

<https://archive.org/details/in.gov.ignca.15299/>; SAS, 'Societies, Institutions, & Exchanging Publications', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 76, (1942), xxxii,

<https://archive.org/details/in.gov.ignca.15300/>; SAS, 'Societies, Institutions, & Exchanging Publications', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 77, (1943), xxxi,

<https://archive.org/details/in.gov.ignca.15301/>; SAS, 'Societies, Institutions, & Exchanging Publications', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 78, (1944), xxxi,

<https://archive.org/details/in.gov.ignca.15302/>; SAS, 'Societies, Institutions, & Exchanging Publications', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 79, (1946), xxxi,

<https://archive.org/details/in.gov.ignca.15303/>.

⁷³ Royal Historical Society (RHS), 'Back Matter', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 18, (1935), 238, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3678609>; RHS, 'Back Matter', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 19, (1936), 266, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3678693>; RHS, 'Back Matter', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 20, (1937), 266,

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3678599>; RHS, 'Back Matter', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 21, (1939), 237, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3678504>; RHS, 'Back Matter', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 22, (1940), 296,

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3678588>; RHS, 'Back Matter', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 23, (1941), 246, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3678660>; RHS, 'Back Matter', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 24, (1942), 182,

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3678472>.

⁷⁴ Institut d'Égypte, 'Liste Des Académies, Bibliothèques, Instituts, Sociétés Savantes Et Administrations Qui Échangent Leurs Publications Avec Celles De L'Institut D'Égypte', *Bulletin De L'Institut D'Égypte* 17, (1935), 294, <https://archive.org/details/BIE-17-1934-1935/>; Institut d'Égypte, 'Liste Des Académies, Bibliothèques, Instituts, Sociétés Savantes Et Administrations Qui Échangent Leurs Publications Avec Celles De L'Institut D'Égypte', *Bulletin De L'Institut D'Égypte* 18, (1936), 282, <https://archive.org/details/BIE-18-1935-1936/>; Institut d'Égypte, 'Liste Des Académies, Bibliothèques, Instituts, Sociétés Savantes Et Administrations Qui Échangent

Leurs Publications Avec Celles De L'Institut D'Égypte', *Bulletin De L'Institut D'Égypte* 19, (1937), 338, <https://ia601908.us.archive.org/3/items/BIE-19-1936-1937/BIE-19%20%281936-1937%29.pdf>.

⁷⁵ Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, 'Exchanges of Publications', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 58, (1938), 414, <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.105965/>.

⁷⁶ University of Bombay, 'Exchanges', *Journal of the University of Bombay* 7 (1938), 167 and 310, <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.277307/>.

⁷⁷ Clara and Ninhos, *Nazi Germany and Southern Europe*, 79.

⁷⁸ Ibid, 80.

⁷⁹ Ibid, 130.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Anders Rydell, *The Book Thieves*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2017), Translated by Henning Koch.

⁸² Ibid, 68.

⁸³ David Welch, *The Third Reich: Politics and Propaganda*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2002), 37.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Guenter Lewy, *Harmful and Undesirable: Book Censorship in Nazi Germany*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), 145.

⁸⁶ Mark Glickman, *Stolen Words: The Nazi Plunder of Jewish Books*, (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2016), 112.

⁸⁷ Rydell, *The Book Thieves*, 8.

⁸⁸ Anonymous, 'D.U. Criticized for Accepting Gift of Nazi Books', *Rocky Mountain News* (Denver, CO), 24 November 1936.

⁸⁹ Leland V. Bell, 'The Failure of Nazism in America: The German American Bund, 1936-1941', *Political Science Quarterly* 85, no. 4 (1970), 585-599, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2147597>.

⁹⁰ Jeffrey Herf, *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 227-8.

⁹¹ Carl Mandel, 'Editorial', *Intermountain Jewish News* (Denver, CO), 4 December 1936.

⁹² Don Weber, 'Faculty Contradict German Gift Charges - R.M. News Answered - University Leaders Deny Condoning Hitler Government by Accepting Books', *The Denver Clarion* (Denver, CO), 25 November 1936.

⁹³ Engene Tillinger, 'History's Greatest Art Theft', *The Atlanta Constitution* (Atlanta, GA), June 1943, <https://search-proquest-com.du.idm.oclc.org/docview/504110563?accountid=14608>.

⁹⁴ The Denver Clarion, 'Beneficent Foreigner Sees that Library Gets Gift: German Consul Presents Classical Literature', *The Denver Clarion* (Denver, CO), 12 November 1936.

⁹⁵ Douglas Campbell, 'Reexamining the Origins of the Adoption of the ALA's Library Bill of Rights', *Library Trends* 63, no. 1 (2014), 42-56. <https://search-proquest-com.du.idm.oclc.org/libraryinformation/docview/1617929654/fulltext/FE3EDB0A4B274EF9PQ/4?accountid=14608>.

⁹⁶ Judith F. Krug and Candace D. Morgan, 'ALA and Intellectual Freedom: A Historical Overview', In *A History of ALA Policy on Intellectual Freedom : A Supplement to the Intellectual Freedom Manual, Ninth Edition*, (Chicago, Il: American Library Association, 2015), 10-30

⁹⁷ Douglas Campbell, 'Reexamining the Origins of the Adoption of the ALA's Library Bill of Rights', *Library Trends* 63, no. 1 (2014), 42-56, <https://search-proquest-com.du.idm.oclc.org/libraryinformation/docview/1617929654/fulltext/FE3EDB0A4B274EF9PQ/4?accountid=14608>.

⁹⁸ Alice Woolbert, 'Staff Organizations Round Table', *Bulletin of the American Library Association* 32, no. 11 (1938), 967-969. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25689549>.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Douglas Campbell, 'Reexamining the Origins of the Adoption of the ALA's Library Bill of Rights', *Library Trends* 63, no. 1 (2014), 42-56. <https://search-proquest-com.du.idm.oclc.org/libraryinformation/docview/1617929654/fulltext/FE3EDB0A4B274EF9PQ/4?accountid=14608>.

¹⁰³ Trina Magi and Martin Garnar, eds., *Intellectual Freedom Manual. 9th ed.*, (Chicago, IL: American Library Association, 2015).

¹⁰⁴ Eric Rentschler, *The Ministry of Illusion: Nazi Cinema and its Afterlife*. (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1996).

¹⁰⁵ Amos Morris-Reich. 2006. 'Project, Method, and the Racial Characteristics of Jews: A Comparison of Franz Boas and Hans F. K. Günther', *Jewish Social Studies* 13, no. 1 (2006), 136-169. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4467760>.

¹⁰⁶ American Library Association, 'Hate Speech and Hate Crime', <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/hate>, (last modified 12 December 2017)

¹⁰⁷ American Library Association, 'Equity, Diversity, Inclusion: An Interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights', <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/librarybill/interpretations/EDI>, (last modified 27 June 2017).

¹⁰⁸ M. W. Lundy, 'Provenance Evidence in Bibliographic Records: Demonstrating the Value of Best Practices in Special Collections Cataloging', *Library Resources & Technical Services* 52, no. 3 (2008), 164-172. <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/provenance-evidence-bibliographic-records/docview/216902498/se-2?accountid=14608>

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Society of American Archivists, 'Provenance,' Society of American Archivists Website, <https://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/p/provenance> (accessed Oct 15, 2019).

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Rydell, *The Book Thieves*, 14-15.