

Remembering The White Rose: (West) German Assessments, 1943-1993

in: *Soundings* 22:9(1994), 25-38.

Harold Marcuse

I

Remembering acts of resistance against an established state power brings with it a number of difficulties. When those remembering are citizens on a par with those who resisted, they must face uncomfortable questions about their own behavior, about their own dedication to the causes for which those they recall to mind summoned their utmost courage. In avoidance of such unpleasant questions many West Germans referred to anti-Nazi resistors as "traitors to the fatherland"; former chancellor Willi Brandt, who had emigrated to Norway and fought against the invasion of Hitler's armies, was a recipient of that epithet in the 1960s and 70s.

On the other hand, when acts of resistance are recollected by official organizations, unwanted parallels and potentially delegitimizing situations may arise. Eulogizing past resistance offers opportunities for present resistance. The late East German government experienced this very directly at commemorative ceremonies for the radical democrats Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, when demonstrators bearing banners with Rosa Luxemburg's words "Freedom is always only the freedom of those with dissenting views" disrupted official commemorations in January 1988 and 1989.

In this paper I will address primarily the latter type of commemoration: the official ceremonies for the White Rose at Munich University, which had been the center of their activities. The speeches held at those ceremonies are indicative of this official type of remembering, although not exclusively so. Public monuments established to recall the White Rose provide access to this same kind of public recollection, but those for the White Rose are less well documented and will not be considered here. Still other sources offer avenues of approach to the more individual aspects of memory. An examination of the scholarly and lay publications about the White Rose, for example, reveals how the eccentricities of individual concerns interrelate with the public recollection focused upon in this essay. Christiane Moll has already referred to the "Scholl-centered" focus of the historical



literature; a German historian has recently outlined the phases of scholarly reception of the White Rose in a fascinating study.¹

Wilfried Breyvogel outlines four phases in the published portrayal of the White Rose: the creation of an exculpatory, heroic myth from 1943 to 1948-49; a biographically oriented normalization of the protagonists spearheaded by Inge Scholl beginning in 1951; the transition from an immaculate, coherent image of the group to critical assessments of contradictory aspects in the White Rose's motivations and actions at the end of the 1960s; and finally in the 1970s and 1980s an increasing emphasis on the cultural milieu in which the students' resolve to take action against the regime hardened. I would add a fifth phase, to which Breyvogel's and Moll's work belongs: the attempt to cut through the baggage of a half-century of interpretation and arrive at an "objective" portrayal of the White Rose based on the critical analysis of known sources and the unearthing of new material.

Breyvogel points out many interesting inaccuracies in the prevailing perception of the White Rose, some of which I would like to mention, if only because of their almost complete lack of influence on the type of recollection discussed here. Breyvogel outlines how, right from the start in 1943, the magnitude of the Munich students' importance was exaggerated for use as a symbol of an "other" Germany, while the futility of this magnified initiative was used for exculpatory purposes. As I will show, this exculpatory function did not emerge in official commemoration until the early 1950s. A comparison of the 1951 and 1955 editions of Inge Scholl's book reveals a "Christianization" of the group which persevered well into the 1960s. That took place at a time when religious motifs were already on the wane in official commemoration. Finally, Breyvogel points out that while Anneliese Knoop-Graf was able to establish Willi Graf's importance within the White Rose in a series of publications beginning in the early 1960s, Alexander Schmorell and Traute Lafrenz seem to have played much more important roles than all previous portrayals would suggest. Schmorell's Russophile and socialist leanings, and Lafrenz' gender and success in concealing her role from Gestapo investigators, as well as their want of a personal writer-advocate after the war, explain this distortion. Again, except for the anti-socialism during the Cold War, this imbalance had little effect on the story to be told here.

The disparity between these two types of recollection points to the need for a terminology which can be used to distinguish between them. In its most basic meaning *remembering* is the process of recalling to mind by an act of memory actual experiences or acquired information. Since this is a fundamentally individual action, I will make

a semantic distinction and use the term *recollection*, which has the additional meaning of "gathering together again," to denote the group or collective action of remembering. This may take a wide range of forms. At one end of the spectrum there are the collective memories that arise from the inchoate interaction between individual or privately shared memories of lived experience, and the decentral dissemination of information about historical persons or events in the public realm (as in school instruction, popular novels and films, scholarly histories and documentaries). At the other end recollection takes the concrete form of *commemoration*, the explicit ritual recollection of an individual or event in the public sphere. Although there is a continuum from what one may call collective memories to official commemoration, one should note that the two poles may interact with each other. Ritual commemoration not only reflects collectively held memories, it is usually practiced with the express intent of reinforcing or redirecting preexisting historical images.

In the examination of the public commemoration of the White Rose in Munich we will see how those official images, in their attempt to mold collective memories, have in turn been shaped, reshaped, and challenged by those less cohesive images of the past held by various audiences. Public recollection is a dialectical process, public memory a contested terrain upon which symbolic battles take place over the signification of events giving meaning to our lives.

II

The students of the White Rose were thorns in the flesh of their contemporaries in Nazi Germany. They wanted to be thorns in the flesh of their fellow Germans. They hoped that the words in the leaflets they clandestinely distributed in Munich in the Summer of 1942 and in early 1943 would rouse those contemporaries out of a presumably fear-inspired moral lethargy. In the second of six leaflets readers found the reproach that any Germans who tolerated through complacency a government with "an infinitely great burden of guilt" were themselves "*guilty, guilty, guilty.*" The fourth leaflet concluded with the words:

We [the White Rose] will not be silent. We are your bad conscience. The White Rose will not leave you in peace!

It has often been noted that intellectuals and artists, and even the mass media, should play the role of the "bad conscience" in political

life. And it is almost trivial to note that no one likes to have a bad conscience.

When the Munich Gestapo uncovered and swiftly eradicated the Munich core of the White Rose resistance group in 1943, its activities elsewhere came to an abrupt halt, with one sole exception. Hans Scholl's close friend Traute Lafrenz had brought the third leaflet back to her home town, Hamburg, which prompted a group centered around Heinz Kucharski and Hans Leipelt, a Hamburg student with a Jewish mother who had also been in Munich that winter, to duplicate and distribute the last leaflet. After the execution of Professor Kurt Huber in July, they collected donations for Huber's widow, but were soon denounced and arrested.

But that exception only underscores the rule: There was no public outcry. Indeed, the disappearance of the self-proclaimed "bad conscience" met with fairly widespread satisfaction, if not to say relief. It was only outside, spatially and temporally beyond the reach of National Socialism, that the words and deeds of the students found positive resonance. Within Germany oppositionals such as Ruth Andreas-Friedrich and Ulrich von Hassell made hopeful notes in their diaries, but in the Reich no broader movement was sparked.²

However, word was carried abroad.³ Helmuth James von Moltke, international law expert and grandnephew of the famous German general, had organized a discussion group of opponents to the Nazi regime on his estate in Eastern Prussia. On a visit to Nazi-occupied Norway in early Spring 1943 Moltke gave a copy of the last leaflet, and a report about the group which he had gleaned from channels at home, to the Bishop of Oslo to bring to London. In the summer of 1943 the Royal Air Force dropped thousands of copies of that leaflet in the Ruhr area, and on 27 June emigré German novelist Thomas Mann dedicated his regular BBC broadcast for Germans to the White Rose. He quoted words Sophie Scholl was supposed to have leveled at her ranting Nazi judge: "Soon you will be standing where I am standing now,"⁴ and he concluded with a statement he had used as a kind of motto for the broadcast: "A new belief in freedom and honor is dawning."

But that, too, was more a hope than a prediction. It took two full years before the utmost exertion of the Allies broke the physical and moral strictures of Nazism and allowed a "new dawn" to emerge in Germany. Even the last-gasp attempt of military circles to assassinate Hitler on 20 July 1944 met with dismal failure and found no echo in the German public sphere.

III

It was not until the first "Day of the Victims of Fascism" in early November 1945, six months after the fall of the Nazi regime, that the first commemorative service for the executed members of the White Rose group was held at Munich University. The Italian-German theologian and moral philosopher Romano Guardini was invited to speak at that ceremony.⁵ Guardini did not mention the deeds of the White Rose, which he referred to obliquely as attempts to "overcome the pollution of spiritual values" and resurrect the "true" order of human existence. He ignored the broad, social morality that had prompted the students to act, imputing the origin of their motivation to "the heart of God . . . brought into the world by Jesus Christ." That absolved his listeners from the necessity of introspection, from the call of the authors of the leaflets to examine their own consciences: "the means by which they became conscious of the ultimate values is not for us to investigate." Indeed, Guardini ignored the impassioned call to "prove through deeds that you disagree!" (fifth leaflet), reasoning that the meaning of the White Rose's resistance activities "did not depend on their realization," but on where "God, in his omniscience . . . will enter it into the great balance sheet of the world."

This first speech prefigured the two main motifs that soon emerged in the official German commemoration of the White Rose: on the one hand it was claimed to have been quasi-religious sacrifice which purged collective guilt; on the other hand its failure was taken as evidence of impotence and futility of opposition to Nazi rule, as a post-factum alibi for the silent, presumably lethargic majority addressed in the leaflets.

Karl Vossler, a specialist in Romance languages who had been appointed provisional rector of Munich University, spoke at the second commemorative ceremony for the White Rose in November 1946.⁶ In contrast to Guardini, as well as to most of his successors in the next decade, he emphasized the exemplary nature of the White Rose's acts, but he limited the scope of the example of the "sacrificial death of heroically brave martyrs," as he called it, to the continuing, personal fight for the "freedom and authenticity of academic pursuits." That freedom could not be inherited or purchased, Vossler said, but could only be gained, nurtured and defended by individual, personal exertion. Vossler, too, absolved the students in his audience of lacking courage, because "the attempt to turn the course [of political events] and establish freedom and peace had to seem extremely reckless, even impossible."

In the next several years the commemoration of the White Rose was overshadowed by the heightening East-West conflict. Brief, more religiously-oriented speeches were held in front of primarily academic audiences. First the cares of life in war-ravaged Germany, then the return to normality after the 1948 currency reform (or even to incipient prosperity in the early 1950s), dominated public consciousness. The "Day of the Victims of Fascism" was officially repressed after 1949, so that February (first arrests and executions) and July (the anniversary of the execution of Schmorell and Huber on the 13th corresponded closely to that of the unrelated assassination attempt on the 20th) became the preferred dates for White Rose ceremonies. In 1952 Robert Scholl, the father of Hans and Sophie Scholl, complained in a letter to the editor that the large Munich newspaper *Süddeutsche Zeitung* did not even report about the ceremony at the University.⁷

In those years, however, the newspapers did usually report about the White Rose, sometimes in great detail. As the years progressed, the motif of exoneration through the sacrifice of the students became stronger and stronger. Even as material conditions improved and physical deprivation disappeared from daily life, German self-pity remained strong. The climax of the exonerative interpretation is marked by its use in a critical indictment of the tendency of many Germans to perceive themselves as victims (of war and Cold War) in a Munich *Merkur* newspaper report in February 1950:

The White Rose has expiated the crimes of the Third Reich for the German people, because not suffering for the suffering of others brings justification, but only acts of free will.

Feelings of victimization and exoneration often went hand in hand.

In February of 1953 West German president Theodor Heuß, one of the fathers of the West German constitutional bill of rights, sent a statement to the Munich ceremony.⁸ He, too, ignored the political nature and implications of the resistance and called the White Rose a symbolic beacon in the "darkest hour" of the "German tragedy."⁹ The privately recollected guilt feelings were so prevalent that Heuß was probably not aware of the double meaning of his words: The beacon both brightened and unburdened a dark collective conscience.

These examples should suffice to illustrate the apolitical, quasi-religious, guilt-cleansing nature of official commemorations of the White Rose in West Germany from the end of the war until the late 1950s.

In July 1958, on the fifteenth anniversary of Professor Huber's execution, Romano Guardini was again the speaker at this Munich ceremony.¹⁰ Once again, Guardini did not mention any of the historical acts of the White Rose, but took Hans Scholl's last words, "Freedom shall live," as the motto for his speech. He warned against two types of unfreedom: the modern subjugation through bureaucracy and technology, and the danger emanating from the "inner enemy" residing in each individual. This was a coded reference to the situation in East Germany at that time, and is indicative of the speeches held during the next few years, which were marked by increasing tension between East and West Germany, culminating in the construction of the Berlin Wall in August 1961. In the late 1950s resistance to Stalinism became a motif dominating official commemoration of the White Rose.

In February 1959 the rector of Munich University ordered the ribbon of a wreath presented by a delegation from an East German university to be rolled up.¹¹ He saw its innocuous inscription, "Hans Scholl, Sophie Scholl — to the fighters against fascism and war," as an insult aimed at West Germany. The literal meaning of "against war and fascism," he explained, was beyond reproach, but it was part of a slogan used by organizations in the "Eastern Zone" (an epithet used in the West to denigrate the East German state) to disparage West Germany. Students overeager to fulfill his will removed the ribbon entirely, drawing criticism from East German and left-wing West German student groups.

A few months later, on the anniversary of the 20 July assassination attempt, protest from the general public and several student organizations forced the postponement of the dedication of a university war memorial. Its Latin inscription read:

A monument of pious memory, dedicated to the dead of three wars, who, crushed by fate, did not die in vain.

This last claim was clearly a slap in the face of the legacy of the White Rose, whose members had explicitly condemned the senselessness of the victims of the war (especially in leaflet 6). Typical of the propensity at that time to lump all anti-Nazi resistance together, regardless of the political goals of its proponents, the Munich student government had planned a commemorative ceremony for the White Rose with its humanistic-democratic tradition on the anniversary associated with the elite conservative-military coup attempt, which the University administration had chosen to dedicate the war memorial.

In 1960, the wreath incident of 1959 was repeated, in which right-wing Westerners now carried off the Easterners' entire wreath. The rector reprimanded the overeager students for their behavior but once again publicly defended their action as preserving West German honor. Because of such incidents the University Senate decided that henceforth the White Rose ceremony would be open to members of Munich University only. At this time a counter-recollection which linked the White Rose to a critique of Nazi legacies in militaristic capitalism was developing.

V.

In the early 1960s the tendency to link the legacy of the White Rose to resistance against the division of Germany continued, but it was also the time in which the student movement was taking root. Two commemorative speeches during this period are especially noteworthy, because they signal a change in both the public and collective memories of the White Rose.

On the twentieth anniversary of the deaths of the core members of the White Rose in 1963, the eminent Lutheran theologian and rector of Tübingen University Helmut Thielicke spoke to the Munich students.¹² Thielicke did not leave out references to "the brothers on the other side of the wall," but he also admitted that there were still "[Nazi] murderers living and working" in West Germany. He criticized the self-righteous way West Germans were clamoring for the return of former eastern territories given to Poland by the Allies, and he assailed the increasing subservience of politicians to public opinion polls, but he also chastised the students who had vehemently protested against the blatant censure of the press in what has become known as the "Spiegel Affair."¹³ Thielicke told his listeners that the White Rose would have "looked ironically" at the "hysterical indignation" of those "professional oppositionals" presently defending the freedom of the press. He penetratingly discerned a "retroactive need to compensate for not having resisted [during the Nazi period]," a problem still plaguing oppositional social movements in Germany in the 1990s (as seen, for example, in the arguments mustered during the debate about German participation in the Gulf War in 1991). Thielicke concluded by noting that it would be a "cheap show" to try to emulate in the present what had required true heroism in the case of the White Rose.

In 1967 Peter Müller from the Max-Planck-Society for the

Advancement of Science in Berlin held another noteworthy speech in commemoration of the White Rose.¹⁴ It was entitled "German Universities between Resistance and Collaboration." Müller discussed both the historical dimension of student resistance and the present situation at German universities. He said that there was one sole retrospective reproach one could make: student resistance had not begun until it was too late; by the early 1940s fundamental political change could no longer have been expected. He made specific bourgeois intellectual traditions, namely mistrust of democracy and trust in authority, responsible for the lateness and inefficacy of university-based resistance. He called for an end to the strict separation of "objective scientific pursuits" and the "awareness of political and social responsibility." Müller's speech, marked an even clearer acknowledgment of the political nature of the White Rose than had Thielicke's four years earlier.

The year 1968 was the twenty-fifth anniversary of the execution of the Scholls and their compatriots, and it was the year in which neo-Nazi parties were elected to the state legislatures in Bavaria and Hesse, and it saw the high water mark of post-war student activism. Walter Bußmann, a recognized German historian of the contemporary period, was invited to speak at the annual University ceremony.¹⁵ His speech, while marked by references to contemporary student activism, can be seen as one of the first attempts to assess the White Rose "objectively" in the context of resistance in Nazi Germany. Before reconstructing that context he asked, "Would our moral substance be sufficient for [active] resistance, if it were only possible with sacrifice and at the risk of life?" That was clearly a provocative remark, made about eight months after the shooting of a Berlin student protesting a visit by the Shah of Iran had galvanized the West German student movement. Bußmann gave a more balanced portrayal of the motivations leading to the White Rose's actions than had his predecessors, including concern for human rights, the war situation, and personal developments in the lives of each participant.

Left-wing Munich student groups called for a boycott of the official event with Bußmann, where they unfurled banners proclaiming slogans such as "Those who celebrate resistance are repressing it." Instead, they offered an alternative "Anti-fascist week of the Scholl Siblings" with, for instance, a teach-in about "Neo-fascism in West Germany." After the debacle with Bußmann, the University did not attempt to sponsor any memorial ceremonies again until 1979. It seems that commemorating student resistance had become too thorny a proposition for a University administration whose

legitimacy was under fire during a period of student activism.

Left-oriented groups such as the Association of the Victims of Nazism and a Protestant student group, as well as more radical socialist and Marxist groups, kept the commemorative tradition alive during the 1970s. The University did its best to hinder their efforts with measures such as denying the groups the use of university rooms. Mirroring his predecessor's support of anti-communist wreath thieves in 1959 and 1960, in calling off the ceremonies the rector cited his fear of the "abuse of the memory of the Scholl siblings for Communist party politics."

An attempt to reestablish the official university commemoration failed in 1979 for fear of disruption by "a minority of extremist and violent anarchists," which caused the co-sponsoring German Trade Union Association to withdraw its support.¹⁶ But the political climate was changing. In 1979 the TV broadcast of the film "Holocaust" galvanized a younger generation with no experience of the politically charged 1960s and early 70s to inquire about and investigate the Nazi period. By the 1980 ceremony the University had prepared additional public-relations measures, such as the publication of a brochure written by a student for students under the auspices of Munich University.¹⁷ Manes Sperber, a left-wing writer who, however, took a hard-line stance in the Cold War and was thus acceptable to both sides, spoke about the "Dialectics of Collaboration and Resistance" at the first University-sponsored ceremony in twelve years. His thought-provoking comments probed the difference between the bonds of untruth that unite collaborators, and the respect for and love of truth that fuels resistance, including that of the White Rose. Two generations after the demise of the White Rose, its official commemoration was finally freed from expiatory religious mystification and feeble attempts at Cold War ideological functionalization, to focus on fundamental questions of human behavior and its political consequences.

VI

On the fortieth anniversary of the executions in 1983, a second, as yet unbroken series of official commemorations at Munich University set in.¹⁸ The fortieth anniversary of the executions in 1983 was marked by the premiere of Michael Verhoeven's documentary film about the White Rose. Willi Graf's sister Anneliese Knoop-Graf presented a biographical account of the group's members, and

University President Professor Hermann Krings interpreted what he saw as "the political meaning of the sign of the White Rose." True to expiatory tradition, the University President saw the White Rose as evidence that even during its deepest humiliation a force for renewal was alive in the university. For him, the predetermined failure of the White Rose was its most important aspect. He attributed what he called the "pointlessness" of the resistance to the downfall of democratic society *before* the Nazi period. The moral of his story was that the democratic state, by implication West Germany in 1983, should be defended in all crises. Professor Krings argued at length that the resistance of the White Rose was a *sign*, not an *example* to be followed. The White Rose was an uprising against evil, he said, and since evil could not be countered by normal political means (as opposed to *injustice*, which could be), the movement was unpolitical. Again we see the official attempt to depoliticize the White Rose, which in actuality, at the latest by early 1943, had developed concrete political goals.¹⁹

Since 1983 the annual commemorative ceremonies hosted by Munich University have featured speeches from widely recognized academics who gave highly personal accounts of what they saw as the relevance of the White Rose. Their individual emphases ranged from the discussion of religious issues (Michael Wyschogrod, 1986; Hans Maier, 1988) to more concretely political assessments (Krings, 1983; Wladyslaw Bartoszewski, 1987; Peter Steinbach, 1989; Hans Mommsen, 1992), to philosophical contextualizations in the framework of moral theories (Arthur Kaufmann, 1990; Gotthard Jasper, 1991). Common to all of them is the personal coming to terms of the speaker with the lives, deeds, and writings of the members of the White Rose. They are characterized as much by introspection as by retrospection.

This change vis-à-vis the commemorations twenty years earlier is evidence of a change in the underlying collective memories of the White Rose. No longer were the speakers addressing an audience which shared the direct experience of Hitler's Germany and seeking to deduce abstract meanings from the White Rose about that experience. By the 1980s the lectures aimed to revivify the White Rose and position it in a politically meaningful context in the present.

The story of remembering the White Rose does not end there, however: the autonomous, student-organized ceremonies have continued as well. For about a decade there has been a parallel series of commemorative events sponsored by student groups. In the late 1970s the officially institutionalized student government ("ASta") was

abolished by the Bavarian state, but an independent, grass-roots organization grew to take its place ("u-ASta"). Since the early 1980s that group has lobbied, unsuccessfully, to have the "Ludwig-Maximilian" University at Munich renamed after the Scholl siblings. In the tradition of the 1968 teach-ins, it has sponsored lecture series about problems of contemporary German society, for instance in 1993 on German racism and hatred of foreigners. At each event the student organizers explained to the audience that they were representatives of the "Geschwister Scholl University," and were committed to supporting the discussion of contemporary topics the University administration did not deem important enough to sponsor.

VII

Looking back over fifty years of remembering the White Rose, Federal President Richard von Weizsäcker said in his address in 1993 that the decisive issue was how today's students reflect upon the legacy of the White Rose.²⁰ The White Rose's hope that a broader public would follow their example was bitterly disappointed at the time of their actions, leading Weizsäcker to ask whether the group could be seen as the beginning of a new political tradition. He argued that freedom is responsibility, the responsibility to defend human rights whenever they are endangered. As a sign of the readiness and capacity to assume that responsibility, the White Rose is a sign of hope, he concluded, but ultimately each generation decides anew whether it will preserve a tradition.

And that is perhaps why we are at this conference in Santa Barbara in 1993, half a world and half a century away from those Munich students in Nazi Germany: to reflect on how recollection of the White Rose might help us to continue a tradition of preserving a humane world from the encroachments of power. In the words of the Czech author Milan Kundera, "the struggle of humanity against power is the struggle of memory against forgetting."

Notes

1. Wilfried Breyvogel, "Die Gruppe 'Weisse Rose': Anmerkungen zur Rezeptionsgeschichte und kritischen Rekonstruktion," in: indem, (ed.) *Piraten, Swings und Junge Garde: Jugendwiderstand im Nationalsozialismus* (Bonn: Dietz, 1991), 159-201.

2. Ruth Andreas-Friedrich, *Der Schattenmann: Tagebuchaufzeichnungen 1938-45* (Frankfurt, 1983), 104 [10 March 1943]; Ulrich von Hassell, *Tagebücher 1938-44*, 28 March 1943.

3. There are various reconstructions of the route; see, for example, Breyvogel, "Gruppe 'Weisse Rose,'" 166. In general I will disregard disparities in the reconstruction of historical events concerning the White Rose and narrate one plausible version.

4. Some works quote a more dramatic rendition: "Our heads may roll today, but one day yours will roll too."

Freisler was killed in an air raid on 3 Feb. 1945.

5. Romano Guardini, *Die Waage des Daseins: Rede zum Gedächtnis von Sophie und Hans Scholl, Christoph Probst, Alexander Schmorell, Willi Graf und Prof. Dr. Huber, gehalten am 4. November 1945* (Tübingen: R. Wunderlich, 1946), 21, 18, 26, 23f.

6. Karl Vossler, *Gedenkrede für die Opfer an der Universität München* (Munich: R. Pflaum, 1947), 20, 21, 9.

In November 1946 a plaque with a brief Latin inscription was unveiled at the entrance to the Grosse Aula. It was later moved to room 315, from where the Scholls had thrown the last leaflet.

7. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 1/2 Mar. 1952.

8. Reprinted in: Harald Steffahn, *Die Weiße Rose* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1992), 153.

9. The beacon metaphor was not unknown at the time; David Clay Large cites its use by Alexander Abusch in 1946, cf. David Large, "'A Beacon in the German Darkness': The Anti-Nazi Resistance Legacy in West German Politics," *Journal of Modern History* 64:Supplement (Dec. 1992), S173-86. For the powerfully expiatory language used by Heuß at the 20 July 1954 ceremony in Berlin, cf. *ibid.*, p. S177.

10. Romano Guardini, "Es lebe die Freiheit!" *Jahrbuch der Universität München* (1957-8), 101-10.

In early July 1958 a bronze plaque was unveiled when the reconstructed university atrium was dedicated.

11. This and the following after: Günther Kirchberger, *Die "Weiße Rose": Studentischer Widerstand gegen Hitler in München* (Munich: University publication, 1980), 36f.

12. Helmut Thielicke, *Von der Freiheit, ein Mensch zu Sein* (Tübingen: R. Wunderlich, 1963), 8, 15, 18, 24, 31.

13. In the fall of 1962 the news magazine *Der Spiegel* published an article critical of Defense Minister Strauss and the desolate state of the West German army. Strauss, with chancellor Adenauer's support, had that issue

confiscated and the staff arrested. Public outcry forced Strauss to resign in 1963.

14. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 23 Feb. 1967.

15. Walter Bußmann, *Der deutsche Widerstand und die "Weiße Rose"* (Munich: M. Huber, 1968), 8.

In January 1968 the newly founded University Institute for Political Science was named after the Scholl Siblings.

16. Kirchberger, "Weiße Rose," 38f.

17. Namely Kirchberger, "Weiße Rose."

18. Sperber's 1980 speech and those from 1983–92, with the exception of 1984, are collected in: *Die Weiße Rose und das Erbe des deutschen Widerstandes: Münchener Gedächtnisvorlesungen* (Munich: Beck, 1993).

19. See Steffahn, *Weiße Rose*, 91f.

20. Richard von Weizsäcker, "Wenn Freiheit nicht in Solidarität mündet . . ." *Kulturchronik* 2/1993, 4–7.