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ABSTRACT

LOTHAR-GÜNTER BUCHHEIM’S DAS BOOT: MEMORY AND THE NAZI PAST

Dean J. Guarnaschelli

This study investigates the relationship between German author Lothar-Günther Buchheim (1918-2007), his bestselling 1973 novel Das Boot (The Boat), and the Federal Republic of Germany’s endeavor to come to terms with the spiritual damage left behind by National Socialism as well as with the responsibility of Germans for that past, known as the Vergangenheitsbewältigung. Buchheim was a reporter for the German Navy during the Battle of the Atlantic who benefitted from distinct privileges, yet he was never in a position of power during the conflict. He fulfilled his duties for the propaganda division with accolades, but thirty years later Buchheim railed against what he perceived to be a varnished truth in West German public memory about the Kriegsmarine and its crews. Michael Rothberg’s theory of the implicated beneficiary is used as a lens to view Buchheim’s life and career in light of this duality. The plot of Das Boot has been retold by others both in Germany and beyond its borders because many people claim that the story bears an anti-war message. Wolfgang Petersen’s critically acclaimed 1981 film and interpretations as a comedy sketch, a live stage play and a streamed television sequel have followed. This trajectory of Buchheim’s personal memory moving into the realm of transcultural memory reflects a process that practitioners of memory studies have described as transnational memory formation. Archival material provides insight into
changing attitudes in the American and German book markets during the 1970s that accounted for the postwar generation’s interest in Das Boot. Video footage and interviews reveal how Buchheim linked the psychological damage that National Socialism caused in Germany and in other societies as a way to demystify the past. Teaching materials from the 1980s reflect the relevance of Das Boot for students then. Buchheim’s activity during World War II yielded many reactions that were conducive to classroom lessons about how Germans remembered the war. His depiction of his own experience was meant to relay empathy, truthfulness, and honesty to readers. The debates that he helped to initiate raise the question at present as to whether Germany’s “mastering the past” serves as a model for other societies analyzing their own histories.
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Introduction: Lothar-Günther Buchheim’s Das Boot: Memory and the Nazi Past

Despite the legacy of psychological damage that followed the collapse of the Third Reich, the Federal Republic of Germany envisioned obtaining what Robert G. Moeller has described as a “usable past.”¹ Driven by both outside influences such as the Allied presence in Germany after 1945, and internal ones by political leaders and intellectuals, the goal was to integrate Germans into European society. As a backdrop to the postwar years, the Sachsenhausen and Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunals were a reminder to the world that Nazi war crimes had been defined and the perpetrators brought to justice. In the postwar decades, West German writers offered readers a way to deal with their recent history in a medium where intricate levels of apology, self-reflection, and criticism intertwined.²

The present study argues that Lothar-Günther Buchheim’s 1973 bestselling autobiographical novel Das Boot became an important intervention in German postwar political responsibility after the book’s reception underwent what the field of memory studies calls transcultural memory formation. The unexpected, record-breaking sales upon its debut catapulted Buchheim’s memoir about the Battle of the Atlantic into the realm of popular literature, which in turn prevented it from undergoing serious analysis in the comparative literature field as it existed then. As a result, Das Boot was not recognized as a part of Germany’s collective memory of World War II until well after Bavaria Films released Das Boot as a major studio film 1981. At that point the arbiters of Germany’s higher culture, those overseeing contributions to its intellectual and national identities, reacted instead to the international debates on the narrative that resounded later. Director Wolfgang Petersen’s critically-acclaimed director’s cut, shown on German
television in 1985, created further discourse among the generations about how the war was to be remembered.

The history of Das Boot, from manuscript all the way to its status at present as a digital-age franchise, illustrates the research goals of memory studies. Published autobiographies like Das Boot are also artifacts that transport memories across borders to reach younger generations, and this shows us that national histories are intertwined. The contesting of memories provided by such works allows for a subtle, yet ever-expanding understanding of the past. Over the last few decades, the discipline of memory studies has had a variety of leading themes, such as victimhood and trauma. With an understanding of Buchheim’s intentions, we gain insight into the process by which a nation confronts its violent past and transitions into a new phase of modernity. Much like a domino act, Germany’s working through the horrors of its past with the aid of modern media forms was the catalyst for the postwar generation in other nations such as Norway to question its own involvement in the same conflict and how it commemorated that time.

Buchheim (1918-2007) studied art formally in Dresden and Munich. Drafted in 1940, his artistic abilities were key in his immediate assignment as a war reporter for the German Navy in service of the propaganda division. Throughout his career, Buchheim was never in a tier of actors held personally accountable for war crimes, yet he was known by name among high-ranking Nazi officers for his photo-essays commissioned for the party’s journals and magazines. Buchheim’s ease of mobility during the war between occupied France, his own residence in Bavaria, and the National Socialist offices Berlin, is an example of his special status despite his never being in command of anyone in the naval hierarchy to which he belonged. As a war artist and reporter for the Nazi
propaganda department, his lack of final control over any drawings, texts, or photography assigned to him, capped off his influence within that sphere.

The obstacles in Germany’s path to rebuilding its postwar national identity included matters such as growing research about the Holocaust, the tension within the Allied occupational zones, and the division of the country into two states that lasted until reunification in 1990. The aim of this period, what historians refer to as the *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* (mastering of the past), was to provide Germans with a way of reckoning with the horror left in the wake of National Socialism so that the Federal Republic could begin its probation as a viable partner in Europe. The infamous West German *Wirtschaftswunder* (economic miracle) of the 1950s was a necessary step in national healing, yet the rapid shift in postwar Germany from near collapse, to an unprecedented industrial comeback, remains an anomaly for many scholars.

For some historians, Germany’s efforts to work through its Nazi past embodied a metaphorical line of demarcation or *Schlussstrich* (final stroke) that signified a welcomed completion of its road to democracy. In a poll from 2015, Germany’s widely read magazine *Stern* reported that 58% of participants saw Germany’s overcoming of its Nazi past as incomplete. At the beginning of 2020, the German multimedia news agency *Deutsche Welle* printed a poll with similar results. From these inquiries, the role of the past in present-day German daily life shows itself to be a tangible presence. The responses in these questionnaires also explain the surge at present in the interest in war-related themes in popular culture at present. Stories about the Battle of the Atlantic, the hunt for escaped Nazis, and marginalized perspectives on the past, appear in new German in popular media like graphic novels, films, television series, and video games.
Looking back at the history of Germany’s grappling with its Nazi past on a national level, several controversial intellectual debates challenged the public’s already uneven sense of collective guilt. Socio-political issues such as the heated Historikerstreit (historians’ debate) in the 1980s, and the controversial Wehrmacht ausstellung (Wehrmacht exhibit) in 1995, are noted by some scholars as being examples of this challenge to public remembrance of the past. Both before and after these open debates, many Germans offered their perspectives on the past so that people born after World War II had access to critical reflections on the past. Some of the shared personal narratives are generally remembered as moving tales of redemption, such as the reflections of Lutheran pastor Friedrich Niemöller. Other personal histories were more difficult to evaluate in terms of guilt, ethics, and victimization, as was the case with Buchheim.

**Introduction.1.: Thesis**

Two factors surrounding Buchheim’s novel point to the importance of understanding the relationship between Das Boot and German postwar political responsibility, which includes collective guilt. Firstly, the narrative’s metamorphosis from book to scripted film in 1981 was driven by others who were born after Buchheim’s generation. This media change, under the supervision of non-eyewitnesses, makes it a prime example of popular memory formation as scholars in the field like Wulf Kansteiner have described it. Secondly, the pattern of locations where both book and film were experienced, namely in Germany, then abroad, and then back to Germany again, illustrates what Astrid Erll has named *traveling memory*. Erll’s term refers to narratives embedded in various communicative forms that leave their point of origin and become
transnational if they are found by others to possess a relatable quality. This is a key feature of postwar memory dissemination inherent in the history surrounding Das Boot and it widens the spectrum of findings related to historical remembrance.

Analyzing Buchheim’s novel with techniques borrowed from memory studies shows why the Vergangenheitsbewältigung (mastering of the past) seemed to have consisted of as much controversy as closure. Postwar silence and conflicting accounts of the war were reactions West Germans had in dealing with their various forms of guilt, be it criminal, moral, or political guilt. This analysis of Das Boot contributes to the idea that memory and culture have no fixed boundaries. The path taken by the book after its initial reception reveals a deeper understanding of what was once called a national history.

Buchheim’s track record for both eliciting upset among war veterans, while gaining the admiration of much of the postwar generation, suggests that there was a price to pay for Germany’s establishing a national view of the past. Confronted with the tumultuous voices of some veterans who felt antagonized by Das Boot, he maintained a position caught between people who related to his claim of delivering an antiwar message, and those whom he condemned as still harboring Germany’s penchant for Heldenmythos (tale of heroism). Buchheim acknowledged that West Germans lived and worked in a sensitive atmosphere that made honoring some participants in the war impossible. To infuse the notion with his own view, he declared how people once spoke of Veteranen (veterans) before Das Boot became a bestseller; due to the novel’s success, he felt that all Germans should now see themselves as Kriegsbeschädigte (war casualties) damaged spiritually from the effects of the war.
Introduction.2: Methodology

Michael Rothberg’s metaphor of the implicated beneficiary builds on the idea of interconnectivity between people and events developed by Hannah Arendt and Primo Levi in their respective works on the intricacies of collaboration during the war.\textsuperscript{14} In Rothberg’s view, traumatic events in history unfold in such a way that fixed terms such as victim, perpetrator, or bystander, become insufficient in analyzing people who were prominent actors with a limited responsibility or authority. Buchheim, unlike some published writers in Nazi Germany, did not go through any denazification process after war. He was never a part of legal proceedings like some others who were labeled \textit{Mitläufer} (people who “follows along”). Related terms like \textit{Belastete} (an incriminated person), \textit{Schuldige} (offender), or \textit{Hauptschuldige} (a prominent member of the guilty party), were never applied to him as was the case for his contemporary, author Hanns Johst.\textsuperscript{15} Rothberg’s metaphor helps in answering the question as to how Buchheim saw himself during the war and in explaining which attitudes in postwar German society influenced him the most by the 1970s.

Rothberg’s concept has two aspects to its nature that make it conducive as a methodology for historical study. Firstly, it identifies an individual or historical actor known to be involved in a conflict where neither the labels of hero, nor agent of harm, are completely applicable. Buchheim is seen in the present study as having met this criterion; he was a war artist from the start of his military service until Germany’s defeat. Secondly, we as onlookers are reminded not to attach present-day judgements to the person in question. Buchheim’s military service during the Third Reich was one that
came with unique privileges but as a naval correspondent he was presented to others on board as a guest with no practical authority.

In Rothberg’s model, guilt has different nuances beyond criminal guilt; this was a major lesson of the trials in Nuremberg. Thus, his theory is a way to view the past in which the actors in question displayed an apparent loyalty or possibly neutrality during times of intense drama such as war. Despite his model being a way to open new avenues for research, Rothberg has stated that competing public memories within a society are not caught up in a zero-sum game in which one narrative becomes the victorious account cancelling out other memories. Instead, the dynamic of competing accounts in public or familial sectors informs subsequent generations as it creates new memories for the younger generation about a given event, especially tragedies. This is also reflected in Erll’s thinking.

Archived materials from Germany were germane to this dissertation. The new archive housed in Buchheim’s own gallery, the *Museum der Fantasie* (Museum of Phantasy) in Bernried granted me permission to use letters from Buchheim as well as digitized copies of his publications. Time spent in the Deutsches Literaturarchiv in Marbach provided me with a valuable review of Buchheim’s first novel and original statistics about its popularity. Both the Akademie der Künste and Deutsche Kinemathek facilities in Berlin were generous sources that supplied original reviews about the movie *Das Boot*. Information about Buchheim’s activity in the 1950s in Darmstadt, supplied by members of the *Darmstädter Sezession* artist group in Germany, was also key in establishing Buchheim’s stance on connecting with the public after the war ended.
The access to letters dealing with the marketing of the novel Das Boot was generously granted by the Harry Ransom Center at the University of Texas; these memos from publishers Alfred A. Knopf and Klaus Piper were instrumental in tracing the history of Das Boot along its trajectory. The correspondence surrounding the book’s debut in the United States was essential in establishing how a controversial text finds an audience outside of its original point of production and in translation. The Chazen Museum of Art in Wisconsin (formerly the Elvehjem Museum) was helpful in supplying documentation about their hosting of the U.S. leg of Buchheim’s art exhibit in 1983.

Mirko Wittwar’s monograph Das Bild vom Krieg (The Picture of War), the first one on Buchheim’s writing, was crucial in breaking down the walls of what constitutes literature in modern times. Wittwar’s insight during our email correspondence was as supportive as it was invaluable.

Multimedia sources pertaining to Buchheim and Das Boot were essential in viewing the stages that he went through over time and bearing they had on his work. Mathias Haentje’s original cut of his documentary film Lothar-Günther Buchheim und die Donau (Lothar-Günther Buchheim and the Donau River), the only one ever made about Buchheim’s boat trip along the Danube, was a key element in getting to the root of Buchheim’s nature.

As described in subsequent chapters in this study, Buchheim wore many hats as a highly active entrepreneur. His crass nature, on camera or during interviews, created the image of an irascible genius that obscured much of what could have been known about his earlier work. An autobiographical novel, problematic in terms of reliability and truthfulness, is a challenge to memory studies. Buchheim’s wartime experience was the
basis for his book, and the narrative behind it was his most effective springboard in addressing Germany’s past. The current study sees the practices of literary studies, film studies, European history, and social sciences, as donating much insight into the formation of this dissertation.

**Introduction.3.: Chapter breakdown, Sources, and Potential Research Issues**

Chapter 1 provides a historiography of memory studies and describes the relevance of seeing *Das Boot* for its impact on the German efforts in reckoning with its past. Practitioners of memory studies such as Erll and Kansteiner provide a theoretical basis for studying novels and twentieth century media. Buchheim’s narrative, in its various phases as a published memoir, a film, and an eventual franchise, is explained within the transnational context that both historians have described. Chapter 2 provides an overview of Buchheim’s early life and the people who influenced him. This is useful in explaining his own statements about his past given in interviews and on camera. In addition, analyzing his formative years help in pinpointing how others saw him as he gained a foothold as a writer with his lesser-known first autobiographical novel from 1941, which coincided with his tenure as a war reporter.

Chapter 3 discusses the history behind *Das Boot* and argues that the novel’s success in becoming a part of global collective memory was due to the forward-thinking minds in both in New York and worldwide who worked together to disseminate it during the 1970s. At the heart of memory studies lies the task of recognizing the competition that memories have. Throughout the turbulence of the 1960s and 1970s, the book industry internationally sought out narratives that shattered longstanding beliefs for a new
generation of readers who were eager to hear what their elders refrained from saying. *Das Boot* was a part of this wave of interest and its appearance in print acts as an example of how this process functioned.

Chapter 4 reviews the critical reception of *Das Boot* and Buchheim. The inclusion of a long-forgotten German high school unit from the pre-unification 1980s about postwar history via *Das Boot* provides the present study with insight as to how the German school system once dealt with memory and World War II in classrooms. Chapter 5 argues that the narrative contained in *Das Boot* as a film possessed what Erll has described as a relatability that audiences sense while watching. This is the necessary quality that modern artifacts have as they undergo her theory of transcultural memory formation. Along the way, this yielded reactions ranging from satire to sequel-like adaptations. More than a decade after Buchheim’s death in 2007, *Das Boot* has been parodied, imitated, and eventually licensed out to new episodes, which demonstrates the character inherent in cultural remembrance: it constantly reshapes itself as subsequent generations seek to explore a past so powerfully moving that it affects their present.
Chapter 1: Buchheim and Transcultural Memory Studies

Chapter 1.1.: An Historiography of Postwar Memory Scholarship

Over the last twenty years, analyzing Germany’s postwar recovery from the perspective of cultural memory studies has become increasingly widespread. A brief historiography of the discipline of memory studies is provided here as a context to highlight the findings that led to Rothberg’s theory of implicated beneficiaries. The field has grown in its scope of defining memory, remembrance, commemoration, and other ways in which recollections are passed on. Intertwined in this process are factors that address political responsibility as it pertains to guilt and victimhood, the aspects of Germany’s postwar issues that are central to this dissertation.

Dorothee Wierling has noted that the original draw of memory studies was not immune to a great deal of critique for some researchers. First and foremost, terms like collective memory (the nationally accepted view of history) and cultural memory (the daily remembrance based on objects and personal artifacts) were not uniform concepts among scholars. This early hurdle in interpretation has long been resolved among scholars in the field. As a response, the discipline has developed subdivisions that presently include the coupling of the word memory with trauma, migration, populism, the arts, and gender, among others. The way in which memories are formed, passed on to others, and commemorated publicly, led many historians to see the value of this branch of scholarship in interpreting the past and in explaining the controversies that accompany public remembrance.

A benchmark in memory studies was Jan Assmann’s work from the 1980s calling for the separation of the concept of memory into communicative and cultural categories.
The distinction he made between face-to-face interactions (communicative memory) and the transmissions of memory through actual artifacts like family photos, diaries, and autobiographies (cultural memory) clarified subsequent work in the field. Aleida Assmann and other practitioners then stated that twentieth century and current media forms are powerful transmitters of cultural memory.\textsuperscript{18} Aleida Assmann further developed these categories in her work. She has credited past intellectuals such as Sigmund Freud, Maurice Halbwachs, and Friedrich Nietzsche as early pioneers who concerned themselves with the repression and even the forgetting of memories, the very topics Buchheim addressed as obstacles in German reflections on the war.

Assmann views the 1980s as a significant point in time that formed a memory turn in German society.\textsuperscript{19} She has explained this era as important in that it indicated a switch in public attitudes towards learning more about Germany’s haunting Nazi past. This was due first and foremost to the rise in Holocaust studies internationally, which went from an avoided topic to becoming a trope used in exploring other historical tragedies worldwide. This is also the decade in which Buchheim saw the transformation of his 1973 bestseller \textit{Das Boot (The Boat)} into a critically acclaimed studio film in 1981. During this same time his Expressionist art collection, arguably one of the most famous privately-owned exhibitions known, went on a four-year international tour.\textsuperscript{20} The works were on display in Israel, Japan, the Soviet Union, and the USA, where Buchheim and the paintings were met with open arms and received rave reviews.\textsuperscript{21} Assmann has stated that remembering historical events on individual levels inside of familial circles, and then following the transfer of these memories by personal or media-based communicative vehicles, allows personal histories the chance to become part of larger narratives.\textsuperscript{22}
The manner in which eyewitness accounts are relayed from one generation to the next after tragedies like the Holocaust is what Irene Kacandes and Marianne Hirsch have deemed postmemory. For them, this concept provides yet another angle from which the role of the past in our present-time can be explored. In their work on communities remembering the Holocaust, both scholars treat the idea of postmemory as the way in which memories of an occurrence are transmitted within a given culture (through pictures and images), especially when the memories carry an ethical axiom for the younger generation, such as “never forget.” This observation about memory can be seen as a way to scrutinize the transfer of memories pertaining to other tragedies across the globe as those born after the fact continue to face a variety of input about the past. Hirsch has posed several questions relevant to potential studies about other historical events:

Why insist on the term memory to describe this structure of transmission?
Is postmemory limited to the intimate embodied space of the family, or can it extend to more distant, adoptive witnesses? Is postmemory limited to victims, or does it include bystanders and perpetrators, or could one argue that it complicates the delineations of these positions which, in Holocaust studies, have come to be taken for granted? What aesthetic and institutional structures, what tropes, best mediate the psychology of postmemory, the connections and discontinuities between generations, the gaps in knowledge that define the aftermath of trauma? And how has photography in particular come to play such an important role in this process of mediation?

To Wulf Kansteiner, memories belong to a hierarchy; those that qualify as the “most collective” are the memories that are most shared among people. These memories seem to transcend the temporal and spatial boundaries of the original event or occurrence. In their collection of essays, Frank Biess and Robert G. Moeller remind us
that there are difficulties in assessing the level of truth in personal narratives, especially when there is an abundance of public commemoration that can influence them.\textsuperscript{26} The balance that Kansteiner and Biess provide in this regard call for the same care needed for this type of historical interpretation as with other approaches. The added benefit of memory studies as a methodology is the humanization of otherwise cold, historical facts. This is how Marianne Hirsch and Leo Spitzer have described their work as historians.\textsuperscript{27}

Erll has noted that all memory is in essence \textit{traveling memory}; the physical mobilization of humans is just one way that memories move about. The term for her is a way for scholars to refer to cultural memory in general. Inherent in remembering the past, she has posited, are always moments of transfer and intersection with other cultures and societies.\textsuperscript{28} In this vein, memory is inescapably always constructed, and most importantly, it is also always contested during its phases of mobility. The insight from research into global perspectives on the same dramatic event is how the field of history continues to grow. This is especially important in an era when it seems that so much has already been said and discovered.

Kansteiner has written that the relationship between higher culture (the academic and intellectual interpretations of the past) and public memory (the reflections of the past in our immediate surroundings) is not necessarily the same as the relationship between popular culture and public memory.\textsuperscript{29} In this view, the importance of investigating a personal artifact that became widely known like \textit{Das Boot} is maintained and its, relatability to readers, overall accessibility, and the general public’s consumption of it, is justified. Kansteiner has also emphasized that the impact of twentieth century media on the public must be acknowledged during historical inquiries since it affects how
collective memory evolves as a given population moves away in time and location from the events in question. Unlike individual memory, collective narratives exist under a different set of pressures and influences, hence collective memory changes and adapts in unique ways compared to those of an individual. A look into Buchheim’s life and his creative works, and the debates that surrounded them, can further illustrate how his projects affected German society during his life and also posthumously.

Twentieth century technology allowed Buchheim to utilize several communicative platforms to disseminate his message of German political responsibility after World War II. As a guiding principle methodologically, the fiction and documentary films that Buchheim created during his career are treated here as ego documents (from the German *Egodokument*) as Rudolph M. Dekker and others exploring this facet of the field utilize the term. These artifacts include his artwork as a teenager during the 1930s, his monographs from the 1950s on modern artists, his bestseller novels, and self-produced documentaries broadcast on German television in the 1980s and 1990s. *Das Boot*, seen as an example of a printed medium in the form of an autobiographical novelization, was read beyond Germany’s borders and inspired an internationally lauded film several years later, which created a new, international dialogue about the war. The transmission of the book across cultural planes and the spreading of its content even further as a movie sparked discussions about memories not generally shared by those who lived through the war. Exploring this topic, though, was welcomed by those born later, including Petersen, the director of *Das Boot*.

Daniel Levy and Nathan Sznaider have made distinctions between the nuances that public memories embody in today’s globalized society. In their view, cosmopolitan
memory, their term for memories that have not been nationally adopted, reflects narratives recognized worldwide. They maintain that this applies to shared memories which have been acted upon in any number of internationally distributed media representations.\textsuperscript{32} Levy and Sznaider’s concept of public memory also illustrates how lesser-known narratives of Germany’s Nazi past, such as that of U-boat crews, transitioned out of the national public sphere of the FRG and across its borders to be validated or contested by others before the narratives returned home again and took a spot in the overall memory of the war. The interest in a “German” narrative about World War II as it was presented by Buchheim was demonstrated by record book sales at home in Germany in 1973 and then abroad in translation shortly thereafter.

\textbf{Chapter 1.2.: An Overview of West German Public Memory}

A survey of West German postwar memory yields shifts. The notion of an “open narrative” as Alon Confino has advocated, is not deterministic or linear, but reflective of historical contingency. Personal narratives illuminate the experiences that form individual memory, which in turn inform collective memory: “Whatever Germans became after 1945 must lie in some measure in their experiences and memories before that period.”\textsuperscript{33} After the war ended, many Germans saw themselves as victims of National Socialism. This included the victimization they experienced as Soviet troops battled to stop Hitler. For a great deal of Germans violence, expulsion from the East, and mass rapes were horrors traced back to the war Nazi waged on Europe. Channeling their national sense of victimization was not possible like it had been after World War I. The speedy economic recovery in the 1950s led to a renewed sense of prosperity and lessened West Germans’
feelings of victimization. By the late 1960s, a growing sense of self-criticism and the acknowledgement of popular culpability in the crimes of the Nazis coexisted with the worldwide cultural rebellion of 1968 rebellion, Holocaust education in the schools, commemorations for the victims of Nazi genocide and the rise in the reflections offered by popular culture, especially American-made television programming. This turn away from self-pity also had to do with youthful rebellion of the children of the wartime generation against their parents.34

After German reunification in 1989, some intellectuals advocated a normalization of German nationalism with previously marginalized experiences creating empathy as was the case for the German victims of wartime bombing. Since reunification, the interest in German-Jewish and Jewish culture has skyrocketed. Germany’s capitol Berlin has attracted many Jews over the last three decades. The rediscovery of old sites and the unveiling of new memorials and museums helped normalize German-Jewish relations and contributed to the German’s interest in their involvement in the Holocaust in a manner whereby the public is not paralyzed by guilt but rather encouraged to engage in global discussions about genocide.

These developments mean that the interest has shifted from a focus on the origins of National Socialism to the consequences of Nazi rule for Germany and other societies.35 The idea of an open narrative in this context differs slightly from the research that pinpointed the beginnings of National Socialism and detailed how it spread. This movement in interest reflects the challenges of historical study in answering certain questions. Researching remembrance and microhistories allow the complex or even
unresolved issues in history to be somewhat embraced as long as these sub-histories provide a level of historical coherence.

Since the end of the war, West Germany led the debate as to whether or not Wehrmacht soldiers and German submarine crews were victims of the Third Reich since the war ended. In recent scholarship, the psychology of German soldiers has been analyzed regarding with the emotional impact of battle. Steven G. Fritz has concluded that individual soldier accounts documented a history of an everyday experience that adds to our understanding as to what some soldiers believed as they fought, such as the promise of a utopian (German) society after battle. Others historians like Omer Bartov have theorized that German soldiers’ motivation was a front-line solidarity that yielded a sense of victimhood and alienation after the war as the search for the real “evil” behind the conflict began.

Chapter 1.3.: Buchheim’s Intervention in German Public Remembrance

What factors led Buchheim to mold his own view of a war-torn past that, as he stated, needed to be rid of the glorification of Germany’s navy under Hitler? Answering this question will shed light on public memory in postwar Germany. Through the controversial reactions that Buchheim expressed in print and on the air to those who engaged with the effects that the popularity of Das Boot had on the public, Buchheim constructed an intervention in West Germany’s endeavor to master the past, known as the Vergangenheitsbewältigung (overcoming the past). The difficulty in defining Buchheim’s level of participation in Germany’s Erinnerungskultur (memory culture), as well as determining his place in the overall goal of German intellectuals and politicians to
understand the past, is that he engaged in many careers simultaneously. As an art curator and art historian in the 1950s and the early 1960s, Buchheim strove for recognition in his attempts at resuscitating the relevance of German Expressionism to modern German cultural history. This artistic genre was targeted by National Socialists most concretely in 1937 for being “degenerate” and, apart from very few art dealers and historians, it was neglected publicly in Germany after World War II. Buchheim attributed this denial to vestigial Nazi attitudes towards artistic expression. This was, Buchheim stated, imparted by Germans who had influential positions who were still braun (brown) at heart, a term used to refer to someone loyal to Nazi ideals. Buchheim’s observation fueled his drive to address the state of aesthetics which he felt was still influenced by a long-standing tradition in German culture for memories of military heroism, the theme most glorified in Nazi-commissioned art.

Buchheim used a German cliché to market Das Boot that was often employed to dramatize the lives of extraordinary personalities such as Karl Marx, Alexander von Humboldt and Hildegard von Bingen, each of whom in their own way challenged the social norms and beliefs of their respective eras. The image of a lone genius toiling away on his opus, cut off from the outside world at great personal cost, is a familiar trope in Germanic narratives characterizing the life and work of pivotal historical figures. German culture, by the turn of the twentieth century, was associated with a plethora of contributions to world society by its numerous ingenious thinkers. Political leaders and guardians of culture in the German lands believed this heritage to be well worth promoting and defending as the twentieth century ushered in a new, modern world order. The role of the genius mind (Genie) in German history was arguably never more
eloquently postulated than by Wilhelm Dilthey in his development of hermeneutics in 1900. In his influential work he promoted philosopher, writer and scientist Johann Wolfgang von Goethe as the quintessential German thinker. To stake his claim in shaping modern German cultural history, Buchheim applied this imagery to himself in reflection of the thirty years he spent coming to terms with his own dramatic experience during World War II, which culminated in 1973 with Das Boot. The application of this aura to his life provided him with marketing benefits for the book by portraying himself as a misunderstood genius telling the truths that others had not dared to tell. The polarized reactions that intellectuals and laypeople had to his novel, and Buchheim’s responses to them, are seen here as an underexplored yet highly informative component of the Federal Republic of Germany’s (FRG) postwar endeavor to openly master its past.

The negative responses that Buchheim received from some German navy veterans indicated to him that he was attacking the very sense of glorification he believed they upheld. To the postwar generation, this was interpreted as a long-awaited unveiling of the psychological atmosphere of the war that was previously stifled. The words of those who opposed his novel, as well as the scathing retorts he gave on record to critics, need to be qualified to assess how he intended for his novel to act as closure on his own postwar malaise and provide others with a way to better understand the past.

Buchheim had been active in writing social commentary since his childhood; the artistically gifted prodigy later became an art major, war reporter, publisher, bestselling author, art collector, and curator of his own namesake museum. The adult Buchheim focused on the conscious insertion of himself in Germany’s turbulent pre- and postwar...
dynamics when he promoted any project based on his past or while being interviewed. His prose, documentaries, and commentaries, were laced with his notion of how a varnished truth about allegiance and bravery among submarine crews and their superiors during World War II remained in place well after the war ended. This became evident to him when the newly forged Federal Republic and its population turned to building a democratic society. *Das Boot*, together with Buchheim’s other creative works, are seen here as personal artifacts in need of scholarly analysis to better understand how the polarized views held by both stern critics and growing numbers of admirers shaped German postwar memory. Noteworthy as well is whether the dialogue about the past lived up to his insistence that German collective memory remained susceptible to a tradition of myth-building.

After the war, Buchheim was certainly not alone in charging the German public with knowing little about Germany’s dark past as FRG leaders embarked on efforts to forge a postwar identity. By the mid-1970s though, Buchheim had established a unique, thirty-year trajectory of efforts to qualify his claim. The consideration of his continued efforts to interact with public thought about the legacy of National Socialism enriches our current level of knowledge about how both collective and collected memories of war, loyalty, and opposition, affect subsequent generations who inherited them. This is useful in tracking how the shaping a national identity unfolds on private and public levels. Buchheim persisted in his social engagement throughout the decades. The 2001 opening of his *Museum der Phantasie* (Museum of Fantasy), arguably his final attempt to draw attention to addressing recent German history, remains his most interactive work achieved before his death in 2007.
Through his prose, Buchheim dealt with his own paradoxical, individual identity of an insider who did not conform to National Socialist mores in the same manner as others, yet he fulfilled his duty as a war correspondent. Thirty years after Germany’s defeat, he set out to dissect his own past by means by publishing *Das Boot*. Through its global success, Buchheim used the text as a medium for exercising his will to demystify public recollections of the war that he felt glorified aspects of service under National Socialism. The result is that Buchheim showed political responsibility, which includes guilt, by later explaining how and why propaganda functioned so effectively in Nazi Germany. As well, he targeted the leftover the honor and glory that the German Navy carried decades afterwards. The horror that he witnessed at sea, the result of practices by both the German and British navies who abandoned living crewmen and civilians in need of rescuing, was a powerful message in his works. To Buchheim, illustrating how the war made both parties excuse this crime against humanity as a strategic necessity was a point the German public needed to explore, just as British writer Nicolas Montserrat had proposed with his literature in the 1950s.

The timing of Buchheim’s memoir hitting bookstores arguably shocked the German public into self-reflection while the postwar generation began confronting their interwar-born parents about their involvement in Germany’s Nazi past. As a result, his novel ushered in a renewed interest for the previously exhausted niche of the Battle of the Atlantic to the German book market. The public’s response to the novel, before and after the international acclaim for Petersen’s cinematic interpretation of *Das Boot* in 1981, spurred an interest among the children of the postwar generation, one that may not have been generated by politics or academics. The mixed reactions to *Das Boot*, even as the
book passed the threshold of two million copies sold worldwide, raise the question in this analysis as to whether Buchheim’s undertaking allowed him to open the door for others to question their own memory of Germany’s Nazi past or the memory about the war passed on to them through other sources.

Buchheim was awarded the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesverdienstkreuz) in 1983. During the mid-1980s, he traveled to the USA, Israel, Japan and Russia with his Expressionist collection and gained positive receptions from exhibit critics and museum visitors who admittedly would not have known the backstory to Germany’s once degenerate artists. In 1985, he was awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of Duisburg and shortly after, the Großes Verdienstkreuz (the highest Order of Merit recognized in the FRG). Buchheim’s convening with both West- and East Germans and entertainers, intellectuals, and politicians from around the world at the Moscow Forum on Peace in 1987 is a rarely acknowledged moment in his career. The forum, Gorbachev’s three-day convocation to promote his political outlook for the Soviet Union, reflects the impact that both his work and his commentaries had on the international public over the years. In 1995, the second installment of his trilogy appeared in bookstands, Die Festung (The Fortress), followed in 2000 by Der Abschied (The Parting), both to critical acclaim. That same year, after decades of public squabbles with politicians and city planners alike, Buchheim finally opened his own museum in Bernried outside of Munich and continued to speculate about future projects, despite his age and declining health.

A past hurdle in understanding Buchheim’s role in challenging Germany’s memory of the National Socialist era is that he used a wide variety of media to address
public memory about the war. At a time in the twentieth century when access to these forums (magazine articles, televised documentary films and art exhibits) was time- and location sensitive, the ability to locate them to build a body of artifacts had not yet been as easily accomplished as in today’s digitized world. To complicate matters even more, Buchheim alienated himself from so many groups through his public outbursts and he forbade the publication of many press releases upon completion that he simultaneously escaped analysis in scholarly fields such as history and comparative literature, where the label of “bestselling author” already excluded many printed works from scholarly review. This stigma denied Buchheim entry into established book market genres such as historical fiction or autobiography.48

As a way to view Buchheim’s postwar activity as a reaction to his wartime activity, a complete view of his life is essential. Rothberg is interested in the way that implicated subjects relate to the problems that their tier of society creates, the one for which they as individuals are not directly responsible. The conditions under which implicated subjects can be identified, or self-identified in Buchheim’s situation, are complex and fluid with many people not having clear-cut roles as to their level of allegiance to a given party or the nature of their known affiliations.49 Buchheim proclaimed himself to have been a witness to the inner-workings of Nazism. In many ways he exemplified the role of a German military officer, albeit with a distinct journalistic function. His duty was propagating compliance in Nazi Germany, yet he was not remembered by those with whom he saw combat as having been indoctrinated by Nazi aesthetics. Riddled with his own shortcomings in social skills and an oddly utilitarian approach to friendships, Buchheim seemed to pour all of his energy into
staying mobile during the war years in order to return home alive. It is therefore his set of creative works from the postwar years, in contrast to that self-survival mode of his active duty, through which he intended to demystify a clouded view of the past for a generation who yet to know its full impact on their own time.

Chapter 1.4.: Conclusion

By using Rothberg’s model as a frame of reference, this study gives weight to Buchheim’s claims that he used his talents to survive the times given the strict consequences for German who disobeyed orders. To do so, he sought to gain the praise of National Socialist decision makers. He described his postwar inner turmoil, rooted in the traumatic experience in 1941 on board the German submarine U-96, as the driving force that pushed him to write the manuscript for Das Boot which consisted of over 2,400 pages of text. Thus, Buchheim dealt with aspects of political responsibility that affected him later, namely the collective guilt and public silence about the horrors of the war. He commented on the experience of writing a memoir as an “Akt der Selbstbefreiung” (act of self-emancipation). His postwar state of mind was, as he called it, “ein Kampf des Gedächtnisses gegen das Vergessen” (an uphill battle of his own memory against forgetting what transpired). Such utterances were useful for Buchheim in eliciting a vicarious reflection from readers to his unease after the war.

Buchheim’s relationship to trauma, though, was on a level that allowed for the marketing of his emotional state as authentic, but not paralyzing. Buchheim made it known that upon returning home after the war he was feeling “vergattert” (caged in) with no relief in sight. In later reflections on this stage of writing Das Boot, he commented on
how the memories that he once harbored were an essential part of his drive to correct the German public’s memory of World War II. Andreas Huyssen’s statement that “the past cannot give us what the future has failed to deliver” is often quoted in works dealing with memory studies. The comment is relevant to Buchheim in that it underscores how his push to demystify the past was also a process in demystifying the present if an honest appraisal of the past is to take place.
Chapter 2: Buchheim’s Formative Years: From Child prodigy to War Reporter

Chapter 2.1.: Buchheim’s Background and Early Years

The interwar culture in which Buchheim was born and raised contributed greatly to how he saw himself, and the conditions of his youth clarify how much of his idiosyncratic behavior developed. Two elements of Buchheim’s younger years are argued here as having influenced how he interacted with others up to the rise of National Socialism in the 1930s, when he served in the propaganda company to report about the German Navy. First and foremost was the impact of his childhood in a dysfunctional home amidst the atmosphere of heated political protests following Germany’s defeat in World War I. Second was his mentorship under Peter Suhrkamp, the last guardian against total Nazi control of the respected “Jewish” publishing house S. Fischer Verlag in Berlin. Both of these factors equipped Buchheim with a savvy for employing his artistic talent for personal gain. As a recognized artist in his hometown at seventeen years of age, and shortly thereafter as a successful Kriegsberichterstatter (war correspondent), Buchheim’s home life and his connection to Suhrkamp never lost their resonance for him when he talked about how his art and prose relayed antiwar messages.

This chapter examines Buchheim’s unconventional upbringing in a broken home and his tutelage under Suhrkamp as experiences that confirmed for him that his strength was in his talent for depicting social unrest. In Nazi Germany, his innate artistic gifts and formal art training served him as a naval reporter ordered to construct what officials deemed as the heroic essence of German soldiers and sailors in battle. At the same time, cultural influencers resilient to Nazi ideology, like Suhrkamp and the S. Fischer editor Oskar Loerke, stated that his photography and writing were ambiguous enough to
appease National Socialist tastes while they simultaneously provided an individualized commentary about the political culture of the late 1930s.

The positive attention that the teenage Buchheim received for capturing the socio-political upheaval of the interwar years in his own hometown of Chemnitz stemmed from the painting lessons he received from his mother. On the brink of World War II, this aptitude for expression was molded even further for Buchheim through his contact to Suhrkamp about the craft of journalism. His early life prepped him to function well in his role as a reporter in 1941 for the Kriegsmarine (German Navy under Hitler) but his personal history was energized by the will to survive, “Ich wollte den Krieg überleben.” (I just wanted to survive the war.). Like many young Germans, Buchheim was well aware of the consequences he would have faced for not fulfilling his obligations to Germany during the war. Despite his success in the propaganda company, he produced photo essays and portraits in the same manner that he had been trained in before the eventual hegemony of National Socialism over the visual arts. This study explains how Buchheim’s background and natural abilities led him to become what Rotherberg has called an implicated beneficiary. The propaganda company granted him a unique mobility and provisioning to complete his reporting that, in his words, did not shield him from the same damaging experience brought on by the war.

Chapter 2.2.: Adolescence and Buchheim’s First Novel: Tage und Nächte steigen aus dem Strom

The first half of this chapter presents the constraints on Buchheim’s childhood that forged his sense of self. Buchheim stated that his origins in a household dedicated to
pursuing aspirations rather than following conventional practices afforded him the ability as a youth to see National Socialists through a different set of eyes than most people. To him they were “eine Ganovenbande...wir lebten in einer Art Boheme, da gab’s keine Nazis.” (a band of thieves…we lived in a bohemian-like fashion, there were no Nazis among us.).

His formative years in Chemnitz and the neighboring town of Rochlitz were steeped in non-conformity in terms of his family structure, especially his unwed, teenage mother’s undocumented political orientation. His own reflections on this time involved descriptions of the stigma surrounding his well-known illegitimacy and his mother’s unemployment, yet it was during these years that he learned the most from her in how to excel in the expressive medium of painting and etching, which would serve him and his family later financially.

As he approached the end of his teenage years, Buchheim wrote as much as he painted, and his own travels after high school were published as articles. With Suhrkamp’s resources, Buchheim’s first novel from 1941, Tage und Nächte steigen aus dem Strom. Eine Donaufahrt (Days and Nights arise from the Current. A Journey along the Donau), was a success. The manuscript was based on his logbook, written during a trip by raft along the Danube River to the Balkan Peninsula. The novel was popular enough to undergo a second printing. Buchheim’s text is treated here as a personal historical artifact, or egodocument, as the concept has developed over the last few decades in the field of history in Europe. As Mary Lendemann has noted, this approach to viewing writing in the form of diaries and other eyewitness accounts, adds agency to history as new knowledge is gained through the perspective of eyewitnesses.
In order to investigate the merit that *Tage und Nächte* offers as a reflection of Buchheim’s childhood and, more importantly, as an indicator of his sense of identity in Nazi German society, a discussion follows in which his travel literature is compared to the works of other young Germans from the same period. The present chapter quantifies the findings scholars have treated mainly in a qualitative manner by means of a vocabulary analysis. Existing scholarship on the young Buchheim has shown that his use of language stood out to Suhrkamp’s editorial staff at the S. Fischer publishing company, who was in need of new publications that justified their continued existence given the preferences Nazi officials announced for Germany’s book market. The relationship that Buchheim and similar traveling writers had to the vocabulary of Nazi-era prose shows how young authors in a popular, well-established genre like exploratory travel journaling maintained their individual modes of expression. Concluding remarks draw attention to a book review by Wolf von Niebelschütz from 1942, which appeared shortly after the novel debuted. His remarks validate the thesis here that the text presents challenges when it is placed in a single camp of either typical or atypical literature produced during the Third Reich.

**Chapter 2.3.: Buchheim’s Mother, Charlotte**

Buchheim’s birth in 1918 began with a connection to the spirit of a much different Germany. Germany’s outgoing Kaiserreich was the last link to a creative side of German culture with great meaning to his artistically gifted mother, Charlotte. The Buchheim family’s own chronicling, as well as his actual *Geburtsurkunde* (birth certificate and record), confirm Weimar in the eastern state of Thuringia as Buchheim’s city of his
For well over a century before that time, Weimar was hailed as Germany’s cultural hub. Thus, Charlotte, unmarried and still a teen, endured traveling to the city of Weimar on the eve of Lothar-Günther’s birth specifically so that he could be born where the giants of the German territories’ art and literary scenes gathered. No mention was made of the infant Buchheim’s biological father, in actuality the Chemnitz statesman Kurt Böhme, who recognized neither paternity for the child, nor financial responsibility for its mother.

Buchheim spent his formative years in Chemnitz, seventy miles from Weimar, after moving into his maternal grandparents’ house with his mother and younger half-brother Klaus, also born out of wedlock two years later after another of Charlotte’s affairs. The first quarter of the twentieth century marked a turning point in the rapidly modernizing German society that also brought about disasters, both spiritual and economical in nature. War, unemployment, and the financial crisis of 1929 made for a bleak outlook for Charlotte’s generation in Europe. It was also a time of irony for former upper-middle class girls like Charlotte who demonstrated an aptitude for the visual arts since German women were not yet allowed to study at art academies to become professionals in the field. The only viable option for Charlotte and other young women was to seek out professional tutors on their own.

The hardships of the era caused much malaise for the young Charlotte and her children; the situation worsened when her father died, leaving her mother in charge of the family’s dwindling finances. Determined to pursue art without any traditional income and the sole custody of two young sons, Charlotte and her mother rented out available rooms to strangers. The boarders, who were from lower social milieus, often served as subjects
for her sketches and paintings, a radical addition to the still-life subjects in Charlotte’s repertoire up to that point. The headstrong young Charlotte was as outspoken in public as she was at home, but the visual arts remained for her a medium which she masterfully executed in interpreting her surroundings.68

Economic stability improved only temporarily for Charlotte and her two sons during her brief marriage to iron factory owner Paul Heinrichs. The marriage ended due to financial stress after the stock market crash of 1929. No political party offered the hungry, desolate population viable answers in Charlotte’s view; the communist demonstrations on the streets of Chemnitz served as a source of commentary in the sketches of Charlotte and the young Lothar-Günther. Her apolitical stance at home did not alter as National Socialism appeared on the horizon.69 Charlotte’s economic hardship did not impede her from artistic outlets, a lesson that she modeled for her son.

In 1933, at age fifteen, Buchheim made the sullen lot of the local unemployed the focus of several works, much like Expressionist artist Käthe Kollwitz had done in the 1920s.70 He produced a linoleum etching that year titled Arbeitslose (The Unemployed). Daniel Fischer has concluded that the faces of the down-on-their-luck men in Buchheim’s piece range in expression, but are all linked by a radical level of energy that they direct towards the onlooker.71 The German unemployed historically have been either pawns of political change, or an obstacle to it, and the emotions during protests by mobs in Chemnitz at this time left an indelible mark on Buchheim as an artist. Fischer has noted that in Buchheim’s piece the potentially dangerous agents are not taking part in a demonstration as depicted in a similar piece from 1928 by artist Gerhart Bettermann, titled Arbeitslosendemonstration (Demonstration of the Unemployed). Instead, Buchheim
places his focus on individuals, making the scene seem like it matches the political spirit of the Marxist atmosphere of the area at that time, but in it the men are not united, in Fischer’s view. This is interpreted here as an example of Buchheim’s Expressionist orientation, the basic impulse behind his subsequent works in other media such as photography and eventually prose.

The metaphor of the young Buchheim having branched away artistically from the technical influence of his mother as they painted together is fitting; the two drifted apart as mother and son. Buchheim gravitated towards the Expressionist style that contrasted with Charlotte’s Impressionist techniques. Bound by their use of color, but separated by their use of brush strokes and other techniques, Charlotte and her son had commonalities and differences in how they perceived the same subjects, even in their immediate surroundings. Their shared way of dodging convention at a time when the government demanded conformity raises the question as to their mental health. Charlotte spent the last two decades of her life in institutions. Buchheim later expressed concern about his own state of mind given his atypical start to life and unique abilities.

Buchheim earned money as a child for his mother and younger brother by selling the linoleum etchings that he feverishly produced and through commissions as a reporter, writing articles under pseudonyms for competing local newspapers in Chemnitz. His keen writing skills stood out despite his young age and his eye for social commentary was rounded out by instructions for popular activities he wrote for his age group. In the early 1930s, Buchheim designed a series of Bastelanleitungen (step-by-step crafts) for youngsters that were eagerly sought out by the young readers of the popular German magazine Beyers für alle (Beyers for Everyone). Buchheim also provided illustrations for
stories written by prominent German authors like Erich Kästner and others who submitted their tales anonymously due to bans on their work following the Nazi book burnings of 1933.75

Among the more positive experiences of Buchheim’s youth were the creative outlets that he afforded himself, namely his articles that appeared in local newspapers and magazines like the Leipziger Illustrierte (Leipzig Illustrated Magazine). The city-organized exhibit that showcased his linoleum carvings was likewise a fond memory. Public acknowledgement of Buchheim’s skill as an artist led to the 1935 monograph about the seventeen year-old titled Lothar-Günther Buchheim: Ein ganz junger Künstler (The Young Artist Lothar-Günther Buchheim) and ranked high among his childhood recollections. Years in advance of Fischer’s similar description of the effects of Buchheim’s piece Arbeitenlose, editor Werner Böhm lauded how the teenage Buchheim “understands like no other how to keep his own feelings at bay in the presence of onlookers, with all senses alerted to rendering his subject”.76 Of all of his childhood recollections, Buchheim’s account of the painting excursions with his mother ranked as the most pleasant, if not for the fact that they were the only memories he had resembling the conventions of traditional parent-child interactions.77

Buchheim’s pre-college years at a boarding school in the nearby village of Schneeberg, mostly funded by a local stipend awarded to him for his artistic abilities, was remembered as a painful experience riddled with anxiety and teasing.78 The torment, due to schoolmates knowing his illegitimate status, led to panic attacks, something Buchheim revisited in his novel Das Boot.79 Buchheim’s recollection of this period focused also on the dramatic impressions that World War I left on German youths such as himself, who
were immersed in the authors and intellectuals embodying the Kaiser’s national ideals of military prowess:


I was not military-minded but I was hooked on Ernst Jünger. Back then there was the German Youth movement, we had Hermann Löns, Hans Grimm, and that whole ilk pushed on us and in part sought out by us. That’s hard to see from today’s perspective. Looking back, I see a twenty-year-old who interests me a great deal, but I was just plain lucky. Fortunately, I had people around me who said, “This is going to end in disaster.”

Buchheim’s words identify the cultural influences on his generation by way of popular writers whose intense nationalism was awakened by World War I. Jünger was not able to maintain that position long in Nazi Germany although he wrote völkisch (intensely nationally oriented). This tied together many of the interwar writers whether or not they proclaimed allegiance to National Socialism in their writing. The effect of National Socialism on Buchheim’s generation was immense due to the alignment of all youth programs and activities into a singular network responsible for defining Nazi youth culture. In Buchheim’s case, there existed a breach in the concept of home that impacted the realms of Schule, Elternhaus and Hitlerjugend (school, household and Hitler Youth), the three pillars promoted by the National Socialist party as necessary for
ensuring a Nazi upbringing.\textsuperscript{84} School and family, the first two, were already compromised for the child Buchheim; opinions vary on the impact of the third, Hitler Youth, in Buchheim’s case. This is due to a lack of evidence of any active participation on his part in youth rallies. Buchheim did earn money by writing for the organization’s publications for children, which greatly satisfied Nazi officials.

Gerrit Reichert provides insight into Buchheim’s apparent membership in the Hitler Youth by way of letters that the young author wrote back home. The Dresden Academy for Art was already re-staffed by 1933 in accordance with the \textit{Gleichschaltung} (the co-ordination of bureaus and offices) with Nazi party-approved faculty members. A positive affiliation with the Hitler Youth at the very least would have been looked upon favorably for any applicant for admission, a goal that Buchheim certainly meant to attain.\textsuperscript{85} Freelance writing as a teenager brought Buchheim the attention that he sought and sustenance to his family, yet his close contact to Hitler Youth leaders and their magazines is explained by the Nazi consolidation process. Youth sports clubs like his successful wrestling team, \textit{Atlas}, were absorbed into the Hitler Youth automatically by Nazi law and the team captains like Buchheim, by default, were recorded as Hitler Youth leaders.\textsuperscript{86}

\textbf{Chapter 2.4.: Peter Suhrkamp’s Guidance}

Buchheim’s friendship with Suhrkamp has been described by others as an essential part of his publishing \textit{Tage und Nächte} at the S. Fischer publishing company.\textsuperscript{87} To Suhrkamp, the novel showed a subtle misalignment on Buchheim’s part with Nazi German society. This section demonstrates how Suhrkamp reached that judgement. The
context of writing in the German Reich has been analyzed recently to include what Benjamin G. Martin has attributed to National Socialist “soft power” through the establishment of the *Europäische Schriftsteller-Vereinigung* (ESV or European Writers' Union). The writer’s union met in 1941 in Weimar (Buchheim’s birthplace), where Nazi representatives introduced their concept for a new writing tradition that they termed “European” to a congregation of authors from Germany’s neighboring countries. The conditions set by Nazi officials were such that Buchheim and others could have used language similarly to some of the more established young authors of the 1930s not branding themselves as National Socialists, but differently than Hanns Johst, who identified himself as a Nazi and even held positions of influence in determining National Socialist high culture.

To provide a context for why Suhrkamp was drawn to Buchheim’s style in *Tage und Nächte*, the content of the book is compared here to Germany’s beloved tradition known as the *Italienreise* (tour of Italy). Up until the early twentieth century, young German elites and youths whose families aspired to upper-middle class life traveled abroad after high school as a way to round off their education. For Germans, Italy maintained its status as a tangible destination of exotic wonders well into the 1940’s, making the idea of an *Italienreise* a concept in its own right. In his studies on identity formation, psychologist Erik Erikson wrote about the important tradition of the tour. German society maintained the belief that travel enlightened the young about the world around them, a custom inspired by the experience captured by the philosopher Johann Wolfgang von Goethe in his own writing.
After completing his Abitur (German final exam series) and graduating from high school, Buchheim also traveled to Italy. His trip was well-documented, and he turned his journal into a photo-essay that was featured in the popular magazine *Leipziger Illustrierte*. Well-suited for a widely distributed magazine, his photographs and text detailed his time in Italy as one that gave him the experience aimed for as a first-time international traveler. Soon afterwards, in 1938, he embarked on his journey to Balkan nations. One factor that made the novel more than simply Buchheim’s second *Italienreise* is the peculiar string of destinations that the teen writer visited. Bucharest, Budapest, and Czernowitz, are indeed locations for the reader to vicariously explore along with Buchheim, but their lure is their unusual past. Buchheim chose atypical locales for his novel compared to the idealized cities in the usual *Reiseliteratur* (travel literature) of the late 1930s such as Rome, Paris or Oslo.

As Gregor Streim and Peter J. Brenner have posited, this genre is vital in discussing Buchheim’s text because the niche is valued for its firsthand, personal reflections of authors concerned with writing about Germany’s present and future. Despite both scholars seeing *Tage und Nächte* as travel literature, they differ slightly in thought as to the role that National Socialist politics played in the text. Brenner has argued that there is no political element to the book, whereas Streim sees Buchheim as not heeding the tenets of National Socialism. Both authors are correct in that there is no mention of Hitler or National Socialism in the novel. Buchheim chose to convey feelings of visiting near-extinct civilizations to his readers, a sharp turn from discovering the wonders of flourishing Mediterranean centers that German youths had become
accustomed to in the popular works of young German authors like Heinrich Hauser and Hanns Johst.

In 1938, the nineteen-year-old art major Buchheim granted himself a self-described *Pause* (break) from German society. The chronicling of this self-imposed “time out” was described by him as such because he had experienced enough of Nazi culture and “wollte nichts als raus” (just wanted out).\(^{93}\) He traveled by inflatable raft with his art supplies and writing utensils in waterproof tubes from the German city of Passau in Bavaria along the Danube River to his endpoint, the Black Sea. Buchheim’s only navigational instrument was a map of the Balkan countries taken out of the iconic German school atlas printed by the Diercke Verlag publishing firm.\(^{94}\) The adolescent reflected early in the novel, “*ich habe keinen Kameraden, mit dem ich eine Weile zusammentun könnte. Ganz allein ziehe ich meinen Weg auf der großen Donau nach Osten...Aber einsam bin ich nicht.*” (I don’t have a single friend right now with whom I would do this, even for a little while. I may be the only one on his way eastward here on the Danube, but I am not the slightest bit lonely.)\(^{95}\)

An important historical context for analyzing the publications of youthful German writers during the 1930s is the atmosphere that surrounded creativity and the arts. In 1933 Adolf Hitler enacted the aforementioned *Gleichschaltung* (consolidation of bureaus and offices) and through it, National Socialists aligned all institutions in the Reich to be in sync with party mandates. For young writers at that time, the control over the arts under Hitler dictated their use of language and preference for literary genres. This impacted their approach if they were serious about publishing in Germany. No area of the
humanities, entertainment, or travel was, in theory, able to exist outside of the checks and balances of the various Reichskammer (chambers) governing them.

As Gregor Streim has noted, changes in the German literary genre referred to as the Reisebericht (travel report) in the 1930s coincided with the formation of the National Socialist program to promote mass tourism, pinpointing a shift in focus within the narratives compared to those published in the previous decade. The nazification of the German travel industry occurred through the establishment of the program known as Kraft durch Freude (KdF or Strength through Joy Program) and its effective advertisement campaign enabled party leaders to construct a statewide tourist culture that was holiday-like on the surface yet imbued with Nazi ideology. Characteristic of the KdF program, at its height before World War II, was the remarketing of old sites in Germany for their cultural relevance for Nazi Germany’s new, nation-wide travel industry.

The impact of KdF policies on Buchheim and other young writers of this popular genre was twofold. On the surface, the KdF was geared for families, thereby reducing the promotion of tales by lone adventurers unless the books were highly nationalistic in nature. German vacationers adhered to prescribed itineraries outlined by the KdF administration that showcased predetermined destinations and agendas. Narratives of travel literature taking place within the Reich were especially effective although the KdF encouraged short cruises to approved countries like Italy or Norway that were close enough to Germany geographically yet exotic in their appeal.

Streim has compared Buchheim’s novel with three works of travel journalism from the same period penned by Hanns Johst, Heinrich Hauser, and Egon Vietta. He has described each of the four authors as having mastered a connection to nature in his
writing. All dealt with the dualities between old and new in civilizations, foreign lands and the Reich, albeit in their own way. Johst held weighty positions in the Nazi party pertaining to cultural affairs and his work in this genre involved creating an image of Germany that set the standard for National Socialist-era prose and theater. According to Streim, Johst’s 1935 novel, *Maske und Gesicht. Reise eines Nationalsozialisten von Deutschland nach Deutschland* (Mask and Face. The Journey of a National Socialist from Germany to Germany) has at its center the goal of constructing for readers a definition of German identity in the face of the various travel destinations he encountered in Switzerland, France, and Scandinavia.

Hauser sought to bridge the gap between major cities and rural towns by seeking out areas in the Reich where industrial advances in German cities were in harmony with man and nature. He offered readers the view of progress that showcased how Germany’s path to the future unfolded in this unity and included areas outside of the Reich in southeast Europe that were of interest to Germany. Vietta also wrote about how cultural stability was the foundation for a new sense of modernity and progress, rounding out the various authors’ contributions to the genre similar in that each one saw himself as a reporter who detailed changes in society.

Whereas the 1920s saw the German travel report as a niche of stylized travel journals embracing the technological advances of the rapidly modernizing world, the next decade yielded stories contemplating the idea of Germany finding its place in modernized society. Streim has advocated for the existence of a different tone in Buchheim’s novel when compared to the others and has described *Tage und Nächte* as not being a work of propaganda. Despite Buchheim’s journalistic similarities to those in the study, Streim’s
conclusion is that *Tage und Nächte* met the need in the National Socialist book market for *Ablenkung und Zerstreuung* (distraction and amusement). This is what the party itself deemed as light reading and illustrates the idea of Nazi soft power that does not reduce the seriousness of mental programming inherent in Nazi politics as it pertains to the arts.\(^9\) This was noted in past research on Buchheim by Anthony Fothergill as an explanation as to why Suhrkamp pushed for the novel to be published at S. Fischer.\(^1\)

Suhrkamp, the highly respected editor of Germany’s widely known *Neue Rundschau* magazine, had been placed at the head of the S. Fischer Verlag after the Nazis removed the Jewish Fischer family from their in-house position. The manuscript was seen by fellow S. Fischer Verlag editor and Expressionist poet Oskar Loerke as a timely and necessary print for the company.\(^2\) Suhrkamp agreed with Loerke that the manuscript fit into his plan to continue the liberal, non-conforming publishing heritage that the company was known for, despite advances in Nazi control of the media.\(^3\) Both figures have been the subjects of scholarly work detailing their antagonistic feelings towards National Socialism.\(^4\) The cognitive dissidence demonstrated by Loerke was representative of the *Innere Emigration* (inner emigration). The term, believed to have been coined by writer Thomas Mann, refers to German authors and intellectuals, some of whom were denounced by National Socialist authorities as being un-German, who remained in Germany and created in effect an “inner emigration” in response to the political climate.\(^5\) The S. Fischer Verlag continued to publish the works of authors who did not identify themselves with the Nazi party. Suhrkamp, despite warnings for his selection of writers, eventually landed in the Sachsenhausen concentration camp for treason (*Hoch- und
Landesverrat) in 1944. This was based on Suhrkamp having maintained working relations with authors no longer endorsed by Nazi officials. The stance that both Suhrkamp and Loerke held against Nazi politics has not been disproven in scholarly realms.

Together, Loerke and Suhrkamp provided the maturing Buchheim with a forum in which he could write in such a manner that Nazi aesthetics were not praised but also not overtly criticized. Their reaction to Buchheim’s manuscript for Tage und Nächte supports the claim that Buchheim was not indoctrinated by Nazi ideology but still provided prose for publication to those who held positions in the literary world prior to 1933 who now had to produce photos, texts and other media in at least a surfactant alignment with the tenets of National Socialism.

As stated earlier, Brenner has concluded that Buchheim did not deal with politics at all in the novel whereas Streim has signaled haste in that conclusion despite the latter having described the text as not being an example of propaganda. There are no statements in Buchheim’s writing confirming a prior convergence of outlooks between Nazi world views and his own that he overcame in his prose, hence the attention given to it by Suhrkamp. This does not mean that Johst, Grimm, and Vietta used the forum of Reiseliteratur (travel literature) exclusively as a showcase for their political thoughts. Much more, these authors showed a type of variation within European literature prior to World War II and during the conflict that is not generally recognized as having also existed in Nazi Germany. Tage und Nächte brings about unique challenges in classifying it alongside the established travel journalism that Johst, et al., wrote in Nazi Germany,
but it also widens the spectrum of what is known about high culture of the Third Reich and the inherent styles of this literary genre.

Besides their common ties to Saxony and Bavaria throughout their lives, both Johst and Buchheim were linked in their obsession for culture and art history. The genre of travel literature in the 1930s bound them together in a medium whose nationally-minded core appealed to the masses. As well, their shared search by way of this literary niche for authenticity in the cultures they visited, a notion of importance in Nazi ideology, is explained by Martin and others as a reflection of the efforts shortly thereafter for a European cohesion in the arts put forth by the party’s high-ranking cultural directors.\textsuperscript{110}

Buchheim and his relationship to art, in particular to the “Bilder” (pictures, images) of the global art world throughout the epochs, is present in the novel. Writing a journey-based text, much like drawing, was for Buchheim an homage to the area where some revelation, small or grand, took place. Buchheim provided his own illustrations of people, animals, and structures for his book that push the published novel towards the edge of the standard category of Bildungsroman (coming of age story) or the aforementioned Reisebericht into the area on the modern hybrid novel.\textsuperscript{111} In Buchheim’s case, the experience of the journey came full-circle not because he returned home with a new outlook or because he bonded with newfound friends, but rather because he wound up just as isolated as he wanted to be, back on the water again.

Buchheim referred to classic artworks at some point in all of his prose, not merely as practical cultural markers for the sake of context, but for the descriptive, interpretive power that they convey.\textsuperscript{112} This is the case in Tage und Nächte, when he describes the
blue sky of his surroundings by means of *The Wedding at Cana* (1562) by Paolo Veronese for its “unermeßlich tiefblau” (immeasurably deep blue). This homage is in complete opposition to the Nazi art aesthetics with which the party imbued young art students because it is international in scope, rendering the reference to be exactly against the ideal with which the *Reichskulturkammer* (Reich Culture Chamber) aimed to indoctrinate students.

To illustrate what Buchheim and Johst had in common in this niche, the following frequency of select words appearing in their respective travel novels are used. Although a complete linguistic comparison of the two authors is outside of the scope of this study, the practice that researchers in the comparative literature field utilize provides a frame of reference for how Buchheim and Johst were bound by factors like language while differing in their politics. The respective occurrences listed from Buchheim to Johst for the words *Deutsch/deutsch* (German nationality/language and “German” in its adjectival form) are forty-one to two, *Krieg* (war) five to three, *Rasse* (race) one to two, and *Volk* (people), seven for both writers.

Where in the word frequency the two authors, labeled by others as non-political (Buchhem) and political (Johst), display similarities and difference can be explained by the nuances of their travel literature. From Johst’s title alone (*Mask and Face. The Travels of a National Socialist*) it is clear what his political identity is, therefore he does not need to convey to the reader the subtleties of his outlook. Buchheim, in contrast, remains the eternal Expressionist who seeks to confront German culture but is now faced in his narrative with others fascinated with his being from Germany. As for war, both authors deal with World War I in their prose. Buchheim takes a risky turn with the terms
race and people(s). Whereas Johst uses *Die Rassen* (Race), a play by Ferdinand Brucker from 1934, to initiate a pessimistic passage about Aryans and Jews, Buchheim describes a marketplace scene in Belgrade where he was accosted by a Jewish merchant bent on selling him an old German Army jacket. Buchheim’s use of *Jude* (Jew) on page 166 is descriptive; in the passage, Buchheim’s focus is his own issue with German culture and not the biological or ideological features of the salesman.

German publications in travel journalism ranged in style and lexical use despite the common themes of nature, cities, and rural dwellings. What Buchheim’s first novel shows scholars in the field of German history is that Nazi literature ranged in intent within this genre. As others have formulated, a text like Buchheim’s met the requirements the state set but was also popular. The fact that is did not look like every other text in its category helps researchers understand that a dictatorship does not always have each area of culture locked down to exclude any deviation.

The stand-out feature for the young Buchheim’s novel as an egodocument is that his own artwork was as much a part of *Tage und Nächte* as his prose. A brief analysis of Buchheim’s original drawing of a farmer in Serbia, *Ein Bauer, der sich mit dem Regenschirm vor der Sonne schützt* (A Farmer shading himself with a Parasol) on page 159 exemplifies his stance on modernity in art and modernity in politics. The farmer was a worthy subject for the drawing to Buchheim; the man’s status as a successful caretaker of the land is reminiscent of the feudal society that once determined all social layers in Europe. The expression on the singular farmer’s face, independent of a background or horizon apart from a few pencil lines in Expressionist fashion, reflects a type of satisfaction with life; his skills at farming have earned him the right to shield himself
from the bright sun, not just with the jacket slung over his shoulders, but with the
Parisian-style parasol, an object not generally produced in this part of Europe.
Buchheim’s interpretation of the farmer is one of a man who has reached a level of
sustenance that still connects him with the earth, but who also displayed pride in having
become a world citizen who appreciates the finer things his culture has to offer.

On page 117, Buchheim’s date and ensuing consensual sexual encounter with a
local girl defines Tage und Nächte as a breach with völkisch writing that other authors in
this publishing category did not entertain. In the novel, Buchheim asks his date, “Wissen
Sie, was Sehnsucht ist?--Ich meine jetzt nicht Liebe und so. Verstehen Sie: Sehnsucht --
aus dem ewigen Trott heraus! Sehnsucht nach irgendwelchen Ländern!” (Do you know
what longing is? I’m not talking about when you’re love; I mean the other longing—like
wanting to escape from the rut that you’re in. Longing to flee to some other country
altogether!).

These words, spoken by a lone traveler who secretly wishes to connect with
kindred spirits that he is unsure even exist, is unable to identify with those back home in
Germany who determine cultural attitudes for the masses. The young Buchheim is fed up
with the world from which he comes but concludes that somewhere he has at least a sense
of home when he writes, “Dunkle Kräfte drängen und schmeicheln, ich möchte mich
sinken lassen. Doch da kommt eine neue Welle und schlägt mir ein Gespräch von weißem
Schaum ins Gesicht…Ich gehöre wieder dem Wasser an” (Dark forces push me and
entice me, I just want to sink to the bottom but then a new wave on the surface sprays the
river’s foam in my face…I am one again with the water”). In his prose he isolates
himself from what irks him, but confesses no wrong-doing, feeling more productive in
solitude than when he is among the masses, a trait that defined the latter Buchheim’s life as well.

Chapter 2.5.: Conclusion

In 1938 the former editor of the newspaper Magdeburgische Zeitung, Wolf von Niebelschütz, along with his father Ernst, had been let go from their positions by National Socialists due to politische Unzuverlässigkeit (political unreliability).119 Wolf von Niebelschütz hoped to find his new job at the Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung in Essen, Germany, less entangled in Nazi affairs. Soon after von Niebelschütz found himself unable to exercise his talents as a literary critic under the editorial control of National Socialists and thusly focused on commentaries on classical authors, causing no friction with Nazi judgements. He was appointed with running the travel section of the paper, which consisted of reports limited to a select few destinations within the Reich and just beyond such as Poland and Finland; von Niebelschütz acquiesced and wrote lines praising Germany and when fitting, the work of high-ranking officials such as Goebbels’ own book, Wetterleuchten.120

The appeal of Tage und Nächte to von Niebelschütz, a once avid traveler forced to visit well-known tourist areas upon his arrival at the Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung, was confirmed in the critic’s 1942 review. Von Niebelschütz praised the young Buchheim for his writing, “Welch ein frisches und keckes Buch, jung bis in die letzte Zeile” (What a refreshing and cheeky book, full of youth right down to the last sentence) and likened the latter’s adventurous Donau River trip to the one that Manfred Hausmann took to the United States in the late 1920s. Niebelschütz pinpointed the fine line upon
which Buchheim balanced when he referred to the book as harboring the “Glücksgefühl der befreiten Seele” (happy feeling of a free(d) soul’).\textsuperscript{121}

Both Buchheim and von Niebelschütz were, by 1942, officially members of the family of authors at the S. Fischer Verlag publishing house. Part of the Nazi control of the media after 1933 was a ban on foreign titles. Publications of the Suhrkamp Verlag declined from thirty-six in 1936 to only ten in 1941 with sales being almost halved.\textsuperscript{122} The review was, intentionally or not, a boost to the publisher. Von Niebelschütz wrote:

\begin{quote}
Bei näherem Hinsehen begreift man auch, warum dieses Buch so unmittelbar anspricht: es ist weder sentimental noch altklug geschrieben, es trifft genau die Mitte zwischen dem Saloppen und dem Ernst…\textsuperscript{123}
\end{quote}

A closer look reveals to all just why this book pulls you in: it is neither sentimental nor pedantic in formulation; it teeters right in the middle between carefree detachment and complete sobriety…

By drawing attention to Buchheim’s reputation as a budding artist, von Niebelschütz also protects the novel as being non-political and entertainment-oriented in its purpose:

\begin{quote}
...immer ist es das Auge des Malers, das diesen Formulierungen zugute kommt.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
...again and again it is the artist’s eye that shapes his prose.\textsuperscript{124}
\end{quote}

This study suggests that Buchheim’s travel novel is a personal document that has similarities and differences to the works in the travel literature that appeared during the 1930s. Furthermore, the illustrations by Buchheim change the genre to which it can be assigned as is common with books at present. Other youths at that time akin to Buchheim such as Hauser had published works in the genre without explicit Nazi coloring, while
writers like Johst used travel novels to demonstrate their National Socialist loyalty. Benchmark studies in the area of youth conformity to Nazi culture, such as that of Arno Klönne, supply the field with cases of group activity stemming from either a political, religious or recreational affiliation.\textsuperscript{125}

In past studies on German youth in the Third Reich, the example Buchheim provided as a sole adolescent without stated Nazi ties like Johst’s is underrepresented. Young artists and authors like Buchheim, who had completed their schooling by 1938, were exposed to the same National Socialist educational system as their contemporaries and were taught by the party’s approved faculty.\textsuperscript{126} The deviations that Buchheim showed by not using proclamations of Nazi loyalty in his publications of travel journalism is explained by the attitudes he absorbed at home and the praise that he received from actual or stand-in parental figures for his achievements. Buchheim achieved a respectable level of popularity in the 1930s when compared to other writers in this branch of the German book market. By writing in a highly accessible and creative manner, he ensured that he was relevant to readers who valued travel journalism for all of its qualities pertaining to seeking adventure and forging cultural identity.
Chapter 3: The novel Das Boot

Chapter 3.1.: An Overview of German Postwar Literature

Publishing executive Günter Berg commented in an article by Germany’s Stern magazine that “there exists a longing for literature to enlighten us on every aspect of reality, although this is a grave misunderstanding of its function.”
When considering Buchheim’s novel Das Boot, Berg’s statement captures the intention of postwar German writers. Buchheim, like other authors in West Germany who lived among the postwar generation, developed his own style to explain his experiences during the Third Reich without taking on an analysis of the war as a whole. The creation of a microcosm, or as Buchheim preferred it, a parallel world (Gegenwelt) for the reader, was a technique these authors used in order to focus in on a particular aspect of Germany’s past and sidestep glorification of those actions in their plots.

Buchheim’s book, described by historians and critics as fitting into the German war novel niche of 1950s and 1960’s known as the Landserroman (soldier novel), chronicles the near-death mission of the German submarine U-96 in 1941. In battling British naval forces, the young crew is traumatized by the inhumane orders they must follow given by Admiral Karl Dönitz and other onshore Nazi leaders. In the background is the threat of the perpetually unforgiving waters of their wartime arena, the Atlantic Ocean. This is the link to a common sense of separateness that the German and British navies shared at sea as their third, mutual enemy covered any signs of the deserted or sunken.

Like other authors of his generation who novelized World War II military campaigns, Buchheim did not purport to enlighten the public about reality per se. Instead,
he and other writers within this genre chose to single out just one part of a much larger, past reality that would otherwise remain inaccessible to their readers due to postwar silence about the war. Buchheim maintained that the medium of literature allowed him to address his own past as well as what he perceived to be inadequacies in Germany’s popular memory of the trauma caused by National Socialism.

Concerned with the deficits in German public memory by the late 1960s pertaining to the horrors of war, Buchheim was adamant that “die deutsche Vergangenheit ist trotz allem, was da geredet und geschrieben wird, absolut unerledigt. Das möchte ich ändern.” (The German past, despite what is said and written about it, is completely unresolved. My goal is to change all of that.).

Chapter 3.2.: The Manuscript for Das Boot

Captured on the title page of the original Das Boot book jacket is Buchheim’s brazen description of his prose as a “novel, but not a work of fiction.” The text is the novelization of his personal diary as a marine reporter in 1941 aboard U-96, a German U-boat heading out on its next mission from its docking bay in LaRochelle in occupied France. Buchheim’s use of the Battle of the Atlantic as the setting and major elements of the U-96’s actual near-fatal missions through the Strait of Gibraltar as the plot allowed him to produce a worldwide commercially successful, yet controversial eyewitness account of the war. The use of first person narration by Buchheim’s literary incarnation, the protagonist Werner, together with all of the characters’ thoughts and actions taking place in the present tense, were intended to enhance the reader’s
experience. Buchheim thus created a vicarious reporting of events, both seen, heard, and smelled, as they occur by way of this technique.

The early phases of the manuscript writing process involved, first and foremost, Buchheim’s revisiting of his diary from the voyage. Crucial for the technical and logistical aspects of the narration was the locating of surviving crewmen, including the U-96’s commander, Heinrich Lehmann-Willenbrock. The process involved the psychologically exhausting drilling of them for their memories on board the submarine. Buchheim’s own photographs from his time on board U-96 prior to a devastating hit to the ship’s hull, the crux of the novel, were also a way for him to channel his own experience. Allied forces bombed the Strait of Gibraltar as the U-boat’s captain had predicted and the vessel sank to the ocean floor badly damaged, with its crew facing death and without a solution in sight. Hundreds of meters underwater, Buchheim-Werner breaks down while recounting the path to self-destruction down which the collective conceit of German society, long imbued with nationalistic myths about loyalty and triumph stemming from before World War I, had led him and his shipmates.

Buchheim’s literary works, with Das Boot receiving by far the most attention in scholarly inquiries, are seen here as his most resonant form of involvement in the public endeavor known as the Vergangenheitsbewältigung (overcoming the past). This well-historicized facet of the Federal Republic of Germany characterizes the nation’s various postwar undertakings to address the legacies of Nazism, both on individual as well as on collective levels. How West Germans in the FRG remembered their nation’s past by 1968, a turbulent time of intergenerational conflict in Germany and globally, was seen as a reflection of the overall validity of the denazification process. This was the series of
actions and events that the Allied victors structured in order for West Germany to combat the spiritual harm brought about by National Socialism, the effectiveness of which many still argue.  

*Das Boot* is treated here as a concrete example of what historians describe as postwar Germany’s *Erinnerungskultur* (culture of remembrance). This phase of the postwar decades is, in essence, the history of Germany’s remembering its Nazi past. This mode of statewide self-reflection encompasses material endeavors, such as the unveiling of monuments of various types to honor the victims of National Socialist politics, as well as metaphysical undertakings, which consist of private reflections on these publicly displayed reminders.

During the 1980s, Germany’s prominent intellectuals voiced their conflicting opinions as to how the past should be interpreted. Fully in the public’s view through the press and other media, the scholarly conversation turned into a very heated public argument known as the *Historikerstreit* (historians’ debate). The premiere of Wolfgang Petersen’s film adaptation of *Das Boot* on German television a few years later allowed him the opportunity to participate in the public debate. Buchheim railed against what he saw as deficits in public memory. He proclaimed that the trauma caused by the war had to be remembered not for the purpose of exonerating groups or delivering an apologetic strain of heroism on the battlefield, but for its link to what he terms “*die Perversität des Krieges*”, the perverse nature of war. With that phrase, Buchheim intended to point out how the horror stemmed from the actions on both sides of the fighting in the Atlantic campaign.
Chapter 3.3.: Das Boot debuts in West Germany and the USA

The socio-historical conditions under which Buchheim compiled the manuscript for Das Boot, and the direction in which the German book publishing industry headed in the 1970s, remain largely separate histories. These two seemingly mutually exclusive facets behind Buchheim’s bestseller are argued here as being more deeply intertwined than previously discussed in the field. This is due to the fact that they received only a modest amount of attention in scholarly circles concerned with Buchheim’s writings despite pertaining to the Piper Verlag and Alfred A. Knopf, the novel’s German and American publishers, respectively.

Relevant to Das Boot were changes in both book markets in the late 1960s and early 1970s that reflected the new industry demands based on the changing interests among their respective readers. In the United States, topics concerning social responsibility such as civil rights, protecting the environment, and a more transparent national self-reflection were gaining popularity. The works of foreign authors in most publishing houses represented at that time only a minor component of the overall publications in the USA. In Germany’s case, difficulty in reaching an international readership was directly affected by the lack of a network for authors’ representation outside of Germany through literary agents, which was customary in other countries. In addition to this hurdle, the publishers looking to showcase authors whom they saw as fit for global book markets meant securing gifted translators who could provide a comparable voice for the original works.
Disseminating new literature in Germany from just prior to World War I until the 1950s largely reflected the preferences of the editor-in-chief as the measuring stick for what material was turned into a novel. Offers from publishing executives to publish the works of their favorite poets, philosophers, and writers were the invitations for establishing a working relationship between the publisher and the author. A break in Germany with these practices of the book publishing moguls occurred in the 1960s when their successors, most often their adult children, looked to demonstrate both to the public at home, and to readers abroad, that they possessed new attitudes towards literature. In essence, the new network of Verleger (publishers), adopted for themselves some of the traits of literary agents. This meant that German publishers actively promoted rising new writers and poets to non-German markets as potential clients.

For postwar Germany, this process was enhanced once German publishing companies located actual literary agents and scouts overseas in countries like the USA, where translated editions would finally introduce the artists to new circles of readers. The process was not easy, and at best, functioned as a combined effort. American publishers, literary agents, and scouts with at least a reading knowledge of German were crucial for properly marketing German authors who possessed the potential to find an audience abroad.

The dramatic scene towards the end of the Das Boot in which Buchheim’s literary alter ego Werner is trapped in the submarine U-96 on the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean is referred to in scholarly works on postwar novels but incompletely analyzed. Werner voices his rejection of the nationalistic spirit instilled so thoroughly in Germany’s youth but this moment has not been explained for its appeal to non-German readers. The
character’s lines contrast to the traditional, and rather positive, portrayal of Wehrmacht soldiers in the majority of postwar German novels. An analysis of this section of the original German text reveals its function within the framework of Buchheim’s own personal mastering of the past, which readers of the novel are then free to juxtapose against the broader, collective effort to overcome Germany’s Nazi past. When analyzed together, the changes in the two book markets and Werner/Buchheim’s crucial soliloquy on the bottom of the Atlantic floor explain the global appeal of Buchheim’s narrative in light of the controversial notion many Germans had of the German soldier or sailor as an underdog in postwar historical drama.

Buchheim’s manuscript for Das Boot was printed in 1973 by Germany’s Piper Verlag, the Munich-based publishing house. By that date, the company proudly looked back at seventy years of kinship with many prominent artists and writers from all over the world. The Piper Verlag was the publisher of the popular almanac created by Franz Marc and Wassily Kandinsky of the artist group Der Blaue Reiter and held the rights to German editions of renowned international books. Writers such as Dostoevsky and others from Italy and England like Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa and Frederick Forsyth, served as a testament to Piper’s commitment to promoting world literature with its writer family.\textsuperscript{141}

During the 1930s the Piper Verlag, like all German media concerns, was required to print reading material conforming to National Socialist aesthetics.\textsuperscript{142} In this vein, the nationalistic works of writers such as Bruno Brehm helped Piper maintain its compliance with Nazi mandates for publishing books. By 1945, book production for many West German publishing houses was granted by Allied forces in their respective zones,
although shortages that resulted from wartime losses in all areas, including paper, affected the industry initially.\textsuperscript{143} Towards the second half of the twentieth century, German book publishing as reached an autonomous state after the Allied countries had regulated the licensure for publishing companies after 1945. After that year, a firm understanding of industry know-how and proof of a democratic spirit to print a wide variety of literary genres were among the criteria needed to obtain certification from the Allies to print books in postwar Germany.

After Nazi Germany’s capitulation, texts focusing on social critique helped re-establish Piper’s publishing licensure in the newly founded FRG.\textsuperscript{144} The notion of Erinnerungsarbeit, the intentional efforts to remember the trauma caused by National Socialism, is carried out by the new literature of the postwar years. Eventually West German non-fiction publications about its recent past became known outside of Germany. Alexander and Margarete Mitscherlich’s important, and controversial work, \textit{Die Unfähigkeit zu trauern} (The Inability to Mourn), a significant work for the Piper Verlag, appeared in 1967.

The history of the German publishing industry in modern times is also one of repression due to the control that the Nazi regime wielded over reading material and other media forms of the day. Many German-Jewish authors who left Germany between 1933-1945 published in makeshift book printing shops (Exilverlagen) in cities like New York. The shops aimed at distributing original German prose to fellow countrymen abroad in the States and to German-speakers in exile elsewhere. For those writers who were not taken up by editors running these facilities, the only way to be heard artistically was through translation by way of an agent with German skills who also appreciated the
original material enough to want to market it. The next phase would be for the agents to find editors with an appreciation for the quality of the original manuscript, who would in turn have the works translated.

This characteristic setup of the German book industry at present, a symbiotic relationship between publisher and author, was soon to evolve. Up until this point, the concept of a literary agent stepping in to represent an author and mediate contract parameters between the two parties was not yet prevalent in Germany, whereas it had been a tradition in the United States and Great Britain that reached back to the nineteenth century. Klaus Piper, who took over the management of the Piper Verlag in 1955 after his father Reinhard’s death, introduced a paperback series for the company. His intent was to pave the way to ‘contributing to the democratization of the German public’ with a more affordable and more reader-friendly binding. The German paperback branch at Piper was instrumental in making new literature transportable for young audiences on the move; for the 500-pages of Das Boot, this new, flexible format was essential.

As they redefined their goals for a new era and distanced themselves from the practices of the prewar generation of publishers, the post-World War II generation of literary publishing giants in the FRG developed a distinct view of themselves within their industry. This “verlegerisches Selbstverständnis” (a publisher’s sense of self-awareness) as Klaus Piper termed it, was the impetus for a publisher to directly respond to changes in a readership that yearned for new, thought-provoking reading material in both the fiction and non-fiction categories. The democratic attitudes of German publishers after 1950, the stated policy of the industry, led to direct, personal relationships with authors whose
work would ideally continue over time through the efforts of partnering with the same publishing company for their subsequent works.\textsuperscript{146}

For both the German and American book industries, the global turbulence of the late 1960s in the form of student revolutions and civil rights demonstrations was in the background of any attempt to create bestselling books. German publishers were asked by the magazine \textit{Zeit} in 1967 for their opinion as to whether the umbrella-like organization of the German book publishers and sellers, known as the \textit{Börsenverein der deutschen Buchhändler}, was in need of reform in order to fit the needs of the times. Buchheim, himself a publisher of his own monographs and calendars in his home-grown publishing house, the Buchheim Verlag, did not denounce the organization entirely, but criticized what he saw as its inflexibility.\textsuperscript{147} Buchheim’s word for this inability for the group to adapt to the time was \textit{gebehindert} ([it] limps). A year later the German police would be called in to the exhibition hall where the organization was meeting to quell a violent student protester at the \textit{Frankfurter Buchmesse} (Frankfurt Book Expo), the publishing industry’s annual trade show in Frankfurt.

In order to create his own path professionally, Piper publishing house heir Klaus aimed to take on bestselling authors who not only interested him, as his father had done, but also those writers whose novels were highly insightful works that signaled his spiritual commitment to a new political system in the FRG.\textsuperscript{148} Karl Jaspers and Hannah Arendt were additions to the Piper roster of authors whose works were sought out by the public, a generation to be known eventually as the 68ers. They addressed the issues in German society that, outside of literature, were difficult to debate in an open forum.\textsuperscript{149}
In 1966 Klaus Piper met Buchheim through mutual acquaintances six years before the manuscript for *Das Boot* was in its final pre-printing stage. Rumors circulated in the Piper headquarters about a spectacular trilogy of novels in the works by the author of Germany’s esteemed *Lexikon der Modernen Malerei* (*Encyclopedia of Modern Painting*). Buchheim’s ties at the Droemer/Knaur printing company, the publishers of his *Lexikon*, did not run deep enough for his manuscript for *Das Boot* to be accepted as his next work there. Droemer editor Fritz Bolle, who had guided Buchheim through the printing of the *Lexikon*, had a low opinion of Buchheim’s antiwar novel concept and repeatedly refused to move forward with it at Droemer, denting the author’s ego unlike any other interaction in the past had done. Owner Willy Droemer, who was on board with the antiwar novel from the very start, eventually gave in to Bolle’s advice and rejected Buchheim’s memoir. Buchheim, a proven editor in his own right and a recognized publisher of his own monographs, popular calendars, and art reproductions, was not going to alter the successful format of the Buchheim Verlag as it stood to publish *Das Boot* himself. He chose to continue the book project in hope that an outside publisher would accept the manuscript under the conditions he set.

Several years later, Buchheim arrived at the Piper Verlag with five separate binders in baskets totaling 2,400 pages under the working title *Herrlich, herrlich wird es einmal sein*. The title stemmed from a stanza of the hymn sung by the U-boat crewman in *Das Boot* known only as the *Bibelforscher* (literally a “bible researcher” but also the Nazi term for Jehovah’s Witnesses). The submarine U-96, crippled from British fire, sank shortly thereafter to the bottom of the sea. Piper editor Walter Fritzsche was assigned the monumental task of turning the binders into a novel. His account of the editing
process in 1972 ranged from feelings of shock at the amount of text regarding a topic that he felt was past any point of relevance to readers by that year, to bewilderment at how he could not stop reading Buchheim’s prose. Fritzsche described his editorial process as one in which he did not eliminate over 1,900 pages, but rather picked out the best among the many passages and made a novel out of them.

The descriptive nature inherent in Buchheim’s writing sets the reader in the arena of the action as it unfolds; the omnipresence of technological environments that constrict the characters in every way. Depictions of sea and sky capture a multitude of color, odor. Every nuance of sunrise and sunset seen from the submarine’s hatch are among the impressions conveyed in the manuscript. None of the seemingly endless hues of color in Buchheim’s text, nor the vocabulary for scents available to him by being as a trained artist, remain in readers’ minds as much as the obscenities spoken by the U-boat crew. Buchheim fought vehemently with the Piper staff about leaving the lines the sailors spoke as they were, insisting that reality had to be reconstructed for the reader. This would become the first point of objection for veterans offended by the obscene language and sexual references that make up the bulk of the dialog on board. Fritzsche noted that he had the arduous task of adhering to Buchheim’s intentions with the novel, since the author was clear about leaving his options open to take his book to another publisher willing to listen to his demands.

Dealing with Buchheim one-on-one was something that Fritzsche also pointed out, albeit lightheartedly, as strenuous. This was noted in his contribution to the Festschrift in celebration of the author’s seventieth birthday published by Hans Brög, Buchheim’s friend, professor, and fellow Expressionist art historian. According to
Fritzsche, Buchheim’s constant, but never obtuse, defense of the novel’s passages depicting idle time on board the submarine is what Klaus Piper termed, “das absolute Auge” (keen eye). This comment referred to the lens through which Buchheim’s interpretation of the world filtered and, in Fritzsche’s opinion, it was the way in which Buchheim transported readers into a world to which they otherwise did not have access without literature. The book sold sixty-five thousand copies before the third quarter of its first year of publication ended with contracts for fourteen foreign language editions already commissioned. Buchheim himself helped French translators find a fitting title, Le Styx, a further sign of his innate linguistic skills and marketing savviness. It was Fritzsche who is credited with changing the original German title to the more sublime Das Boot knowing that to a discerning reader, Buchheim’s world was a separate space into which the reader would be transported, one indeed having existed in the past but to which the later generation finally had access. By 1978, two million copies had been sold worldwide.158

As introduced earlier in this chapter, West German publishers in the 1970s generally only used agents and scouts sparingly, for the most part only for gathering information about foreign books that might be successful after their translation into German.159 The move away from this practice to an American-style model is best explained through the extraordinary life and pioneering undertakings of Joan Daves, who worked her way up in the book industry to establish her own independent agency in New York. Daves built up a rare, but highly reputable working relationship with major German publishers by the late 1960s. A decade later, Daves had complete autonomy in dealing with the German writers that Piper saw as potentially lucrative for the American
book market. According to Daves, the limited chances for German authors in the American book market during that decade depended greatly on editors in the USA who were willing to advocate for the relevance of a foreign author not currently known outside of his or her own country.\textsuperscript{160}

The trust bestowed upon Daves by German publishers like Piper, Suhrkamp, and others, stemmed from her proven awareness of the promotion phase, a part of publishing that was necessary for a modern German author to be successful in the United States. More importantly, Daves’ search for American publishers who could read German and who were also willing to help advocate for less famous German writers abroad was the right formula in the postwar decades. In essence, this notion promoted the exchange of cultural understanding between the two countries. Daves demonstrated this successfully in her representation of the postwar German writer Heinrich Böll in the USA. Her contacts at McGraw Hill led to a much supported, generally warm reception of Böll’s texts and resulted in profitable but expectedly modest sales. In time, this proved to be a chance to open the door for negotiations for a very interested team at Alfred A. Knopf. Daves, having overseen this process from its meager beginnings, was thought of as a catalyst for Böll’s eventual positive reception in the American book market and her efforts are arguably an essential step in his being awarded the Nobel Prize in 1972.\textsuperscript{161}

Born Liselotte Davidson in Berlin to Jewish parents in 1919, Daves was sent to New York in 1938 at her father’s insistence to escape Nazi persecution; only her mother was to survive the war. German publisher Siegfried Unseld of the Suhrkamp Verlag noted during a trip to New York City in 1961 that Daves was the most promising out of all of the American literary agents he considered for representing German writers in the
Daves’ track record for literary representation on either side of the Atlantic proved to be one that introduced cutting-edge authors and thinkers to the ‘other’ market. In 1963, Daves paved the way for the successful introduction of German language editions of Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring and Why We Can’t Wait by Martin Luther King, Jr., published by the Econ publishing company and Fischer Bücherei, respectively.

Daves saw her work as a literary agent between the two national book markets as having inherently different duties, depending on the country in question. On the German end, she represented the publisher and the author simultaneously. Regular correspondence between Daves and publishers such as C.H. Beck, Suhrkamp, Hoffmann & Campe, Kiepenheuer & Witsch and Rowohlt solidified her role in the cultural exchange between Germany and the United States. Her legacy at Piper by the 1970s included German clients of international acclaim including Ingeborg Bachmann, Siegfried Lenz, and Nelly Sachs. Eventually, in the early 1980s, she would represent Willy Brandt for the American edition of his Nord-Süd-Bericht (The Brandt Report). In 1974, Lothar-Günther Buchheim was under her watch after his success in Germany with Das Boot and she was convinced that his book would do extremely well in the United States, even before the negotiations for the rights were finalized. Daves’ enthusiasm was expressed in her simultaneous communications between her office, the Alfred A. Knopf, Piper Verlag and William Collins & Sons, the British publisher of Das Boot.

The Alfred A. Knopf publishing house, through mediations with Carol Brown Janeway, its in-house agent, editor, and scout, continued the work that Joan Daves set in motion for Buchheim’s US debut. Janeway recommended to Knopf that the accomplished
translator Denver Lindley be contracted for Das Boot. Lindley had exemplary translations of Thomas Mann, Erich Maria Remarque and Hermann Hesse credited to his name. His wife Helen would be credited as well for the translations as his partner. Janeway, though, ran into a problem in setting up the translation of Das Boot into English. Unaware that the staff at the Williams Collins publisher in the UK expected to share the expense of the translation into British English, she held her ground at Knopf and maintained to Collins that she was unaware of any dealings regarding a shared translation nor with hiring anyone else but the recently contracted Denver and Helen Lindley. The British publisher had assumed that the prize-winning English translator John Maxwell Brownjohn would begin the work and had contracted him to complete the work, believing it was sharing the fees with Knopf. Company owner William Collins himself expressed his dismay at the misunderstanding in a letter to Joan Daves.\textsuperscript{165}

Janeway’s impression of Buchheim as an author matched that held by others in the publishing industry.\textsuperscript{166} She believed, as Buchheim himself often claimed, that his writing style was overwhelmingly influenced by non-German writers, specifically Hemingway and Faulkner.\textsuperscript{167} At least in retrospect, years later, she wrote that she had slowly become fond of his unique personality. This was preceded by her uncensored labeling of him as a ‘monster,’ which stemmed from his stubborn attitude and otherwise narcissistic traits.\textsuperscript{168} Janeway’s instinct to secure a translator for Knopf who was held in high regard was crucial to transitioning Buchheim’s bestseller, loaded with ribald German slang, into any other language. She noted in an interview that the British edition was not anywhere near the American version in terms of book sales and she attributed this to the different translations. Janeway maintained that there was a lack of voice in the
British version, something that she knew the Lindley’s would be able to produce as they had done before in their work on the Thomas Mann book.\textsuperscript{169}

Chapter 3.4.: Reception

Buchheim’s depictions of German World War II submarines as technological wonders, but their crews as lewd and rambunctious, was an original break with existing public assumptions about German submarine battalions of the 1940s. The initial 1973 book reviews were divided, and the portrayal of crews in Das Boot upset German veterans’ groups as much as the behavior was corroborated by others.\textsuperscript{170} Franz K. Stanzel has cited two popular newspaper book reviews in his work to demonstrate the polarity. In terms of criticism, one reviewer deemed the novel as just continuing the myth-building it sought to clarify; the praise Das Boot received from another newspaper focused on the idea of reality that did not put officers and crews in a civilized light.\textsuperscript{171} Both reviews converge on an important point, namely that the protagonist Werner is the literary incarnation of Buchheim, whose eyewitness account is used to provoke aspects of Germany’s collective memory.

The most well-known effort to discredit Buchheim can be found in the book by veterans Kurt Baberg, Karl Friedrich Merten titled Wir U-Bootfahrer sagen: ”Nein! So war das nicht!” Eine Anti-Buchheim-Schrift [We submariner say “No! That’s not how it was.’ An Anti-Buchheim-Publication] from 1986.\textsuperscript{172} Michael Hadley has written that Buchheim and Merten exchanged insults but shortly thereafter a revision of Admiral Dönitz took hold as the former naval commander released his autobiography. As a result,
Buchheim was eventually recognized as having contributed to the debunking of much of the mythology that surrounded the Kriegsmarine.\textsuperscript{173}

Balancing out the raunchy crew of the submarine U-96 in Buchheim’s text was the image of the ship’s commander, known in the novel only as the “\textit{der Alte}” (the Ol’ Man), a literary model of Captain Heinrich Lehmann-Willenbrock. The captain represented the fading class of mariners steeped in honor by way of their training at the Prussian \textit{Kadettenanstalt}, but now forced to help Nazi leaders sacrifice young lives in combat. This part of Lehmann-Willenbrock’s training is how Buchheim raised questions in the novel \textit{Das Boot} about remembering the submarine commander’s difficulty in directing his crew to see past the unethical decision making that occurred at sea.

It is through the dialog between Buchheim’s Werner and the “Old Man” that the topic of Nazi propaganda and its long-lasting effect on the public take a central position in the novel. Buchheim’s role as a war correspondent for the German propaganda division obligated him to depict in both image and words the heroics of German soldiers and sailors in the line of duty. The paradox of propaganda as the National Socialists explained it to journalists like Buchheim was that heroism was to be constructed, not based on observations or even real service. For Buchheim, his experience on board U-96 as captured in \textit{Das Boot} pushed this idea into the forefront for the public to explore by reading about the fear and disillusionment the crew experienced in his story.\textsuperscript{174}

After \textit{Das Boot} debuted in Germany in 1973, Buchheim received praise for the storyline, but heated reactions quickly ensued. Issues were taken up in the press regarding the novel’s unbridled depictions of young German U-boat crew members, its criticism of the commands given by Dönitz, and the idea of unethical tactics in battle. Each one of
these elements contributed to Buchheim’s goal of addressing the long-term effects of Nazi propaganda on Germany postwar memory with the unethical tactics not being exclusive to Germans. It is through this common link in Buchheim’s microcosm of abandoning live seamen that made the British and Germans not good and bad sides but rather two sides sending their own to a sure death.

Meeting Buchheim halfway on the topic of Nazi Germany and the German maritime forces under Hitler was a newfound curiosity demonstrated by German readers at this time. As much as students took sides against their parents as to why so much about the war was suppressed years later in public forums, many veterans and military leaders who served under Hitler began to voice their opinions of Buchheim’s narration publicly. In the case of German war novels published during the first two decades after Hitler’s defeat, authors sought to entice readers to revisit Germany’s war-torn past vicariously by means of both autobiographical and historical characterizations. In the academic fields of German studies, comparative literature, and European history, the motif of the Wehrmacht soldier as a victim of National Socialist politics and the party’s extreme social structuring is widely recognized but not uniformly accepted. This view of the German Wehrmacht soldier as a pawn of Nazi ideology is arguable applicable to the submarine crew in Das Boot as well, especially in Buchheim’s portrayal of the U-boat’s final mission at the conclusion of the novel. As an author, Buchheim made the point that he focused on the individual, and not on large groups, because to do so would imply either an apologetic attitude or a glorification of battle. Instead, he wanted to convey what individuals experienced in war, which for Buchheim was the fear never properly conveyed by survivors to the postwar generation.
In light of the placement of German soldiers alongside other victims of National Socialist politics, Buchheim remains under-researched in scholarly circles compared to his German contemporaries in this genre between the late 1950s until the early 1970s, especially when analyzed for their interpretation of the war and its actors. An examination of the existing scholarship on Buchheim and German anti-war novel writers of this period provides insight as to what degree of influence the socio-political conditions in Germany had on the authors and their identification with military-affiliated protagonists. Of particular interest is whether Buchheim and other writers in this area of literature provided the reader with any way of differentiating between military-based narratives, Wehrmacht and German Navy in this case, so that an individual reader can judge whether or not characters in this genre should be proclaimed to be victims of Nazi politics and propaganda.

What brought back the tired idea of the submarine novel to the German book market with new energy was Buchheim’s own history. He was one of several professional artists assigned the classification Kriegsberichterstatter (war correspondent) for the German Navy in 1941. Richard Schreiber was his colleague and, in a sense, his rival on a professional level. The similarities in their qualifications as painters culminated with both men having artwork selected by the PK (Propagandakompanie), the propaganda division, for display in the Haus der Kunst (Center for the Arts) in Munich, the showplace for Nazi-approved art. Works on exhibit there were seen as the aesthetic antidote to the outlawed art deemed entartet (degenerate), thereby reinforcing the concept of ‘un-German’ attributes needing to be eradicated from society. Later, Buchheim would offer his opinion of the Haus der Kunst as a monument of
remembrance, albeit that of a dark memory in German history, hence it should remain in place.\textsuperscript{182}

The tightrope that Buchheim walked on socially upon his return to civilian life was not clear to him at first. Schreiber, like Buchheim, had the responsibility of capturing the essence of German soldiers in battle intended for magazines and newspapers to harness support of the public, ultimately in the PK’s preferred medium of illustration. Being talented writers as well, Buchheim and Schreiber both published monographs on European artists after the war. In contrast to Buchheim’s early career in the 1950s as a self-employed museum curator with a positive public image, the discovery of Schreiber’s membership in the National Socialist party was the cause for the latter his losing a professorship at the University of Düsseldorf.\textsuperscript{183}

\textbf{Chapter 3.5.: Buchheim in Good Company}

Buchheim and his contemporary, author and naval historian Hans Herlin, have arguably the most significant commonalities in their careers than any others within the niche of German-produced World War II submarine battle literature.\textsuperscript{184} This study suggests that together, the two authors represented a type of writing that deviated from previous trends in the genre’s history. During their early postwar careers, both authors developed ties to major magazines in which either their work, or interviews about their work, were featured. Herlin’s fifteen-part series, \textquote{\textit{Cain, wo ist dein Bruder Abel?}}\textquote{Cain, where is your brother Abel?\textquoteclose} appeared in \textit{Stern} magazine in 1960. Buchheim was well acquainted with \textit{Stern} founder Henri Nannen, but received the most attention from the magazine \textit{Der Spiegel}, with coverage by Wilhelm Bittorf forming convincing
reviews of Buchheim’s achievements. Herlin became an editor at Stern and later a publisher at the Molden Verlag; Buchheim was the head of his own publication facility, the Buchheim Verlag. Each writer had selected works translated into British English by noted translator John M. Brownjohn and film adaptations of their major works were highly successful. Close ties to France, French culture, and its language also played immense roles in their personal and professional lives.

It is fitting to link Buchheim and Herlin together regarding U-boat history and the literature that it led to after Germany’s defeat. In the 1970s, Michael Salewski had formulated the thought “wer vom Krieg schreibt, schreibt ein Kriegsbuch. Es gibt keine ‘Anti-Kriegsbücher’” (“Whoever writes about the war, writes a war novel. There are no ‘anti-war novels’”). Salewski’s sentiment intended to relay to readers how the destructive nature of war encompasses an entire society, that no party is unaffected by the horror that lay in battle’s wake. This is fitting since each author recognizes in his prose that the open sea was the formidable ‘other enemy’ in addition to the British sea and air forces of the Battle of Atlantic. Buchheim and Herlin made no hesitation in showing how the fate of the captains and crews in their respective books was drastically more horrific than the battles that took place on land or in the air.

Important tenets of both authors is their steadfast refuting of any misclassification of their work as being part of a scheme to recapture the essence of a Heldenepos (a tale of heroism). Herlin’s publications continued to revisit the aftermath of Nazi rule, even if they no longer took place during the war, such as in his 1975 book Freunde (Commemorations). The historical accuracy of the narrations, and the topic of sacrifice in the face of imminent defeat, also run through both authors’ texts. It is noteworthy to say
that despite the plot of Das Boot entails one single encounter, whereas Verdammter Atlantik involves five shorter chronicles of various factual U-boat missions, both narratives have turned to historical fiction as the vehicle to compensate for the many years spanning the battle arena and their publications.¹⁹⁰

A stylistic difference between Buchheim’s Das Boot and Verdammter Atlantik is the dialog Buchheim maintains with the reader, who receives all information through the thoughts of the protagonist, Werner. To some this held Das Boot back from the level of literary quality achieved by Herlin. Buchheim attempted to incorporate much about the peculiarities of modern German through his writing. He showed his sensitivity for the subtleties of colloquial German speech and dialects, such as in the passage in Das Boot where he contemplates the adjective bomfortionell, which was a popular word for “great” in 1941. A reference that a reader from Buchheim’s generation would know, this replacement for wunderbar (wonderful, miraculous) and schön (nice, fantastic), was most likely a mutation of an already bastardized French loan into German, bonforzionös.¹⁹¹

The central figure in each of Herlin’s five passages comprising Verdammter Atlantik is the historically true submarine captain of the respective vessels (Heinz Eck, Werner Henke, Wolfgang Lüth, Günther Prien, and Peter Zech). In Das Boot, the captain, “der Alte” and Werner, Buchheim’s literary alter ego and guest marine reporter on U-96, arguably share center stage in the plotline. The technique common to both portrayals of World War II U-boat navy captains in Das Boot and Verdammter Atlantik is that of steadfast, but not uncritical commanders, who have opinions about the Nazi indoctrination of their increasingly younger crews. The respect that the crew have for their captain is the bridge to the reader’s hope that they adopt his critical stance. The
vessels are rendered as the instruments that let the captains carry out their duties as sole decision makers on board while at sea.

Ships and marine-oriented technology are highly significant in both works, not solely because of the military setting, but arguably as reminders of modernity that add a level of irony regarding the brutality of men at war. For Buchheim, this fascination with the U-boat’s technological prowess subsided after the war and was balanced out by a concern for its evolution. Buchheim stated his opposition to Germany’s rearmament in the decades after the war and he expressed doubts about the use of atomic energy by the Navy, a logical power source for U-boats that was lethal in accidents caused by human error, the variable that would promote the horror that he warned against in his prose.192

Both writers’ depictions of Admiral Dönitz as a type of ‘commander-turned-bureaucrat’ is present in their writing.193 The necessity of denouncing Dönitz is instrumental in Das Boot for Buchheim to anchor his argument about how unethical commands regarding enemy crews, as well as those commands that killed civilians at sea, exploited the loyalty inherent in career naval officers like Lehmann-Willembrock. This was for Buchheim a further aspect of the “Perversität des Krieges” (perverse nature of war) that he professed was the reason for breaking down any sense of glorification of the military branch.194

The open sea as a mystical force that presents itself as a deadly, third opponent in submarine warfare, is a familiar one to readers of postwar U-boat literature. This staging of antiwar narratives was used by Buchheim and Herlin as a way into the psychological observation they prepared for readers. Polish-British writer Joseph Conrad was considered a master of this genre by avid readers, especially those who themselves
remembered the interwar years vividly. Conrad was banned in Nazi Germany shortly
after 1933, a significant detail when considering how depictions of warfare can seem to
deal with heroism on the surface, but have a deeper reflection on war at their core.
Buchheim described the oceanic element, nature’s own all-powerful weapon, as one that
could guarantee no signs of a lost battle be left behind once enemy ships were sunk and
their crews had drowned. This became part of his theory of the *Perversität des
Kriegerischen*.195 Echoing in Buchheim’s war novels, *Das Boot* in particular, are
instances where this comes into play.

**Chapter 3.6.: Catharsis for Buchheim**

Buchheim intended to make two points in *Das Boot*. The first was his message
about the importance of remembrance as a way to overcome the past. The second was the
value of an un tarnished truth. Buchheim made a career out of selling his narrative to
ensure that remembrance stayed functional. As a former war reporter, he aimed to break
postwar silence as proof to himself that he dealt with his past. Buchheim treated the issue
of abandoning living soldiers, and in some cases, civilians at sea. This was the outcome
of certain missions experienced both British and German forces, as a breaking point for
crews.

By exposing this facet of the Battle of the Atlantic, Buchheim raised questions
about unethical battle practices that both sides took part in. That British and German
navies committed unethical acts against their own men is how Buchheim constructed his
antiwar message. The scene in *Das Boot* on pages 392-4 concern a British tanker
torpedoed by U-96 hours earlier. Upon surfacing, the captain and officers on deck
witness how the tanker continues to burn as survivors jump to the death with no British rescue attempts in sight. Buchheim’s narrator Werner sees one British sailor raise his hand out of the water as if to flag down the submarine.

Buchheim uses Dönitz as a way to embody the notion of amorality in Nazi ideology. The separate world that Buchheim created through the submarine in *Das Boot* tops off with Dönitz in a practical sense for the crews. Dönitz ordered German submarines whose crews once believed their missions to be to stop supply ships from reaching Great Britain to also fire on battle ships and civilians. The option to take prisoners on board was non-existent, which was a stance the British fleets took as well. This allows Buchheim to use the military, here the German Navy, as a way to sum up how duty and unethical practices created the difficult scenario that he felt begged to be forgotten through a glorification process where Hitler seemed to have had a lesser range of influence than in other branches of the services.

An essential link to understanding where Buchheim’s artistic license takes hold is in interpreting the emotional, yet definitive realization that his protagonist Werner makes as U-96 remains stuck on the ocean floor. The flaw Buchheim saw in German identity in this passage was previously brought up in his first autobiographical novel, *Tage und Nächte steigen aus dem Strom. Eine Donaufahrt.*\(^{196}\) As described in Chapter 2 of this dissertation, the 1938 book borrowed the popular motif of the time, the *Reisebericht* (travel journal). The semi-lawful trip along the Danube River brought the young Buchheim from Passau in Bavaria to the Black Sea.\(^{197}\) Buchheim used the word “taboo” in 1938 in a similar manner to the senior Buchheim in *Das Boot*, yet it has been overlooked in the literature on Buchheim. More than simply the idea of a taboo in its
social discourse sense, Buchheim applied the word in his writing to his own non-compliancy with Germany’s efforts to forge a national identity. In *Tage und Nächte*, and then again over thirty years later in *Das Boot*, Buchheim explores the plight of the renegade personality. In *Tage und Nächte*, Buchheim is confronted at an open market by a merchant looking to push off an old World War I Wehrmacht jacket on him, knowing that he is German. The young Buchheim does all that he can to ignore the man, not just by pretending to not hear the pushy salesman’s many pitches, but through a conscious effort to avoid what is really attacking him, namely the German identity that the merchant attaches to him. Buchheim assures himself that he is impervious to the verbal barrage, “Ich bin tabu gegen alle Angriffe.” I am taboo against all attacks.). The young author Buchheim uses this passage to address his own identity on two levels; the first, to show how the civilizations along the Danube associated German identity with a strict military identity, and secondly that his youth was giving way to adulthood in 1938, while it harbored a rejection of his German identity.

As a perpetual outsider, Buchheim, by age twenty-two, possessed the ideal traits for the task of being a *Kriegsberichterstatter* (war reporter). It was in this form that he was moved out of regular citizenry, a risky status for the opinionated, nationally resilient Buchheim, who had, consciously or not, dodged three prior draft letters.198 Buchheim, upon enlistment, chose the German Navy, which he knew to be least Nazified of the armed forces.199

In the climactic scene in *Das Boot*, the protagonist Werner, facing a sure death as the bombarded submarine U-96 lay on the ocean bottom in disrepair and running out of oxygen, asks himself whether or not anyone realizes where their own vanity has landed
them. For Werner, the unforeseen pending death for the insane cause for which the Nazi leaders have entrapped their own youth must not prevent his existence, for it is holding the ship together. He tells himself that his life is taboo from this plan, “Mir kann nichts geschehen. Ich bin tabu. Durch mich ist das ganze Boot gefeit.” (Nothing is supposed to happen to me. I am taboo. It’s me who’s holding this whole boat together.).

Werner, now cynical of the old propaganda that his generation grew up with, is recounting the impact that Germany’s cultural past had on his generation. In this passage he talks about the near-mythological reverence that German culture had for the World War I battle campaign at Langemark. In 1914, the lesson school children learned, the German military captured 200 French soldiers there, all the while singing the German national anthem as they surrounded their francophone enemy. As Bernd Hüppauf has noted, the heroic, myth-like image of young motivated soldiers became the subject of endless German poems, songs, youth group celebrations, monuments and eventually formed the base of National Socialist propaganda as it extended well into the 1930s.

Shortly after that, Werner recites a line from the poem “Schlacht, das Maß” (“Battle, the Measure”) by Rudolf G. Binding. Binding died in 1938 and was never a registered member of the National Socialist party, but his nationalistic sentiments play a central role in his poetry. Werner, Buchheim’s extension in the novel, reflects on how much propaganda material was forced on his generation. As Anthony Fothergill has observed, Denver and Helen Lindley omitted the source of the quote in the Knopf edition of Das Boot, surely in order to spare American readers from the otherwise random reference at a dramatic moment with the obscure Binding, who is hardly known outside of Germany. Whether this was noticed by Buchheim is unfortunately undocumented.
The autobiographical constellation of protagonist and author, Werner/Buchheim, rejects the propaganda in which his generation was immersed. His acting this out is his disengagement from identifying himself with any cause tied to the war. It is also his ultimate rejection of any strain of National Socialism, which has at its core the waging of destruction at the cost of its population’s youth. Having experienced firsthand the ‘perverse nature of warfare,’ the surviving Werner/Buchheim’s burden is only momentarily lightened once the submarine is temporarily repaired and the order to resurface is given. The one chance to release the remaining tanks and float back to the surface is initiated and the ship sails on the surface back to the German-occupied port in LaRochelle, France. U-96 is then bombed by an Allied force airstrike. Apart from Werner and the Ol’ Man, most of the crew is severely wounded or killed.

Buchheim directs his reader to consider the experience of the individual sailor at the depth of his emotional plunge in comparison to his pre-war state of mind at the beginning of the novel when the crew celebrated their new mission with a raunchy night of drinking and near-destruction of the club in France. Buchheim’s plea by 1973 is that a collective overcoming of the past, or enlightening others about the experiences behind it, means remembering the amoral nature of war without glorification it. Das Boot, as both novel and feature film, seem to end with Werner as one of only a few survivors of the attack at the port. Despite any future plans for the other characters, Buchheim allows the reader to survive only with Werner, sharing his horror and realizations about the role they played in a senseless Nazi war. Werner is but one individual whose experience we as readers might falsely judge together with other crew members. This approach would only
cloud Buchheim’s message that a group-level analysis is not the way to see how fear reached some and shook off any last sentiments of identification with National Socialism.

Buchheim concluded his 1985 television documentary Zu Tode Gesiegt: Der Untergang der U-Boote, with his professed mantra “den einzelnen Mann glorifizieren, die Einpeitscher aber dekuvrieren” (glorify the individual soldier, but expose those who wield the whip). This final judgement demonstrates that Buchheim had no agenda in which he viewed the Wehrmacht as a single concept to be exonerated, hence perpetuating the Heldenmythos (cult of heroism), that he sought to debunk. His use of the word dekuvrieren (or decouvrieren) above is important because Buchheim is conveying to the audience the hidden aspect of National Socialism that allows it to extend itself into the postwar years.

Chapter 3.7.: Conclusion

For David G. Thompson, Buchheim’s prose functioned as a type of catharsis for the author. Thompson has written that the novel Das Boot presents more evidence of “accusation than apology” regarding Wehrmacht images. In contrast to that, Hans Wagener had posed the question, “Ist ’Das Boot’ ein Antikriegsroman?” (Is Das Boot an antiwar novel?), which puts Michael Salewski’s statement about there not being anti-war novels at all (only novels about war), in a new light since recognizing a book classification called “anti-war” is not uniform among academics. What both scholars realized is that the medium of novel still showed promise for postwar reflection with readers either in agreement with any messages in the text or dismissing it altogether.
It is noted here that Buchheim’s intent was to capture the past for his present-day readers, this was the reason why he needed to portray many soldiers as enthusiastic, some as critical of their mission, and others as traumatized. This reflected his practice of only lumping National Socialists into a single category, the *Einpeitscher* (the slave drivers), who must be collectively denounced in German minds, according to him.

In line with his infamously abrasive public persona, Buchheim stated in a 1996 interview with Heidelberg University’s campus magazine *Ruprecht* that “historians are naturally drawn to documents. Academics aren’t witness to anything, so they rely on them. They eventually turn into liars because there is never any truth in documents.” Buchheim’s scathing and inaccurate comment, a trademark feature of his choleric personality, was made in part to defend his publications, which were based on his own eye-witness account of World War II and not reconstructed from written sources. To him, this made their interpretation as prose possible but less effective than taking them for the truth that he presented them to be, the reason why he used the term “*Logbuch*” (log book) when he referred to how *Das Boot* should be marketed. Also targeted by Buchheim’s decree were veterans for whom the “*Perversität des Krieges*”, the perversity of war, the prime example of inhumanity in the twentieth century, something too humiliating to relive. Buchheim also meant to reach intellectuals in art history circles whom he labeled as unwilling to address what he saw as vestigial attitudes towards modern art left over from the Nazi aesthetics once forced into place during Hitler’s reign.

As Lynn L. Wolff has asserted, literature as historiography has its merits in terms of viewing the past for those with no personal memories of world events. In this regard, *Das Boot* cleared the way for later twentieth century literary endeavors that took
similar levels of creative license. As Fothergill has noted, publications by the German postwar generation writing after *Das Boot* is best represented by the works of W.G. Sebald. In his critically acclaimed novel *Austerlitz*, Sebald constructs a vicarious, but well-researched review of Germany’s wartime past. The novel is an example of the tradition to bring the past into the future so that it continues to be contested as Buchheim had wished for with *Das Boot*. 
Chapter 4: Popular and Critical Reception

Chapter 4.1.: Buchheim as a Public Figure

Almost eighty years ago, both Lothar-Günther Buchheim and Antoine de Saint Exupéry, two gifted artists also intent on becoming writers, published eyewitness accounts of their combat experiences during World War II. In *Jäger im Weltmeer* (Hunters at Sea) Buchheim’s 1943 “prototype” for Das Boot, he attempted to relay a message similar to Saint Exupéry’s *Pilote de Guerre* (Flight to Arras) from the same year about the senselessness of war. Despite the fact that they were on opposite sides of the conflict and belonged to different military branches Das Boot meant that Germans, like their French and British counterparts, could preserve their wartime memories in prose as a way of dealing with their experiences. This was a link to global public memory that Buchheim aimed for in 1973. The initial reactions from the general public, intellectuals, and navy veterans, were mixed. Not long after hitting the stands, the book went into its second printing and Buchheim was a household name in Germany. A stance by intellectuals, though, was not detectable.

Understanding the role that Buchheim’s life and creative works played in West Germany’s quest to publicly assess the consequences of its Nazi past requires a syntopical view of the analyses of his life and his creative productions. Just as essential is exploring the opportunities that afforded him access to a voice in the public realm after World War II, something he expressed as having been dominated by privileged intellectuals and media sensationalists.210 This chapter discusses the critical reception of *Das Boot* and Buchheim within the context of what Assmann has described as communicative memory graduating into cultural memory, which is the replacement of
eyewitness-based accounts that once informed the public, with ones acquired through media forms of all kinds.

Erll’s contributions to the field help explain the trajectory that transcultural memory takes. Her theory, called “traveling memory,” is used here to illustrate the path taken by the debates and retorts concerning Buchheim and *Das Boot*. The discussion that follows demonstrates how this process translates from a metaphoric state into historic terms and shows how the narrative in Buchheim’s autobiographical novel became a part of West German cultural memory.

Scholarly opinions about Buchheim’s claims to promote an antiwar message through *Das Boot* did not follow a predictable, singular path in which harsh critique eventually mellowed into general respect for his writing. Nor did studies on his work only boom with the bestseller’s surge in 1973 and taper off once the book was adapted as a screenplay for the box office success directed by Petersen. The factors surrounding his career by the early 1980s, the apex of his popularity concerning the novel, were fluid. The number of citizens with acute, personal memories of National Socialist hegemony lessened as a new generation of German politicians, born after WWII, inherited the legacy of the war that Germany waged under Nazi rule. German citizens as a whole needed to weigh whose accounts were legitimately a part of a common memory of the past, and whose were damaging to the idea of mastering that same past.²¹¹

Over the decades since Germany’s economic recovery, Buchheim equipped himself with the necessary skills to showcase his talents in a variety of media types in an attempt to knock out the generally accepted narrative of a fearless, unparalleled German naval fleet under Dönitz. His goal was to replace that stereotype with his own memory of
scared, narcissistic juveniles, many of whom were ashamed of their blind nationalism as commands at sea increasingly resembled a breach in ethics. From the relative neutrality Buchheim had as a public figure in the postwar years, to his condemnation by veterans after 1973 as a Nestbeschmutzer (someone who fouled their own nest) for writing Das Boot and then beyond to international success, the pattern of responses to him and his creative works only sporadically matched public and intellectual sentiments associated with efforts in overcoming the past.

The often polarized outlook of West German intellectuals and public figures that placed them into different philosophical camps regarding postwar guilt and moral obligation determined the manner in which Buchheim and his work were received. Central to analyzing how scholars interpreted the success of a fictionalized autobiography such as Buchheim’s opus Das Boot is the recognition within academic circles that the 1973 novel was “popular” in a two-fold manner. Regarding sales and distribution, the novel broke records at the time; in terms of its cultural relevance, it was a personal memoir fictionalized just enough to be at the core of heated arguments among laypeople and intellectuals. Buchheim chose to respond to, and in some instances even provoke, the critics engaged with the meaning of his work. Despite the varying views on the effectiveness of his claims, neither historical validity nor technical aspects described in the book were challenged by experts or academics but rather applauded for their accuracy.

Areas of public life in West Germany where the controversy brought about by Buchheim and Das Boot was felt were indicative of the process germane to memory studies as Astrid Erll has studied the subfield, traveling memory. The methodology used
here reflects Erll’s notion. In her approach, historians can observe how input from a live source who experienced an event is taken in by media consumers, who in turn judge the memory, and it is either corroborated or rejected. In the case of Das Boot, the meaning of what German U-boat commanders and crews thought and felt, mysterious to many people even after the war, was again revisited by survivors and curious younger citizens twice due to the commercial success of Bavaria Film’s cinematic version of the novel.

Since the earliest years of postwar German democracy, popular media depicted Buchheim and his work in a way that kept the image of his irascible nature in sight, especially when he was unable to procure image reproduction rights for his monographs, end quarrels with other professionals, or win zoning disputes to begin building his highly promoted modern art museum. His success internationally, with career highlights such as receiving the Grobes Verdienstkreuz (German Cross of Merit) in 1986 and corresponding lows such as his 1988 live, on-air defamation of respected intellectual Bazon Brock and a local Bavarian comptroller who blocked the progress of Buchheim’s museum plans at the time, shows how the West German public’s relationship to Buchheim did not follow a predictable path. His efforts to ensure the honesty of his writing showed both personal and collective transparency. The path he chose publicly cost him and German society much anguish at an intersection in time when addressing the inhumanity caused by Nazi Germany during World War II was coupled by generational rifts, protests about the war in Vietnam, and concerns about life in East Germany.
Chapter 4.2.: The 1940s: The Start of a Public Image

One of the earliest postwar commentaries on Buchheim’s developing career linked him with Nazi Germany’s inner-workings in the propaganda division, albeit without any detectable judgement on his former war reporter duties. In 1948, the newly-founded popular magazine Der Spiegel placed him close to the denazification process as the downfall of his former war reporter colleague Richard Schreiber unfolded. As evidence of Schreiber’s Nazi party membership surfaced and ended his career as an art professor, Buchheim was granted a seemingly judgement-free postwar life and career. This is another aspect of Buchheim’s life that is reminiscent of Michael Rothberg’s concept of the implicated beneficiary. This discrepancy in treatment outlines how the two former Kriegsmaler (combat artists) were bestowed with different postwar identities from outside forces; one whose past was imbued with activity used to create Nazi propaganda, which was Schreiber’s fate, and the other exhibiting a type of neutrality, despite Buchheim’s deep affiliation with the internal actions of the wartime propaganda machine. It is argued here that the German press, heavily managed in feuilltonist areas for its compliance with Allied-occupied stipulations as denazification in the FRG was underway, indirectly enabled Buchheim’s peacetime civilian career to begin free of associations as having privileges in Nazi party even though he was a war artist. The availability of party documentation dictated the shunning for Schreiber, a painter and not a soldier. For the press, physical evidence of party membership determined character in situations of doubt. There is no documentation of party membership for Buchheim.

The 1948 article “Akademische Schinken” by Der Spiegel detailed the incident about his former compatriot war reporter Richard Schreiber, whose Nazi party
membership had recently been discovered and upset students and university leaders. Schreiber, who remained connected to the art world, was on staff as a teacher at the Arts Academy in Düsseldorf and a respected art historian in the latter part of the decade. The article included the connection Schreiber had to Buchheim, one of the only other war reporters in the German Navy during World War II, since it was the latter’s first wife, Geneviève (Gwen) Militon, who provided Schreiber with a character reference to the Arts Academy administration.²²¹ At the time, Buchheim curated his own art exhibits featuring French modernists together with his Gwen and the support of her father. The news article described the background to Schreiber’s dismissal from his teaching position at the academy, a demand fueled by student lobbyists once the discovery of his registration with the National Socialist party surfaced and word circled around campus.

The magazine article is significant in that it documented how the wartime artistic and journalistic duties of Schreiber and his co-reporter Buchheim were seen as secondary to the apparently more egregious choice of Nazi party membership, a matter which was demonstrated for Schreiber but not for Buchheim. Schreiber unsuccessfully contested his severance from the institute with his weak defense, namely that his party membership had been arranged by his father, allegedly for Schreiber’s own protection during the war. Schreiber hoped that leverage from Militon, a former French resistance agent with wartime ties to Buchheim and his former U-boat captain Heinrich Lehmann-Willenbrock, would suffice in reversing the dismissal from teaching. Militon credited Schreiber with her survival during the war and made clear in her statement to the board at the academy that “[n]icht ein einziges seiner Bilder ist Propaganda.” (not one of his pictures counts as propaganda.)²²² Despite Militon’s clout with her proven anti-Nazi espionage as well
as her friendship to the highly respected Lehmann-Willenbrock, Schreiber was unable to convince the academy’s administration of the lack of any allegiance on his part to National Socialist ideology.\textsuperscript{223}

After 1948, \textit{Der Spiegel} continued to follow the ups and downs of Buchheim’s budding career with an occasional contribution by Buchheim himself, based on his art history expertise.\textsuperscript{224} The former war reporter and S. Fischer publishing house author could now add self-made art curator to his professional highlights.\textsuperscript{225}

\textbf{Chapter 4.3.: The 1950s-60s: Buchheim establishes Roots}

By the 1950s, economic recovery in German was underway. Buchheim’s art exhibits in Frankfurt featured the selected works of French and German modern artists that he and his first wife Gwen obtained through contacts, with the formerly ‘degenerate’ German Expressionist artist groups \textit{Die Brücke} and \textit{Der Blauer Reiter} dominating their attention. The exhibits, which were organized during the early years of the Buchheim Verlag’s artist monograph production, featured German Expressionists. To Buchheim, these eyewitnesses to history documented the horror they experienced as soldiers during World War I in their work and as a result, voiced their social anxiety as the interwar years gave way to National Socialism.

Buchheim explained the social disregard for these artists after World War II as the result of a ‘second wave’ of artistic persecution tolerated by the public. At this time, museum directors avoided the ‘degenerate’ art style at all costs so as not to be associated with the topic of Nazi Germany. This ironic trend in postwar aesthetics fueled the fire for Buchheim’s pending criticism of West German memory, the eventual impetus for \textit{Das}
Boot. In 1950 a chance for Buchheim to interact with the general public, exhibiting artists, and intellectuals, as a panelist on abstract art, occurred. The first of the “Darmstädter Gespräche” (Darmstadt Conversations), a series of public talks about modern art in postwar Germany, was organized by art historian Hans Gerhard Evers. Alongside fellow artist-professor Willi Baumeister, and in the company of elites like philosopher Theodor W. Adorno and psychologist Alexander Mitscherlich, Buchheim and others took part in the heated discussions in which they defended to the live audience how modern art functioned in light of the “un-German” label given to it by National Socialists a decade earlier. Art critic and Nazi apologist Hans Sedlmayr was the cause for the tension Buchheim and others felt as they defended abstract art as a style.

By 1960, Lothar-Günther Buchheim had made a name for himself in the art world as a cunning dealer who was also a uniquely conceived self-publisher and head of the modest but serious Buchheim Verlag publishing house, yet it was his temper in the face of controversy that quickly became his signature trait for the loyal and growing Der Spiegel readership. Expressionist artist and core Bauhaus instructor Wasily Kandinsky’s widow, Nina, denied Buchheim permission to print his book on the artist group Der Blaue Reiter using images of Kandinsky’s work. In court she claimed the images were outside the scope of discussion in his book, a matter she was prepared to defend regardless of outcome.

Buchheim, enraged at the idea of second- or third party art ownership dictating public access to art history, didn’t hesitate to use the incident to announce in print his ideas concerning public realms and fine art. He fired back publicly that same year with a pamphlet fresh from his own press titled, Die Kunst, Witwen zu verbrennen (A User’s
Buchheim insisted fully that the publication was not triggered by his recent squabble over reproduction rights with the widow Kandinsky, but instead was a “moralische Rettungsboje und Lockerungsübung” (moral life jacket and warm-up exercise). The issue was not settled until a final round in court in 1966, with a decision against Buchheim’s publication of the Kandinsky pieces, increasing his embitterment for Nina Kandinsky. The widow, despite financial restitution, wished afterward for Buchheim to be “verboten” (literally “forbidden” but meant as “cancelling” him) as she termed it. The media coverage may not have put either personality in a positive light, but it did publicly reinforce Buchheim’s expertise regarding modern art and showcased his vested interest in the German public’s access to this part of its national history.

Chapter 4.4.: The 1970s: The Popular Reception of Buchheim

Immediately after 1973, popular sensationalism about Buchheim’s court battles over public access to fine art shifted over to historical scholarship as Das Boot broke international sales records. Serious studies on Buchheim’s role during World War II, and the relationship he fostered to West Germany’s endeavor to ‘master the past’ through the novel’s publication, centered on controversy. It is suggested here that the dialogues and productions across the media that sought to investigate Buchheim’s effect on West Germany formed a concrete example of what historians concerned with memory studies see as a necessary part of the Federal Republic’s national endeavor to overcome the past.
The negotiation among laypeople and critics as to where Buchheim’s story ceased to be a memoir and became fiction was ignited at least in part by the Piper Verlag publishing house’s furnishing the 1973 book jacket with Buchheim’s proclamation that his novel was not fiction (*ein Roman aber kein Werk der Fiktion*). The concern that intellectuals had as to whether an autobiographical source can be treated as part of a larger, public historiography of postwar reflection, placed the ‘Buchheim debate’, as Michael Hadley has termed it, between the endpoints of Nazi party denunciation and the continued growth of exoneration of German troops that typified German postwar literature. The effect of Buchheim’s efforts to engage with the public about his experience during the war, when seen in this light, reveals the actual process of “mastering the past,” the interacting with, and arguing about, experiences offered by those present at an event that may or may not allow younger generations to gain a sense of how the past impacts them. As Rothberg has stated, memories of the past compete with each other but one view does not cancel out the others. Buchheim represented a challenge to the memory of the past that he felt shielded the real feelings and emotions that the postwar born could use to see why the silence after the war occurred.

Throughout the modest, but growing amount of scholarly attention paid to *Das Boot* since its publication in 1973, Michael Salewski’s 1976 analysis *Die Wirklichkeit des Krieges (The Reality of War)* served as the common point of departure for all subsequent work about the novel’s effect on West German society put forth by both European and American scholars.²³² Salewski’s study, subtitled *Analysen und Kontroversen zu Buchheims “Boot”* (Analysis and Controversy surrounding Buchheim’s *Boot*), earned its pivotal role in studies on Buchheim not only through its format, which combined
historical observations with analyses of public reactions, but also because Salewski was a naval officer who belonged to the postwar generation. Salewski saw *Das Boot* as a mix of literature and reality, a symbiotic relationship where each aspect kept the other in check. The events were never denied their validity by readers and they were also never treated by critics or veterans in such a manner as to play down Buchheim’s portrayal of the danger involved in the campaign.

The inclusion of major German newspaper articles with negative comments about the style and characters in *Das Boot* made Salewski’s book a work of historical significance that used published reactions to answer the question as to what effect a fictionalized account could have on Germany. Salewski’s work on *Das Boot* let reviews from professionals and veterans form the core of his work. This was a sign of Salewski’s confidence that Buchheim’s argument was solid: the discomfort in reviewing the past would allow the truth, especially Buchheim’s version, to surface. At that point understanding the war’s impact could be discussed for those who were not witness to its horror.

Subsequent historians and literary critics who analyzed Buchheim’s projects since the appearance of Salewski’s seminal work, albeit with their respective academic goals in mind, represented varying scholarly camps. The draw of Salewski’s work for scholars is its blended format of historical interpretation of articles that appeared in widely-read magazines, its overview of press-related reactions, and most intriguing, the World War II veteran reader responses to *Das Boot*. Salewski’s study has long served as a basis for viewing Buchheim’s career and productions after the debut of the novel. Over the five decades since the publication of *Das Boot*, reactions to the book and its author continued
to surface. Agreement about Buchheim’s stated mission of breaking the postwar silence that he felt prolonged the glorification of Germans soldiers and sailors was met with incongruent opinions as to his success in doing so.

Since *Die Wirklichkeit des Krieges* is the most highly cited work in serious examinations of Buchheim’s contributions, a look for works overshadowed by Salewski’s insightful, but strictly historical study, is necessary to expand upon the reception that surrounded Buchheim at the height of his fame. Ingeborg Drewitz, whose writing is significant in analyzing Buchheim’s career in light of his reported efforts to confront myths about Germany’s Nazi past, is often cited for her 1981 anthology of German anti-war literature, *Die zerstörte Kontinuität (The Breach of Continuity).* As a successful playwright, activist and journalist, Drewitz discussed *Das Boot* and other postwar writing from the perspective of an accomplished literary expert. Her chapter on Buchheim, it is proposed here, must be seen as the reprinted 1973 article from where it was taken, Germany’s literary journal *Neue Deutsche Hefte,* restoring its three-year precedence ahead of Salewski’s study.

Unlike popular newspaper book reviews, a literary journal can be limited in readership due to an intellectual focus. Being more than a judgement of the novel, the ideas treated in Drewitz’ article not only concerned the subject matter of German naval crews during World War II but also the choice Buchheim made in waiting thirty years to publish his memoir aboard the submarine U-96. Drewitz saw the Piper Verlag publishing house exclamation on the book jacket that the text was “*ein Buch wie ein Orkan*” (a book that hits like a hurricane) as Piper’s strategy to promote Buchheim’s work as being in the company of Herman Melville and Norman Mailer, also tough writers with epic tales to
tell. More important to Drewitz than an association with world-class novel writers though, was the artistic license that Buchheim adopted as a writer.

In her opinion, Buchheim makes his point to his readers by emphasizing the severity of events from 1942 even though he placed them in 1941. The resulting effect achieved by Buchheim, according to Drewitz, is a perceived reality and not an actual reality, thereby preserving the importance of the events and the dramatic flow for readers. The tapering off of successes by German U-boats in 1942 confirmed for Drewitz the presence of literary intentions on Buchheim’s part. Drewitz interpreted Buchheim’s prose as his exploration of the Widerspruch (contradictory nature) that materialized in West German society after the war, namely the recognition by the public that National Socialism was wrong despite the glorification of servicemen’s’ deaths upheld by public for years thereafter.

Drewitz’ article also laid the foundation for appreciating Buchheim as having had the daunting task of facing the responses of veterans and other survivors of the war before it reached its true audience, the generation of teens and adolescents of the 1970s who inherited a multitude of problems stemming from a past imbued with National Socialist rule. The author had noted in 1973, in advance of Salewski, that Buchheim was addressing the individuality of the officers and crews. She does not assure the reader that Buchheim reaches his goal in analyzing the war with his phrase Perversität des Krieges (the perversion of battle) and its effect on those individuals, but his intent in addressing the war was clear.
Chapter 4.5.: The 1980s: Heated Debates

Forty years after Germany’s defeat, a significant percent of West Germany’s active professionals and political leaders were young enough to have no personal recollection of World War II. The emotive and contentious discourse involving Buchheim sharpened as he exercised his media savvy with his own television production about the Battle of the Atlantic, a way for him to distance himself from the movie by Bavaria Films that he openly faulted for its focus on action. This decade also marked the widening of his circle of friends to include artists, entertainers, and world leaders. The idea of international relations with the Federal Republic at that time, as formulated in the speeches of Chancellor Helmut Kohl, was predicated on the acknowledgement by the “new” generation of West German officials that they bore the responsibility for the past. Kohl’s use of the term Wende (turning point) to describe a new intellectual and political awareness was significant, even if the idea of a new intellectual direction and the handling of German collective guilt (Kollektivschuld) were not uniform public policies.

Kohl’s controversial comment that the postwar generation had the “grace of a late birth” (Gnade der späten Geburt), the fortune of being born after the atrocities caused by National Socialism, marked the era as especially volatile in terms of defining justice and bearing responsibility. Gerd Bucerius, co-founder of the German newspaper Die Zeit, posed the question in his own 1985 article whether or not soldiers are murderers. Bucerius used Buchheim’s narrative, at the time best known through Petersen’s film, as his frame of reference. Bucerius' family history, and his own input as to how the question about guilt, participation, and exoneration were to be answered, made up the bulk of the article. Bucerius’ point was that if the generation that remembers the war is not in
agreement about how to remember it, then the younger generations cannot be expected to
reach clarity on it either.

After 1981, Petersen’s cinematic interpretation of the novel, especially after its
record-setting run on German television in 1985 as a mini-series, is often credited in
scholarly circles with drawing academic attention internationally to Buchheim and his
prose, as David G. Thompson has noted.246 Magazines and newspapers reported on
Buchheim with colorful headlines which reminded readers that Buchheim was as a rabble
rouser, albeit with credentials. It is necessary to recognize that the West German press
made a spectacle out of Buchheim. It is suggested here that Buchheim, consciously
complicit in the media attention-grabbing or not, actually wanted to be portrayed as right
but obsessed as a way to draw attention to sensitive issues. The media, therefore, depicted
Buchheim as a truth-teller who sought out such attention in order to achieve his goals.
The side effects of media attention for Buchheim, positive or negative, lead to many
opportunities. Filmmaker Franz Seitz asked Buchheim personally to play the role of the
art dealer Dr. Erasmus in his now classic cinematic adaptation of Thomas Mann’s Doktor
Faustus.247

The varying reactions to the novel by those who experienced the Battle of the
Atlantic and those who were born after it, went a second round worldwide after
Petersen’s film premiered in 1981. Buchheim was on-set as an advisor along with his
former commander Heinrich Lehmann-Willenbrock and made his dissatisfaction with
Petersen’s screenplay known from the time his screenplay was rejected by Bavaria Films
until he deemed the final editing as Hollywood-style nonsense. This new dynamic, where
Buchheim’s work was interpreted by others, as opposed to him having complete
autonomy, adds to our understanding as to how memory “travels,” as Astrid Erll has explained it with her metaphor. When a particular event is witnessed, recorded, and passed on to the public, who in turn uses a new medium to revisit it and rework it, the creation of a forum of exchanges about the past is set. Petersen’s version of Das Boot was targeted to an audience even younger than the one Buchheim intended for the novel. Scenes not in the novel that Petersen inserted on his own accord, such as the “oil rag” scene where Werner’s unwelcomed presence on board is made known when he gets hit in the face with an oil-soaked rag by an anonymous assailant, illustrate this transfer. The director’s dissemination through film of Buchheim’s memoir is an example of how memory of events long gone is no longer communicated by the eyewitness but rather the media form of the times.

Buchheim now stood as much for spreading his message of breaking silence as he did for having chronicled a part of history. In the mid-1980s, the American phase of his traveling Expressionist art collection in Wisconsin provided much positive press in two local papers with local news also covering the exhibit’s content. Buchheim was invited along with other prominent West- and East Germans to Moscow by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1987 to attend the Moscow Forum for Peace. Dealing with the past was, by the late 1980s, a topic of relevance abroad as much as it was at home in Germany. As Gorbachev promoted diplomatic attitudes that broke with the Soviet past, Buchheim and others became de facto ambassadors for the concept of exposing the aftermath of autocracy in its various forms.
Chapter 4.6.: Das Boot in Education

For West German public schools in pre-unified Germany, incorporating the highly sensitive project to overcome the past (Vergangenheitsbewältigung) into the national school curriculum had long since been outlined by the Kultusministerkonferenz (KMK, the Ministry of Cultural Affairs Conference). The non-federal, but highly integral association, was created in 1948 before the Federal Republic was founded and consisted of conferences at which West German ministers of education established ways to reach the educational goal of learning about Germany’s past under Hitler.²⁵¹

This volunteer organization, encouraged by the Allied nations after Germany’s defeat, supervised curricular decisions at the state level. As a system of checks and balances after the decentralization of government in the FRG, the KMK was concerned with how the topic of Hitler’s reign ought to be dealt with in public school education. One of its first publications, Behandlung des Nationalsozialismus im Unterricht (On Treating the Topic of National Socialism in the Public School Curriculum) was an official KMK decree outlining the incorporation of units of study exposing school-aged students to the topic of Germany’s Nazi past whereby the development of critical thinking skills would be enforced.

In 1984, teacher Tilman Grammes authored an article for Diskussion Deutsch, a German professional journal dedicated to sharing curricular ideas designed and field tested for implementation in the public school system. Grammes chronicled the development of a unit on interpreting Germany’s National Socialist past that he based on student interest. The focus of his concept was to capitalize on the enthusiasm of high school students who knew the storyline of Das Boot due to the popularity of Petersen’s
film. At that time, many students had seen Das Boot in the theater but for most it was known as a television miniseries that they wanted to see again together with their classmates in school. The energy among German teens in the mid-1980s for Das Boot inspired “Boot-Partys” (gatherings around the televised episodes of Petersen’s film); as a context, many Germans at that time were already huddled around the television to watch tennis star Boris Becker play, which made for an atmosphere in which the present acted as a segue to remembering the past.252

Petersen’s comments, reprinted in Grammes’ article, help him make the case that the students’ interest was piqued by the setting in both the novel and film. As Petersen had stated in an interview, the plot of Das Boot concerns transformations of young Germans at the height of the war when the Battle of the Atlantic became a showcase of inhumanity practiced by both German and British navies. This was not addressed in scholarly circles prior to British literary treatments of the arena like Monerrat’s 1951 novel The Cruel Sea. Monserrat opened the discussion on how modern naval battles turned two opponents into foes with a common enemy: the ocean that threatened to kill both and cover it up for no one to commemorate. This took the discussion away from British defense and German aggression to tell a marginalized history of what eyewitnesses like Buchheim and Monserrat shared. Historian Marc Milner and others do not see the Battle of the Atlantic as the history of the tensions between the British Royal Navy and the Kriegsmarine (Hitler’s wartime navy).253

To Buchheim, the hunters and the hunted during this war campaign made human life disposable since survivors of non-supply ships and supply ships, the presumed targets of German submarines, were not to be taken prisoner at sea. The generation for whom
Buchheim wrote, those born well into the 1950s, were eager to hear this part of the war generation’s burden. Petersen maintained that the fear U-boat crew had, coupled with their awareness of the inhumane decisions passed on to them from leaders such as Dönitz, were truths that needed to be explored. This was completely different than the trope of servicemen longing to regain something lost while fighting an imminent defeat.254

The popularity of the U.S. miniseries *Holocaust* that also aired in the Federal Republic in 1983 acted as public reflection on the rise of National Socialism fifty years earlier. Grammes saw this as a catalyst for new approaches to the topic in public schools. The use of media in curricular design, which brings with it aspects of production, promotion, and criticism, was essential in fostering student engagement with the topic of Nazi propaganda and military service under Hitler.255

Using Buchheim’s novel *Das Boot* and Petersen’s film allowed Grammes and his students not only the chance to interact with the concept of overcoming the past, the idea appealed to the classes.256 The trend in Germany in the 1980s for lessons about National Socialism was to move away from often outdated textbooks in favor of project-oriented lessons. By that decade, classroom or grade-level excursions to local monuments and the employment of the media equipment of the day, like VCRs, were alternatives to routine curricular readings and allowed for more student input. For his lesson on overcoming the past, Grammes researched a way to link the eyewitness account that Buchheim provided in the 1970s with the same passages from his 1943 book *Jäger im Weltmeer (Hunters at Sea)*. Grammes was able to reproduce many original passages from *Jäger im Weltmeer*, which was published only as author and editor copies by the Suhrkamp Verlag before a
bombing in Leipzig displaced the manuscript. Students read passages from both of Buchheim’s books side by side in order to compare how the author treated his memory three decades later in Das Boot.

The concept behind Grammes’ lesson design was to allow students to step out of the passive role of listener and engage with the material at hand from the point of view they knew best, their own. The lesson goals of forming opinions and discovering backstories to popular works began with the task of addressing where, if at all so, Buchheim’s account was expanded 30 years later by its author. Important to Grammes in the unit design was guiding students to express what the conditions at the time of writing both narratives, separated by three decades, were like for the same author. Grammes facilitated the discussion about Buchheim’s story in both Jäger im Weltmeer and Das Boot that predates the one among intellectuals and laymen after the Piper Verlag’s “reprint” of the surviving editor’s copy in 1996.257

The uniqueness of this student-centered lesson plan is Grammes’ use of Jäger im Weltmeer. The content and format of the book resemble that of Das Boot, but with only one tenth of the full-length novel’s text. Many lines spoken by the men on board were identical to the manuscript for Das Boot. Through the German National Library in Leipzig, Grammes secured passages from one of the few 1943 copies of Jäger im Weltmeer for comparison to the 1973 text of Das Boot.

Grammes tied the intertextual comparison into a secondary round, this time involving the books and the film. Grammes felt that the point of the novel was disillusionment, best illustrated through the words and thoughts of the protagonist named Werner, Buchheim’s literary self. This occurs during his soliloquy towards the end of the
book. For Grammes, the film made use of the bombing of the German-occupied French port at St. Nazaire, the location of the first and final scenes, to mean that the lost war was the outcome of the crumbling Nazi regime. The lost war however, meant that many surviving young adults had to deal with their role in it.258

Grammes’ curricular project bolsters the defense of an aspect of Buchheim’s work that was so often under fire by critics in the late 1970s, that the author’s past as a propaganda reporter insured at least some glorification of the war and submarine captains in the German Navy. Jäger im Weltmeer, the de facto prototype for Buchheim’s account of the past, and his 1973 full version realized as Das Boot, were created three decades apart. That is presumably ample time for the addition of exculpatory passages that would have found praise among navy veteran groups. German journalist A.J. Andreas has noted that there is not a trace of propaganda in Jäger im Weltmeer, but rather an acute level of skepticism in the photos, something a war reporter is instructed to not allow.259

In 1986, just three years prior to German reunification, the intellectual debate erupted as to whether Nazi German history was becoming normalized, the Historikerstreit (historians’ debate). At that time, German naval veterans Karl Friedrich Merten and Kurt Baberg published Wir U-Bootsfahrer sagen nein! 260 Buchheim’s character, and not the details of U-96’s missions, was challenged in the book.261 A self-admitted outsider as a journalist on board U-96, Buchheim was free to move about the ship to take pictures. Merten used photos of Buchheim looking aloof on ship decks as his proof that Buchheim was unreliable as a chronicler of the war. As the decade came to a close, Buchheim felt so insulted talking on live television with German philosopher
Bazon Brock about art, whose interest the former doubted, that he stormed offstage from the popular talk show *Ich stelle mich* in 1988.\(^{262}\)

**Chapter 4.7.: The 1990s: Scholarly Reception of *Das Boot***

In the post-unification years, the topic of historiography and its effect on German public memory was taken up by German intellectuals. In 1993, David G. Thompson argued that the debates brought up by Buchheim by means of *Das Boot* were still in need of academic attention. In Thompson’s reasoning, Buchheim had achieved a brutal revisiting of his past status as a war reporter for himself and his readers. By breaking the long-standing taboos protecting the image of heroism, Buchheim provided a look into the psychology of the German World War II veteran. This was a timely contribution from an area of popular culture because by the 1990s the fate of Wehrmacht soldiers and POWs held captive in the USSR, along with narratives of ethnic Germans expelled from their homelands, were joining intellectual and political concepts of victimization stemming from the conflict. In reference to Buchheim, Thompson has noted that “[u]nfolding the controversy reveals how Dönitz (former commander-in-chief of the U-boats) and his adherents dominated discussion of the naval campaign for nearly thirty years, perpetuating a "heroic myth" which proved more congenial to most veterans than a frank appraisal of their experiences.”\(^{263}\)

An important point in Thompson’s text is his recognition that “the persistence of myths about the U-boat war has much to do with the general failure to recognize that memoirs such as Dönitz' (and for that matter, even official histories) are works of literature, whose meanings depend largely upon style and technique. History written
according to the nineteenth century conventions of the "unified point of view, chronology, and the omniscient narrator" assumes a tone of authority, yet these techniques offer no monopoly of truth."264 Here, many years in anticipation of Rothberg’s idea of the implicated subject, Thompson has shed light on the postwar duality that encompassed Buchheim and Dönitz. It is accepted in academic circles that the scale tipped toward making Dönitz the personality remembered for being an arch-collaborator with the National Socialists who denied unethical actions and Buchheim the figure pointing out the immoral acts that all sides in a war practice. Thompson has left readers of his article with the thought that “many of the U-boat men who survived must have wondered why they had been spared while others had not. For its author, Das Boot was an act of catharsis--more accusation than apology, but an attempt at Vergangenheitsbewältigung nevertheless.”265

The ‘new’ 1996 edition of the book Jäger im Weltmeer followed the respectable success of Buchheim’s second and third books in his submarine trilogy, Die Festung (The Fortress) and Der Abschied (The Parting). Jäger im Weltmeer did not have a welcomed reception from readers outside of submarine enthusiasts. The majority saw the book’s photo montages as the work of a propaganda producer and not an enlightened authority on the effects of National Socialism, especially a self-proclaimed one. To make matters more complicated, the original book design included a forward by Dönitz, which was left out of the reprint. Although the Dönitz forward not making it to the re-release has been argued as suspicious, Buchheim’s inclusion of a quote by author Ernst Jünger, received no little negative attention.266 Buchheim commented that the removal of the original forward was intentional since a forward by Dönitz or other leaders was commonplace in
naval publications appearing during the war and may also have been provided by an approved ghost writer. The original front matter, now eliminated to make way for a new forward by Buchheim, was the concept so that the book’s content could be judged by the public based solely on the text and photos, out of the shadow of Dönitz. It is accepted in scholarly circles, and confirmed by Buchheim, that Peter Suhrkamp not only came up with the title of the book, which was carefully ambiguous, he also talked Buchheim into the book project in the first place. The S. Fischer Verlag needed to produce a book with the potential to sell that at the same time support the guise of Suhrkamp’s compliance with National Socialist party media regulations. The plan did not reach its final stage, adding to the allure of a ‘resurfacing’ book.

The drama that Buchheim attached to the writing process, the thirty years of toil that led him to obsessively pen thousands of pages about a single voyage at sea, is arguably an effective, if not compelling approach, to marketing the novel. This was part of the publication process, at least on the American side, as Carol Brown Janeway and Joan Daves, Alfred A. Knopf’s champions of promoting foreign literature in the United States, already believed when Buchheim caught their attention.\(^{267}\) After the commercially successful 1995 debut of his second novel in the trilogy, *Die Festung*, single chapters in several academic works on various aspects of World War II featured contributions about Buchheim’s literature.\(^{268}\) Hans Wagener’s inclusion of *Die Festung* in his chapter on German postwar literature was the first attempt to treat Buchheim with criticism in light of Salewski’s work.\(^{269}\) The outcome was not entirely negative, although his findings were vehemently rejected later by Mirko Wittwar in 2009. Wagener had pointed out that the significance of the disdain among the crew of U-96 for Hermann Göring, overshadowed
by the focus on denunciation of Karl Dönitz in scholarly articles about Buchheim’s prose, is an important part of the author’s critique of Nazi leadership not just solely for incompetence in leadership but also because of the ideology commanders clung to which was supposed to lead Germany to victory.\textsuperscript{270}

Chapter 4.8.: The 2000s: Transparency

The more recent North American scholarship on Buchheim, written either in German or English, coincided by the end of the first decade of the new millennium with articles published in Europe, culminating with the publication of Mirko Wittwar’s monograph on Buchheim’s Das Boot trilogy, Das Bild vom Krieg (The Image of War) in 2009. Despite the interest in Buchheim in academics that grew up this time, Wittwar’s study is to date only the only full-length book that is dedicated to Buchheim’s view of the war. It is the second book about him since Lothar-Günther Buchheim. Ein ganz junger Künstler, which appeared when the budding author-artist was just seventeen years old.\textsuperscript{271}

In 2000, Frederick J. Harris had studied the role of technology in reading Buchheim. At first glance, it contrasts with the publication by Franz K. Stanzel from 2006, in which the latter analyzed Das Boot for its literary qualities. Despite his focus on machinery in warfare, Harris keeps Buchheim in good artistic company with his comparison of a sea-air dynamic by way of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry’s 1942 novel, set in France two years earlier, Pilote de Guerre (Flight to Arras). The idea of technology imprisoning soldiers on either front below sea level or miles above the battle arena is central to Harris’ study. The steel U-boot in Buchheim’s novel takes on a biological persona of its own according to Harris, but this type of romanticism in the Buchheim’s
narration, more so than in Saint-Exupéry’s case, is abandoned in order to return the reader to a sense of reality in which the technological wonder of the U-boat that drew young Germans into adventure now sealed them into their coffin. Harris’ argument is all the more lucid when one considers that *Jäger im Weltmeer*, Buchheim’s model for *Das Boot*, was completed in 1943 despite not having had an original print distribution.

Harris has noted the ease with which Buchheim is likened to Remarque but the difference in his opinion cannot be underestimated; besides the different world wars represented in the two works, the idea of comradeship also can be mistakenly attributed in *Das Boot* as a point of glorification. Harris has suggested that the U-boat crews reflected less on the cause for which they fought and more on the notion that they had been granted an elite status, which he felt bordered on satire. Due to their leader Karl Dönitz having taken on the high command of the German Navy, his incompetence determined the fates of submarine crews. The drunken rantings of submarine officers in the novel and film are metaphors that support this.

Frank K. Stanzel offers a look into *Das Boot* and its journey into bestseller territory by pinpointing the relationship between it and another successful German war novel, Erich Maria Remarque’s *Im Westen nichts Neues (All’s Quiet on the Western Front)*, a comparison with fruitful outcomes considering that all war novels are problematic to a certain degree. The dramatic ending to both works, when seen for their anti-war message, unfold differently to get the reader to experience the senseless death on the battlefield. Whereas Remarque’s protagonist Bäumer dies in vain, Buchheim’s Werner barely survives and must live with his experiences. Among the most sobering for Buchheim’s U-boat crew is dealing with the command to not take prisoners
on board, making the mission not just the sinking of ships, but the extending of destruction by stranding surviving British crews on their burning vessels. By Buchheim’s death in 2007, printed material, televised exposés, documentary films and online forums with a focus on military history, constituted the body of criticism of Buchheim’s accomplishments; these media productions also provided various interpretations of his declaration to challenge German postwar memory. The following year, the latest edition of Killy’s Literaturlexikon again recapped Buchheim’s achievements and quoted Salewski, stating that the former naval reporter’s mix of work represented an “allgemeingültiges Symbol vieler Erfahrungen vieler Menschen” (all-encompassing symbol of great deal of memories of many people) that helped launch the West German Vergangenheitsbewältigung.

Mirko Wittwar’s 2009 study of Buchheim’s literature, was the first monograph on the author’s prose and also the last scholarly work containing original interviews with the author. Wittwar, fully aware of the foundation that Salewski and Hadley as historians provided to the overall scholarly understanding of the multi-faceted writer, saw the authenticity of Das Boot and the rest of the trilogy as the way in which Buchheim dispelled myths about the war. Wittwar uses the 1995 follow-up to Das Boot, the second installation in the trilogy, Die Festung, as a way to see how Buchheim used the perspective of the artist, his main character Werner’s vocation, as a way to view the breach in ethics that he pinned to the commands of naval admiral Karl Dönitz.

Wittwar’s analysis of Die Festung shed light on one of Buchheim’s main tenets concerning public memory of the war, that the Nazi leadership was never about to offer itself up for the thousand-year Reich that it boasted to have founded. Instead, the Nazi
command sacrificed its youth to the cause, cushioning the fatal blow with propaganda that glorified the ritual of sacrificial death. Buchheim used Das Boot and Die Festung as a forum to counteract the art commissioned by Josef Goebbels. His intention as a writer was to remind readers who lived through the war, and teach those born after it, that the art of individualistic-minded artists was extinguished under the Nazis. It is this claim that Buchheim used to prove to doubters that his own personal ideology was in opposition to the changes in aesthetics the National Socialists made national.

In 2010, the first steps in a non-German production of Das Boot were underway, yet in a media format never before associated with Buchheim’s work, the theatrical stage. The Norwegian change in format and location of an already disputed recollection of a German past corresponded to a profound step in Erll's view of cultural memory, namely that narratives adopted as valid memories within a given culture undergoes an international ‘review’ since no memory stays within the constructs of “nation” or “state”. As societies outside of a given area interact with the cultural memory exported to them by different media sources, associations and evaluations resonate back to the location in question. Buchheim’s effect on West German memory continued to be evaluated across borders for a message that, in Norway’s case, coincided with national efforts by the country to explore its own involvement in World War II.

Buchheim’s effect on subsequent generations was profoundly illustrated in 2012, as former campus newspaper student editor Gabriel Neumann reflected on his interview with Buchheim for Heidelberg University’s publication Ruprecht, conducted almost twenty years earlier. Neumann asked Buchheim about the re-printing of his 1943 photo journal Jäger im Weltmeer. Shortly after Neumann’s interview appeared in the campus
paper, a retort from a reader affiliated with a self-described independent, anarchist newsletter titled *Graswurzelrevolution* (*Grass-roots Revolution*), known only as “Reinhard”, was received and published in the next *Ruprecht* edition. Since the font for the word *Leserbriefe* (Letters to the Editor) was reduced in that edition of *Ruprecht* for layout reasons, the letter from the semi-anonymous Reinhard appeared at first glance to be the opinion of *Ruprecht* editors.278

The letter, apart from the layout oversight, was an immediate red flag. Reinhard wrote that *Das Boot* glorified Nazi Germany and that Buchheim was a Nazi sympathizer. The slanderous letter from Reinhard caught the attention of the German *Verfassungsschutz* (Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution) as well as Buchheim’s lawyers. In the meantime, Reinhard handed out flyers on campus claiming that the *Ruprecht* conducted interviews with the likes of murderous Nazis like Buchheim. Neumann noted in the article that the matter was cleared up quickly for Buchheim’s lawyers but Reinhard was subjected to a phone call from Buchheim himself, arguably one in which legal action against the slander was threatened.

The case that Neumann reported on while at Heidelberg University is significant in that it showed how German students saw Buchheim as of the late 1990s.279 Neumann knew of Buchheim’s art career and bestseller fame, but did not tie him in with politics, past or present. It was now clear to Neumann and the paper’s staff that Buchheim was ready and able to combat any defamation of his character with a team of lawyers against terms like “Nazi” as Reinhard had written. The end of that decade signaled a fading off of familiarity among youths about Buchheim’s career. In that sense, Buchheim’s past no longer qualified as common knowledge to the college-age Germans of that period.
Franz K. Stanzel’s second undertaking of *Das Boot* offered a look into the constraints that surrounded the book and rounded off the scholarly discussions at present about Buchheim’s effect on Germany’s attitudes towards remembering the war. Stanzel has addressed the point that Buchheim introduced the idea of the sea-faring, national enemy Great Britain having been a formidable adversary that was greatly underplayed in Nazi propaganda. Stanzel’s understanding is that the similarities of enemies at war on the open sea, emphasized by Buchheim himself in his self-made documentary from 1985 by discussing Monserrat’s *The Cruel Sea*, leads to the conclusion that the Battle of the Atlantic is crucial for finding an antiwar lesson, although only time allows for such distancing.

The account by Buchheim’s son Yves that appeared in 2018 about his life with his father and stepmother, detailing the family history and their professional dealings in art, was judged as a scathing report rather than a traditional biography by reviewers. As original as a family chronicling about Buchheim may be, that same year saw Gerrit Reichert’s empirical analysis of Buchheim’s life and career, especially his postwar association with Heinrich Lehmann-Willenbrock, the inspiration for the submarine commander in *Das Boot*, known as “der Alte” (“the Ol’ Man”). Reichert’s privileged access to documents and other artifacts housed in Buchheim’s museum, the *Museum der Phantasie*, was granted by the *Buchheim Stiftung* (the Buchheim Foundation). As stated in the introduction to Reichert’s work, the foundation was interested in following through with transparency regarding Buchheim, his art collection and his past. Before Buchheim’s widow Diethild passed away 2014, she revealed to the German government
that Buchheim’s fortune was in Swiss banks where it had never been taxed by the FRG and followed protocol to have the funds declared in Germany and subjected to taxation.

The year 2019 marked the most recent public reference to Buchheim at present when the debut of the new sequel television series to Das Boot on Germany’s SKY channel. The American opening credits to the series credit “Dr. Phil. Lothar-Günther Buchheim” with the baseline story for the sequel, reflecting the honoraray doctorate title from the University of Duisburg that has not been used in the past for crediting Buchheim with intellectual property, such as in Wolfgang Petersen’s cinematic feature film where it is not mentioned.\(^{282}\)

Changes in general public opinion of Buchheim, as well as in the critical reception of his work after his 1973 breakthrough matched the increase media forms that enveloped his base-story. The history of the German Vergangenheisbewältiung involved theory and practice; attitudes towards Buchheim’s stated goals changed with tolerance levels as the West German population faced its past. Looking back at Buchheim’s life and works recalls Aleida Assmann’s notion of the three components of public memory, namely the neural memory of the author Buchheim, the social construct of his memoir sailing over borders and inspiring dialogues about the war, and finally the ancillary projects others based on his narrative.\(^{283}\)

**Chapter 4.9.: Conclusion**

With time, the harsh critical reception of Buchheim and Das Boot waned, producing an acceptance of his narrative as an honest account. Historians like Salewski saw this as the effect of Buchheim’s claim to tell what he believed to be true. Going into
the World War II, the German population had different backgrounds, some survivors and veterans were raised in pro-Nazi households and some grew up with liberal ideals, yet all were subjected to the same war. Buchheim stated in the forward to the 1996 reprinting of *Jäger im Weltmeer* that the war generation consisted of *Beschädigten...und Gebrochenen* (damaged and broken-down people) and meant by this that no one came home unaffected, which is interpreted here as Buchheim’s reasoning for exposing how senseless exonerating entire groups such as the German Navy or the Wehrmacht was. Culturally, Buchheim saw the Germans as living out the lot of the war’s losers in that a German account of the war would be hard to air. Allied authors and influencers of culture could work on the past through the works of Hemmingway, de Saint-Exupéry, and Monserrat, but in Buchheim’s view, Germans were not encouraged to offer their interpretation of the events leading to the war by means of literature. Instead, he felt they were designated a history outlined by the Allied forces.

Professionals like Drewitz and educators like Grammes validated Buchheim’s claim that if glorification is to be avoided, then silence about the war must also end; Buchheim expressed this in his works most clearly in his documentary for German television, *Zu Tode Gesiegt*. Although periods of admiration and antagonism surrounding Buchheim were always present after 1973, Buchheim eventually reached a status where very few Germans associated him with any other activity outside of the authorship of *Das Boot*, a book not immediately thought of anymore as a true story with origins in a 1943 prototype, but rather the basis for a suspenseful film about a likeable crew of underdogs, regardless of the side they fought for.
Chapter 5: The Film *Das Boot* and Transnational Reflections on the Past

Chapter 5.1.: *Das Boot*: A Comparison of the Book and the Film

To director Wolfgang Petersen, the postwar silence of the 1950s meant that there was no moral to the story of Germany’s war-torn past for his generation. In his 1981 film *Das Boot*, Petersen preserved Buchheim’s attempts to show how amoral decisions had been made by Germans and the British navies. Reactions followed from German and non-Germans, liberals and conservatives, survivors and postwar born citizens alike.\(^{285}\) *Das Boot*, like other feature films about Nazi Germany produced in the Federal Republic after 1945, was intended to reach audiences worldwide. The film is described here as a catalyst that linked transnational postwar memories of the World War II in ways that past research on Buchheim has never treated. As is often the case with studio films, the medium itself did not promise that characters and events depicted on camera, or that the plot itself, was true in every detail. The historical past showcased in the film is Buchheim’s take on the war. For both fans and critics of *Das Boot*, the Battle of the Atlantic is less mysterious as a historical war campaign. Although this is an educational side-effect of Buchheim’s eyewitness account, his claim to contributing to Germany’s overcoming its Nazi past was in part his cry for the replication of his memory for others to adopt and a manoeuver that he organized to further steer it. It is argued here that his intention doing so was to allow him to further address the aesthetics he found in war campaigns, such as the silence and the color of the war arenas, and maintain his own relevance to his time for projects he oversaw that are detailed in Chapters 2 and 4 of this dissertation.
Relevance was a goal of Buchheim’s in the sense that postwar German cinema displayed a changing attitude regarding previously untold World War II narratives and unfamiliar eyewitness accounts of lesser-told aspects of the battles. Well-received cinematic adaptations of successful novels existed before Das Boot and they already played a role in reshaping cultural memory. The result of Das Boot’s box office success was the global, public contesting of individual and group recollections alongside Buchheim’s own. West Germans in the 1980s entered a new stage in their state-supported brand of dealing with their Nazi past on a collective level. This was important at a time when the reunification of the two German states was only several years away. The television success of Das Boot as a miniseries in 1985 across the German-German border in the German Democratic Republic was attested to by young viewers, who tuned into West German television at ever-increasing rates.²⁸⁶

Debates in the media in the 1980s by viewers who identified with the protagonists in Das Boot who denounced Admiral Dönitz and Adolph Hitler in specific scenes, eventually spilled into East Germany. As knowledge of the movie spread and its broadcast as a television event made its way into communist East Germany, the intellectual discussion of what the past meant to both states decades later now widened.²⁸⁷

The popular image of the submarine in movies, as both Michael L. Hadley and Linda Koldau have postulated in their respective works, is a trope that they have described as pertinent to postwar social criticism.²⁸⁸ In their train of thought, the submarine reached its zenith in popularity during the Cold War, embodying the level of technology that made it into an atomic masterpiece that world navies rushed to possess. However, it also led to cases of nuclear accidents, leading to skepticism about its true
Regardless of the actual state of submarine ship status over the decades, there were over 150 submarine movies made worldwide.

Media studies as a discipline enriches the field of history since some feature films are conducive to audiences exploring cultural phenomena. The feedback from the general public as to why and how films affect collective memory informs media studies. The transfer of *Das Boot* from novel to movie was achieved by Petersen, outside of an intriguing script, through the use of innovative camera techniques and sound effects that ranked as the best developed at the time. Like many films based on historical fiction, changes in scenes and characters for the sake of the movie’s narrative flow take place. Seeing both forms of the same narrative together though, yields a better idea of what information is seen as most crucial for passing on to others. Past literature pointed out differences in the book and film yet these comparisons are argued here as less vital than two lesser-known ones discussed here.

The first scene from the film set the tone for capturing Buchheim’s denouncing of the Dönitz legacy of loyal, patriarchal leadership in the early 1940s, something that the film’s producers emphasize later as well. It was one vestigial attitude about the war that many scholars felt lasted until Buchheim’s *Das Boot* reached its bestseller mark. The way to show it on camera was difficult to execute on set. Buchheim focused throughout the book on the captain’s beliefs about the orders from Dönitz leading to a near-sacrificial death. For Petersen, capturing this on film in an artistic manner beyond the dialog was important. The solution was realized as a fly landed on the prop photograph of Dönitz that hung by the officers’ table. Remarkably, this iconic scene is only addressed in one
scholarly work by Lukas Bartholomei. The scene, though, is a way in which Petersen reaches the audience without re-stating what could become clichés as dialog.

Buchheim’s relationship to Petersen and producer Günther Rohrbach are a type of “story behind the story” to the filming of the novel. Buchheim was in the role of the eyewitness who wanted to pass on his memory to the postwar-born Petersen. Regardless of how antagonistic Buchheim was on set in his limited role as an advisor, it was Petersen’s mastery of his craft that allowed for the major themes of the novel to transfer to the screen without changing what he felt Buchheim intended in the novel about dismantling the glorification of the war.

As Bartholomei has described his findings:

_Spielfilme sind also vor allem dann für die historische Forschung von großem Wert, wenn man das Geschichtsbild von einer bestimmten Epoche untersuchen möchte. So vermittelt eben ein Film wie ’Schindlers Liste’ nur wenig über die Judenverfolgung im Nationalismus an sich, sondern zeigt vielmehr, wie sich zu Beginn der 1990er Jahre die Filmemacher in den USA die NS-Zeit vorgestellt haben und dies ist mentalitäts-geschichtlich von großem Interesse._

Commercial films are incredibly valuable in historical research, especially if you are researching the attitudes towards historical events that existed during a given epoch. A film like Schindler’s List therefore does not inform audiences any further about the persecution of Jews in Germany during National Socialist rule per se; instead it shows how filmmakers in the 1990s perceived the history that led to it. This is indeed of great interest from the point of view of getting behind the mentality of an era.
A major difference between the book and film emerges from Buchheim’s text. In the novel he raises questions for the reader through the sailors on board. This happens also as a type of preparation for the reader to ponder what the crew says off-the-cuff, in the reality of their time, speaking and thinking the way Buchheim reported them to be. On pages 139 and 169, Buchheim addresses Judaica. The first passage involves Werner’s pondering why a shipmate used the word menkenke (fuss, craziness), a Yiddish term. This scene has never been addressed in any work on Das Boot yet it offers insight into why Buchheim seems, on the surface, to curtail anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany.

This brief dialog lets the reader in on the Berlin natives’ lack of sensitivity for the fact that German-Jewish life had influenced their language and culture in ways assimilation had masked.

The second instance, on page 169, involves not a direct quote from a character, but rather a reference to a folk song sung mainly by children, Es war’n einmal drei Juden (There were once three Jews). The song has at least six stanzas and in some versions many more. Since the song involves counting and repeating syllables, it is used to pass the time, not far from the concept of the American tune Bingo. The inclusion of this scene by Buchheim is argued here as also intentional. The author wanted to further demonstrate how the crew was unaware of their proximity to German-Jewish culture was, even in the micro-society of the submarine’s confines.

Cinematography is widely agreed to have been the twentieth century’s most powerful medium for transporting historically-oriented material that informed the memory of both individuals and audiences. Over the decades since the end of World War II, the movie industry worldwide addressed national memories of the war with a
multitude of viewers in mind. Wolfgang Petersen’s 1981 motion picture adaptation of Das Boot affected both West German and international patterns of remembrance beyond the dichotomy of right and left political criticism. Das Boot is argued here as a transporter of wartime remembrance across boundaries that caused reactions in other societies about on their own national histories. This chapter taps into Erll’s theory of “mnemonic relationality,” the likeability factor felt by audiences in films by first surveying the scholarship on the movie alongside reviews of Das Boot that appeared after it premiered in 1981. Two independent artistic ventures based on the movie produced by non-Germans afterwards will be introduced. The discussion that follows reveals how the plot of Petersen’s movie allowed the facilitators of the two projects, Canadian and Norwegian nationals, to analyze their own respective cultural remembrances of the war. The movie reviews used in this chapter hail originally from the United States, Germany, Great Britain, Canada, France, and Norway. The projects based on Das Boot include a satirical short film from 1984, Das Boobs, by Canadian comedy troupe Second City Television (SCTV), and the dramatic stage production Das Boot created in Norway in 2012. This set of Das Boot-inspired material not only pre-dates the 2018 debut of the televised “sequel” to Das Boot, it informs the field of memory studies that Petersen’s film is the starting point of a process that researchers such as Erll have described as embodying transculturality, the relatability factor given off by a plot to audiences in the film’s home environment and internationally.
Chapter 5.2.: Reception

Erll has described the developments inherent in cultural memory as a process that emerges from the relations, both material and social, between interacting societies. In this vein she sees plot structure, one of her three criteria alongside with distribution and editing, as the driving force that determines how successfully a film shares memories across national lines. In 1973, the novel Das Boot challenged many of the widely-held beliefs about the Battle of the Atlantic. The discussion introduced in Chapter 3 of this dissertation over whether or not the book relayed an anti-war message as Buchheim proposed resurfaced with Petersen’s screenplay for the 1981 film. Noteworthy in that step was the change in generations from Buchheim to Petersen since the latter explained his role as that of a storyteller. This wartime-to-postwar generational shift was a process that created discussions in open forums about the war at a time when the number of eyewitnesses to that battle campaign began decreasing and the number of young Germans seeking firsthand accounts from those who lived through the war increased.

Most of Das Boot takes place underwater in the submarine, which produced the wanted claustrophobia that audiences felt. Facets of the film such as the violence of war attributed to male-dominated European society and the yearning for adventure by the naïve new recruits have been highlighted in the existing critical reception of Das Boot. For scholars who contemplated the state of German national cinema after the war and its claim as a way to analyze the past, Das Boot presented challenges in Petersen’s portrayal of the nationalistic crew as the underdogs in what seemed like a thrill-seeking American action movie.
Das Boot the film has been analyzed from different angles in popular articles as well as in academic works since it premiered in 1981, albeit not beyond the scope of an essay or a chapter in another work. Scholars and critics agree that Petersen intended his film to register as a contribution to the post-war German anti-war film genre. However, they have largely overlooked the film’s transcultural reach. Part of the marketing for Das Boot was Buchheim’s anecdote that he guarded the film against offers from Hollywood producers whom he believed would ruin any of his antiwar messages in the novel by replacing it with action scenes. Other promotional endeavors for the film included interviews with Petersen taped during Wilhelm Bittorf’s on-set documentary film Die Feindfahrt von U-96 (The Patrol of U-96). From 1980 to 1985 Bittorf chronicled Das Boot in his magazine articles for Der Spiegel from the movie’s pre-production stage through to its television run. Bittorf’s ties to the popular magazine Der Spiegel initiated much media hype. He released his own documentary in 1981 that he made on-set as Petersen shot the movie. Buchheim later created his own separate documentary as per a licensing agreement but he used the forum to give his own backstory to the Battle of the Atlantic and didn’t mention Petersen’s film at all. Bittorf’s articles promoted Das Boot without question as if they were Buchheim’s own press releases, but they included statements from British viewers from the BBC to illustrate the international appeal of the film.

For Buchheim, additional success was bolstered due to the symbiotic boost in public interest that his prose created for the film, and vice versa. The sparse but serious scholarship that developed in response to the movie’s reception abroad. The most comprehensive academic attention paid to Petersen’s Das Boot is found in the
publications by Linda M. Koldau, Brad Prager, and Hester Baer. The motif of the U-boat after World War II itself is significant, as Koldau has posited, in that the rise in interest in submarines marked an attitude shift internationally. In her view, popular culture showed a renewed intrigue in an old fascination concerning ships constructed for extended undersea operation. She has concluded that submarine-themed interest groups in online public forums have “fanbases” that attract other lay U-boat aficionados from across the globe. This particular extension of modern warfare, the undersea boat, is as much a point of intrigue for the technically-inclined as it is for the military history buff. Koldau has cited Hadley’s use of the term “Buchheim-Welle” (Buchheim-wave) to indicate a revival of submarine themes in movies and books after Das Boot’s success. Buchheim commented on his former obsession with the idea of submarine technology, a point he emphasized in his self-made documentary Zu Tode gesiegt (Victoried to Death) from 1985.

Koldau’s chapter on Das Boot outlines her theory that Buchheim created a microcosm of German wartime society within the U-boat U-96. On board are loyal Germans, at least one self-identified Nazi, and later many Germans who are guilt-ridden due to their proximity to Nazism. Petersen captured this in his film but his final casting of popular actors and unknowns for the film was the key to developing audience responses to the characters. The split reactions among the German book reviewers as to the level of fact versus fiction in both film and book were akin to the acute sensitivity levels of 1970s German society, as Koldau has summarized it. The mix of public upset and rekindled interest in an anti-war trope aimed at the public and not at academics led Koldau to the conclusion that Buchheim tore down what other postwar novels and films had built up,
namely a façade of a glorified past in this particular battle arena and he did so without apology or excuses about being “Nur-Soldaten” (soldiers just doing their duty).

Koldau’s words “Buchheim-Debatte” (Buchheim-debate), used in reference to the revisionist history that grew in the 1980s, targeted the idea of Buchheim having sidestepped broader discussions of German war guilt. Buchheim’s critics questioned the degree to which Das Boot handled war guilt amidst its claim to review the past. Koldau has concluded by means of veteran U-boat crewmember statements that convincing postwar diagnoses, such as the existence of a German “Unfähigkeit zu trauern” (inability to mourn), became the de facto description of West Germans accepted anywhere until the late 1970s. In her closing, Koldau has noted that the initial mixed reviews in Great Britain and the United States still have to be seen in light of the movie being a product of 1980s filmmaking trends. In his mostly pessimistic review of Das Boot, British reviewer Richard Combs had stated in 1982 that the film was made by Germans to be “acceptable to their ex-foes”. This is, even in a negative review, a sign that foreign audiences sensed how they were part of a larger dialog that put aside identifying Nazis and focused on the tragedy induced by the Battle of the Atlantic. American critic Lenny Rubenstein had underscored the relationship between the revered film version of Monserrat’s The Cruel Sea and Petersen’s film as a way to see Buchheim’s narrative.

Historian Brad Prager has described the 1959 movie Die Brücke (The Bridge) by Austrian filmmaker Bernhard Wicki as the production, albeit not a submarine movie, that paved the way for the antiwar message that many feel Das Boot delivers. Wicki’s film, itself the focus of numerous scholarly works in film- and German studies, was also based on an autobiography. Writer Georg Dorfmeister supplied the story for the movie that was,
like *Das Boot*, also nominated for an Academy Award. The film dealt with the idea of German youths yearning for their chance to serve their Fatherland. As American troops drive the Wehrmacht back though, the boys face certain death. They are even criticized for their attempted heroism as only one traumatized boy returns home.

Prager’s view of *Die Brücke* having acted as an ice breaker of sorts allowed West German audiences to take on the idea of guilt and exoneration vicariously. The cinematic portrayal of nationalistic, naive youths corrupted by a military state acts in Prager’s work as a precursor to this same theme as it manifested itself in *Das Boot*. In his analysis, Prager has tied in Frankfurt School philosopher Theodor Adorno’s judgement that “we will not have come to terms with the past until the causes of what happened then are no longer active” with an acute remark by psychologist Peter Homans. The latter stated that choosing to not work through the past is the same as continuing to choose fascism.

Taken in this manner, Petersen’s claim to use cinematography to reach a new level of clarity (*sich gesundheitfilmen*) as an attempt to create a meaningful, but also successful film in the Hollywood tradition, mirrors the efforts of Joan Daves, who secured the American publication rights to Buchheim’s novel at the Alfred A. Knopf publishing house in the 1970s. Daves, who championed the publication of German authors in the United States after World War II, helped keep Knopf on the forefront of current thought by way of literature in translation. Like Petersen’s sense for the antiwar message in Das Boot’s plot, Daves knew when sharing narratives through prose could act as a bridge between cultures on the mend politically.

Prager has observed the theme in *Das Boot* pertaining to the individual and the intricacies of loyalty that he or she inherits at birth from the state. Buchheim defended
the idea that individuals could be praised for their military service, but not groups. This is, as Prager has written, because Buchheim acknowledged the existence of Nazis and non-Nazis, unlike the tendencies of an apologist. Prager has described the identification with the submarine’s loyal but Nazi-criticizing captain that Das Boot viewers undergo parallels the crew’s admiration for him even as it was clear to them that their deaths were imminent. To Prager the captain remained Buchheim’s metaphor for the good German soldier. In her 1982 review of Das Boot for the New York Times, Janet Maslin wrote about the Hollywood influence on the film and on Petersen, but noted his very un-Hollywood move to end the film on a grim note where everyone perishes, driving home his antiwar message “in no uncertain terms.”

For Hester Baer, Das Boot represented a turn in German filmmaking in the 1980s, one she has described as neoliberal. The films from that decade took on topics told from different perspectives than expected. Her term reflects the association of the 1980s with economic and societal movements that aimed to break with established views. In this regard, she has described Das Boot as the forerunner of the idea at that time that German film is popular while serving a conservative agenda. This stance, which arguably still prevails at present, is interpreted in this dissertation chapter as being akin to the same intersection in public outlook mentioned by Assmann in her historiography of memory studies and cultural identity. Baer has concluded that World War II is removed from a larger political context in Das Boot so that viewers focus on the inner workings of the crew’s destiny in the senselessness caused by the fighting. She has noted that the film “ultimately recoups male defeat, so that privileging male lack becomes an affirmative
strategy in representing World War II and the Nazi war machine.” Hence the men involved can only blame themselves and their leaders for the death they face.

Baer, like Prager, referred to Klaus Theweleit’s book *Männerphantasien* (Male Fantasies) when they described the almost exclusively male representations onscreen as a psychological review of the World War II period as it was seen by the 1980s. The weaknesses of Western male-dominated societies, and the hierarchies germane to them, are well-suited for scrutiny in the submarine trope. The need to review the war in light of these aspects of modern society was noticed internationally in that decade and not long after, satire magnified the analysis.

Chapter 5.3.: SCTV, Canadian Satire, and Das Boot

As Sabine Hake has summarized, the idea of a national cinema creates illusions for the researcher. Her overview of the industry informs us that the actual impact of popular or critically-acclaimed films on public memory is somewhat misleading. Hake has noted that in Germany’s case the element of the “national” is both the driving force, and the intended outcome, of its film industry. Petersen’s goal was to create a German film about a strictly German past whose core narrative was nonetheless a tale of the human condition, accessible to all audiences. This section considers a satirical television sketch from Canada, Das Boobs, that has never been addressed in the existing critical work on Buchheim or the global impact on remembrance provided by Petersen’s movie. The inclusion of the comedy sketch in the discussion about Das Boot shows how the movie displayed a much wider spectrum of influence than previously documented in academic circles. Important to note is that after 1981, a postwar-born generation
completely outside of Germany used the setting of the movie in a unique ways to examine aspects of their own cultural identity.\(^\text{328}\)

Buchheim maintained throughout his career that the Battle of the Atlantic was especially heavily laced with Nazi propaganda. To him, the German public’s association of heroism with the campaign continued to shroud the horror that scarred its survivors. Fear amongst crews and claims of amorality from U-boat commanders were masked by photo reports of industrious sailors as Buchheim had been ordered to create. To Buchheim, the Nazi-produced reality glorified their service well and the feelings many veterans had about the senselessness of Nazism and led them to quickly suppress their experiences after returning home. This carefully crafted propaganda, in many ways an extension of the militarism so readily accepted in Germany society long before the war, was addressed in the novel and in the film as being so influential in preparing the increasingly younger crews for service. Buchheim spoke with a hint of irony when touring for *Das Boot*, which he promoted as a “*Roman aber kein Werk der Fiktion*” (a novel, but not a work of fiction).\(^\text{329}\)

Irony, itself a component of satire, is a part of studying historical remembrance that has not been fully addressed in analyzing reactions to Buchheim’s tale.\(^\text{330}\) The Canadian parody of *Das Boot* signaled a moment when the memory transportation of the original film reached a point of international contesting whereby modifying the “facts” from the original film lent itself to non-German reflections on cultural history. Eventually, the idea of using humor to see difficult pasts would become more widely exercised in modern media.\(^\text{331}\)
SCTV’s skit serves as an example of how parodying *Das Boot* stemmed from the serious nature of the movie’s setting yet still addressed the idea of remembrance. In 1984, the Canadian television sketch comedy aired *Das Boobs*. The satire poked fun at the English-dubbed version of *Das Boot* that North-American audiences would have recognized. The spoof capitalized on the idea of voiceovers for the “foreign” SCTV short film to add further irony and sustain a much-wanted level of culture shock with the dubbed audio with viewers. The skit is billed to the television audience as having been part of a fictitious international film festival. Elements of the *Das Boot* trope, such as the steadfast but humane German commander, and the ship’s coming-of-age crew, were prominent features of SCTV’s parody. The behavior of the teenage sailors, exaggerated by grafting Peewee, the main character from Canada’s largest grossing comedy up that year, the sophomoric B-comedy film *Porky’s*, set the tone for the skit’s message of how national histories were being debated in media like film and whether they provided sources of pride or pain for their citizens.

In *Das Boobs*, two female sailors are introduced onboard the submarine in time for the ship’s next mission. This scenario hints at the classic observations regarding all-male paradigms made in serious articles applied to *Das Boot*. With females on board, the men are now surely doomed since their ability to deal with their own shortcomings will be even more exaggerated within the context of the stifling U-boat environment.

The parody by North Americans is significant in that it touches upon the idea of cross-cultural remembrance. It departs from a positive global sharing of history by making the “Germans” on camera all delusional in some way or another. The interpretation here is that the spoof still recognizes one of the main points defended by
Buchheim and Petersen, namely that National Socialists sacrificed the very male youths they indoctrinated in a senseless war that the party’s elite knew they had little chance of winning. Noteworthy is that no sympathy on the part of the Canadian comedians or viewers for the German crew is needed for this to be conveyed. The two cultures do not have to be in agreement about the perspectives of the sailors to see that a pathetic lot during the war also applied to the Kriegsmarine. Under the extreme conditions associated with the Battle of the Atlantic, first and foremost, was the excommunication from land and the invisibility of their more than competent adversary, the British Royal Navy. From the perspective of Buchheim’s writing, it is in this war campaign that the blindly nationalistic German adolescents realized the sure death bestowed upon them by the Third Reich.

The relevance of SCTV’s Das Boobs is that an independent comedy troupe with vast North American media exposure applied satire to a widely popular German trope aimed at revisiting the idea of Germany’s own victimization during the war. The focus in the sketch on the ribald atmosphere in the vessel and the blending of American pop culture from that era into the “dubbed” crew created a multi-tiered distancing from history. In remembrance, humor was used “as a weapon” as Erin Hanna has described typical SCTV spoofs. By portraying Germans as they did in the spoof, the comedians indirectly send a message about how Canadian cultural identity finds satire in seriousness. Hanna has cited Stuart Hall’s definition of a society’s cultural identity as being fluid. This lends itself to SCTV’s comedic style. The writers of Das Boobs uses the “foreign language” feel of the mock film to distinguish Canadian identity. Since watching an original-language version of the film would rarely have been the tradition
among audiences in North America, the spoof allowed for a cleverly formulated Canadian reception of German remembrance.338

In critic Jay Scott’s review for the Canadian newspaper *The Globe and Mail*, Petersen is quoted as having said that much of the military consisted of “young, naive kids who fell for stupid propaganda.”339 The reviewer’s words are then “the subtext is that it could never happen to him [Petersen], or to us.” SCTV’s *Das Boobs* revisits that thought through its over-the-top plot with similarly naïve characters. Scott’s review also suggests that Petersen wanted viewers to “step away from it [war] and feel superior to it, without having implicated ourselves.” Rothberg’s theory of the implicated beneficiary, in this context, picks up on sentiments like Petersen’s above that postwar German generations had by the 1980s about insiders like Buchheim who strove to create debates about World War II. In Petersen’s statement, the implication is that the war is no longer a threat but the storyteller or film director and audience member still can make sense of the guilt, complicity, and even honor that existed then.

French-Canadian culture responded more somberly to the mood of *Das Boot*. As one Canadian film reviewer has noted, “*Petersen ne filme pas le bateau, mais le drame humain à bord*” (Petersen isn’t filming the boat but rather the humanity within it), and that “*la quasi-totalité du filme se passe à l’intérieur du sous-marin il n’existe pas de hors-champ à l’intérieur de cette coque, l’immolation du peuple allemand sur l’autel de la guerre conformément du vœu de Hitler* (almost all of the movie takes place inside the submarine, there is no the exterior to the hull, the wartime altar upon which the Germans are immolated according to Hitler’s will).340
Chapter 5.4.: Das Boot on stage in Norway

The 2012 Norwegian mainstage theatrical production of Das Boot, written and directed by Kjetil Bang-Hansen, established the first non-German, but fully authorized manifestation of Buchheim’s narrative in a different medium. The stage play, adapted for the theater by Bang-Hansen and approved by Buchheim’s estate, was officially the first production within the “Das Boot franchise” that had no possibility of being addressed by Buchheim himself. Decades after its run in the 1980s, the film Das Boot was well received at a film festival in Norway with laudations such as “en reise til utkanten av forstanden” (a journey to the edge of sanity). Similar praise for Bang-Hansen’s stage production followed its premiere in Oslo.

The irony of Oslo as the site of Bang-Hansen’s premiere, since it was one of the stops detailed in Hanns Johst’s Nazi travelogue Maske und Gesicht discussed in Chapter 4 of this study, is seen here as also highly indicative of the links between “national” histories. Bang-Hansen has described his project as “…en tøff oppgave å dramatisere dette. Vi har en ubåt som ligger stille, den går ikke opp og ned, og vi er ikke i vann. Men poenget har vært å stille materialet i et nytt lys” (...a tough job to turn it [the film] into a stage play. We’re dealing with a submarine that is lying there totally still, it’s not going up and down and we aren’t surrounded by water. However, the point was to cast new light onto the material at the heart of the play.). In expanding on that idea, Bang-Hansen has expressed that “[k]ritiske røster til selve prosjektet å lage teater av ‘Das Boot’ hørte vi aldri. Det antimilitære aspektet er nok så sterkt at eventuelle prinsipielle innvendinger forstummet. Tvert i mot tror jeg dristigheten i å oppføre Das Boot på scenen var en del av suksessen.” (We never heard any protest about making Das Boot
into a play. The anti-military aspect is so present in the plot that it stifled any objections. In contrast to that, I believe that the audacity of the switch to the stage was a huge part of its success.).

In her review from 2013, Idalou Larsen has placed the book and film above Bang-Hansen’s play but her observation that the staging conveys “en utvilsomt imponerende realisme, som til en viss grad klarer å formidle det fredsbudskapet som Kjetil Bang-Hansen tydeligvis ønsker å gi oss” (an undoubtedly impressive realistic tone, which to some degree captures the antiwar message that Kjetil Bang-Hansen clearly wishes to pass on to us). Critic Therese Bjørneboe has written that Bang-Hansen gave the submarine in his stage play a Norwegian name, by which he “fordreier antikrigsbudskapet til enda en gang å handle om nordmenn som ofre” (plays with the antiwar message to make Norwegians the ones sacrificed). After 2012, Norwegian interest the Nazi occupation of its past resurged with a sharp focus on changes in art and institutions, as Gregory Maertz has posited. Even though 2008 was a milestone for Norwegian occupation in film with the premiere of Max Manus (Man of War, Joachim Rønning, dir.), critically acclaimed movie and television productions reflected the national inventory of Norwegian behavior during the war with Kampen om Tungtvannen (The Sabateurs, Per-Olav Sørensen, dir.) in 2015, Kongens nei (The King’s Choice, Erik Poppe, dir.) in 2016 and Den 12. Man (The 12th Man, dir. Harald Zwart) in 2017.

As Clemens Maier has observed, Canada and the Scandinavian countries provided examples of veterans and postwar generations who experienced the widening of cultural remembrance in their respective lieux de mémoire (sites of memory, commemoration) even if at different times and rates after World War II. Maier has drawn the conclusion
that in both Canada’s and Norway’s postwar remembrance histories, veteran unrest due
to the changes in approach that museums in their countries initiated regarding
remembrance led to public disputes. In 2005 the Canadian War Museum in Ottawa
openly questioned the ethics of Allied bombings of Germany, which led to cries for
boycotting from insulted Canadian veterans. In Norway, the balancing out of
victimization with collaboration ushered in new exhibits and materials at the
_Hjemmefrontmuseum_ (Museum of the Home Front) that Maier has named as a type of
“new moralism” where the postwar generation tried to compensate for the loss of
knowledge after the war due to marginalization stemming from the focus on guilt. This
made the Norwegian experience more akin to the national project in Germany to
overcome its past.

Chapter 5.5.: The Power of Television

In 1985, _Das Boot_ aired on German public television as a miniseries with bonus
material added that never appeared in the theatrical version. German weekly magazines at
the time promoted television programming with zeal. The news and cultural hub _Der
Spiegel_, through the contributions by documentary filmmaker and journalist Bittorf,
became a megaphone for _Das Boot_. The widely distributed popular magazine _Bild
Zeitung_ posed the controversial German psychologist Christa Meves why so many
mothers in the 1980s cried while watching _Das Boot_. Meves compared the lot of the
German submarine U-96 in the story, and its crew, with the phenomenon of human
gestation.
The vessel’s hull was the main setting featured in Petersen’s vision, just as it was in Buchheim’s bestseller. For weeks on end leading up to its final mission in 1941, the steel housing of U-96 served as the full-time environment for the doomed naval unit during the Battle of the Atlantic. In Meves’s understanding, this dynamic took on the aura of a metaphysical embryo submerged in the amniotic fluid of its mother. The comparison of U-96 with an endangered embryo Meves had envisioned it, opens the discussion as to the actual function that Petersen’s award-winning adaptation of Buchheim’s book served within the framework of West Germans dealing with their Nazi history. The movie *Das Boot* was, as indicated by the accolades and skepticism about its director’s claim to show what war was like for young Germans, demonstrates Erll’s view about German-made movies and their ability to shape public memory. *Das Boot* presents the viewer with a trope in which devoted young fighters who realize that the error of their ways was to a great extent their own fault, whether from arrogance, ignorance, or blind loyalty to autocratic power.

The potential for suspense that submarine films offered audiences has been a benefit to filmmakers recounting the past by means of this genre’s representation of a microcosm, hence *Das Boot*’s transfer from an original purely German narrative to one accepted on a broader, international level.\(^{352}\)

Meves reached for a classically Freudian-based imagery to bolster her explanation of why the film evoked a maternal instinct among its German female viewers as they watched the fates of the main characters unfold on-screen.\(^ {353}\) In 1995, Hadley had pointed out that Meves’ finding revealed how “surrogate mothers were weeping for surrogate sons”.\(^ {354}\) This reaction to Meves’s take on the plot represents how part of dealing with a
fraught past may mean empathy in places where it is least expected. Petersen asserted to British interviewer David Childs in a 1982 interview alongside Das Boot star Jürgen Prochnow that he and the movie’s financers wanted to see what was “behind this heroism.” This indicates how National Socialism was meant to be dealt with in the film, heroism included, although the manner in which this was accomplished --audience identification with German submarine crews-- was an early critique of the film in many countries.

It is important to note that Meves was referring to the 1985 televised version of Petersen’s film in her analogy. Petersen has noted that the German reception of Das Boot after its 1981 premiere was not encouraging at first. Its box office momentum, though, picked up as nominations for international film prizes were announced. This matches the theory that Rothberg has defended, namely that public memories are not involved in a “zero sum game” with one another wherein one singular interpretation of the past wins out, no matter how popular the medium is. Empathy towards an unusual protagonist is something legitimately felt by movie audiences watching historical fiction films, often regardless of viewers’ sex or age. It indicates an opening in collective mental processing whereby a narrative coming from the margins or from another culture may be told and validation given, albeit at different paces and for different reasons in terms of an audience’s relationship to the plot’s historical context. Rothberg’s concept of the implicated beneficiary, which addresses historical figures who neither caused harm to others yet profited in some capacity from their status, is explained in the first chapter of this dissertation for its relevance to Buchheim.
In alignment with the tenets of memory studies, there is evidence that *Das Boot* possessed the traits that Erll associates with the complicated processes of public memory formation, among which is repetition and reenactment of an event and the eventual adaptation of its content. Meves’s assignment of a mother-fetus motif to the ship was her way to explain popular feelings about the film since it placed the concept of guilt or fault temporarily aside in order to address the topic of loss. Public tolerance for this approach to understanding the past was a path taken in the 1980s in West Germany by individuals and groups who remembered the horrors of the World War II and those who wanted to know why it was not common knowledge. Not until the film’s last scenes did the full significance of the de-emphasis of German guilt become clear. The content of the screenplay was, despite Buchheim’s insistence to the contrary, generated from his fictionalized personal account as much as a filmmaking techniques could convey.

**Chapter 5.6.: Conclusion**

*Das Boot* in its forms as a 1973 novel and a 1981 film meets the criteria that Erll and other historians concerned with memory studies have determined as the route that modern media productions take as they become widely known after much contestation to become accepted into larger circles of remembrance on a collective level. Buchheim opened the *Museum der Phantasie* (*Museum of Fantasy*) in Germany, his own museum, shortly before his death. The facility not only houses and curates his collection of formerly banned Expressionist paintings, it makes *Das Boot* a link to the past for the German public by featuring the photos and manuscript-related written works that led to the novel’s publication.
In terms of overcoming the past, Buchheim’s attempts to widen the public’s perspective on what Germans felt while fighting the war but were later silenced or marginalized, turned into a type of franchise. Erll and others have described transcultural memory as the eventual adoption of the narratives of others, countrymen or not, due to a factor in the film, book, or other artifact that audiences respond to in a positive way. Once Buchheim became a success after Das Boot hit the bookstores globally, he could then return to projects focusing on the effects of Nazi control over art and aesthetics in the Third Reich. The marketing for Das Boot in any of its forms, even at present as a new streaming miniseries, created a branding for Buchheim, Petersen, and the networks carrying the continued narrative.357

Making a franchise out of a historical epoch risks negating what history as a field of study strives to accomplish, namely discover new links between accepted findings. The entertainment industry, as it applies to film and television in particular, runs the risk of being an overproducer of input that unintentionally clouds public memory. Buchheim went to great lengths to state that he represented the truth and he effectively disseminated his account, even if it was openly contested by opponents. Novelizations of history, even if autobiographical, were always raising skepticism as to whether they worked in serious contexts of teaching about history.

Buchheim and Petersen are intertwined in the history behind Das Boot to the point where few people distinguish between book and film; the streaming series Das Boot that started in 2019 will also likely replace the memory of the film and book. Memory can be transnational but also fickle; Buchheim’s stated fear of forgetting as a way to introduce the importance of remembrance was a good, dramatic selling point for his
novel; it also indicated how remembering one experience always involves letting other
details fall to the wayside.
Chapter 6: The “Future” of the Past: Empathy, Honesty, and Truthfulness

Buchheim, a former insider to the Nazi propaganda machine who professed decades later to clear up misunderstandings about the horror of war, is a valuable subject of scholarly investigation. His honesty about his military service and his particular portrayal of officers and crews in Das Boot took on harsh critique and caused widespread skepticism because Germany’s national endeavor to master the past was a constantly developing phenomenon and a fraught topic. Buchheim’s creative works and lifetime achievements found a controversial place in West Germany’s collective memory of World War II. In order to make what he called an anti-war statement in his writing, Buchheim was upfront about the path he took to survive the war. To address the political guilt that he and others harbored, he made a convincing case for his version of the past as the real memory, but at the cost of fellow U-boot veterans and others who criticized Das Boot.358

As revealed in Chapter 1, Buchheim kept Germans in the Federal Republic, and eventually people around the globe, debating the viability of multiple national wartime recollections. Thirty years after the war ended, it was by resuscitating an exhausted literary genre that Buchheim’s personally stylized interpretation of the Battle of the Atlantic presented readers with a way to evaluate public recollections of Nazism. His narrative, fictionalized but agreed upon by many as accurate, evoked empathy in Germany and abroad.

The Vergangenheitsbewältigung, Germany’s emotion-laden national task of facing its Nazi history, was an unprecedented collective goal during the twentieth century. With it came a great imbalance between the philosophy that drove it and the
social preparedness of the public to undertake such as a reflection. The anguish that Buchheim caused the West German public, especially his fellow eyewitnesses to the war, was a side-effect of his attempt to overcome the past that came without much warning. In light of this unrest, the endeavor to master the past on a public level brought about unease at different times as memoirs appeared at different rates and discussions on formerly taboo topics became openly addressed with the appearance of new films and interest in the Holocaust developed.

Chapter 2 of this study explored Buchheim’s early years and the influences in his life that shaped his character by the time he was ordered to board U-96 as a war correspondent in 1941. Buchheim is argued as having benefited from a unique set of privileges during the war due to his artistic abilities. Despite his obligation to the propaganda division, he maintained a level of aesthetic expression in his work for them that many after the war saw as atypical. In Chapter 3, Buchheim is described as having advertised himself as an eyewitness to the inner world of Nazi propaganda materials. He used this imagery of himself as having “come clean” as he published *Das Boot*. Due to a growing interest in books about equal rights, world sustainability, and challenging the values of the pre-1968 generation, Buchheim’s perspective on the Nazi era was seen by others as right for the times, and he found an audience in many areas of the globe.

The backstory to *Das Boot* and the marketing of the novel used Buchheim’s initial enthusiasm for Germany’s mobilization during the Battle of Atlantic in 1941 as a bond to others from his generation. Buchheim is remembered for claiming that he went through an honest appraisal of his own attitude as a young, highly recognized *Kriegsberichterstatter* (war reporter). His purpose in doing so was to transmit a sense of
transparency and responsibility as a storyteller. Buchheim’s statements about his stated goals as a writer who sought to overcome the wrongdoings of the Third Reich shed light on how elusive the blueprint for debating the past was to the historical actors of his time.

As indicated in Chapter 4, opinions about Buchheim’s reputation and his circle of friends over time shifted. Buchheim was an ex-propagandist with a great deal of connections to Promis (prominent figures) in Germany and elsewhere, while to others he was a former child prodigy with a talent for capturing aspects of life across the media conducive to battling commonly held myths about German history. That both views of Buchheim existed is telling in that memory studies suggest how contesting the “truth” is never a smooth process. The far-reaching success that Petersen’s Das Boot achieved was shown in Chapter 5 to be an important piece of research connecting Buchheim to the transnational memory studies scholarship. Using the terminology that Astrid Erll, Aleida Assmann and others have developed, it became clear why non-Germans also questioned the validity of their national postwar narratives as Norway did. As a way to begin these difficult national self-reflections, the plot structure of Das Boot served as an example of an account that was meant to serve this purpose. 360

The framework in research for the present study supplied by use of the implicated beneficiary theory helped explain Buchheim’s actions over a significant amount of time. Buchheim’s particular duty during World War II afforded him the experience to form an opinion of Germany’s past that needed to be disseminated to the public. After the war, he spoke about how West Germans were not unknowing victims of Nazi control. Instead, Buchheim saw the war as making victims out of all sides and he worked to show how the glorification of groups like submarine divisions meant prolonging the myths that
shrouded an honest appraisal of the past. Those who critiqued him in the 1970s turned to questioning Wolfgang Petersen after 1981. After the film debuted, they focused on the director’s risk of the audience anywhere identifying with characters fighting on the “wrong” side. Petersen was adamant about recreating an atmosphere for audiences that could elicit such feelings if present-day judgements about the war were to truly not interfere with the plot.

Mirko Wittwar has highlighted the significance of analyzing the Das Boot for its role as literature created to help Germans contemplate the past. Buchheim used the motif of the German Navy submarine crew, cut off from the rest of the world but often remembered as bravely filling every waking minute preparing for battle, as a way to convey a different reality for readers. Wittwar has noted that Das Boot is Buchheim’s attempt to explain an aspect of modern warfare that he saw as crucial to understanding the scope of Nazi ideology. Buchheim attempted to show that the German military was groomed to experience war as a modern, technological phenomenon requiring their passive acceptance of the orders from Dönitz and others under Hitler. Buchheim’s pictures and words therefore let the reader experience the irony of seemingly productive, youthful, duty-fulfilling crews who spoke energetically of action in 1941 only to lose three-quarters of their military branch a short time later.

A further dimension provided by the implicated beneficiary theory was framing how the behavior and attitudes displayed by Buchheim related to Germany’s postwar political history over the years and accounted for his success in popular literature. Alongside West Germany’s endeavor to revisit their collective understanding of the Nazi era were episodes of social and political unrest which further complicated the times. The
conclusion drawn here is that Buchheim’s de facto slogan about his role as an insider who became a truth-teller eventually appealed to younger Germans, especially as the turbulence of the late 1960s culture took hold and generational conflicts escalated.

Political literature in Germany in the 1970s like *Das Boot* addressed the sentiments of the readers growing up at that time. Influencing the youths of the 1970s were the introduction of the *Notstandsgesetze* (German Emergency Acts) in 1968, which were steeped in controversy since they gave the federal government control in a state of emergency, overriding individual rights. Waves of terrorism were felt in Germany at that time, such as in the case of the Red Army Faction (RAF or “Baader-Mainhof Gang”), and rallies against German rearmament and environmental issues took hold.363

The relationship that Buchheim’s work has to the overall concept of *politische Literatur* (literature addressing political issues) as Helmuth Kiesler and Christine Lubkoll define it, is seen as justified since it was not just political in scope, but also used literary techniques to create a narrative.364 The identity of an artist, which for Buchheim formed the core of his consciousness throughout the stations of his life, was also that of the main character in one of his two children’s books titled *Onkel Max* (Uncle Max).365 The main character, an artist whose entertaining episodes of forgetfulness form the narrative, was an attempt to engage young Germans with the ideas of trusting one’s memory. An unusual literary genre for Buchheim at first glance, the book is impossible to separate with its author’s goal as a writer addressing public memory.

German writer and philosopher Hans Magnus Enzensberger once stated that postwar German society saw its share of *Gratismut* (advice given after the fact without risk).366 Even if not directly applied to Buchheim, the term is worthy of consideration
given the questions his critics had in light of what he did and did not accomplish with his writing, career and connections. This study has shown that Buchheim’s prose and related works were based on his eyewitness accounts, but emotionally, they were much more than experiences of the past, the opposite of Enzensberger’s observation.

As Susan Neiman has stated, postwar Germany’s focus on the victimization that Nazism caused for its own citizens, if shifted onto the victimization that National Socialism caused for others, has the potential to be a lesson for all times.367 Buchheim’s attempts to evoke a sense of empathy among readers worldwide by being truthful was a risk that yielded certain successes and also retained some shortcomings. As Neiman has pointed out, victimization is a human trait. She maintains that if one nation can cease from describing its own citizens as victims of the trauma it caused, a model for political responsibility for other societies is formed. Buchheim’s aim was to portray the war generation as possessing qualities that were admirable on an individual level, but collectively, they searched for the same faulty sense of glory after the war. In the 1970s, Buchheim’s train of thought arguably contributed to the idea of overcoming the past. As the narrative of Das Boot continues to be retold, it is likely to relate its original message of getting past victimization by demystifying public memory so that the plight of others affected by Germany’s past is ultimately recognized.
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153. Edda Ziegler, 100 Jahre Piper, 282. See the following footnote, the title translates as Glorious, glorious shall it be one Day but is based on the American English text by G.F. Root. The translation is my own.

155. This sentiment exists in many articles but is also an editor’s point of view. See Edda Ziegler, 100 Jahre Piper, 282-283.


159. Mark W. Rectanus, German Literature in the United States (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1990), 90.


166. Author Johannes Mario Simmel and publishers Klaus Piper and Albrecht Knaus contributed their memories of interactions with Buchheim’s book project in Hans Brög et al., eds., *Kaleidoskop*, 1998.


171. Kurt Baberg and Karl Friedrich Merten, *Wir U-Bootfahrer sagen: "Nein!" So war das nicht!” Eine "Anti-Buchheim-Schrift* [We U-boat crews say, “No! That’s...
not how it was!” An anti-Buchheim publication], Coburg: J. Riess Verlag, 1986. This is stated in Michael L. Hadley, Count not the Dead. The Popular Image of the German Submarine (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1995). Heinrich Lehmann-Willenbrock’s response to Buchheim regarding the novel Das Boot was “Deine große Arbeit war der Mühe wert.” (Your project was well worth the effort.), a compelling statement from an agent of the actual battle reflecting on Buchheim’s novel years later. In “Bomm-Tsch-Jwumm” [Boom-Shh-Vom], Der Spiegel, August 13, 1973, 98.


174. Details about the chronology of various receptions to Das Boot, many of which contained quotes by Buchheim, can be found in Franz K. Stanzel, “Literarische und historische Anatomie eines Bestsellers: Lothar-Günther Buchheims Das Boot,” Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift, No. 56 (2006): 204.

175. Buchheim stated in interviews that he was expecting 3,000 copies to be the first printing total, a far number from the 50,000 initial run. Buchheim’s point is that he
thought his first guess would have matched the actual readership consisting of fellow veterans. The interest was estimated to be much higher by both the German and American book markets, see Mirko Wittwar, *Das Bild vom Krieg: Zu den Romanen Lothar Günther Buchheims* (Berlin: Rhombos Verlag, 2009), 27.


179. This will be examined in the following chapter of this dissertation.


181. For a complete discussion of ‘degenerate’ art as well as the issues the National Socialists saw in terms of modernization and modernism, see Jonathan Petropoulos, *Artists under Hitler: Collaboration and Survival in Nazi Germany* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 19-27.
182. Buchheim’s words were, "fraglos ein Denkmal, im negativen Sinne ein Dokument für das Dritte Reich." The other personalities questioned were in favor of tearing down the building, Abendzeitung, January 13-14, 1990.


184. There are over 350 works belonging to this genre as per Peitsch, “Towards a history of Vergangenheitsbewältigung: East and West German War Novels of the 1950’s,” Monatshefte 87, no. 3 (1995): 289. The 1980 and 1988 reprints of Herlin’s Damned Atlantic are mentioned by Hadley as being significant in showing how few U-boat books before Das Boot reached the postwar generation in a manner where they maintained relevance in an antiwar context for readers. In Michael L. Hadley, Count not the Dead. The Popular Image of the German Submarine (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1995), 152.

185. Buchheim’s initial publications were monographs of various modern artists and the catalogues for his exhibitions in his first art museum in Frankfurt, established together with his first wife, Geneviève Militon. Yves Buchheim, Buchheim: Künstler, Sammler, Despot. Das Leben meines Vaters (Munich: Wilhelm Heyne Verlag, 2018), 155-158.

186. Buchheim’s Das Boot and Herlin’s Freunde were both adapted for cinema.


189. Denouncing Dönitz was a technique to demonstrate a lack of any hero worship or glorification of war in these narratives. Fothergill and Witwarr will be used later for their interpretation of the notion of the *Heldenepos* debate.

190. There is a time span of thirteen years between the 1960 novel version of Herlin’s *Verdammter Atlantik*, which appeared as a chapter series in Germany’s *Stern* magazine in 1958 and Buchheim’s book *Das Boot*, which was available for sale in 1973.


193. The references that Buchheim’s submarine commander, *der Alte*, makes to Dönitz and the decisions imposed on submarines under the admiral’s reign are central in establishing the anti-Nazi attitudes of Werner, The Ol’ Man, and others on board. This will be explored in the chapter analyzing Wolfgang Petersen’s cinematic interpretation of the novel. The function of focusing on Dönitz in *Das Boot* is best explained by Mirko Wittwar in Mirko Wittwar, *Das Bild vom Krieg* (Berlin: Rhombos Verlag, 2009), 66.


196. There is no English language edition, I translate this title as the Waves gave rise to new Days.

197. Due to meager finances, Buchheim’s trip was well under the one-thousand Reichsmark limit set for travel outside of Germany. However, a written invitation from the Hungarian government to visit a youth organization there was helped Buchheim obtain a passport.

198. Although this was mentioned by Buchheim in numerous interviews, it is alluded to in letters to him by a former girlfriend in 1940, Christine Hoffmann. The State Archive in Munich confirmed for Gerrit Reichert that Buchheim had no less than three addresses just prior to his enlisting, which corroborates Buchheim’s narrative of not receiving the first letters while still a student. Gerrit Reichert, Buchheim 100 (Feldafing: Buchheim Verlag, 2018), 247.


207. The translation is my own; the original quote is “Dokumente sind etwas für Historiker. Die müssen sich an Dokumente halten, weil sie keine Zeitzeugen sind. Und werden so zu Lügnern: Weil in Dokumenten nie die Wahrheit steht.” In “Ein Phantom aus dem Ozean der Geschichte,” Ruprecht Heidelberger Studentinnenzeitung, 45, (1996). Viewed online on October 11, 2018 at https://www.ruprecht.de/wp-
Buchheim did not recognize oral history, which would have broadened the definition of “document” significantly.


209. Fothergill, *Secret Sharers*, 194. Fothergill linked Buchheim with writers such as Sebald who continue the quest to not let guilt stand in the way of remembering even that which is painful.


211. This observation, which also has historical reflections in German politics of the 1980s, created discomfort for some people during discussions about Nazi Germany. Torben Fischer and Mattias N. Lorenz, eds., *Lexikon der “Vergangenheitsbewältigung” in Deutschland: Debatten- und Diskursgeschichte des Nationalsozialismus nach 1945* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2007), 9.

212. In this view, there is no particular decade after the war that accomplished more or less in terms of public projects or events to overcome the past than any other but rather each one presented ways to deal with new challenges from within and outside of West Germany. Martin and Sylvia Greiffenhagen, eds., *Handwörterbuch zur politischen

214. Salewski, Wagner, and Witwarr emphasized this point in their respective works; see their works cited in this chapter.


216. The prior chapter deals with the various aspects of Buchheim’s art and the articles from the German popular press surrounding his goal of founding his own museum for modern art.

217. Buchheim was either lauded for his efforts or captured at his worst on television. The series’ title/episode is Ich stelle mich: Lothar Günther Buchheim, WDR, 1988. Buchheim lashed out at another personality, the regional board member and Feldafing mailman Andreas Nebel on Titel, Thesen, Temperamente, ARD, 1988.


220. A singular incident in 1945 regarding an alleged gasoline theft from American forces in peacetime ended his brief elite status in October of that year. Buchheim was appointed “Chief of the M.G. Police of Feldafing” by the American military in Germany, making him in service of Allied officers in his hometown after the war. Buchheim served six months of a one-year sentence at the Justizvollzugsanstalt in Kaisheim in Bavaria. The case was first described by Yves Buchheim in his memoir *Buchheim: Künstler, Sammler, Despot. Das Leben meines Vaters* published by the Munich-based Wilhelm Heyne Verlag in 2018 and also presented by Gerrit Richter in *Buchheim 100* (Munich: Piper Verlag, 2018), but was mentioned by Buchheim himself in 2001 in *Der Abschied (The Parting)*, the third novel of the *Das Boot* trilogy, whose manuscript was started in the 1980s.


222. The translation is my own. Militon’s testimonial to Schreiber’s character was centered on proving that he was not a Nazi. Militon’s citation, translated literally into English, is without emotion (None of his pictures were propaganda).


225. “Akademische Schinken” [Academic hams], Der Spiegel, 8. See Chapter 2 of the present study for the background to Buchheim’s association with Suhrkamp and the S. Fischer Verlag.

226. Hans Gerhard Evers, Das Menschenbild in unserer Zeiten. Darmstädter Gespräche [The image of mankind in our time] (Darmstadt: Neue Darmstädter Verlagsanstalt, 1950), 144. Art historian Hans Sedlmayr spoke in Darmstadt against modern art by calling it symptomatic, which Baumeister, Buchheim, and others, saw as propogating former Nazi aesthetics. For Baumeister’s work in this area beyond the talks in Darmstadt, see Axel Schildt and Detlef Siegfried, Deutsche Kulturgeschichte: Die Bundesrepublik von 1945 bis zur Gegenwart [German cultural history. The Federal Republic from 1945 to the present] (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 2009), 86-8.


228. The translation is my own.


231. Buchheim’s life and career, and the criticism of his productions, demonstrated that many Germans were remembering the war differently yet actively engaged with confronting the past. This is an extension to the time frame that Robert G. Moeller has noted regarding the 1950s and 1960s. As Moeller has formulated, there was a


234 Mirko Wittwar, discussed later in this chapter, notes that Salewski does not analyze Das Boot as a text, but rather the reactions to it.


238. Ingeborg Drewitz, ibid., 151.
239. Ingeborg Drewitz, ibid., 152.

240. Ingeborg Drewitz, ibid., 152.


249. Barbara Buenger, email to the author, July 10, 2020. Buenger gave talks during the exhibit’s run in Wisconsin, which was unprecedented in scope. She said that during the Soviet run, the paintings had been hung according to Buchheim’s exhibit plan but overnight the Soviet colleagues rearranged the exhibit according to a color scheme. Buenger speculated that this was to lessen the impact of the genre on the Soviet visitors.

250. Walter Paper highlighted the notion of change in the Soviet Union under Gorbachev and the inclusion of German writers and scientists with the former group of professionals having more impact on the event than the latter. Walter Pape, “Vita Nuova. Moscow and the German Writers”. In Keith Bullivant, Geoffrey J. Giles, Walter Pape, eds., *Germany and Eastern Europe: Cultural Identities and Cultural Differences* (Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 1999), 174.


255. Tilman Grammes, “‘*Das Boot’: Eine Unterrichtseinheit*”, 434.

256. Tilman Grammes, “‘*Das Boot’: Eine Unterrichtseinheit*”, 434.


259. Buchheim provided the reprint forward and writer Alexander Rost supplied the commentary at the end, where the reference to Andreas appears. Lothar-Günther Buchheim, *Jäger im Weltmeer* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe Verlag, 1996).


264. David G. Thompson, ibid., 72.


266. In the afterword, Alexander Rost explains the eventual disdain the Nazis had for Jünger, making his poetic offerings about duty and loyalty all the more ironic as a choice. For recent discussions on the topic, please see Andreas Huyssen, “Fortifying the Heart: Totally Ernst Jünger's Armored Texts” in *New German Critique* 59, Special Issue on Ernst Junger (Spring - Summer, 1993): 3-23.

267. Please see Chapter 3 of this dissertation for the full discussion.

268. Among others, the research of Michael Salewski, David Thompson, Hans Wagener, Mirko Wittwar, Franz K. Stanzel, and Gerrit Reichert are mentioned here.


270. Hans Wagener, “*Von Böll bis Buchheim*”, 333.


272. In 2006 Stanzel wrote a chapter dealing with the concept of ambiguity in representations of war. In his line of thought, Stanzel described how war novels, unlike
graphic works like painting and sculpture, fall short of depicting the “total war” since the
narrator, if in first person, must find a way to reach readers upon dying with all others in
Parallelen und Analogien in deutscher und englischer Marinesprache und Propaganda.”
In Gunst, Claudia and Thomas Schneider, eds. Krieg und Literatur Jahrbuch XV11. Von
Paraguay bis Punk: Medien und Krieg vom 19. bis zum 21. Jahrhundert (Goettingen:

273. Fothergill has analyzed how Conrad’s influence on works in this genre led to
comparisons of the latter with Buchheim, at least in the US book market. Conrad is
mentioned in Das Boot because he was banned as reading material when Buchheim
served on U96 in 1941. Anthony Fothergill. Secret Sharers: Joseph Conrad’s Cultural
Reception in Germany (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006).

274. Wilhelm Kühlmann, ed., Killys Literaturlexikon. Autoren und Werke

275. Mirko Wittwar, Das Bild vom Krieg. Zu den Romanen Lothar-Günther
Buchheims (Berlin: Rhombos Verlag, 2009), 176. Wittwar’s analysis of the scene in Die
Festung in which Rodin’s sculpture The Burghers of Calais is compared by
Buchheim/Werner to the National Socialists’ inability to place themselves in front of
their constituents is different from that of Hans Wagener, who interpreted the scene as the
statue representing the fate of Germans as a whole.


278. The letter claimed that the reprint was the doings of a fascist; the members of “Graswurzelrevolution” denounce Buchheim further at https://www.graswurzel.net/gwr/1997/02/die-weltliteratur-des-faschistischen-mannes/.


280. This was addressed by both Stanzel and Witwarr, see works cited list.


Reichert’s book is a production of the Buchheim Verlag, commissioned by the Buchheim Stiftung that oversees Buchheim’s Museum der Phantasie in Bernried, Germany. As stated in the book, which accompanied the exhibit with the same name in celebration of the museum founder’s birth a century ago in 2018, a transparency regarding Lothar-Günther Buchheim’s past was initiated through the artifacts presented during the homage.

282. Buchheim’s honorary doctorate was given by the University of Duisburg in 1985 for his contributions to art history (Professor doctor honoris causa). Art historian Hans Böhm was head of the committee that supervised the academic verification. Hans Brög, letter to the author, November 27, 2019.


284. In Chapter 3, I mention Buchheim’s suggestion to recognize a degree of glorification for individuals who displayed comradery and condemned Nazi leadership, but exoneration for the German Navy as a whole was never mentioned (*den einzelnen Mann glorifizieren, die Einpeitscher aber decouflieren*, glorify the individual, but down with the leadership.). His portrayal of the vulgarity and perverse behavior of the navy saturated his prose in *Das Boot*. Buchheim’s idea of reality was bringing the fear,
immorality and self-importance among young Germans then to light since that is what the postwar silence stifled in his view.


287. Hadley has noted that East German popular culture was focused on denouncing the German Navy under Hitler without any efforts to exonerate any parties within it. In Hadley, Count not the Dead, 136.

288. See Hadley, Count not the Dead, 146, and Koldau, Mythos U-Boot, 144.

289. The final novel in Buchheim’s Das Boot trilogy was Der Abschied (Munich: Piper Verlag, 2000), which took place aboard the Otto Hahn, a nuclear ship retired from service and serving as a transporter, captained by none other than Heinrich Lehmann-Willenbrock, the captain of U-96.


293. Lothar-Günther Buchheim, *Das Boot* [The Boat] (Munich: Piper Verlag, 1973), 139 and 169. A major question about Germany’s reckoning with its Nazi past is the normalization of the Holocaust. After Ronald Reagan’s speech in Bitburg, Germany, for the recognition of the Wehrmacht soldier, this debate gained momentum. As stated in the introduction to this dissertation, Buchheim and the postwar authors sought to address single aspects of the war for their readers. Buchheim, though, planted the passages on the pages listed above to have the reader him- or herself question the relationship between Jewish-German culture and mainstream German culture. It is maintained here that a “mythology” in postwar narratives skipping over Jewish genocide that some see as having developed in the 1980s does not include Das Boot if the book is properly reviewed. See Eric Rentschler, “The Use and Abuse of Memory: New German Film and the Discourse of Bitburg” in *New German Critique* 36 (1985): 67-90.

294. An important distinction to make in contributions to the field of memory studies is that of the types of memory recognized in the discipline. Cultural memory is found in artifacts and in the practice of rites, making it known to “insiders” of a culture.
295. Although it is outside the scope of this chapter, media and cultural studies as fields have researched the relationship between film and audiences. Theories range from descriptions of the “audience” as a construct to more concrete approaches. Ian Christie, *Audiences* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press), 1997.

296. For a comprehensive list of submarine motifs in historical settings, literature, folk and popular music and popular culture in general, see Linda Maria Koldau, *Mythos U-Boot* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010), discussed in this chapter. Former French ambassador Jean-Pierre Brunet found *Das Boot* to have captured the very same experience he had onboard French submarines during World War II. In Hans Brög, Diethild Buchheim, and Hans A. Neunzig, Hans A., eds. *Kaleidoskop für Lothar-Günther Buchheim zum 70. Geburtstag von seinen Freunden* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1998), 28.


300. The film has been studied for its message about war, its use of music and sound effects, as well as psychological aspects of submarine service. See Brad Prager, “Beleaguered under the Sea: Wolfgang Petersen’s Das Boot as a German Hollywood Film” in Light Motives: German Popular Film in Perspective, Randall Halle and Maggie McCarthy, eds. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2003) 237-59.

301. Articles written after 1981 will pay homage to the film if they are geared towards the novel, such as in the case of Mirko Wittwar’s recent monograph, Das Bild vom Krieg. Zu den Romanen Lothar-Günther Buchheim (Berlin: Rhombos Verlag, 2009). Film studies such as those of Brad Prager and Hester Baer, cited in this chapter, acknowledge differences in the two in terms of scenes and script.

302. The studies by Brad Prager, Hester Baer, and Michael Hadley in the works cited section are germane to this chapter. Both the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany produced films after the war dealing with National Socialism as well as German anti-Semitism. Wolfgang Staudtes’ Die Mörder sind unter uns had appeared already in 1946. Further East German milestones in the genre are represented by Nakt unter Wölfen (Naked among Wolves) in 1963 and Jakob der Lügner (Jakob the Liar) in 1975. In West Germany, Die Brücke (The Bridge) premiered in 1959, Der Blechtrummel (The Tin Drum) based on Günther Grass’s novel with the same title in 1977, Das Boot in 1981 and Das schreckliche Mädchen (The Nasty Girl) in the 1990s. The new millennium ushered in Die Harmonists (Comedian Harmonists) and Der Untergang (Downfall) in 1997 and 2004, respectively. DEFA, the former state-owned, East German film company, produced postwar films addressing anti-fascism and German

303. Buchheim was adamant against the film falling into the hands of Hollywood moguls out of concern that he would not be allowed to provide the script, to say the least. His book Der Film Das Boot detailed aspects of Petersen’s film that he felt were not up to his standards but still allowed for an indirect acknowledgement of the overall quality of Petersen’s intentions. In Lothar-Günther Buchheim, Der Film Das Boot: Ein Journal (Munich: Goldmann Magnum, 1981).

304. Wilhelm Bittorf, “‘Das Boot’.’ Als Wahnsinn imponierend” [Das Boot. An impressive level of insanity], Der Spiegel, December 29, 1980, 78-87 and “Der lange Atem dieser Irrsinns-Odysee” [The endurance of this Odyssey of Insanity], Der Spiegel, February 18, 1985, 191-266.


306. “Das Meer ist das Fruchtwasser” [The open sea is the Amniotic Fluid], Der Spiegel, 1985.

Koldau has surveyed the motif as it existed in forums online, in social organizations, and in international cinema. Koldau, *Mythos U-Boot*, 12. The exhibit in North Germany, *100 Jahre deutsche U-Boote (The German Submarine at 100 Years)* is also a sign of public tolerance for topics once reserved for veteran groups or select audiences. Director John McTiernan’s *The Hunt for Red October* (1990, Paramount Pictures) and Johnathan Mastow’s *U-571* (2000, Universal Pictures) are two examples of the popular image of the submarine reminiscent of Petersen’s *Das Boot*.


Koldau is referring to the widely debated study by Alexander and Margarete Mitschlerlich, *Die Unfähigkeits zu trauern. Grundlagen kollektiven Verhaltens* from 1967.


Brad Prager, email to the author, January 7, 2020. A single, undefined search on IMDb (the International Movie Data Base) yielded more than fifty hits.


317. For a detailed chronicling of Daves’s role in this history, please see Chapter 3 of this dissertation.


322. See Chapter 1 for Assmann’s statement on the 1980s as an important time for German cultural identity.


324. The 1977 book Männerphantasien (Male Fantasies) by Theweleit is cited by Baer and Prager as again being relevant to their articles. The thesis professed by Theweleit revolved around the socialization process needed to produce fascist males. With females on board, the men are, according to Theweleit’s thinking, now surely doomed since their shortcomings will be even more exaggerated within the context of the stifling, all-male U-boat environment.


326. Sabine Hake, German National Cinema (New York: Routledge, 2007), 4-5.

328. A sense of total integration within Europe did not materialize. Responsibility among German filmmakers even after German reunification was not part of an official policy but rather their own attitude. In 1992 Petersen and fellow filmmakers Michael Verhoeven, Volker Schlöndorff and Werner Herzog protested a decision made by the German Film Export Union (since renamed the German Films + Marketing GmbH) not to nominate the critically acclaimed film Europa, Europa as that year’s entry as Germany’s bid for the Academy Awards Oscar in the Best Foreign Film category. The directors expressed their support for director Agnieszka Holland and their disdain over the organization’s referring to the film as not being German due to its mix of financial backing, its having been shot in Poland and its use of other languages throughout the film. Bernhard Weinraub, “German Film Makers Express Support for “Europa,”” The New York Times, January 28, 1992, 11. There are over seven production companies listed for the film besides Bayerische Rundfunk, www.imdb.com/title/tt0099776/.

329. See Chapter 3 of this dissertation for the novel’s history and marketing details.

331. Parody, satire and humor in relation to World War II, especially the Holocaust, was explored by Mel Brooks in the documentary *The Last Laugh*, Tangerine Entertainment, 2016.

332. The idea has been applied to trauma before but in the case of *Das Boot*, not directly regarding parody from non-German sources. As an example of the scholarly interest, see Jill Twark, “Approaching History as Cultural Memory Through Humor, Satire, Comics and Graphic Novels.” *Contemporary European History* 26 (2016): 1-13.


338. This sentiment was captured in a review from 1983 in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* by Ann Kolson titled “Cable’s lure translates into dubbed ‘Boat.”


341. Buchheim died in 2007. It is not possible to know whether or not Buchheim would have allowed the granting of rights to a stage play at all.


347. The art exhibit at KODE in Bergen, Norway, ran from 2015-16. The topic of what the treatment of art in this historical context says about our view of it was an important segue into other topics such what the Nazi stance on art and artistic creativity
shows in light of assumed categorizing into “German” or “degenerate” art. See KODE.

Art exhibit in Bergen, Norway. https://kodebergen.no/en/exhibitions/art-battle and

Gregory Maertz, “War art/Art War. Wehrmacht Modernism in the Context of Official

German and Norwegian Policies in World War II” in Art in Battle, Frode Sandvik and


348. See Clemens Maier, Making Memories: The Politics of Remembrance in

Postwar Norway and Denmark (Florence: European University Institute, 2007), 387.

Museums and other institutes are prime examples of such sites; Clemens notes the

Canadian War Museum (Montreal Holocaust Museum) in Ottawa and the

Hjemmefrontmuseet (Norwegian Resistance Museum) in Oslo, mentioned in his study.

349. Maier, Making Memories, 392.

350. Ibid., 393.


According to the article, sixty percent of all households in West Germany with a
television confirmed having seen the televised version of Das Boot. The original quote is

“Schiffe sind symbolisch der Uterus (Gebärmutter). Und, logisch: Das Meer ist das

Fruchtwasser.” The translation is my own.

352. Buchheim, for all the confrontations that he instigated or against which

defended himself regarding the accuracy and honesty behind his novel, was eager to see

whether anyone else could get the irony in publishing a personal history that readers

would adopt as their own take on the past. Buchheim claimed that he used his own view

of the war as a way to get others to shed any last element of propaganda that would cloud

their understanding of National Socialist ideals. To Buchheim, Salewski understood the
entire project’s point. Buchheim’s words were “Sie haben glanzvoll formuliert, worum ich selber mich immer wieder tastend bemühe” (You formulated perfectly why it is that I even bother to type anything up at all). Gerrit Reichert, *Buchheim 100* (Feldafing: Buchheim Verlag, 2018), 211. The translation is my own.


354. Hadley, *Count not the Dead*, 159.


356. Please see Chapter 1 where Rothberg’s concept of the implicated subject is described.

357. The 2019 televised continuation of *Das Boot* is owned by Sky Deutschland and claims to use the plots of both *Das Boot* and Buchheim’s sequel novel, *Die Festung* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1995).


359. Rothberg explains how early attempts in Germany to deal with the legacy of Nazism was understandably built around the dichotomy of victim-perpetrator model which he feels limits the investigation. The fist attempts to reduce the predominance of psychoanalysis in viewing Germany’s Nazi past is perhaps best exemplified by Karl Jaspers in Karl Jaspers, *Die Schuldfrage. Von der politischen Hoffnung Deutschlands* [The question of German guilt. Germany’s political hope] (Munich: Piper Verlag, 1965).
Jasper originally published his text in 1946, based on his lectures. Psychoanalysis was the main method in 1967 when Alexander and Margrete Mitscherlich published their influential study *Die Unfähigkeit zu trauern. Grundlagen kollektiven Verhaltens* [The Inability to Mourn: Principles of Collective Behaviour] (Munich: Piper Verlag, 1967).


362. Irene Kacandes and Marianne Hirsch are cited in Chapter 1 for their work on relaying trauma narratives. See also Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), for the discussion about how narratives about trauma are relayed in comparative literature, in particular regarding war.


365. Buchheim wrote two children’s books with *Onkel Max* being directly related to his efforts to confront German collective memory. Lothar-Günther Buchheim, *Onkel
Max (Feldafing: Buchheim Verlag, 1961) and Jackie, das Rennpferd (Feldafing: Buchheim Verlag, 1962).


Bibliography

Primary Sources


Secondary Sources


Baberg, Kurt and Karl Friedrich Merten, Wir U-Bootsfahrer sagen: "Nein! So war das nicht!" Eine Anti-Buchheim-Schrift [We submariner say “No! That’s not how it was.’ An Anti-Buchheim-Publication] (Grossaltingen: Reiss Verlag, 1986).


*Der Spiegel*. “Das Meer ist das Fruchtwasser” [The ocean is the amniotic fluid]. March 11, 1985.


Grammes, Tilman. “’*Das Boot’: Eine Unterrichtseinheit zur Auseinandersetzung mit einer Form deutscher Vergangenheitsbewältigung’*” [The Boat. An educational unit for confronting a type of overcoming Germany’s past]. In *Diskussion*


Harris, Frederick J. “War at Sea: Technology in Buchheim’s *Das Boot.*” *CEA Critic* 63, no. 1 (2000): 27-35.


Hüppauf, Bernd. “Emptying the Gaze: Framing Violence through the Viewfinder.”
New German Critique 72 (1997): 3-44.

---. “Schlachtenmythen und die Konstruktion des 'Neuen Menschen’.”
In Keiner fühlt sich hier mehr als Mensch... Erlebnis und Wirkung des Ersten Weltkriegs. Edited by Gerhard Hirschfield, Gerd Krumeich Gerd and Irina Renz.
Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 2006, 43-84.


Klee, Ernst. *Das Kulturlexikon zum Dritten Reich. Wer war was vor und nach 1945* [Cultural Dictionary of the Third Reich. Who was who before and after 1945]. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 2007.


Memory Studies Association, homepage at www.memorystudiesassociation.org.


Prager, Brad. “Beleaguered under the Sea: Wolfgang Petersen’s Das Boot as a German Hollywood Film.” In Light Motives: German Popular Film in Perspective, edited


Robbins, Jeff. Second City Television. A History and Episode Guide. Jefferson:


Scott, Jay. “Germans tell their side Old-fashioned war movie, with a twist.” *The Globe*
and Mail, April 3, 1982.


**Archival Material**


Buchheim, Yves. Telephone conversation with the author, 2019.

Buchheim, Yves. Email correspondence to the author June 17, 2019.


Kjetil Bang-Hansen, email to the author, October 22, 2019.


Neumann, Gabriel. Email to the author, October 15, 2019.


VITA

Name                        Dean J. Guarnaschelli

Baccalaureate Degree        Bachelor of Arts,
                            SUNY at Buffalo
                            Buffalo, NY
                            Major: Anthropology and German

Date Graduated              September, 1990

Other Degrees and Certificates Master of Education,
                                  SUNY at Buffalo
                                  Buffalo, NY
                                  Major: K-12 Foreign Language
                                  Education, NYS Certification in
                                  German

Date Graduated              February, 1994