The question of disabled veterans of the Great War has many aspects: the surgical advancements stimulated by the war; the post-war social reintegration of invalid ex-service men; their political role; the social acceptance of disfigured bodies. All European countries shared a huge number of dead and disabled, to the extent that the interwar period has been described as a process of collective mourning.\(^1\) The integration of maimed veterans was not only a medical, political and economic question, but also a cultural and educational one. Belonging to a country that had won or lost the war was a key point. In France and in England the community supported invalid veterans, who were recognised as symbols of national strength.\(^2\) In the Weimar Republic, on the other hand, they became a symbol of defeat. So whereas the welfare policy in favour of war invalids was very poor in France and England but the social recognition was high, in Germany the war’s victims were totally protected and integrated in the work system, but were also socially marginalised by the community, not being recognised with visible rituals of thanksgiving. Being considered victims of the war instead of heroes, they incarnated the humiliation of the defeat in their shattered limbs, rather than the pride of courage.\(^3\)

This paper focuses on the Italian case in general, and on the work of the Italian orthopaedist Riccardo Galeazzi (1866-1952) in particular. Galeazzi’s pioneering work for the rehabilitation of maimed soldiers and his ideas on repairing bodies as well as minds will be compared to the approach of the German orthopaedist Konrad Biesalski (1868-1930). The latter was one of those doctors and orthopaedists who did
not confine their work to medical cure, but extended it to educational care and social provision, an approach deemed progressive at the time. To illustrate the relationship and the difference between these two giants in the field we will first go back to their attitude towards born cripples. We will underline Galeazzi’s debt to Biesalski, but also his originality, particularly in the role played by work in education and rehabilitation and in repairing not just bodies, but also minds.

**German Educational Views On Cripples’ Education: Biesalski and Würtz**

When Germany declared war, Biesalski was already the reference point for cripples’ education. Paediatrician, orthopaedist, surgeon, he cared about the destiny of the lame and the cripple. He was the author of an analytical census about young cripples published in 1906. The study showed that nearly 100,000 young Germans (under 15 years old) were deformed, a number that meant that the total number of cripples in Germany, young and adult, rose to circa 500,000. In spite of the fact that Germany could boast the first school for crippled boys (Technische Industrieanstalt für krüppelhafte Kinder), opened in 1832 in Munich by Johann Nepomuk Edler von Kurz with private means and taken over by the Bavarian State in 1844 (now named Königliche Zentralanstalt für Erziehung und Bildung krüppelhafte Kinder), the number of homes for lame, paralysed and deformed people in Germany was limited to 39. Only 3,371 places were therefore available, a hugely inadequate number. In 1906 in Berlin Biesalski opened his Home for the cure and education of cripples (Krüppel-, Heil- und Erziehungsanstalt für Berlin-Brandenburg, then named Oskar-Helene-Heim) that became famous, thanks also to the work of the teacher Hans Würtz (1875-1958), who joined Biesalski in 1911.

Biesalski advocated social provision and legal recognition for crippled people and spread his ideas in the German Union for the Cure of the Cripples (Deutschen Vereinigung für Krüppelfürsorge), founded in 1909, in which he soon became a leading figure. He strongly defended the right of deformed people to be considered “infirm”, but also to receive special education and job training. He rejected mere assistance and believed in the importance of linking medical and surgical therapies with educational action in special and vocational schools in order to make cripples able to earn their living. He eventually managed to see his ideas materialise in the German Law of 6 May 1920. This law accepted his definition of cripples as infirm, thus eventually recognising their right to receive help from the state.

Biesalski distinguished between the feeble minded, who could not reason properly and therefore could not work, and cripples, who could not work because of physical deformation. It was thus possible to train the latter in order to enable them to earn
their living instead of begging. They would be recognised as citizens, since they would be taxed like other healthy people. Darwinist conceptions crept in in the idea of “useful” and “non-useful” people, who were a burden for society. Being able to support themselves and to pay taxes was for Biesalski the way for cripples to obtain equality. Striving towards this aim, he believed that not only had the deformed body to be cured, but the soul too. In this respect he was influenced by Würtz, who was the theorist of the \textit{Krüppelpädagogik}. Würtz thought healthy people were utterly different from deformed ones, whose souls were crippled as well as their bodies. The disfigurement of their bodies was so bad that it altered their way of thinking and of perceiving the world. According to him, every departure from normal wellbeing clouded the person’s self-esteem so that crippled people ended up with typical character traits: egocentrism, feelings of discrimination and impairment, morbid sensitivity, irritability, envy, mistrust, intransigence, harsh self-assertion.

These “weaknesses of the soul” made the cripple envious of healthy people and incapable of living in society, whereas work could redeem the deformed man, giving sense to his life and putting him in a condition to bear life’s struggles with healthy men. According to Würtz’s \textit{Krüppelpädagogik} only years of segregation in special school-homes could mould crippled children’s souls: inside the school progressive education was applied, but children had to live segregated for years to be able to enter into society when adults.

\textbf{Biesalski and Würtz and the \textit{Kriegskrüppel Re-education}}

As soon as the war started, Biesalski began to act for the mutilated soldiers. Already in September 1914 welfare services for invalid soldiers were opened up everywhere in Germany. In November 1914, four months after the start of hostilities, Germany had more than 2,500 places for the cure of maimed soldiers. The Oscar-Helene-Heim offered 100 beds for the treatment of the seriously injured. A workshop for prosthesis-making was opened in the Oscar-Helene-Heim, as well as a school for soldier amputees, where two teachers were mutilated soldiers.

In 1917 the number of German disabled soldiers had already reached one million. The burden for the state, in terms of pensions and welfare, was enormous (not taking civilian invalids into account). Before World War I, invalid soldiers who received a pension lived in centres far from cities, segregated from society. If they worked they would lose their pensions. Biesalski was firmly opposed to this concept. He travelled all over Germany and held countless conferences proving the necessity of making the mutilated able to go back to work and regain their place in society. According to Biesalski what threatened rehabilitation was not the severity of the injury, but
rather the manner in which the maimed was perceived and treated by the general public. Returning to work was important for the economic independence of the amputee as well as for the prosperity of the nation. In 1915 Biesalski wrote a pamphlet on the subject, stressing the importance of both orthopaedic care and vocational training, which had enormous success. In 1916 140,000 copies had already been sold, and it was translated into Hungarian, Slovenian, Polish, Bulgarian and Turkish. The Oscar-Helene-Heim was recognised as a model institute in Germany and abroad. In 1916 Würtz published an article on the example of a train driver who lost an arm and with great determination managed to build himself an artificial arm that worked so well that after an official medical examination he was allowed to go back to work. Moreover, he could see to his kitchen garden and carry on a normal life as a husband and father. Würtz underlined the importance of man’s will – the article’s title was “The will wins!”.

But the examples of the war-mutilated gradually outnumbered those of civilian invalids, so that after the war the former came to overshadow those born crippled, as Würtz lamented in 1925. But Würtz himself had to some extent contributed to this change, for when describing historical and literary examples of crippled people Würtz had exhibited a rather ambivalent attitude, both describing as heroes war amputees, like Götz von Berlichingen, who carried on fighting, and depicting as morally deformed and antisocial other cripples, such as Richard III and Lord Byron, thus distinguishing between those whose healthy bodies were deformed in adult years and those born cripples.

The massive presence of war cripples required a shift in mental attitude and linguistic choice, for the war invalids could not be seen as morally guilty and deceptive by birth; quite the opposite, they had to be honoured for their sacrifice for the nation. In Germany, the use of the word cripple (Krüppel) for war invalids (Kriegskrüppel) had its difficulties, since the word Krüppel was perceived as a negative, “with a hideous sound” (it was a swearword in South Germany), so much that Biesalski asked to turn to other European languages and use more neutral words, like Kriegsgeschädigt (war-damaged) or Kriegsinvalid. The change was not easy, so that Biesalsky and Würtz decided to reverse the discourse, altering the perception of the word Krüppel and making it a positive one. Whereas the concept of the deformed man was associated with being unable to work and being a beggar, possibly with a nasty soul, it had now to remind people of heroic attitude, iron will and the ability to go back to work: it had to become a name of honour. This did not actually happen.

The Weimar Republic, with the national Pension Law of 1920, was actually the European state that spent the most on invalid veterans (between 1922 and 1932 war pensions accounted for nearly 20% of total governmental spending). Nonetheless, it failed to win their gratitude, for economic support was not the only answer to the
needs of mutilated soldiers, who asked for social recognition as well, recognition also linked to a cultural attitude. National Socialism publicly recognised and distinguished mutilated soldiers and presented them as heroes for their sacrifice (Opferhelden). Nevertheless images of severely wounded war cripples were censored, and only mild images of superficially wounded heroes were allowed.

Galeazzi, Director of the Pious Institute for Rickets Sufferers of Milan

In Italy, the Pious Institute for Rickets Sufferers (Pio Istituto dei rachitici), now the Orthopaedic Hospital (Istituto Ortopedico Gaetano Pini), was founded in 1874 in Milan by Dr. Gaetano Pini (1846-1887), a leading figure of the Italian democratic wing of Free-masonry and a patriot (he had fought with Garibaldi). Pini stressed many times that cripples were clever, but remained illiterate, not being able to attend school. He used to quote the example of Giacomo Leopardi, the great Italian poet, who was a hunchback, to prove what a profound mind a deformed man could have. Pini challenged the traditional idea of a correspondence between physical imperfection and corruption of the soul.

Pini managed to raise money from rich and poor people, masons, liberal and Catholic, intellectuals, noblemen, shopkeepers and banks: the Milanese were known for their philanthropic attitude. The Institute directed by Pini opened in 1875 as a special school for crippled children aged 4-10, where they received both medical cures and educational instruction, following the state programme for primary schools. This school rapidly became a model and acquired international fame.

After Pini’s death in 1877, the Board of the Institute appointed Pietro Panzeri (1849-1901) as the new director. Panzeri, who had also fought with Garibaldi, was a skilful surgeon. In 1884 he obtained the lectureship (libera docenza) on orthopaedics at the University of Pavia – the very first chair of orthopaedics in Italy. In 1884 he founded the first Italian review of orthopaedics, Archivio di ortopedia.

In 1896 the Orthopaedic Hospital of Bologna, the Rizzoli Institute, was opened, thanks to private investors, and Panzeri was appointed director. He died prematurely in 1901, and in 1903 Riccardo Galeazzi – after a competitive procedure – became director of the Pious Institute of Milan. Born in 1866 in Turin, in 1899 he had obtained the lectureship (libera docenza) in surgery. He remained as director until his retirement in 1937.

In 1903 Galeazzi also became director of the review Archivio di ortopedia, an office he held for 35 years. Already in his first three years Galeazzi managed to restructure and renew the infirmaries and the surgical theatres and to build new wards. A big new ward, with an autonomous operating theatre, was dedicated to paying patients.
Thanks to the money coming from private patients the Institute eventually gained the desired economic viability.\(^{25}\)

In this way, the Institute got bigger and reserved more space for adults, while still keeping its paediatric unit. The school for rachitic children became the *Asilo Mylius*, where only the youngest (2-5 years) and worst affected children were admitted.\(^{26}\) Since rickets were now diagnosed early, rachitic children could integrate in normal schools, but for many others this was not the case. So Galeazzi in 1908 opened the home and school for lame, mutilated and paralysed children (*Scuola di lavoro per storpi, mutilati e paralitici Sofia Carmine Speroni*), and in doing so realised Pini’s dream of a vocational school for young cripples and the mutilated. The young patients received prosthetic limbs, too. Since his arrival Galeazzi had opened a little workshop for prosthesis-making inside the Institute, thus putting into effect Panzeri’s wish. Thanks to an agreement with the City Council, the Institute provided artificial limbs and orthopaedic aids for all the mutilated and crippled poor of Milan and the surrounding areas. The Pious Institute, together with the Rizzoli Institute, became a leading prosthesis centre. Galeazzi was particularly concerned with kinematic prostheses. Even if at the time that kind of prosthesis was still not very well developed and posed surgical, medical, training and rehabilitation problems, he was convinced it was the right solution and kept working on it.\(^{27}\)

In 1906 the Institute gained the status of orthopaedic clinic in the recently founded post-graduate clinics in Milan.\(^{28}\) In 1911 Galeazzi was appointed full professor of orthopaedics. The Institute and its director rapidly acquired international fame. In 1910 the Institute received the Grand Prix at the International Exhibition of Buenos Aires.\(^{29}\)

**Galeazzi’s Educational Views on Cripples and the German Model**

Galeazzi was a man of culture who had very up-to-date knowledge of the orthopaedic world, read the main foreign literature and attended international congresses. He knew of the German census carried out by Biesalski in 1906, which he had already quoted from extensively in his inaugural lecture for the academic year 1906-07.\(^{30}\) In 1910 he took part in the first congress on the cure of cripples organised by the *Deutschen Vereinigung für Krüppelfürsorge*, representing Milan’s Institute;\(^{31}\) and when Biesalski died in 1930 he wrote a long and stirring obituary notice in his *Archivio di ortopedia*. He admired not only the brilliant orthopaedist, but – and perhaps even more – the socially engaged doctor and his invaluable work for cripples, saying that not only in Germany but in the entire world orthopaedists “shall always bow in reverence of his memory and shall always refer to his admirable example of scientific hard-working, of
never ending charity and goodness in favour of so many forgotten by nature”. From Galeazzi’s words it is clear that he knew Biesalski personally – he also remembered his dead colleague’s human qualities, such as his courtesy, his patience with other people’s mistakes and his great heart.

Galeazzi sometimes used language that echoed Darwinism and the Krüppelpädagogik; orthopaedics had a social aim, he said for instance in 1907, for not only did it cure bodily deficiencies, it also prevented diseases and deformities with the use of physical training and gymnastics, so that it managed to “uplift the level of the average body and increase the individual’s vital energy, to make him stronger in the struggle for existence”. He too spoke of work as “regenerative” and of begging as “degrading”, and defined the professional schools for the crippled as necessary for reasons of social order, morality, public security, as well as of charity and humanity. However, Galeazzi’s pedagogy did not consider the soul, the intellect and the heart of a cripple as the mirror of their deformed body. He rather indicated that a lack of education and moral misery were the causes of their way of thinking. In fact, Galeazzi, like Pini before him, stressed that crippled children could not attend public schools, since they often could not walk and, even if they could, they remained unemployed afterwards because of the revulsion at employing deformed persons. So they were condemned by society to begging and misery. True enough, cripples might be rancorous, liars and haters of other men, but not from birth: these behaviours were consequences of the environment. The special school had not only to develop the intellectual faculties, it had also and above all to educate the character, with individual teaching, proper tools and prostheses, particularly the kinematic ones.

Galeazzi, like Pini, recognised the importance of parental links and therefore, whenever possible, of letting crippled children live at home, whereas the German approach claimed that it was necessary to provide homes for cripples, at which attendance was compulsory. Galeazzi used Darwinian language that echoed Biesalski and Würtz when he said that cripples should learn, through intense discipline and an individual technique, not to be overwhelmed by healthy persons, their paramount aim being to prove themselves to be equals. One can often catch the influence of Biesalski in Galeazzi’s works: in the definition of the cripple as a sick man who needed a medical cure and social welfare; in the refusal to have a merely passive charity; in the pedagogical concept of work as a source of liberation. One can also trace Würtz’s Krüppelpsychologie in Galeazzi’s words, when he too defined the deformed man as one whose character had been hopelessly corrupted by society, which turned him in a morally despicable person, a selfish, nasty liar.

Yet, if he owed much to Biesalski and Würtz, Galeazzi seems less closed to a positivistic anthropology. For Galeazzi the key to cripples’ redemption was indeed work, but he did not limit the meaning of work to the economic aspect. He aimed at giving cripples the cultural and social capacity of being independent. Nevertheless
working did not simply coincide with earning a living. The worst affected cripples could not reach economic independence by their work and needed life-long assistance. Nonetheless, Galeazzi thought work was the means of giving them some dignity. By working (not necessarily by earning enough to be independent) a disabled person proved his own dignity: it was not the final product of work that counted (even if Galeazzi stressed that many times cripples managed to produce items by no means inferior to those made by normal workers), it was the sheer act of working, and the effort it implied, that gave people back human dignity. He clearly said it was not a question of the economic value of men, but a moral question that a civilised state could not refuse to face; “even if little or none were the product of the [cripple’s] work”, it would nonetheless be worthwhile and just to teach and provide him with an occupation, for that gave him “the moral satisfaction, which derives from having completed something useful. Consequently, from this point of view the question whether the economic value of the cripples’ product compensates society for the expenditures it has to face to support them, is of secondary importance”.

Working without one or two limbs often meant constant fatigue, and required a “discipline” that through the years shaped the will. Galeazzi believed that “the regenerative influence of work” came from this acquired self-discipline, which proved that the disabled were not inferior to others. He believed in a “defects-compensating pedagogy” and stressed that “incredible results could be obtained by developing the faculties of adaptation and compensation”. By describing this pedagogy as “compensatory”, Galeazzi anticipated the work of the Russian psychiatrist Lev Vygotskji (1896-1934), but he may well have known it from Sante De Sanctis (1862-1935), the father of Italian child psychiatry (a friend of Montessori (1870-1952), who was developing it in the same period) or from Alfred Adler (1870-1937). The concept had also long been familiar in blind and deaf-mute education.

Mutilated Soldiers: Re-education to Work and Prosthetics

Italy joined the war on 24 May 1915. Galeazzi, who was a true patriot, volunteered as a medical colonel, thus obtaining the officer status that would make it easier for him to deal with the army authorities. Between April and June 1915 he obtained from the Board of the Institute permission to transfer the Casa di lavoro Ottolenghi in Gorla (a little municipality outside Milan), originally planned for civilian invalids, to military sanitary authority. The Casa di lavoro Ottolenghi was a villa with a vast garden, donated to the Pious Institute by the rich philanthropic countess Fanny Finzi Ottolenghi. Galeazzi agreed to be the unpaid director of the Casa di lavoro Ottolenghi, which was turned into a “retraining school” for war cripples, called the
Finzi Ottolenghi Refuge. Thanks to an agreement with the Ministry of War, a nearby military orthopaedic hospital was quickly opened, on 18 September 1915. Amputee soldiers came to the military orthopaedic hospital after having been operated on in other hospitals. Their stumps were seen to and artificial limbs were fitted. When the physical treatment was completed, the patient started occupational retraining in the nearby Ottolenghi Refuge.

Galeazzi’s work for disabled veterans was tireless and his ideas were ahead of his time. In 1915 he started organising conferences on maimed veterans’ rehabilitation, in Milan and in other cities and published articles, booklets and brochures on the topic. His model of assistance was the German one, and Biesalski remained a point of reference, despite the fact that Germany was now an enemy nation. Galeazzi in fact boasted that already in prewar Germany there were 54 industrial schools for the lame and cripples, with 221 workshops teaching 51 job skills. Six months after the outbreak of the war the number of these schools had already jumped to 138. They were modelled on the Industrial school of Münich. Galeazzi already knew the German situation well, but obviously could not visit the enemy country during the war. Instead, he went to France and visited various institutes and retraining schools. He considered the Belgian school at Port-Villez to be the best for its scientific character. Indeed in the Port-Villez Institute limbless veterans underwent a medical, pedagogical and technical examination to establish the inclination, strength and capabilities those men had. He thought England and Russia had good models of welfare networks, which could be turned into centres for maimed veterans. He noticed that in France, where war disabled were free to decide whether or not to join a work rehabilitation programme, only 10% of them entered the retraining schools: thus, he thought this had to be made compulsory. Also Sir Robert Jones, whose work for mutilated British soldiers was immense, thought that discharging veterans into civil life without rehabilitation was wrong. Actually, the Italian law of 1917 on disabled veterans prescribed only 15 days of compulsory stay in a school of re-education, and that only for indigent soldiers. The official results confirmed Galeazzi’s view: the disabled who had undergone re-education managed more easily to find a place in society, whereas those who had rejected that period tended to become passive.

His ideas came from his conception of crippled people and his previous work for them, and were applied by him in the Ottolenghi retraining school for war cripples, which soon became a national model, as did that of Bologna. The Ottolenghi retraining school rehabilitated circa 500 men every year – totalling more than 2,500 men in the war years. The war amputated had to stay until they were declared ready to go back to their families, when able to cope with their prostheses at the end of the training period. The school had 100 beds. It was run by the Board of the Pious Institute of Rickets Sufferers. Its discipline was military, with medical officers, but there were also nuns and civilian personnel. The Minister of War, the Milanese Committee for
war needs and the Lombardy Committee for the Mutilated financially supported the Ottolenghi school.50

In the Ottolenghi school Galeazzi set up an experimental laboratory, where individual work and resistance coefficients (the capacity to carry on muscular activity for a determined length of time) of every mutilated soldier were empirically studied and improved, thanks to the rational training of the mutilated or weakened limb. Special training was provided for those who had lost their right arms and had to become left-handed (Fig. 1).

Eventually the veteran was trained to work with the artificial limb and began vocational training.51 The loss of lower limbs was less problematic than amputation of arms: leg prostheses were in fact rather good and allowed walking and the climbing of stairs, whereas it was not possible to reproduce hands’ complex functions.52 In 1919 it was calculated that 12,289 Italians had lost upper limbs and 19,347 had suffered leg amputation.53

Galeazzi kept working at kinetic and functional prostheses for work, trying to reduce their functional inadequacies.54 The orthopaedic workshop produced new prostheses for upper and lower limbs, also improving the Vanghetti Kineplasty hand (in 1898 Giuliano Vanghetti had constructed an artificial limb that moved using muscle contractions).

In 1916 the orthopaedic workshop of the Pious Institute could no longer cope with the increasing number of requests for prostheses. Utterly appalled by the potential danger of speculation on prosthesis, and knowing that their price in Italy was already higher than in other countries (industrial production did not exist), Galeazzi collected funds (60,000 lire) for the opening in Gorla of the National Prosthesis Workshop for mutilated soldiers, which was recognised by Royal Decree on 24 February 1916.55 This National Workshop was industrial and scientific in character and was supervised by orthopaedists. It occupied a big area, of 2,200 square metres and produced leather, wood and fibre aids. In wartime it employed 200 workmen and was the leading Italian prosthesis workshop.56 Artificial arms with special fittings to match types of industrial machinery were produced as well.

In the Ottolenghi school the illiterate were taught to read and write. When possible, the veterans were trained to go back to their previous workplaces, but that was only rarely possible. Often another type of work was suggested in accordance with the patient’s remaining capacities and the results of the abovementioned experimental laboratory. Vocational teachers and officers helped the veterans to find the professions and the training most suitable for them.57 There were four barracks with workshops for carpenters, tailors, clog and shoemakers, wicker basket makers, leather workers, sculptors in wood and saddlers (Fig. 2).

Farmers, too, were taught how to work with an artificial limb (the majority of soldiers were peasants: 60% of the amputees according to Galeazzi’s experience, but
85% of disabled veterans according to official statistics of 1918). The more cultivated invalids learned other professions in order to enter the post office or other state or private offices. This more advanced intellectual teaching was carried out in the Institute of the Marcelline Nuns. There was practical training in firms, too. Others had art lessons in the Academy of Fine Arts of Brera.

Galeazzi explained that six months were usually enough to complete the rehabilitation, which was carried on, as for young cripples, through the “regenerating” power of work (in fact in other Italian schools a year was the average period). He stressed the importance of rapid intervention: straight after the mutilation, in fact, the disabled became very depressed. It was essential to fight the depression, and this was possible when they lived together with other mutilated soldiers, whose success could be seen. Residence in hospitals had to be reduced to the minimum, and crippled soldiers were rapidly (and compulsory) shifted to industrial schools, where the best teachers were veterans. Through work and thanks to the example of other veterans, it would be possible to overcome the horror of the mutilation. Sharing the same sorrow and efforts would make the maimed soldiers brothers in a deep sense: the retraining school was “a truly human school, because it respects the principle of social equality, that brings close the weak and the stout in a brotherly harmony […] with the active cooperation of millions of citizens”.

Galeazzi advocated military discipline in the retraining schools, but he insisted on the necessity of opening many schools in order to let the mutilated be as close to their families as possible. He thought it would be desirable to reintegrate them into working society and to let them stay with sane people, whose gratitude would be a
moral comfort. They also had to be free to leave the school to go to the cinema and to enjoy some entertainment. Amputees had to go out: no shame or pity for them, but pride.62 Others feared that the impact of the sight of a mutilated soldier could produce revulsion against the war rather than encouragement to join the army. There was no fear of defeatism in Galeazzi, who was a patriot who kept insisting on society’s moral duty to maimed soldiers. Indeed Italy followed this model in many schools for occupational re-education throughout the country, thanks to the involvement of citizens and local boards, institutions, local authorities and state finance. Galeazzi’s system of “moral re-education” and his school, the very first to be scientifically organised in Italy, were put forward as models for all of Italy by medical captain Giovanni Selvi as early as in 1916.63 Galeazzi also stressed the importance of female presence in the hospitals in the form of the nurse: women had a particularly well developed sense of mercy that could effuse a sense of peace in the highly distressed souls of men far from their families.64

As mentioned above, Galeazzi thought that work was necessary not just to give economic independence, but to restore human dignity. Indeed he immediately asked the state to provide mutilated veterans with an invalidity pension as soon as possible, before their prostheses were ready, and also to provide them with training for work and give them jobs in the state administration and offices. He often referred to the Industrial Home and School for Lame, Mutilated and Paralysed Children, which had opened in 1908, as an example because there the orthopaedist advised on what kind of jobs young cripples could be taught to do, on the basis both of the body’s capabilities and problems and the children’s character and psychology.

As for those invalids whose condition was so severe that independent living was impossible, occupational retraining was nonetheless to be done. Even if they could not earn enough to live on, they were not to be deprived of work and its moral value, as Galeazzi had already argued for the civilian disabled. All invalids had to be given both a pension and the chance to work. He advocated state welfare, as well as philanthropy: citizens too had to be involved. This position was similar to that proposed by Salvatore Galgano, professor of civil law at the University of Naples who, in 1919, stressed the importance of making the war disabled able to help themselves (with microcredit, cooperatives of the mutilated, payment facilities for buying wares or work tools, etc.). Their motto was to be “back to work” instead of perpetual welfare.65 For Galeazzi and Galgano the state, civil society and the disabled themselves should work together.

In Italy local participation was high and committees for assistance to veterans spread everywhere in 1915-16 until, on 25 March 1917, Law n.481 unified them in the National Institution for War Disabled (ONIG) and on 29 April the disabled veterans themselves set up in Milan their own association (ANMIG, Associazione Nazionale Mutilati e Invalidi di Guerra), which in 1918 had 20,000 members, soon rising to
The 1917 Law also gave the ONIG the task of facilitating the reintroduction of disabled veterans into the world of work, but only by Law n.1312 of 21 August 1920 were public services compelled to employ war invalids. Invalid ex-servicemen were represented in the war propaganda and in the aftermath in school texts, posters and magazines as men worthy of respect and honour.

Galeazzi himself also set up the local committee for the assistance of mutilated soldiers and was made responsible for the occupational retraining schools; he published many scientific works on artificial limbs, prostheses and rehabilitation and held many meetings with military physicians about artificial limbs and rehabilitation; he worked with Lavinia Mondolfo, who in Milan looked after the blind veterans and their occupational retraining and advocated their rights. In 1916 the Prime Minister appointed Galeazzi a member of the royal board which was set up to study assistance for and the re-education of mutilated, crippled and blinded soldiers. During the war he was member of the executive board of the ONIG. Galeazzi was also often heard as expert in the special committee of the Chamber of Deputies in Rome.

The End of the War: Conclusions

After the war Galeazzi was appointed a member of the inter-allied conference on the aftercare of disabled men: he played an active part in the conferences in Paris and London and in 1920 chaired the conferences in Lisbon, Rome and Brussels. In Paris he was finally hailed as honorary chairman.

In 1921 the Ottolenghi Refuge in Gorla ceased to function. In 1924 the Casa di lavoro Ottolenghi for civilian crippled was reactivated, as originally planned. The question of the war mutilated was now a social and political one, no longer a surgical and rehabilitative one. The Pious Institute in Milan, along with the Rizzoli Institute in Bologna, represented a leading source of experience in Italy and abroad, which had been strengthened during the Great War. In 1923 the prestigious American review, The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery, pointed to the two as two of the best centres in Europe.

It has been noted that the success of a retraining school for mutilated veterans was strictly dependent on its director's personality, his attitudes, his teaching practice, his competence and his moral authority. Galeazzi certainly had the right personality. He was as fervent a patriot as Pini and Panzeri, but politically conservative, whereas his predecessor had followed democratic left-wing trend. He shared with his two predecessors a strong belief in human dignity. He never distinguished between once healthy men who had suffered amputation and those who had been born crippled, defending the rights of both and stressing the importance of work as a means of
respecting the dignity of men and women (it is worth noting that only in 1966 did the Italian state award pensions to people born with a severe physical disability). He admired Biesalski but surpassed his ideas of rehabilitation and work, conferring a moral value to them and not just an economic one. Therefore repairing a permanently injured body did not necessarily imply returning to the workforce and regaining economic independence (desirable but not always possible) but it always entailed the restoration of human dignity.
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