“Lifeline” was recently installed on the grounds in front of Wheeler House. Created by Klaus Herbrich, the sculpture consists of two blocks of green Vermont serpentine, each with a significant vein of white calcite. If the blocks are aligned, the white line is broken. If, however, the artist’s intention is followed and the line is aligned, then the blocks are offset. Herbrich created the sculpture to symbolize lost unity, and the discontinuity between past and present, but with hope as a lifeline running through both. The artist intended the symbolism of this work to be applicable both to the Holocaust and to the experience of slavery in the United States.

Herbrich was in Vermont as a participant in the Vermont Artist Exchange Program in 1992. He is a member of the Gruppe D artists based in Dachau, Germany. Born in Czechoslovakia and educated in Munich, he has presented workshops in Austria and Italy. “Lifeline” was donated to the Center for Holocaust Studies by “Friends of Holocaust Studies” in 1992 and has been in storage since that time. The Center for Holocaust Studies is grateful to Denise Youngblood and the Department of History for enthusiastically agreeing to provide a location for its installation. In addition we would like to thank the ad hoc outdoor sculpture committee for their diligence and support. (Photo: Shirley Fortier.)
Reports

Another Successful Miller Symposium

Gabi Wurmitzer

The second Miller Symposium, “Business and Industry under the Nazi Regime” got underway early on a beautiful April Sunday. Despite glorious sunshine, the Campus Center Theater in the Billings Student Center at the University of Vermont filled quickly with an interested and eager audience. Members of the local Jewish community, as well as dedicated students and faculty members gathered to be welcomed by then interim president of UVM Edwin Colodny. President Colodny extended his gratitude to the sponsors of the symposium, Leonard and Carolyn Miller, and expressed his personal interest in one of the most tragic human rights abuses of the Twentieth Century. The Jewish Holocaust was inflicted upon the European Jews by the Nazis and their political and economic agenda. Business in Nazi Germany was extremely politicized, and the business community was under pressure to follow the oppressive rules of the Nazi Party. The extent to which this political oppression infringed on business practices was at the center of the discussions of the five presenters, who had journeyed to Burlington from as far away as California, where Professor Gerald Feldman teaches at the University of California at Berkeley, and Chicago, where Professor Peter Hayes lectures at Northwestern University. The guest speakers were introduced by Professors David Scrase and Jonathan Huener of the University of Vermont and Francis Nicosia of St. Michael’s College.

All of the speakers have conducted extensive research on the subject of Nazi atrocities before and during the Second World War in the archives in Germany and Eastern Europe and have read thousands of pages of official and unofficial, as well as at the time classified communiqués, memoranda, files, orders, notes and other documents in their search for answers to the still burning questions: “why and how did it happen and who was implicated, involved and responsible in the dispossession and mistreatment of the European Jewry?” “It” of course, being the eradication of six million European Jews during the twelve years of the Third Reich.

Professor Harold James of Princeton University began the morning with “‘Aryanization’ and the Involvement of German Banks,” providing an overview and summarizing the historical background of the banking system in Germany in the 1930s. The collapse of the world’s economic markets in 1929 reverberated into the 1930s and brought as a consequence changes in business and politics that would mold the future of Germany and Europe. Corporate scandals erupted in those years and capitalism had been discredited to an extent. The anti-capitalist thinking of the emerging Nazi Party appealed to many. Government support and the political interference it brought were readily accepted by many banks and other institutions. Professor James focused his attention on a few very important financial institutions and bank managers and their role in the ‘Aryanization’ of Jewish assets. The Deutsche Bank was an example of an important financial institution hit hard by the economic downturn. Miscalculations made years earlier came back to haunt the Jewish bank president Oscar Wassermann. The government took control of the bank, and key positions within the banking hierarchy were filled with Nazi personnel in 1933.

Wassermann was fired and replaced with Georg Adolf Solmsen, another very important and prominent banker, who came from an old and trusted Jewish banking family. Like many accomplished professionals, Solmsen did not consider himself Jewish. Solmsen had heard and read about the rising anti-Semitism in the early years of the 1930s but was not worried for himself or for the German Jews. He was convinced the rhetoric would come to nothing. His opinion changed gradually. Professor James provided the audience with an excerpt from a letter written by Solmsen describing the growing hostility against Jews in all spheres of business activity. At this point, in April 1933, Solmsen had slowly become aware of a trend toward the removal of all Jews, including himself, from the German economy. In 1934 a new personnel director entered Solmsen’s bank, and the purges of people unsympathetic to the new regime began. Eventually even Solmsen was purged and replaced by a party member, Walter Pohle.

Pohle played an important role in the transfer of Jewish businesses to German people in the years 1937-38. He facilitated the take-over of the Jewish owned leather firm Adler und Oppenheimer by a German company; with the new owners the name was changed to Norddeutsche Leder. A more radical take-over occurred when Pohle was in Czechoslovakia. There, without any resistance from the population, Pohle transferred the banks and their deposits, first in the Sudetenland and later in the whole country, into German custody. Slowly, Germans loyal to the Nazi regime replaced all officials, bank presidents and other key personnel.

By 1938 banks had become suppliers of information. Banks were obligated to furnish the Nazi government with the financial information of their clients. The banking world had become passive about the invasions of the Nazi government. For many, compliance offered a way to overcome the negative reputation banks had during the depression years. Faster than could be imagined, the banking world became entrapped by a regime that portrayed itself as the embodiment of the common good. To live up to the hypocritical standard set by the Nazi Party, providing social good for all Germans, the Nazis required businesses to remove all Jews from the economy, expropriate their assets, and turn these assets over to Germans. The years of economic depression and the ensuing economic turmoil thus served as a springboard for the excesses of the Nazi Party. A vulnerable country looked on passively, while the groundwork for the destruction of Jewish livelihoods was laid.

Professor Feldman further illuminated the appropriation of Jewish assets. Where Professor James covered the background and history of “Aryanization,” Professor Feldman explored its moral implications. The title of his presentation implied a highly charged debate over the cooperation of German banks and insurance companies: “Financial Institutions and Nazi Germany: Reluctant or Willing Collaborators?” His argument was built around the premise that the Great Depression of the 1920s and 1930s had provided an ideal starting point for political involvement in the business relations of financial institutions. The collapse of world stock markets and the ensuing economic instability, high unemployment and distrust of financial businesses caused a loss of confidence in banks. Corrupt banking practices and inighting among different banks further contributed to a decline in trust. In 1933 the German Minister of Economics stated the sentiment of
the time succinctly: businesses were not able to rebuild themselves and had to become aligned with a strong political party. In those years it was believed that only the young, strong, energetic Nazi Party would have the power to rebuild the economy and re-establish trust in banking and insurance firms. Most banks shared this belief and thus let Nazi officials without banking expertise take over key positions, even as they removed many Jewish employees, and began to appropriate Jewish capital and assets.

Nazi support saved and revived a crumbling insurance market, too. After the pogroms in November of 1938 insurance liabilities were estimated to be over 20 million Reichsmark; the government reduced the number to 1.3 million, claiming that the Jews were responsible for the pogroms themselves, since all Jewry was guilty of the murder of Ernst vom Rath in Paris, which supposedly had ignited the pogroms in Germany. It has now become clear that the German population was not so agitated by the murder of a political attaché’s assistant as to start violent reprisals against Jews. The pogroms had indeed been initiated by party members at the behest of propaganda minister Goebbels.

Just as many Jewish bank directors and officials had been removed, so too were Jewish insurance companies taken over by German companies, and Jewish shares sold to German banks. Furthermore, German insurance companies were involved with providing insurance coverage of labor camps. One document provides evidence that the Allianz insurance company knew exactly how many slave laborers were held in the Lodz ghetto, but waived its right to inspection of the property, in effect closing its eyes to the atrocities, and profiting from its blindness.

When the Reich Citizenship Law of 1935 and its subsequent implementation ordinances took effect, the banks had an open channel to appropriate Jewish property and capital. The law excluded Jews from German citizenship, so that the deportations to concentration camps began under a “legal” umbrella. Jews deported to the East were reported to be living abroad and all property of owners living outside Germany was confiscated. The Gestapo, the banks and insurance companies worked closely together on this project. The Gestapo passed lists of deported Jews to the companies, who would then reassign the assets to the Reich. Also, the banks gave the government complete information on all persons living abroad, whereupon the Reich confiscated all assets of such persons. Banks also appropriated real estate from Jewish families. Up until 1937 the banks tried to compensate Jews as fairly as possible for their property and land, but after that date the “Aryanization” of Jewish property became business as usual. All scrupules had been blown away by the whirlwind of the regime. After the Anschluss of Austria in March 1938, the takeover of Austrian banks provided access to more Jewish assets and property.

Professor Feldman concluded by calling the banks and insurance companies of the Third Reich intermediaries in the transfer of Jewish assets to Germans. Moral concerns seemed to have played a minor role with the prospect of personal and professional gain. This informative and contemplative presentation ended the morning session and the lunch break was much needed to digest not only the food, but also a rich array of facts and information.

The afternoon session widened the scope of discussion to include American investment in Nazi Germany, the culpability of the chemical industries and the business of slave labor camps. The afternoon presenters attempted to illuminate corporate social responsibility during the Third Reich. Professor Simon Reich focused primarily on the lawsuit filed by former slave laborers against Ford Motor Company, and the company’s role and involvement in slave labor, with his presentation on “Who Was In Charge? American Investment and the Question of Culpability.” The Ford Motor Company had opened a plant in Cologne in the 1920s and by the 1930s had widened its products’ market share to thirteen per cent within Germany. Hitler had admired Ford’s mass production strategies and had given orders to build the Volkswagen plant in Wolfsburg mirroring Ford’s plant in Ohio. He also awarded Henry Ford the Iron Cross for contributions to the social well-being of Germany. Ford himself was a pacifist and naively never thought Germany would go to war with the U.S.

In 1936 new laws discriminating against foreign firms were passed, but Ford was awarded governmental contracts to build military vehicles. Ford’s production of civilian vehicles declined steadily due to the lack of raw materials, and the redirection of all available materials to building military equipment. 1938 brought an end to Ford’s amicable relations with the German government. The company was declared an enemy of the state and confiscation was imminent. To appease the Nazis, new management was installed with the German Robert Schmitt as the CEO. The company was not confiscated, but the lack of raw materials, non-existent consumer purchasing power, and the decline in governmental contracts led to company losses early in the year 1940. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, the American parent company withdrew all American company officials and cut off all support to its German subsidiary. Ford Germany struggled on its own. The influx of workers into the German plant in April of 1942 was at the heart of a lawsuit brought against the company after the war. Many surviving slave laborers brought charges against the American parent company for failing to pay adequate salaries to the workers during the war. During Ford’s investigation fifty slave laborers were documented. Russian contract workers sent from concentration camps, Italian POWs and French prisoners had been used at the German plant and also had been paid, albeit not commensurate to the amount of work performed. Ford’s investigation was extensive, but in the end the company established that no laws were broken and the laborers were treated fairly. Professor Reich concluded that if anyone should be held responsible for paying compensation to these workers it should be the German government, which interned the individuals in the first place, and which profited from production at the Ford plant during the war years, since the company was exclusively fabricating military vehicles. Professor Reich cited Ford as an example of a company that was not running away from its corporate responsibility and its murky past. Had culpability been established, Ford would have been willing to compensate the victims and admit its guilt. In this case, perhaps Ford can be blamed for naiveté in becoming involved with the Nazi regime, but not for systematic and conscious efforts to exploit innocent lives, as companies within the chemical industry had done.

The culpability and involvement of chemical companies such as IG Farben and DEGUSSA was at the heart of Professor Peter Hayes’ discussion entitled “The Chemistry of Business-State Relations in Nazi Germany.” Both companies were heavily involved in supporting the regime and profiting from plundered and stolen property. IG Farben was one of Germany’s largest chemical companies, specializing in the manufacture of rubber and gasoline from coal. It is still best known for supplying the deadly Zyklon
B gas to the concentration camps. DEGUSSA, with only ten percent of IG Farben’s capital, is infamous for smelting silver and gold plundered from Jewish households and dead Jews. DEGUSSA also had a part in the fabrication of chemicals for torpedoes and bombs; produced ingredients for the production of Plexiglas, rubber tires, and Zyklon B; and distributed gas masks to the concentration camps for the protection of the Sonderkommandos responsible for disposing of the gassed Jews.

This short description alone makes it clear that these two companies were very much economically and financially dependent on the actions of the Nazi regime. Differences between these companies were due to size; because IG Farben was ten times the size of DEGUSSA it was able to fend off political interference. The company retained its independence in research activities and focused on achieving its own goals, which were determined as much by financial greed as by the actions and needs of the government. There is no doubt that IG Farben profited in some way from the use of slave labor, especially at Auschwitz III (Monowitz). Professor Hayes cited 30,000 as the number of slave laborers used by the company, of whom eighty per cent died. Reports showed that IG Farben did not reap a financial profit from its slave labor employment; however, it did use this cheap labor to sustain its large-scale production and research efforts in a time of labor shortages. While IG Farben may not initially have had Nazis within its ranks, it was certainly aware of many ways to profit from Nazi actions by catering its products to the military and the killing apparatus. The atmosphere within the Reich was such that cooperation with the government was essential.

DEGUSSA as the much smaller company felt this pressure much more urgently; like many smaller firms, it had been infiltrated by a “party clique,” which made production dependent on the needs and wants of the regime. DEGUSSA agreed to the smelting of the stolen gold and silver, taken from the dead bodies, only because it speculated on receiving more profitable supplies from Belgium and France once the German armies had occupied these territories. The firm never made any large-scale profits from their involvement with the government. It was never allotted any slave laborers either, because its production was not essential for the war effort. Despite these facts, DEGUSSA was implicated in the Holocaust because of its sale of gas masks to concentration camps. Professor Hayes argued that both companies knew of the suffering their products caused, but never abandoned their relationships with the regime. Their moral obligation would have been to cease the production and sale of many of their products, like Zyklon B. The two companies may have been structurally different, but both knew that their products would cause mass death and misery, and yet neither abandoned its plans. This neglect of moral obligations was taken into consideration when judgment was brought upon them at the post-war trials.

Professor Michael Allen’s “The Business of Genocide: SS, Slave Labor, and the Concentration Camps” was the final presentation of a long and exhaustingly interesting day. Professor Allen had just published a book on the subject (reviewed on page 9) and gave the audience an overview of its contents. He divided the topic into four chronological periods, beginning with 1933-36, when many companies began to align themselves with what appeared to be the party most likely to gain control of the government. During this time Nazi-owned firms appeared, as did the first camps for political prisoners; the Nazis also staged their first attempts to profit from the free labor in these camps.

Between 1936 and 1939, massive Nazi building and rearmament efforts brought about full employment. The Earth and Stone Works, founded in 1938, provided work for many Germans building monuments and buildings in honor of the Führer. Slave labor was justified to the public as culturally valuable and many more labor camps were built around large-scale industrial enterprises such as stone quarries. However, the unskilled prisoners were unable to produce culturally valuable monuments. Their ignorance of how to use the most modern machinery, installed by the technology-enamoured Nazis, resulted in injury to the prisoners and damage to the machines. Although the labor camps were unprofitable, the Nazis persisted. When war began in 1939, the focus shifted to the confiscation of building materials from eastern Jews and Poles and the use of slave labor to construct housing for SS troops and for Germans being resettled in the East.

Between 1942 and 1945, with most able-bodied men in the armed forces, the labor shortage became chronic and private corporations clamored for cheap slave labor from the camps. The condition of the slave labor force had deteriorated, due to chronic food shortages and rampant disease. Mismanagement and corruption meant that by 1943 most of the SS-owned firms had become insolvent or bankrupt. The Nazis were not even able to keep their assets in good working order, and the slave labor system became unprofitable.

Allen’s presentation concluded the second Miller Symposium: Business and Industry under the Nazi Regime. A wide palette of topics was discussed in depth and audience members came away with more understanding and knowledge of the business practices and economic strategies of the Third Reich. It was a demanding schedule, but worth it, especially for those who stayed until the end, for each presentation built upon the previous, forming a multifaceted picture of the exploitation of human capital by banking and industry.

Gabi Wurmitzer is a master’s degree candidate at the University of Vermont.
Speakers at the Miller Symposium on Business and Industry during the Nazi Regime, from left to right: Gerald Feldman, University of California, Berkeley; Simon Reich, University of Pittsburgh; Harold James, Princeton University; Michael Allen, Georgia Institute of Technology; and Peter Hayes, Northwestern University. (Photo: University Photography.)

Consul General Dr. P. Christian Hauswedell, assisted by Nancy Colodny, wife of UVM Interim President Edwin Colodny, presents Raul Hilberg with “Das grosse Verdienstkreuz des Verdienstordens der Bundesrepublik Deutschland” (Commander’s Cross of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany). The ceremony was held in Englesby House on 9 April 2002. (Photo: University Photography.)
With a topic as delicate as the Holocaust, it is difficult to adequately depict both the events that occurred, and the emotional and cultural backlash that resulted. It is simplistic to believe that statistics and historical facts are adequate, in and of themselves, to extend a degree of understanding across time and space. It was with this in mind that the organizers of the ninth annual “Holocaust and Holocaust Education” summer seminar at UVM planned our week-long intellectual journey during the last week of June.

Our seminar consisted of five, eight-hour days, and two evening keynote speakers. There were thirteen people in attendance, eight of whom were Vermont middle school and high school teachers, while the other five were UVM undergraduates. Teachers came from as far away as Bennington to attend this year’s seminar. Those who traveled from the southern or central parts of the state stayed over in the Burlington area aided by grants given by the Center for Holocaust Studies at UVM.

Our seminar had several professors including Professor David Scrase, Professor Wolfgang Mieder, and Professor Jonathan Huener from UVM, as well as Professor Frank Nicosia from St. Michael’s College, Professor Sam Intrator from Smith College, and Robert Bernheim, a graduate student from McGill University. They presented lectures and attended classes throughout the week, and served as resources for all of us. We also were fortunate to have Aranka Siegal, a Holocaust survivor, in attendance during the week. She has taken part in the seminar each of the last nine years, and was an invaluable presence in the classroom.

The general structure of the course provided a solid historical footing from the very first day through lectures on “The Unique and Universal Aspects of the Holocaust,” as well as “The History of Antisemitism and the Rise of the Nazis,” and “The Invasion of Poland and the Establishment of the Ghettos.” This gave us important background information as we prepared to hear from eyewitnesses about their experiences of the events of the Holocaust. We also had the opportunity to learn about the war-time and post-war responses to the Holocaust in the areas of art, literature, and music. This even included a live musical performance during a lecture by Lois Price of the UVM Lane Series on “Music and Survival during the Holocaust.”

Six survivors and one rescuer graciously shared with us their experiences through their eyewitness accounts. As we listened to Simon Barenbaum, Gabe Hartstein, Susi Learmonth, Henny Lewin, Yehudi Lindeman, Aranka Siegal, and Marion Pritchard we were given the opportunity to imagine the enormity of the fear and tragedy experienced by our speakers. This was crucial for us in beginning to comprehend the tragedy of the Nazi Holocaust on a personal level.

The age differences and locations of experiences among the eyewitnesses provided many interesting perspectives on what happened to them during the years of the Holocaust. Henny, originally from Lithuania, and Yehudi, from the Netherlands, were hidden as very young children. Gabe, from Hungary, was somewhat older. Aranka, also from Hungary, and Simon, from France, were teenagers as was Susi, who immigrated to the United States from Austria in 1938. Marion, recognized as a Righteous Gentile for her rescue work, was a university student at the time the Nazis invaded her native Holland.

It was a powerful intellectual and emotional week. At the completion of the course, many felt a sense of disappointment that it was over so soon. We desired more information. Lindsay Holton, a UVM student said: “After taking this class I have come away with so much more than just what I had read in books. My favorite part of the class was being able to hear the survivor and eyewitness testimonies. To me it makes the history come alive....” We had been swept away by the enormity of the suffering and tragedy, and also overwhelmed by the bravery and courage of those who resisted evil and assisted those in need. Ruthie Bolton, a teacher from Bennington concluded her comments on the week with: “What man does to man is incomprehensible—but how some people respond to the needs of others is heartening.”

**THE EVENING LECTURES:**

**JEWISH ARTISTS IN NEW YORK**

*Courtney Goldsmith*

This year’s summer lecture series began with Matthew E. Baigell, a Professor of Art History at Rutgers University, presenting “Jewish Artists in New York During the Holocaust Years.” Professor Baigell discussed the Jewish art scene in New York during the 1940s. At that time Jewish artists rarely showed that they were Jewish because of pressures from dealers saying that Jewish themes in artwork would not sell because of American anti-Semitism. Many Jewish artists chose to be recognized as American or international artists in order to appear more assimilated.

During Hitler’s rise to power in the 1930s, New York artists were aware of the increase in anti-Semitism in Germany. A response to these changes was a painting called *Whither Now?* (1939) by the American Modernist painter, Max Weber, who was known for the Jewish themes in many of his works. The painting was a response to the destruction of many Jewish businesses and synagogues. “What are they going to do now?”

In the early 1940s people in New York and throughout the world were learning about the Nazi persecution of the Jews. There were no secrets. Jewish artists faced several questions: How to record and respond to the Holocaust? What to paint or sculpt? When America entered the war there were written accounts of what was going on, but very few visual records. Many Jewish refugees came to New York from Europe around 1940. Some of them became involved in gallery exhibitions, and in the New York art world. Jewish-American artists had different experiences from the European refugees, which in turn were reflected in their art. In general, the art done at the time of the Holocaust was not violent or possessed by ill-feeling. Much of the art was of images of the Jewish culture, a way of memorializing the fast disappearing...
traditions. Many scenes included images of Rabbis and the Torah scrolls. The Torah scrolls are the most sacred possession in the Jewish congregation. Ben-Zion made a lithograph in 1942 of a person presenting the scrolls for the world to see. He called it *Holding the Scrolls*. This was an act of defiance, showing the survival of the Jewish people in the face of the destruction happening in Europe.

Max Weber also painted *Hasidic Dance* (1940), a painting of men in Hasidic garb dancing in a traditional way expressing joy and celebration. This dance is commonly done at certain holidays and weddings. Weber chose this scene as a way to pass on the traditions of an average Jewish man, in hope that future generations would continue them after the Holocaust ended.

Many artists also used Christian imagery in their depictions of the Holocaust. The most common was the use of the Crucifixion, the image of the Jewish Jesus being crucified. There was an exhibition of crucifixions in New York in 1942. One significant depiction of the crucifixion is Marc Chagall’s *Yellow Crucifixion* (1943), which depicts the Jewish Jesus on the cross with a prayer shawl draped across his body, and an open blank Torah scroll lacks the words of God. The figures in the front suggest fleeing refugees, or the Flight to Egypt. In the background a sinking ship memorializes the sinking of the *Struma* in 1942 in the Black Sea.

The figure of the Wandering Jew represents the artist himself, feeling as if he never had a place of his own. Everything in this painting depicts suffering and shows that the Jewish Jesus’ death did not redeem anyone.

Jacques Lipchitz, a sculptor from France, used mythological themes to express his feelings about what was happening in Europe. The *Rape of Europa* (1941) shows Europa stabbing the bull that had human arms, hands, and front legs. She is fighting her rapist, who is Hitler; she is fighting for her life.

After explaining such images, Professor Baigell concluded the lecture by stating that American Jewish artists in New York were deeply concerned about the fate of the European Jewish community, and used many different forms to express their hopes as well as fears.

### THE CONFISCATION OF JEWISH PROPERTY

**Natalea Haynor**

On 27 June 2002 Martin Dean, Applied Research Scholar for the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, gave a lecture at the University of Vermont entitled “The Confiscation of Jewish Property During the Third Reich.” The lecture centered on the role that the confiscation of Jewish property played in the Holocaust and the effects it had on the Jews themselves. The confiscation process furthered the hatred of the Jews and dehumanized them in the eyes of the surrounding populations. Therefore, it became one of the essential components in the development of the Holocaust itself.

During the Holocaust, before the Jews were systematically murdered, they were methodically deprived of their possessions. The process of confiscation varied in different regions throughout Europe, but the end result was basically the same. The ‘legal’ confiscation of Jewish property was intended to benefit the Reich through the sale of Jewish property and from taxes on Jewish money and/or possessions. The flight tax is but one example; a tax of twenty-five percent on capital assets was imposed on any Jewish person trying to emigrate from Germany or Austria in order to make sure that Jews could not take their wealth with them when they were trying to escape persecution. By 1938 all Jews were required to register their property; by this means, the Reich was able to keep track of most Jewish economic activities. Local and national authorities worked together to follow all Jewish dealings at the time.

The registration was not the first effort by the Reich to try to drive Jews out of the economy. As early as 1933, Jews were no longer allowed to hold civil service positions and practice other professions. In addition, some Germans also boycotted Jewish goods and services that spring. Dean cited the example of tenants refusing to pay rent to Jewish landlords, knowing that no one would force them to pay a Jew. Jewish wealth was thought of as ‘ill-gotten’ gains; it was widely accepted that the Jews did not deserve the wealth or what little property they had, and that the property should be brought back into German hands.

The regulations and restrictions on the Jews even extended to requiring Jews to ask for permission to access what little money they had, and to submit formal requests to the government asking for money and detailing why they needed to use money out of their own savings accounts. Then on 25 November 1941 the Eleventh Implementation Decree under the Reich Citizenship Law effectively confiscated some 778 million Marks by taking possession of all remaining Jewish property. This decree also took away the citizenship of any Jew leaving the borders of the Reich, and confiscated all remaining bank accounts, stocks, and bonds of that Jew.

The substantial paper trail left behind by the Nazis has given researchers valuable insights into the lives of Jews at that time, and into the dealings of those within the bureaucracy of the Reich. The idea of Jewish property as ‘ill-gotten’ gains was used to further foster anti-Semitism throughout Europe, and help the Reich achieve the “Final Solution.” As a closing thought, Martin Dean explained why it is important to understand the confiscation process. He stated that the money and property gained not only benefited the Reich, but also individuals within the system, and, without that benefit, anti-Semitic feelings alone would not have been sufficient for the horrendous destruction that marked the Holocaust. He concluded his remarks for the evening by stating: “this history also uncovers the many difficult choices and privations forced upon Jews as they attempted to survive the mounting onslaught on their possessions and liberties that became the Holocaust.”

Courtney Goldsmith, and Natalea Haynor are recent graduates of the University of Vermont. Kim Torrey is a current student at the University of Vermont.
THE WILKOMIRSKI AFFAIR: A SUMMARY
David Scrace
University of Vermont

The “Wilkomirski affair,” as it has become known, erupted in 1995 and has, in the past seven years, run its course, and is perhaps already receding into the distant realm of history. Although more is yet to be written on the matter, there is now such clarity, indeed finality, set before us that we can see the affair in its entirety, and draw our own conclusions—however different these might be.

When Fragments appeared in German in 1995 and in English one year later it was immediately hailed by many as a small masterpiece. Its author received awards, prizes, and invitations; there were radio and TV interviews and programs. Very soon, however, doubts were raised about the book’s authenticity, notably by Daniel Ganzfried in Switzerland, and Mark Pendergrast (see Bulletin, Vol. 3, No. 2 (1999), p.1-6). These doubts were given voice in newspapers, journals, and the other media, including the Internet. In a matter of months it was clear that Fragments was fiction at best, or bald-faced lies, deceit, or a hoax at worst. The very identity of the author was thrown into question. There was near the certainty that Binjamin Wilkomirski was someone else. More studies appeared, the evidence mounted. By the year 2000 and the publication of a study in German by Stefan Mächler, commissioned by Binjamin Wilkomirski’s agent to determine the full truth, most of the facts had been incontrovertibly revealed. Wilkomirski was not, in fact, Jewish, not a survivor, but was born illegitimate in Switzerland in 1941. This child, Bruno Grosjean, was, after a period spent in homes and foster-care, adopted by a childless couple in Zurich, Dr. Kurt Dösekker and his wife Martha. He now became Bruno Dösekker. Mächler’s book came out in English translation in 2001, with the text of Fragments included as an appendix.

Those who have fitfully followed the developing scandal in the press or on the Internet and who have surely often been baffled or, at least, confused by the revelations have reacted in many different ways: with anger, disappointment, skepticism, cynicism or, even, a degree of detachment—after all, this was not the first such scandal. Studies are now available that allow the curious to determine quickly the full facts of the case—if not to find complete and convincing answers to such questions as Why? How? Does the book have any value? Should it remain available or be withdrawn from the market? Should one even read it? Not least among all the many questions that are being asked is the one major question concerning the author, who, in face of the overwhelming evidence proving him to be Bruno Grosjean, still sees himself as the child survivor of the Holocaust that is portrayed in Fragments.

Stefan Mächler’s book is a detailed, dispassionate, and scholarly (but very readable) account of his research and findings. Often he is able to provide explanations for the memories and images supposedly arising from Wilkomirski’s ordeal surviving the Holocaust. The topography of the “farm in Poland,” where Motti made his “glider out of paper and sticks,” is identical with the children’s home in Adelboden, where Bruno Grosjean spent several months in early 1945 and where there was a boy who played with model airplanes. Although, as befits a scholar of history, Mächler carefully avoids any conjectures about Bruno Dösekker’s stability or mental health, he does provide a wealth of information that might allow readers to draw their own conclusions, and this is one of the great merits of his book.

Equally measured and dispassionate, and equally engaging, indeed compelling, is Blake Eskin’s book A Life in Pieces (2002). Eskin’s interest stemmed from the fact that his family’s name before they emigrated from Riga to the USA was Wilkomirski. An initial desire to find out whether Binjamin Wilkomirski was related soon turned into a quest for the truth, which came inexorably as he was researching his book through the revelations of Ganzfried, Pendergrast, Lappin, Gourevitch, and Mächler. Eskin puts all the various arguments into perspective and adds substantial information concerning the varied reception accorded Wilkomirski by all the interested parties, especially child survivor groups.

The Wilkomirski affair is not, of course, the only such scandal. Before Fragments there was Jerzy Kosinski’s Painted Bird, which was clearly labelled a novel; in this case the controversy centers more on the author and his personality than the work. Then there was “Helen Demidenko” in Australia, who, in her book The Hand That Signed the Paper, describes how most of her family had been killed in the Ukraine by “Jewish Communist Party officials,” but who was in fact Helen Darville, of English background. “Lauren Grabowski,” who emerged with Wilkomirski’s help as a child survivor he had known in Poland, proved to be a double impostor. She was, in fact, Lauren Willson, like Grosjean an illegitimate child, who masqueraded first as a victim of child abuse, and then re-emerged with a changed identity as a child survivor of the Holocaust.

Other scandals have played out in Germany and are accordingly less known here. All attest to the extremely sensitive nature of anything that combines history and artistic invention (or lies). Lawrence Langer addresses the problem in an essay titled “Fictional facts and Factual Fictions: History in Holocaust Literature” that originally appeared in 1990, five years before the publication of Fragments. “When the Holocaust is the theme, history imposes limitations on the supposed flexibility of artistic license.” Cynthia Ozick also addresses the same problem in an essay “The Rights of History and the Rights of Imagination.” If a writer wishes to bridge the gap between history and imagination by writing a fictional work based in history, then, says Ozick, fictional autonomy ceases to exist and the rights of history win out. In Wilkomirski’s case, of course, these arguments are moot, since he always insisted and still insists that the book is not fiction.

Although many answers and useful critical notions have come out in the wake of the Wilkomirski affair, there are still wide divergences in the reactions to it and, even, in the acceptance of these facts and findings. Deniers feel re-enforced in their denial; those who rely on documentary facts and who suspect memory, like Raul Hilberg, will knowingly smile as they in turn feel vindicated; proponents of memory, whether or not they accept the theory and practice of repressed memory, remain convinced that deep-seated primal memory fragments exist—even if Binjamin Wilkomirski does not. Documentary facts alone provide information, clarity, certainty, history, but the human face of the Shoah
is not effectively portrayed. Memoirs, for all their limitations, provide the human element. This is one reason why *Fragments* was initially so successful. Fiction, and art in general, is a useful tool in our approaches to the Holocaust, but, like all tools, it must be used carefully and appropriately.

**Selected Reading List:**


---

**BOOK REVIEWS**


Michael Allen’s *The Business of Genocide* tells the story of the rise of the SS and its Business Administration Main Office (WVHA) under the leadership of Oswald Pohl. The book begins with SS Reichsführer Heinrich Himmler’s dabbling in business projects in 1934, founding the Nordland Verlag Publishing Company and other enterprises to help publicize the SS worldview, and concludes with the collapse of Germany at the end of World War II. The WVHA began organizing large-scale concentration camp factories in 1938, and it was responsible for a vast network of slave labor. This organization oversaw a number of industrial projects during the war, and SS civil engineers designed and constructed the concentration camps, including the gas chambers and the crematoria. In the later stages of the war, they built underground factories for the production of the V-1 cruise missile and the V-2 rockets under the leadership of Hans Kammler, the most productive of the SS managers.

These managers, and the Nazis in general, were infatuated with modern technology. According to Allen, they viewed technology in a racial light, and believed that adopting the most modern machines displayed their racial superiority. They were anti-capitalistic; they believed in working for “social” goals rather than profit. Allen reiterates the basic contradiction in the aims of the SS at many points throughout the book. They set up factories to produce goods and to aid the war effort on the one hand, but they also wished to destroy the very slave labor needed to achieve these aims on the other. “Productivism” for them was first and foremost to punish, brutalize, and eliminate the prisoners, “useless eaters” and enemies of the regime, the very source of labor needed to build the New Order in the East and ensure the very survival of the Third Reich itself. Allen tells this tale in a narrative that combines collective and individual biography with institutional history. He presents the mini-stories of the figures who were hired by Pohl to move the SS business enterprise forward. These men were all convinced Nazis—accountants, lawyers, engineers and supervisors—, imbued with the values of the SS, but their experience as managers was a secondary consideration even though they were responsible for the administration of large corporations. Allen “argues that the modern management of technological systems works only when managerial consensus (based on ideology) and sound knowledge of the complex material realities of production can be brought together in a coherent system.” The WVHA had the ideological consensus, but lacked the understanding and managerial skill to deal with large business enterprises. This is why it failed.

Max Weber (1864-1920), the great German theoretician of modern bureaucracy, used the “iron cage” metaphor to describe the plight of middle managers in large corporations. He saw these men as constrained by cultural meaninglessness and impotent to resist the imperatives of the corporation, much like Kafka’s “puppet figures” in *The Trial* and *The Castle*. Historians and others often used this powerful metaphor to understand and explain the horrors of the Holocaust, and it was also used by perpetrators to avoid culpability. The picture of the Nazi bureaucrat was forever set in our minds by Hannah Arendt’s depiction of Adolf Eichmann as the atomized organization man, more amoral than actively perpetrating evil. In Allen’s view, the genocide was hardly such an absentminded distraction and could not have issued from any isolated individual decision. “Far from being mere cogs in the wheel of a murderous system, the young ambitious Germans who worked for the WVHA believed in National Socialism and in their ability to solve their nation’s most pressing problems through the vigorous application of modern industrial methods.” Kurt Wisselinc, a relatively obscure SS midlevel manager, was typical of Pohl’s WVHA officers. He felt empowered, filled with the “fury of work,” and like the others described in the book, he endowed his institution with “personal significance.” These were the men who mediated the horror at every stage in the concentration camps.

Peter Hayes described *The Business of Genocide* as an “impassioned, iconoclastic, and deeply researched book that imparts new insight into the relative roles of ideological conviction and careerism in motivating the most vicious perpetrators of the Holocaust, the SS men who managed the concentration camps and the exploitation of inmate labor.” Allen’s book is a very detailed study of one part of the huge bureaucracy of the Third Reich, and it called to mind the struggles I had as a young student trying to understand the organizational structure of the much simpler Roosevelt administration. Allen provides a useful guide to “Abbreviations” in the front of the book to help with the numerous acronyms, and another later in the book for the fifty-eight pages of notes. There are also a number of structural charts to help the reader understand the organization of the SS bureaucracy, a very good index of proper names, and a bibliography to help with the thousands of notes.

The book opens with a description of the three separate initiatives of the SS: Himmler’s first industrial ventures, the financial administration under Pohl, and the foundation of the concentration camps (IKL) by Theodor Eicke. These were distinct units in the mid-1930s, but eventually the exploitation of slave labor
brought them together. Pohl and the other managers accepted the “primacy of policing” policy (brutality and terror), set by Eicke for all prisoners, even though this interfered with the efficiency of work. The drive to be “modern” in the name of culture and race doomed many of the industrial projects set up in the camps because the SS seemed incapable of organizing the workers and training them to use the sophisticated machinery employed. You needed more than machines; you needed a healthy workforce to do the kind of work required of the prisoners. Only two enterprises thrived in this climate. The textile factory (TexLed) at the Ravensbrück Camp and the SS Construction Corps (BIs) were the most successful ventures using concentration camp labor. Ravensbrück was a women’s camp and many women knew how to sew, so little training was required. The heavy construction projects of the BIs utilized the thousands of unskilled laborers available in the camps and had the added benefit of fulfilling the SS goal of using up the prisoners. Both of these enterprises were led by competent, though brutal, managers: Felix Krug at Ravensbrück and Hans Kammler, Director of BIs. Competence was the prime ingredient missing in most SS businesses.

Throughout, Himmler, Reichskommissar for the Reinforcement of Germandom (RFK) after 1939, and his WVHA managers kept their eye on the most important goal of the SS, to construct a New Order in the East for Aryan settlers, and Allen devotes an entire chapter to these plans. After the fall of Poland, “the SS initiatives were manifold and involved the pacification of indigenous peoples, their extermination, and the transplantation of ‘Aryan’ settlers as the vanguard of German imperialism in the territories of the East.” This involved driving out and murdering the population of Poland and the Slavic states to the east. The creation of the New Order remained a fixation through 1942, and it continued to be mentioned in SS documents almost until the end of the war. After 1942, when the Germans started losing battles and territory, the WVHA was called upon to change direction and help with the manufacture of armaments to support the war. Albert Speer was made Reich Minister of Armaments and Munitions and soon began his involvement with the SS in order to attract labor for his projects. Most German workers were already committed to fighting in the war, and the only supply of labor great enough to fulfill the contracts for armaments was held in the concentration camps. This expansion of the SS was not, according to Allen, a power grab. As the description on the book jacket states, Allen’s book “powerfully contradicts the assumption that the SS forced slavery on the German economy, demonstrating that instead industrialists such as Speer, Volkswagen, Messerschmitt and I.G. Farben, actively sought out the WVHA as a valued partner in the war economy.”

Michael Thad Allen’s The Business of Genocide is an important book. According to Christopher Browning, “The WVHA has been a huge gap in existing scholarship on important institutions in the Third Reich, and engineers have hitherto escaped the scrutiny that has fallen on many other professions in Nazi Germany. In one book Allen has filled both of these gaps admirably. He convincingly exposes as entirely false the alleged dichotomy between apolitical, naïve, task-absorbed technocrats and ideologically driven, highly politicized Nazi fanatics.”


The reasons for this phenomenon, not unlike the sudden appearance of books on this subject following the opening of Rudolf Hochhuth’s play, The Deputy, in 1963, are not entirely clear. Certain developments might, however, explain some of the recent intense scholarly interest in this topic. These include initiatives by the current pope acknowledging the responsibility of the Catholic Church for wrongs committed against the Jews over many centuries, together with, ironically, his efforts to have Pius XII canonized, and his continuing reluctance to allow scholars full access to the Vatican archives. Moreover, we live in an era of sudden availability of new sources of documentation on Nazi Germany and the Holocaust. The wealth of new documentation in eastern European archives, made available to scholars since the collapse of the Soviet Union more than a decade ago, has enabled scholars to reassess familiar topics in the history of the Holocaust. Despite this additional information, the role of the Vatican and Pope Pius XII remains shrouded in mystery, and will likely continue so until the Vatican archives are fully and freely opened to scholars. The recent demise of the international scholars’ commission on the Vatican archives would seem to indicate that such an opening is not likely to occur in the near future.

Current interest in the papacy of Pius XII might also be explained as an obsessive search for evidence of papal anti-Semitism. This reflects a larger need by some to explain the actions of those in power who committed genocide, or at least tolerated it, in terms of an active and virulent hatred of Jews. For some it is still difficult to accept that many were simply ambivalent or indifferent to the fate of the Jews between 1933 and 1945. Hence the on-going search for the one document that would reveal Pius XII as a passionate anti-Semite who actually supported the extermination of the Jews of Europe.

Yet no one has found such evidence, not even John Cornwell, who in his excellent study trumpeted his exclusive access to some hitherto classified Vatican records but never claimed to have found concrete evidence of Pius XII’s support for the destruction of Europe’s Jews. But Cornwell and others, despite an inability to prove beyond doubt the existence of eager or active complicity in the murder of six million Jews, have brought us closer to the realization that for the behavior of Pius XII, as for that of some Nazis, the explanation may be rather more complex but no less damning. Ambivalence toward the extermination of a group of human
beings on the part of leaders and institutions in a position to do something to stop the genocide establishes complicity and guilt as much as active hatred and participation in the process of mass murder.

Susan Zuccotti’s *Under His Very Windows: The Vatican and the Holocaust in Italy* is a splendid account of the Holocaust in Italy. It is also, in part, a study in papal ambivalence toward the fate of the Jews in Europe during the Second World War, but one that offers few new revelations or conclusions about the role of the Vatican in general, and Pope Pius XII in particular. The reader once again discovers a Catholic Church that, as an institution, maintained its traditional antipathy toward the Jews, based not merely on the obvious religious grounds, but also on the political, economic, and social manifestations of modernity that the Catholic Church rejected, particularly its pathological fear of Marxism. The anti-Jewish legislation in Germany and later Italy during the 1930s occasioned no opposition from the Vatican, nor did it ever pose a threat to the Concordats and the overall cordial relations between the Papacy and the two fascist regimes. Once again, the reader confronts a church that interceded from time to time on behalf of “non-Aryan Christians,” Jews who had converted to Catholicism. The author also presents a pontiff who remained silent and essentially ambivalent to the fate of the Jews of Europe during World War II, lamenting on occasion only in the most general terms the suffering of many peoples throughout Europe as a result of the war, and ignoring the particular plight of the Jews. Finally, there are the countless stories of individuals, lay and clergy, Catholic and non-Catholic, who on their own initiative provided protection for Jews. Of course, Pius XII’s ambivalence neither abetted nor precluded the many heroic acts of individual Catholics in support of the Jews. In other words, there is neither evidence that he encouraged Catholics to help the Jews nor discouraged them from doing so, an indication of ambivalence about rather than enthusiasm for the destruction of Europe’s Jews.

So what makes this book a worthwhile contribution to the literature of the Holocaust? Zuccotti presents the most detailed and up-to-date account of the Holocaust in Italy and in the Italian-occupied areas of Europe during World War II, augmenting material covered in her excellent book, *The Italians and the Holocaust: Persecution, Rescue, Survival* (1987), which deals primarily with the reasons of ordinary Italians to the plight of the Jews in Italy. Furthermore, *Under His Very Windows* does provide some important new information on the Holocaust in Italian-occupied southeastern France and Croatia, such as the papacy’s diplomatic intervention with the Italian government to prevent deportations from those territories, as well as the fate of non-Italian Jews who had made their way into Italy or those territories occupied by Hitler’s Italian allies. Thus, through the prism of Vatican interests and policies, the reader finds the most comprehensive account to date of the fate of the Jews under Italian control, areas within which the Pope and the institutional Church presumably had the greatest opportunity to influence events. It is within this context that official inaction or ambivalence on the part of the Pope and his church is particularly tragic and abhorrent.

Zuccotti examines papal attitudes and policies toward the Jews against the backdrop of the anti-Jewish laws in pre-war Italy, as well as the plight of Jews in Italy during its wartime alliance with Germany between 1940 and 1943, in the Italian zones of occupation in France and Croatia, and in Italy during the period of German occupation after the Italian surrender in 1943. Slightly more than half the book is devoted to this last period.

Before he became Pope Pius XII in March 1939, Eugenio Pacelli essentially welcomed the consequences if not the modern, racial rationale of Mussolini’s anti-Jewish laws of the fall of 1938, laws that reversed the modern emancipation of Italy’s Jews and restored them to their pre-modern status in a Christian society. As pope, Pacelli actively tried to protect only those Jews who had converted to Catholicism from the consequences of the anti-Jewish laws, thus following in the footsteps of his predecessor, Pius XI. Vatican relations with the Italian government between 1940 and 1943 regarding the Jews in Italy and, especially, in Italian-occupied France and Croatia are particularly compelling. In the Italian occupied areas of Croatia, the Vatican, in a “perfunctory, polite, and dilatory” manner, urged Mussolini not to cooperate with the Germans by deporting the Jews from the Italian zone in Croatia, something the latter did not intend to do in any case. Yet the Vatican did virtually nothing to protest the slaughter of Jews, Serbs, and others in the German occupation zone of Italy by the Catholic Ustasha regime in Zagreb. In brief, Vatican help, minimal in any case, was not decisive in the Italian occupation zone of Croatia. In Italian-controlled southeastern France, the Vatican similarly argued against deportations of Jews. In southeastern France as well the Italian authorities had no intention of cooperating with the Germans in the matter of deportations, and not a single Jew was deported from the Italian zone in France.

The only explanation for Pius XII’s opposition to deportations from Italian-occupied areas remains the obvious embarrassment that would result from the deportation of Jews to their deaths from territories where the Vatican presumably wielded authority and influence. In other words, the Vatican might be forced to do something it steadfastly wished to avoid, namely a public recognition of and opposition to the mass murder of the Jews. But the weak Vatican responses to deportations from Catholic countries such as Slovakia, Vichy France, and the German-controlled parts of Croatia, as well as its virtual silence in the face of the deportations from German-occupied Italy beginning in late 1943, would seem to indicate that there would have been no Vatican response had the Italian government cooperated with the Germans in deportations from its territories before 1943.

Ultimately, this book draws the same overall conclusion about papal behavior with regard to the mass murder of the Jews during the Second World War as most of the other studies of this subject have done. With the exception of converted Jews, Pius XII did very little to help the Jews in Italy and, for that matter, the rest of Europe. Moreover, the author’s summary list of likely reasons for this behavior is certainly accurate and useful, if not entirely new. They include Vatican fears that: confrontation with the Axis powers would harm the Catholic Church in Europe in general, and the Vatican in particular, while doing nothing in the end to relieve the plight of the Jews; the ability to help Jews who had converted to Catholicism and the Jewish spouses of mixed marriages would be compromised; and the desire for a separate peace between the Germans and the Allies at the expense of the Soviet Union would be jeopardized. In assessing the significance of Pius XII’s personal attitudes toward the Jews, the author correctly points to the larger Vatican culture of antipathy, shared by Pacelli, toward the forces of modernism of which it considered the Jews to be the primary instigators and beneficiaries. In this context, the author reminds us that Vatican silence in the face of German crimes con-

Major cataclysms, conflicts, revolutions, and turmoil—especially those with international elements—tend to leave a residue of linguistic shorthand, of foreign words that are taken into other languages more or less permanently: Bolshevik, putsch, flak, apparatchik, and blitz are all common examples. Not all linguistic borrowings linger; for example, at the time of the strictly fundamentalist rule in Iran, Britain’s Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, known for her own autocratic ways, was given the title Ayatollah, but it never stuck; she continues to be known as the Iron Lady. Sometimes words or phrases are translated into English: for example the “ethnic cleansing” was originally etnièko čišaunje in the former Yugoslavia.

Given the magnitude of the catastrophe of 1933-1945 and the genocide that was such a major part of the war years, it is not surprising that the Third Reich has yielded so much language with such a wealth of hidden meaning. There has long been a need for a lexicon of Nazi German, especially one that gives not only a translation of the word or phrase, but also an explanation of the undertones or background to the term, its euphemistic nature, perhaps, or its particularly macabre connotations. Robert Michael and Karin Doerr have now provided us with just such a book. It is, as Wolfgang Mieder states in his Foreword, “...a dictionary of the special vocabulary, phrases, slogans, and euphemisms of Nazi German,” that includes “military and governmental terms, hundreds of abbreviations and acronyms, code names, stereotypes, ethnic slurs and so forth.”

Today, more than half a century after those dark, catastrophic years, many people (especially the young) do not know any of the words and terms beyond “Führer,” or, perhaps, “Judenfrage,” and “Endlösung.” Words such as “Appell,” “Kapo,” or “Judenstern” are probably clear to most, but what about “Blitzmädel” or “Rassenschande”? Michael and Doerr provide all the essential information: the “Blitzmädel,” for instance, is the “lightning girl. Name for female communication helper working for the Wehrmacht.” “Rassenschande” is “Race defilement. Sexual activity between Jews and Aryans, Jews and German citizens, and Jews and those related by blood to German citizens was considered a crime as defined in the September 1935 Blood Protection Law.” The compilers list no fewer than seventy-three terms beginning with the word “Rasse” (race), thus confirming the centrality of race, biology, blood to the Nazis’ program. “Blut” (blood) with its many compounds appears fifty-one times, and “Reich,” together with its many compounds, occurs 183 times! Heinrich Himmler, the most powerful man in Germany after Hitler, was known among the people as the “Reichsheini,” or, as the compilers tell us, the “Reich Ass. Heinrich Himmler’s nickname; a pun on Heinrich/Heinri, or dumb ass.” When the term merits it, the compilers are expansive in the descriptive explanation. “Nachtd-Nebel-Erlaß” (Night-and-Fog-Decree) merits ten lines, while “Organisation Todt” (“Todt Organization”) gets eight lines. The wry humor and irony shared by soldiers everywhere led, as we hear, to another bitter pun toward the end of the war: “Organisation tot” (“Dead Organisation”) was soldiers’ slang for the final war years, referring to the increasing disorganization and red tape in the German army.” The verb “organisieren” meant “to procure war years, referring to the increasing disorganization and red tape in the German army.” The verb “organisieren” meant “to procure war years, referring to the increasing disorganization and red tape in the German army.” The verb “organisieren” meant “to procure war years, referring to the increasing disorganization and red tape in the German army.” The verb “organisieren” meant “to procure war years, referring to the increasing disorganization and red tape in the German army.” The verb “organisieren” meant “to procure war years, referring to the increasing disorganization and red tape in the German army.” The verb “organisieren” meant “to procure war years, referring to the increasing disorganization and red tape in the German army.”

In addition to the English translation of words, phrases, and other terms, there are historical facts wherever relevant, as well as explanations, clarifications, dates, figures, and statistics. The vast number of contractions (Gestapo for “geheime Staatspolizei”), abbreviations (“K-Häftling” for “Kugelhäftling,” the inmate destined to be murdered through a bullet through the neck), and acronyms (NSV for “Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt” or National Socialist People’s Welfare) are identified and explained very well. Sometimes a humorous note, despite the macabre content enters in: e.g. the “NSV-Schweinechen,” or “Piglet of the National Socialist pig-slop collection. Image on propaganda poster naming kitchen waste as suitable pig fodder to be collected as a public welfare measure. Printed on the poster were the words [in German] “I eat potato peels, vegetables, salad and fruit, but not chemicals, cleansers, and spices.” There are fifty-nine acronyms beginning with the letters NS.
In addition to the dictionary section and three [!] forewords, an appendix lists the major concentration camps and ghettos, ranks in the army, Waffen SS, and airforce (why not the navy?), the SS divisions, the concentration camp triangular badges. The appendix also contains the texts of some of the most frequently sung Nazi songs, as well as (English only) the party program of 1920. There is the “loyalty oath,” as well as the Nazi designations for the months (October, for example, was to be called “Ghilhard, Weinmond (wine moon).” There are also a “Children’s Prayer,” and some of the Führer’s “Maxims” from a 1936 school primer. The latter are particularly chilling, sinister and sickening, since they are aimed at conditioning the innocent. The appendix also contains a mnemonic for learning the alphabet. A select bibliography guides those who wish to know more about Nazi German. As is almost inevitable with such a lexicon spanning the languages, there are some misprints, which slightly mar an otherwise first-class work, which is surely destined to become a standard volume in all Holocaust libraries.

David Scrase
University of Vermont


Alvin Rosenfeld has argued that Holocaust writings, notably memoirs, seem to be more the consecutive and often repetitive chapters of an ongoing, multi-authored story than the discrete narratives of single personalities. Thus, he argues, we, as readers, should focus on memoirs as a composite literature made up of collective, rather than isolated voices. While Holocaust memoirs clearly constitute a distinct genre, which, like other autobiographical reconstructions, shows how the self writing in the present was constituted in the past, it also forms a testimony in which authors try to shape experience into a discourse that allows for an explanation of personal survival in the fulcrum of the Holocaust. The memoirs reviewed here evidently contribute to such a composite literature, but they also demonstrate how the force of individual personality and post-Holocaust life stories conspire to also formulate highly distinctive narratives. This is even more so given the shared gender and age of the authors and the accompanying prominence of the theme of “coming of age” during the Holocaust. As such, the two memoirs bolster Rosenfeld’s argument by the availability and comparability of other memoirs of female “coming of age” during the Holocaust.

Born in 1932, Edith Bruck was raised in a small Hungarian village by a poor, quarrelsome, but sometimes affectionate family. In the early years of the war, it was the incremental isolation of the Jews that thwarted Edith’s attempt to fit in and feel connected to a world larger than her family. Passover 1944 was the point at which the Nazi noose constricted around the Hungarian Jewish community and sealed its fate at Auschwitz. There, twelve-year-old Edith and her older sister, Eliz, were separated from their parents and brothers and spared the immediate fate of the crematorium. After three months at Auschwitz, the sisters embarked on a perilous journey to labor camps run by Organisation Todt, to Dachau, to Christianstadt, and, finally, to Bergen-Belsen until liberation in April 1945. By the end of that year Edith and Eliz were wending their way back to Budapest in search of the remnants of their family. Two adult sisters, who had avoided deportation, took in the two girls, but bickering and tension hindered a happy reunion. A disastrous love affair with a cousin and an arranged marriage with another man dominated Edith’s immediate post-liberation experience. By summer 1948, she and her husband had made their way to Israel and, unsurprisingly, divorced. A gutsy seventeen-year-old, Edith struggled to make a life in Haifa, soon marrying, twice and without success, other Hungarian émigrés. Integration into Israeli society eluded her and she proceeded to her present homeland, Italy, marrying an Italian and becoming a professional writer, in Italian. Who Loves You Like This is a translation of her memoir, first published in 1958.

Just a year older than Edith Bruck, Ruth Kluger also is a writer, as well as a now retired Professor of German at the University of California, Irvine. Unlike Bruck, who ends her narrative at her departure from Israel for Italy, Kluger offers a complete autobiography from childhood in her native Vienna right up to the present. Her Holocaust experience included internment in Theresienstadt, Auschwitz-Birkenau, and, like Bruck, Christianstadt. In contrast to Edith, separated forever from her mother upon arrival at Auschwitz, Ruth survived along with her mother, who died at age ninety-seven in the year 2000. Like the majority of Holocaust memoirs, Still Alive traces the “before,” “during,” and “after” of Holocaust survival, presenting in chronological order the details of deportation, incarcerations, transports, and liberation. Shared experience and shared age provide many parallels in the “during” portions of Bruck’s and Kluger’s memoirs, even though their pre-Holocaust lives had differed as to cultural, socio-economic, and educational background. The parallels stem, I believe, from a shared, female, early adolescent psychological reaction to the same sorts of extreme circumstances presented by the Holocaust experience. Indeed, a shared quality of both memoirs is the ability to transmit, from an adult retrospective, the nuances of a child’s coping both physically and psychologically with the experience of the Holocaust. Both provide a (horrific) glimpse into a child’s eye view, seemingly unobstructed by the lens of later life experience.

Otherwise the memoirs contrast, and not solely because Kluger covers her life up to the present and Bruck does not. Stylistically they differ, with Bruck’s spare, straightforward approach contrasting with Kluger’s more literarily complex and embellished presentation. More pointedly, Bruck does not interperse her narrative with a self-conscious adult analysis of the childhood experience. Whereas Kluger very deliberately comments on childhood and post-Holocaust lives had differed as to cultural, socio-economic, and educational background. The parallels stem, I believe, from a shared, female, early adolescent psychological reaction to the same sorts of extreme circumstances presented by the Holocaust experience. Indeed, a shared quality of both memoirs is the ability to transmit, from an adult retrospective, the nuances of a child’s coping both physically and psychologically with the experience of the Holocaust. Both provide a (horrific) glimpse into a child’s eye view, seemingly unobstructed by the lens of later life experience.

Shared age and gender, along with evident facility with language, highlight a similarity between the two memoirs in the imper-
ors as a genre clearly express a need to testify and contribute to history, Bruck and Kluger (along with some others) also engage in the process of writing for therapeutic purposes, trying to make sense of the impact of the Holocaust on their subsequent lives. It is not Bruck, but her Italian husband, in a foreword to the volume, who elucidates the long agony and compulsion suffusing the writing endeavor for Bruck. Kluger, on the other hand, speaks for herself and is very self-conscious about how writing the memoir has enabled her to make sense of her self and of her often ambivalent and contentious relationship with her mother. Indeed, this relationship serves as the strongest connecting thread in the memoir. Kluger purposely did not publish the English version of her memoir, first published in German in 1992, until her mother’s death.

While Kluger, but not Bruck, intellectualizes to a degree her life history, both memoirists achieve a sometimes brutal honesty about themselves, about their familial interactions, and about their relationships with men, before, during, and after the Holocaust. Their admitted difficulties with men clearly are felt by both authors to have been impacted by psychological experiences emanating from the Holocaust. The self-disclosure penetrating both memoirs not only may have provided therapeutic cleansing for the authors, but draws the reader into the miasmatic world of the Holocaust. We cannot imagine going through such horror, but projections of our own coming-of-age can be used to try to imagine it. Despite Auschwitz and the rest of it, the authors still had to make a journey towards adulthood. Their honesty and ability to reconstruct their child’s-eye view affirm the power of testimony and its intersection between memory and history.

Despite their distinctive voices, however, the memoirs also participate in a wider, composite Holocaust literature. Reading Bruck and Kluger brings to mind other works, including the female “coming of age in the Holocaust” memoirs of Judith Isaacson, Nechama Tec, Magda Denes, and others. All describe experiences of fear, loss, and survival with emotional clarity and psychological insight, resulting in narratives illuminating the young female perspective. While they differ in the extent to which a mediating adult self interjects into the narrative, all present a childhood consciousness that tells a tale so painful to listen to. We hear their voices in remembrance of the more than one million children who did not live to tell the tale.

Carroll Lewin
University of Vermont


It is well known that during World War II Jews frequently tried to save their lives by hiding. Anne Frank’s diary is perhaps the most famous example of an account by a hidden Jew. Many Jewish families used fake identities and moved from place to place in order to avoid being captured, and to survive. But survival was never easy, especially for those who lived in ghettos. In the hope of saving their little ones, parents often tried to smuggle their children out of harm’s way by sending them to Catholic convents or even to live with non-Jewish families. It wasn’t easy to find families who were willing to risk their lives in order to help the children survive the Holocaust.

Your Name is Renée is about a hidden child, who lived in Nazi-occupied France. Ruth Kapp Hartz was only four years old when her older cousin Jeannette taught her to hide her identity. When she moved from Paris to Toulouse to join her uncle Heinrich and his family, Ruth was not allowed to show her German-Jewish identity outside of her family circle. For her safety, Jeannette taught Ruth that she was French and, to make it more believable, she renamed her Renée. In order for Renée to blend into the French culture, she learned to behave like all other French children. She went to kindergarten and sometimes even attended church in order to appear “normal.”

In Toulouse, Renée lived with her mother in a one-room apartment and waited for her father Benno to return from the Foreign Legion. At a Sabbath dinner, Renée’s family was warned about a building roundup, so they left Toulouse immediately to avoid capture. From Toulouse they went to St. Juery where her other uncle, Oscar, and his family lived. But even there it wasn’t safe to stay more than a short time and they moved again, to Arthes. With the help of the French Resistance, they managed to find friends and protectors, who gave them an apartment to live in. In the same village, a chance encounter began another friendship with a French family, who also protected Renée’s family.

Despite the efforts to protect this poor family, in this small village, it was impossible to hide their identity for long. The family came under pressure from blackmailers and police interrogation, and Arthes, too, became unsafe for Renée’s family. The only solution to these problems seemed to be for the family to split up. While Renée’s mother remained in Arthes, her father went to a farm in the mountains, and Renée was sent to the convent at Soreze. She was separated from her parents for the first time.

Dealing with the anxiety and uncertainty that Renée experiences, this part of the story is heartbreaking. The sisters at Soreze always told Renée that she was an orphan, like everyone else. She couldn’t talk about her parents and she even began to question whether or not she was an orphan until she received a smuggled bag of candies, which assured her that her parents were alive. Renée stayed in the convent and learned about Catholicism until, a few months before liberation, she went back to Arthes to be reunited with her parents.

The book itself is divided into three parts: Escape, In Hiding, and Liberation. The author uses very simple language that accentuates the child’s perspective in the story-telling. Life-threatening situations, moving from place to place, hunger, and fear are all seen through this child’s eyes. Photographs of the family from that era are included in the book and these make the story even more personal.

The author, Stacey Cretzmeyer, a former student of Ruth Kapp Hartz, was interested in what happened to Jewish children in France during World War II. She contacted Ruth Kapp Hartz for references or connections in France when she began her research. Upon discovering that Mrs. Kapp Hartz was one of those children, Cretzmeyer decided to focus on her former teacher’s story. Together, these women have achieved an emotive, historical illustration of one child’s perspective of surviving the Holocaust, which will hopefully reach a broad audience and also be used as an educational tool.

Amra Dumisic

Amra Dumisic is a recent graduate of the University of Vermont.
Editor Mindy Weisel is to be commended for compiling this volume. Twelve women (thirteen if the editor’s brief preface is included) from a variety of backgrounds and professions reveal how the daughter of one or two Holocaust survivors has shaped their lives. An informative introduction by Eva Fogelman, pioneering social psychologist and psychotherapist, provides a helpful context. It is equally useful if read as an afterword. Individual chapters are introduced with a brief paragraph covering the editor’s connection to the author and closing with a similarly succinct biography.

The contributors do not follow a specific format, but the individual contributions fall naturally into certain groups. Helen Epstein, Hadassah Lieberman, Kim Masters, and, in part, Deb Filler share accounts of their visits to Europe. Masters and Filler travel to their families’ places of origin with one or both parents. Lieberman joins the American delegation to Auschwitz to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of its liberation. These personal essays derive much of their force from the author’s explicit exploration of the tangled web of parallels and disjunctions between their current travels and their relatives’ final journeys during the Holocaust.

In “Normal,” Epstein travels by train from Prague to Berlin as part of an author’s tour. Her essay explores the emotional terrain she must negotiate during the journey. Most tellingly, she considers the question raised by a German reporter, who asks “Do I think that to be German will ever be normal?” Epstein discovers “in that place where I think of Germany as a collection of concentration camps I am startled to discover that I also believe in a normal that is defined as ‘not Auschwitz.’”

Another group of contributors, including Patinka Kopec, Vera Loeffler, Aviva Kempner, and Miriam Morsel Nathan, consider how their artistic endeavors have been shaped by their family legacies. Weisel herself, in the preface, analyzes the relationship between her art and her role as a daughter of survivors, and one of her paintings is used in the jacket art. The brief autobiographical essays by Loeffler and Nathan are followed by examples of their artistry—Loeffler’s photographs and Nathan’s poetry. The combination of context and text is especially effective in illustrating how the legacy of the Holocaust has affected these women’s work.

The very lack of context works against the contribution by Nava Semel. The story is extremely effective in showing how an Israeli has been able to break through that society’s silence about the Shoah (as Fogelman explains in the introduction). However, the lack of an autobiographical statement from the author—a break with the format of the preceding chapters—and the editor’s description of the writer as “the voice for the second generation,” lead the reader to expect that the first person narrator of the story is a member of the second generation. It is therefore disorienting to discover that the narrator is, in fact, a camp survivor, and is remembering the woman who contributed to her survival. The confusion created by this avoidable situation diminishes what is otherwise an extremely powerful work of fiction.

Sylvia Goldberg, Lily Brett, and Rosie Wiesel write personal essays about their sense of the legacy of the Holocaust. Goldberg considers the way a subconscious impulse led her to discover more about her early childhood and eventually led to a revelation about her father. Lily Brett explores the emotional legacy of the second generation in the aptly titled “Letting Myself Feel Lucky.” In “Starting Over,” Rosie Wiesel considers the continuity devotion to Judaism and life in Israel have brought to her and her family.

Rosie Wiesel, who grew up in an Orthodox home, is the most religiously observant of the contributors, but each of these women feels connected to her Jewishness in a religious as well as an ethnic sense. While these connections are varied, each one has been deliberately reached.

Daughters of Absence reflects the diaspora of the post-war era as well. Many of the contributors were not born in the United States and two, Deb Filler and Lily Brett, grew up in New Zealand and Australia, respectively. A number were born in 1947 or 1948 in Europe, and emigrated to the United States when they were old enough to have memories of their birthplace. Thus it is not only the absence of extended family, but a sense of having come from somewhere else that shapes their consciousness.

This collection is not a scholarly volume, nor does it pretend to be comprehensive in its consideration of the effects of the Holocaust on the daughters of survivors. Nonetheless, it is worth reading for the individual voices of the contributors, all of whom bear witness not only to the deeply felt, enduring absence of extended families, but to the benison and burden that is their legacy as the children of survivors. In the words of Kim Masters, “When it was all over, there were still no answers to many of my questions. Who were we? […] What did we become because of Hitler, and what in spite of him?”
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