

The Persecution and Murder of the Jews, 1933–1945

The Persecution and Murder of the
European Jews by Nazi Germany,
1933–1945

Series edited on behalf of the German Federal Archives,
the Institute of Contemporary History Munich-Berlin,
and the Chair for Modern History
at the Albert Ludwig University of Freiburg

In cooperation with Yad Vashem

Volume 1

edited by

Götz Aly, Wolf Gruner, Susanne Heim, Ulrich Herbert,
Hans-Dieter Kreikamp, Horst Möller,
Dieter Pohl, and Hartmut Weber

English edition also edited by

Michael Hollmann, Sybille Steinbacher,
Simone Walther-von Jena, and Andreas Wirsching

International Advisory Board for the English edition

Nomi Halpern, Elizabeth Harvey, Dan Michman,
and Alan E. Steinweis

The Persecution and Murder of the
European Jews by Nazi Germany,
1933–1945

Volume 1

German Reich
1933–1937

Executive Editor
Wolf Gruner

Coordinator of the English-language edition
Caroline Pearce,
with the assistance of Dorothy Mas

DE GRUYTER
OLDENBOURG

יָד וָשֵׁם
YAD VASHEM
THE WORLD HOLOCAUST
REMEMBRANCE CENTER

THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE
FOR HOLOCAUST RESEARCH

The original German edition was published under the title:
Die Verfolgung und Ermordung der europäischen Juden
durch das nationalsozialistische Deutschland 1933–1945,
hrsg. im Auftrag des Bundesarchivs, des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte und des Lehrstuhls
für Neuere und Neueste Geschichte an der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg
von Götz Aly, Wolf Gruner, Susanne Heim, Ulrich Herbert, Hans-Dieter Kreikamp,
Horst Möller, Dieter Pohl und Hartmut Weber,
Bd. 1, Deutsches Reich 1933–1937, bearbeitet von Wolf Gruner,
© München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag GmbH, 2008

Coordinator of the English-language edition between 2014–2016
Alex J. Kay,
with assistance of Carla MacDougall

ISBN 978-3-11-035359-4
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-043519-1
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-043321-0

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018019475

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2019 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Typesetting: Meta Systems Publishing & Printservices GmbH, Wustermark
Cover and dust jacket: Frank Ortmann and Martin Z. Schröder
Printing and binding: Beltz Grafische Betriebe GmbH, Bad Langensalza

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Foreword to the English Edition	7
Editorial Preface	11
Introduction	15
List of Documents	61
Documents	79
Glossary	801
Approximate Rank and Hierarchy Equivalents	817
List of Abbreviations	821
List of Archives, Sources, and Literature Cited	827
Index	843

Foreword to the English Edition

The Persecution and Murder of the European Jews by Nazi Germany, 1933–1945 presents a broad range of primary sources in a scholarly edition. A total of sixteen English-language volumes will be published in this series, organized according to chronology and geography. The series documents the horrific historical events embodied by the terms Holocaust and Shoah. This English-language edition reproduces all the materials in the German edition but has been adapted for an English-speaking readership. Apart from those originally written in English, all documents have been translated from the language of the original source.

This first volume contains documents on the persecution of Germany's Jews between 1933 and 1937. The second volume covers the period from January 1938 to the beginning of the Second World War in September 1939, thereby encompassing the antisemitic policies pursued in Austria and the Sudetenland following their annexation to the Third Reich. The subsequent volumes focus on the persecution and murder of the Jews in the large swathes of Europe that were occupied by the Wehrmacht, came under German control after the start of the Second World War, or were allies of Nazi Germany. Particular attention is paid to those regions in which the most Jews lived, especially Poland, the occupied Soviet Union, and Hungary. The murder of the Jews of Central and Eastern Europe is described using a wealth of new documents. The Jews in North Africa were also affected by Nazi policies, either directly (in Tunisia and Libya) or indirectly via the Vichy government (Algeria and Morocco). Their fate is documented in a number of the sources included in volumes 5 and 12 on Western Europe, though it does not form a focal point of this series.

The sources used for this edition are written documents and, occasionally, transcribed audio materials, dating from the period of National Socialist rule between 1933 and 1945. The decision was taken not to include memoirs, reports, and judicial documents produced in the period after 1945. However, the footnotes make extensive reference to such retrospective testimonies and historical accounts.

The documents within each volume are arranged chronologically. The editors have chosen not to group documents thematically in an attempt to avoid oversimplified or teleological interpretations of events. At the same time, the aim is to record the responses, whether restrained or more vocal, to Germany's anti-Jewish policies. Hence, the documents indicate how some of the non-Jewish population displayed empathy and a desire to help the persecuted, while others gloated or blatantly encouraged murder. The varied responses from the victims themselves include trust, confusion, fear, determination, or desperation. Functionaries of all kinds are given a voice, as are ordinary citizens, intellectuals, and domestic and foreign observers. The documents shed light on the actions and reactions of people with differing backgrounds and convictions and in different places, and indicate their intentions as well as the frequently limited options available to them. The editors place particular significance on private letters, diary entries, and appeals by the persecuted Jews. As the historian Saul Friedländer has noted, 'theirs were the only voices that conveyed both the clarity of insight and the total blindness of human beings confronted with an entirely new and utterly

horrifying reality'.¹ It is also important that this primary source collection contains a representative selection of documents left behind by the perpetrators, especially as it is being compiled in Germany, where the central planning of the persecution and murder occurred.

This first volume illustrates the blend of coldly calculating actions and violence that brought about the disenfranchisement of the Jews, and the variety of reactions to these policies up to the end of 1937. The documents present a wide variety of perspectives: from Königsberg to Stuttgart, from the Jewish family bulletin to the antisemitic smear-sheet, from the law courts to the spa, from the sports club to the school, from the Post Office official fired for racial reasons to the speeches of Hitler. This multi-perspective approach will also be adopted in subsequent volumes, although the focus of the sources selected will be adapted in each case in accordance with the regional circumstances and the course and impact of the German-instigated 'final solution to the Jewish question'. The continuously shifting focus and the chronological presentation of the sources result in a juxtaposition of documents that may appear confusing or contradictory. However, this necessarily fragmentary but also differentiated version of events opens up the possibility of varying approaches and interpretations.

It goes without saying that a primary source collection such as this bears witness to the time and place of its compilation, as well as to the editors involved. Moreover, it reflects the contemporary state of knowledge of events, which inevitably has gaps. And yet the editors consider such a collection to be of enduring relevance, for a number of reasons. First, it adds to the scholarly literature underpinning what is now a broad consensus on how and why the murder of nearly 6 million Jews came about. Second, it reflects the increased range of archival sources that have become available since the end of the Cold War, not only in the former Eastern Bloc but also in Western Europe. Third, the growing temporal distance from the National Socialist period and the dwindling number of those who experienced it directly emphasize the importance of undertaking such a project, which places the historical events and context in the foreground. Fourth, it seems important to produce such a source collection in Germany in view of the country's direct involvement in the events described and its continued academic and public discourse on responsibility for them. Fifth, the series is an invaluable supplement to the wealth of publications now available on the subject, and also to the documents that have already been reproduced. Primary source collections with a thematic focus are shaped almost exclusively by their educational objectives. Such collections focus on specific political aspects or themes depending on the editors' aims and the country of publication. From a historiographical perspective, objections can be raised against almost all such publications. The sources are generally printed in abridged form due to a lack of space, and they are often reproductions of documents already in print. Moreover, and more crucially, the contents are often presented out of context. In other words, the editors of such source collections tacitly assume that the documents 'speak for themselves' on account of the monstrous events concerned. This results in compilations of abridged documents that are arranged in a way that dramatizes events for effect.

1 Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, vol. 1: *The Years of Persecution, 1933–1939* (New York: HarperCollins, 1997), p. 2.

As well as providing a scholarly reference work, this series of volumes seeks to contribute to the commemoration of the murdered Jews of Europe. It is designed for teachers, researchers, or members of the general public who wish to learn about and reflect upon the persecution and murder of the European Jews under the German National Socialist regime and would like to draw on authentic testimonies.

The production of the series has been generously funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) as a long-term humanities project. The S. Fischer Foundation kindly provided a grant to fund the one-year pilot project for the original German edition. The English edition, which is also DFG funded, is a joint project with the Yad Vashem International Institute for Holocaust Research. In addition to the sponsors, the editors are most grateful to the large number of archivists, public officials, historians, and private individuals who have lent assistance to the project. They have provided the editors with advice and comments on sources and with information for the annotations, including the biographical details of the persons featured in the documents. John Bendix, A. G. Blunden, Todd Brown, Alex J. Kay, Charlotte Kreutzmüller, Sophie Leighton, Kathleen Luft, Jennifer E. Neuheiser, Charlton Payne, and Nicola Varns translated the German-language documents for this first English-language volume in the series. Alicia Brudney translated the Yiddish-language document. Alicia Brudney, Joseph Dunlop, Ashley Kirspel, Benedict Oldfield, Barbara Uchdorf, Ana Lena Werner, and Max Zeterberg contributed to this volume as student assistants. Technical assistance was provided by Johannes Gamm. The following people contributed to the original German volume as student assistants: Romina Becker, Giles Bennett, Natascha Butzke, Florian Danecke, Ulrike Heikaus, Ivonne Meybohm, Titus Milosovic, Remigius Stachowiak, and Elisabeth Weber. Gudrun Schroeter contributed in her capacity as research fellow. Despite all the care taken, occasional inaccuracies cannot be entirely avoided in such a source collection. We would be grateful for any notifications to this effect. They will be taken into account for future publications. The address of the editorial board is: Institut für Zeitgeschichte München–Berlin, Edition ‘Judenverfolgung’, Finckensteinallee 85/87, 12205 Berlin, Germany.

Berlin/Munich/Freiburg/Klagenfurt, December 2018

Editorial Preface

This primary source collection on the persecution and murder of the European Jews should be cited using the abbreviation PMJ. This citation style is also used in the work itself where there are cross references between the individual volumes. The documents are consecutively numbered, beginning anew with each volume. Accordingly, 'PMJ 1/200' refers to document number 200 in the first volume of this edition. The individual documents are presented as follows: title (in bold type), header, document, footnotes.

The titles have been formulated by the editor(s) of the respective volume and provide information on the date of origin of the document, its core message, author, and recipient(s). The header, placed underneath the title, is part of the document itself. It specifies the type of source (letter, draft law, minutes, and so on), the name of the author, the place of origin, the file reference (where applicable), remarks indicating confidential or classified status, and other special features of the document. The location of the ministries or other central agencies in Berlin at the time, for instance the Reich Security Main Office or the Chancellery of the Führer, is not cited. The header also contains details about the addressee and, where applicable, the date of the receipt stamp, and it concludes with the date of origin and reference to the stage of processing of the source, for instance 'draft', 'carbon copy', or 'copy'.

The header is followed by the document text. Salutations and valedictions are printed, though signatures are only included once, in the header. Instances of emphasis by the author in the original document are retained. Irrespective of the type of emphasis used in the original source (for example, underlined, spaced, bold, capitalized, or italicized), they always appear in italics in the printed version. Where necessary, additional particulars on the document are to be found in the footnotes. In order to enhance readability, letters and words are added in square brackets where they are missing in the original due to obvious mistakes, or where the meaning would otherwise be unclear in the translation.

A list of abbreviations can be found at the back of the volume. Uncommon abbreviations, primarily from private correspondence, are expanded in a footnote at the first mention in a given document.

Handwritten additions in typewritten originals have been adopted by the editors without further indication insofar as they are formal corrections and most probably inserted by the author. If the additions significantly alter the content – either by mitigating or radicalizing it – this is mentioned in the footnotes, and, if known, the author of the addition(s) is given.

As a rule, the documents are reproduced here in full. Only in exceptional cases, where individual documents are very long, for instance in the case of antisemitic diatribes, is the document abridged. The same applies to minutes of meetings that do not address in their entirety National Socialist anti-Jewish policy or the associated responses. Such editing is indicated by an ellipsis in square brackets; the contents of the omitted text are outlined in a footnote. Undated monthly or annual reports are dated to the end of the month or year that they appear. Only in a few exceptional cases is a deviation made from the chronological organization of the documents: in this volume in the case of the life

stories of Jewish émigrés written in 1939/1940 for a competition organized by Harvard University. These descriptive texts, which were written soon after the period covered but nonetheless retrospectively, are classified in some cases according to the date of the events portrayed rather than the date of origin.

The first footnote for each document, which is linked to the title, contains the location of the source and, insofar as it denotes an archive, the reference number, as well as the folio number(s) if available. Reference to copies of archival documents in research institutions and in the German Federal Archives in Berlin are always made if the original held at the location first mentioned was not consulted there. In the case of printed sources, for instance newspaper articles or legislative texts, this footnote contains standard bibliographical information. If the source has already been published in English in a document collection on National Socialism or on the persecution of the Jews, reference is made to its first publication, alongside the original location of the source. The next footnote explains the origins of the document and, where appropriate, mentions related discussions, the specific role of authors and recipients, and activities accompanying or immediately following its genesis. Subsequent footnotes provide additional information related to the theme of the document and the persons relevant to the content. They refer to other – published or unpublished – sources that contribute to historical contextualization.

The footnotes also point out individual features of the documents, for instance handwritten notes in the margin, underlining, or deletions, whether by the author or the recipient(s). Annotations and instructions for submission are referred to in the footnotes where the editors consider them to contain significant information. Where possible, the locations of the treaties, laws, and decrees cited in the source text are provided in the footnotes, while other documents are given with their archival reference number. If these details could not be ascertained, this is also noted.

Where biographical information is available on the senders and recipients of the documents, this is provided in the footnotes. The same applies to persons mentioned in the text if they play an active role in the events described. As a general rule, this information is given in the footnote inserted after the first mention of the name in question in the volume.

The short biographies are based on data found in reference works, scholarly literature, or the Central Database of Shoah Victims' Names established and run by Yad Vashem. In many cases, the information was retrieved by consulting personnel files and indexes, municipal and company archives, registry offices, restitution and denazification files, or specialists in the field. Indexes and files on persons from the Nazi era held in archives were also used, primarily those of the former Berlin Document Center, the Federal Commissioner for the Records of the State Security Service of the former German Democratic Republic (Bundesbeauftragte für die Unterlagen des Staatssicherheitsdienstes der ehemaligen Deutschen Demokratischen Republik), and the Central Office of the Judicial Authorities of the Federal States for the Investigation of National Socialist Crimes (Zentrale Stelle der Landesjustizverwaltungen zur Aufklärung nationalsozialistischer Verbrechen) in Ludwigsburg, the last of these now stored in the German Federal Archives.

Despite every effort, it has not always been possible to obtain complete biographical information. In such cases, the footnote in question contains only verified facts such as the year of birth. Where a person could not be identified, there is no footnote reference.

Biographical footnotes are not added in the case of extremely well-known individuals such as Adolf Hitler, Thomas Mann, or Albert Einstein.

As a rule, in the titles and footnotes inverted commas are not placed around terms that were commonplace in National Socialist Germany, such as Führer, Jewish Council, or Aryanization. In line with the circumstances of the time, the terms Jew and Jewish are used for people who did not regard themselves as Jewish but were defined as such on the basis of racial legislation and thus subjected to persecution. References in the documents to the ‘Gestapo’, an acronym of the German GEheime STAatsPOLizei, and to the ‘State Police’ denote one and the same institution: the Secret State Police.

The Glossary contains concise descriptions of key terms and concepts that are repeated on multiple occasions or are related to the events and developments described in the volume.

All primary and secondary sources consulted are listed in the footnotes and bibliography. Where English-language versions of these sources are available, these are included. If a document has already been published in English translation but has been retranslated for this volume, this is indicated in a footnote.

The index includes all names referred to in the volume and all places significant to the content of the respective documents. It also contains organizations and institutions, as well as terms and concepts relevant to the volume.

Note on the translation

British English is used in all translations into English. Where a document was originally written in British or American English, the spelling, grammar, and punctuation of the original have been retained, with silent correction of minor typographical or grammatical errors and insertions in square brackets to clarify the meaning if necessary.

The spelling and style of the translated documents broadly conform to the guidelines in *New Hart’s Rules: The Oxford Style Guide* (2014). Accordingly, the ending -ize rather than -ise is preferred throughout.

SS, Wehrmacht, and certain other ranks are given in the original German, as are titles where there is no standard equivalent in English or where there may be confusion with contemporary usage. A table of these terms and an indication of their position in the National Socialist hierarchy is included after the Glossary. In addition, terms commonly used in German in scholarly literature on the period are presented in German in this volume and explained in the Glossary.

All laws and institutions are translated into English in the documents. In the introduction and footnotes, foreign-language terms and expressions are added in brackets after the translation where this is considered important for understanding or context.

If a word or phrase appears in German in a non-German document, the German is retained in the translated text and its meaning explained in a footnote or, if necessary, the Glossary. The original spelling of foreign organizations is retained in the footnotes. The titles of published works not in the English language are not translated unless the work in question is of contextual or substantial relevance.

In order to avoid confusion between British and American English, dates are spelt out in the order day, month, and year. Foreign proper names are not italicized. Thus, names of institutions, organizations, and places are written in roman type in the footnotes, but legislation and conceptual terms are in italics.

In the titles, footnotes, and translated documents, place names are written according to the contemporary (English) name or the name commonly used in scholarly literature on the period. This also applies to places that have since been renamed, so, for example, 'Danzig' not 'Gdańsk'. Diacritical marks in languages such as Czech and Polish are retained, with the exception of the names of the extermination camps in Eastern Europe, where they have been removed in order to emphasize that these camps were established by the German National Socialist regime. Hebrew and Yiddish terms are described in the footnotes along with any other words requiring explanation.

Introduction*

For well over half a century, scholars have been exploring the origins of Nazi Germany's extensive and uncompromising campaign of terror and persecution against the Jews. The antisemitic state policy that was introduced in 1933 and culminated in the Holocaust, or Shoah, has also been thoroughly scrutinized. Many other aspects of the period, such as Jewish daily life, the interaction between a variety of institutions, organizations, and individuals in the process of victimization, and the role of ideology, have additionally been described and analysed. Nonetheless, the passing of the generations that witnessed the persecution and genocide of Europe's Jews by Nazi Germany highlights the need to present a comprehensive collection of contemporary documents from the viewpoints of victims, perpetrators, and those not directly involved in the crimes. That is the purpose of this series.

There is broad consensus that the decision taken by the Nazi leadership to murder the European Jews was not based on a preconceived plan. Although in only a matter of months Germany's anti-Jewish policy had exceeded the forms of discrimination against minorities that were common in many countries at the time, it was not yet clear to most contemporaries that it would culminate in Europe-wide mass murder. In the words of the renowned Holocaust scholar Raul Hilberg: 'No bureaucrat in 1933 could have predicted what kind of measures would be taken in 1938, nor was it possible in 1938 to foretell the configuration of the undertaking in 1942.'¹ After Germany unleashed the Second World War in September 1939, the Wehrmacht subjugated much of Europe, thereby bringing millions of Jews under German control, including many who had managed to flee Germany beforehand. The process leading to genocide developed in a large number of complex and distinct stages. It culminated in summer 1941 in the unprecedented plan to exterminate a people consisting of close to 10 million individuals in Europe who, though extremely diverse and scattered across nations, had been defined

* Götz Aly was the lead author for the introduction, which has undergone minor revisions and updating for the English-language edition.

1 Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, 3rd edn, vol. 1 (New Haven, CT/London: Yale University Press, 2003 [1961]), p. 50. Hans Mommsen describes this process using the term 'cumulative radicalisation': Hans Mommsen, 'Cumulative Radicalisation and Progressive Self-Destruction as Structural Determinants of the Nazi Dictatorship', in Ian Kershaw and Moshe Lewin (eds.), *Stalinism and Nazism: Dictatorships in Comparison* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 75–87. See also Karl Schleunes, *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz: Nazi Policy towards German Jews, 1933–39* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1972); Uwe Dietrich Adam, *Judenpolitik im Dritten Reich* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1972); Leni Yahil, *The Holocaust: The Fate of European Jewry, 1932–1945*, trans. Ina Friedman and Haya Galai (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990 [Hebrew edn, 1987]); Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, vol. 1: *The Years of Persecution, 1933–1939* (New York: HarperCollins, 1997) and vol. 2: *The Years of Extermination, 1939–1945* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007); Peter Longerich, *Holocaust: The Nazi Persecution and Murder of the Jews*, new edn, trans. Shaun Whiteside (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010 [German edn, 1998]); Christian Gerlach, *The Extermination of the European Jews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

as a 'race'. The extermination would essentially take place without distinction of age or gender, and be carried out within the shortest possible time. German officials called this the 'final solution to the Jewish question'. By 8 May 1945, close to 6 million people had been murdered because they were Jews or defined as such.

Between 1933 and 1941 the decisions to progressively deprive the German Jews of their rights, jobs, and property were instigated, influenced, and agreed upon by the representatives of various institutions and organizations, as well as by individuals, most notably Adolf Hitler. They were driven by ideologically inspired mass hatred, as well as by material, political, and, ultimately, military considerations. Moreover, the hatred of Jews and the desire to wipe out Jewish existence were directed not only against Jews as a physical presence, but also against preconceived notions of the Jewish spirit, and the idea of human equality underlying modern political, social, and economic systems. In this way, Nazi Germany's foreign, social, economic, cultural, and linguistic policies became intertwined with the 'Jewish question'. Once the Nazi regime had decided upon mass murder, it was primarily, though not exclusively, carried out by Germans. It was Germans who developed and implemented the methods of persecution, mass shooting, and ultimately the construction of the extermination camps, even though they enlisted the support of governments, bureaucracies, police units, and many individuals in different ways and to different degrees to carry out the 'final solution' in the occupied European countries. The evidence of collaboration does not lessen either the guilt or the responsibility of the Germans. In reconstructing the events, however, we must also ask how the persecution of the Jews was facilitated by non-Germans in the countries occupied by and allied with Germany.

The electoral successes of the racist and antisemitic National Socialist German Workers' Party (hereafter Nazi Party, NSDAP) from 1928 onwards and Hitler's entry to power in 1933 resulted from the political and economic climate in Germany, which had its origins in Germany's defeat in the First World War, the humiliation of Versailles, and the subsequent period of inflation. Many Germans were haunted by the fear of losing their livelihoods, and their outlook was dominated by despair, poverty, and resentment. From 1929 on, the Great Depression fostered a climate of political radicalization.

Unquestionably the National Socialist state mobilized both Christian anti-Judaism, which had evolved over centuries, and the nationalist resentment that had developed during the nineteenth century. After 1938 such sentiments were similarly mobilized in the annexed and occupied countries of Europe. Nonetheless, it would be wrong to assume that a unique, unusually malignant form of antisemitism had taken root in Germany in the decades before 1933, an antisemitism that would inevitably lead to Auschwitz. Such teleological explanations, questionable from a methodological and theoretical perspective, constitute an attempt to provide a 'causal explanation whereby the monstrousness of the annihilation of the Jews was the outcome of a monstrous history', and thus to exorcise the horror of the crimes.² The reflections that follow on Germany's national history and the situation of the Jews in the centuries prior to the National Socialist regime should be read with these reservations in mind.

2 Reinhart Koselleck, 'Deutschland – eine verspätete Nation?', in Reinhart Koselleck, *Zeitschichten: Studien zur Historik* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2000), pp. 359–380, here p. 377. On Koselleck's critique in this essay of the so-called *Sonderweg* thesis, see Niklas Olsen, *History in the Plural: An Introduction to the Work of Reinhart Koselleck* (New York: Berghahn, 2012), pp. 246–249.

*Emancipation of the Jews and German Nationhood
in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*

In the German principalities that existed within the politically decentralized Holy Roman Empire, the enlightened statism of the late eighteenth century gave rise to calls to abolish special taxes and tolls, residential restrictions, and prohibitions for Jews that had been passed down from the Middle Ages. At the forefront of this development were the playwright Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, with his drama *Die Juden* (The Jews, 1749), and the poet Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, acclaimed during his lifetime, who lamented in his 'Ode an den Kaiser' ('Ode to the Kaiser', 1782): 'how our mob dehumanizes the people of Canaan!' In 1781 Christian Wilhelm Dohm's exposé *Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden* (Concerning the Amelioration of the Civil Status of the Jews) was published in Berlin. A product of the Protestant north, it was one of the standard texts on Jewish emancipation in Europe, and it put forward an argument that was rarely accepted by Christians in those times: 'The Jew is even more man than Jew.'³

The epochal caesura wrought by the French Revolution (1787–1799) and the Napoleonic Wars (1803–1815) increased the pressure for change in the German principalities, which had up to then remained largely feudal in nature. In Prussia, a government commission had begun work in 1787 on a law concerning the legal status of the Jews. In 1812 King Friedrich Wilhelm III signed the edict 'concerning the civil status of the Jews' as part of the Stein-Hardenberg reforms, which were instigated in an attempt to rationalize Prussia's administration after it had lost half its territory in the Second Treaty of Tilsit (1807) signed after Napoleon's victory over Prussia and Russia. The edict guaranteed citizenship to the Jews in the Old Prussian territories, but restricted their access to public and elective office. During the politically reactionary period after the founding of the German Confederation in 1815, the restrictions were tightened somewhat, but distinctly eased again during the period of the 1848 revolutions. The emancipation of the Jews was finalized in constitutional law in the German states of the Confederation around 1860 and extended to the whole of the Reich upon the establishment of Imperial Germany in 1871.

There had not been a straightforward or uniform approach to Jewish emancipation in either the principalities of the Holy Roman Empire or the individual sovereign states in the loose-knit German Confederation. By contrast, although France did not emancipate the Jews in the course of the 1789 Revolution, it did so overnight with a law passed two years later in November 1791. This was followed by the imposition of certain restrictions during the Napoleonic era. Both concepts, the liberal-revolutionary in France and the reformist-autocratic in Germany, aimed at assimilation, that is, 'that the Jew should be de-Jewified', as a Württemberg commission report put it in 1828.⁴ If one considers

3 Christian Wilhelm von Dohm, *Concerning the Amelioration of the Civil Status of the Jews*, trans. Helen Lederer (Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College, 1957 [German edn, 1781]), cited in Paul R. Mendes Flohr and Jehuda Reinhard, *The Jew in the Modern World: A Documentary History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 28–36, here p. 30.

4 Cited in Reinhard Rürup, *Emanzipation und Antisemitismus: Studien zur 'Judenfrage' der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), p. 24.

the actual situation of the Jews in French Alsace and that of the Jews in neighbouring Baden, there were few substantive differences.

In the nineteenth century, Russia still encompassed large parts of Poland and was home to most of the world's Jews. If one compares the emancipation of the Jews in Germany not with France but instead with the Russian Empire, which directly bordered Germany at the time, the process in Germany was swift and efficient. The Jews in tsarist Russia were regulated in their freedom of movement and repeatedly subject to outbursts of violence from their Christian neighbours. After 1812 the Prussian west just across the border offered them the reverse image of the anti-Jewish despotism that would not be overcome until the Kerensky government that came to power during the February Revolution of 1917: an almost utopian degree of legal security, economic freedom, and opportunities.⁵

Within Germany, Jewish emancipation, positively construed as a necessary aspect of civil progress and the law of reason, found committed advocates for more than a century. But these advocates were held in check for a long time and caught up in public discussions that stalled their efforts. Once the Jews had finally become citizens with equal rights, many of those in the majority society continued to believe that the long-disputed people of another faith could not be 'real' Germans. The enduring strife had further stigmatized them and reinforced the sense of 'infamous birth', even among Jews who were well integrated.

'How loathsome it is always having to establish one's identity first! That alone is enough to make it so repulsive to be a Jew.' With these words, Rahel Varnhagen described her attitude towards life in Berlin in the early nineteenth century.⁶ Decades later the compulsion to justify oneself continued after the founding of Imperial Germany in 1871. In the context of the 'Berlin Antisemitism Dispute' in 1879, Hermann Cohen, a professor of philosophy at the University of Marburg, noted how 'the old trepidation [was] reawakened'.⁷ Although Theodor Mommsen, a liberal proponent of integration, stood up for the Jews, unlike his historian colleague Heinrich von Treitschke, he still asked these same Jews to 'dispense with [their] special ways as much as possible'.⁸ Nonetheless, it would be incorrect to assert that a general attitude of antisemitism prevailed among the middle classes and petty bourgeoisie at this time.

Prior to 1871, policy in the German states was characterized by overcautious reforms, and not only with respect to the Jews. In a parallel development, the aspiring middle

5 For a comparison of the various paths toward Jewish emancipation across Europe, see Pierre Birnbaum and Ira Katznelson (eds.), *Paths of Emancipation: Jews, States, and Citizenship* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995).

6 Cited in Hannah Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen: The Life of a Jewess*, new edn, ed. Liliane Weissberg (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997 [1957]), p. 252.

7 Cited in Karsten Krieger (ed.), *Der 'Berliner Antisemitismusstreit' 1879–1881: Eine Kontroverse um die Zugehörigkeit der deutschen Juden zur Nation. Eine kommentierte Quellenedition*, 2 vols. (Munich: Saur, 2003), p. 338. Also see Walter Boehlich (ed.), *Der Berliner Antisemitismusstreit* (Frankfurt am Main: Insel, 1965); Marcel Stoetzler, *The State, the Nation, and the Jews: Liberalism and the Antisemitism Dispute in Bismarck's Germany* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2009).

8 Cited in Shulamit Volkov, *Die Juden in Deutschland 1780–1918* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2000), p. 49.

classes, craftsmen, and farmers, who would be legally held in check for a long time to come, and later the industrial workers, championed a limited conception of the fundamental values of liberty and equality. Significantly, at the Congress of Vienna in 1814/1815, which established the political boundaries in Europe following the Napoleonic Wars, the delegates from Frankfurt am Main, Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck turned against the aristocratic advocates of Jewish emancipation, as did those representing the interests of the southern German bourgeois cities. 'There was indeed a struggle for equal rights and human dignity,' historian Franz Schnabel wrote of the feebly principled representatives of the third estate: 'there was a desire to bring down the barriers that were an obstacle to the freedom to earn a living, but there was also opposition to peddling, people were interested in suppressing the Jews, and flogging was regarded as essential in criminal matters.'⁹

A prime example of this narrow interpretation of civil liberty was Friedrich List. Born in Reutlingen and later professor at the University of Tübingen, List was an advocate of the Customs Union (Zollverein) and the extension of the railway system. He commented in 1817: 'In addition, no community should be burdened with certain classes of people whose religion or general character is incompatible with civil society, e.g. Jews, separatists, etc.' In 1818 he emphatically championed equal rights for Catholics in the predominantly Lutheran Kingdom of Württemberg, 'but one must not go to the opposite extreme and, for example, now force on the communities citizens and proprietors from the tribe of Israel'.¹⁰

In 1806, after the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire, there was – in the language of the day – a *deutsche Völkerschaft*, a 'German people'. The notion of the German *Volk* expressed hopes that were long left unfulfilled and were still evident at the start of the National Socialist regime. Hence, Albert Einstein was expatriated in 1934 as a Prussian, not a German. It was not until 5 February 1934 that the designation 'German' was added to passports, following an edict from Hitler's interior minister, Wilhelm Frick. Because the German nationalist revolutionaries of the *Vormärz* period (1830–1848) had not inherited a consolidated feudal state, they had to formulate their vision in two ways: first, as a republican overthrow of a political system that was no longer practicable, and, second, according to a concept of a transnational, and as such treasonous, union. They referred – 'as far as the German tongue can be heard', 'from the Meuse to the Memel, from the Adige to the Little Belt', lyrics to what would become the German national anthem in 1922 – to the supposed commonality of language and history, of German character and blood. The socio-political process of inclusion encouraged a corresponding exclusion, a shutting out of 'strangers'. The statutes of the nationalist revolutionary German Societies (*Deutsche Gesellschaften*) founded by Ernst Moritz Arndt, one of the leading proponents of German nationalism and unification, declared that only Christians could become members, while 'the French, Jews, and philistines' were not allowed

9 Franz Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, vol. 2: *Monarchie und Volkssouveränität* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1933), p. 225; see also Volkov, *Die Juden*, p. 20.

10 Friedrich List, *Schriften, Reden, Briefe*, vol. 1: *Der Kampf um die politische und ökonomische Reform 1815–25* (Aalen: Scientia, 1971), part 1, p. 158, and part 2, p. 853; Franz Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, vol. 3: *Erfahrungswissenschaft und Technik* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1934), p. 351.

to join. Shortly after 1815 the original student fraternity in Jena, which adopted black, red, and gold as its colours, included in its by-laws a passage that had previously been rejected by a narrow margin, stating that only someone who was 'a German and a Christian' could become a member. The anti-Jewish provisions were deleted from the by-laws of the fraternities in 1831, but were reintroduced after 1880.¹¹

During the following decades, German linguistic and cultural nationalism, which had been canonized by the brothers Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm and extolled by the poets of German romanticism, served as inspiration for the intellectual and spiritual leaders of the many European nation states which did not take shape until later: from Athens to Helsinki, from Turin to Bucharest, from Belgrade via Budapest and Prague to Warsaw and Riga, finally to the Zionist Congress in Basel in 1897. They adapted the Germans' romantic idea of the nation state and used it as a conceptual basis for new nationalist movements. By 1918, if not before, national revolutionaries had become state leaders. They combined the German idea of linguistic nationalism with the French model of the unitary state, to the double misfortune of the respective national minorities.

What the pioneers in the nineteenth century had interpreted as the arrival of the 'Springtime of the Peoples', what Prince Klemens von Metternich, Chancellor of the Habsburg Empire, sought to suppress as 'the Teutonism of universities and gymnasts',¹² degenerated during and after the First World War into a hyper-nationalism that was as intolerant as it was widespread. It ultimately justified itself by reference to the peoples' right to self-determination, which US President Woodrow Wilson had brought into play in January 1918 as the future blueprint for lasting peace in Europe. Scarcely had that transpired when Wilson's secretary of state, Robert Lansing, noted in alarm: 'The phrase [self-determination] is simply loaded with dynamite. [...] What a calamity that the phrase was ever uttered! What misery it will cause!'¹³ Among the European minorities, there was one minority par excellence that was unable to rely on a state and, if necessary, on that state's army for its protection: the Jews, especially those in Eastern Europe. At the Paris Peace Conference of 1919/1920, the chief negotiators of the Western states, who drew thousands of kilometres of new nation-state borders through Europe as part of the terms for peace, were quite aware of the dangers looming for minorities. For this reason they made provision in the agreement, if only half-heartedly, for the protection of national, religious, ethnic, and cultural minorities. But they 'did not foresee the possibility of wholesale population transfers or the problem of people who had become "undeport-

11 Georg Simmel, *Sociology: Inquiries into the Construction of Social Forms*, trans. and ed. Anthony J. Blasi, Anton K. Jacobs, and Mathew Kanjirathinkal (Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill, 2009 [German edn, 1908]), pp. 601–620 ('Excursus on the Stranger'); Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte*, vol. 2, pp. 248–249; Norbert Kampe, *Studenten und 'Judenfrage' im deutschen Kaiserreich: Die Entstehung einer akademischen Trägerschicht des Antisemitismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988); Lisa Fetheringill Zwicker, *Dueling Students: Conflict, Masculinity, and Politics in German Universities* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2011), pp. 103–117.

12 Klemens Wenzel Lothar von Metternich, 'Die Deutsche Frage: Genesis, Verlauf und gegenwärtiger Stand derselben. Denkschrift an Erzherzog Johann, Reichsverweser, London, August 1848', in Richard von Metternich-Winneburg (ed.), *Aus Metternichs nachgelassenen Papieren*, vol. 8 (Vienna: Braumüller, 1884), pp. 443–453.

13 Robert Lansing, *The Peace Negotiations: A Personal Narrative* (New York/Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1921), pp. 97–98.

able".¹⁴ Furthermore, in those countries of Central, Western, and Southern Europe which had adapted liberal democratic systems from the first half of the nineteenth century, and where Jews had been emancipated for decades, most Jews did not regard themselves as an ethnic minority akin to their co-religionists in Eastern Europe.

From Imperial Germany to the First World War

Industrialization began appreciably later in Germany than in Britain but then took place far more swiftly. Both countries mined almost equal amounts of coal in 1913, but German mining had increased more than sixfold since 1891, while British mining had increased by only 150 per cent. In 1875 British blast furnaces had produced three times the amount of pig iron yielded by German ones; in 1913 Imperial Germany produced 30 per cent more than Britain. The disparity in steel production was even greater. These indicators of an industrial boom concealed enormous social and cultural upheavals such as social dislocation on a huge scale, fear of a loss of livelihood and destitution, and the decline of entire occupational groups, trades, towns, and regions.

Britain had more than sixty years to grapple with the consequences of industrialization. It was able to mitigate problems with the help of its colonial resources, and it benefited from tried and tested political institutions that had matured over a period of many decades. Owing to its federal tradition and constitutional structure, the German Reich, which had only been created in 1871, did not even have a proper finance ministry or independent tax revenue until 1919. The politicians and ministry officials had to get to grips with rapid progress and social dislocation, but in order to do so they first had to create the necessary institutional tools. These efforts were only partially successful. Measured against the rapid pace of development, however, the accomplishments of Imperial Germany in the areas of legislation, education, science, transport, social policy, and hygiene were substantial.

Many Jews took on the challenges of the new era successfully. They were forced to seize the new opportunities and did so unreservedly, while substantial sections of the Christian majority population experienced the end of the established order as both a loss and a threat. The long-established middle classes made up of craftsmen, shopkeepers, those running medium-sized farms, officials, and persons of authority declined and a new middle class appeared on the scene, consisting of lawyers, doctors, procurators, merchants, brewers, stock exchange traders, theatre managers, and founders of department stores.¹⁵ The Jews had a thirst for education and proved to be high achievers, and soon they accounted for a percentage of the middle class disproportionate to their overall share of the population.

14 Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, new edn (New York: Harcourt, 1973 [1951]), p. 276. For a general overview, see Carole Fink, *Defending the Rights of Others: The Great Powers, the Jews, and International Minority Protection, 1878–1938* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

15 Hans Paul Barth, 'Gesellschaftliche Voraussetzungen des Antisemitismus', in Werner E. Mosse (ed.), *Entscheidungsjahr 1932: Zur Judenfrage in der Endphase der Weimarer Republik* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1966), pp. 135–155.

In 1867 Jews comprised 14.8 per cent of Berlin's grammar school (Gymnasium) pupils, although only 4 per cent of the city's residents were Jewish. At the humanistic Mommsen Grammar School in Charlottenburg, the vast majority of first-year pupils in 1910 were Jews. 'Intellectual arrogance was not altogether absent, but there was nevertheless a good sense of comradeship', Rudolf Schottlaender noted in his memoirs. 'The teachers too, almost all of them non-Jews, avoided anti-Jewish remarks.' The proportion of Jewish students at Prussian universities was 9.6 per cent in 1886/1887, while the proportion of Jews in the overall population was less than 1 per cent.¹⁶

From 1870 to 1884 Leopold Guggenheim served as the mayor of Gailingen in southern Baden. The example of this town provides an insight into the situation of the Jewish population at the time. In 1875 the town had around 1,700 inhabitants, of whom 700 were Jews. A passage in the inspection report of the Grand Ducal District Office, dated 12 September 1878, commented on relations between Christians and Jews: 'As recently as forty to fifty years ago, the vast majority of the Jews [had] belonged to the less well-off segment of the population', but now they had overtaken the Christian citizens 'to a significant extent in terms of assets'. 'Almost all of them live from trading (specifically, cattle trading), while the Christian inhabitants, with few exceptions, are dependent upon agriculture and daily wages. Almost all the sizeable houses are in the possession of Jews. [...] This inequality of wealth, which came about gradually, might also explain why a certain tension is evident between the two denominational groups.'¹⁷

According to 1895 statistics, one in two working Jews was self-employed, but only one in four Christians. While 11 per cent of the Jews were salaried employees, the comparable figure among the Christians was 3 per cent. As the historian Shulamit Volkov demonstrates by using the example of tax liability, this situation led to distinct economic discrepancies:

In the early twentieth century, the Jews in Frankfurt am Main, for instance, paid on average four times the amount of taxes paid by a typical Protestant town citizen and eight times the amount paid by a Catholic. In Berlin, the payments amounted to 30 per cent of the city's tax revenue, while the Jews made up only 15 per cent of the taxpayers and just over 4 per cent of the city's population.¹⁸

The German Jews had nothing to lose in the old system, which had worked to their disadvantage and had been more or less static for centuries. Their opportunity lay in the new dynamics, in entrepreneurship, in science, in the corridors of business, law, and the media. Those who rose to affluence were frequently involved in local councils. They initiated foundations for welfare, education, and research. In Frankfurt am Main they were among the founders of the university. The Jewish hospital in Gailingen naturally

16 Rudolf Schottlaender, *Trotz allem ein Deutscher: Mein Lebensweg seit Jahrhundertbeginn* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1986), p. 8.

17 Eckhardt Friedrich and Dagmar Schmieder-Friedrich (eds.), *Die Gailinger Juden: Materialien zur Geschichte der jüdischen Gemeinde Gailingen aus ihrer Blütezeit und den Jahren der gewaltsamen Auflösung* (Konstanz: Arbeitskreis für Regionalgeschichte e. V., 1981), pp. 23 and 48.

18 Volkov, *Die Juden*, pp. 53–54.

admitted Christians too, although the government of Baden was critical that: 'Jewish charity also attracts many "scroungers"'.¹⁹

German Jews considered themselves part of national and local culture. Concurrently, separate Jewish associations and lodges developed. Once merely tolerated as subordinates, they had become active citizens. This transformation was symbolized by the New Synagogue on Oranienburger Straße in Berlin, built between 1859 and 1866, shortly before formal legal equality was granted to Jews. Rising up alongside the domes of the Protestant cathedral and the City Palace of the Hohenzollern dynasty, its magnificent gilded dome made a self-assured impression and stood out from those of other European cities.

In this context, new kinds of enemies of the Jews emerged after 1871. They twisted the discourse on the 'Jewish question' so that it became negatively charged. The change is reflected, for example, in the publisher's advertisement for an anti-Jewish pamphlet dating from 1879:

At one time there was a 'Jewish question' that went like this: Are we entitled to suppress and persecute the Jews? This question is settled; we have granted them rights equal to our own, everywhere (this is under way even in Romania). And what is the result? There is now a new Jewish question, and it goes like this: Shall the Jews suck us dry and eventually dominate us?²⁰

The shift took place against the backdrop of developing political democratization, with its multiparty system and mass politics. This provided fertile ground for inflammatory rhetoric, simplified arguments, and the scapegoating of allegedly dangerous elements. Antisemitism, thus reformulated, absorbed the fears of the long-established members of society, the disorientated, those who had lost out as a result of modernization, and those who were threatened by it. Tied in with this development was the famous essay 'Unsere Aussichten' (Our Prospects), also written in 1879, with which Heinrich von Treitschke sparked the aforementioned 'Berlin Antisemitism Dispute'. He took aim at the desire for upward mobility among the Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe: the 'multitudes of assiduous trouser-selling youths', whose 'children and grandchildren are to be the future rulers of Germany's stock exchanges and Germany's press'. As the dispute continued, Treitschke castigated the Jews' 'continuous mocking invective' and their 'offensive self-overestimation', which, he said, were detrimental to German Christians' moral rectitude and their 'ancient good-natured willingness to work'.²¹

In 1930 the historian Arthur Rosenberg analysed the strong response evoked by Treitschke's scholarly antisemitism which he viewed as an 'ideological buttress' for Christian university students and graduates who lacked the status conferred in Wilhelmine

19 Reinhard Rürup, 'Emanzipation und Krise: Zur Geschichte der "Judenfrage" in Deutschland vor 1890', in Werner E. Mosse and Arnold Paucker (eds.), *Juden im Wilhelminischen Deutschland* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1976), pp. 1–56, here p. 47.

20 'Annonce für das Buch "Kulturgeschichte des Judentums" von Dr. Otto Henne-am Rhyn', in Wilhelm Marr, *Der Sieg des Judentums über das Germanentum* (Bern: Costenoble, 1879).

21 Heinrich von Treitschke, 'Our Prospects', in Stoetzer, *The State, the Nation, and the Jews*, pp. 309–316, here pp. 312 and 313.

society²² by aristocratic birth, and who, in their subservient quandary, had no idea how to make use of the opportunities presented by civil liberties. They envied their Jewish fellow students for their thirst for education, confidence, and desire to get ahead, their obvious joy in the present and their optimistic curiosity about the future. 'In defence of their social position', Rosenberg believed, many Christian students regressed to a Germanophile racial ideology because they could in this way elevate themselves to the nobility vis-à-vis their Jewish fellow students.²³

After 1880 numerous associations emerged that excluded Jews – from the Reich German Association of the Middle Class (Reichsdeutscher Mittelstandsverein) to the German Agrarian League (Bund der Landwirte), the German National Association of Commercial Employees (Deutschnationaler Handlungsgehilfenverband), the Union of Christian Farmers' Associations (Vereinigung Christlicher Bauernvereine), and the student fraternities. In addition, there were old and new antisemitic groups such as the German League (Deutschbund), the Wagner Society, the Gobineau Society, and the Reich Hammer League. In response, the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith (Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens, CV) was founded in 1893 with the aim of combating antisemitism and defending the rights of German Jews. In paragraph 1 of its charter, the CV's most important task was defined as the 'strengthening' of Germans of the Jewish faith 'in the energetic preservation of their civic and social equality and in the unswerving cultivation of German convictions'.²⁴

The Jews repeatedly found prominent defenders among their Christian compatriots. One such advocate was Gerhart Hauptmann, who addressed the new antisemitism in his tragicomedy *Der rote Hahn* (The Conflagration), first performed in 1901. One of the protagonists is the sympathetically portrayed, upstanding Dr Boxer – 'a vigorous man of thirty-six. Physician. Of Jewish birth', as he is described in the list of characters. In this play, malice, treachery, speculation, and arson originate exclusively from Christian protagonists. Hauptmann exposes the openly antisemitic foreman Schmarowski as a conniving, 'poisonous little devil', but also shows the subtle nature of the anti-Jewish misgivings. In reaction to Boxer's intention to practise medicine in his native community after years spent working as a ship's doctor, the chief official, Baron von Wehrhahn, offers the following objection: 'I wonder whether this is an appropriate territory for [you]?' Von Wehrhahn turns out to be irritated at the social mobility of the returning resident ('Your mother still has the little [corner] shop here'), and Boxer must explicitly call his attention to the soldierly merits of his late father ('a tradesman'): he 'was in the reserve forces and was decorated with the Iron Cross in 1870'. Instead of replying, von Wehrhahn mumbles faint approval: 'Ah, yes. Of course. I recall.' The fact that Boxer's mother's windows had just been smashed suggests to him: 'Mischievous boys, no doubt.' Exactly who the culprits were remains a mystery.²⁵

22 'Wilhelmine' denotes the period between 1890 and 1918 when Germany was under the rule of Kaiser Wilhelm II.

23 See Arthur Rosenberg, 'Treitschke und die Juden: Zur Soziologie der deutschen akademischen Reaktion', *Die Gesellschaft: Internationale Revue für Sozialismus und Politik*, vol. 7/2 (1930), pp. 78–83, here p. 82.

24 *Jüdisches Lexikon*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1927); Avraham Barkai, 'Wehr Dich!' *Der Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens (C. V.) 1893–1938* (Munich: Beck, 2002), pp. 219–220.

The staunchly antisemitic organizations in Wilhelmine Germany were not especially strong in terms of their membership numbers, but their propaganda was not without influence.²⁵ The intellectual centre of these movements was ultimately the Pan-German League (Alldeutscher Verband), which was founded in the late 1800s. In 1912 its chairman, Heinrich Claß, under the pseudonym Daniel Frymann, published a diagnosis of the times. His book *Wenn ich der Kaiser wär* (If I were the Kaiser) exemplified the lines of reasoning behind post-1871 modern antisemitism.

Claß integrated clichés from Charles Darwin's theory of the evolution of species in the struggle for existence, from the nascent science of genetics, and from the racially orientated science of anthropology that had blossomed in the age of colonialism. Placing his considerations against the culturally pessimistic backdrop of 'decay', he described the population agglomerations in the industrial centres, the decline of the established middle class, and the sapping of German national vitality. He railed against debauchery and pomposity in the upper class, against social democracy, and against the tendency towards decadence and Americanization in contemporary art. Claß perceived German Jews as the fundamental root of these evils. In this variant of antisemitism, later refined by the NSDAP, the Jews were described as rootless, eternally wandering elements, constantly assimilating anew, and signifying a source of 'infection' for the main threats that millions of people associated with the modern world: the uprooting of what was time-honoured and traditional, the destruction of familiar ways of life, a compulsion to move into the new metropolitan areas, continuing uncertainty, and constant pressure to adapt. According to Claß, the 'heyday' of the Jews had coincided with the advent of industrialization. Their 'instinct', he said, had no other object than 'acquisition'. 'With their unscrupulousness, their avarice, their indifference to right and wrong, honour and dishonour', he asserted, they would decisively influence German economic life and, moreover, would dominate posts in journalism, the theatre, the legal profession, and medicine, which had the potential to shape public opinion.

To fight off these efforts, Claß demanded that all Jews be deprived of their civil rights. He wanted the Law of Aliens to be applied to them, and called for their taxes to be doubled and further immigration to be banned. In addition, he demanded that their right to hold public and military office and to work as lawyers, teachers, or theatre directors be revoked, as well as their right to vote and to stand for election. At the same time, he believed that a person who embraced the Jewish faith was not the only one who should be regarded as a Jew. Instead, ancestry should be the determining factor, he thought, as it was a matter of immutable inherited characteristics. Claß also ascribed distinctive hereditary traits, albeit noble ones, to the German Christian majority population. He explicitly rejected the idea of a universal humanism, reduced it to the 'solidarity of the Germanic peoples', and enquired polemically:

25 Gerhart Hauptmann, 'The Conflagration' [Der rote Hahn], in Ludwig Lewisohn (ed.), *The Dramatic Works of Gerhart Hauptmann*, 7 vols. (New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1912–1917), vol. 1: *Social Dramas*, pp. 511–649, here pp. 512, 570, and 586.

26 Fritz Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961); Peter G. J. Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria* (New York: J. Wiley, 1964).

Where does it start and where does it end, this [group] we are expected to love as a part of mankind? Is the depraved or half-brutish Russian peasant of the commune, the black in East Africa, the half-blood of German South-West Africa or [are] the insufferable Jews of Galicia or Romania part of mankind?²⁷

In 1913 the Czech sociologist Thomas Masaryk, speaking about the pan-Slavic variant, coined concepts such as ‘zoological patriotism’.²⁸ In political terms, racial antisemitism, with its peremptory, imperial tone, was directed against the two most significant currents of the day – liberalism and socialism – that were both allegedly under Jewish influence.

Jews in the First World War

With the outbreak of the First World War, antisemitic spite faded into the background. The Kaiser, political parties, and social groups sought to establish a domestic truce. Most Jewish Germans wanted to prove themselves as patriots and soldiers. The patriotically minded Jew Ernst Lissauer composed the battle hymn ‘Hassgesang auf England’ (Song of Hate against England) – ‘We all have only one enemy, England!’ With Walther Rathenau, Albert Ballin, Max Warburg, and Carl Melchior, distinguished Jewish industrialists and bankers joined the leading ranks of the German wartime economy. There was a brief period of national solidarity, but the tide turned with the military crisis.

In the summer of 1916 Matthias Erzberger, a Reichstag delegate from the Catholic Centre Party – supported by members of the National Liberal Party and even a few Social Democrats – submitted a formal question in parliament:

How many individuals of Jewish stock are at the front lines? How many in the rear supply area? How many in garrison administrations, departments for the supply of food and equipment, etc.? How many Jews have been subjects of complaint or declared to be unavailable for military service?²⁹

Owing to the loss of files during the Second World War, the details of the background to this cannot be ascertained. In any event, the Minister of War set a deadline of 1 November 1916 for a ‘Jew census’ (*Juden-zählung*) in the army. In fact, on a percentage basis, the proportions of Jewish and Christian soldiers serving at the front in the First World War were equal, as were the proportions of those killed in action. Yet, what Walther Rathenau had predicted as early as the summer of 1916 finally came to pass: ‘The more Jews who are killed in this war, the more strongly their opponents will give evidence that they all sat back behind the front lines to engage in war profiteering.’³⁰

27 Daniel Frymann [Heinrich Claß], *Wenn ich der Kaiser wär’: Politische Wahrheiten und Notwendigkeiten* (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1912), p. 186.

28 Thomas G. Masaryk, *Zur russischen Geschichte und Religionsphilosophie: Soziologische Skizzen* (Jena: Diederichs, 1913), p. 257.

29 Cited in Götz Aly, *Why the Germans? Why the Jews? Envy, Race Hatred, and the Prehistory of the Holocaust*, trans. Jefferson Chase (New York: Metropolitan, 2014 [German edn, 2011]), p. 101.

Nonetheless, it would be erroneous to consider policy in Imperial Germany solely from the perspective of antisemitism. Indeed, as early as 1878, at the Congress of Berlin, which reorganized the territories of the states in south-eastern Europe, the German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck had contributed decisively to forcing a decision to include Articles 43 and 44 in the constitution of henceforth sovereign Romania. Owing to the frequent pogroms, the European Great Powers agreed to afford protection to the Jews of the country, and the two articles provided that the difference of religion and denomination could not be cited as grounds to exclude anyone from civil rights, occupations, honorary posts, and business. However, in the decades that followed, the governments of the new Romanian nation state circumvented the provisions with every means imaginable.

In the First World War, Romania fought on the side of the Entente against the Central Powers. In early 1918, however, Germany and Austria-Hungary succeeded in concluding separate peace agreements with both Russia and Romania. Despite the extremely tense military and domestic political situation, Germany forced through Articles 27 and 28 in the Treaty of Bucharest, which was ratified at the end of March 1918. Mindful of the unpleasant experiences of the previous forty years, the authors of the treaty once again placed the country under an obligation to respect the legal equality of all religious faiths and to 'naturalize the stateless population of Romania, including the Jews, regarded there as aliens until now'. Max Warburg, the financial adviser to the German delegation, warmly congratulated the chief German negotiator, State Secretary Richard von Kühlmann, although the German right-wing press reproached him for having bowed to 'pan-Jewish interests' and for embittering 'the Romanians against Germany unnecessarily'.³¹

In 1914 approximately 50,000 immigrants from Eastern Europe, characterized as *Ostjuden*, were living in Germany without having acquired citizenship. The different Jewish experiences of the emancipation and democratization processes in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had created a distinction between Eastern European Jews on the one hand and Western and Central European Jews on the other. Emancipation and secularization had brought about the decline of the traditional Jewish community structure in Western and Central Europe and the estrangement of many Jews from Judaism and Jewish communal life. Due to the enormous waves of Jewish emigration, predominantly from Eastern Europe from the 1880s onwards, a number of Jewish religious and political groups had moved to other countries, and as a result Jewish life was both fragmentary

30 Letter from Rathenau to Wilhelm Schwaner, 4 August 1916, cited in Werner Jochmann, *Gesellschaftskrise und Judenfeindschaft in Deutschland* (Hamburg: Christians, 1988), p. 111; Egmont Zechlin, *Die deutsche Politik und die Juden im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969); Werner T. Angress, 'Das deutsche Militär und die Juden 1914–1918', *Militärgeschichtliche Mitteilungen*, vol. 19 (1976), pp. 77–146; Jacob Rosenthal, 'Die Ehre des jüdischen Soldaten': *Die Juden zählung im Ersten Weltkrieg und ihre Folgen* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2007); Tim Grady, *The German-Jewish Soldiers of the First World War in History and Memory* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011); David J. Fine, *Jewish Integration in the German Army in the First World War* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012); Peter G. Appelbaum, *Loyal Sons: Jews in the German Army in the Great War* (Edgware/Portland, OR: Vallentine Mitchell, 2014); Tim Grady, *A Deadly Legacy: German Jews and the Great War* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017).

31 Benjamin Segel, *Rumänien und seine Juden: Zeitgemäße Studien* (Berlin: Nibelungen, 1918); Hans Schuster, *Die Judenfrage in Rumänien* (Leipzig: Meiner, 1939), pp. 108 ff.; Elke Bornemann, *Der Frieden von Bukarest 1918* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1978).

and diverse. Consequently, in no country were all Jews organized in a monolithic, united body, and they certainly did not speak with one voice.³²

During the First World War the number of *Ostjuden* in Germany rose by an additional 30,000 after the German wartime economic authorities began in 1915 to recruit workers from the occupied Russian part of Poland, including Jews with an explicitly 'Orthodox orientation'. By that summer, Jewish workers were, for the most part, forcibly recruited and soon became targets of antisemitic agitation. In response to this pressure the military authorities closed the borders to *Ostjuden*, claiming that they had proved to be 'reluctant to work, unclean, morally unsound'. Moreover, it was asserted that they had frequently failed to fulfil their contractual obligations and had drifted away to the large cities, where they represented a potential source of unrest that was difficult to control.³³

Some of the East European Jewish labourers remained in Germany after the war's end. As a result of the Russian Revolution and the civil wars in Europe that were waged under the slogan of the 'right to self-determination', hundreds of pogroms took place in Romania, Hungary, and the regions reclaimed either by Soviet Russia or by Poland and the Baltic states.³⁴ Such acts of violence and the deliberate economic pressure placed upon the Jewish minorities in the fledgling nation states forced hundreds of thousands of Jews to flee to Western Europe and the United States. In 1923 the number of *Ostjuden* in Germany was estimated at 130,000.³⁵

Jewish Life and Antisemitism during the Weimar Republic (1918–1933)

Jews constituted less than 1 per cent of the population of Germany during the Weimar Republic. Though they had lived almost exclusively in villages and small towns at the beginning of the nineteenth century, by 1900 the majority of German Jews lived in big cities. In 1910, 60 per cent of German Jews lived in urban areas of more than 100,000 inhabitants, and this figure had risen to more than 70 per cent by 1933. By that time, only 10 per cent of German Jews lived in the countryside, while 20 per cent lived in small towns and villages. According to the 1925 census, 564,973 registered Jews lived in the Weimar Republic, 71.5 per cent of whom resided in Germany's largest federated state, Prussia.

32 Trude Maurer, *Ostjuden in Deutschland: 1918–1933* (Hamburg: Christians, 1986); Frank M. Schuster, *Zwischen allen Fronten: Osteuropäische Juden während des Ersten Weltkrieges (1914–1919)* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2004).

33 Ulrich Herbert, *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland: Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge* (Munich: Beck, 2001), pp. 99–103.

34 Robert Gerwarth and John Horne (eds.), *War in Peace: Paramilitary Violence in Europe after the Great War* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

35 Steven E. Aschheim, *Brothers and Strangers: The East European Jew in German and German Jewish Consciousness, 1800–1923* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982); Ezra Mendelsohn, *The Jews of East-Central Europe between the World Wars* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983), pp. 40 ff.; Jack Wertheimer, *Unwelcome Strangers: East European Jews in Imperial Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987); Israel Bartal, *The Jews of Eastern Europe, 1772–1881*, trans. Chaya Naor (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002 [Hebrew edn, 2002]); Heiko Haumann, *A History of East European Jews*, trans. James Patterson (New York: Central European University Press, 2002 [German edn, 1998]).

An organization unique to Central Europe, the 'community' (*Gemeinde*), served as a focal point of German Jewish life. Created to centralize local Jewish activities, the Jewish Community embraced all Jews, including non-citizens. Jewish communities that became public corporations during the Weimar Republic were empowered by the government to organize local Jewish communal and ritual affairs. They recruited rabbis and religious functionaries, maintained and built synagogues, and ran a variety of institutions, among them newspapers, social associations, libraries, hospitals, and charity funds. Tax revenues, collected either by the government on behalf of the Jews or by the community itself, supported communal activities. Nonetheless, despite several attempts to create an umbrella organization for all German Jews, such an organization did not come into being until after Hitler's ascendance to power.

Attempts to promote a sense of Jewish identity in Germany were in sharp contrast to Jewish associational life in Eastern Europe. German Jews established no trade unions and very few professional associations. Although many individual Jews enjoyed acclaim in the arts, cultural activities such as music and theatre were only rarely organized under Jewish auspices. The occupational profile of German Jews differed markedly from that of the general population. Though the Jews had been historically barred from many professional endeavours, Judaism's emphasis on learning and knowledge allowed them to take advantage of the benefits offered by modern society, first and foremost education, in order to climb the social and professional ladder. It was for this reason that in some professions, such as journalism, law, medicine, and retail, Jews were overrepresented in relation to their overall share of the population. Concentrated in a small number of professions (more often than not in urban areas), Jews were particularly conspicuous to the Weimar Republic's often vehement critics. While most German Jews were middle class, a significant proportion of the Jews living in Weimar Germany, many of them Yiddish-speaking refugees from Eastern Europe, eked out a humble existence as industrial workers, artisans, or pedlars. The hyperinflation of the early 1920s and the Great Depression greatly complicated the lives of virtually all German Jews.³⁶

The immediate post-war period saw a resurgence of hostility towards Jews across Europe. This radicalization had several causes, above all the devastating social, political, and moral consequences of the First World War. The Jews were blamed not only for military setbacks on the battlefield but also for social conflicts on the home front. This 'new antisemitism', which naturally stemmed from older cultural and economic prejudices, now spread widely to social circles that had not previously been hostile to Jews. Antisemitism was also radicalized as a result of the revolutionary movements that developed from 1917 onwards, in which some Jews played a leading role. This in turn gave antisemites a pretext for blaming Jews for the political upheavals and for combating socialism and Bolshevism as allegedly Jewish inventions. In Central European countries, counter-revolutions by *völkisch* groups and authoritarian, anti-democratic combat leagues accentuated antisemitic sentiments. Groups whose social and economic status had

³⁶ Michael Brenner, *The Renaissance of Jewish Culture in Weimar Germany* (New Haven, CT/London: Yale University Press, 1996); Wolfgang Benz, Arnold Paucker, and Peter Pulzer (eds.), *Jüdisches Leben in der Weimarer Republik / Jews in the Weimar Republic* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); Donald L. Niewyk, *The Jews in Weimar Germany*, new edn (New Brunswick, NJ/London: Transaction, 2001 [1980]); Aly, *Why the Germans? Why the Jews?*, pp. 18–32.

been ruined by the First World War were among the main pillars of these radical right-wing movements. These included former soldiers who were unable to reintegrate into civilian society, dismissed civil servants, debt-ridden farmers, or students, who were particularly susceptible to antisemitic racial theories. The frequently problematic process of establishing successor states out of the debris of Austria-Hungary or the Russian Empire led in many instances to violent national conflicts, which affected the often large Jewish minorities.³⁷

In the early years of the Weimar Republic, antisemites in Germany also regrouped in unprecedented numbers. At first they gathered mainly in the German-Völkisch Protection and Defiance League (Deutschvölkischer Schutz- und Trutzbund), which had around 600 local associations in 1922, with 200,000 members.³⁸ It was only in this post-war climate with its susceptibility to theories of conspiracy, betrayal, and doom that *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, published in a German edition in 1920, began to have a greater impact. The book, a crude hoax written by the secret police in tsarist Russia, purported to document a plot to take control of the world hatched by leading Jewish representatives on the fringes of the 1897 Zionist Congress in Basel. In addition, the novel *Die Sünde wider das Blut* (The Sin against Blood) became a success, selling 250,000 copies between 1917 and 1934. It was written by a chemist, Artur Dinter, who espoused the theory of 'blood protection' based on racial biology. Given the large number of Germans who had died in the war, and a lost war at that, the concept of 'blood protection' attracted the interest of a public that felt extremely vulnerable and weakened.

The Kaiser Wilhelm Society, which fostered scientific research, founded the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics in the Berlin district of Dahlem in 1927, and appointed the anthropologist Eugen Fischer as its director. Together with the botanist Erwin Baur, the director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Breeding Research, and his pupil Fritz Lenz, Fischer had published the two-volume work *Menschliche Erblchkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene* (Human Heredity Theory and Racial Hygiene) in 1920/1921. The so-called 'Baur-Fischer-Lenz' was published in several editions until 1944, and it purported to be serious science. Yet the scholarly work also allowed the ideas of racial hygiene and eugenics to become socially acceptable in circles that were repelled by gutter antisemitism. Baur, Fischer, and Lenz converted coarse prejudice into seemingly well-founded, biologically substantiated knowledge and turned the 'Jewish beak' into a genetically dominant 'convex nose'.

In the section written by Fischer, one could read that 'the special position of the Jews' was attributable to the fact that they 'are wholly out of the ordinary in the domain of the Europeans'. From this it followed that in the 'hybrid population', meaning the joint descendants of Jews and Fischer's 'normal' Europeans, the dominant characteristics of the Jews broke through: 'the black hair, the convex nose, and perhaps some of the facial features'. In his section, Lenz outlined the threats that allegedly originated from Jews from the standpoint of genetics. Accompanying his arguments with statistics, he asserted that Jews had a far higher incidence of genetically caused blindness, deafness, and mute-

37 William I. Brustein, *Roots of Hate: Anti-Semitism in Europe before the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 47, 270–273, 282–285, 288, 339.

38 Uwe Lohalm, *Völkischer Radikalismus: Die Geschichte des Deutschvölkischen Schutz- und Trutzbundes 1919–1923* (Hamburg: Leibniz, 1970).

ness, developed diabetes more frequently, and were particularly susceptible to ‘manic and melancholic disorders’. By contrast, he said, ‘the Nordic man’ surpassed all other races in terms of ‘steadfast will and solicitous forethought’; he marched ahead ‘in the vanguard of mankind with respect to intellectual gifts’. Lenz concluded that the Near Eastern race, of which he deemed Jews a branch, had genes that were orientated ‘less towards the domination and exploitation of nature than towards the domination and exploitation of human beings’. He ascribed to the Jews an ‘astonishing ability’ to ‘get into the minds of other people and guide them according to their will’.³⁹

From 1920 onwards a *völkisch* group that campaigned against the Jews in an especially radical and uncompromising way became a subject of debate: the NSDAP. In the *Jüdisches Lexikon* published in Berlin in 1927, the Bavarian lawyer Wilhelm Levinger wrote in the section ‘Antisemitism, History (Germany)’:

In early 1920 the ‘National Socialist German Workers’ Party’ was founded in Munich; its leader soon was Adolf Hitler, who, as a young architectural draughtsman in Vienna, had absorbed the thinking of the [antisemitic] Christian Social Party and cried out for revenge for the treachery of the ‘November Criminals’,⁴⁰ because Germany, he said, could free itself from its external enemies only after destroying the Marxists and Jews, whom he viewed as the ‘internal enemy’.

The ‘large numbers of determined supporters’, initially acquired only in Bavaria, came, according to Levinger, ‘mainly from academic circles but also from among workers, who, disappointed, [had turned away] from communism’. Although the election successes had quickly diminished, Levinger warned in 1927

that the *völkisch* idea, and thus antisemitism as well, scarcely separable from it, still dominates broad segments of the German people, who regard the Jews as an element of a foreign nation, an element one may approach only with mistrust in matters concerning the Fatherland.⁴¹

After the lost war, the NSDAP and other radical right-wing splinter groups placed unity and concord at the heart of their agenda. They built on the popular belief that the nation had too frequently been at odds with itself and had failed to take advantage of its historical opportunities precisely because, as at the end of the war and then during the peace negotiations, it had been betrayed from within its own ranks. This notion was associated with a phantasmagoria of malevolent forces alien to the German *Volk*, forces that, it was

³⁹ Erwin Baur, Eugen Fischer, and Fritz Lenz, *Menschliche Erblichkeitslehre und Rassenhygiene*, vol. 1, 3rd edn (Munich: Lehmann, 1927 [1921]), pp. 119, 138, 148–149, 215, 290, 368, 538, 547, and 557–559; Peter Weingart, Jürgen Kroll, and Kurt Bayertz, *Rasse, Blut und Gene: Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988); Alan E. Steinweis, *Studying the Jew: Scholarly Antisemitism in Nazi Germany* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 2006).

⁴⁰ The reference is to the German leaders who signed the armistice agreement on 11 November 1918.

⁴¹ ‘Antisemitismus, Geschichte (Deutschland)’, in *Jüdisches Lexikon*, vol. 1, pp. 342–348, here pp. 345–346.

claimed, had repeatedly undermined the more or less natural drive for unity. At the centre of this obsession the NSDAP placed several variants of ‘the Jew’, tailored to appeal to different audiences: for example, the Jew was described sometimes as the barely discernible and therefore especially wily ‘Jewish assimulant’, at other times as an *Ostjude* who allegedly rejected integration and was part of a shadowy parallel society. To both these artificially created figures the shapers of public opinion on antisemitism imputed characteristics hostile to the nation, such as ‘defeatist’, ‘part of an international conspiracy’, and ‘self-serving’.

The *völkisch* propagandists presented the figure thus sketched either as a ‘plutocratic Jew’ or as a ‘Jewish Bolshevik’. While the former was allegedly destroying the middle class and driving both the rural and the proletarian underclasses into ‘big money’ bondage, the latter was blamed for the communist revolution, that is, the perceived end to decency, morals, and religion, and of law and honestly acquired property. The threatening scenario that was thus described to an obsessive degree had no lack of apparent support in factual events: the internal collapse during the war; the October Revolution in Russia; the ‘war guilt’ clause in the Treaty of Versailles, which almost every German considered shameful; the ethnic struggles on the eastern fringes of the Reich; the bloody left-wing and right-wing coup attempts within its borders; and, finally, inflation. In addition, young right-wing intellectuals preached a dry, purportedly ‘factual’ form of antisemitism: ‘We hate [...] the Jew not because he is a Jew; rather, we reject him as a *Volksgenosse*, because his inner values are alien to ours.’⁴² Nonetheless, that did not cause the modern antisemites to abandon the traditional stereotypes of Christian animosity towards the Jews. In 1920, when Adolf Hitler gave an address in Munich’s Circus Krone building entitled ‘Politics and Race – Why Are We Antisemites?’, he concluded with the exclamation: ‘We want to prevent our Germany from also suffering, as Another did, death on the cross!’⁴³

Antisemites justified their agitation as a defensive measure. The final chapter of Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* is titled ‘The Right of Self-Defence’. The same message is contained in the title of the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service (*Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums*), issued in April 1933. The draft for the partial expropriation of the Jews, which officials from the Reich Ministry of Finance devised in the summer of 1937, was headed ‘Law on the Settlement of Damages Inflicted on the German Reich by Jews’ (Doc. 285). Underlying these articles was the assertion that the Jews had enriched themselves at the expense of the German people.

The NSDAP’s manifesto was based on two forms of the principle of equality that had been developed during the nineteenth century. Both could readily be combined with antisemitism. As *National Socialists*, on the one hand, the party preached the political idea of the ethnic homogeneity of the nation. As national *socialists*, on the other hand, they promised a greater degree of social equality. Of course, they did not conceive their egalitarian demand in universal terms, as the socialists had done in theory. Instead, they reduced the scope of their ideal of equality, limiting it to a large, ethnically defined col-

42 Cited in Ulrich Herbert, ‘“Generation der Sachlichkeit”: Die völkische Studentenbewegung der frühen zwanziger Jahre’, in Ulrich Herbert, *Arbeit, Volkstum, Weltanschauung: Über Fremde und Deutsche im 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1995), pp. 31–58, here p. 49.

43 Alan Bullock, *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny* (London: Hamlyn, 1973), p. 96; Eberhard Jäckel and Axel Kuhn (eds.), *Hitler: Sämtliche Aufzeichnungen* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1980), pp. 906–909.

lective: 'the German *Volk*'. To those who were members of this group, they promised social equilibrium and improved chances of advancement.

Point 4 of the NSDAP programme of 25 February 1920 read: 'None but members of the nation may be citizens of the State. None but those of German blood, whatever their creed, may be members of the nation. No Jew, therefore, may be a member of the nation.' Point 23 dealt with the forces 'of a kind likely to disintegrate our life as a nation'. The economic policy section of the programme was directed against department store magnates, war profiteers, and land speculators, against usurers and black marketeers, whom it was deemed important to dispossess. This meant Jews.⁴⁴

In addition to the NSDAP, the right-wing German National People's Party (DNVP) offered a political home to notorious antisemites. The Stahlhelm (literally 'steel helmet'), a nationalist conservative paramilitary association, introduced a so-called 'Aryan Paragraph' in 1924 for its nearly 400,000 members. This clause reserved membership solely for people belonging to the 'Aryan race' and excluded 'non-Aryans', particularly Jews and those of Jewish descent. The same step was taken by the Young German Order (Jungdeutscher Orden), with 200,000 members; the Reich Agricultural League (Reichslandbund), with 1 million members; the German Student Fraternities; and the German League of Gymnasts.⁴⁵ The charter of the German National Association of Commercial Employees, with its 400,000 members, had featured an 'Aryan clause' since the founding of the association in 1893.

Antisemitism found violent expression in the paramilitary Freikorps and in the secret societies. In the post-war years they carried out assassinations of alleged traitors to the national cause, such as the leader of the Catholic Centre Party, Matthias Erzberger, along with prominent politicians of Jewish origin in particular. The left-wing revolutionaries Rosa Luxemburg and Kurt Eisner and the German Foreign Minister, Walther Rathenau, were the best-known victims of such political murders, which were intended as punishment by example and propaganda by deed.

After the failed attempt by Hitler and his nationalist allies to seize power in the so-called Munich Beer Hall Putsch of 8/9 November 1923, and the successful currency reform in the autumn of the same year, the Weimar Republic stabilized and the number of antisemitically motivated acts of violence declined. Until 1932 there were, as a national average, fewer than twenty instances per year of synagogues being defaced with graffiti or Jewish cemeteries being desecrated. Such incidents indicated a suppressed potential for anti-Jewish aggression that erupted only in the form of clandestine activity. Usually, youths were found to be the offenders, and their actions did not always have political motives.⁴⁶

44 Gottfried Feder, *The Programme of the N.S.D.A.P. and Its General Conceptions*, trans. E. T. S. Dugdale (Munich: Eher, 1932 [German edn, 1927]), pp. 18–20.

45 Jochmann, *Gesellschaftskrise*, pp. 99–194.

46 Martin Sabrow, *Der Rathenaumord: Rekonstruktion einer Verschwörung gegen die Republik von Weimar* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1994); Dirk Walter, *Antisemitische Kriminalität und Gewalt: Judenfeindschaft in der Weimarer Republik* (Bonn: Dietz, 1999). According to the records of the CV, between 1923 and June 1932 there were 125 cemetery desecrations and 48 instances of graffitied slogans and vandalism at synagogues in the German Reich: Harry Pross (ed.), *Die Zerstörung der deutschen Politik: Dokumente 1871–1933* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1959), pp. 260–262.

The situation was different in the student milieu. The German University Circle (Deutscher Hochschulring), in which a majority of the traditional student fraternities had banded together, swiftly assumed an antisemitic orientation and began to set the tone as early as 1921. During this period the University Circle won an average of two thirds of the seats in the student parliaments and was thus able to assume leadership of the Deutsche Studentenschaft (German Students' Union, DSt). When the Prussian Minister of Culture forbade the DSt leadership to exclude students of Jewish ancestry, the result was a strike ballot at Prussian universities in December 1926. Turnout was high, and 77.6 per cent of the voters were in favour of continuing to deny membership to Jewish fellow students.⁴⁷

The outcome of the vote is significant because it indicates how deeply many students, even in the calm phase of the Weimar Republic, harboured *völkisch* ideas. Quite soon, many of the students became involved in the emerging anti-bourgeois and anti-academic National Socialist German Association of Students (NSDStB).⁴⁸ There the tone was casual and sarcastic. For example, in the spring of 1929 a Rostock student joked that word should be given in advance as to when the Jews would be sailing for Madagascar from the emigrants' quay in Hamburg: 'The Hamburg SA Band is ready and willing to play the farewell song.' In the elections to the General Students' Committee (AStA) in 1930, the NSDStB won 32.4 per cent of the valid votes cast at German universities. In 1931 it garnered 44.8 per cent of the vote, and by 1932 the share had risen to 49.1 per cent.⁴⁹ Given the political climate at German universities, it is not surprising that tens of thousands of young students shortly afterwards became supporters and beneficiaries of the National Socialist state. They immediately put their energies into fleshing out the vague and variable Nazi ideology from within so that it corresponded to a 'rational' concept of rule. Scarcely had the NSDAP come to power before it engineered a change of leadership and a generational shift more far-reaching than Germany had ever known – 'the National Socialist revolution was in large measure a revolution of the younger generation'.⁵⁰

Varieties of latent antisemitism were felt in daily life and could be detected in a multitude of settings. This fact was well recorded in letters written by Jewish holidaymakers attesting to their encounters with everyday forms of antisemitism and sent to the CV.⁵¹ Until 1933, however, the Jews' enemies in Germany also encountered stiff opposition. During the Weimar years, there were multiple waves of protest against antisemitism, which involved all the newspapers from the moderate right all the way to the left. This

47 Ulrich Herbert, *Best: Biographische Studien über Radikalismus, Weltanschauung und Vernunft 1903–1989* (Bonn: Dietz, 1996).

48 Geoffrey J. Giles, *Students and National Socialism in Germany* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985).

49 Michael Grüttner, *Studenten im Dritten Reich* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1995), pp. 26 ff. and table 25, p. 496; on Rostock: *Akademischer Beobachter: Kampfblatt des Nationalsozialistischen Deutschen Studentenbundes*, vol. 1 (1929), p. 96.

50 Horst Möller, *Die Weimarer Republik: Eine unvollendete Demokratie*, new edn (Munich: DTV, 2006 [1985]), pp. 283–284.

51 Jacob Borut, 'Antisemitism in Tourist Facilities in Weimar Germany', *Yad Vashem Studies*, vol. 28 (2000), pp. 7–50; Frank Bajohr, 'Unser Hotel ist judenfrei': *Bäder-Antisemitismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2003).

was the case after the serious antisemitic violence and looting in Berlin's Scheunenviertel neighbourhood (1923), the murder of Rathenau (1922), and the increasingly frequent desecrations of cemeteries in 1924/1925.

The left-liberal German Democratic Party (DDP) declared to its constituents in 1927: 'Antisemitism, in German "hatred against Jews", is an immoral movement, because it appeals to the basest instinct.' In 1930 the Berlin newspaper *Der Abend* launched an attack on the Nazis' antisemitism: 'It is the distinguishing mark of all ethical inadequacy to consider oneself more valuable or innately superior,' the newspaper stated, and shortly afterwards: 'It is proof of the German people's political shortcomings that we must go through a second period of rowdy antisemitism. But we obviously are not yet past the political teething problems in this country.' German bishops routinely opposed the myths alleging that Jews carried out ritual murder, and the republican association of combat veterans known as Reich Banner Black-Red-Gold also staunchly opposed antisemitism. On 25 March 1928 the Holy See issued a decree stating that it condemned 'especially the hatred against the people once chosen by God, namely the hatred that commonly goes by the name of "antisemitism"'. This declaration was in keeping with older Vatican doctrines regarding the 'duties of love' towards 'Jewish fellow citizens' that had been issued during the controversy with the antisemitically orientated Christian Social Party in Austria. After the anti-Jewish riots on Berlin's Kurfürstendamm in 1931, which were instigated by the city's branch of the NSDAP under the leadership of police chief Count Helldorf, the *Welt am Montag* newspaper used the word 'pogrom', the *Berliner Volkszeitung* wrote of a 'cowardly assault', the *Berliner Tageblatt* referred to 'terrorists', and *Vorwärts* discerned the 'mob' at work.⁵²

The mayor of the aforementioned town of Gailingen in southern Baden, who was a member of the Catholic Centre Party, mounted energetic resistance to the NSDAP's antisemitic machinations there, which began in 1928. He prohibited public bell-ringing to announce Nazi meetings, stating that it was a breach of the peace. He ordered the confiscation of antisemitic swastika stickers which read 'Selling cloth and silk is something every Jew can do, but what he won't do is sit at the loom!' He further requested that the town of Konstanz send mounted police to keep forty activists in check. In addition, all the democratic parties organized a protest demonstration in Gailingen in 1930, 'to put an end to the dreadful swastika nuisance'. The Baden regional government provided legal and political support for the demonstration.⁵³

These examples say little about the specific attitude of individual Catholics, Protestants, Social Democrats, or middle-class liberals, but it is clear that there were some determined efforts made during the Weimar years to confront antisemitism. In addition, as a constitutional state, the Weimar Republic afforded protection to all citizens, including Jewish ones. In isolated instances, of course, there were court decisions in which sympathy with the antisemites was evident – but these decisions provoked scandals. In the case of attacks, insults, or defamatory propaganda, going to court remained the most effective measure against antisemites throughout the existence of the republic. The CV employed this method with success. When the synagogue at Kottbusser Tor in Berlin was defaced on the night of 16–17 February 1930 with twenty swastikas and the slogan

⁵² Walter, *Antisemitische Kriminalität*, pp. 151–154 and 211–221.

⁵³ Friedrich and Schmieder-Friedrich (eds.), *Die Gailinger Juden*, pp. 55–64.

‘Perish Judah, death to Judas, vengeance draws near’, a Berlin court of lay judges sentenced each of the five perpetrators to five months in prison. The public prosecutor’s office had requested nine months.⁵⁴

German Jews at the Beginning of the Nazi Era

According to the findings of the June 1933 census, the German Reich had more than 65 million inhabitants, 502,799 of whom professed the Jewish faith. Of these Jews, 160,564 lived in Berlin. Only there and in Frankfurt am Main did they reach a proportion of around 4 per cent of the population. In other big cities, Jews constituted approximately 1 per cent of the inhabitants. Moreover, 15.5 per cent of the Jewish population lived in localities numbering fewer than 10,000 inhabitants and 13.6 per cent in towns ranging from 10,000 to 100,000 inhabitants (Doc. 52). One fifth of the Jewish population did not hold German citizenship. Most members of this group had arrived as immigrants in Germany from the countries of Central and Eastern Europe in the decades prior to 1933: 56,000 were Polish citizens, more than 4,000 were citizens of Austria, more than 4,000 others were Czechoslovaks, and just under 20,000 were considered stateless.⁵⁵

Most of the German Jews belonged to the urban middle class. In 1933, 61 per cent of those who were employed worked in trade and commerce, 23 per cent worked in industry and the skilled crafts, 12.5 per cent described themselves as members of the civil service, and 1.7 per cent worked in the agricultural sector. While only one in six Christians in the workforce was self-employed, among Jews it was one in two. Because the self-employment statistics also included farmers, the actual proportions in the cities differed even more significantly than the statistical picture indicates (Doc. 53). In Prussia in 1933, of 11,674 lawyers admitted to practice, 3,370 were Jewish. Among the approximately 52,000 physicians in the territory of the German Reich as a whole, there were 8,500 Jews.⁵⁶

54 Pross (ed.), *Die Zerstörung*, p. 262.

55 *Statistik des Deutschen Reichs*, vol. 451: *Volks-, Berufs- und Betriebszählung vom 16. Juni 1933: Volkszählung. Die Bevölkerung des Deutschen Reichs nach den Ergebnissen der Volkszählung 1933*, no. 5: *Die Glaubensjuden im Deutschen Reich*, compiled by the Statistisches Reichsamtsamt (Berlin: Verlag für Sozialpolitik, Wirtschaft und Statistik, 1936), pp. 13–14.

56 Esra Bennathan, ‘Demographische und wirtschaftliche Struktur der Juden’, in Mosse (ed.), *Entscheidungsjahr 1932*, pp. 87–131; Werner F. Kümmel, ‘Die Ausschaltung rassisch und politisch missliebiger Ärzte’, in Fridolf Kudlien (ed.), *Ärzte im Nationalsozialismus* (Cologne: Kiepenheuer und Witsch, 1985), pp. 56–81, here p. 76; Tillmann Krach, *Jüdische Rechtsanwälte in Preußen: Über die Bedeutung der freien Advokatur und ihre Zerstörung durch den Nationalsozialismus* (Munich: Beck, 1991), pp. 39 and 416; Konrad H. Jarausch, ‘Jewish Lawyers in Germany, 1848–1938: The Disintegration of a Profession’, *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, vol. 36 (1991), pp. 171–190, here p. 181; Thomas Beddies (ed.), *Jüdische Ärztinnen und Ärzte im Nationalsozialismus: Entrechtung, Vertreibung, Ermordung* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014); Douglas G. Morris, ‘Discrimination, Degradation, Defiance: Jewish Lawyers under Nazism’, in Alan E. Steinweis and Robert D. Rachlin (eds.) *The Law in Nazi Germany: Ideology, Opportunism, and the Perversion of Justice* (New York: Berghahn, 2015).

Rapid urbanization and a fall in the birth rate, which began relatively early in Jewish families, led to the number of German Jews decreasing by 56,000 between the 1925 census and the June 1933 census (20,000 at most may have fled Germany for political reasons during the first half of 1933). In the 1920s, representatives of German Jewry feared the imminent decline of German Jewish communities. The *Jüdisches Lexikon*, published in 1927, reported that 'despite a 29 per cent increase in marriages in the previous fifty years', the number of births had fallen by more than 43 per cent during this period. In Berlin, it said, maintaining the Jewish population at the same level would require 'a relentless influx of Jewish persons from outside'.⁵⁷ Moreover, the Jewish population, classified on the basis of religious affiliation, was decreasing as a result of the strong assimilationist trend. After the First World War, more and more Jews converted to Christianity or chose to marry partners of different faiths. In 1927 one third of all German Jews entered into marriage with non-Jews. Their children were generally raised as Christians or received a secular upbringing.

Most Jews considered themselves socially, culturally, and politically as part of German society. At the same time many maintained a significantly loosened yet genuine sense of connection to their origins and faith. Among the schools of religious thought, the Reform Liberal current was dominant. By contrast, the Orthodox communities had few members. Up to the end of the Weimar Republic, the Zionist movement did not play a major role within German Jewry. Even though the German Jews were mostly inclined towards the liberal political parties, among them were also numerous supporters of communist and socialist, conservative and German nationalist opinions.⁵⁸ It could not have been further from their minds to regard themselves as a national minority and to found a special party. Unlike, for instance, the Jews of Poland or Romania, they did not take part in the 'Congress of Organized National Groups in the European States', a non-governmental advocacy group created in Geneva in 1925. They regarded themselves as Germans of the Jewish faith, who were, and intended to remain, loyal citizens.

Antisemitism as a State Objective

On 30 January 1933 the NSDAP attained power in Germany. The author of the editorial published in the *Jüdische Rundschau* the next day described the Party as a 'movement hostile to the Jews'. Nonetheless, he placed hope in those forces in German society that would oppose 'barbaric anti-Jewish politics' (Doc. 1). German President Paul von Hindenburg had only reluctantly appointed Adolf Hitler as Reich Chancellor and he instructed him to form a coalition cabinet. Overcoming the economic and constitutional crisis, reversing the ignominy of Versailles, putting an immediate halt to reparations payments,

⁵⁷ 'Antisemitismus, Geschichte (Deutschland)', in *Jüdisches Lexikon*, vol. 1, pp. 345–346.

⁵⁸ Martin Liepach, *Das Wahlverhalten der jüdischen Bevölkerung: Zur politischen Orientierung der Juden in der Weimarer Republik* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1996).

and rearming Germany – in short, ‘strong-arm’ politics, as common goals, united the National Socialists and the nationalist conservative forces in the new government.⁵⁹

Decisive for the success of the NSDAP was the fact that it appeared outwardly as a unified force. As the first modern *Volkspartei*, a broad-based party with mass appeal, it presented itself as neither regional, nor religious, nor tied to any specific social class.⁶⁰ Many Germans hoped that such a policy could overcome the old national trauma of internal fragmentation: the separation into clans and denominations, which was viewed as historically calamitous; the self-destruction in the Thirty Years War; the particularism, and the social antagonisms, which had intensified dramatically during the Great Depression. ‘For a long time, the most varied enemies of our people have thrived on the conflicts and the issues of a thirty-year-long war of religion’, as Carl Schmitt expressed it in 1934. He continued: ‘We almost pulverized ourselves by being for generations on end, inwardly as well, a war zone for all intellectual and spiritual conflicts.’⁶¹ According to this reading of German history, the welfare of the state and the people had all too long been neglected in favour of particular interests. This situation, many Germans believed, had brought about the collapse of the home front at the end of the First World War, had persisted in the squabbling among the political parties in the Weimar Republic, and had ultimately led to the brink of civil war.

Once the NSDAP was in power, it made antisemitism a fundamental component of its government programme, one that strove for the national ‘self-liberation’ of Germany. The programme combined anti-Jewish prejudices with small shopkeepers’ fear of department stores, craftsmen’s dread of industrialization, and farmers’ worries about cheap imports, falling prices, and insolvency. There followed specific measures providing debt relief for farmers, stabilizing the producer prices for foodstuffs, halting property seizure and eviction notices that were already legally binding, and prohibiting discounts in order to protect retailers from being undercut by department stores. For workers, protection against wrongful dismissal was markedly increased.

University graduates, the number of whom had risen as a result of the Weimar Republic’s educational policies, feared for their employment prospects. They considered the demand for a quota for Jews at universities and grammar schools – corresponding to their proportion of the overall population in Germany – to be a fair means of ensuring equalization. In the summer of 1932 almost 4,000 Jewish students were enrolled in German universities, but by the summer of 1934 their number had dropped to 656. Research assistants and unsalaried lecturers eagerly applied for the positions newly vacated by

59 Karl Dietrich Bracher, *The German Dictatorship: Origins, Structure, and Consequences of National Socialism*, trans. Jean Steinberg (New York: Praeger, 1970 [German edn, 1969]); Martin Broszat, *The Hitler State: The Foundation and Development of the Internal Structure of the Third Reich*, trans. John W. Hiden (London: Longman, 1981 [German edn, 1969]); Ludolf Herbst, *Das nationalsozialistische Deutschland 1933–1945* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1996); Klaus Hildebrand, *The Third Reich*, trans. P. S. Falla (London: Allen & Unwin, 1984 [German edn, 1979]); Norbert Frei, *National Socialist Rule in Germany: The Führer State, 1933–1945*, trans. Simon B. Steyne (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993 [German edn, 1987]); Richard J. Evans, *The Third Reich in Power, 1933–1939* (London: Allen Lane, 2005).

60 Jürgen W. Falter, *Hitlers Wähler* (Munich: Beck, 1991).

61 Radio address by Carl Schmitt (directional transmission to America on 15/16 April 1934), published in *Die Deutsche Studentenschaft: Nachrichtendienst*, vol. 7, issue B, no. 6, 17 April 1934: BArch, NS 38/190p194/IV.

Jews, who were summarily dismissed. Between 1933 and 1936, around 940 professors, assistant professors, and university employees were forced to leave the German universities, mostly because they were Jews. The same thing occurred in other sectors of the civil service and, at a later stage, in the private sector. The mass dismissal of Jewish teachers in 1933 made it possible, despite all the compulsory economic measures and spending freezes, to immediately hire 60 per cent of the 1,320 'Aryan' applicants.

Self-employed retailers and entrepreneurs suddenly lauded their firms as 'purely German', and profited from the politically desired downfall of their Jewish competitors: they took over their public contracts, wooed their customers, expanded, and finally bought at a ridiculously low price the stock of merchandise belonging to their competitors, who had been driven into bankruptcy. The pressure on Jewish-owned firms made it easier to consolidate and restructure medium-sized companies, and shifted the costs of this process on to a population group suffering discrimination. Managers of firms, banks, and insurance companies participated in their own way in the process of economic modernization that was funded by racial discrimination. The number of private banks in Germany thus fell from 1,350 to 520 between 1932 and 1939. At the end of 1935, 915 private banks were still in existence, 345 of which were considered 'non-Aryan'. By 1939 they had all, without exception, been absorbed by 'Aryan' entities.⁶² During the years of the Great Depression, millions were looking for work, and only a few had any objection to the immigration of *Ostjuden* being halted.

Academics immediately devised new projects that met the requirements for public funding. Many managed the transition with seeming ease. Thanks to the government's guidelines and as a result of the emigration of entire academic faculties,⁶³ scholars who had long thought along *völkisch* lines, and junior researchers who were willing to adapt, gained control over terms and definitions, topics, research methods, grant awards, and appointments to tenured professorships. The members of every academic discipline worked more or less intensively on formulating their fields of study according to anti-semitic principles. Even physics was not spared, although it was easier for the humanities scholars, biologists, and medical professionals to give their subjects a racial and *völkisch*-social scientific slant. The following examples illustrate this.

In 1936 the Munich historian Karl Alexander von Müller, who was influenced by nationalist conservative thought, became a co-founder of the 'Research Department for the Jewish Question at the Reich Institute for History of the New Germany'. In his opening address he rhapsodized about the fact that historical and comparative race research

62 Michael Grüttner and Sven Kinas, 'Die Vertreibung von Wissenschaftlern aus den deutschen Universitäten', *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, vol. 55, no. 1 (2007), pp. 123–188, here p. 126; Marion A. Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 25; Bennathan, 'Demographische und wirtschaftliche Struktur', p. 131; Günther Keiser, 'Der jüngste Konzentrationsprozeß', *Die Wirtschaftskurve*, vol. 18 (1939), p. 148, cited in Franz Neumann, *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism, 1933–1944* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2009 [1942/1944]), p. 117; Albert Fischer, 'Jüdische Privatbanken im "Dritten Reich"', *Scripta Mercaturae*, vol. 28, nos. 1–2 (1994), pp. 1–54, here p. 19.

63 Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich, and Research Foundation for Jewish Immigration, New York, *International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Emigrés, 1933–1945*, 3 vols. (Munich: Saur, 1999 [1980–1983]); Horst Möller, *Exodus der Kultur: Schriftsteller, Wissenschaftler und Künstler in der Emigration nach 1933* (Munich: Beck, 1984).

was no longer ‘taboo’. He celebrated the newly created focus of research and third-party funding as an ‘arsenal for the battle of the minds’. The same year, Carl Schmitt opened a conference of the Reich Group of University Teachers on the topic ‘Jewry in the German Legal Profession’ with statements such as the following:

What the Führer has said about Jewish dialectics is something we must repeatedly instil in our own minds and in those of our students, in order to avoid the great danger of ever-new attempts to dissemble and to talk an issue to death. Emotional antisemitism alone does not accomplish the task; what is required is conviction founded on knowledge.⁶⁴

Emanuel Hirsch, who held the chair of systematic theology at the University of Göttingen, described Marxism in 1934 ‘as the product of a German–Jewish mixed marriage and as evidence for the impossibility of Jewish emancipation on the soil of Christian nationhood’. He interpreted Bolshevism as ‘perhaps even an unbelieving aberration of the Jewish religion’. The biologist Ernst Lehmann, a professor of botany in Tübingen, was working on a ‘German biology’ that was up to the task of recording, in ‘endless work carried out by one individual’, the ‘hereditary factors and characteristics of various human races’: ‘Where necessary and possible, the ensuing consequences will have a legal underpinning (laws pertaining to Jews).’⁶⁵

A similar willingness to adapt was found among musicians, visual artists, journalists, film directors, and theatre people. The theatre critic Herbert Ihering took over from his rival Alfred Kerr at the *Berliner Tageblatt* after Kerr, who had a Jewish background, fled into exile with his family. Later, Werner Höfer began his career as a writer for the culture section of the same newspaper by cautioning the public against Heinrich Heine’s lyric poetry, which he described as ‘mouldy’ fruits of ‘political conditioning’ and as ‘posturing’. The renowned theatrical director Max Reinhardt was forced to leave Germany. His disciple Veit Harlan rose to become Joseph Goebbels’s film director of choice. Among his films was the propaganda feature *Jud Süß* (Jew Süss), which premiered at the Venice Film Festival in 1940 and was screened to considerable acclaim in many European cinemas. The name of the musician and composer Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, who had rediscovered the works of Johann Sebastian Bach, vanished immediately from the concert playbills in 1933. Conversely, Bach was turned into the embodiment of ‘German ethnic stock’ – by means of an appeal in the spring of 1933, in which leading choirmasters and organists sought to prevent ‘non-native, cosmopolitan church music from being

64 Cited in *Das Judentum in der Rechtswissenschaft: Ansprachen, Vorträge und Ergebnisse der Tagung der Reichsgruppe Hochschullehrer des NSRB am 3. und 4. Oktober 1936*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Deutscher Rechtsverlag, 1936), p. 14.

65 Address by Professor Karl Alexander von Müller, in Walter Frank (ed.), *Deutsche Wissenschaft und Judenfrage: Schriften des Reichsinstituts für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1937), pp. 5–14; Hirsch cited in Robert P. Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch* (New Haven, CT/London: Yale University Press, 1985), p. 154; Lehmann cited in Ute Deichmann, *Biologen unter Hitler: Vertreibung, Karrieren, Forschung* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1992), pp. 289–303. On Müller, see Matthias Berg, *Karl Alexander von Müller: Historiker für den Nationalsozialismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014).

presented to our people'. Among the appeal's initiators was Günther Ramin, the musical director of the St Thomas Choir of Leipzig from 1940 until his death in 1956. In 1936 he had played at the wedding of Hermann Göring, and in March 1941 he produced the first German recording of the entire St Matthew Passion.⁶⁶

After the Second World War, the historian Joseph Wulf documented the opportunism of the artists and journalists and the alacrity with which they had jumped on to the totalitarian bandwagon. Wulf, who was born in Chemnitz in 1912 and educated as a rabbi in Cracow,⁶⁷ concluded: 'In our century, one might almost say that the concentration camp inmate has understood the nature and purpose of the concepts of freedom and public opinion far more concretely than the intellectual.'⁶⁸ Wulf was speaking from personal knowledge: as a member of the Jewish resistance movement in Poland, he had been arrested in 1941 and went on to survive Auschwitz.

In February 1933, in a number of localities, SA and SS forces organized the first, frequently violent boycotts targeting Jewish business people and university lecturers (Doc. 3). After the Reichstag election on 5 March 1933, which produced a narrow majority for the nationalist coalition, though not for the NSDAP alone, Hitler instructed his Minister of the Interior, Wilhelm Frick, to draft anti-Jewish laws. As previously discussed by conservative politicians in 1923 and 1932, Frick wanted to begin by expelling all Jews of Polish or Russian origin, the so-called *Ostjuden*, from the country and by putting a stop to any further immigration (Doc. 8). On the surface the behaviour of the Nazi leadership was contradictory. While Hitler, on 10 March 1933, publicly expressed opposition to spontaneous acts of antisemitism, Hermann Göring refused the following day to extend police protection to Jewish businesses. On 19 March 1933 the National Socialist leaders encouraged the propensity of their grass-roots supporters for engaging in violent disruption by publishing a demand in the *Völkischer Beobachter* newspaper calling for Jews to be ousted from Berlin's local courts.

From the outset a part of the foreign press reported critically on the discrimination against Jews in Germany. Jewish and non-Jewish organizations, particularly in the USA and Britain, discussed the provision of aid to German Jews and organized public protests (Docs. 14 and 20). Some called on consumers to refuse to buy German goods, in order to put economic pressure on the National Socialist government. In reaction Hitler decided to stage an anti-Jewish boycott. On 1 April 1933, a Saturday, SA guards and activists from the German nationalist Stahlhelm organization blocked access to Jewish-owned businesses, law firms, and medical practices throughout the German Reich. They daubed anti-Jewish slogans on shop windows, doors, and pavements. In his radio address the

66 On Harlan, see Erwin Leiser, *'Deutschland Erwache!' Propaganda und Film des Dritten Reiches*, new edn (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1978 [1968]), pp. 141–146, and Franck Noach, *Veit Harlan: The Life and Work of a Nazi Filmmaker* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2016). On Höfer: 'Zeitalter des Namenlosen?', *12 Uhr Blatt*, 1 Nov. 1943, cited in Friedrich Lambart (ed.), *Tod eines Pianisten: Karlobert Kreiten und der Fall Werner Höfer* (Berlin: Hentrich, 1988), pp. 179–180. On Ramin: Fred K. Prieberg, *Musik im NS-Staat* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1982), p. 346.

67 On Wulf, see Klaus Kempster, *Joseph Wulf: Ein Historikerschicksal in Deutschland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013).

68 Joseph Wulf, *Presse und Funk im Dritten Reich* (Gütersloh: S. Mohn, 1964), p. 5; Joseph Wulf, *Musik im Dritten Reich; Die bildenden Künste im Dritten Reich; Literatur und Dichtung im Dritten Reich; Theater und Film im Dritten Reich*, 4 vols. (Gütersloh: S. Mohn, 1963).

same day, Joseph Goebbels encouraged ‘the German people’ to seek ‘recompense’ from the Jews. In many places, shops were looted and customers who resisted the boycott were photographed or filmed, and sometimes mistreated. Murders were committed in Chemnitz, Plauen, and Kiel (Doc. 22).⁶⁹

The evening before, university professor Victor Klemperer had written in Dresden: ‘Ever more hopeless. The boycott begins tomorrow. Yellow placards, men on guard. Pressure to pay Christian employees two months’ salary, to dismiss Jewish ones.’ The next day, he observed: ‘People poured down Prager Straße and looked at it all. [...] There will be an explosion – but we may pay for it with our lives, we Jews.’ A directive from the Baden Ministry of State shows how quickly the state’s antisemitic policy had lodged itself in children’s minds. On 3 April 1933 the ministry pointed out in the Baden newspapers ‘that insults directed at Jewish school pupils by their fellow pupils cannot be tolerated’.⁷⁰

Behaviour of the ‘Aryan’ Majority

It is difficult to estimate the extent and nature of popular antisemitism at the beginning of National Socialist rule. There are some indications that most Germans did not embrace state-propagated hatred in the early years of Nazi rule. The 1 April boycott, for example, lasted only one day due to a lack of resonance with German shoppers. Nonetheless, the vast majority reacted with indifference to the state’s anti-Jewish policies. As early as 1932 Otto von Harling, a clergyman who was involved in a Christian mission to the Jews, complained: ‘The crudeness with which not only everything Jewish is dragged through the mire but also the Jew is personally insulted, [...] all that is barely considered to be disgraceful and unjust by large parts of the population; [...] while in America the representatives of various churches have issued statements opposing the excesses of antisemitism.’⁷¹ Looking back at the final years of the Weimar Republic, Franz Böhm, who later became a Bundestag delegate for the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and after 1952 led the restitution talks with Israel on behalf of West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, said: ‘If and when anti-Hitler slogans were to be heard at all in those days, they placed emphasis on other things, but they did not focus on revulsion for

69 Armin Nolzen, ‘The Nazi Party and Its Violence against the Jews, 1933–1938/39: Violence as a Historiographical Concept’, *Yad Vashem Studies*, vol. 31 (2003), pp. 245–285; Robert Gellately, *Backing Hitler: Consent and Coercion in Nazi Germany* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 27; Michael Wildt, *Hitler’s Volksgemeinschaft and the Dynamics of Racial Exclusion: Violence against Jews in Provincial Germany, 1919–1939*, trans. Bernard Heise (New York: Berghahn, 2012 [German edn, 2007]), pp. 77–84; Hannah Ahlheim, ‘*Deutsche, kauft nicht bei Juden!*’ *Antisemitismus und politischer Boykott in Deutschland 1924 bis 1935* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2011), pp. 241–262.

70 Victor Klemperer, *I Shall Bear Witness: The Diaries of Victor Klemperer, 1933–1941*, trans. Martin Chalmers (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1998 [German edn, 1995]), pp. 12–13 (entries for 31 March and 3 April 1933); newspaper excerpt cited in Friedrich and Schmieder-Friedrich (eds.), *Die Gailinger Juden*, p. 80.

71 Quotations from Mosse (ed.), *Entscheidungsjahr 1932*: Hans-Joachim Kraus, ‘Die evangelische Kirche’, pp. 249–270, here p. 259; Karl Thieme, ‘Deutsche Katholiken’, pp. 271–288, here pp. 272–273; P. B. Wiener, ‘Die Parteien der Mitte’, pp. 288–321, here pp. 290–291; Hans-Helmuth Knütter, ‘Die Linksparteien’, pp. 323–345, here p. 332.

antisemitism.⁷² In addition, historian Saul Friedländer wrote with respect to the year 1935: ‘The populace appears to have been mainly passive in the face of such ongoing party agitation: Although there was no resistance to it, outright anti-Jewish violence often encountered disapproval.’⁷³

From this perspective, lack of concern for the fate of persons not deemed part of the *Volksgemeinschaft* was perhaps the most significant behavioural tendency of German society that facilitated the killing of the European Jews. Documentary evidence was provided in April 1933 in the reply of Cardinal Michael von Faulhaber, spiritual leader of the Archdiocese of Munich and Freising, to a letter from a Catholic who was deeply troubled by the Jew-baiting. Faulhaber’s reaction presaged the slippery slope down which the civil forces of German society began to slide. ‘These actions against the Jews’, he wrote:

are so very unchristian that every Christian, not merely every cleric, ought to speak out against them. For the higher Church authorities, [however,] there are far more important questions of our time; because schooling, the continued existence of the Catholic associations, and sterilization are even more important issues for Christianity in our homeland, especially as we may assume, and to some extent have already seen, that the Jews can help themselves and we therefore have no cause to give the government a reason to turn the Jew-baiting into Jesuit-baiting. (Doc. 30)

In addition to the reactions of the many whose own interests mattered more to them than their persecuted neighbours, there was also a widespread attitude that can be characterized as passive antisemitism. A sizeable number of ‘Aryan’ Germans regarded the Jewish Germans as alien elements that had seemingly prospered disproportionately in the past. For the most part this attitude resulted in the rejection of direct violence, but not to any disapproval of the state-ordered deprivation of rights.

Since Jews were quickly excluded from associations and from public life in general, colleagues from the world of business and the civil service vanished, and social contacts were almost automatically lost. Anyone who was not particularly courageous could simply let these contacts wane. This was by no means the universal approach, as the example of Ernst Loewenberg demonstrates. He had taught German at the Lichtwark School in Hamburg, a reform-friendly, coeducational institution, and, as a holder of the Iron Cross, he did not lose his position until March 1934. The pupils, even those who joined the Hitler Youth, maintained contact with their greatly respected teacher. In the allotment garden, Loewenberg spoke with their parents: ‘Where they are unobserved, they too behave as before.’ At the end of 1934, at the wish of his former pupils, a study group headed by Loewenberg was created, in which poems by Rainer Maria Rilke were read and discussed. Only after the headmaster summoned a few pupils and accused them of

72 Cited in Jochmann, *Gesellschaftskrise*, p. 193.

73 Friedländer, *Nazi Germany*, vol. 1, p. 125; David Bankier (ed.), *Probing the Depths of German Anti-Semitism: German Society and the Persecution of the Jews, 1933–1941* (New York: Berghahn, 1999); Susanna Schrafstetter and Alan Steinweis (eds.), *The Germans and the Holocaust: Popular Responses to the Persecution and Murder of the Jews* (New York: Berghahn, 2015).

having ‘proved their moral immaturity in such a blatant manner by working with a Jew’ did Loewenberg put an end to the meetings, against the wishes of the pupils. He wondered: ‘Has a Nazi living in our building reported us to the authorities? It’s more likely that word got round at school.’⁷⁴

This story is probably atypical. However, it shows how even if Jews and non-Jews sought to maintain friendly relationships these could be brought to an abrupt end. Fairly rapidly, invisible barriers arose, such as those described by Rabbi Joachim Prinz in 1935: ‘The Jew’s lot is to be neighbourless.’ He added: ‘We would not find it all so painful if we did not have the feeling that we once *did have* neighbours’ (Doc. 161). For the officials of the SS Security Service (hereafter SD), including Adolf Eichmann, who were responsible for monitoring the Jews, this was not enough. In their opinion, at the end of 1937 the ‘unanimous repudiation of the Jews by all parts of the population’ was still largely absent.⁷⁵

Reactions of the Persecuted

The representatives of the Jewish associations in Germany reacted to the unexpectedly strong threat by going on the offensive. In April 1933, putting all their differences aside, they founded the Central Committee of German Jews for Relief and Reconstruction (Zentralausschuss der deutschen Juden für Hilfe und Aufbau), which was financed by Jewish communities and foreign relief organizations. All the large Jewish organizations joined forces in the committee: the CV, the Zionist Federation for Germany, the Relief Association of German Jews, the League of Jewish Women, the Prussian Regional Association of Jewish Communities, the Jewish Community of Berlin, and the Orthodox association Agudat Yisrael. The Central Committee undertook social welfare work and economic aid, arranged for the expansion of Jewish schools, a step that quickly became necessary, and offered help and advice to those who wanted to emigrate. In terms of its practical activities it was to become the most important component of the Reich Representation of German Jews (Reichsvertretung der deutschen Juden), which was founded on 17 September 1933 as an umbrella association of the major political Jewish organizations.⁷⁶ The Reich Representation was largely composed of the groups that had already made up the Central Committee, but with the addition of the Reich League of Jewish Combat Veterans, which was as influential as it was patriotically German in attitude. The representatives of the Jewish associations chose Leo Baeck as president of the Reich Representation. Born near Posen in 1873, Baeck was a religious scholar, rabbi, and philosopher who had served as a military rabbi in the imperial field army in the First

⁷⁴ Account by Ernst Loewenberg, written in 1940 in Boston, in Monika Richarz (ed.), *Bürger auf Widerruf: Lebenszeugnisse deutscher Juden 1780–1945* (Munich: Beck, 1989), pp. 449–458.

⁷⁵ Cited in Michael Wildt (ed.), *Die Judenpolitik des SD 1935 bis 1938: Eine Dokumentation* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1995), p. 165.

⁷⁶ Otto Dov Kulka (ed.), *Deutsches Judentum unter dem Nationalsozialismus*, vol. 1: *Dokumente zur Geschichte der Reichsvertretung der deutschen Juden 1933–1939* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); Avraham Barkai, ‘Jewish Self-Help in Nazi Germany, 1933–1939: The Dilemmas of Cooperation’, in Francis R. Nicosia and David Scrase (eds.), *Jewish Life in Nazi Germany: Dilemmas and Responses* (New York: Berghahn, 2012), pp. 71–88.

World War. He was widely considered the recognized representative of Liberal German Judaism, the main sub-current of Reform Judaism to develop in Germany in the first half of the nineteenth century as a secession from Orthodoxy.⁷⁷ Guided by his sense of duty, Baeck assumed the appointment. The first public statement of the Reich Representation bears his imprint:

At a time that is as hard and difficult and trying as any in Jewish history, but also significant as few times have been, we have been entrusted with the leadership and representation of the German Jews by a joint decision [...]. We must understand [the new regime in Germany] and not deceive ourselves.⁷⁸

While the German Zionists redoubled their efforts to awaken a sense of Jewish national identity in 1933, expedited emigration to Palestine, and, as a movement that opposed assimilation, were supported in all this by the National Socialist state, the Association of National German Jews (Verband Nationaldeutscher Juden) continued to battle for the rights of the Jews in Germany until the organization was banned in 1935. Beyond such differences of opinion, the Reich Representation considered itself the overall spokesperson for Jews with regard to the National Socialist government and repeatedly protested against despotism. For example, in January 1934 the Reich Representation sent the position paper 'On the Present Situation of the Jews' to the Reich government. The almost eighty-page text documented the various forms of discrimination against the Jewish population in Germany, particularly in the economy (Doc. 99). Organizations such as the Reich League of Jewish Combat Veterans, the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith, and several synagogue congregations also addressed petitions and complaints to Reich ministries, regional authorities, and municipal administrations (Docs. 47, 110, and 141).

The persecuted fought back. But they did so with civility, as if their adversaries were bound by the same notion of justice and would act in good faith. The Nazi persecutors, however, behaved improperly, constantly changed the rules, and were themselves uncertain what their next steps would be. They had no well-thought-out plan, but rather for the most part made ad hoc decisions – impelled and intoxicated by the self-generated pull of continual radicalization. They acted in the conviction that there was 'only the constant move forward on the road toward ever-new fields'.⁷⁹

77 See Michael A. Meyer, *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1988).

78 Statement by the Reich Representation in *C.V.-Zeitung*, 21 Sept. 1933, cited in Yahil, *Holocaust*, pp. 77–78; Barkai, 'Wehr Dich!'; Georg Heuberger and Fritz Backhaus (eds.), *Leo Baeck 1873–1956: Aus dem Stamme von Rabbinern* (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag, 2001).

79 Cited in Arendt, *Origins*, p. 394, with reference to Theodor Maunz, *Gestalt und Recht der Polizei* (Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, 1943). Also see Martin Broszat, 'Zur Erklärung des nationalsozialistischen Judenmords', in Hermann Graml and Klaus-Dietmar Henke (eds.), *Nach Hitler: Der schwierige Umgang mit unserer Geschichte. Beiträge von Martin Broszat* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1988 [1986]), p. 247; Hans Mommsen, 'The Realization of the Unthinkable: The "Final Solution of the Jewish Question in the Third Reich"', in Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *The Policies of Genocide: Jews and Soviet Prisoners of War in Nazi Germany* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986), pp. 97–144.

The trust that German Jews continued to place in state institutions was demonstrated, for example, when the Jews of Treuchtlingen still turned to the local police in 1936 after teenagers intruded on a funeral ceremony and threw stones at the mourners. In 1937 Martha Beerwald, the mother of the philosopher Hannah Arendt, devised 'dinner party menus in the event of Hitler's overthrow', dreamed of her daughter's return to Germany, and, in light of the relative calm after the issuing of the Nuremberg Laws, had 'completely reconciled with Germany again, generally speaking'.⁸⁰ What is notable about this story is not so much the credulity of the mother as that of the astute, extremely well-informed daughter, who had emigrated to Paris back in 1933. The two women met up in Geneva, but Hannah Arendt apparently did not try to prevent her mother from returning home to Königsberg.

Violence and Special Legislation

At the beginning of National Socialist rule, there were no clear terms of reference for anti-Jewish policy. Discrimination and persecution were initially not the result of 'Führer orders' and Party resolutions. Following the principle of trial and error, the new state-sponsored antisemitism took shape gradually in an open process lasting many years and escalating on repeated occasions. Politicians and administrators in the nerve centres of the Reich took part in the process, as did local councils, active supporters of the NSDAP, work colleagues, apolitical clubmates, or the initiators of spontaneous popular campaigns.

Factors and interests of many kinds had an influence on antisemitic practices, sometimes slowing them down, sometimes speeding them up. The National Socialist leadership would regularly instigate brief waves of violent antisemitism only to then rein them in again by means of legislation – legislation that imposed restrictions on the Jews but also appeared to guarantee them residual freedoms and exceptions. In this way, out of numerous individual measures and practical suggestions, which were often not embraced immediately, there emerged an unclear but consistent manner of governing. The antisemitism of the street gave way to less conspicuous administrative routine, but it could be reactivated at the 'right' moment. The treacherous interplay between arbitrary violence and temporary moderation was characteristic of German policy towards the Jews prior to the November pogroms of 1938, in accordance with the pattern described by Ian Kershaw: 'pressure from below; green light from above; further violence from below; brakes from above assuaging the radicals through discriminatory legislation. The process had ratcheted up the persecution several notches.'⁸¹

Regardless of the methods, the aim from the very outset was to intimidate and terrify German Jews and to compel them to flee the country. The fact that in so doing the National Socialist leadership did not initially follow a clear strategy, but rather acted

80 Michael Wildt, 'Gewalt gegen Juden in Deutschland 1933–1939', *WerkstattGeschichte*, vol. 6, no. 18 (1997), pp. 5–80, here p. 65; Hannah Arendt and Heinrich Blücher, *Briefe 1936–1968*, ed. Lotte Köhler (Munich: Piper, 1996), letter from Arendt to Blücher, 13 Sept. 1937, p. 80.

81 Ian Kershaw, *Hitler, 1889–1936: Hubris* (London: Allen Lane, 1998), p. 571. Also see Wolf Gruner, 'Die NS-Judenverfolgung und die Kommunen: Zur wechselseitigen Dynamisierung von zentraler und lokaler Politik 1933–1941', *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, vol. 48, no. 1 (2000), pp. 75–126.

spontaneously and in accordance with the particular situation, is demonstrated by the 'Law on the Status of the Jews', which was drafted right after the boycott in early April 1933. An interdepartmental group, which was probably headed by Hitler's deputy, Rudolf Heß, had prepared it in order that 'legal' means could be used in the future to avoid direct violence and prevent foreign protests. The draft provided for occupational bans and the expulsion of foreign Jews, and prohibited sexual contact between Jews and non-Jews. Jews were to be labelled with a 'J' after their name and forced to join a state-supervised 'Association of Jews in Germany'. The preamble to the draft emphasized that the fundamental aim of the law was 'to take full advantage of the historically unique moment in order to cleanse the German people and to free it from an alien power, which has openly and secretly ruled it in its own house in ways that constituted an existential threat' (Doc. 27).

Hitler did not approve the bill. He preferred a slower approach. The first antisemitic laws were thus directed against Jewish members of specific occupational groups, e.g. lawyers, civil servants, salaried employees, and labourers in the public sector. For this purpose, in the context of the Civil Service Law (*Berufsbeamtengesetz*) of 7 April 1933, a regulation was required defining who was to be considered a Jew or 'intermarried with a Jew' (*jüdisch versippt*). By implication, the so-called 'Aryan Paragraph' also established who was to be considered an 'Aryan *Volksgenosse*' (Doc. 32). The ensuing legal provisions applied only to officials working for the state, regional, and municipal authorities. But in the following months it was used by the boards of most German associations and non-governmental entities to exclude all Jews or deprive them of their salaried or voluntary offices. By 31 December 1933 even the League of Blind War Veterans had expelled seventeen members on account of their 'non-Aryan' ancestry.⁸² Jews who had converted to Protestantism suddenly became 'Jew Christians' (*Judenchristen*). In September 1933 the General Synod of the Protestant Church of the Old Prussian Union passed a resolution adopting the 'Aryan Paragraph' for its clergymen and officials (Doc. 75). Other Protestant regional churches and organizations followed suit.

The Law on the Revocation of Naturalization and the Deprivation of German Nationality, which was promulgated in mid July 1933, created the legal basis to revoke the German citizenship of people who were considered 'undesirable' from a *völkisch* standpoint, especially Jews of Polish or Russian origin naturalized after 1918.⁸³ In his seminal work on fascism published in 1963, the historian Ernst Nolte wrote: 'A state which deprives a section of its citizens of citizenship, through no fault of their own, in fact abrogates all other contracts and commitments from the past'.⁸⁴ Concurrently, ministry officials were discussing a law that was intended to deprive the German Jews as a whole of their civil rights and to distinguish between 'Aryan' citizens of the Reich and 'non-Aryan' subjects of the Reich. It was not issued until the end of 1935, as one of the two

82 Gabriel Richter, 'Blindheit und Eugenik: Zwischen Widerstand und Integration', in *Blinde unterm Hakenkreuz: Erkennen, Trauern, Begegnen* (Marburg an der Lahn: Deutscher Verein der Blinden und Sehbehinderten in Studium und Beruf, 1991), pp. 16–34, here p. 21.

83 *Gesetz über den Widerruf von Einbürgerungen und die Aberkennung der deutschen Staatsangehörigkeit*, 14 July 1933, *Reichsgesetzblatt*, 1933, I, p. 480.

84 Ernst Nolte, *Three Faces of Fascism: Action Française, Italian Fascism, National Socialism*, trans. Leila Vennewitz (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966 [German edn. 1963]), p. 378.

Nuremberg Laws.⁸⁵ In July 1933 Göring put a halt to prosecution of the antisemitically motivated murders and acts of violence committed up to that time, as they had taken place, he said, during the course of the National Socialist revolution. Those already sentenced were granted amnesty (Doc. 69).

Following the April boycott, various foreign governments had intervened in opposition to the persecution of the Jews. The Polish ambassador in particular made repeated visits to the Reich Foreign Office. Inside Germany, the Jewish organizations and communities protested, but non-Jewish Germans did so as well. To the extent that the press had not been subjected to *Gleichschaltung*, the reporting of some individual newspapers continued to be critical. For example, on 11 April 1933 the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* published Wilhelm Furtwängler's letter protesting against the exclusion of Jewish musicians from the German stage. 'Ultimately, there is only one dividing line I recognize,' the chief conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic had written to Goebbels, 'that between good and bad art.'

In September 1933 Martin Bormann from the staff of the Deputy of the Führer ordered the lifting of the bans enacted in some places that prohibited Jews from going to public baths, markets, or certain villages (Doc. 76). This directive, however, in no way altered the fundamentally ambivalent policy. For example, on 17 January 1934 Minister of the Interior Frick criticized the blanket application of the 'Aryan Paragraph', but conveyed to the Reich and regional authorities that his intention was by no means to prevent the 'special treatment of non-Aryans'.⁸⁶

From late 1933 until the end of 1934, the initiative with regard to the persecution of the Jews shifted to local authorities. While some cities lifted their anti-Jewish regulations again in the second half of 1933, municipal officials in other areas made arbitrary decisions against Jewish citizens and organizations. In many places, NSDAP groups such as the SA or the National Socialist Organization of Crafts, Trade, and Commerce (NS-Hago) boycotted Jewish firms without having received any central directives (Docs. 12, 15, 141, 143, and 147). A sizeable number of innkeepers, hoteliers, and business people denied Jews access to their premises. In the public display cases of the Nazi smear-sheet *Der Stürmer*, Germans who continued to make purchases in Jewish shops were named and shamed, occasionally even with accompanying photos.

On several occasions Hjalmar Schacht, the Reich minister of economics and president of the Reichsbank, intervened in instances of discrimination not regulated by law. He was not motivated primarily by humanitarian considerations and matters of legal principle. Rather, he mainly feared that arbitrary action at local level would be detrimental to the country's economic interests, particularly abroad (Doc. 189). In addition, in the first years of the National Socialist regime, by no means all German judges were

85 Kurt Pätzold, *Faschismus, Rassenwahn, Judenverfolgung: Eine Studie zur politischen Strategie und Taktik des faschistischen Imperialismus 1933–1935* (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1975), p. 140.

86 Herbert Michaelis and Ernst Schraepler (eds.), *Ursachen und Folgen: Vom deutschen Zusammenbruch 1918 und 1945 bis zur staatlichen Neuordnung Deutschlands in der Gegenwart. Eine Urkunden- und Dokumentensammlung zur Zeitgeschichte*, vol. 9: *Das Dritte Reich: Die Zertrümmerung des Parteienstaates und die Grundlegung der Diktatur* (Berlin: H. Wenzler, 1964), doc. 216, p. 397; Kurt Pätzold (ed.), *Verfolgung, Vertreibung, Vernichtung: Dokumente des faschistischen Antisemitismus 1933–1942* (Leipzig: Reclam, 1983), doc. 25, pp. 70–71.

willing to issue verdicts that were desirable from the standpoint of racial policy. Until 1937, several rulings were issued in favour of Jewish pedlars whom municipal offices for public order had denied permission to set up market stalls. In 1935 the Prussian Higher Administrative Court reversed a lower-court opinion, which had stated: 'Owing to the observations made over the course of centuries' and the 'approach that is characteristic of the German people', Jewish pedlars as a whole ought to be 'regarded as unreliable and therefore excluded'. The high court's decision became legally binding and *Jugend und Recht*, a journal for trainee lawyers, seethed: 'The German people do not stand behind this verdict rendered in their name.'⁸⁷

Withdrawal, Self-Help, and Emigration

While the economic situation of most Germans stabilized after 1933 and soon improved, Jewish families experienced a drastic social decline and often had acute financial difficulties. In the very first year of National Socialist rule, tens of thousands of Jews were laid off or forced to accept substantial losses of income. Of the approximately 100,000 Jewish-owned firms and shops in 1933, 25,000 vanished in the two years that followed. Most small and medium-sized firms suffered serious losses of revenue due to ongoing local boycotts. They were forced to dismiss personnel or went bankrupt. Jewish physicians had already lost their accreditation with health insurance companies by the summer of 1933, and thus a substantial proportion of their patients, and half of their practices closed by 1937. The experience of Jewish lawyers was similar: to protect their interests, a non-Jewish client was de facto dependent on an 'Aryan' lawyer.⁸⁸ Increasing numbers of Jewish women entered the workforce in order to contribute to the family's income. Many retailers who lost their businesses as a result of persecution sought to make ends meet as door-to-door or travelling salesmen.

The feeling of growing isolation affected the assimilated families in particular, especially the men. They had been more strongly integrated than their wives into the world of work and the activities of non-Jewish clubs and associations. Out of necessity, they soon changed their behaviour. They sought to avoid drawing attention to themselves or causing any conflict, and now did something that never would have crossed their minds before: they gave preference to restaurants with Jewish proprietors, who advertised in the Jewish newspapers to which they had recently begun to subscribe. The Jewish community and family newspapers urged their readers not to behave in a way that might attract attention. They published job advertisements in which Jews sought Jewish employers, and notices in which shops run by Jews tried to woo new Jewish customers.

⁸⁷ Memorandum from the German Council of Municipalities, Department IV [1937], LAB, Rep. 142/7, 4-10-2/Nr. 13; Ernst Fraenkel, *Der Doppelstaat: Recht und Justiz im 'Dritten Reich'*, new edn. (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1984 [English edn, 1941]), p. 121 (this example is not in the English-language original, *The Dual State: A Contribution to the Theory of Dictatorship*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941).

⁸⁸ Kimmel, 'Die Ausschaltung', p. 76; Jacob Boas, 'The Shrinking World of German Jewry, 1933-1938', *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, vol. 31 (1986), pp. 241-266, here pp. 254-255; Avraham Barkai and Paul Mendes-Flohr, *Deutsch-Jüdische Geschichte in der Neuzeit*, vol. 4: *Aufbruch und Zerstörung 1918-1945* (Munich: Beck, 1997), p. 232.

Within a matter of months, German Jews and Germans who scarcely remembered their Jewish roots became Jews again. This change was seen in the rapid upswing in the activities of Jewish clubs and associations, a boom fuelled by isolation and fear. The Reich League of Jewish Combat Veterans and its youth and sports clubs gained almost 50,000 new members in only a few years. Despite the substantial increase in emigration to Palestine, which began without delay in 1933, the Zionist Federation for Germany saw its membership swell from 7,000 in 1932 to 22,000 in 1935. Young people in particular turned to the Zionists, and thus the Zionist youth organization Hehalutz (The Pioneer) swelled from 500 members in 1933 to 16,000 at the end of 1935.

In the schools the situation was similar. In 1933, 75 per cent of all Jewish school-children attended state schools, but by the end of 1937 the figure was only 40 per cent. In Berlin, over the same time period, the number of Jewish pupils at state schools declined from 12,746 to 2,704. Simultaneously, enrolment at Jewish schools rose from 2,000 to 8,845. For most pupils, as W. Michael Blumenthal reports, school was ‘comforting and protective, and the teachers were dedicated and sympathetic and did their best to shield us from outside pressures’. Most of the children were from assimilated family households and received here their ‘first exposure to Jewish religion and [...] traditions’. Their parents reacted with a ‘mixture of embarrassment and bemusement’ when their children suddenly began to chant Hebrew prayers.⁸⁹

The enforced retreat from what had now become ‘Aryan’ German public life was reflected in the upsurge in newly formed Jewish cultural leagues (Kulturbünde). The first such organization came into being in Berlin in the summer of 1933, with an initial membership of 12,500.⁹⁰ It was headed by the physician and musicologist Kurt Singer. Leo Baeck served as honorary chairman along with the painter Max Liebermann and the novelist Jakob Wassermann. Soon the culture leagues numbered more than 70,000 members in around 100 German cities. The Berlin Culture League was able to open its first theatre season in October 1933 with Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s *Nathan der Weise* (Nathan the Wise). It did not take long for the authorities to forbid Jewish actors and musicians to perform the works of ‘German composers’ and ‘German dramatists’.

After a while, the nature of the Jewish communities changed. Once primarily religious centres, they now became providers of legal advice and welfare. They granted microloans to shopkeepers who had been harmed by the boycott, helped those who had been laid off to search for new employment, and placed young people in apprenticeships. The possibilities for providing such help dwindled as the number of those in need of advice and aid increased and – conversely – the receipts of donations and contributions decreased. State interventions additionally hampered the work. In individual provinces of the German Reich, Jewish communities lost the tax privileges they had previously enjoyed as public

⁸⁹ Barkai and Mendes-Flohr, *Deutsch-Jüdische Geschichte*, pp. 237–240; Wolf Gruner, ‘Die Reichshauptstadt und die Verfolgung der Berliner Juden 1933–1945’, in Reinhard Rürup (ed.), *Jüdische Geschichte in Berlin: Essays und Studien* (Berlin: Hentrich, 1995), pp. 229–266, here table 2, p. 257; quotation from W. Michael Blumenthal, *The Invisible Wall: Germans and Jews. A Personal Exploration* (Washington, DC: Counterpoint, 1998), p. 342.

⁹⁰ Eike Geisel and Henryk M. Broder, *Premiere und Pogrom: Der jüdische Kulturbund 1933–1941. Texte und Bilder* (Berlin: Siedler, 1992); Rebecca Rovit, *The Jewish Kulturbund Theatre Company in Nazi Berlin* (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press, 2012); Gabriele Fritsch-Vivié, *Gegen alle Widerstände: Der Jüdische Kulturbund 1933–1941* (Berlin: Hentrich & Hentrich, 2013).

corporations. Associations and foundations were shut down by the Gestapo and dispossessed by the tax offices. Jewish employment agencies were banned. In late 1936 the Reich Fiscal Court revoked, with retroactive effect, the exemption of Jewish foundations and communities from the payment of the wealth tax, an exception enjoyed until then by charitable organizations in general.

When the municipal social security offices began to reduce benefits for the Jewish poor in 1935, Jewish welfare offices stepped in to assist. In October of the same year, impoverished Jews were excluded from the aid provided by the Winter Relief Agency of the German People. As a result, the Jewish communities were forced to set up, within a matter of weeks, their own winter relief organization funded by donations. While the number of 'Aryan' unemployed dropped by two thirds between 1933 and the summer of 1936, the number of Jews out of work rose steadily. In mid 1936, more unemployed Jews were counted than at the start of the National Socialist dictatorship, in total 37,204⁹¹ – despite the fact that more than 80,000 Jews had already emigrated, the vast majority of them of prime working age. In order to relieve German Jews of their growing financial burden, Jewish organizations outside Germany contributed substantial funds, especially to the Reich Representation of Jews in Germany and the Central Committee of the German Jews for Relief and Reconstruction. The main sources of financial aid were the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), the Central British Fund for German Jewry, and the Jewish Colonization Association.⁹²

In 1933 alone, 37,000 German Jews left their homeland.⁹³ At first the neighbouring European countries of France, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Czechoslovakia were the main destinations of the refugees, in addition to Britain and Palestine. International Jewish aid organizations supported the immigrants, many of whom had fled in haste during the first few months, carrying only a single suitcase. In 1934 and 1935 the number of Jewish emigrants decreased to 23,000 and 21,000, respectively. By the end of 1937 more than 125,000 had left Germany. Of a total of 116,000 children and young people between the ages of six and twenty, 67,000 had emigrated. As a result of the rapid decline in membership, many smaller Jewish communities disbanded as early as 1933 and 1934 (Doc. 101).

Tens of thousands of Jewish Germans took an alternative path. They fled from the smaller communities to the big cities. In general, people there were more liberal-minded, though many were simply more indifferent. The Jews there experienced far less social pressure to adapt than people in the smaller municipalities, villages, and market towns.

91 Clemens Vollnhals, 'Jüdische Selbsthilfe bis 1938', in Wolfgang Benz (ed.), *Die Juden in Deutschland 1933–1945: Leben unter nationalsozialistischer Herrschaft* (Munich: Beck, 1988), pp. 314–411, here p. 374. Also see Salomon Adler-Rudel, *Jüdische Selbsthilfe unter dem Naziregime 1933–1939: Im Spiegel der Berichte der Reichsvertretung der Juden in Deutschland* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1974); Wolf Gruner, *Öffentliche Wohlfahrt und Judenverfolgung: Wechselwirkung lokaler und zentraler Politik im NS-Staat (1933–1942)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2002).

92 Yehuda Bauer, *My Brother's Keeper: A History of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, 1929–1939* (Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1974), pp. 105–137.

93 On emigration, see Werner Rosenstock, 'Exodus, 1933–1939: A Survey of Jewish Emigration from Germany', *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, vol. 1 (1956), pp. 373–390; Herbert A. Strauss, 'Jewish Emigration from Germany: Nazi Policies and Jewish Responses', *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book*, vol. 25 (1980), pp. 313–361, here p. 26, and vol. 26 (1981), pp. 343–409.

A good indicator of this trend is the disappearance of Jewish retail businesses. All told, their number was halved in Germany between 1933 and 1937.⁹⁴ In the villages and small towns, almost all the Jewish-owned retail shops soon had to be abandoned. Because social control was so much tighter in such places, customers stayed away. While around 20 per cent of such businesses in Hamburg and 30 per cent of those in Berlin had to close, the figures were 47 per cent in Heidelberg, 57 per cent in Göttingen, and 69 per cent in Marburg.⁹⁵

When looking back at the history of the Holocaust, it becomes clear that the more antisemitic the behaviour of 'Aryan' neighbours, customers, and work colleagues at the beginning of the National Socialist regime, the more quickly the embattled Jews chose to flee, thereby saving their lives. However, if long-standing Christian friends and acquaintances were helpful and supportive, the persecuted Jews were more likely to opt to stay. That choice dramatically reduced their chances of survival.⁹⁶

After 1935, emigrants no longer focused on Europe and Palestine but looked instead towards South Africa, the USA, and Latin America. In those regions, however, the number of immigrants remained small at first. Between 1933 and June 1937, approximately 17,000 Jews made it to the USA, distinctly fewer than allowed by the annual quota of 26,000 German immigrants. In the first few years the German state supported and facilitated emigration to Palestine and, to this end, concluded the 'Haavara' (Transfer) Agreement, which simultaneously increased the export of German goods by means of an indirect transfer of the emigrants' capital. Between 1933 and 1937, 40,000 German Jews arrived as immigrants in Palestine.⁹⁷

Aid organizations in Germany and in the neighbouring European states arranged and paid for visas, railway tickets, and passage on ships for emigrants who did not possess the requisite wealth. Jewish newspapers, particularly community papers, reported in detail on the conditions of travel and admission to various countries, and on the possibilities for learning trades and languages or sitting additional examinations that could be helpful for immigrants. Lawyers such as Robert M. W. Kempner, later assistant US chief counsel at the post-war trial of the major Nazi war criminals before the International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg, offered their services 'for the proper and speedy completion of your emigration'. Both young women and young men published personal ads in search of a spouse: 'I'm looking for a man who is prepared to establish a life in Palestine with me. I am twenty-three years old, pretty, and well-to-do.'⁹⁸

94 Avraham Barkai, *From Boycott to Annihilation: The Economic Struggle of German Jews, 1933–1943*, trans. William Templer (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1989 [German edn, 1987]), pp. 110–113.

95 Frank Bajohr and Dieter Pohl, *Der Holocaust als offenes Geheimnis: Die Deutschen, die NS-Führung und die Alliierten* (Munich: Beck, 2006), p. 29. On Berlin, see Christoph Kreuztmüller, *Ausverkauf: Die Vernichtung der jüdischen Gewerbetätigkeit in Berlin 1930–1945* (Berlin: Metropol, 2012).

96 Konrad Kwiet, 'Gehen oder bleiben? Die deutschen Juden am Wendepunkt', in Walter Pehle (ed.), *Der Judenpogrom 1938: Von der 'Reichskristallnacht' zum Völkermord* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1988), pp. 132–145.

97 Rosenstock, 'Exodus', p. 376; Werner Feilchenfeld, Dolf Michaelis, and Ludwig Pinner, *Haavara-Transfer nach Palästina und Einwanderung deutscher Juden 1933–1939* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1972); Francis R. Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question*, new edn (New Brunswick, NJ/London: Transaction, 2000 [1985]).

Because Palestine and Latin America both gave priority to immigrants who were farmers and craftsmen, Zionist organizations in particular intensified a strategy they had already developed in the 1920s: offering occupational training on farms and courses in skilled crafts and trades. In 1936 there were approximately thirty such training sites in Germany and one non-Zionist training camp in Groß-Breesen in Silesia (Doc. 266). Similar facilities were open to German Jews in many European countries. The young people thus trained were given priority when immigration certificates for Palestine were issued.

At the training centres the young people learned about raising livestock, tilling the soil, and horticulture in order to prepare themselves for the hardships of a new life in Palestine or elsewhere. Ideologically they drew upon an existing set of ideas: socialism, belief in the constructive role of the vanguard and in the German youth movement, the adventurous spirit of the pioneer, national self-discovery, and the romanticizing of ordinary life, in opposition to an increasingly arduous present. In particular, however, the young people could feel relatively free there. Joel König reported on the retraining camp at Steckelsdorf, west of Berlin. Even after the war had begun, he said, it was ‘a peaceful enclave – and there we were allowed to live’.⁹⁹

Nonetheless, in the mid 1930s a considerable number of German Jews, deeply attached to their homeland, still hoped that the National Socialist regime would fail and collapse within a short time. Consequently, they tried to persevere in the country, even if they understood clearly that the basic situation in German society had changed.¹⁰⁰ Outside Germany, there were Jewish organizations that feared that a collapse and emigration of German Jewry would boost anti-emancipation policies in other countries, such as Poland. James Marshall of the JDC was quoted in April 1935 as stating that emigration was a concession to the Hitler theory that the Jews must get out. There were other groups in Germany ‘that have seriously suffered’, he said, and he ‘felt that in trying to emigrate, German Jews tended to set themselves off from other groups who in the long run would be helpful to them’.¹⁰¹

1935: *The Year of the Nuremberg Laws*

In December 1934 the top-ranking officials of the National Socialist state placed on the agenda the ‘complete elimination of the Jew from the German community’. They discussed the comprehensive ‘legislative settlement of the Jewish question’, a matter that

98 Advertisements in the *Jüdische Rundschau* in 1935, published in Susanne Heim, ‘Deutschland muß ihnen ein Land ohne Zukunft sein’: Die Zwangsmigration der Juden 1933 bis 1938’, in Eberhard Jungfer et al. (eds.), *Arbeitsmigration und Flucht: Vertreibung und Arbeitskräfte regulierung in Mitteleuropa* (Berlin: Schwarze Risse; Göttingen: Rote Strasse, 1993), pp. 48–81, here p. 50.

99 Werner T. Angress, *Between Fear and Hope: Jewish Youth and the Third Reich*, trans. Christine Granger (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988 [German edn, 1985]); citation from Joel König [Ezra Ben-Gershom], *David: Aufzeichnungen eines Überlebenden* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1979), p. 115.

100 For an analysis of the changing strategies of German Jews for coping with conditions in their homeland, see Guy Miron, *The Waning of Emancipation: Jewish History, Memory, and the Rise of Fascism in Germany, France, and Hungary*, Part 1: ‘Germany, 1929–1938’ (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2011), pp. 30–53.

101 Bauer, *My Brother’s Keeper*, p. 116.

had already been pondered repeatedly. It included the prohibition of marriages between Jews and non-Jews, and its objective was the complete social isolation of Jewish Germans (Doc. 146). In January 1935 a centrally steered propaganda campaign began once again, followed by acts of violence in which the Hitler Youth participated to an increasing degree, along with the SA and SS (Doc. 169). Concurrently, the state-controlled press vilified Jews, calling them ‘race defilers’ and ‘criminals’.

On 20 August 1935 an inter-ministerial meeting was held in the Reich Ministry of Economics to discuss the economic consequences of certain Party activities (Doc. 189). Hjalmar Schacht reported on the head of the Reichsbank branch in Arnswalde, who had been named and shamed in one of *Der Stürmer*’s public display cases because he had made a purchase in a Jew’s shop. Schacht spoke ‘of the utmost perfidy and infamy’ of this tactic and demanded that an end be put to the practice of denunciation. While a representative of the Ministry of Propaganda saw ‘nothing reprehensible’ in it, Minister of the Interior Frick spoke out in opposition to such abuse and announced that his ministry would soon submit a number of orders intended to ‘solve the Jewish question in a completely legal manner’. That same day he proclaimed in a decree that Hitler had categorically prohibited any independent action.¹⁰² In the case of such directives, local Party offices frequently held the view that ‘certain orders, particularly in the area of the Jewish question, would have to be formulated with foreign countries in mind’. But it was known to every ‘authentic National Socialist’, they believed, how ‘the true will of the Führer [is] to be carried out’.¹⁰³

At the Nuremberg rally a few weeks later, Hitler, Goebbels, Frick, and Heß discussed what became known as the Nuremberg Laws.¹⁰⁴ Even before this Party congress had ended, the laws were passed by acclamation in a special session of the German Reichstag. They consisted of two parts: the Reich Citizenship Law (*Reichsbürgergesetz*) and the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour, or Blood Protection Law (*Gesetz zum Schutz des deutschen Blutes und der deutschen Ehre*, or *Blutschutzgesetz*). The former revoked the political rights of the German Jews and declared them mere subjects of the state (*Staatsangehörige*). Henceforth, only ‘Aryan’ Germans could be citizens of the Reich (*Reichsbürger*). The Blood Protection Law forbade marriages and extramarital sexual relations between Jews and non-Jews. In addition, ‘for the protection of German honour’, Jews were forbidden to display the Reich flag and the swastika flag (Docs. 198–199). From this point on, German criminal law recognized the crime of race defilement (*Rassenschande*). In the years that followed, Jewish men in every part of Germany were denounced, by neighbours and others motivated by resentment and sexual envy, for actual sexual relationships with ‘Aryan’ women or a merely suspected *occasio*

¹⁰² Hilberg, *Destruction*, pp. 35–36.

¹⁰³ Report by the Regierungspräsident in Wiesbaden, 31 August 1935, documented in Otto Dov Kulka and Eberhard Jäckel (eds.), *The Jews in the Secret Nazi Reports on Popular Opinion in Germany, 1933–1945*, trans. William Templer (New Haven, CT/London: Yale University Press, 2010 [German edn, 2004]), enclosed CD, no. 1141 (in German).

¹⁰⁴ Neumann, *Behemoth*, p. 151; Hans Mommsen, *Das NS-Regime und die Auslöschung des Judentums in Europa* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2014), pp. 49–66; Cornelia Essner, *Die ‘Nürnberger Gesetze’ oder die Verwaltung des Rassenwahns 1933–1945* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2002), pp. 113–154; Magnus Brechtken et al. (eds.), *Die Nürnberger Gesetze – 80 Jahre danach: Vorgeschichte, Entstehung, Auswirkungen* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2017); John J. Michalczyk (ed.), *Nazi Law: From Nuremberg to Nuremberg* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017).

proxima, the ‘proximate occasion of sin’. They were persecuted by the Gestapo and sentenced by the courts to imprisonment or penal servitude. The German women involved were not prosecuted, but quite often they were publicly humiliated for ‘race betrayal’¹⁰⁵ (Doc. 186).

The Reich Supreme Court in Leipzig availed itself of the new laws in a noteworthy way and declared that the German Jews had undergone ‘civil death’. On 27 June 1936 it rejected the claim for damages filed by a Jewish film director whose contract had been cancelled in February 1933 by his non-Jewish producer, who had acted out of racially based political opportunism. On the basis of the clause stating that no remuneration would be forthcoming if the director could not fulfil the contract because of illness or death, the highest German court ruled that ‘civil death’, a concept stemming from the older law of aliens and now introduced by the new race laws for Jews, was equivalent to ‘physical death’. The exact words of the judges’ ruling were that the ‘change in the legal validity of personhood arising from legally recognized, race-related political viewpoints’ was to be ‘treated as equivalent’ to the event of physical death as provided for in the director’s contract.¹⁰⁶

After the passage of the two laws in Nuremberg, the definition of the term ‘Jew’ became the subject of heated debate. On one side were the racial science experts, who wanted to use all manner of complicated methods to trace every conceivable ‘drop of Jewish blood’, if possible. On the other side were the officials of the Reich Ministry of the Interior, who sought a bureaucratic procedure that would be as efficient as possible, one that would function ‘automatically’. Hitler aligned himself with the administrative pragmatists. The First Regulation to the Reich Citizenship Law was thus issued on 14 November 1935 (Doc. 210). It provided that anyone with at least three grandparents of the Jewish faith must in the future be regarded as a ‘Jew by race’ (*Rassejude*). Under this regulation, someone who had two such grandparents was defined as a *Mischling* (half-caste) of the first degree, while someone with only one grandparent of the Jewish faith was henceforth considered a *Mischling* of the second degree.

In 1933 the *Mischling* category included approximately 150,000 persons. Discrimination often came as a greater surprise to them than to so-called full Jews (*Volljuden*), especially as the National Socialist definition of a Jew diverged from that under Jewish religious law. Almost without exception they thought of themselves as Germans and had difficulty understanding why, often as early as 1933, they were denied access to clubs and associations, the Hitler Youth, or careers as military officers. For that reason, in June 1933, the Reich Association of Christian German Citizens of Non-Aryan or Not Pure Aryan Descent was founded to represent the interests of those termed *Mischlinge*.¹⁰⁷

105 Alexandra Przyrembel, ‘*Rassenschande*: Reinheitsmythos und Vernichtungslegitimation im Nationalsozialismus’ (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003); Patricia Szobar, ‘Telling Sexual Stories in the Nazi Courts of Law: Race Defilement in Germany, 1933 to 1945’, in Dagmar Herzog (ed.), *Sexuality and German Fascism* (New York: Berghahn, 2005), pp. 131–163.

106 Fraenkel, *Der Doppelstaat*, p. 127 (this passage is not in the English-language original, *The Dual State*).

107 Aleksandar-Saša Vuletić, *Christen jüdischer Herkunft im Dritten Reich: Verfolgung und organisierte Selbsthilfe 1933–1939* (Mainz: P. von Zabern, 1999). After the compulsory exclusion of all ‘full Jews’, the Reich Association was renamed in 1936 as the St Paul’s Covenant (Paulus-Bund), Association of Non-Aryan Christians.

In addition to the *Mischlinge*, a further 50,000 Jews lived in so-called mixed marriages (*Mischehen*). Their partners were classified as ‘intermarried with a Jew’, and stigmatized for that reason.¹⁰⁸ Thousands of married couples divorced in order to secure the professional future of the ‘Aryan’ spouse (Doc. 109). If the couple decided nonetheless to remain married, in the great majority of cases that protected the Jewish spouse from deportation later on. For the Christian spouse, the mixed marriage entailed enormous disadvantages (Doc. 191). Victor Klemperer dedicated his book *LTI: Notizbuch eines Philologen* (*The Language of the Third Reich*), published in 1947, to his non-Jewish wife, Eva, who had endured with him the humiliation, the Dresden ‘Jew houses’ (*Judenhäuser*), the fear, and the hunger: ‘For without you this book would not exist today and neither would its author.’¹⁰⁹

From the very outset – and in increasing measure after 1935 – many officials were dismissed because they were married to Jewish women or because they had Jewish grandparents as well as Christian ones (Doc. 303). The scope was never precisely delineated in the case of the *Mischlinge* and mixed marriages, for pragmatic reasons and in order to keep the ‘Aryan’ relatives quiet. As a result, the informally defined sphere of contact between non-Jewish and Jewish Germans was transformed into a murky zone of separation characterized by fearful and considerate silence, beyond which the ‘full Jews’, above all, were isolated.

Because the Nuremberg Laws aimed to segregate the German Jews from the Christian majority population, the Gestapo Central Office (Gestapa) shut down the Association of National German Jews on 14 November 1935 on the grounds that it was hostile to the state, and confiscated its assets.¹¹⁰ The Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith was forced to change its name to the Central Association of Jews in Germany (Centralverein der Juden in Deutschland). The Reich Representation of German Jews now had to be called the Reich Representation of Jews in Germany (Reichsvertretung der Juden in Deutschland).

The Centralization of Policy towards Jews

An organization that later acquired central importance in the persecution of the German and the European Jews played only a minor role in the first few years: the SD. It had been established in 1931 as the NSDAP’s own intelligence organization by Reinhard Heydrich, at the time a 27-year-old former naval officer. From April 1933 to 1934 Heydrich, together with his mentor Heinrich Himmler, ran the Bavarian Political Police. Just one

108 H[ans] G[ünther] Adler, *Der verwaltete Mensch: Studien zur Deportation der Juden aus Deutschland* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1974), pp. 278–322; Beate Meyer, ‘Jüdische Mischlinge’: *Rassenpolitik und Verfolgungserfahrung 1933–1945* (Hamburg: Dölling und Galitz, 1999).

109 ‘To my wife Eva Klemperer’, dedication, Dresden, Christmas 1946, in Victor Klemperer, *The Language of the Third Reich: LTI, Lingua Tertii Imperii: A Philologist’s Notebook*, trans. Martin Brady (London: Athlone, 2000 [German edn, 1947]).

110 Decree issued by the Gestapo Central Office (Gestapa) (II 1 B 2–64 640/J. 577/35), 18 Nov. 1935, cited in Joseph Walk (ed.), *Das Sonderrecht für die Juden im NS-Staat: Eine Sammlung der gesetzlichen Maßnahmen und Richtlinien. Inhalt und Bedeutung* (Heidelberg: Müller Juristischer, 1981), p. 141.

year later the two men succeeded in taking over the Gestapo Central Office in Prussia and, step by step, in unifying the political police forces of the various provinces under the Gestapo and placing them, along with the Criminal Police (Kripo), under central state control.¹¹¹

From mid 1935 the Gestapo attempted to catalogue individual Jews on the basis of the membership rolls of Jewish organizations. The local Gestapo offices monitored the Jewish organizations in their jurisdiction. They persecuted individual Jews for violation of anti-Jewish regulations, for currency offences, and, later, for so-called race defilement. Such action was ordinarily taken on the basis of denunciations. Primarily, however, the Gestapo dealt at first with the political opponents of the regime: between 1933 and 1937 the Gestapo in Krefeld thus took action against a total of 180 persons, 19 of whom were Jews, between 1933 and 1937.¹¹²

In October 1935 Hitler adopted the proposal of Reichsführer SS Heinrich Himmler to give the entire police force an ideological mission. This meant assigning it complex tasks that went beyond the usual functions of ensuring public order, conducting surveillance, and, if necessary, employing terror. The police now became, as Heydrich's deputy Werner Best expressed it, the 'guardian of the political health of the German people's body [*Volkskörper*]'. On 17 June 1936 Hitler appointed Himmler Chief of the German Police in the Reich Ministry of the Interior. Himmler restructured the police and created two main offices: the Order Police and the Security Police. The latter was an amalgamation of the Criminal Police and the Gestapo under the control of Heydrich. In addition, Heydrich continued to head the SD, which slowly turned from a Party agency into a state institution. In both organizations, sections for Jewish affairs were established, though they only slowly gained influence. From now on, the police and the SS were firmly linked. Himmler referred to himself as Reichsführer SS and Chief of the German Police. Heydrich held dual functions as head of the SD and head of the Security Police. Formally, however, he did not receive the title Chief of the Security Police and the SD until 27 September 1939.¹¹³

In 1936, with the Olympic Winter and Summer Games approaching, the Reich government paid increased attention to international reactions. The Winter Olympics were held from 6 to 16 February in Garmisch-Partenkirchen. When the Jewish student David Frankfurter shot the leader of the NSDAP Regional Group for Switzerland, Wilhelm Gustloff, in Davos on 4 February, the National Socialist leadership made sure that no acts of

111 Hans Buchheim, 'The SS: Instrument of Domination', in Hans Buchheim, Martin Broszat, Hans-Adolf Jacobsen, and Helmut Krausnick, *Anatomy of the SS State*, trans. Richard Barry, Marian Jackson, and Dorothy Long (London: Collins, 1968 [German edn, 1965]), pp. 127–301, here pp. 145–156; Robert Gellately, *The Gestapo and German Society: Enforcing Racial Policy, 1933–1945* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990); Carsten Dams and Michael Stolle, *The Gestapo: Power and Terror in the Third Reich* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014). On Heydrich, see Robert Gerwarth, *Hitler's Hangman: The Life of Heydrich* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011). On Himmler, see Peter Longerich, *Heinrich Himmler: A Life*, trans. Jeremy Noakes and Lesley Sharpe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012 [German edn, 2008]).

112 Eric A. Johnson, *Nazi Terror: The Gestapo, Jews, and Ordinary Germans* (New York: Basic Books, 2000), pp. 143–158.

113 Buchheim, 'The SS', pp. 166–172; George C. Browder, *Foundations of the Nazi State: The Formation of Sipo and SD* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1990), pp. 208–249; Herbert, *Best*, pp. 168–180 and 186–191; Best quotation: p. 169.

anti-Jewish violence took place (Doc. 225). On 7 March the Wehrmacht entered the Rhineland, which had been designated a demilitarized zone under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles (1919) and the Treaty of Locarno (1926). Neither Britain nor France intervened. As a result, this risky undertaking helped to strengthen Hitler's domestic standing and substantially increased his freedom of action: 'Without wavering and hesitating, literally regardless of the consequences, the regime relied from now on upon momentum, military build-up, and war. Inaction was something it rejected as a threat to its existence.'¹¹⁴

Hitler had scarcely opened the Summer Olympics in Berlin on 1 August 1936 when he wrote the secret position paper on the Four-Year Plan. The memorandum outlined the goal of arming Germany within four years for a war of aggression. In this secret text Hitler spoke in thinly veiled terms of the planned dispossession of the Jews. They were to be held liable collectively for all damage 'inflicted on the German economy and thus on the German people by individual members of this criminal group'.¹¹⁵ To fund the military build-up, such large loans were taken out that they could be paid off only with the spoils of a predatory war. To the various objections to the unprofitable arms build-up and the manifestly dubious methods of financing it, Göring, as Plenipotentiary for the Four-Year Plan, responded with this comment on 17 December 1938: 'No end to the military build-up is foreseen. The only thing that matters here is victory or defeat. If we are victorious, the economy will be sufficiently compensated.'¹¹⁶

The SD, with only about 200 employees in the entire Reich in 1934, had neither the human resources nor the requisite authority to influence anti-Jewish policy in a significant way. Only after the passage of the Nuremberg Laws did the systematic 'fight against Jewry' begin in the SD. In January 1936 Department II 112 was established especially for this purpose. Adolf Eichmann and Dieter Wisliceny, who were later two of the main organizers of the deportation of the European Jews, worked there from the beginning. In 1937 they were joined by Herbert Hagen and Theodor Dannecker. In April 1937 Wisliceny considered it the mission of the department to provide 'absolutely solid information to the state and Party', on the basis of which 'legislative and police measures' against the Jews could follow.¹¹⁷ To make the use of terror as unerring as possible, the SD's section for Jewish affairs attempted in 1937 to create a registry of all 'Jews and persons of Jewish descent'. After a certain amount of back and forth, it was decided at the suggestion of the Reich Ministry of the Interior to compile the registry with the help of the census scheduled for the early summer of 1938, as such a method was apparently a great deal cheaper and, above all, more reliable (Doc. 288). Due to the *Anschluss* of Austria, the census was postponed by one year, to 1939. Then, however, the personal data of all German Jews and Jewish *Mischlinge* was gathered and put on record in the registries of residents.¹¹⁸

114 Klaus Hildebrand, *Das vergangene Reich: Deutsche Außenpolitik von Bismarck bis Hitler 1871–1945* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1995), p. 611.

115 Wilhelm Treue, 'Hitlers Denkschrift zum Vierjahresplan 1936', *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, vol. 3, no. 2 (1955), pp. 184–210, here p. 210.

116 Cited in Hildebrand, *Das vergangene Reich*, p. 623.

117 Michael Wildt, *An Uncompromising Generation: The Nazi Leadership of the Reich Security Main Office*, trans. Tom Lampert (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010 [German edn, 2002]); Wildt (ed.), *Die Judenpolitik*, pp. 108–110 (note by Wisliceny, 7 April 1937); Herbert, *Best*, pp. 203–211.

On 1 November 1937 sixty-six SD department heads, section heads, and support staff assembled for a meeting. They all had responsibility for the Jewish question, either in the Berlin central office or in the SD district branches. They listened to twelve short papers and took three hours to discuss the agenda item 'General Debate'. In his paper Dannecker explained the 'methodology' with which the SD men were supposed to make life unbearable for the Jews:

Don't let up for an instant, use admonitions to keep the leading Jews in suspense at all times, react immediately to every aspiration or sentiment, even the slightest, that goes against our principles – in short: complete penetration into Jewish private life and particularly Jewish political life. In this way the thought of emigration will inevitably be fostered and the idea of possibly continuing to stay in Germany after all will be increasingly undermined.¹¹⁹

Even before Göring had been officially appointed Plenipotentiary for the Four-Year Plan, he had held a forerunner position as head of the Raw Materials and Foreign Currency Staff, created in the spring of 1936. In this capacity, on 7 June 1936, he had tasked SD chief Heydrich with setting up a Foreign Exchange Investigation Office (Devisenfahndungsamt). This body was under the 'personal and direct' authority of Göring, and it subsequently ensured that the relevant customs and foreign exchange inspection centres applied the exchange regulations to German Jews with exceptional harshness. Göring needed foreign currency. It was the only way to pay for the imports necessary for the arms build-up, and the only way to buy the 5 million tons of grain in foreign markets that were stockpiled as a national grain reserve in the event of war. In the twelve months that followed, the newly created office collected foreign currency with an equivalent value of 473 million Reichsmarks.¹²⁰

To carry out the process of dispossession, which was extraordinarily successful by the standards of the times, two laws targeting affluent Jews were passed. First, the Law against Economic Sabotage, which punished the illegal transfer of assets into a foreign country with lengthy prison sentences or even death; second, the Law for the Amendment of the Law on Foreign Exchange Control. This allowed the tax offices to confiscate a substantial part of the assets of persons 'suspected of pursuing emigration' as security for the Reich Flight Tax (*Reichsfluchtsteuer*), which was to be paid later. Officially, Jews could transfer their assets to other countries through the Deutsche Golddiskontbank. To do so, they had to accept a deduction amounting to 20 per cent in January 1934. In June 1935 this was raised to 68 per cent and in October 1936 to 81 per cent.¹²¹ Emigration continued to be encouraged, but it was not intended to result in 'any disadvantages to

118 Wildt (ed.), *Die Judenpolitik*, pp. 35–37 and 153–154; Götz Aly and Karl Heinz Roth, *Die restlose Erfassung: Volkszählen, Identifizieren, Aussondern im Nationalsozialismus*, new edn (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch; 2000 [1984]), pp. 92–95.

119 Agenda item cited in Wildt (ed.), *Die Judenpolitik*, pp. 127–156, here p. 150.

120 Adam Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction: The Making and Breaking of the Nazi Economy* (London: Allen Lane, 2006), p. 214.

121 Peter Longerich, *Politik der Vernichtung: Eine Gesamtdarstellung der nationalsozialistischen Judenverfolgung* (Munich: Piper, 1998), pp. 118–121 and 125–126; laws dated 1 Dec. 1936: *Reichsgesetzblatt*, 1936, I, pp. 999–1001.

the German state'. The 'encouragement' consisted primarily of elevating the use of terror against 'the Jewish minority to such an extent that its emigration became cheaper – in other words, as much foreign currency as possible could be conserved, as much property as possible confiscated'.¹²²

The dispossession of the Jews to the advantage of the German public coffers thus began in the summer of 1936. Not only that: from this point onwards, the fate of the persecuted was linked to a plan for war that, as proclaimed, allowed only 'victory or downfall'. By May 1937 the SD was considering how the Jews should be dealt with in the event of war (Doc. 283). In this context it becomes clear why in 1938 Göring pushed through the laws with which the Jews were compelled to report their assets and with which they were ultimately deprived of the freedom to dispose of these assets.

In April 1933 the German state had denied Jews the right to work in the public sector and to perform official duties as civil servants. In so doing, the National Socialist government dislodged from the constitutional edifice the capstone of the emancipation of the German Jews, which for all practical purposes had not been set in place until 1919. Next, in May 1935, Jews were denied the right to carry arms in the defence of the nation, an entitlement not gained until the First World War.¹²³ With the passage of the Nuremberg Laws, the ancient European ban on marriage between Jews and Christians was restored. Between 1933 and 1937 the Jews were subjected to various restrictions on their economic activities in the different regions, communities, and branches of the economy. Not until 1938, however, were they 'excluded from the German economy', both legally and in practice. The first right that had been granted to the Jews in Germany at the beginning of their emancipation was thus the last to be lost.

122 Heim, 'Deutschland', p. 50.

123 Military Service Law, 21 May 1935, *Reichsgesetzblatt*, 1935, I, p. 609.

List of Documents

- 1 Jüdische Rundschau, 31 January 1933: editorial on the appointment of Adolf Hitler as Reich Chancellor
- 2 Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte, January 1933: editorial on the struggle against international Jewry
- 3 C.V.-Zeitung, 9 February 1933: report on anti-Jewish riots in Gersfeld, Hesse
- 4 C.V.-Zeitung, 23 February 1933: article criticizing anti-Jewish propaganda on the streets of Berlin and in the Nazi press
- 5 Völkischer Beobachter, 5/6 March 1933: appeal by the NSDAP to 'German artists' to vote at the parliamentary elections
- 6 Walter Gyssling describes riots and abuses in Munich on 9/10 March 1933
- 7 On 14 March 1933 Hermann Badt offers the Deputy Minister President his resignation as Prussian representative to the Constitutional Court
- 8 On 15 March 1933 the Reich Minister of the Interior recommends that the immigration and naturalization of Ostjuden be prevented
- 9 Max Moses Polke reports on the persecution of Jewish judges and lawyers in Breslau between 11 and 17 March 1933
- 10 On 18 March 1933 the Combat League for German Culture calls on the Prussian Minister of Culture to exclude Jews from the cultural institutions of the Ruhr
- 11 On 20 March 1933 the German ambassador in the USA sends a telegraph to the Reich Foreign Office regarding press reports about the persecution of Jews in Germany
- 12 On 24 March 1933 the mayor of Munich orders that municipal contracts no longer be awarded to Jews and foreigners
- 13 On 25 March 1933 the metal trader Fritz Schünemann encourages the mayor of Munich not to sell scrap metal to Jewish firms
- 14 New York Times, 27 March 1933: article regarding preparations for mass protests in the USA against Hitler's anti-Jewish policies
- 15 On 28 March 1933 the Frankfurt city administration orders the dismissal of its Jewish civil servants
- 16 On 30 March 1933 the state commissioner for Berlin prohibits the municipal administration from placing announcements in the 'Jewish press'
- 17 Völkischer Beobachter, 30 March 1933: the NSDAP calls for an anti-Jewish boycott across Germany
- 18 On 30 March 1933 the private tutor Johann Ackermann proposes a boycott of Jewish tutors in Munich
- 19 On 30 March 1933 the Association of German Engineering Institutions calls on its member firms to combat 'international atrocity and boycott propaganda'

- 20 Discussion between representatives of Jewish organizations on 31 March 1933 in Paris regarding the persecution of Jewish Germans
- 21 Henriette Necheles-Magnus describes expressions of solidarity during the anti-Jewish boycott on 1 April 1933 in Wandsbek
- 22 The Times, 3 April 1933: article regarding the murder of the Jewish lawyer Schumm and other acts of violence on the day of the boycott
- 23 On 3 April 1933 Director Eugen Feuchtmann reports to the chairman of the board of directors of Johannes Jeserich AG on the forced resignation of two Jewish directors
- 24 On 3 April 1933 patent lawyer Richard Wirth declares his solidarity with his Jewish colleagues
- 25 On 4 April 1933 the Jüdische Rundschau calls for the development of a new Jewish self-assertiveness in response to the boycott
- 26 On 5 April 1933 the student Heinrich Marx deliberates whether to remain in Berlin following the boycott or to leave
- 27 The unimplemented draft of a law 'for the regulation of the status of the Jews', 6 April 1933
- 28 On 7 April 1933 the Reich Foreign Office opposes the granting of minority rights to Jews in Upper Silesia
- 29 Law for the dismissal of Jewish and politically undesirable civil servants, 7 April 1933
- 30 On 8 April 1933 Cardinal Faulhaber writes to Alois Wurm about the latter's protest against the persecution of Jews
- 31 On 10 April 1933 the Regional Contract Office for the State of Saxony proposes that Jewish firms no longer be permitted to supply the army, navy, or police
- 32 The Aryan Paragraph introduces the first legal definition of the term 'non-Aryan', 11 April 1933
- 33 The business representative Walter Hoffmann writes to Göring on 12 April 1933 to intervene following press reports in the USA concerning acts of violence on the day of the boycott
- 34 On 15 April 1933 Karl Jarres writes to Theodor Lewald following the latter's resignation as president of the German Reich Committee for Physical Exercise
- 35 On 16 April 1933 Hertha Nathorff records her impressions of a meeting of the League of German Female Physicians in Berlin
- 36 Jüdische Rundschau, 25 April 1933: article on the suicide of a Jew with German nationalist convictions
- 37 On 26 April 1933 Charlotte Gumpert informs Minni Steinhardt in Palestine about the political situation in Germany and conditions for emigrants
- 38 Otto Marx reports on his arrest in Weiden and his imprisonment in Dachau concentration camp in March/April 1933
- 39 On 3 May 1933 a resident of Bonn protests to Minister President Hermann Göring against the persecution of German Jews

-
- 40 On 6 May 1933 the National Socialist German Reich Estate Agents' League criticizes the approach taken by the Reich Association of German Estate Agents during the process of Gleichschaltung
 - 41 On 9 May 1933 Heinrich Marx reflects on his personal situation in Berlin and on conditions in higher education institutions
 - 42 On 13 May 1933 the Israelite Religious Community in Munich complains to the Reich Foreign Office about measures against Jewish associations in Munich
 - 43 Report by company representative Oskar Vangerow on the Jews and the mood in Poland, 16 May 1933
 - 44 On 18 May 1933 Karl Landau asks retired Vienna senior municipal councillor Engelbert Siegl about employment opportunities
 - 45 On 22 May 1933 the Polish Legation protests against attacks on Polish nationals in Germany
 - 46 Directive issued to the German delegation in Geneva on 24 May 1933 to prevent a discussion in the Council of the League of Nations on the persecution of Jews in German Upper Silesia
 - 47 On 29 May 1933 the Jewish Community of Berlin complains to the state commissioner for Berlin about the city administration's anti-Jewish measures
 - 48 Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte, May 1933: article about the 'solution to the Jewish question'
 - 49 On 11 June 1933 a representative of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee reports on a discussion with Leo Baeck in Berlin regarding the organization of the emigration of German Jews
 - 50 New York Times, 12 June 1933: report regarding a campaign to support German Jews
 - 51 On 12 June 1933 the Juvenile Court with Lay Judges in Frankfurt sentences Jewish youths for distributing political leaflets
 - 52 The Reich Statistical Office reports on the regional distribution of Jews by faith according to the results of the census of 16 June 1933
 - 53 The Reich Statistical Office reports on the occupational distribution of Jews by faith according to the results of the census of 16 June 1933
 - 54 On 17 June 1933 the street vendor Luise Rupprecht asks the Breslau Chief of Police to expel a competing Jewish street vendor from the square
 - 55 Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung, 19 June 1933: report concerning a speech by Berlin's mayor to American local politicians
 - 56 On 19 June 1933 Max Osborn writes to Minni Steinhardt about his plans to emigrate to Palestine
 - 57 On 22 June 1933 the director of the Institute of Physics intervenes with the Breslau University administration on behalf of the lecturer Hedwig Kohn
 - 58 On 22 June 1933 Professor James Goldschmidt protests to the Prussian Ministry of Science, Art, and Education against the withdrawal of his authorization to teach

- 59 The board of the Talmud Torah School in Hamburg discusses the situation of Jewish schools at a meeting on 28 June 1933
- 60 A regional organization of the Central German Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith reports on the situation of Jews in Saxony and Saxony-Anhalt in June 1933
- 61 On 1 July 1933 Hans Kantorowitz refuses to leave the Berlin Gymnastics Association
- 62 On 13 July 1933 Isaac Meyer writes to the Senckenberg Natural History Society in Frankfurt to justify his resignation
- 63 On 18 July 1933 scientists at the Potsdam Observatory denounce their colleague Professor Erwin Finlay Freundlich as an 'anti-nationalist descendant of Jews'
- 64 On 26 July 1933 the German Council of Municipalities permits the city of Preußisch Friedland to partially exclude Jews from public baths
- 65 The executive board of the Hamburg Medical Association resigns in July 1933 because of an anti-Jewish amendment to the statutes
- 66 In late July 1933 a member of Deutsche Bank's management board, Franz Urbig, reports on the dismissal of board members Theodor Frank and Oscar Wassermann
- 67 On 4 August 1933 the Association of Synagogue Congregations of the province of Upper Silesia lodges a complaint with the Reich Foreign Office regarding discrimination against Jews
- 68 On 11 August 1933 the Reich Representation of Jewish Regional Associations in Germany complains to the Reich Minister of Labour about occupational restrictions placed on physicians
- 69 The Prussian Ministry of Justice quashes criminal proceedings on 11 August 1933 in the case of the murder of a Jewish dentist
- 70 On 14 August 1933 the Reich Ministry of the Interior sends the Reich Foreign Office and the Prussian Minister of the Interior a preliminary list of persons to be deprived of citizenship
- 71 Advertisement from mid August 1933 for the programme of the newly established Culture League of German Jews
- 72 On 23 August 1933 Johannes Schräpel informs the Reich Minister of the Interior about the Gleichschaltung of the Association of Budgerigar Enthusiasts
- 73 Special session of the board of directors of the Jewish Community of Berlin on 24 August 1933 to ensure kosher food in spite of the ban on shechitah
- 74 On 25 August 1933 the Hamburg Mayor Vincent Krogmann notes a request by Jewish organizations for negotiations with the NSDAP
- 75 On 6 September 1933 the Protestant Church of the Old Prussian Union introduces the Aryan Paragraph
- 76 On 12 September 1933 Martin Bormann calls on the Gauleiter to stop local anti-Jewish measures
- 77 Juristische Wochenschrift, 16 September 1933: article on legal possibilities for the annulment of mixed marriages

-
- 78 From the debate of the Congress of European Nationalities on 18 September 1933 on the persecution of Jews in Germany
 - 79 Junge Kirche: report, dated 20 September 1933, by the Faculty of Theology at the University of Marburg opposing a limitation of the rights of non-Aryan Christians
 - 80 The chairman of the German Gymnastics Association writes to Rupert Naumann on 23 September 1933 in response to his concerns about banning all Jews from the Berlin Gymnastics Association
 - 81 On 25 September 1933 the Reich Ministry of Economics criticizes the banning of Jewish dealers from trade fairs and markets
 - 82 On 5 October 1933 the billboard-advertising company Städte-Reklame GmbH asks the Trustee of Labour in Hesse for an opinion on putting up advertising for Jewish firms
 - 83 On 9 October 1933 the dismissed civil servant Johanna Rosenthal asks the Berlin Main Post Office Headquarters to grant her a pension on compassionate grounds
 - 84 On 10 October 1933 conductor Erich Erck applies to the Bavarian State Minister for Education and Culture for the authorization of a Jewish Culture League
 - 85 On 19 October 1933 the Reich Association of Christian German Citizens of Non-Aryan or Not Pure Aryan Descent writes to the government to offer its support
 - 86 On 24 October 1933 the Reich leader of the German Medical Association urges the Association of Statutory Health Insurance Physicians to use lists of non-Aryan doctors discreetly
 - 87 Deutsches Philologen-Blatt, 1 November 1933: article on the introduction of racial studies in schools
 - 88 Völkischer Beobachter, 15 November 1933: article on the demand of the 'German Christians' that 'Jewish Christians' are excluded from the Protestant Church
 - 89 On 15 November 1933 the trader Louis Skalawski complains to the Reich Minister of Economics about being barred from a Berlin market
 - 90 On 4 December 1933 the municipal school inspector of Berlin forbids teachers to marry Jewish partners
 - 91 New York Times, 24 December 1933: article on the work of the High Commissioner of the League of Nations and aid for Jewish refugees
 - 92 On 29 December 1933 Fritz Wolfes asks the mayor of Hanover to lease a sports hall to the Jewish Gymnastics Association
 - 93 Ernst Hofmann reports on mistreatment at the hands of SS and SA men, 1933
 - 94 Pariser Tageblatt, 4 January 1934: commentary on the cancellation of the boxing match between Max Schmeling and King Levinsky
 - 95 On 4 January 1934 businessman Julius Fromm protests against the planned retraction of his German citizenship
 - 96 Der National-Sozialistische Erzieher, 13 January 1934: article on 'racial separation'
 - 97 Juristische Wochenschrift, 13 January 1934: article on two Reich Labour Court rulings concerning the dismissal of Jewish employees

- 98 Letter dated 26 January 1934 from a German to the Foreign Policy Office of the NSDAP, describing her impressions from a trip to Poland
- 99 Memorandum dated January 1934 on the situation of the Jewish population, sent by the Reich Representation of German Jews to the Reich government
- 100 The Gestapo Central Office informs the Prussian Minister of the Interior about a meeting of the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith held in Deutsch-Krone on 4 February 1934
- 101 On 5 February 1934 Rabbi Wahrmann reports on the mounting social and pastoral problems in his Silesian district
- 102 On 7 February 1934 the Dresden Chamber of Industry and Commerce calls on the Saxon Ministry of Economics to exclude Jews from serving as sworn experts
- 103 On 9 February 1934 the Central Germany Branch of the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith (CV) reports on the representation of the interests of Jewish salaried employees
- 104 On 13 February 1934 the hotelier Hanns Kilian complains to the municipality of Garmisch about the denunciation of an Austrian performer as a Jew
- 105 On 18 February 1934 a Jewish pupil and her parents write to a teacher who emigrated to Palestine
- 106 Report on the performance of the school puppet show Till Ülespiegel in late February 1934 in Cologne-Ehrenfeld
- 107 On 27 February 1934 State Secretary Herbert Backe voices misgivings to the Gestapo Central Office over the retraining of Jews for agricultural occupations
- 108 On 4 March 1934 Gertrud Baumgart writes to Paula Tobias about the women's movement and about the Jewish question as a vital issue for Europe
- 109 Deutsche Justiz, 23 March 1934: article disagrees with a court decision precluding 'racial differences' as grounds for applying to annul a marriage
- 110 On 23 March 1934 the Reich League of Jewish Combat Veterans protests to Reich President Hindenburg over the exclusion of Jewish soldiers from the German armed forces
- 111 Frankfurter Zeitung, 28 March 1934: article about the ongoing elimination of Jews from the economy
- 112 Printed form of the NSDAP Kreisleitung in Ansbach, dated March 1934 for submitting a declaration of honour to sever all contact with Jews
- 113 Die Neue Welt, 5 April 1934: news reports about anti-Jewish riots in Gunzenhausen and the increasing Nationalist Socialist propaganda against 'race defilement'
- 114 On 10 April 1934 the Groß-Karben gendarmerie reports on the public humiliation of a woman on the grounds of race defilement
- 115 A clipping from the Pariser Tageblatt along with a letter from the Reich Minister of Labour to the Deputy of the Führer, dated 25 April 1934, about the exclusion of non-Aryan business managers from the 1 May celebrations

-
- 116 Report, dated April 1934, by the Gestapo Central Office in Berlin on the surveillance of Jewish organizations and their activities in Germany
 - 117 *Völkischer Beobachter*, 11 May 1934: excerpt from a speech by Josef Goebbels criticizing detractors, the Jews, the churches, and the foreign press
 - 118 On 26 May 1934 the Regierungspräsident of Frankfurt an der Oder issues a statement to the Prussian Minister of Finance justifying the confiscation of Hugo Simon's estate
 - 119 Excerpt from the Sopade report for May/June 1934 about reactions to the persecution of Jews in Germany
 - 120 On 2 June 1934 Legation Counsellor Hermann von Stutterheim reports on a discussion with Leo Löwenstein, the chairman of the Reich League of Jewish Combat Veterans
 - 121 Report by Vice President Fritz Grau during a session of the Criminal Law Commission on 5 June 1934 about 'race protection' and the social segregation of the Jews
 - 122 On 13 June 1934 State Secretary Hans Pfundtner writes to the Reich Minister of Agriculture proposing the creation of closed camps for the agricultural retraining of Jews
 - 123 On 14 June 1934 the Gestapo Central Office orders the seizure of the assets of the League of Jewish Employees in Prussia
 - 124 On 14 June 1934 Julius Plaut asks Hamburg's Reichsstatthalter, Karl Kaufmann, to retract his dismissal
 - 125 *Haynt*, 15 June 1934: article on the establishment of an 'antisemitic international' in Nuremberg
 - 126 On 23 June 1934 Kurt Rathenau informs his brother Fritz about the catastrophic situation of his company Ernst Rosenberg & Co. in Berlin
 - 127 Petition to the Regional Tax Office in Silesia dated 4 July 1934 requesting exemption from the Reich Flight Tax for Erich Frank, appointed professor at the University of Istanbul
 - 128 Margot Littauer describes her everyday school life in Breslau in mid 1934
 - 129 *Internationales Ärztliches Bulletin*, July/August 1934: article about the murder of Erich Mühsam in Oranienburg concentration camp
 - 130 On 2 August 1934 the Gestapo prohibits members of Jewish youth organizations from wearing uniforms and participating in military sports training
 - 131 *Verordnungsblatt der Obersten SA-Führung*: on 16 August 1934 the Deputy of the Führer, Rudolf Heß, prohibits NSDAP members from consorting with Jews
 - 132 On 29 August 1934 the Tenants' Protection Association in Frankfurt proposes that the mayor rename certain streets and squares
 - 133 On 29 August 1934 the Reich Office for Emigration Affairs provides information concerning the state and problems of Jewish emigration from Germany in the second quarter of the year

- 134 On 31 August 1934 Reichsstatthalter Fritz Sauckel urges Hitler and Heß to expropriate the Simson Arms Factory in Suhl
- 135 On 16 September 1934 the historian Willy Cohn describes a visit to a Zionist Hachsarah camp
- 136 On 21 September 1934 the state commissioner for Berlin makes arrangements on the occasion of the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles
- 137 *Der National-Sozialistische Erzieher*, 13 October 1934: draft syllabus regarding the treatment of the Jewish question on so-called State Youth Days
- 138 On 13 October 1934 the Regional Farmers' Leader for Saxony-Anhalt writes to the Reich Farmers' Leader to justify the removal of Jews from the local economy
- 139 On 16 October 1934 the Regierungspräsident in Liegnitz reports to the Prussian Minister of the Interior about an incident in Görlitz in connection with a 'Jewish department store' hoisting a swastika flag
- 140 On 29 October 1934 SA member Werner Siemroth denounces his Hamburg employer for employing Jews
- 141 On 12 November 1934 the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith informs the Reich Ministry of Economics about the hindrance to Jewish traders in town markets
- 142 On 22 November 1934 Heinrich Himmler asks Hitler to oblige the Federation of Bavarian Regimental Officers' Associations to expel its Jewish members
- 143 On 26 November 1934 an NSDAP member sends an anonymous letter to the ministries in Berlin in protest against the ongoing boycott of Jewish shops in Braunschweig
- 144 *New York Times*, 4 December 1934: report on Germany's pledge to take heed of the rights of Jews for one year in the event of a reincorporation of the Saar territory
- 145 *Juristische Wochenschrift*, 7 December 1934: the Hanau Labour Court overturns the dismissal of a Jewish employee
- 146 Discussion at the Staff of the Deputy of the Führer in Munich on 20 December 1934 regarding 'special legislation on Jews'
- 147 On 22 December 1934 the management of the Hermann Tietz department store informs the Reich Ministry of Economics about an antisemitic pamphlet
- 148 On 27 December 1934 the Gestapo Central Office dissolves the Association of German Motor Car Owners for having Jewish members
- 149 *Pariser Tageblatt*, 30 December 1934: article regarding a conference of East Prussian communities on the decline and destitution of the Jewish population
- 150 The Aid Committee of Hamburg's United Jewish Organizations reports on financial aid, emigration assistance, and professional training provided in 1933 and 1934
- 151 Martin Andermann describes the political and social changes that took place in the city of Königsberg in 1934
- 152 On 4 January 1935 Hamburg's health and relief authority writes to SA-Oberführer Heusser to insist on the necessity of buying from Jewish traders

-
- 153 On 19 January 1935 the SS-Standortführer in Berlin prohibits SS men and their families from having private contact with Jews
- 154 Report by the Gestapo Central Office in Berlin on the situation of Germany's Jews in December 1934 and January 1935
- 155 On 17 March 1935 the NSDAP member Walter Tanke denounces participants in a 'Jew-friendly' church gathering to the Stettin Gestapo
- 156 On 22 March 1935 the Catholic Church establishes the Aid Committee for Catholic Non-Aryans
- 157 On 22 March 1935 the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith reports on anti-Jewish incidents in Mecklenburg communities
- 158 On 23 March 1935 the gendarmerie informs the regional council in Hünfeld about an attack on visitors to the Rhina Synagogue
- 159 On 3 April 1935 the Reich Ministry of the Interior informs the Office of the Wehrmacht Adjutant to the Führer and Reich Chancellor about the estimated number of Jews in the German Reich
- 160 On 8 April 1935 the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith protests to Mayor Goerdeler against the boycott of Jewish doctors in Leipzig
- 161 Jüdische Rundschau, April 1935: speech by Rabbi Joachim Prinz concerning the social and cultural isolation of the Jewish population
- 162 Berliner Tageblatt, 20 April 1935: article on the call of the German Council of Municipalities to abolish municipal financial subsidies for Jewish schools
- 163 On 2 May 1935 Victor Klemperer describes his dismissal as professor of Romance languages at the Dresden Institute of Technology
- 164 On 8 May 1935 Naftali Unger briefs the Palestine Shipping Company on the difficulties in obtaining training positions for Jewish youth on ships
- 165 Discussion between the German Army Ordnance Department and the Flick Corporation on 22 May 1935 concerning the Aryanization of the Simson Arms Factory in Suhl
- 166 Werdauer Zeitung, 23 May 1935: report concerning an antisemitic speech at a meeting of the Women's Office of the German Labour Front
- 167 On 24 May 1935 Paula Tobias protests to the Reich Ministry of the Army about the discrimination against her sons caused by the new Military Law
- 168 On 26 May 1935 the lawyer Leopold Weinmann urges the Reich Ministry of the Interior to take action against the instigators of anti-Jewish violence in Munich
- 169 A mother's complaint about her 15-year-old son's participation in nocturnal activities of the Hitler Youth against Jews in Munich (around 26 May 1935)
- 170 On 28 May 1935 the Gestapo Central Office demands that the Reich Minister of Justice prevent marriages between Jews and non-Jews
- 171 In a letter of 29 May 1935 Professor Johann Plesch responds to the Kaiser Wilhelm Society's demand for additional contributions

- 172 Der Stürmer, May 1935: the mayor of Meißen is insulted as a 'slave to Jews' in a purported letter to the editor
- 173 Antisemitic polemic by Adolf Stein on Jews in Berlin, dated 4 July 1935
- 174 Meerer Zeitung, 12 July 1935: article on cases of so-called race defilement
- 175 On 13 July 1935 the Regierungspräsident in Düsseldorf asks the Reich Minister of the Interior for instructions regarding the handling of Polish Jews by the Police for Foreign Nationals
- 176 Neue Zürcher Zeitung: article dated 16 July 1935 about anti-Jewish violence on Kurfürstendamm associated with the screening of an antisemitic film from Sweden
- 177 On 17 July 1935 the head of the Regional Welfare Office in Berlin reduces welfare benefits for newly arriving Jews in need
- 178 On 19 July 1935 Reich Minister of the Interior Frick informs Hitler about the practice of changing Jewish names
- 179 On 20 July 1935 Mr and Mrs Lau complain to the newspaper Das Schwarze Korps about Jews in a Berlin allotment garden area
- 180 On 24 July 1935 the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith informs the Reich Minister of the Interior about acts of violence in East Prussia, Mecklenburg, Hesse, Westphalia, and Berlin
- 181 In anticipation of a future law, Reich Minister of the Interior Frick bans marriages between Jews and non-Jews on 27 July 1935
- 182 Anti-Jewish prejudices within the Confessing Church: a letter from schoolmistress Elisabeth Schmitz to Walter Künne, 28 July 1935
- 183 On 31 July 1935 the Gestapo Central Office reports to Reinhard Heydrich on new plans for discriminating against the Jewish population in Berlin
- 184 On 31 July 1935 the German Labour Front writes to the SD Main Office to propose name changes for Jews
- 185 Das Schwarze Korps, 7 August 1935: article calling on the population to arrest Jews
- 186 On 8 August 1935 the Gestapo informs the Reich Foreign Office about the public humiliation of a woman in Beuthen
- 187 On 15 August 1935 the head of the NSDAP Gau organization in East Prussia demands that the Landrat in Marienwerder be excluded from the Party
- 188 On 17 August 1935 the Gestapo Central Office orders the State Police offices to provide material for a central 'Jewish registry'
- 189 Ministers' conference on 20 August 1935 concerning the next steps in anti-Jewish policy
- 190 On 22 August 1935 Walter Kühne's section in the Reich Ministry of Finance airs proposals for tax discrimination against Jews
- 191 On 25 August 1935 the historian Willy Cohn reports on the situation of an acquaintance living in a mixed marriage
- 192 In late August/early September 1935 a citizen of Leipzig writes to Mayor Haake with suggestions for the further marginalization of the city's Jews

-
- 193 On 7 September 1935 the Reich Railways ask its agencies to take action against the posting of anti-Jewish signs on Reich Railways premises
 - 194 On 7 September 1935 a colleague assembles material for Reichsbank President Hjalmar Schacht concerning future burdens on the economy due to Jewish emigration
 - 195 On 9 September 1935 the Gestapo Central Office outlines to Reich Minister Walther Darré its own proposals for the 'solution of the Jewish question'
 - 196 On 10 September 1935 the German News Agency comments on the decree of Reich Minister Bernhard Rust ordering the creation of separate schools for Jewish children
 - 197 On 11 September 1935 the State Political Police departments are requested to report Jews to the Regional Tax Authorities prior to their emigration
 - 198 The Reich Citizenship Law, proclaimed in Nuremberg on 15 September 1935, turns German Jews into second-class citizens
 - 199 The 'Blood Protection Law', promulgated in Nuremberg on 15 September 1935, prohibits marriage and extramarital sexual relations between Jews and non-Jews
 - 200 On 22 September 1935 State Secretary Wilhelm Stuckart explains drafts of the First and Second Regulations to the Reich Citizenship Law to Reich Physicians' Leader Gerhard Wagner
 - 201 Jüdische Rundschau, 24 September 1935: statement by the Reich Representation of Jews in Germany regarding the Nuremberg Laws
 - 202 Comments from 25 September 1935 concerning a presentation by the head of the NSDAP's Racial Policy Office, Walter Groß, about Hitler's new approach to the Jewish question
 - 203 On 25 September 1935 the head of the Department of National Health in the Reich Ministry of the Interior uses Mendel's principles of heredity to justify the prohibition of marriage between Jews and non-Jews
 - 204 On 27 September 1935 the Swiss ambassador in Berlin reports on the increased number of applications for immigration permits by German Jews
 - 205 On 9 October 1935 State Secretary Wilhelm Stuckart informs Reich Minister of the Interior Wilhelm Frick about the planned law for restricting the economic activity of Jews
 - 206 Frankfurter Zeitung, 11 October 1935: report on a statement made by the Racial Policy Office of the NSDAP about mystical tendencies in 'racial theory'
 - 207 On 16 October 1935 Reich Minister of the Interior Wilhelm Frick protests to Robert Ley against the marking of non-Jewish shops by the German Labour Front in Saxony
 - 208 On 27 October 1935 NSDAP member Peters urges Mayor Krogmann to dismiss Jewish collectors from the Hamburg State Lottery
 - 209 On 1 November 1935 the Branch Group for Private Health Insurance asks the relevant Economic Group for permission to exclude Jewish policyholders
 - 210 The First Regulation to the Reich Citizenship Law of 14 November 1935 defines the term 'Jew'

- 211 On 16 November 1935 Albert Herzfeld reports on the compulsory dismissal of his non-Jewish household help
- 212 *Pariser Tageblatt*, 25 November 1935: editorial regarding the absurdity of the definition of race according to the Nuremberg Laws
- 213 Travel report dated 29 November 1935 about the dramatic situation of the Jewish population after the enactment of the Nuremberg Laws
- 214 On 12 December 1935 Reich Minister of Justice Franz Gürtner discusses with Hitler the removal of Jews from the liberal professions
- 215 A leading official in the Reich Ministry of Education reports on the top-level conference on 12 December 1935 regarding the continuation of anti-Jewish policies
- 216 On 14 December 1935 the city of Radeberg reports to the Saxon State Minister for Economics and Labour on the boycott of Jewish businesses
- 217 On 17 December 1935 ministry representatives discuss the economic and financial advantages and disadvantages of Jewish emigration
- 218 On 19 December 1935 the Gestapo Central Office in Berlin announces how the concept of 'prohibited individual actions' against Jews is to be interpreted
- 219 *Die neue Weltbühne*, December 1935: Heinrich Mann protests against the persecution of Jews in Germany
- 220 In early January 1936 the Jewish Telegraphic Agency provides information on plans to finance the mass emigration of Jews from Germany
- 221 *Danziger Echo*, 7 January 1936: article on the resignation of the High Commissioner of the League of Nations over the persecution of Jews in Germany
- 222 *Der Stürmer*: letter from a National Socialist Christian warning the churches against baptizing Jews en masse, January 1936
- 223 From the Sopade reports of January 1936 regarding reactions in Germany to the Nuremberg Laws
- 224 On 4 February 1936 the Regierungspräsident in Potsdam informs Gauleiter Wilhelm Kube of his planned circular directive concerning the Jewish question
- 225 On 5 February 1936 the Reich Minister of the Interior orders that anti-Jewish excesses occasioned by the assassination of Wilhelm Gustloff in Davos must be prevented
- 226 On 13 February 1936 the sales representative Bernhard Eidmann complains to the retailer Ludwig Bertram about the selling of goods from Jewish firms in Aryan shops
- 227 On 3 March 1936 the Karlsruhe Regional Tax Office reports to the Reich Minister of Finance on cooperation with the Gestapo in monitoring Jews
- 228 On 3 March 1936 the German Council of Municipalities lets the mayor of Stuttgart introduce restrictions on Jews in municipal public baths
- 229 The Beck publishing house pitches its annotated edition of the Nuremberg Laws to the National Socialist Association of Teachers on 5 March 1936
- 230 On 12 March 1936 the emigration advisor for the Jewish Community in Leipzig reports on those seeking advice and their financial situations

-
- 231 The Potsdam government circumvents a directive issued by Reich Minister of Justice Franz Gürtner on the purchase of plots of land by Jews (around 26 April 1936)
- 232 Slaughterhouse director Karl Boerner terminates business relations with Gustav Schroeder in Waren (Müritz) on 30 May 1936
- 233 On 17 June 1936 the Regierungspräsident in Königsberg writes to the Reich Minister of the Interior to outline an amendment to the charter of the Driesen Foundation discriminating against Jews
- 234 *Historische Zeitschrift*: the establishment of the column 'History of the Jewish Question', spring 1936
- 235 *Pariser Tageszeitung*, 23 June 1936: article about conditions for the German Jews shortly before the Olympic Games in Berlin
- 236 On 1 July 1936 Albert Herzfeld reports on his expulsion from the Reich Association of German Artists and on being banned from practising his profession as an artist
- 237 On 9 July 1936 the government of Silesia plans to make it compulsory for Landräte and mayors to compile a civil registry of the Jews
- 238 On 16 July 1936 the Reich Circle for Propaganda and Public Enlightenment issues recommendations for the conduct of the SA towards foreigners and Jews during the Olympic Games
- 239 On 21 July 1936 the historian Willy Cohn criticizes the behaviour of Eastern European Jews during a convalescent stay
- 240 *Jüdische Rundschau*, 24 July 1936: article on the number and destinations of Jewish emigrants
- 241 On 30 July 1936 Medical Officer Wilhelm Dopheide from Hagenow justifies his boycott of Dr Hans Sommerfeld to the Mecklenburg Ministry of State
- 242 On 31 July 1936 Martin Gumpert writes to his sister in Palestine about the problem of transferring money and assets when emigrating to the USA
- 243 On 14 August 1936 the Jewish Social Service and Youth Welfare Office in Berlin asks the Foreign Currency Department of the Regional Tax Office to authorize support for a Jewish refugee family
- 244 On 30 August 1936 State Secretary Hans Pfundtner complains to the Bavarian Minister President about Jewish spa guests in Bad Kissingen
- 245 On 2 September 1936 Mally Dienemann reports on antisemitism in Offenbach am Main
- 246 On 16 September 1936 the Reich Ministry of Economics informs the Reich Minister of Food about the complaints of Jewish grain-trading companies
- 247 On 28 September 1936 Alex Löwenstein gives Rosalie Gehrike in Berlin an account of his new life in Argentina
- 248 Meeting of state secretaries in the Reich Ministry of the Interior on 29 September 1936 about the further course of anti-Jewish policy
- 249 On 6 October 1936 the German embassy in Warsaw reports to the Reich Foreign Office on Polish initiatives concerning Jewish emigration

-
- 250 Amtsblatt der Preußischen Regierung zu Königsberg: regulation issued by the Oberpräsident on 7 October 1936 regarding name changes for towns
- 251 Pariser Tageszeitung, 11 October 1936: article about the expulsion of German Jews from economic life
- 252 On 12 October 1936 the Chief of the Security Police asks the Chief of the Order Police in Berlin to alter the registration system so as to improve the collection of data on baptized Jews
- 253 Invitation from the People's Association for the German Reich Church to a Reformation church service to be held in Grabow on 2 November 1936
- 254 On 14 November 1936 the Gestapo Central Office informs local Gestapo offices about the regulations for the Jewish Winter Relief in 1936/1937
- 255 On 19 November 1936 the retailer Julius Block asks the Berlin police to make an exception and grant him a passport valid for five years
- 256 Deutsches Recht, 15 December 1936: article on a court judgement against a bequeathal to Jews instead of the legal heirs
- 257 On 18 December 1936 State Secretary Wilhelm Stuckart communicates the draft for an anti-Jewish special tax law to the Reich Ministry of Finance
- 258 On 21 December 1936 the Gestapo Central Office issues a ban on the public gathering of Jews
- 259 Zeitschrift des Vereins für Geschichte Schlesiens: review of the antisemitic book *The Jews in Germany* (1936)
- 260 Reports on antisemitic measures and incidents in Germany (1936)
- 261 Walter Gottheil talks about his life in a small German town in 1936
- 262 Ernst Marcus reports on the fears of the Jewish middle class in Breslau in 1936/1937
- 263 Pariser Tageszeitung, 28 January 1937: article on the practice of pursuing and punishing cases of race defilement in Germany
- 264 On 1 February 1937 Reinhard Heydrich informs the Deputy of the Führer about the granting of public house licences to Jews
- 265 On 8 February 1937 the Israelite Association for Old Age Benefits and Nursing Care applies to the Regierungspräsident in Hanover for a permit to collect donations
- 266 On 18 February 1937, 16-year-old Werner Angress describes his reaction to the suicide of his group leader in the Groß-Breesen retraining camp
- 267 Advertisement for the antisemitic play *The Dancing Jew*, enclosed in a letter from the Franz Wulf publishing house dated 20 February 1937
- 268 On 2 March 1937 the head of the personnel section of the City of Munich criticizes a staff official in the welfare section for granting too extensive welfare to a Jew
- 269 Die Kameradschaft, 10 March 1937: proposal for an antisemitic social evening topic for the Hitler Youth
- 270 Jüdische Rundschau, 16 March 1937: article about two court decisions on making purchases in Jewish shops

-
- 271 On 9 April 1937 Karl Scherk invites the Jewish landowners and householders in Stettin to found an interest group
- 272 On 16 April 1937 Rabbi Wahrmann reports on the grave problems confronting Jewish communities in Silesia
- 273 On 17 April 1937 the Düsseldorf leather goods salesman Paul Malsch writes to his son from the Netherlands to describe the political situation in Germany
- 274 Joseph B. Levy describes the B'nai B'rith Lodge in Frankfurt and how it was closed down by the Gestapo on 19 April 1937
- 275 Hermann Lesser writes to the Reich Association of German Small-Animal Breeders on 27 April 1937 to propose the establishment of a Jewish dog breeders' organization
- 276 On 29 April 1937 Adolf Hitler outlines his anti-Jewish strategy to NSDAP Kreisleiter at the Vogelsang National Socialist Castle elite training school
- 277 On 3 May 1937 the Office of the Plenipotentiary for the Four-Year Plan summarizes the effects of the Aryanization of the Jewish art trade
- 278 On 7 May 1937 the Office of the Plenipotentiary for the Four-Year Plan discusses the classification of Wertheim as an Aryan company
- 279 On 14 May 1937 Bertha Meyer, who had emigrated to Prague, asks the Foreign Currency Office of the Greater Berlin Tax Office to waive the fees for storage of her household effects
- 280 *Frankfurter Zeitung*, 16 May 1937: article on the increased revenue from the Reich Flight Tax as a result of the mass emigration of Jews
- 281 On 19 May 1937 the chief official of the Civil Registry Offices in Frankfurt reports to the mayor about his plan to marry Jewish couples on designated days
- 282 On 21 May 1937 the German Council of Municipalities summarizes the results of a survey on the treatment of Jewish patients in municipal hospitals
- 283 On 28 May 1937 the SS Security Service discusses preliminary measures against Jews in the event of war
- 284 Lecture by Theodor Oberländer on the strengthening of German influence in Eastern Europe, spring 1937
- 285 On 16 June 1937 the Reich Ministry of Finance asks the Deputy of the Führer for a response on the planned introduction of special taxes for Jews
- 286 On 22 June 1937 the Reich Foreign Office informs the embassies of the German position towards the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine
- 287 *Zwischen Weichsel und Nogat*, June 1937: article demanding that a Jewish farmer leave the village of Gnojau
- 288 On 12 July 1937 the SS Security Service holds talks with the Gestapo to discuss the next census and the racial registration of the Jews
- 289 *Der Fremdenverkehr*: reproduction of the decree issued by State Secretary Hans Pfundtner on 24 July 1937 concerning the separation of Jewish from non-Jewish guests in baths and spa resorts

- 290 Pariser Tageszeitung, 24 July 1937: article about the introduction of a defence tax targeting Jews in the National Socialist state
- 291 In summer 1937 Max Warburg submits to State Secretary Wilhelm Stuckart proposals to encourage Jewish emigration
- 292 Report by the Jewish Central Information Office dated 11 August 1937 regarding anti-Jewish riots in Upper Silesia following the expiry of the treaty on minorities
- 293 On 11 August 1937 the émigré Günter Bodlaender in Prague asks a relief organization to support his emigration to the Philippines
- 294 On 13 September 1937 the historian Willy Cohn comments on the failure of his attempts to emigrate to Palestine
- 295 Völkischer Beobachter: Adolf Hitler's closing address on Jewry and Bolshevism at the ninth NSDAP rally in Nuremberg, 13 September 1937
- 296 On 15 September 1937 the chief public prosecutor in Frankfurt requests permission from the Reich Minister of Justice to initiate criminal proceedings on account of defamation of the SS newspaper Das Schwarze Korps
- 297 On 30 September 1937 a Berlin local branch of the NSDAP demands the termination of leases to Jewish tenants of the municipal housing associations
- 298 On 3 October 1937 Gary Samuelis writes to Kurt Polley in Berlin about his difficult start in the USA
- 299 Position paper dated 16 October 1937 on the establishment in Munich of Europe's largest library for the study of the Jewish question
- 300 Haynt, 17 October 1937: article on the situation in Germany and resistance on the part of Jews in Poland
- 301 Conference at the Reich Ministry of the Interior on 18 October 1937 on the mass emigration of Jews
- 302 On 18 October 1937 Julius Salinger writes to Kaspar Arendt in Berlin to tell him about conditions for immigrants in South Africa
- 303 On 18 October 1937 Police Detective Ernst Patzer appeals to Adolf Hitler for a new post after being dismissed due to his 'mixed marriage'
- 304 On 26 October 1937 the Reich Office for Foreign Exchange Control disseminates information about changes in the financing of mass Jewish emigration
- 305 Jüdisches Gemeindeblatt für Rheinland und Westfalen, 29 October 1937: article on conditions for the Jews in the communities of Cologne and Breslau
- 306 On 9 November 1937 the chairman of the Berlin City Council writes to the Reich Minister of Education to justify his decision to limit the number of pupils at a Jewish private school
- 307 Paul Malsch from Düsseldorf writes about the opening of the propaganda exhibition 'The Eternal Jew' (around 10 November 1937)
- 308 On 12 November 1937 the Relief Association of Jews in Germany issues a report on the progress and organization of emigration

-
- 309** On 18 November 1937 the physician Hertha Nathorff bemoans the surveillance by the Gestapo of her lecture at the League of Jewish Women
- 310** On 20 November 1937 the 17-year-old Werner Angress describes his flight from Germany
- 311** On 23 November 1937 the Reich Foreign Office urges the head of the Reich Chancellery to ensure that Jewish shops are marked as such
- 312** On 26 November 1937 Minister of Propaganda Joseph Goebbels advocates the exclusion of Jews from German cultural life
- 313** The Jewish Community of Merzig writes to the Reich commissioner for the Saarland on 29 November 1937 regarding the repair of the damaged synagogue
- 314** On 7 December 1937 the German Labour Front plans to push through the legal exclusion of Jews as factory leaders
- 315** On 15 December 1937 Hermann Göring, as acting Reich Minister of Economics, limits the foreign currency and raw material allocations for Jewish companies
- 316** On 18 December 1937 State Secretary Hans Pfundtner sends the head of the Reich Chancellery the draft of a regulation directed against Jewish physicians
- 317** On 28 December 1937 the SS Security Service demands information from the SD Main Districts on the practice of approving itinerant trade licences for Jews
- 318** In the 1937 Reich Medicinal Almanac, Jewish physicians are indicated with a colon
- 319** The executive of the Jewish Community of Berlin reports on vocational training and retraining measures in 1937
- 320** The Reich Representation of Jews in Germany reports on the development and the problems of Jewish welfare support in 1937

DOCUMENTS

DOC. 1

Jüdische Rundschau*, 31 January 1933: editorial on the appointment of Adolf Hitler as Reich Chancellor¹Hitler's government*

The appointment of Hitler as Reich Chancellor and the formation of a government in which the National Socialists hold the most important positions of power puts an end to the condition of ambiguity and constantly repeated confusion that has characterized the preceding epoch of Germany's domestic history. As Jews we are confronted by the fact that a power inimical to us has taken over the government in Germany. Whoever had a sense of reality and was not misled by the reassurances of the liberal press, which again and again believed it had witnessed the demise of the National Socialist movement, could make no mistake about the fact that the political restructuring and changes in the mentality of the German people that have come to light in the major electoral successes of the National Socialists would sooner or later have to find their counterpart in the composition of the government as well.

National Socialism is a *movement hostile to the Jews*. Its antisemitism is programmatic to a degree that no other party has been. It owes a large part of its propagandistic success to the unscrupulous smear campaign against the Jews. This could never prevent us, however, from recognizing the fact that National Socialism has become a decisive force within the German nation, which it would be a mistake to disregard. For that reason, when Hitler was rejected by the Reich President² on 13 August and 25 November, we did not in any way appear as relieved and satisfied as did a part of the Jewish community that refuses to see the big picture and clings to isolated political phenomena of the day. Hitler was met with opposition and resistance, but if his path to power was obstructed in the last half-year, it was certainly not because of his antisemitic programme. If anything, one can say that, even without Hitler's seizure of power, the exclusion of the Jews was already being conducted under pressure from Hitler's party.³

When Hitler was rejected for the first time, the *Jüdische Rundschau* made striking parallels with the creator of the Christian Social Party in Vienna, Dr *Lueger*.⁴ Lueger, who in his time was as much the symbolic figure of antisemitism for the world as Hitler is today, was twice rejected by Emperor Franz Josef after his election as mayor of Vienna. He had to be confirmed on the third occasion and in this way triumphed over the old

1 'Regierung Hitler', *Jüdische Rundschau*, 31 Jan. 1933, p. 1. This document has been translated from German. The *Jüdische Rundschau* emerged in 1902 as the organ of the Zionist Federation for Germany from the *Berliner Vereinsbote*, which had been founded in 1895 (from 1901 the *Israelitische Rundschau*). As one of the largest Jewish weeklies in the German-speaking countries, it propagated the goals of the Zionist movement. In 1933 it appeared twice weekly in Berlin, edited by Heinrich Loewe. In 1934 it had a circulation of 37,000. Banned in Germany after the pogroms of Nov. 1938, it was published from March 1939 to 1940 in Jerusalem as the *Jüdische Weltrundschau*.

2 Paul von Hindenburg (1847–1934) was Reich President from 1925 to 1934.

3 Thus, Leo Kestenbergl, for instance, was dismissed by the Reich government from the post of head of music in the Prussian Ministry of Culture in 1932: for his biography, see Doc. 5, 5/6 March 1933, fn. 2.

4 Dr Karl Lueger (1844–1910), lawyer; practised law in Vienna, 1874–1896; founder of the antisemitic Christian Social Party in Austria, 1891; mayor of Vienna, 1897–1910.

emperor. Our speculation that Hitler would follow the same path has been confirmed. Less than twenty-four hours ago, the solution to the cabinet crisis was still thoroughly unclear. An agreement between the individual groups on the right, who only a short time ago had bitterly fought among themselves, still seemed impossible. Even the role of individual personalities in this endgame is difficult to comprehend, but it is not our concern to assess them. The right-wing *DAZ*⁵ claimed in its Sunday edition that until now Hindenburg had resolutely refused to accept Hitler as leader of a presidential cabinet, and since Hitler's chances for a parliamentary majority are slim, the *DAZ* raised the question: 'Does the Reich President hope that Hitler's movement will relent, or has he himself decided to relent?' By this the newspaper meant that the one option excludes the other.⁶

As these lines go to press, the foundations on which the new cabinet is to be built are as yet unknown. It is unclear above all whether the Centre [Party]⁷ can supply a viable parliamentary form for the cabinet. The regime appears to depend on the support of groups that are bound by their principles and the imperative of political acumen to safeguard the fundamental rights of citizens as guaranteed by the constitution. The Reich President, who has appointed Hitler, is bound by his constitutional oath, his moral authority, and his international reputation. The civic equality of German Jews is, however, *anchored in the constitution of the Reich*. We can only repeat what we wrote in these pages on 12 August:⁸ 'If Hitler becomes Reich Chancellor, the programme of the National Socialist Party, with its well-known anti-Jewish statutes, must not become the programme of the German Reich. As party leader, Hitler could draw upon the support of the masses he has fanaticized, but as Reich Chancellor he has to recognize that Germany consists of different elements that have a right to respect for their distinctiveness.' The German Jews, constantly threatened and offended, demeaned and maligned by the Reich Chancellor's party, demand from *every* government, whichever it may be, respect for their existence, their honour and kind. The entire world is now looking at Germany, especially the Jewish people. Despite the numerical insignificance of German Jewry, the fate of the German Jews is the focus of attention for all Jews in the world. We are convinced that even among the *German people* forces are still alive that will turn against barbaric anti-Jewish politics. Furthermore, Germany's status among all the cultural nations depends upon its behaviour with regard to the Jewish question. Even a National Socialist-ruled Germany cannot ignore the entanglement of international relations.

The *German Jews*, for whom the new turn of events cannot have been unexpected, have to maintain their inner calm and dignity. It goes without saying that German Jewry *will fight with all means and energy* against every attempt at formal and factual disenfranchisement and dispossession. This battle can only be led by a Jewry that is filled with unflinching pride for its heritage. Attempts at assimilation and self-denial have come to

5 *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*. The newspaper appeared from 1861 to 1918 as the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* and thereafter until 1945 as the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*.

6 Report in the section 'Unsere Meinung' (Our View), *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* (Reich edition), 29 Jan. 1933, p. 1.

7 The author means the Catholic Centre Party (Zentrumspartei), which was represented Catholic Germany. It was founded in 1870 and active until 1933.

8 'Hitler Reichskanzler?', editorial, *Jüdische Rundschau*, 12 August 1932, p. 1.

an end. Those German Jews who trusted the false slogans of their past leaders and devoted themselves to faith in progressive improvement through 'enlightenment' have lost the ground beneath their feet. In the face of the conditions created, German Jewry must more than ever unite to help itself. To keep the spirit of Judaism alive and active – that is the task at hand. Never was it so important as it is now to keep the faith in Judaism and its future strong and unwavering. The Jewish people are the bearer of imperishable values, the inheritor of an incomparable history. In times of danger and in times of hardship, we must make every effort to raise awareness of this fact.

DOC. 2

***Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte*, January 1933: editorial on the struggle against international Jewry¹**

Arno Schickedanz,² Berlin:

*A concluding word on the Jewish question*³

Introduction

Recognizing that after the spiritual and material collapse a völkisch renewal of Germany can only take place on an idealistic basis that corresponds to the ancestral character of the German people and its inherent disposition, and leads it again to dominance, National Socialism felt compelled from the outset to take a stand against all alien influences. If it wanted to achieve a rebirth of Germany, then it had to harken back to the eternally renewing forces of its race and soul, restore them to victory, and repel and eliminate as far as possible any influence of a foreign race on the psyche that prevented the unfolding of our own, or adulterated it. It was thus compelled to nationalize the nation in order to save it, and in the process encountered the opposition of those forces that internationalized the nation, in order, whether consciously or unconsciously, to corrupt it for their own benefit. National or international, those are the two solutions from which all others recede; the destiny of the German people will be decided between them. For this reason, however, the confrontation between the nation reawakened in National Socialism and Jewry is unavoidable. All internationalizing tendencies were embodied in Jewry, the – strange as it may sound – national people par excellence, which ceaselessly influenced the other nations and the German people in particular, both spiritually and materially. This influence was already prevalent in the French Revolution, which distorted a

1 'Ein abschließendes Wort zur Judenfrage', *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte*, vol. 4, no. 34 (1933), pp. 1–3. This document has been translated from German. The so-called Academic Journal of the NSDAP was edited by Adolf Hitler until the end of 1933; Alfred Rosenberg was its editorial director. The journal appeared from 1930 to 1944.

2 Arno Schickedanz (1892–1945), journalist; joined the NSDAP in 1923 and took part in the Beer Hall Putsch the same year; director of the Berlin office of the *Völkischer Beobachter*, 1930–1933; chief of staff of the Foreign Policy Office of the NSDAP, 1934–1945; head of the main office in the task force known as Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg, 1940–1945; author of *Die Juden: Eine Gegenrasse* (1927).

3 A detailed summary of the article appeared in the *Völkischer Beobachter* under the title 'Die Judenfrage': *Völkischer Beobachter* (northern German edition), 5/6 Feb. 1933, 2nd supplement.

misunderstood and unfortunate ideal of humanity into the [notion of the] equality of everything human and contrasted its outward pacifistic expressions of liberation with an inward reign of blood, only to then acquire a greater scale and significance in the recent past with growing affluence and the utilization of all technological progress. On the one hand, international financial obligations among states sprouted up under Jewish leadership as creeping plants that threatened to strangle national economies. This process was supported by unhealthy parallel phenomena developing simultaneously within the individual national economies, within which industrial and merchant giants grew. These were controlled or managed by Jews who, disregarding or even in direct opposition to national needs, formed their cartels or waged wars of competition. On the other hand, an inner front was established under Jewish leadership that ran through all Volksgemeinschaften and broke up the Volksgemeinschaften under the pretext of wanting to combat those parasitical phenomena. If the call to arms during the French Revolution was 'liberty, equality, and fraternity', which in practice then materialized on the scaffold, it is now, in the next stage, based on the false doctrine of the Jew Marx-Mordechai:⁴ 'class rule' and the annihilation of all that is rooted in the soil, organically conditioned and natural, in favour of a shadowy, construed notion of an international community of interest formed by all those supposedly exploited by a 'capitalism per se'. In this way, the German people are threatened like all others by this intellectualized falsification of real life, and in fact from two sides, both of which are under an international slogan as well as Jewish leadership: through Jewish speculation in financial capital and through Marxism.

The ultimate victory of either side would mean the demise of the German Volk. In the first instance, this would be through a slowly worsening ailment that would definitively sap all remaining healthy life forces and dynamism of the nation, which could be furthered by artificial measures such as exporting slave labourers, emigration, and so on and so forth, while other, stronger peoples occupy the space vacated. In the second instance, it would be through having an internal bloodstream like no other, which would mean the extermination of the most valuable racial elements, the most creative and headstrong, the most German in character and essence, which could never ever bow to such a reign of deluded notions alien to its nature. In both cases, the fate of Germany would be sealed. It would be eliminated from the history of peoples, and Judaism would then have experienced not its first, but certainly its greatest, triumph.

In this respect, the fight against the Jews has entailed the attack on the hostile centre of power. Naturally, it can only be won after the defeat of its Jewish support, in particular of its bodyguard, Marxism. However, to have taken it up and declared it an item on its agenda, without deviating from it despite an unprecedented reaction from an opponent at the height of his powers, is already in and of itself to the enormous historical credit of National Socialism, which only later generations will fully appreciate. The awareness that has already arisen among the broadest swathes of the German people to the effect that there will be no recovery of the German people, no liberation from the reign of inferiors, no salvation from empty talk as a cloak for anti-national efforts without the elimination of Jewry and the overcoming of its deluded notions is itself a result of this

⁴ The author means Karl Marx. Mordecai or Mordechai is a central figure in the Old Testament Book of Esther.

struggle for German rebirth. It is thus stated in the NSDAP manifesto: 'Only those of German blood, whatever their creed, may be citizens of the state. No Jew, therefore, may be a Volksgenosse.' This provides the basis for the next demand: 'Whoever is not a citizen of the state, shall only be able to live in Germany as a guest and must be subject to legislation pertaining to foreign nationals.'⁵

DOC. 3

C.V.-Zeitung, 9 February 1933: report on anti-Jewish riots in Gersfeld, Hesse¹*Terror in Gersfeld*

Over the course of the last week the windows of various Jewish families in Gersfeld were smashed. Moreover, a Jewish businessman who gave chase when the windows were shattered was stabbed with a knife and seriously injured. The perpetrators fled but left behind a cap and gloves, so that one can expect them to be identified.

Larger riots broke out on the evening of Saturday 4 February. The leader of the NSDAP, the carpenter Heun,² called on his followers at the marketplace to fetch the Jewish inhabitants from their houses. The fanaticized multitude hereupon marched to the house of the respected businessman Bachrach³ from the Liebstädter company. Three National Socialists forced entry into the house and injured the unsuspecting businessman Bachrach, who was sitting in the company of his family, with punches and kicks that were so severe that he collapsed and required medical attention. The barbarous attack is all the more incomprehensible since businessman Bachrach has never been active politically and enjoyed widespread popularity both personally and in business.

5 Cited here are points 4 (misquoted) and 5 of the NSDAP manifesto from 24 Feb. 1920: Walther Hofer (ed.), *Der Nationalsozialismus: Dokumente 1933–1945*, new edn (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1988 [1957]), p. 28.

1 'Terror in Gersfeld', *C.V.-Zeitung*, 9 Feb. 1933, p. 41. This document has been translated from German. A weekly newspaper with the subtitle '*Blätter für Deutschtum und Judentum*' (Newspaper for Germandom and Jewry), from May 1922 the *C.V.-Zeitung* was the organ of the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith (CV) and successor to the CV organ *Im Deutschen Reich*, published from 1895–1922. The *C.V.-Zeitung* reported on Jewish life in German society and addressed the topic of antisemitism. It had a circulation of 40,000 in 1935.

2 Wilhelm Heun (b. 1894), carpenter; joined the NSDAP in 1930.

3 Correctly: Sally Bacharach (b. 1881), businessman; lived from 1909 in Gersfeld and moved to Fulda in March 1934 with his wife, Ida.

DOC. 4

C.V.-Zeitung, 23 February 1933: article criticizing anti-Jewish propaganda on the streets of Berlin and in the Nazi press¹

Who benefits from it?

New antisemitic agitation. Falsehood about ritual murder. The 'Protocols'. The 'Jewish Hoarder Slogan' and other accusations. What do our friends say?

I

L. H.² On Kurfürstendamm and on Tauentzienstraße in Berlin the sale of a brochure has been announced over the last few days: *The Demand of the Hour: Jews Out!*³ The decree of 4 February protecting the German people (section 2, § 9, no. 6) threatens printed periodicals with prohibition 'if a religious community recognized under public law, its institutions, customs, and objects of religious worship are insulted or maliciously degraded in them.' The meaning of these paragraphs unambiguously aims to remove religious communities and their institutions, which are already protected as such under the penal code (§ 166), from the daily political struggle. Respect for religion should also be held sacred by dissenters. It cannot be the aim of the legislator to restrict this *meaning* of the emergency decree, of which we also approve, merely to *periodical* print matter. It must for this reason be utterly disconcerting that Dr von Leers,^{4a} a well-known member of the National Socialist Party, whose takeover of government was immediately followed by that emergency decree, has composed a flyer containing severe insults not only towards Jewry as an alleged political power but also towards the *Jewish religion*. We are the last ones who would call for censorship of printed matter. But we regard it as our duty to point out that writings such as this *Demand of the Hour* are liable to provoke an *atmosphere of civil war and pogrom*, and that their dissemination in these times constitutes an immediate threat, not only to the Jews but also to the German people in their entirety. Even if Dr von Leers writes in his afterword: 'National Socialism fights against Judah, not to do violence to the poor Jews, but to remove the opportunity for influence from a domineering foreign people, not to organize pogroms, but to expel the Ostjuden who are detrimental to the country, to make the remaining Jews politically and economically innocuous as foreigners', he does not thereby diminish the effect.

1 'Wem nützt das?', *C.V.-Zeitung*, 23 Feb. 1933, pp. 58–59. This document has been translated from German.

2 Dr Ludwig Holländer (1877–1936), lawyer; counsel, 1908; later director of the Central Association of Jews in Germany (CV); editor-in-chief of the *C.V.-Zeitung*, 1932; author of works including *Deutsch-Jüdische Probleme der Gegenwart* (1929).

3 The brochure *Die Forderung der Stunde: Juden raus!* was distributed by National Socialists in uniform in front of buildings such as the department store Kaufhaus des Westens (KaDeWe) with the slogan: 'Jews out! From the secret files of the Public Prosecutor's Office, from Minister Göring': quoted from a petition by Jean Sklarz dated 23 Feb. 1933. Sklarz had complained to Göring that his name was referred to in the brochure as 'Jewish and Galician': GStA PK, I HA, Rep. 90b/133, fol. 1.

4 Dr Johann von Leers (1902–1965), lawyer and journalist; attaché in the foreign service, 1926–1928; joined the NSDAP in 1929 and the SS in 1936; from 1929 editor-in-chief of the Nazi journal *Wille und Weg*; professor in Jena, 1938; in Italy (after 1945), in Argentina (1950), and in Egypt (1955); author of works including *Juden sehen dich an* (1933) and *Die Verbrechernatur der Juden* (1944).

Dr von Leers would probably dismiss as slander the reproach that he harms Jewry as a religious community. However, we can prove it to him from his own writing. He dedicates a large chapter of his text to alleged Talmud citations and the ritual murder commandment. 'For hours on end', he thus concludes his chapter, 'one could list cases of Jewish ritual murder, where poor, innocent little children have been butchered and tortured to death by Jewish devils.' He adds in bold type: 'Mothers, make sure that the Jewish menace to your poor children is removed from the country.'

The Reich Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized in Talmud trials that the claims of Jewish ritual murders are absurd. Yet even if Dr Leers is not familiar with the jurisprudence of the Reich Supreme Court, as someone who has delved into the question of ritual murder he must have also read contrary studies and the numerous statements of leading Christian academics who have clearly stated there is no such Jewish ritual murder. He would have to know that even noted opponents of the Jews have rejected this allegation and that the very same blood libels were made by the Romans against the Christians, by the Chinese against the European missionaries, by the French Catholics against the French Protestants; in short, wherever religious minorities sought to hold their own in the midst of prevailing views. He should have read the work *Blood in the Faith and Superstition of Men*⁵ by the prominent Protestant theologian Strack and the collections of papal bulls, which defend themselves against such accusations of murder. Dr von Leers, who roots around in cases dating back centuries, should have rather cited the bull of *Pope Paul III* of 14 May 1450, which states:

We have heard with displeasure that for several years now certain men, as firebrands and, as is said, mortal enemies of those Jews, blinded by hate and envy or, what seems more likely, by avarice, so that they might be in a position to appropriate the possessions and property of those same Hebrews with a certain appearance of legitimacy, falsely accuse them of killing small children, drinking their blood, and committing all manner of monstrous crimes which specifically target our said faith – and in such a way strive to stir up the resentment of ordinary Christians against them, whereby it so happens that the Jews are frequently unjustly robbed not only of their possessions and property, but even of their life.

Or he could have cited that bull of *Pope Innocent IV* of 25 September 1253 which threatens to punish the dissemination of *accusations of ritual murder with excommunication*. He should have read the official document dating from July 1236 in which the *Hohenstaufen Emperor Friedrich II* prohibits the accusing of Jews of ritual murder 'once and for all'. Finally, in the course of his studies he must have also found the resolution of the *Congress of Orientalists* to Rome dating from October 1899 which, at the request of the consistory Professor *Kautzsch*,⁶ unanimously pronounced: 'The accusation that

5 Correctly: *Blood in the Faith and Superstition of Mankind*; Hermann L. Strack, *Das Blut im Glauben und Aberglauben der Menschheit: Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Volksmedizin und des jüdischen Blutritus* (Munich: Beck, 1900); originally published under the title *Blutaberglaube bei Juden und Christen* in 1891. Strack (1848–1922) was professor of Protestant theology and a committed critic of antisemitism.

6 Dr Emil Kautzsch (1841–1910), Protestant theologian; professor of the Old Testament.

some commandment pertaining to followers of the Jewish religion might have ever prescribed or even alluded to the use of Christian blood for ritual purposes is downright absurd and does not befit the century that is now coming to an end.

Dr von Leers draws a second important element for the demand in his title 'Jews Out!' from *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. He asserts that the authenticity of these 'Protocols' has been wrongly doubted and that they are in fact a compilation of decrees from a secret Jewish conference held in the year 1897.⁷ It is unnecessary to discuss in greater detail this book, which has long been branded as a forgery and even recognized as such by the anti-Jewish side. Enough of this; we have to point out these things that are humiliating for the entire German nation because we consider it our duty. But unfortunately we also see just how little the fanatical Jew haters whom we meet *are concerned with rectifying factual errors*.

II

On 18 February this year the *Angriff*⁸ wrote: in Lübeck, the Jew and SPD leader Leber⁹ was released from custody. The Jew Leber had allegedly called for the murder of [SA] Marinesturmmann and Party Comrade Brüggemann.¹⁰ In the last edition of the *C.V.-Zeitung* we already pointed out that Leber has nothing whatsoever to do with Jewry.¹¹ Why does the *Angriff* repeat this assertion? Only in order to incite the people against the Jews? Using the same method, it designates as Jewish the notorious scandals of recent years which also have nothing whatsoever to do with Jewishness and Jewry. Karl Marx, who is referred to as Mordechai,¹² allegedly wrote his work *Capital* at the behest of the international Jewish masonic lodges. Utter nonsense, which does not become any more true by its constantly being repeated.¹³ So it is with everything else.

III

German Jews shake their heads as they observe the monstrous figments of a foolhardy imagination that have to date found their way into the National Socialist newspapers! What has happened in the economy over the last fourteen years has supposedly been

7 The 'Protocols' comprise a fraudulent compilation of different texts (parts of which date from the 1860s), which were first published in their current version in Russia in 1903; see the critical edition: Jeffrey L. Sammons (ed.), *Die Protokolle der Weisen von Zion: Die Grundlage des modernen Antisemitismus – eine Fälschung. Text und Kommentar* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 1998), pp. 8–16. For an English translation, see *The Jewish Peril: Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, trans. George Shanks (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1920 [Russian edn, 1905]). See also Doc. 25, 4 April 1933, fn. 4.

8 *Der Angriff* (The Attack): the newspaper of the Berlin NSDAP.

9 Julius Leber (1891–1945), economist; Reichstag delegate for the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), 1924–1933; held in a concentration camp and in prison, 1933–1937; member of the Kreisau Circle; arrested after the assassination attempt of 20 July 1944 and executed in 1945.

10 The article appeared in the section 'Kurzmeldungen' (News in Brief): *Der Angriff*, 18 Feb. 1933, p. 2. The *Völkischer Beobachter* also referred to Leber as a Jew: *Völkischer Beobachter* (northern German edition), 19/20 Feb. 1933, p. 2.

11 The *C.V.-Zeitung* criticized a corresponding report in the *Westdeutscher Beobachter* from 2 Feb. 1933: *C.V.-Zeitung*, 16 Feb. 1933, p. 50.

12 Central figure in the Old Testament Book of Esther.

13 See also similar claims in an article published in the *NS-Monatshefte*, Jan. 1933, Doc. 2.

born of a prevalent Jewish influence. Jewish people have supposedly, as vampires of the German people, facilitated and capitalized on war, inflation, and deflation, and have ultimately become rich from the economic crisis that is destroying Germany. The *Angriff* even traces the rise of the price of lard to the *slogan about Jews being hoarders*, rather than tariff increases. The *Völkischer Beobachter* calls us ‘bed bugs’ and demands our extermination.¹⁴ Many friends reckon that it is not worth stooping down to this level; every word of argument is superfluous, for whoever writes something like this knows that he won’t be taken seriously, doesn’t even want to be taken seriously. One should not, they say, waste thoughts and energy on these concoctions. Such are the words of the confident type of critical, worldly German Jew. Over there, deep in the ranks of the National Socialist electorate, the same verdict. The sorrow and complaints of the German Jews are indeed understandable, but as politically experienced people, German Volksgenossen of the Jewish faith ought not to let themselves get worked up. Nothing, they say, is as bad as it seems, and one must distinguish between exaggerated chants of the masses and the actual goals of German National Socialist politics. The propaganda that refers to us as bed bugs, will, they continue, also abate, and therefore wise restraint is advisable, rather than protest.

We can no longer follow this advice without a second thought. We still believe that editors and agitators are not prompted by exuberance and indiscretion, but that we have to seek the intention and system behind the tone and direction of all fomentation. The fact that anti-Jewish propaganda was circulating *before* the accomplishment of the political goal, in order to bind the masses together and to symbolize the opponent for them, was known to us. The fact that even *after* taking power the tone of the outpourings of official organs such as the *Angriff* and *Völkischer Beobachter* is increasingly and vehemently anti-Jewish should worry us. What good is the propaganda that compares us to bed bugs when one needs to know which issues are really at stake? The German people want work and bread, and they desire the resolution of *actual* problems, which in reality have nothing to do with the so-called Jewish question. We cannot be content with the repudiation of these monstrous and base attacks. We cannot casually dismiss the outpourings of National Socialist organs, as the former NSDAP Reichsleiter for organizational affairs, Gregor Strasser,¹⁵ has recently done in a statement in the *Fränkischer Kurier*, because the standard of the *Stürmer* and its editor define the character of the attacks themselves. In the case of statements by organs of a political, fundamental, indeed now official nature, such as the *Völkischer Beobachter* and the *Angriff*, we must raise the

14 An article signed ‘KL.’ states that ‘foreign Jews’ can be observed in the Berlin cityscape. The author equates them with lice that nest in crevices and rapidly reproduce. According to the article, they must be subjected to radical treatment. Only the ‘fiercest fumigation of the infected space’ can drive them out: ‘Berliner Spaziergang: Die Wanzen’ (Berlin stroll: The bed bugs), *Völkischer Beobachter* (Berlin edition), 12/13 Feb. 1933, *Berliner Beobachter*, daily supplement to the *Völkischer Beobachter*, p. 2.

15 Correctly: Gregor Straßer (1892–1934), pharmacist; joined the NSDAP and the SA in 1921; participated in the Beer Hall Putsch in 1923; imprisoned in Landsberg am Lech; NSDAP Gauleiter for Lower Bavaria, 1925–1929; NSDAP Reichsleiter for propaganda, 1926–1928; NSDAP Reichsleiter for organizational affairs, 1928–1932; resigned from all Party posts in Dec. 1932; managing director of the firm Schering-Kahlbaum, 1933–1934; murdered during the Night of the Long Knives on 30 June 1934.