MILLER ENDOWMENT ESTABLISHED

The Center for Holocaust Studies is delighted to announce the establishment of a new endowment by Leonard (UVM '51) and Carolyn Miller. For several years the Millers have been generous supporters of the Center for Holocaust Studies at the University of Vermont, making possible both the Miller Symposium on German Medicine and Ethics under National Socialism, held in April 2000, and an upcoming symposium on business and industry in the Third Reich, scheduled for April 2002. Leonard Miller, who is also active on the Holocaust Studies Advisory Board, received a B.S. in Business Administration from UVM. He and Carolyn are successful entrepreneurs who have engaged in educational pursuits throughout their lives.

The Miller Endowment has been established in honor of Leonard’s 50th reunion at the University of Vermont. It will sustain and enhance the Center for Holocaust Studies and thus further the University of Vermont’s mission to create an engaged and service-oriented academic community. The Miller Endowment will provide annual financial resources to sustain the programming, services, and curriculum of the Center for Holocaust Studies.

Leonard and Carolyn Miller
Everyone Knows...?  
David Serafin  
University of Vermont

Abdul Hamid (1876-1909), pinnacled massacres accounted for some three thousand dead—out of about two and a half million Armenians in the empire. They were convenient scapegoats for the domestic and political decline of the Ottoman Empire during the nineteenth century. The demise of Sultan Hamid and the reinstatement of the Ottoman constitution by the new government of Sultan Young Turks (who got their expression from one) seemed, at first, to promise better times for the Armenians. It was not to be. In April 1915, leading Armenians were summarily arrested, deported, and shot. The remaining Armenian population, the aged, the women and children were then told they would be "re-located," in the first part of the plan, they died in death camps. Great columns were marched toward the Syrian and Mesopotamian desert. Deprived of food and water, savagely treated by the police accompanying them and by the Turkish and Kurdish populations of the provinces they traversed, well over a million, perhaps as many as a million and a half, perished miserably in 1915, there were just over two million Armenians in Turkey. In this way the new Ottoman Empire, in effect Turkey, became "cleansed" of Armenians. In the process Turkey enriched itself vastly at the expense of the expatriated victims—just as the U.S. government sends over the life insurance policies carried by Armenians with American firms, since they and their beneficiaries were now, as they openly stated, all dead.

The killings, their extent, and magnitude were well known throughout Europe and America. Ambassador Henry Morgenthau and other U.S. diplomats in Turkey kept their government well informed. They trusted far too much, however, in Turkey in Turkey and were therefore tried in absentia. The Europian and American public, however, was not as easily convinced. The New York Times, for example, published extensive reports of the atrocities, the killings, the death marches, and the numbers of dead. The Germans, allies of the Turks in World War I, also kept careful records and expressed grave misgivings at the behavior of their ally. At the end of this war, which also marked the end of the Ottoman Empire, the Turkish government in itself ceded to pressure from military officers to try the leading perpetrators for war crimes. The main perpetrators were, however, no longer in Turkey and were therefore tried in absentia. By concentrating on the Young Turk leadership, whom they found guilty, the authorities in effect exonerated the nation. The Armenian government to this day has never accepted responsibility, indemnified victim families, or sought out the many killers. Indeed, it has systematically denounced the victims of its genocide (as later defined by the United Nations) and sought to explain the deaths away as the result of a regrettable but necessary fight against the "traitors" within its midst in time of war. The Armenian leaders were said to have collaborated with the Russians, for example.

In this denial and refusal to take responsibility the Armenian government, as well as the government of the United States as well as the government of Turkey, Turkish government threatened to ban all Hollywood films in Turkey if the film were made. The U.S. State Department brought pressure to bear on Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, as well as on 20th Century-Fox, and no Edman material went to Turkey. MGM has said in August 1935, just before the outbreak of war, "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

Some progress has been made in recent years by the Armenian genocide to the world's attention, and in bringing Turkey to acknowledge it: in 1984 the Permanent People's Tribunal on the Armenian Genocide, brought together by minority rights groups in London, the United States, and Germany, I found Turkey guilty of genocide. They called upon the United Nations to recognize the Armenian Genocide. In 1987 the European Parliament issued a resolution calling on Turkey to recognize its past guilt in the Armenian Genocide and made such recognition a precondition for admissibility to the European Union. On the other hand, because of the government's consistent official policies in NATO held by Turkey, the U.S. Senate as recently as 1989 defended by twelve votes Senator Bob Dole's bill proposing commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. The various encyclicals and the English language, with the exception of the Encyclopædia Britannica and the Encyclopedia of Genocide (reviewed in the Bulletin, Vol. 5, No. 1) are singularly silent on the Armenian Genocide. If addressed, it is often not called genocide, and is sometimes played down and shown simply as a drastic reaction, in time of war, to a demand from the Turks within their own borders. In some cases it is simply ignored.

There are denials not only in Turkey, but even in the United States, moreover within the ballyhooed walls of academia. Princeton University has harbored two prominent deminers, Professor Bernard Lewis and Professor Heath Lowry, and accepted Turkish funding for the "Anatolian Chair in Turkish Studies." Lewis was brought to court in France and was found guilty of civil charges brought against him for "denying the reality of the Armenian Genocide." Armenian Genocide deniers have also been attacked in the United States. Here prominent scholars such as Richard Hovannisian, Eric Lilias, Eric Liebken, and Mark Sisson have written on the subject, and a petition opposing Turkish denial was signed by over 150 American scholars including (including Hovannisian and Hovannisian and Hovannisian and Hovannisian and Hovannisian, and Hovannisian and Hovannisian and Hovannisian).

Studies have been made comparing the Armenian Genocide with the Holocaust, but it is clear that Turkey's sustained denial of its crimes has largely been successfully. In comparison, the Holocaust, despite the attempts of deminers, remains generally accepted as historical fact throughout most of the world. The literature documenting it is overwhelming, and the mass of survivors of the catastrophe. The only thing, however, is wrong. The Armenian Genocide preceded it by a quarter of a century. Recognition of this does nothing to diminish the importance of the Holocaust. It helps to understand the similarities, however, even as the two genocides continue to erupt throughout the world with terrifying frequency.

I have tried bravely in compiling this account on the above-mentioned Encyclopædia of Genocide, edited by Israel W. Chamy. This, the second edition, as well as the previous edition, was made with the assistance of works by scholars such as Marjorie Morehouse, Robert Melson, Vakhtan N. Dadian, and Robert Paul Adham. And a bibliography of two works written under the aegis of the International Bank of Armenia, survivors, namely 1) Peter Balaban, Black Flag of Fate. A Memoir. (New York: Broadway Books, 1998), and 2) Zohrab Khanjian, A Revolution. (New York: Avon Books, 1999). In this account, Peter Balaban describes growing up in a close Armenian family in New Jersey without ever hearing more than a few words in the genocide, which his grandmother survived. His book is an effective mix of three different stories — a memoir of an American childhood and adolescence, with all the typical trials and tribulations; another memoir of an Armenian upbringing; and a brief history and documentation of the genocide and its denial by the Turks. Nancy Kricorian uses the death of her survivor grandmother to drive home the past and describe her. Zabelle's, history, surviving against all the odds, getting to America through an arranged marriage, and a new life in which the genocide is never discussed and seldom mentioned. It is, too, an effective book. The Forty Days of Dust, the 1933 novel by the Austrian writer Franz Werfel, widely read in its time, describes a famous act of resistance while fleeing to, in an unspecified country, the Jewish Holocaust in 1933. Not only among the differences between the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust is the death of survivor accounts. Does this contribute to the forgetting, or denial, of the Armenian Genocide?  

Claims on Swiss Banks

The Swiss Bankers Association has published the list of dormant accounts. A six-month deadline for survivor claims began on 5 February and ends on 5 July 2001. The list of dormant ac- counts and information on how to file claims can be found under www.dormantaccounts.ch. (Information received from the AHD Literatur.)

Sephardic Music at UVM

Friday, 9 March 2001, La Neft, a Quebec-based group specializing in medieval and Sephardic Music will perform at UVM. This Late Series Concert will be held at the UVM Recital Hall at 7:30 p.m. The event is cosponsored by the Center for Holocaust Studies. For ticket information contact the Line Series at (802) 656-4400.

A Quiet Spring for UVM CHS

Professor David Serafin, Director of the Center for Holocaust Studies at The University of Vermont, is on sabbatical for this academic year, although he continues to edit the Bulletin. In his stead we are pleased to have Arthur S. Kunin, M.D., Professor Emeritus of the College of Medicine, serving as Acting Di-rector. Kunin is not new to the position, having served in a similar capacity two years ago.

Holocaust history professor Joanne Holder is on teaching leave this semester, while he prepares a book manuscript for publication, "German Deeds, Polish Soil, Jewish Shoah: Auschwitz and the Politics of Commemoration" is scheduled to appear in 2002.

Due to the absence from the classroom of these two instructors, we do not expect to host any public events this spring. Instead we will be working on various publishing projects, and planning for the summer lectures.
REPORTS

EMBACHER EXPLORES AUSTRIAN-JEWISH RELATIONS IN THE POST-SHOAH ERA
Katherine Quinn Johnson

The fall of 2000 was a busy semester for the Center for Holocaust Studies at UVM, with no fewer than three lectures in October. The first of these, “Traumatized Identities: Jews and Austrians after the Shoah” was delivered by Professor Helga Emo Bach, a distinguished expert on the history of Austria, at the University of Salzburg. Emo Bach’s lecture expanded on material she had already addressed in this publication (Volume 4, Nos. 1 and 2). “Traumatized Identities” gave the receptive audience a solid overview of relations between Austria, the Jews, and Israel from the immediate post-war era through the Waldheim affair of the 1980s and the Freedom Party’s rise to power in the 1990s, climaxing with the election of Heinz Fischer as Prime Minister in February 2000.

The roots of the problematic relationship between Jews and Austrians in the post-war era can be traced back to the Moscow Declaration, which proclaimed Austria the first victim of Nazi Germany (the source of the so-called “Victim Thesis”). Austria used this declaration to exclude itself from liability in any of the crimes of Nazi Germany, ignoring the fact that a majority of Austrians welcomed their country’s annexation by the Germans, and that many Austrians participated in the persecution of the Jews. Politicians not only inflamed the role of the Austrian resistance, but also drew parallels between Austrian suffering during the war and Jewish suffering in the Holocaust.

Then returned to post-war Austria could do little to counter the official illusion. Of the 6,000 returnees, most expressed a belief in the Victim Thesis, in part because they, too, wanted to share this belief, and in part because they were afraid to criticize Austria, fearing a new wave of anti-Semitism if they did.

The relatively warm relationship that existed in the post-war period between the new states of Israel and Austria reinforced the Victim Thesis. Israel neither demanded reparations from Austria, nor imposed sanctions on travel to Austria, nor forbade the import of goods from Austria, in contrast to its policy toward Germany. Diplomatic and trade recognition were in part due to Austria’s importance as a neutral country during the Cold War; in other words, Austria was economically valuable, and Austria’s somewhat less turbulent economy made it a less likely source of reparations. Emo Bach did note that the Israeli press, however, was frequently at odds with the official attitude, drawing attention to Austria’s intimate involvement with Nazi Germany.

The Waldheim affair in the 1980s resulted in the first crack in the facade provided by the Victim Thesis. Waldheim, who had been Secretary General of the U.N., was investigated for the post of Austrian Prime Minister in 1986 when the World Jewish Congress accused him of concealing his past. Evidence had been found revealing a closer involvement in Nazi war crimes than Waldheim had previously acknowledged. The vehemence of the anti-Semitic rhetoric in Austria revealed the illusory nature of the Victim Thesis. Not until Chancellor Franz Vranitzky’s 1993 speech to the Israeli national assembly did Austria admit complicity in the events of the Nazi era and not until 1995 was an official apology established. By this time the Jewish Community in Austria had developed into a moral authority. As Emo Bach noted, this itself was not an unproblematic development, because it made possible the instrumentalization of Jews in defense of Austria. For example, Austrian politicians distinguish between Jews who are willing to show Austrian forgiveness and those who are not.

Emo Bach closed her lecture by describing the current situation. Following the election of Jörg Haider and his Freedom Party in February 2000, Israel broke off diplomatic relations with Austria. The country has portrayed itself again as victims of the world’s misperception. Haider himself has a rather diffuse relationship to Jews, both claiming friendships with individual Jews and attempting to use those same friendships for political gain. He has also attempted to link reparations payments to Jews with those to Austrian POWs and Sudeten Germans. The Freedom Party is not specifically anti-Semitic, but hostile to foreigners and the language used by Haider and his associates shows how thoroughly they have been infected with Nazi ideology. After fifty-five years, it would seem that little has changed in the relationship between Austria and the Jews and that has not necessarily changed for the better.

HILBERG LECTURES TO NEW YORK ALUMNI

On 15 November 2000, Saul Hilberg, Professor Emeritus of Political Science presented “The Holocaust: Who Knew What When” to an appreciative audience of 175 alumni, parents and friends of UVM and the Center for Holocaust Studies. Dean Maglari (UVM ’67) introduced the speaker. This enormously successful event was sponsored by the New York Regional Alumni Board and the Center for Holocaust Studies, and was hosted by Stephen Penwell (UVM ’84) at Morgan Stanley Dean Witter.

ANTONY POLONSKY ON POLISH SOCIETY AND THE HOLOCAUST
Erika B. Brownie

On 18 October Professor Antony Polonsky, Albert Abramson Professor of Holocaust Studies at Brandeis University, delivered a lecture in John Dewey Lounge on Polish society during World War II. The author of numerous books and articles on Polish history and Polish-Jewish relations, Professor Polonsky based his lecture on his recent article “Beyond Condemnation: Apologies and Apologies: On the Complexities of Polish Behavior Towards the Jews During the Second World War” (Studies in Contemporary Jewry, vol. 15, edited by Jonathan Frankel, Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 190-224).

Ninety percent of Polish Jews lost their lives during the Holocaust, a grim statistic that prompted the central question addressed in the lecture: Why did so few Polish Jews survive and how do we characterize their reaction of the Polish nation? Due to the high number of victims of Nazism who were Polish citizens, explaining the behavior of Polish society is an important theme in Holocaust research. Professor Polonsky provided the audience with some historical background on relations between Poles and Jews, and then went on to explain the Nazi occupation regime’s effect upon relations between the two groups. He approached this issue first by describing the nature of the genocide, then by examining the extreme brutality of Nazi rule in Poland, and finally discussing the behavior of non-Jewish Poles during the Holocaust.

The chronology of genocide in occupied Poland, from the work of mobile killing units to the establishment of extermination camps, raises many moral and ethical issues in the Polish context. Before condemning Polish society for its actions or inactions, Professor Polonsky noted the role and character of the Nazi occupation regime must be examined. Polonsky also discussed the “widening gap between Poles and Jews” that was made more extreme during the first two years of Nazi occupation. Anti-Jewish propaganda was prevalent; Jews were often associated with parasites and diseases like typhus. Poles were also encouraged by the Nazis to participate in anti-Jewish violence. All of this in combination caused further deterioration of Polish-Jewish relations.

In explaining Polish behavior during the Holocaust, Professor Polonsky described what happened rather than to assign responsibility to a specific group. Because ties between Poles and Jews were broken, Jews moved further outside of the ordinary Pole’s “universe of obligation.” Although the majority of Poles did not help alleviate the tragic situation that Jews faced during World War II, Professor Polonsky reminded the audience that many did help, such as members of Zegota, a resistance organization devoted to aiding Jews in a variety of ways. The acts of Zegota and others were significant, and should not be overlooked.

The following day, our history seminar “The Holocaust in Poland” had the privilege of meeting with Professor Polonsky. We then had the opportunity to discuss the previous day’s lecture and pose questions relating to our areas of interest and current research projects. Discussion in the seminar covered a variety of topics, including the controversial film Schindler’s List, the work of historians Christopher Browning, and the debate surrounding the work of Daniel Goldhagen. Professor Polonsky is a fascinating individual, and our class was fortunate to have three hours to speak freely with such a respected scholar.

OMER BARTOV PRESENTS NINTH HILBERG LECTURE
Katherine Quinn Johnson

On Tuesday, 24 October 2000, Omer Bartov, John P. Birxke Distinguished Professor of European History at Brown University, presented the 9th Hilberg Lecture to a large and appreciative audience in Carpenter Memorial Auditorium. “The Holocaust: From Event and Experience to Memory and Representation” was more theoretical than many recent Hilberg lectures focusing on approaches to the Holocaust rather than the event itself. Bartov’s central argument may be summarized as follows: historians of the Holocaust tend to fall into the same categories as those directly involved in the catastrophe itself—that is to say, there are historians of the perpetrators, historians of the victims, and, to a lesser degree, historians of the bystanders. Many historians, especially those in Germany, have been interested in the perpetrators and have concentrated on the objective, factual records kept by the bureaucracy that implemented the Final Solution. Yet, for those studying the Holocaust from the victim’s point of view, the bureaucratic record appears secondary to the reality of the victim’s experience. Further, when one considers who is writing the history, one comes to realize that the way an event is experienced, subjectively, has bearing on the way the event is reconstructed from a historical perspective.

The varieties of approaches taken toward the study of history in the post-Holocaust era bear this out. In reaction to the demise of the Nazi era, many post-war scholars insisted on a scientific approach to history, studying long-term processes and broad trends. However, this adherence to objectivity meant that the subjective experience of life in the Third Reich, whether as a supporter of the regime or as one of its targets, was missing from (continued on the following page)
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SUMMER COURSE SCHEDULED

This year’s summer seminar, “The Holocaust and Holocaust Education,” will run from July 25-29, meeting daily from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Designed for teachers, K-12, and undergraduate and graduate level students, this seminar introduces the students of the Holocaust, a subject that also yields significant insights into human behavior and moral conduct. Students hear oral testimony by Holocaust survivors, rescuers, and liberators and attend workshops on interdisciplinary methods for teaching literature and history, information technology resources and their use, teaching and using primary source documents, and teaching and interpreting the visual arts in the classroom. Two evening lectures, open to the public, will be held in conjunction with the course; the speakers, dates, and time will be announced closer to the event. Because of the intensive nature of this course, a limited number of applicants are available to subsidize the cost of housing for participating students living outside Chishtuden County. For more information about the course or the stipend, please contact the Division of Continuing Education, http://kearn.edu or phone (1-800) 659-2299.

BOOK REVIEWS


SYLVANIO ARIETI (1914-1983) was born in Pisa, where he spent his youth and served as a member of the city’s small and close-knit Jewish community, but vital Jewish community. He studied psychiatry at the venerable University of Pisa and, shortly after graduating with a doctorate in medicine from New York in 1939. He met his wife, the very pinnacle of his discipline, editing The American Handbook of Psychiatry and receiving the National Book Award for Science for his interpretation of Schizophrenia.

Avoiding direct experience of the Holocaust by means of emigration, he nonetheless kept in close touch with the events in his home town from 1939-45, especially the fate of the leader (the Parnass) of the Pisan Jewish community. The Parnas, together with six other Jews who were seeking protection from the occupying Germans and five Christians, was brutally murdered by the Germans in August 1944, a month before liberation. After the war Arieti returned to Pisa numerous times to interview witnesses and research the situation leading up to the murders. His “Scene from the Holocaust” as the book’s subtitle runs, is, therefore, a carefully researched and documented work that describes everything as accurately as possible, even though the writer was not himself present as the events were taking place.

The “scene”—Arieti is suggesting a dramatic element in his story—is pervaded by tension and a sense of forbidding throughout. For all the book’s brevity, it proceeds at an unusually slow pace, leaving the reader incapable of rushing to the climax. Forced to moderate one’s speed of reading, one has ample time to ponder a number of underlying questions such as the essence of fear and charisms. One other such question centers on the Parnas’s phobia, his chronic fear of animals. This phobia has an obvious symbolic meaning, of course. The Germans are being like animals. But there are much deeper ramifications to this interpretation, as the psychiatrist with a special interest in schizophrenia and phobias is superbly equipped to show us. In this, the whole book proceeds similarly: the happiness are, on the surface at least, straightforward, but there is a constant expectation that the author is deriving much deeper. In the concluding chapter, a kind of epilogue after the events, indeed the end of the story, Arieti spells out his thesis in a most convincing manner. The book is not so much a psychological study as a compelling narrative with psychological overtones. It has a clearly identifiable Italian setting, the historical elements are demonstrably factual, yet it is also a book dealing with the nuances of the human spirit and weaknesses. It is a very fine book indeed.

“The Parnass” was first published in 1979 and has now been re-issued, attractively, by Paul Dry Books. When first came out it was much praised by the critics, including Primo Levi, who found it “at once an accurate and documented historical study, and the interpretation made by one of today’s greatest psycholo-


Wolfgang Mieder, in two earlier seminal articles, researched the National Socialists’s propagandistic use and misuse of sayings and proverbial expressions. With his new book, in German, titled In figure veritatem, he has continued his work by focusing on Viktor Klemperer, the new world-renowned diarist, who was targeted as a Jew during the Nazi era. (In English book: "In langue veritatem: Sprichtüretliche Rhetorik in Viktor Klemperers Diaries 1933-1945").

The title of this attractive little book and white volume, with a small cover portrait of Klemperer, is itself a play on the ancient Latin phrase in vento veritatem, Klempner’s clever twist of that phrase to In langue veritatem because his general leitmotif for the language of the Third Reich. Now known as Nazi-deutch, this was a vernacular that achieved multiple contradictory objectives: it signified and revealed, while also concealing the regime’s intentions and actions. It contained the totalitarian elements that are associated with the Third Reich: terms of persuation, exclusion, persecution, and annihilation. Klemperer called it langue terribelli imperii, and in his diaries established the connection between this language and the people, be they National Socialist manipulators and mouthpieces of ideological propaganda, or those who, like him, bore the brunt of Nazi speech acts and subsequent deaths. Klemperer’s stories bear mute testimony pointing to the perpetrators who disguised human rights violations with linguistic distortions. They also lay bare the horror suffered by the victims of deception and betrayal.

In order to come closer to the truth of the Jews’ frightful life under the Nazis, Klemperer resorted to the use of sayings or colloquialisms. Mieder has examined Klemperer’s diaries as well as his Nazibuch eines Philologen (Buch (Newspaper of a Philologist)) to assess the surprising frequency of Klemperer’s usage of proverbial speech. Mieder is drawn to highlight the diaries’ awareness of the power of language, as well as its limitations. By closely studying the text, he illuminates effectively how the German language both lost conventional meaning and became potent and deadly. Mieder demonstrates how the negative function of language as figurative speech returned to a point of literalness where oral threats could harm people or result in their murder. Where conventional language might say facetiously a ‘false step could
In the more than fifty years that have passed since the end of World War II, numerous debates have developed over the many controversies concerning the Nazi "Final Solution." Michael J. Neufeld and Michael Berenbaum in their recent publication, *The Bombing of Auschwitz*, represents the first attempt to bring historians and commentators to the controversy over the issue of the Allies' failure to aid the Jews of Europe during World War II by compiling articles from the most prominent historians involved in the controversy.

The book is based on a symposium held on 30 April 1993, at the Smithsonian Institution, and Neufeld and Berenbaum have assembled an impressive sampling of the central arguments involved in the debate over Allied culpability. Reputable scholars, including Martin Gilbert, Henry Feingold, Walter Laqueur, and Gerhard Weinberg (to name just a few), provide an eclectic and interesting range of perspectives on Allied culpability. To date, the controversy has remained disorganized and contentious, with historians presenting conflicting facts and analysis and openly contentious views. It is apparent that one of the unspoken goals of Neufeld and Berenbaum's work is to provide a forum to resolve some of these conflicts and provide a path for future synthesis.

David Wyman was able to illustrate in the 1970s, it is impossible to claim that Auschwitz-Birkenau could not have been bombed. The controversy that has ensued over the past twenty years has focused on how many lives, if any, could have been saved by such an act. The Allied governments, as they have to the situation, were needed to do so. The Bombing of Auschwitz provides the reader with a clear understanding of the strengths and weaknesses involved in both the controversy over Allied culpability and the counter-factual history in which the debate is involved. What is clearly evident from the collection assembled by Neufeld and Berenbaum is that two distinct groups have developed in recent years. The first, led by Wyman, is focused on condemning the Allies for failing to aid the Jews in the face of a clear moral imperative (regardless of any likelihood of success). Although Wyman himself chose not to be included in this collection, his work is well-covered by the other participants and by Michael Neufeld's detailed and thorough accounting of Wyman's work. Historians opposed to the moralistic condemnation of Allied inaction cite the lack of technical ability, the unlikelihood of success, and the historical context to cast considerable doubt on Wyman's thesis. Over the past twenty years these two camps have become even more entrenched in defense of their views. However, Neufeld and Berenbaum point out that in recent years several historians, including Gerhard Weinberg, have come to the conclusion that, while it is likely that little, if anything, could have been done to save the Jews, an air raid would have been a symbol of the Allies' condemnation of the Nazi's "Final Solution."

*The Bombing of Auschwitz* represents an attempt to bring both camps toward this new middle ground of understanding the Allies' inability to accomplish much in the way of aiding the Jews, while also remaining critical of Allied inaction.

What the authors fail to address is the significance of the period of Allied inaction. It is easy for contemporary historians to look back fifty years and use the emotional fervor of what is often viewed as history's most horrific event to imply that the Allies were complicit or "guilty." What role, if any, did the democratic nature of the United States and Great Britain play in the politics of such an attack? Did the political implications involved in such an attack hold any significance for the stability of the Allied alliance? Lastly, what about the multi-national composition of Auschwitz? Historians of the controversy speak only to the Jewish population; however, it must be remembered that any attack on Auschwitz would have involved Soviet POWs, British airmen, Polish prisoners, and German citizens. To name just a few. The answers to such questions are unclear and will remain so because of the nature of "history." As unsettling as these questions seem in the face of what many historians perceive as a clear "moral imperative" they see questions that must be asked in an attempt to keep historians honest. The absence of such questions (and others) rests not entirely on Neufeld and Berenbaum, but rather, on the historians who will continue with this controversy in the coming years. All the same, some historians might find the absence of such discussion from Neufeld and Berenbaum's work a little frustrating, if not shortchanged.

Neufeld and Berenbaum have done historians a service in bringing together this collection of essays. This work not only provides a standard for future progress in the research and publication of work on the surrounding controversies, but it provides amateur historians with an in-depth and well-assembled overview of the strengths and weaknesses of both sides of the debate. Counter-factual histories such as the controversy over the failure of the Allies to bomb Auschwitz pose many significant problems not only to the writing of objective histories, but also to the justifiable conclusions from which Neufeld and Berenbaum succeed in not only presenting prominent works involved in the controversy, but also in providing an objective analytical overview of the issues involved in the debate. In providing an assembled volume of work on the Failure of the Allies to bomb Auschwitz, Neufeld and Berenbaum have taken the first step toward finding some form of historical middle ground. As with many historical debates, finding an acceptable middle ground is an arduous and time-consuming process of documentation, debate, and revision. In the end, most readers will find *The Bombing of Auschwitz* an informative and well-assembled work on one of the more contentious debates surrounding the Holocaust. However, scholars looking for a significant contribution to the field will likely find the work from Berenbaum and Neufeldander to challenge the scholarship and address the significant shortcomings of the debate.

Edward O'Connor
In the introduction to this stimulating, wide-ranging, well-written, and thoroughly researched investigation of German-Jewish literary relations from Gethsekind: Snapchat's literature (the work of great men), written in 1749) to the 1939 publication of Freud's Moses and Monotheism, Ritchie Robertson outlines his method of approach to this period. As late as March of 1939, he declared, the German, Marinus Buber still spoke of a German-Jewish "synthesis." Zionism or socialism was not seen as an alternative to this ideal, whose perceived successes had turned out to be delusions. More recently, scholars like David Cowen, Paul Lawrence Rose, and Daniel J. Goldhagen have seen in German history a mounting frenzy of exclusivism and anti-Semitism whose inevitable conclusion was the attempted destruction of European Jews. Not only does Robertson disagree with this latter argument on the grounds of historical evidence: he also maintains such an interpretation of German history has the potential to turn German and Austrian Jews into tragic figures blind to their impending doom — in effect blaming them because they lacked the knowledge edge we possess in hindsight. His goal therefore becomes the following: "to go back to the period when the Holocaust was still unimaginable and understand the age of assimilation as contemporaries did" (p. 4).

To be sure, for all the wealth of historical information he provides on the particulars of Jewish life in German-speaking Europe from the seventeenth through the twentieth centuries, Robertson is not striving for a psychological portrait of "how it really was." Arguing that terms like "German" and "Jewish" are cultural constructs whose forms and content shift over time, he turns to narrative-expository texts as well as novels, short stories, poetry, plays, and autobiographies — for an analysis of the role it played in shaping such texts. Hence, he organizes the five main sections of his study more thematically than chronologically, with a stress on how individual authors construct an idea of German-Jewish interaction based on one of the following five paradigms: Enlightenment: liberalism; anti-Semitism; assimilation, and dissimilation. Nor does Robertson stay away from an evaluation of the consequences of these various attitudes and approaches to the question of Jewish Emancipation. This book is indeed not only to inform its reader, but also to challenge comfortable assumptions. On both levels, it succeeds brilliantly.

With respect to the German Enlightenment, for example, Robertson argues that "the secularization and rationality" in the long run disassociated the discourse of tradition- al Judaism without affording Jews more than qualified acceptance in German society" (p. 32). In Lenz's play Die Juden (Jews in Venice) and Nana der Weiss (Nana the Wise, 1779) cultural diversity is not so much championed as it is bypassed, in that Jews are portrayed as figures of exceptional virtue, but also as devoid of characteristics or beliefs that would distinguish them from their Gentile counterparts. In similar fashion, the Prussian civil servant Christian Wilhelm von Dohn argued in 1781 for gradual Jewish emancipation from civil society, but only to the extent that Jews proved themselves worthy of becoming productive citizens through a process of acculturation. Such a viewpoint, Robertson observes, not only made emancipation contingent on "good behavior," but also continued to draw attention to Jews and their supposedly distinctive qualities long after full civil emancipation in Austria and German territories had taken place in 1867 and 1871. Finally, Moses Mendelssohn — the greatest representative of the Jewish Enlightenment, at whose request Dohn wrote his tract — emphasized Judaism as a necessary religion, with consequent strictures on its rational morality. In so doing, Mendelssohn left unanswered the question as to why Jews, if they were not chosen people, should not be part of a system of belief, such as Christian deism or Kantian idealism, particularly if there were societal advantages to be gained in remaining in their religious heritage. Indeed, of Mendelssohn's eight children, four of them converted to Protestantism or Catholicism, as did many other members of the cultural Jewish middle class in the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

During that time, many of those who retained their cultural identities as Jews also identified themselves with liberalism, the political movement that had grown out of Enlightenment ideals. Robertson gives Heinrich Heine, Arthur Schopenhauer, Stefan Zweig, and Sigmund Freud as the most prominent literary representatives not only of the creed of Liberalism, but also of its aporia. Enlightenment failure in the progress of reason, for example, suffered severe blows when modern anti-Semitism emerged as a movement that claimed science in support of its depictions of Jews as a parasitic race depleting the vitality of the German body politic.

In his chapter on anti-Semitism, Robertson points out its uncanny ability to shape cultural images of Jews for the next hundred years, advances a linguistic variant, in that it claims that Jews speak European languages as if foreigners: cut off from the vital energies of the "Volk," they can only mimic the creative impulses of others. While putting such things onto the stage in the character of Mme. in Act 2 of Siegfried, whose "hidden language" of undercover Jews' secret language learns to deprecate — with fatal consequences for Mme. (p. 162) Robertson points out the frustrating character of this shaping-shifting anti-Semitism for assimilationist Jews. "While the Enlightenment had contributed to the assimilation of Jews, its opponent, modern assimilationists, now pronounced their willingness to adopt Western values," he writes (p. 162). While many Germans and Austrian Jews, along with their philo-Semite supporters, formed groups such as the Verband zur Ehre des Antisemitismus (Society for Defense against Anti-Semitism, 1893), under such circumstances it was not surprising that others internalized anti-Semitic images of Jews in the way described by the writer Theodor Lessing in his book Der judische Schwiegervater (The Jewish Father-In-Law, 1793). Others responded by attempting to become "more German than the Germans," Robertson calls this phenomenon the "hyperassimilation," giving as real-life examples Jewish Wagnerians such as the conductor of the Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra and the writer for the Hitler for incorporation into the new social order. Lest we too quickly shake our heads incredulously at such extremes, Robertson recommends the reading of Friedrich Wolf's exile drama Professor Immanuel (1934), whose title figure exemplifies the mistreatment and disillusionment of parochial German Jews who identified with their country, only to find themselves vilified by Nazis and even defended by the majority of their neighbors and erstwhile co-workers — a scenario that corresponds all too closely to Victor Klemperer's diary entries between 1933 and 1945.

The final section of Robertson's study addresses the Jewish "disillusionment" from German culture in the decades immediately before and after World War I: the "Jewish Renaissance" initiated by figures such as Buber and Scholem; the growing interest in forms of Jewish life and religion in Eastern Europe, including the depiction of Galician life in novels by Karl Erich Franzos and Joseph Roth; and poetry and writers by poets such as Richard Bern-Hoffmann and Eliezer Katsnelson-Schiller that drew upon the image of the Jew as Oriental; Theodor Herzl's literary and imaginative talents employed in giving shape to his vision of Zionism; and Arnold Zweig's advocacy of, and growing disillusionment with, Zionism in his novel Der Streit um den Serbenkonkordat (The Dispute over the Serb-Greek Concordat, 1927) and De Freund keilt beim De Freund geht home (The Friend goes home, 1932). That this latter novel features as an account of the 1929 violence between Arabs and Jews because of disputes over access to the Wailing Wall (p. 498) suggests that the issue of dissent not only between Arabs and Jews, but within the Jewish community — the title figure is an ultra-orthodox Dutch Jew who is murdered by a young Zionist from Poland — has more than mere historical significance.

Indeed, Robertson provides such a wealth of vignettes and concise treatments of literary figures and their works that this book review could turn into a listing of names and titles and still not exhaust its riches; readers interested in specific authors and their literary works will find Robertson's index (pp. 521-534) most helpful. His book is extensively researched, with over 400 notes and a "Select Bibliography" (pp. 505-526) of primary and secondary sources that receive mention more than once. Without a doubt, The "Jewish Question" in German Literature, 1745-1939 deserves to become a standard work for historians, literary scholars, and the interested general public.
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