Earlier this year, during a medical teaching mission to Minsk as part of Jewish Health Care International, I had the opportunity to visit Chervin, the shtetl where my father was born, and to reunite with my remaining family there and in Minsk, the capital of Belarus. One of my cousins, a retired engineer, had traced our family ancestry seven generations, back to 1720. It is of interest that several boys were stated to have died as infants, but later appeared alive as adults; this was a ploy used frequently by Jews to avoid conscription of their male children into the Czar’s army. Our family name, Kabakov, means “roadside inn” in Russian, but actually derives from the Hebrew “kadosh ben adoshin” (martyr son of martyrs).

Chervin, a small town of 4,000 inhabitants located sixty kilometers east of Minsk, was originally settled in the twelfth century; Jews began arriving there in the mid-eighteenth century. In the 1880s, my grandfather, a tailor, and his brother, a carpenter, came from Minsk to Chervin, or Igumen, as it was known then. By the early 1900s more than two-thirds of the shtetl’s population were Jews; there were synagogues and a Jewish club with a drama circle, and Yiddish was the language of the marketplace.

The great Yiddish poet and playwright H. Leivick (né Leivick Halpern) was born in Chervin in 1888. He went to cheder with my father and his cousins. Leivick was arrested in 1906 for illegal revolutionary activity and was exiled to Siberia.

My father was conscripted into the Czar’s army in 1914. He was captured during World War I, spent two years in a German prison camp, escaped, and returned to Chervin. There he joined the Red Army and fought for Trotsky for four years before deserting and emigrating to the United States in 1920. He told me that the reason he left was that instead of one Czar there were 100 commissars. My grandparents remained in Chervin until 1929, when their house was taken over by the Communists; then they, too, emigrated to the United States.

On 2 July 1941, the German army captured Chervin and confined the some 2,000 Jews in a ghetto consisting of wooden houses without running water, heat, or indoor toilets. The Jews of Chervin, together with others from surrounding areas, remained in those houses, which still stand today, until 2 February 1942, when they were all marched three kilometers to a clearing in the forest, were made to dig their own mass graves, and were machine-gunned to death. My great-uncle Moshe, his two daughters Zina and Lisa, and Lisa’s five-year-old daughter Clara were among those murdered.

The monument erected by the Soviets at that site reads: “Here are buried the remains of over 2,000 Soviet citizens, shot by the German Fascist barbarians on 2 February 1942.” One month later, on 2 March 1942, the Germans marched 5,000 Jews from the Minsk ghetto, including all the children from the Jewish Orphanage, to a large gravel pit near a hillside and machine-gunned them to death. A memorial was erected at the site by the Jewish community of Minsk, and was inscribed in both Russian and Yiddish (the only memorial in the Soviet Union to have such a bilingual inscription) with the words: “A memorial for all time for 4,000 holy martyrs (kedoshim) who were killed at the hands of the bloodthirsty enemies of the human race, the Fascist murderers and hangmen.” Stalin attempted to have the Yiddish inscription removed, but he was opposed by a group of Jewish war heroes and the memorial remains as originally inscribed to this day.

My uncle, David Segalovich, was among some 100 Jews hanged by the Nazis. His wife, my aunt Olga, and their two young children, ages four and nine, were placed in the Minsk ghetto. She managed to survive by working as a slave laborer in a German radio factory.

In late June 1943, as the Russian army was advancing on Minsk from the east, all the remaining Jews in the Minsk ghetto
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Stanley Burns was with the troops that liberated Dachau. He wrote these letters home to his family in Proctor, Vermont. Burns was a member of the permanent camp staff after its liberation on 29 April 1945. The letters are reproduced here as written.

14 May, 1945

Dear Mom and Dad,

I am going to try to dash a quick one off here, sort of on the sly.

I had three swell letters from you today, and let me tell you, they were some morale builder. My morale could stand a little building right now. You have probably been wondering what the score is with my telling you that even though the war is over, there is still plenty of work for this outfit. I can clear you up on that right now, I guess. When the war ended we moved back to the Dachau concentration camp, just outside of Munich. Being in the most notorious of all Germany’s concentration camps should in itself explain the low ebb feeling I have probably been putting into my letters of late. I won’t try to describe things to you, for such things are sickening to think about. All I will say is that you can believe anything you read about these places, for with my own eyes, and with my own nose, witnessed everything that correspondents write about. I believe I have seen many things that aren’t fit to write about. For days I was under an emotional shock after coming to this place. Any feeling I ever had for the German people as human beings has vanished. I actually cannot convince myself that human beings could have done such things.

You can probably understand now why I was wondering what will be done with the outfit now that V-E day has come and gone. Ordinarily I would say that we would be shipping out for the Pacific war in a month or so, but we have a big job cut out for us here, caring for all these ex-German prisoners, the most pitiful cases you can imagine. There is no surgical work being done, so I am in charge of a ward at night. It is not as interesting as surgery, but it has its good points, and at least it isn’t that old rush, rush, rush that we have had for almost seven months in the field.

We have rather ritzy sleeping and eating quarters. We took over the SS officers’ area and boy, did they ever live like kings. Quite a difference between the life of an SS trooper and the common Wehrmacht, I can see.

There are beaucoup souvenirs to be had around here and I have picked up some. Mostly small things like Nazi arm bands, S.S. pins and so forth. They will probably all seem like so much junk right now, but a few years from now I will have something to show I was over here. One thing I got was a common, porcelain beer mug from a Munich Beer hall. Nothing fancy, but I have been wondering if I shouldn’t send it to old Westy!

Next time you write, let me know how many war bonds and how much cash you have received from the War Dept. in my name. A lot of money has been taken from my pay this past year and from what [you] tell me, you have hardly received any of it. While in the states I bought two twenty-five dollar bonds, and since I have been across, six fifty dollar bonds. Besides that I have sent

The monument in Chervin commemorating the massacre of 2 February 1942. Photo Courtesy of Bernard Kabakow.
home at least one hundred fifty in cash. Let me know what you have received and if it doesn’t tally within reason, I’ll do a little inquiry.

Love,

Stan

Dachau, Germany

16 May, 1945

Dear Mom and Dad,

I got myself a shower and haircut this afternoon, so I feel like a new man right now. The water in the shower was about as cold as the Otter Creek in March, but it served the purpose alright. Rather hard to stay under it for more than two seconds without beginning to look a little cyanotic though.

Took a little jaunt the other day with one of the drivers of this outfit. I can now say that I have been in Austria. I visited the town of Innsbruck, where Hitler and Mussolini met back in the old days and made the earth tremble with their decisions. I also saw Brenner Pass, was right up in it. In my mind there is no country as beautiful in Europe as there is right around that section. The mountains, the Alps, still had plenty of snow fields left on them. It practically made me drool to see those snow covered peaks. So near; and yet so far.

It is amazing to watch these patients respond to good medical and humane treatment. When we first received them, they were nothing more than animals. They not only looked like animals, but they acted like animals. They could think only of themselves. This ward was a madhouse with clamors for food, blankets, pillows, water and even crazy things like lemonade, for a great many were crazy with fever. After a couple of days the place became typically Army, all orderly and neat. It may not seem like much to read about it, but to see it happen was just like watching a human being grow from infancy to manhood in three days. They got over their animal like selfishness and couldn’t do enough to make things easier for us and the really sick patients. I really think that our decent humane treatment had almost as much to do with their recovery as did our medical treatment.

When our ambulances went to the compound the first time to get patients, the men had to literally drag the patients into the ambulance, for they thought they were going to the crematorium in the extermination camp. Now that the news of the food and treatment has gotten around, our ambulance drivers have to guard their vehicles when they go to the compound hospital, because so many try to stow away.

I can imagine that you are wondering what kind of diseases I am being subjected to while working here at the concentration camp. Well, there is every type disease imaginable, typhus seems to have reign though. One thing I want to make plain to you is that there is no need to worry about my catching anything. Leave it to the army to be cautious and thorough. I have had so many shots in the arm for this and a million other things that I doubt if there is anything left on earth I could catch now, unless it was a cold. All for now.

Love,

Stan

28 May, 1945

Dear Mom and Dad,

I just got through reading an old time magazine telling about the atrocities uncovered at various German concentration camps. After what I have seen, I can honestly say that what the public is seeing and hearing is tame, as compared to the real thing. This is how bad things really are.

Well by this time you have had the thrill of seeing Betty graduate Phi Beta Kappa, and I’ll bet it was a thrill too. Now it is two down and one to go. I wonder when and how I will ever graduate.

Something just happened that will give you a good laugh. I am sitting in our day room, a good twenty feet from a corner where three fellows have been laboring over a bung in a 20 gal. keg of famous Munich beer they had just rolled down the hall. Evidently the beer got well shaken up, for when the bung popped, the beer squirted a good 18 ft and only 2 feet short of the letter. Some stuff they drink over here!

Love,

Stan

31 May 1945

Dachau, Germany

Dear Mom and Dad,

I had a day off today and took a ride on the mail truck to Augsburg. It must have been a beautiful town in its day, but is very much a rubble at present.

The German doctors, nurses, and technicians are gradually relieving us of our duties on the hospital ward. Rumors are out that we will be moving out before the end of the week, most probably into tents. This move will be what is called a “staging area,” usually preceding a P.O.E. [Point of Embarkation]. If my mail begins to come thru again with a censors signature and stamp on it, then you can give up hope of my being home for a year or two; for I’ll be on my way to C.B.I. [China, Burma, India]. If my mail isn’t censored within the next month or so, either I am headed for the States, or else things haven’t been decided yet.

It really riles me to work with these German doctors. I have been acting as a sort of go-between for an American major and German captain. Even with my little bit of German I have had to tell the Kraut off for being so insolent. I can’t help thinking that these Jerries aren’t paying enough.

Stan

Bad Mergentheim

Germany

June 6, 1945

Dear Grandma,

Your V-mail letter which arrived a few days ago reminded me that it has been quite some time since I have written you. Probably Mother has told you that even though this war is over I have been working long hours helping to clean up the ill famed Dachau Concentration Camp. Words cannot describe the misery and outrageous things that went on there. Rather than to try to
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In the spring semester of 2003, Bernard and Gina Gotfryd once again visited the campus to speak to our students. During one of the classes they attended, a student, Jennifer Bell, made this sketch of Gina.
CHAIM ENGEL 1916-2003

Michael Schaal

I first knew Chaim Engel as a friend of my parents. The two families were drawn to each other after overhearing each other’s accents on the shore of a lake in Connecticut, one Sunday afternoon late in 1957. It was only a few weeks after the Engels had come to the United States. In the years that followed, as the two families met, I intuitively knew that Chaim was different from many other family friends. It eventually registered for me that he and Selma had both been in concentration camps. Years later I heard the story of Sobibor, read the book and saw the movie. The Sobibor uprising, one of the biggest escapes from a Nazi camp, and the August 1943 escape at Treblinka, another death camp in Poland, are often cited to contradict claims that Jewish prisoners died without resistance.

In its obituary for Chaim Engel, The New York Times summarized part of the story:

During World War II, Mr. Engel was a prisoner at Sobibor, a secret death camp in eastern Poland, where 250,000 people, chiefly Jews, were murdered. On Oct. 14, 1943, 300 prisoners escaped in an uprising that involved killing guards and camp officers. Only 50 of those who escaped survived until the end of the war, but all had faced near certain death as prisoners.

At the last minute, Mr. Engel volunteered to fill in for a conspirator who could not go through with his assignment of killing an SS sergeant. In Richard Raske’s Escape From Sobibor (Houghton Mifflin, 1982), Chaim Engel recalled in an interview that as he stabbed the sergeant, he screamed the names of family members killed by Nazis.

After escaping Sobibor, Chaim and Selma Engel spent ten to twelve days and nights wandering in the woods. They were lucky to find a Polish farmer and his wife who hid them from the Germans until July of 1944, when the Russian army swept through that part of Poland. They stayed in contact with this couple throughout their lives.

The Engels stayed in Poland for one more year, encountering anti-Semitism and fearing for their lives. In the Parczew Forest, Selma gave birth to a son. Soon afterward the family traveled to Odessa. From there they boarded a ship to Holland. Someone gave them milk for the baby. It was contaminated and a few hours later the baby died. They buried him at sea.

Selma and Chaim lived in Holland until 1951. While there they had a daughter and a son. They emigrated to Israel and in 1957 came to the United States. They supported themselves by working in whatever way they could. Selma took in ironing. Chaim had a bread route. They bought a card store and eventually a jewelry store. They retired in 1985 in Branford, Connecticut. Chaim and Selma had four grandchildren.

The Chaim Engel whom I knew in the late 1950s and 1960s was a quiet and calm man who radiated a sense of decency in the way he spoke and acted. At the time he owned and operated a bread route. He was confident without being arrogant, patient and loving toward his family, and unfazed, even delighted by the intensity of his wife, Selma. She said of him in Escape from Sobibor, “He was the only man who took his girlfriend along.” He enjoyed and adored his daughter Liddy and son Freddy.

Once, when I was about fourteen he made a special trip to pick me up and give me a ride to his daughter’s birthday party. We rode together for about a half hour. Chaim began to allude to his experiences in the concentration camp, seemed to hesitate, and then changed the subject. I could tell, though, that those times were never far from his consciousness.

For most of my adult life, with a few exceptions in my early twenties, I lost touch with the Engel family. Then, in Burlington, Vermont, I became involved with a group of second and third generation survivors who organized multi-generational gatherings for the wider community of Holocaust survivor families. The five Gatherings and two panel discussions that were held between 1995 and 1999 were sponsored and fully supported by the Center for Holocaust Studies at the University of Vermont.

The second of the panel discussions grappled with the legacy of the Holocaust. From the terrible things that were done to human beings, especially Jews, by the Nazi perpetrators, what might be learned by and passed on to future generations? If there is a Legacy of the Holocaust what might it be? The steering committee concluded that no one was more qualified to speak to the issue than survivors themselves. Chaim Engel was one of the six exceptional individuals invited to participate and to speak on the question: How would you want your experiences remembered by future generations? The other panelists included Liselotte Ivry, Gina Gottfried, Thaddeus Stabholz, Jack Pomerantz, and Selma Wijnberg Engel. I was privileged to moderate the discussion.

Our survivor guests arrived the day before the panel and had the opportunity to get to know one another. Both then and during the panel discussion, Chaim was much the way I had remembered him. He refused to be egocentric or dramatize his role in the dramatic events of his life. He was thoughtful and clear and did his best to respond to the questions that people posed to him. He was deferential and kind as he alluded to the story that he had told on so many other occasions. In reviewing the videotape of the Legacy panel, I was struck by Chaim’s realism. “The survivors,” he said, “have done their part. We go to the schools and speak to the young. We tell our stories and sit for hours while we are videotaped for the historical archives. Now it will up to the young people to remember the stories and tell them. It will be up to others to learn the lessons, because soon all of the survivors will be dead.”

Both Jack Pomerantz and Chaim are gone now. Both died on the Fourth of July, although in different years. Perhaps it is a coincidence that both died on such an important day in the history of their adopted country. Perhaps not.

In my view, one real legacy of the Holocaust and the lives of Chaim Engel, Jack Pomerantz, and the other individuals who graced us with their presence on that panel nearly five years ago, was not only in what happened to them during the Holocaust, but in the lives that they lived after those terrible years ended. It is a story of resiliency. I have known survivors who have been imprisoned and oppressed by their own bitterness. Their rage has been so consuming that it has contaminated their lives and wreaked havoc with family members. Who can blame them after what they have been through? I cannot say that had I seen what they saw, lost what they lost, experienced what each of them experienced, that I would not have been affected in the same way.

(Continued on page 9)
On the morning of Monday 23 June class began like any other, with the passing out and discussion of the syllabus. I marveled at how much was going to be crammed into our week—eight eyewitness testimonies from hidden children, survivors of death camps, rescuers, and those who were displaced as a result of the Holocaust, nine scholarly presentations, one musical performance. In addition, two keynote speakers would participate in the Center for Holocaust Studies summer lecture series.

To kick off the week, our “host,” Robert Bernheim, a Holocaust historian and former teacher at CVU, began by speaking about the unique and universal aspects of the Holocaust in relation to other acts of genocide. The presentation was a wonderful model for teachers, demonstrating a clearly outlined and creative point of entry into teaching about the Holocaust.

Following Robert Bernheim’s introduction, Frank Nicosia, professor at St. Michael’s College, and, like Bernheim, a board member for the Center for Holocaust Studies gave a clear and succinct overview of the history of European anti-Semitism stretching from the sixteenth century through the Holocaust, and also spoke about the rise of the Nazis to power. His talk summarized two chapters he had written for The Holocaust: Introductory Essays, edited by David Scrase and Wolfgang Mieder—the primary text for the course.

Following Professor Nicosia’s historical perspective Professor Jonathan Huener, a member of the history department at UVM, shared his insight into the Nazi invasion of Poland and the establishment of the ghettos. After examining the Program of the National Socialist German Workers’ Party, as it was recorded on 24 February 1920, and looking at Hitler’s 13 February 1945 reflections on his policies toward the Jews, we watched The Story of Chaim Rumkowski and the Jews of Lodz. Together these three items illustrated the amazing attention the Nazis paid to detail; they also illuminated the chaos and impulsiveness that accompanied the Holocaust. It was an enlightening presentation.

At the close of class on Monday afternoon any apprehension about sitting in class for eight hours a day, five days in a row, had subsided. I was overjoyed to have the opportunity to embark on this week-long journey through the Holocaust.

Tuesday was a day of personal testimonies by Gabe Hartstein, Simon Barenbaum, and Aranka Siegal. Hartstein, currently a resident of Burlington, Vermont, was seven years old and living in Budapest, Hungary when the Holocaust started for him. He spoke of “that Sunday morning,” when the Germans began marching in the streets of Hungary and recalled being impressed—so much so that he and his friends started playing German soldiers. It wasn’t long before he learned of his Jewish identity and learned firsthand the ramifications that accompanied such an identity. His story, intertwined with that of Raoul Wallenberg, the Swedish diplomat who saved over 100,000 Jews from certain extermination by the Nazis, made for an effective and valuable presentation.

After Hartstein spoke, Simon Barenbaum of East Middlebury, Vermont shared with us his story about the Holocaust and its impact on him, a young boy in France. He was fourteen years old when the Germans entered Paris in 1940. His older brother was deported to a concentration camp and soon thereafter Simon was sent into hiding to avoid the same fate. He grew homesick after spending only two months in Normandy, and at the age of fifteen decided to return to Paris to be with his parents. Upon his return, his father was sent to Drancy; Simon and his mother soon followed. When the kindness and ingenuity of a fur worker eventually freed them from Drancy, Simon joined the French Underground, and was one of the first to greet American paratroopers on the shores of France. Today a monument stands in France commemorating the Underground—and therefore Simon—for his efforts and accomplishments in leading the Americans to the German strongholds. His story is an amazing one of strength, courage and perseverance. It is not shared without heartache, though. Simon’s brother perished at Auschwitz.

Following Simon’s story, Aranka Siegal offered the second Hungarian perspective of the day, as she shared with us the heart-wrenching story of the years she spent in concentration camps. She recalled beginning to hear about the Holocaust at age nine, although she wasn’t taken to the ghetto until April of 1944, at age thirteen. She “celebrated” her fourteenth birthday in Auschwitz and was liberated from Bergen-Belsen by the British Army at age fifteen, weighing a measly sixty pounds, and after having spent time in three different concentration camps. She shared with us her memories from the morning she did not pass inspection and was put in a group with the other “discards” from the camp, while her sister, who seemed to be holding up better than she, was selected for work detail. The girls were destined to be split up until a friend of their mother pulled a girl out of the work detail line to reunite her with her mother, and pushed Aranka into the line, saving her life. Following liberation Aranka did not return to Hungary. After living with a family in Sweden for three and a half years, she emigrated to the United States. Her story is a powerful one, written about in her two books, Upon the Head of the Goat and Grace in the Wilderness.

On Wednesday the day began with a presentation by David Scrase, the Director of the Center for Holocaust Studies and a professor of German at UVM. He shared with us a variety of literary resources people can explore for their own edification or for use in the classroom. He provided a written synopsis of each resource he mentioned, as well as the appropriate audience for each. His succinct and easy-to-follow presentation was an invaluable part of the course.

Scrase’s presentation was followed by yet another personal account, that of Yehudi Lindeman, a hidden child in Holland during the Holocaust. In the fall of 1942, Yehudi’s mother sent him away, at the age of four, to live with strangers. Yehudi, a child survivor of the Holocaust, denied that he had anything to do with the Holocaust until the mid-1980s. In his own mind he was just a kid and it was the adults who were the survivors. He remembers that after the war Jews didn’t share their stories and didn’t acknowledge a common bond. They were terribly humiliated—a bit ashamed, initially, to be Jewish. For Yehudi, the wounds were painful and present until he was fourteen or fifteen, but by twenty he was comfortable in his own skin. His story lent itself to a discussion of people’s motivations to take Jewish people into hiding and was a beautiful introduction into Marion Pritchard’s story.

Pritchard, a resident of Vershire, Vermont, was a rescuer during the Holocaust, working with the underground in the Netherlands to save the lives of Jewish people. One day, while sitting on
a park bench, she witnessed several German soldiers rounding up Jewish kids and throwing them into the back of truck. When two Dutch women tried to intervene they, too, were thrown into the back of the truck. Pritchard watched from a short distance away, but did nothing to help. She was ashamed of her inaction and this shame spawned her desire to get involved with the underground and actively save Jews. She doesn’t think of herself as a hero, or as being particularly brave, but after listening to her story one cannot help but be overcome by respect and admiration for her. She is a truly remarkable woman.

Another personal testimony shared on Wednesday was that of Susi Learmonth, a resident of Corinth, Vermont. Learmonth was born in Vienna, Austria in 1926. On 12 March 1938 German troops entered Austria and annexed the country; Susi’s life changed drastically. The park she visited regularly was restricted; the benches in the park were reserved for Aryans. Jews were no longer allowed to attend public school. Her father, a Jewish doctor, could no longer see Aryan patients. On 27 September Learmonth and her family left Austria on a train bound for Italy, en route to the United States. They arrived in the United States on 10 November 1938—Kristallnacht. Susi and her family were fortunate to have escaped such terror, but were unsure what life as refugees would hold for them. The one thing they were sure of was their desire to throw lifelines across the Atlantic, securing affidavit sponsors for Jews who still remained in Austria.

On Thursday morning Wolfgang Mieder, the chair of the Department of German and Russian at UVM, kicked things off with a presentation entitled The Use of Language and the Third Reich: Hitler’s “Mein Kampf” and the Diaries of Victor Klemperer. He began with a discussion of the Macht and Ohnmacht, or power and powerlessness, of language. After that he showed slides of the Pied Piper and other fairy tales in German folklore, and helped facilitate an analysis of the language and imagery used. He spoke of the wonderful misuse of fairytales as effective manipulation tools for propagandists. Following the slides, a discussion of stereotypes ensued. The discussion then segued to Hitler and specifically the writing of Mein Kampf, the anti-Semitism throughout it, the propaganda surrounding it, and the proverbial language used in it. His talk was incredibly captivating and didactic.

Mieder’s talk was followed by yet another amazing presentation, this one given by Lois Price, focusing on music and survival during the Holocaust. Throughout her presentation, Price shared with us a variety of music and gave insight into what motivated prisoners to compose, sing, and perform. The music she chose to share was powerful and much more gut-wrenching than anticipated. Siegal, who had joined us for the presentation, sang along with some of the songs and frequently shared with us her own memories of hearing certain songs. At the end of the presentation Price was joined by two friends to perform Three Warsaw Polonaises, with Price on flute, Holly Thistle on violin, and Janet Green on cello. It was a brilliant performance and wonderful to “experience” an aspect of the Holocaust to which many of us had never been exposed.

After Price’s presentation, Scrase returned to give a highly enjoyable, informative, and interactive presentation on the art of the Holocaust. He explained that art was not only a means of recording something, but that it embodied creativity and that as humans, we all need creativity in order to function. He gave a brief overview of the artistic tradition in a few of the camps and showed slides of various works of art. Because of his familiarity with all the works, Scrase was able to consistently point out important details that those of us who were unfamiliar with the works missed. His instruction and guidance created a wonderful learning environment for all.

Friday, the last day of the course, consisted of a variety of presentations, some by survivors, others by scholars. Steve Rogers, a senior historian with the Office of Special Investigations at the U.S. Department of Justice in Washington, D.C. began the day with a presentation entitled Tracing Nazi War Criminals and Holocaust Era Assets: Questions and Issues for Holocaust Studies in the 21st Century. He made clear the distinction between war crimes and crimes against humanity, and specified that it is crimes against humanity that the Office of Special Investigations primarily deals with. His talk indicated that bringing perpetrators to court is a very long, tedious process.

A logical follow-up to Rogers’ presentation was Craig Pepin’s presentation entitled The Nuremberg Trials and War Crimes in General, which looked at how the Holocaust was represented at the trials. He shared with us the reasons for the trials and explained the four crimes that an individual could be charged with—war crimes, crimes against the peace, conspiracy, and crimes against humanity. The complexity that surrounded the trials was made evident.

After two scholarly presentations, the day, and the course, ended with two more individual testimonies. Henny Lewin spoke about growing up in Lithuania during the Holocaust and Henri Weinstock spoke about his experience as a hidden child in Belgium.

Following the German invasion of Lithuania Lewin and her family were sent to the ghetto. While working in the women’s brigade, Lewin’s mother was responsible for transporting clothes to Kovno. It was there that she made contact with a Catholic priest responsible for saving over 200 children from the ghetto. With his help, Lewin’s mother smuggled three-and-a-half year old Lewin out of the ghetto in a suitcase. She was the first child smuggled out of the ghetto. Eventually, in the spring of 1944 Lewin’s parents managed to escape from the ghetto; they went into hiding until the end of 1945, when they were reunited with Lewin.

Henri Weinstock, a hidden child during the Holocaust, shared with us an interview he did with 20/20 that offered insight into his years in hiding with a contingent of eighty-three children concealed by a Catholic nun in Belgium. He recalls that “the sheer pain of being abandoned was like death.” In 1945 Henri was reunited with his father. His mother perished in a concentration camp. His presentation was a powerful one, demonstrating that hidden children came out of hiding with few visible scars, but wounded within. His presentation also served as testimony to the goodness of those who made a difference.

This course, as I hope has been conveyed, included a wonderful array of speakers whose various stories and presentations created a mosaic, both literally and figuratively. One of the strengths of the course was its structure. Never was it confusing, nor overwhelming. Throughout the week, those of us enrolled in the course marveled at how lucky we were to experience a comprehensive history of the Holocaust through lectures, photographs, films, music, artwork and most importantly, personal testimonies. Nancy Wutke, a high school English teacher enrolled in the course, says, “I was amazed at the number of personal testimonies. I was
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Gruner on German Municipalities and the Holocaust
Katherine Quimby Johnson

A small but appreciative audience braved the late June heat to hear Dr. Wolf Gruner speak on “Forgotten Places of Persecution: German Municipalities and the Holocaust.” Professor Gruner has been a John F. Kennedy Memorial Fellow at the Center for European Studies at Harvard University. He will be Desmond Lee Visiting Professor at Webster University in Saint Louis beginning with the fall semester 2003. The author of four works in German on the persecution of the Jews during the Holocaust, he is also a member of the editorial board of Beiträge zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus. Forced Labor and the Jews, his first book publication in English, is forthcoming.

In his introduction Gruner briefly traced the historiography of the radicalization of the persecution of the Jews. During the immediate post-war period historians attributed responsibility overwhelmingly to the Nazi Party and the Gestapo and SS. That is to say, orders originated at the top of the fascist hierarchy and were disseminated downward. Studies of individual municipalities, which began to appear in the 1960s, showed that municipalities were also responsible for widespread, systematic anti-Jewish measures. Although these local studies multiplied, many historians continued to view instances where municipalities exceeded the directives of the central government as isolated. For the past decade Gruner has investigated the combination of local and central policy that drove the acceleration of anti-Semitic measures, chiefly in Germany, but also in areas that came under Nazi control after September 1939, as bureaucrats moved from positions in Germany to positions in Poland and applied their experience there.

German cities, although responsible for carrying out the central government’s policies, were, by tradition, largely self-governing and responsible for a wide range of civil institutions governing daily life. When the Nazi party came to power in 1933, seventy percent of the Jewish population lived in the fifty largest German cities. Thus their lives were shaped in large part by local measures. At a time when the central government’s goal was the expulsion of the Jewish population, municipal ordinances, while varying from place to place, were the first to dehumanize and segregate the Jewish population. For example, on 18 March 1933, the mayor of Cologne ordered Jewish enterprises excluded from municipal contracts. Other cities soon followed suit. The central government did not release a similar order until five years later. Gruner’s research has revealed that, in fact, local practice had a huge impact on central procedures, as well as on the experiences of their Jewish inhabitants.

The Nazi policy of eliminating opposition and establishing exclusive control also extended to municipalities. After 1933 most, but not all, mayors who were not members of the Nazi party were fired and replaced by party members. Of the twenty largest cities, only four mayors retained their positions. With most municipalities under party control, the central government strengthened the role of mayors, and also of department heads, all of whom became important in the propagation of anti-Jewish measures.

Also in 1933, six previous organizations of municipalities were merged into the German Council of Municipalities and membership was made mandatory. The council administration was led by Karl Fiehler (a rabid anti-Semite and the new mayor of Munich), and employed 300 civil servants. In addition to a Department for Jewish Affairs, every other department within the council also dealt with anti-Jewish measures. According to Gruner, the importance of the German Council of Municipalities in the escalation of anti-Jewish measures has been underestimated.

Cities viewed the central government’s national boycott of Jewish businesses on 1 April 1933, and the subsequent introduction of the first anti-Jewish law as validations of municipal anti-Jewish measures and began a new round of repressive restrictions. Whereas previous measures had all addressed segments of the Jewish population, in the summer of 1933 a number of towns banned Jews from public swimming places, one of a number of such actions coordinated by the Council of Municipalities. However, the ever-increasing number of municipal anti-Jewish measures did not fit the Nazi Party’s plans and, in September 1933, it prohibited all local measures not covered by Nazi law. Some towns complied with the decree from Berlin, some rescinded the ordinances but did not change their practice, and others ignored the decree altogether.

A broad wave of municipal anti-Jewish measures followed the enactment of the Nuremberg Laws in 1935; many municipalities forbade Jews entry. At the same time the Nazi leadership decreed that local governments could not take measures unless they had been cleared by the central government, a decree that was not enforced. The Council of Municipalities tried to formalize municipal self-government, requesting a decree allowing municipalities to formulate anti-Jewish measures on their own initiative. The Ministry of the Interior drafted such a decree, but it was blocked by Rudolf Hess, who stated that the time had not come to solve the Jewish question in public. The Council of Municipalities then developed its standard response to municipal requests, which was to say that cities governed their own facilities. Over time, coordinated by the council, local anti-Jewish actions were synchronized. These local developments led to increased Jewish emigration during 1936 and 1937. By 1938 some towns had almost completely excluded Jews from their boundaries.

After the Anschluss in 1938, the Nazi leadership centralized and coordinated policy between institutions, frequently basing it on the practices of municipalities, while simultaneously depriving municipalities of their active role. Kristallnacht, in Novem-
ber of the same year, led to a new centralized policy regarding the Jews. Jews who did not emigrate would be segregated and made to perform forced labor. The central government gave the municipalities authority to begin constructing ghettos, which some cities began immediately, while others waited until 1940-1941. Most municipalities employed forced labor in their public works divisions, especially parks, cemeteries, and street building. By 1941 forty cities and towns had created forced labor camps; these were especially prevalent in the areas around Cologne, Munich, and in Silesia. Gruner contends that these early municipal camps were important preconditions for the mass deportations. By providing sites for deportation centers and transportation, municipalities paved the way for the “Final Solution.”

In sum, German cities and towns played an active role in radicalizing the persecution of Jews at the local level. Almost every department in every town was involved in the drafting and implementation of segregationist measures, local measures that affected national decrees. Gruner concludes that the mutual dynamic between the central and local governments was responsible for the speed and intensity with which anti-Jewish measures were radicalized.

In response to the number of cogent questions that followed the talk, Gruner discussed variations within the implementation he described in his talk. For instance, overall Berlin and Munich were forerunners. After that, it depended mainly on the department involved; Hamburg moved quickly to exclude Jews from receiving social welfare, while Leipzig and Dresden led the way in ghettoization. Individual civil servants were largely responsible for this variation, sometimes motivated by interdepartmental rivalries. Compliance appears to have been motivated by questions of institutional interest and personal benefit, all of which contributed to the radicalization of the persecution and to the stability of the Nazi regime. Instances of an individual civil servant ignoring anti-Jewish ordinances, such as the member of the Munich Department of Welfare who continued to provide normal assistance to Jews, and who was not sanctioned for his actions, show that it is always up to the individual how he or she should behave.

Gruner’s talk provided food for thought, not only about the past and how we interpret it, but also about the nature of politics and self-interest. As a result, it has implications not simply for our view of history, but for our view of current events.

(Continued from page 5)

Yet there are others, like the six panelists who came to UVM that day who were different. Each was scarred and profoundly affected by what happened to them. Each of them went on to live functional, full lives. All of them married and had families. Many, both men and women, went on to establish successful business and professional careers. After retirement all of them began to speak about their Holocaust experiences to groups, including school children. Many of them have written about their Holocaust experiences.

I will remember Chaim Engel as a true steward of the Holocaust legacy. He was a man who displayed courage in the face of horror. He understood deeply what it was to love and to be committed to his family. Chaim was above all resilient. He found the balance between creating a good life and doing his part to preserve the memory of the Holocaust through his words and his actions.

Chaim Engel was a good man.

MEGARGEE LECTURES ON THE WEHRMACHT’S CRIMES IN THE EAST
Christopher Niendorff

On 26 June 2003 Geoffrey Megargee, who currently holds the position of Applied Research Scholar at the Center for Advanced Studies at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, gave an evening lecture at the University of Vermont. The presentation was in conjunction with the annual “Holocaust and Holocaust Education” course offered by the Center for Holocaust Studies at UVM. His lecture titled “A Blind Eye and Dirty Hands: The Wehrmacht’s Crimes in the East, 1941-1945” was attended by an appreciative audience consisting of students, UVM faculty and staff, and members of the general public.

Megargee began his lecture with a short description of what the word Wehrmacht stands for, namely the Armed Forces of Nazi Germany. The Wehrmacht consisted of the Army, Navy and Air Force, but in his lecture Megargee focused only on the actions of the Army. He referred to the common belief that the German Army fought a “clean” and “honorable” war and did not participate in the gruesome mass executions and other horrible actions, which were carried out by the SS forces and small killing squads. According to Megargee, this is far from the truth and little less than a myth. In fact, the Wehrmacht was much more involved in German war crimes than previously believed and most of the German military elite fully supported Hitler. Megargee evaluated the underlying causes of this support for Hitler and the Nazi party in detail.

The German military barely existed after its defeat in World War I. It had suffered 1.7 million casualties and was blamed for the outbreak of the war. In accordance with the Treaty of Versailles, Germany was allowed a military force of only 100,000 men, resulting in an almost complete loss of German military power. In addition, military circles commonly believed that Germany did not lose the war on the battlefield, but on the home front. Many believed in the so-called Dolchstosslegende (“Stab In the Back Legend”), which refers to the assumption that the war had been lost due to Jewish and Communist propaganda at home. In case it ever needed to fight a war again, the German military developed a “Total War” philosophy. Military circles believed that “Total War” required the exploitation of all national resources and the wartime targeting of the enemy’s civilians as well as its military. The German military desperately sought someone who could revive it and bring back its former power and recognition. That someone was Adolf Hitler.

From the start, Hitler promised the military a powerful new role, including heavy military rearmament and aggressive war. In return for these promises, the military became Hitler’s willing accomplice and gave him a free hand in politics. Hitler kept his promises to the military; under his rule the military forces of Germany drastically expanded from seven to seventy-one divisions and later to 125 divisions. Hitler brought the military even closer to himself when he asked for an oath of personal allegiance, which guaranteed him the complete loyalty of all military forces. Megargee added that not all of the senior officers liked Hitler and his ideas in fact some of them even despised him—but newly gained power overwhelmed those personal opinions.
The second part of the lecture presented the crimes committed by the Wehrmacht on the eastern front either on its own or in conjunction with other forces of Nazi Germany like the SS or the “Sondereinsatztruppen.”

For many years the first military campaign against Poland was believed to be a “clean” campaign in regard of the actions of the military. According to Megargee this is far from being true. From the beginning of the Polish campaign the command of the military issued orders to kill all of the Polish intelligentsia as quickly as possible, to destroy the infrastructure of the country and to exploit the Polish population as a labor force. In fact, leaders of the military provided the SS killing squads with detailed lists naming key Polish figures to be executed. Many officers regarded these actions as a valuable part of the “total war strategy.”

Megargee added that some senior officers resisted those tactics, but as soon as their resistance became too obvious they were released from their duties or forced into retirement.

The German campaign against Russia, “Operation Barbarossa,” which Hitler designated a “war of ideologies,” was undeniably the most brutal campaign of the war. The military was involved in mass executions and other egregious crimes on the Eastern Front. Even before the campaign officially began, the high command of the Wehrmacht issued a decree stipulating the destruction of entire villages with all their population, beginning with the invasion of Soviet territory. These so-called “collective measures” were backed up by granting German soldiers immunity from charges of war crimes, meaning that if German soldiers killed a civilian they would not be punished. This decree also set out the so-called “Commissar Order,” directing German frontline troops to take no prisoners, but to shoot every Soviet commissar on sight. In the first six months three million P.O.W.s were captured, of whom approximately 10,000 to 20,000 were killed right away because they were Jews or Communist party officials. 1.3 million prisoners died of starvation and malnutrition under German supervision. Altogether 3.3 million Soviet P.O.W.s died during the course of the war. The majority of these deaths resulted from the so-called “Hunger Plan” developed by the German military command. German soldiers on the front were ordered to confiscate food from Soviet civilians to feed themselves, with the long-term goal of starving the Soviet population to death.

The “Sondereinsatztruppen,” which are believed to have killed about 1.5 million people by the end of 1942, could count on full army cooperation and support. In fact most of the army leaders knew about the mass executions. In addition, military intelligence supported them with information, maps, lists of names. Both officers and troops took part in the shootings. Those in command told their troops that the brutal killings were necessary to win the war and ordered that no pictures be taken of such actions. In addition to its other activities, the Wehrmacht itself was in charge of running various camps, mainly forced labor and P.O.W. camps.

Megargee also took into account the drastic change in the German military justice system. During World War I the German military court sentenced forty-eight German soldiers to be executed, whereas during World War II 20,000 to 30,000 German soldiers were shot for insubordination or desertion, died in camps, or were put in small suicide attack squads.

According to Megargee one of the worst German war crimes was not directed against a so-called enemy but against the German soldiers themselves. Even though it was more than obvious during the last months of World War II that the war could not be won for Germany, the majority of military commanders ordered their troops to fight to the death, thus causing hundreds of thousands of unnecessary deaths. Megargee argued that many military leaders did not order their troops to surrender because they were obsessed with the Dolchstosslegende, mentioned earlier. Others truly believed that the war could be won and their sense of duty and especially their sworn oath to Hitler did not allow them to stop fighting. Other high level officers were bribed by the NSDAP, receiving double pay or a luxury estate for their families; in effect, their loyalty was bought.

As a closing comment Megargee pointed out that most of the seventeen to nineteen million Germans who served in the Wehrmacht were not involved in any war crimes, but as research in this topic proceeds it gets more and more obvious how many actually got “their hands dirty.”

(Continued from page 3)


FOLKSINGER PERFORMS
SONGS OF THE HOLOCAUST AT UVM

Courtney Magwire

On Thursday, 10 April 2003, musicologist Jerry Silverman performed a program of ballads and songs from the Holocaust in the University of Vermont Recital Hall. Many of the songs that Silverman performed appear in his book and CD set The Undying Flame, a compilation of 110 Holocaust-era songs in sixteen languages. Each song included in the book was translated from its original language into singable English. While putting together the musical arrangements, Silverman tried to keep as close as possible to the stylistic traditions of the songs. The songs and ballads that he chose for his performance at UVM reflect a wide range of experiences of the Holocaust and express the strength of the human spirit in the face of evil through messages of hope, resistance, and the will to survive.

“The Peat-Bog Soldiers,” one of the earliest recorded songs dealing with concentration camp inmates, was composed by Rudi Goguel at the Börgermoor concentration camp in northwestern Germany. Although it was censored shortly after its 1933 debut during a cabaret presentation in the camp, it found its way into other camps and was subsequently published and then recorded in 1938. The first verse of “The Peat-Bog Soldiers” expresses the despair that the inhabitants of the camps had to face: “Here in dreary desolation, / We’re behind the prison wall. / Far from every consolation, / Barbed wire does surround us all.” The final verse, however, looks toward the future with steady optimism. It reads, “But for us there is no complaining, / Winter will in time be past. / One day, free, we’ll be exclaiming, / Homeland, you are mine at last.”

Another ballad entitled “In Vilna Was Issued a Brand-New Decree” chronicles a spontaneous act of resistance by a group of four thousand Jews near Vilna, (Vilnius, Lithuania). The Gestapo rounded them up and transported them to the city of Vilna, under the pretext of transferring them to the Kovno (Kaunas, Lithuania) ghetto. While in transit, the Gestapo began killing the prisoners, who only then realized that they had been deceived by their captors. They defended themselves frantically and bravely against the armed Germans, using anything they could find as weapons, including their fists, iron bars, and clubs. Thanks to the courage of the Jews, approximately thirty of those marked for execution managed to escape.

The final song that Silverman performed during his concert was written by an American woman named Rosalie Gerut, whose parents survived the Lodz ghetto, Auschwitz, and Dachau. Hearing her parents’ stories about the horror they experienced during the Holocaust profoundly influenced Gerut as a child. When we listen to the lyrics to her song “We Are Here,” Gerut’s commitment to social justice, and to helping those affected by the Holocaust, becomes evident. The song speaks of the importance of remembering the past. It also points out that survival and the will to survive are continued acts of resistance against injustice. Gerut writes, “We’re here, our seeds are planted in the land. We’re here, although they thought we’d die at their command. We’re here, and no one ever will erase our stand.”

Those who witnessed Silverman’s performance took a musical journey through many events of the Holocaust and caught glimpses into the lives of the people who experienced it. By combining his musical talent with intensive research, Silverman has made an invaluable contribution to Holocaust studies.


ANNOUNCEMENTS

2003 Hilberg Lecture
Sir Martin Gilbert delivers the twelfth annual Raul Hilberg Lecture at 8:00 p.m. on Monday, 3 November 2003 in Campus Center Theater, Billings Student Center at the University of Vermont. Overflow space will be available in Ira Allen Chapel. His topic is “The Holocaust: The Christian Clergy as Rescuers.” The author or editor of more than fifty works on the Holocaust, including The Macmillan Atlas of the Holocaust (1982), The Holocaust (1985), and The Boys (1996), as well as an eight-volume biography of Winston Churchill, Gilbert’s most recent title is The Righteous: The Unsung Heroes of the Holocaust (2003).

Claims Deadline Extended
The International Commission on Holocaust Era Insurance Claims (ICHEIC) has announced an extension of the deadline to file claims in connection with unpaid insurance policies issued to victims of the Holocaust. The deadline of 30 September 2003 has been extended to 31 December 2003. For more information on the claims process call 1-800-957-3203 or visit www.icheic.org.

UVM Theatre Stages Holocaust Work
From October 1-12, the UVM Theatre presents twelve performances of “Remember the Children: Terezin.” Veronica Lopez directs the staged reading. The original poems and art work were created by some of the 15,000 children under the age of fifteen who were interned in Terezin between 1942 and 1944; fewer than 100 survived. For more information visit http://www.uvmtheatre.org/Index1024.html

Live from NYC’s 92nd Street Y at UVM
New York City’s 92nd Street Y uses satellite technology to broadcast its world-renowned speakers. Fall speakers include Anita Diamant (21 October) and Elie Wiesel (6 November). View both lectures at the University of Vermont’s Campus Center Theater, Billings Student Center. Admission will be charged. Tickets are available at the door or from one of the sponsors: Temple Sinai, Ohavi Zedek, and from Vermont Jewish Communities by mail to 212 Battery Street, Burlington, VT 05401.

One approaches a new general history of the Holocaust with skepticism. Given the recent appearance of Yehuda Bauer’s revised History of the Holocaust and Genocide: A History by Debórah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt, both furnishing complete and compelling coverage of the topic, why publish something new at this time? Moreover, with so many current works providing in-depth coverage of various aspects of this complex topic, how can one hope to do justice to the Holocaust in fewer than 230 pages? Well, Doris Bergen quickly vanquishes such doubts. She has, in fact, written one of the best treatments of the Holocaust currently available. While War & Genocide may not convey the depth of analysis found in Leni Yahil or the wealth of detail provided by Raul Hilberg, it is a remarkably successful history presenting both the nuance and detail required to absorb student and expert alike.

Although Bergen’s volume is a synthesis of pre-existing research and publication, it is constructed on a solid foundation of concepts that find reinforcement throughout the text. Several of these should be touched upon as they establish Bergen’s position in Holocaust studies. First, Bergen argues that the Nazis’ targeting of Jews necessitated a long-lived prejudice that was by no means unique to Germans. She claims that Hitler “could not simply have invented a category of enemies,” presupposing that a “majority of the population” would “turn against them” (2). Jews—and one might add Gypsies, Poles, homosexuals, Afro-Germans, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and Communists—were already the victims of deeply rooted prejudices. And yet, Bergen stresses, Hitler’s racism—i.e., his anti-Semitism—was a new form of hatred, which viewed “the Jew” as a biological threat to the German (read “Aryan”) bloodstream. Hitler’s racial ideology did not make the Holocaust inevitable, but it made it a logical outgrowth of Nazi rule. Secondly, Bergen echoes Henry Turner in maintaining that Hitler’s rise to power was by no means inevitable. Hitler’s appointment as German Chancellor was the product not of electoral victory but of political naïveté on the part of lesser men who blindly believed that they could both control and use the Nazi leader.1 There were other political options for Germany in January 1933. Thirdly, Bergen stresses that, whereas the Holocaust may be associated with “the murder of approximately six million European Jews” (ix-x), tens of thousands of non-Jewish Europeans also fell victim to National Socialism’s ideological goals. Indeed, in view of its length, the book’s coverage of the assault on the mentally and physically disabled, Roma, homosexuals, Jehovah’s Witnesses, Afro-Germans, Soviet prisoners-of-war, and political opponents is remarkably solid. Moreover, Bergen argues that the horrific and interlocking fate of each category of Nazi victim was inextricably fused with Hitler’s perspective on “race and space.” At one point, for example, she states that the “fates of Polish Christians and Polish Jews under Nazi occupation were linked in complicated ways that we cannot understand if we study those groups of people in isolation from each other” (119).

Arguably the most important feature of War & Genocide is its superb coverage of the World War II. If, as Bergen argues, Hitler’s worldview was animated by “race and space,” then war was an inevitable outcome of his rule. Taking to heart Gerhard Weinberg’s appeal that the war be viewed through Hitler’s eyes, she underscores that the Holocaust required the war.2 “War provided a cover for mass murder,” she notes (141). Thus, Bergen combines her impressive command of Holocaust scholarship with a firm familiarity with the European theater of operations. More significantly, given the implications of her title, she has a solid understanding of the war and its importance to Nazi racial doctrine. While one can point to a wealth of reasons for finding this book appealing, its detailed focus on the World War II is particularly refreshing. Historians are gradually coming to appreciate that, had Nazi Germany not gone to war, there would have been no Holocaust.3 The war and the Holocaust were inextricably linked.

No book is without minor flaws, including War & Genocide. Early on, for example, Bergen claims that in 1492 “King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella of Spain expelled all Jews and Muslims from the Iberian Peninsula except those who agreed to convert to Christianity” (5). In fact, many of Spain’s Jews fled in 1492 to Portugal, only to find themselves expelled again, along with Portugal’s Jews, in 1497. The statement that “an estimated 20 million Europeans died” in World War I (27) is odd, unless one adds influenza deaths to the total—however, the influenza epidemic was not a product of the war. Most historians accept a figure of 9-10 million war-related deaths. It should also be noted that Horst Wessel was not killed in the 1920s (67) but in fact met his death at the hands of Albert Höhler on 17 January 1930. Yet these are minor points. Of greater import is Bergen’s statement that 1928 “brought an electoral breakthrough” for the NSDAP, as the party became “a force in the Reichstag” (49). In fact, the Nazis limped out of the May 1928 Reichstag elections with a pitiful 2.6 percent of the vote and a paltry 12 of the 491 seats elected—a reduction of two from the mandates they had held since December 1924. Since Bergen goes on to argue that the 1928 election results demonstrate that the party’s “national popularity preceded the Great Depression,” one is left to wonder whether the NSDAP would have achieved national recognition without the depression. The real watershed for the Nazis were the state elections in Thuringia in December 1929, in which the party received 11.3 percent of the vote; yet, even this followed on the Wall Street crash. A final criticism is the book’s lack of footnotes. Whereas Bergen occasionally embeds references in her text when she uses quotations, there are times when her statements beg for a citation. That said, she provides an invaluable list of titles, organized by chapter, at the end of her book.

Relating these flaws should not diminish so excellent a book as War & Genocide. Bergen has clearly researched and absorbed a wealth of material related to the Holocaust and World War II. The product of her efforts is exceptional. For those seeking to “teach and learn,” Bergen provides a solid, accessible, and well-argued presentation of the Holocaust, especially in terms of its connection to the war. It should not be overlooked.

Notes
1 See Henry A. Turner, Jr., Hitler’s Thirty Days to Power: January 1933 (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1996).
Nazis] that the overwhelming majority of the Jews they killed had come into their reach only because of the war” (pp. 26-27).


C. PAUL VINCENT
Cohen Center for Holocaust Studies
Keene State College


While the primary theme of this book is the exploration of the different and shared experiences women and men had when facing the ordeals of the Holocaust, Nechama Tec also focuses on the historical contexts that led to that phenomenon, as well as the chronological development within this era with its sociological, political, economic, and cultural substructures. The seven chapters cover the distinct stages towards the Nazi goal of Jewish annihilation, namely the identification, intimidation, humiliation, and dehumanization of Jews, life in the ghettos, and, finally, the situation in concentration camps as the last stage in the chain of destruction. At the same time, the author describes the many courageous efforts of Holocaust victims to survive by escaping and engaging in the resistance movement.

In this research on gender and the Holocaust Tec addresses the general female and male psychological make-up, the traditional gender roles as universal features of every society, and how they played out in times of extreme conditions. These collective and individual gender comparisons help understand not only the development of different coping strategies, but also the complexity of the undeniable interdependence of female/male actions/reactions and thus the essence of the human experience. Tec describes the female traits, roles, and expectations in any patriarchal society in normal times and how they significantly changed in the Nazi era. The intelligent, rational, aggressive, and competitive men, according to patriarchal principles, first represented a bigger threat to the Nazi regime than women and thus had to be more vigorously persecuted. In contrast, the submissive, cooperative, nurturing, self-sacrificing, and life-protecting women with natural survival instincts had learned to endure hardships, to adapt, and to accommodate and thus were more resourceful and better equipped to deal with hostile environments. Early on, Jewish men experienced psychological death through degradation; since men tend to give up when they cannot be in control, Jewish women had to take on traditionally male roles. Of course, many men were also physically absent, in work camps or in hiding. As the sole providers for and protectors of their own families and others these women became more visible and therefore more vulnerable. While Jewish communities were well aware of the assaults against men, the murders of women were less coordinated, therefore less noticed. After the first German military setback, however, when the Germans concentrated on winning the war against the Jews, the persecution of Jewish women was carried out in a more systematic fashion. Not only did they face forced labor and endure sexual assault, they also were punished as actual and potential mothers in the Nazi effort to stop the perpetuation of the Jewish race.

Tec also describes the internal structures of the ghettos, often a highly fragmented community where social conflicts shattered the traditional social order. Women and men were equally involved in organizing cultural events in order to create a more dignified present. They also combined forces in preparing for armed resistance, which allowed them to dream of a more human and meaningful future. Women found temporary respite and self-fulfillment by contributing to the welfare of others. But these self-sacrifices often hastened their deaths, whereas men, unable to adjust to new circumstances, frequently died severely depressed and broken.

Tec not only discusses gender-specific responses to ghetto life but also provides extensive insights into the broader effects of the Nazi machinery of annihilation. Historical data and memories of personal experiences are effortlessly interwoven. Interviews with survivors reveal that women were more inventive in finding hiding places and more accepting of their losses when they encouraged their children to flee. Most men had to live in hiding since circumcision put them at a higher risk of being discovered on the Aryan side. Physical exams were required for work placement and one had to apply in person to obtain a Kennkarte (an ID card used by Poles as a work permit). Since East European Jewish women were traditionally confined to domestic spheres they blended more easily into non-Jewish settings as maids and governesses. Interviewees also stated that, generally, Christians were more willing to help women. Since these numerous personal stories often describe similar experiences of and responses to the catastrophic wartime events, the analyses of the role and function of gender during the Holocaust become repetitive. Redundancy compromises the effectiveness of statements and conclusions.

Life in the concentration camps was an equally horrific experience for women and men, but they responded differently to different acts of terror. Generally, male prisoners were treated more harshly (the hard physical work was designed to kill) and they were emotionally weaker than women, who possessed a stronger will to survive. Women developed better life-sustaining coping skills by defining themselves in relation to others, by being able to share their resources, and by being more knowledgeable about food and hygiene. Only the fate of mothers of small children and pregnant women was irrevocably predetermined.

In the last chapter, Tec discusses the development of resistance movements in Nazi-occupied countries, their inherent hierarchies, and the effects of social, cultural, economic, and political conditions on the partisan struggle. Only men were considered fit for combat; men occupied leadership positions. Here, too, women assumed subservient roles again as couriers and liaisons. Anti-Semitism prevailed in Soviet detachments, in which women were considered the officers’ property. As well, these detachments followed the Soviet model of reversing the previous social order. Men who belonged to the pre-war Jewish elite had to carry out the least desirable jobs; the more valued military duties were given to the uneducated poor.

Tec bases her findings on wartime diaries, postwar memoirs, archival materials, and, above all, numerous interviews with survivors, which she conducted in six languages over a period of ten years. Resilience and Courage offers valuable insights into the different experiences and coping strategies of women and men during the Holocaust.

Theresia Hoeck
University of Vermont

In this newly translated work, Götz Aly and Susanne Heim look at a group of perpetrators and collaborators within Nazi Germany that the research has generally neglected until recently, namely university-trained (and often university-affiliated) sociologists, economists, demographers, and technocrats. Aly and Heim assert that the decision to eliminate entire population groups in Eastern Europe was directly shaped by academic and technocratic debates on overpopulation and efficiency. Moreover, they offer the provocative thesis that the fusion of these arguments with Nazi racial theory, and the collaboration between their academic supporters and the Nazi party, was a necessary precondition to mass murder. Although at times the thesis is overstated, this study remains the best introduction available in English on the role of the social science intelligentsia in the Holocaust.

In the eyes of the groups Aly and Heim study, virtually all of Eastern Europe suffered from overpopulation, which led to economic inefficiencies as well as social problems. Involvement with the Nazis, as well as the acquisition of huge new territories in the East created the preconditions for destruction: “….[the] wishful thinking of the planners beat a path where action would later follow. In calling for ‘solutions’ and ‘relief’ they anticipated in thought the mass murder that was to take place in reality” (p. 71). Furthermore, a good number of them entered into government service and became actively involved in planning the identification, mass emigration, and resettlement of “undesirable” population groups. Aly and Heim conclude that once war closed outlets for relocating groups of people (such as the idea of moving Eastern European Jews to Madagascar), the logic of overpopulation theory led inevitably to the one remaining way to solve the “problem”—the mass murder of the “Final Solution.”

Earlier work has pointed to the crucial importance of the bureaucratization of persecution after 1938 as a precursor to annihilation; Aly and Heim offer the “why” behind this shift. Young, university-trained professionals and academics, frustrated by the lack of employment opportunities in late Weimar, jumped at the possibilities for professional advancement offered by the Nazi purge of government and the universities. Once in place, their rational plans for increasing the inefficiency of “backward” Eastern Europe merged with the ill-defined Nazi ideology of racial superiority, producing concrete plans for mass population transfers to create a Germanized Lebensraum. Most provocatively, Aly and Heim argue that Nazi racial ideology would never have had such a devastating effect without being combined with the “objective” social science of population studies. Thus the Holocaust was not a departure from civilization and a reversion to barbarism, as the Nuremberg trials and many subsequent historians have averred, but rather an extreme manifestation of the efficiency and social engineering tendencies of modernity.

Sometimes, however, by stressing that for many technocrats economic and social considerations were more important than Nazi racial policies, Aly and Heim overstate the case. Early on we are told that the confiscation of Jewish businesses in Austria after the Anschluss had more to do with economic rationalization and efficiency than with racial hatred. This “Aryanization” created large numbers of Austrian Jews with no means of support, thereby affirming Nazi racial stereotypes of Jews as unproductive, and leading to concentration camps as the most “efficient” way of dealing with them. Later, a 1941 justification for the starvation of millions of Russians was made on the basis of “geopolitical realities, without a single reference to racial ideology” (p. 239). At other points, Aly and Heim are more careful to see racism as a fundamental, and not merely complementary precondition: Resettlement programs were “founded on the racist notions of National Socialist society, [and] it developed these into a practical instrument of social engineering” (p.74). Such confusion belies the inherent problems of rejecting the overwhelming directive power of racial ideology in the Nazi state, as Aly and Heim, in stressing the technocratic rationalism of the population planners, at times seem to do. Moreover, the authors draw very little distinction between academics who actively pursued population policy and extermination in conjunction with government authorities, and those who discussed pre-war population issues and territorial revision in terms laced with latent anti-Semitism, but who shrank from the violent conclusions of wartime resettlement experts. These gradations of guilt and complicity are worth drawing out more explicitly.

But such small inconsistencies do not justify rejecting the wider contours of Aly and Heim’s arguments. Moreover, they point to the reasons, unexplored by Aly and Heim, as to why this particular facet of the Holocaust has remained hidden for so long. That many of the individuals under discussion here were young, highly intelligent and motivated, well connected, and generally disdainful of the coarser aspects of Nazism in particular and politics of any kind in general, made it easier for Allied occupation authorities (who desperately needed experts to run basic services in the post-surrender occupation) and later the West German state to reintegrate them into public life. Perpetuating the perception of Nazism as anti-modern, anti-intellectual and anti-civilization served many purposes after the war, including that of shielding this group of perpetrators and collaborators from blame. The questions that Aly and Heim ask here were simply not considered proper subjects for a long time because of the threat they posed to those who had survived the war with reputations relatively intact. The publication of this volume in Germany a decade ago sparked a long-running and fruitful discussion about the involvement of certain postwar academic luminaries in this aspect of Nazism.

Ably translated by A.G. Blunden, this study is accessible to non-specialists, filled with nuggets such as a description of a 1943 Baedeker’s Guide for visitors to the General Government of Poland (visitors to the spas of central Poland should not travel unarmed, it advised). Much work has been done in the intervening decade by young German scholars like Ingo Haar and Michael Fahlbusch that buttresses support for Aly and Heim’s basic argument about the involvement of academics and academically trained professionals. As an examination of one previously understudied yet crucial group directly complicit in the destruction, Architects of Annihilation serves not merely as an important contribution to Holocaust studies, but also a valuable reminder to present-day technocrats and social scientists not to get too wrapped up in their own abstractions of reality.

Craig K. Pepin
University of Vermont
Marion Pritchard received an honorary doctor of laws degree at Commencement in May 2003. Recognized as Righteous Among the Nations for her efforts to rescue Jews in Holland during the Holocaust, she recently retired from the advisory board of the Center for Holocaust Studies at the University of Vermont, which she joined at its inception in 1993.

Our Contributors

Jennifer Bell is an artist and undergraduate at the University of Vermont, majoring in Studio Art.

Stanley Burns, M.D. was not yet twenty years old when he served as a member of the permanent staff at Dachau. He received his medical degree, and later taught at the University of Vermont School of Medicine until his retirement.

Kristina Guarino of White River Junction is a teacher in training.

Theresa Hoecck, a native of Austria, is a lecturer in the Department of German and Russia and directs the German House Program. She also teaches German at St. Michael’s College in Colchester, Vermont.

Bernard Kabakow, M.D. graduated from the University of Vermont School of Medicine. He currently practices medicine in New York City, specializing in the treatment of cancer.

Christopher Niendorf is an undergraduate at the University of Vermont, majoring in German and Political Science.

Craig K. Pepin received his doctoral degree from Duke University. His area of interest is the issue of memory and the historical reconstruction of memory, especially in Germany.

Michael P. Schaal, M.S.W. practices psychotherapy in Burlington Vermont. A founder of the Gathering of Survivor Families, and chair of its steering committee, he is also a member of the Center for Holocaust Studies Advisory Board.

C. Paul Vincent is Professor of History and director of the Cohen Center for Holocaust Studies-Keene State College.

New Faces

Congratulations to Professors Jonathan Huener and Marilyn Lucas on the birth of their daughter Anna! Huener is on parental leave from the University of Vermont Department of History for the fall semester. In his absence Robert Bernheim, instructor of our summer seminar, is teaching “The Holocaust.” Craig Pepin, author of the review of Architects of Annihilation, which appears on pages 14-15 teaches “European Civilization” and “Europe: 1815-1945.” We are pleased to have so many with so much expertise on the Holocaust in our university community.

The Bulletin of the Center for Holocaust Studies is published semiannually by the Center for Holocaust Studies at the University of Vermont. All correspondence, including address changes, should be sent to: The Center for Holocaust Studies, Old Mill A301, The University of Vermont, 94 University Place, Burlington, VT 05405-4055, or to Holocaust.Studies@uvm.edu.
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The Center for Holocaust Studies at the University of Vermont was established in 1993 to honor the scholarly and pedagogical legacy of Raul Hilberg, Professor emeritus of Political Science at The University of Vermont. His monumental work, The Destruction of the European Jews, changed the way historians and students around the world view the Holocaust. Since Dr. Hilberg began his research at the University of Vermont in the late 1950s, what was a reluctance to confront the facts of the Holocaust has given way to a hunger for the truth.
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ADA: For accommodations please contact Sally Knight at 802-656-3166 before 25 October 2003.