
IT IS A CRUEL PARADOX OF POSTWAR GERMAN, INDEED POSTWAR WESTERN HISTORY THAT THIS ACT OF FORGETTING, THE UNWILLINGNESS TO RECOGNIZE THE REALITY OF THE ROMANY HOLOCAUST DOCUMENTED BY HACKL IN ABSCHIED VON SIDONIE, HAS, BY CONTRAST TO THE JEWISH HOLOCAUST AND DESPITE THE EFFORTS OF DISTINGUISHED RESEARCHERS SUCH AS GABRIELLE TYNNAUER, DONALD KENRICK, IAN HANCOCK, SYBIL MILTON, AND MANY OTHERS, CONTINUED TO THE PRESENT DAY. THAT, OF COURSE, IS THE MAJOR MOTIVATION OF HACKL’S ARTFUL AND TROUBLING DOCUMENTARY RECONSTRUCTION. TWELVE-YEAR-OLD SIDONIE ADLERSBURG IS A GYPSY GIRL OF MIXED RACE, WHO—UNUSUALLY—HAS BEEN ADOPTED AS A FOUNDLING BY THE FREETHINKING, WORKING-CLASS BREURATHER FAMILY, AND BROUGHT UP THOROUGHLY ASSIMILATED TO AN ALTERNATIVE GERMANIC TRADITION: HUMANISTIC, COSMOPOLITAN, TOLERANT. YET NONE OF THIS COUNTS IN THE BARBARIC EPOCH FROM 1933 TO 1945. THE ACCULTURATED GIRL IS GRADUALLY ISOLATED FROM HER SOCIETY ON THE FAMILIAR, PREJUDICIAL GROUNDS OF RACE AND COLOR, UNTIL AT LAST, IN MARCH 1943, SHE IS COMPULSORILY RESTORED TO HER PRESUMED BIRTH MOTHER AND AT ONCE TRANSPORTED TO AUSCHWITZ, THERE TO DIE. THE PURPOSE OF HACKL’S FORENSIC ANALYSIS OF HER FATE IS OF COURSE TO RESIST THE DENIAL OF MEMORY BY MAKING A MONUMENT. THE TEXT IS THAT MONUMENT IN WORDS.

BUT HACKL’S MONUMENT IN WORDS ALSO DOCUMENTS THE LACK OF OTHER MONUMENTS, AND THE COMPLICITY OF INSTITUTIONS IN MAINTAINING A STONY SILENCE. AFTER THE WAR, HER ADOPTIVE FATHER, BREURATHER,
writes for confirmation of Sidonie’s transport to the mayor of Hopfgarten, the last place her presence was recorded. But this man, an ex-Nazi, refuses to acknowledge responsibility and invents an obfuscatory fiction. Similarly, those who connived at Sidonie’s removal from Letten can produce carefully-crafted equivocating official documents which, read one way in 1943, sealed her fate, but, read another way in 1947, appear scrupulously considerate of all parties’ interests. A monument to the war heroes of the Luftwaffe is built. But for Sidonie even a commemorative tablet is refused. After Breurather’s death in 1980, his son Manfred can only achieve the private gesture of an inscription to Sidonie on his father’s gravestone. The passionately engaged “chronicler,” Hackl’s self-figuration in the text, finally succeeds in persuading the local socialists to set an inscription into their clubhouse wall. But official recognition is still denied. Sidonie is written out of the local historian’s Heimatbuch. The inhabitants of Letten live on as if she had never existed.

But Abschied von Sidonie is more than a protest against the local failure to come to terms with the past. It is also a bene tekel directed at Austrian and German society as a whole. Estimates as to the number of Romanies who were murdered at Auschwitz, Dachau, Buchenwald, Ravensbrück, Mauthausen, Lackenbach, and elsewhere vary from 275,000 to 500,000, and may yet be revised upwards. Eisenman’s recently completed Holocaust monument in Berlin now commemorates the Jewish victims of the Holocaust. Yet in postwar Germany there is to this day, outside of some few inscriptions in the preserved camps, no official monument to the Romany Holocaust. The decision to build was taken in 2002. But little progress has been made.

Indeed, an historical line can be drawn connecting this slow advance toward recognition in our day with the slow moves of the immediately postwar years toward official acknowledgment of the Romany fate under National Socialism. The Bundesentschädigungsgesetz (Federal Compensation Law) of 1952 had defined the victims of National Socialist persecution in such a way as largely to exclude Romanies from its provisions. Victims, under this provision, were deemed to be those who had suffered by reason of political opposition, race, faith, or Weltanschauung. But the Bundesgerichtshof (Federal Court of Justice), glossing the paragraphs in 1956, decided that only those Gypsies who had been transported to the death camps after Himmler’s Auschwitz decree of March 1943 should fall within this definition. It thus excluded those whose fate befell them earlier from compensation under these terms and, in some cases, from any compensation at all. It also seemed retrospectively to absolve the persecutors before 1943 from the charge of racism. Only in 1965 was this view revised to extend the definition back to 1938, the actual beginning of the transports. Only in 1979-1981 were government provisions made to extend compensation after the end of the official applications deadline (1969) beyond the Jewish community. And only in 1982 did Bundeskanzler Helmut Schmidt explicitly acknowledge on behalf of the government that Romanies too had been victims of National Socialist racism.

But if Hackl’s book demonstrates the continuation of prejudice against the Gypsies after the Nazi era, it also recalls its far deeper historical roots, in centuries-old institutionalized Germanic anti-Gypsyism, by naming historical institutions whose provenance stretches back to the beginnings of Romany life in German-speaking lands. Eighteen months after Sidonie’s adoption by the Breurathers, the authorities are still energetically pursuing her birth mother. A major factor in their ultimate success is the Internationale Zentralstelle für die Bekämpfung des Zigeunerunwesens (International Center for Combatting the Gypsy Nuisance), an enormous centralized archive of detailed information about all known persons of Gypsy provenance, which was founded at Vienna in 1935. The social service authorities consult it for assistance. The influence of this organization, founded of course before the Anschluss, stretches forward in time to Robert Ritter’s Rassenhygienische und bevölkerungsbiologische Forschungsstelle (Racial Hygiene and Population Biology Research Unit, 1936), which adapted and expanded the resources of the Zentralstelle to include pseudo-scientific anthropological data. It was Ritter’s unit that provided the evidential basis for the transportation of Gypsies within the Reich.

But the Zentralstelle in Vienna also connects the Romany Holocaust to the longstanding anti-Gypsy tradition. For in 1935 it was far from an innovation. In fact, since the end of the eighteenth century Germanic states had sought to establish an informational register of all persons of Romany provenance as the instrument of official control over an ethnic group constantly perceived as a menace or nuisance. The immediate predecessor of the Zentralstelle was the Zentralbüro für die Bekämpfung der Zigeunerplage (Central Bureau for Combating the Gypsy Plague), founded in 1929 in Munich. Its role was to co-ordinate the imperial German Gypsy policy, which consisted in implementation of measures contained in the Gesetz zur Bekämpfung von Zigeunern, Landfahrern und Arbeitsscheuen (Law to Combat Gypsies, Tramps, and the Work-shy, 1926). This was in turn derived from the Prussian Anweisung zur Bekämpfung des Zigeunerunwesens (Instruction for Combatting the Gypsy Nuisance, 1906), and that too was merely descended from anti-Gypsy provisions of 1886 and 1871. But even the Munich Zentralbüro was only a development of the first central Nachrichtendienst (information service) for the surveillance of Gypsies, which was inaugurated in 1899 in the Munich interior ministry. Its chief, Alfred Dillmann, produced the notorious Zigeunerbuch (Gypsy Book, 1905), a widely circulated documentation of alleged Gypsy felons, which in its turn continued the tradition of the Sulzer Zigeunerliste (Sulz Gypsy List, 1784), perhaps the first published list of alleged Gypsy felons and earliest ancestor of Ritter’s archive. All of these early anti-Gypsy institutions and laws have one major premise in common. They were of course not racist in any modern scholarly sense of the term. Indeed their use of the word “Gypsy” tends to be defined very loosely, by non-ethnic features such as appearance, behavior, and wandering habit. But they all shared the cultural presumption of the intrinsic criminality of the Gypsy community (and most vagrants), and all therefore sought to establish a comprehensive bureaucratic system permitting total police control over the members of the Romany community. Its goal was either to integrate them forcefully into the way of life of the settled community, or to expatriate them to another state (where the control process would begin over again).

Of course these institutions too had their roots in still deeper historical strata. If the advent of Romanies in Germany is first documented at Hildesheim in 1407, and their first letters of protection from Emperor Sigismund date from 1423, then we should recall that the Reichstag at Lindau revoked these letters in 1497 on grounds of alleged criminality. As a result Gypsies were declared vogelfrei (oulawed) in German lands. Stripped of rights, they were thus placed at the mercy of local rulers and popula-
A New Home
By Irene Katzenstein Schmied

On a Friday afternoon in April 1939 I was just ten years old, standing with my mother on a platform at Victoria Station in London. Several ladies moved about the platform. Which one would be Mrs. Muirhead, and where would she be taking me? My mother—once a journalist in Berlin, now working as a domestic outside London—could not have me stay with her, nor could my previous hosts continue to have me.

Almost three months had passed since I had come to England on one of the Kindertransports from Berlin. Sponsored by the British Government, the Kindertransports were organized by religious, secular, and Jewish community organizations in Britain, in collaboration with Jewish community organizations throughout Germany and Austria. This rescue effort brought some 10,000 children to Britain between December 1938 and the outbreak of war in September 1939, thereby saving them from sharing the fate of many of their parents who were unable to leave in time.

Child that I was, I remember only childish things about the trip, such as a distinct whiff of the delicious cocoa at the Jewish Domestic Science School in Hamburg where we stopped for lunch and play-time before boarding the ship, the SS Manhattan; but I remember nothing about the actual parting from my parents at the Lehrter Bahnhof in Berlin nor of the train journey. That evening I listened, spellbound, to the stories of final farewells told by my glamorous and seemingly grown-up (at least in my eyes) cabin mates: would they ever see their parents, their boyfriends again? At least, I knew that my mother would soon join me in England.

The next evening’s debarkation in Southampton brought a trip on a double-decker bus to the sound of the drumming of the dark rain and the sweeping of tree branches on the roof. Breakfast at our overnight accommodation—a school, or possibly hostel—brought the first taste of porridge (still today a “comfort food”), steaming under a blanket of brown sugar. The train ride to London and arrival at Victoria Station followed. Tante Hilde (a friend of my parents) greeted me and whisked me into a taxi right there in the station, where I thought it had come specifically for me. I listened, spellbound, to the stories of final farewells told by my mother and me. In this way, my mother came to grips with a persistent family dilemma.

The previous summer my mother and I had visited these same friends, Kurt and Hilde S. It was then—while I tossed feverishly in bed with an infection and a sense of foreboding—that my mother must have persuaded our London relatives to give guarantees for her and me. In this way, my mother came to grips with a persistent family dilemma.

Ever since 1933 the issue of how to leave Germany hovered tensely in the air as the one subject that my otherwise mild parents could never agree on. Periodic scenes and arguments were followed by a return to deceptive normality; my father—a lawyer and already fifty years old—concentrating ever more on his book, my mother knitting her anxiety into ever more garment. Finally in 1938 after the Anschluss, she decided to apply for a domestic visa to England and to take me with her. Such a household job was felt to be out of the question for my father,
who had never even so much as cooked an egg. But eventually her decision led him to take steps of his own. The Kindertransports that began during the tense period after *Kristallnacht* seemed to both of them a good way of speeding me out of harm’s way. Anything might still happen.

How different it was at Turners Wood this time. My room—a maid’s room under the sloping roof—could be reached only by a dark, narrow staircase. Perhaps it was this nightly climb that plunged me into a black hole of dejection. I did not realize then how fortunate I was to be staying with friends in a house already familiar to me, not in a children’s camp or in the home of complete strangers, as did so many other Kindertransportees.

A Saturday three weeks later brought my mother’s arrival. The sound of her voice, the comfort of her presence created a sense of home. But by Monday she had to leave. I had somehow expected things would change. Depressed again and increasingly withdrawn, no longer even able to cry, I sought comfort in writing in the diary that she had brought me.

My unhappiness and night wanderings around the house perplexed Tante Hilde and Onkel Kurt, who—in their own way—had tried to be kind. Besides they needed space for ever more of their own relatives arriving from Berlin. They suggested that I move out. My mother turned to Bloomsbury House, one of the cluster of relief agencies that looked after the German and Austrian refugees arriving in England. A temporary, possibly permanent home for me was found in the country.

So now there I was, waiting with my mother for a new chapter in my life to begin. A heavy-set, plainly dressed, clearly middle-aged woman, with a tweedy, countrified appearance, and a ruddy complexion approached us, and introduced herself as “Pauline Muirhead.” Her grey eyes sparkled with intelligence, and there was an educated clip to her voice. She aroused an immediate feeling of confidence in my mother. The sense of trust and liking that spontaneously felt made the parting from my mother less painful, and the upcoming trip into the country more exciting.

Soon the train was chugging through a landscape that over the years would become so familiar and beloved that even now, when I travel through the more urbanized Sussex scenery, I remember it as it was then—sixty-five years ago—the rural landscape with its fields and hedges, the rising curve of the Sussex Downs, the villages. From Rotherfield rail station (no longer in existence) we climbed up the long hill to Dyke End, the Muirhead’s cottage. A sprite-like, wizened old gentleman with long white curls at the side of his head, emerged from the fire-lit, book-lined living room to greet me in German. It was the octogenarian Professor John Henry Muirhead, an eminent moral philosopher in his time, and one of the founders of Birmingham University, where the auditorium bears his name.

The next morning I woke up to a new world. Through the open window came scents from the garden—all two acres of it. Even the cherry tree in our far smaller suburban Berlin garden, fast vanishing from my memory, was no match. Here rows of blooming Japanese cherry trees led up to the summerhouse where the professor worked on his memoirs. Daffodils and irises bloomed everywhere. The garden ended in a grassy, unkempt area, almost a field, where rabbits frolicked unchecked. From there, the village with its stone houses, thatched cottages, and church spire could be seen standing against the horizon.

The day after my arrival was marked by a tea party for some of the ladies from the local refugee committee. The following days brought more such occasions, including a tea party for all the local refugee children. My diary entries could barely keep up with all these events and with descriptions of all the new surroundings. My low spirits, even my homesickness, evaporated. I even forgot that my mother was about to visit us on her day off.

The morning of the next Saturday found Dame or Damey (as I was to call her in adaptation of the German term “Die Dame”) standing again on the platform at Rotherfield Station. I watched my mother descend from the train, beginning to wave at us. For an instant I wanted to run towards her. “*Mutti, Mutti!*” The words formed silently in my throat. But I held back, conscious of Dame next to me. Tall and slender in her still fashionable tailor-made suit, my mother now appeared strange to me—somehow foreign.

Those trips to visit us at Dyke-End were to become so important to my mother during the ensuing war years, when as an enemy alien—even if considered a “friendly” one—she would have to get travel permission from the police. For me they were increasingly discomforting. Even the long letters she was later to write to me at boarding school were hardly read. Dyke End and school had become my world, despite fleeting flashes of forlornness, an almost unrecognizable homesickness.

My father came over to England in July 1939 on a temporary visa, equipped with a permanent visa for Santiago, Chile, assuming that we would all to go there together. Perhaps it was my mother who persuaded him to leave without us, perhaps it was the Muirheads or perhaps he himself decided that it would be best for me to remain at Dyke End and for my mother to stay in England to watch over me? Life in Chile for a middle-aged professional couple without practical means of support and with a ten-year-old daughter in tow would have been precarious. I would never have received as good a schooling there as I did in England.

In hindsight life at Dyke End was not all quite perfect, particularly after the Professor’s death in early 1940. After all, it was a foster home under the supervision of various local and regional refugee committees. Two more refugee girls (later to become like sisters to me) joined us to supplement Dame’s now meager income and to provide her with the bulwark of affection and companionship she needed to combat her depressions. Some misunderstandings developed between her and my mother. When I was around fifteen years old, I began to spend some part of my vacation from boarding school with family friends or relatives. Yet even today my English family, now in its third generation, has come to be as dear to me as my own family, and the magic of the rolling countryside, its fields, villages and the gardens hidden behind its trees still casts a spell over me.

The seven years of family separation ended in Santiago, Chile in July 1946 when I—still very much an English school girl, barely Jewish any longer, and no longer speaking German—and my mother arrived in Santiago, where I soon found work teaching in an English school. The rift of growing up apart from my parents never healed, certainly not with my father, who died shortly after we reached Chile, and in some ways not with my mother either, even though we developed a very intense relationship. Yet over and above the separations and resulting estrangement of the emigration process towers the fact that it was my mother’s decisiveness, British immigration policy, and in my case the Kindertransport, that saved us from the fate that would otherwise have been ours.
Drawing Conclusions from a Sojourn in Hades: The Work of Gerhard Durlacher, an Auschwitz Survivor
Laureen Nussbaum
Portland State University

In his fine essay “In Memoriam Gerhard Durlacher 1928-1996” (3, I[1998]: 9-11) Yehudi Lindeman apprised the readers of this Bulletin of Durlacher’s beautifully written autobiographical essays. Durlacher, the son of German Jewish refugees, wrote in his adopted language, Dutch. At the time of his death, only the first two of the five slim volumes that constitute his oeuvre had been translated into English. In the meanwhile, his third and most ambitious book, De zoektocht (1991), is also available in English under the title The Search (1998). Unfortunately, it has gone largely unnoticed. In addition, several shorter Durlacher texts have appeared posthumously in the original Dutch. These new publications provide reason enough to revisit his legacy.

A brief bio-bibliographical review of Durlacher’s life may be helpful. Gerhard Leopold Durlacher was born 10 July 1928 in Baden-Baden, Germany, the only child of a middle-class, music-loving Jewish couple. He was a rather dreamy boy. In 1937, he and his parents fled to the Netherlands. A little over a year after the German occupation of that small neighboring country, Jewish children were no longer allowed to attend public school. Gerhard was tutored for a while. In October 1942, when he was fourteen, the Durlachers were seized and deported first to the Dutch transit camp Westerbork, then, in January 1944 to Theresienstadt (Terezin). On 18 May 1944, the family was sent on to Auschwitz. Despite this bitter recognition, Durlacher writes with great respect in the third story of Stripes in the Sky about the remarkably courageous attitude of the Danes vis-à-vis the systematically perpetrated inhumanity, deemed incredible by most other contemporaries. Although rumors about atrocities were rife, few people were able to allow these unspeakable horrors to enter their consciousness, without suffering serious mental damage themselves. Durlacher’s “Afterthoughts” to the title story reads: A world in which the aged, the ill, children and pregnant women are destroyed as useless garbage, in which every human dignity is jeered at, in which a human being is nothing more than vermin-ridden cattle, no
longer useful once it has consumed its own muscle tissue, can only be faced up to by a few. Reports about what was happening ‘over there’ cannot be accepted for they undermine all our values.

This is how Durlacher attempts to explain the conduct of the silent bystanders in most of the occupied lands, as well as in the Allied countries at the time, and he adds: “It then takes courage and determination to open your mouth and protest” (Stripes, pp. 25-26).

Animated by the positive reception of his slim volume of war memories, Durlacher turned to his early childhood recollections, which reach back to the beginning of 1933, the time Hitler came to power. In 1987, Drenkeling, the Dutch original of Drowning: Growing up in the Third Reich (1993), appeared. It is another slender book with short accounts in the present tense. Durlacher succeeds in recapturing the feelings of disempowerment and helplessness, a feeling that dominated his early childhood in Baden-Baden. In these short pieces he also tells of the willingness of individuals to stand up for humaneness, of simple people like his nurse maid, Maria, or the waiter, Fritz, or a non-Jewish neighbor boy who stood by him when he was dropped by all the others. These people were like spots of light in the gathering, increasingly threatening darkness. After half a century, with quite some trepidation, Durlacher revisited the region of his early years. The repeatedly proffered excuse: “We didn’t know anything, well hardly anything,” arouses his indignation and caused him to close his book of early memories with the following tart observation:

This is not a country of the blind, the deaf and the dumb. Anyone who wanted to hear could hear. Anyone who wanted to see could see. The speeches in which hoarse demagogues proclaimed our destruction were blared from every loudspeaker since January 1933. The measures aimed at isolating us, which daily chipped away our freedom, were printed in big bold letters in every newspaper. Countless Germans allowed themselves to be led into barbarism. Countless Germans, indifferent or paralyzed by fear, watched us drowning before their eyes. And a few of them, courageous like Fritz, the waiter in Riva on Lake Garda, rescued one of the drowning from the waves.

Drowning, p. 97

Once Durlacher’s devastating memories had broken out of their vault, he felt the need to have them corroborated by research in libraries and archives as well as by contacting his former fellow prisoners. The Search tells of this quest and of his link-up and the eventual reunion with some of the eighty-nine “‘Birkenau Boys,” who, teenagers at the time like Durlacher himself, had not been sent to the gas chambers during the Auschwitz selection of 10 July 1944. At the reunion in Israel, they discovered that they were spared as a group because two Jewish women, mistresses of the camp commander and of one of his highly placed subordinates, had pleaded for the boys to be assigned to labor details rather then be gassed with their families (The Search, pp. 169 ff). This revelation supplements Durlacher’s earlier unraveling of the history of the Auschwitz “family camp” in “The Illusionists,” the afore-mentioned third story in Stripes in the Sky (pp. 43-70).

Durlacher’s account of his re-connection with each of the handful of his fellow survivors in the United States, Canada, and Israel is deeply moving and so is his rendering of each individual’s story of survival. For every one of them it had been immensely difficult to live with the memory of a destroyed childhood, with the recollection of the horrors and humiliations experienced in the concentration camps, with the grief for murdered close relatives and friends, with the rage against both the perfidy of their torturers and the indifference of the rest of the world. Despite those heavy and lasting burdens, many of these survivors had managed to become professionals and several of them, Durlacher included, had been able to find some solace in music and the arts. Only two of them were religious Jews; the dozen or so others all led more or less assimilated lives, forgoing the comfort of traditional faith.

Just like Durlacher’s previous books, The Search consists of a number of separate stories, each of them recounting a specific episode as truthfully and concisely as possible. All of them are meticulously researched and they are seamlessly connected. The reader is made aware of many insoluble tensions and unanswerable questions. How can concentration camp survivors reconcile the incongruity between their heavily burdened memory and “normal” daily life, without beginning to doubt their mental images and without repressing them? On the other hand, how do we, who were spared their ordeal, or how do younger generations face former death-camp inmates? How do we overcome our awe, our uneasiness, our powerlessness, and our guilt feelings vis-à-vis people who had to go through hell? How do we hone our understanding for their sensitivities, the personal ones as well as those regarding threatening social and political developments? How do we commemorate?

Durlacher gives us small hints. In all of his books, the ones mentioned above as well as the two subsequent collections of short autobiographical stories —unfortunately not (yet) translated into English—Quarantaine (Quarantine) of 1994 and Niet verstaan (Not understood) of 1995, he distills the essence of his experiences. Time and again he takes care to offset his horrible memories with examples of human kindness, of helpfulness, and of courage displayed by individuals he encountered before and after the catastrophe, for instance, as a child refugee in Holland in the nineteen-thirties, or during his harrowing trip back from the Russian infirmary in Silesia to the Netherlands. Even in the camps, he met charismatic fellow prisoners, whom he remembers with profound gratitude. The reader feels invited to ponder and to emulate these models.

The author’s informed reflections on clearly defined and vividly re-experienced key episodes of a turbulent youth also were appreciated beyond the Dutch borders. His books were read and he was honored both as a first-hand witness and as a sensitive writer; this recognition in turn gave him a sense of satisfaction. Writing became an inner necessity. It helped him sort out his experiences. Time and again he takes care to offset his horrible memories with examples of human kindness, of helpfulness, and of courage displayed by individuals he encountered before and after the catastrophe, for instance, as a child refugee in Holland in the nineteen-thirties, or during his harrowing trip back from the Russian infirmary in Silesia to the Netherlands. Even in the camps, he met charismatic fellow prisoners, whom he remembers with profound gratitude. The reader feels invited to ponder and to emulate these models.

The author’s informed reflections on clearly defined and vividly re-experienced key episodes of a turbulent youth also were appreciated beyond the Dutch borders. His books were read and he was honored both as a first-hand witness and as a sensitive writer; this recognition in turn gave him a sense of satisfaction. Writing became an inner necessity. It helped him sort out his experiences. Time and again he takes care to offset his horrible memories with examples of human kindness, of helpfulness, and of courage displayed by individuals he encountered before and after the catastrophe, for instance, as a child refugee in Holland in the nineteen-thirties, or during his harrowing trip back from the Russian infirmary in Silesia to the Netherlands. Even in the camps, he met charismatic fellow prisoners, whom he remembers with profound gratitude. The reader feels invited to ponder and to emulate these models.

The author’s informed reflections on clearly defined and vividly re-experienced key episodes of a turbulent youth also were appreciated beyond the Dutch borders. His books were read and he was honored both as a first-hand witness and as a sensitive writer; this recognition in turn gave him a sense of satisfaction. Writing became an inner necessity. It helped him sort out his experiences. Time and again he takes care to offset his horrible memories with examples of human kindness, of helpfulness, and of courage displayed by individuals he encountered before and after the catastrophe, for instance, as a child refugee in Holland in the nineteen-thirties, or during his harrowing trip back from the Russian infirmary in Silesia to the Netherlands. Even in the camps, he met charismatic fellow prisoners, whom he remembers with profound gratitude. The reader feels invited to ponder and to emulate these models.

These posthumously published materials show most clearly Durlacher’s propensity to draw personal and political conclusions from his life’s experiences. In his critical reflection “Herdenken is vooruitzien” (To Commemorate is to Look Ahead), written for the fortieth anniversary of the liberation of the Netherlands, he recalls the extremely cold reception that greeted the survivors from both the German and the Japanese prison camps upon their return to the Netherlands, when the war was finally over. After a brief summary of the horrors these prisoners had gone through, he remarks: “The people who returned from Hades have rarely had the feeling of finding recognition or comprehension for their sojourn in the nether-world. And perhaps that is too much to expect.” In this context Durlacher repeats the passage from *Stripes in the Sky* dealing with the unimaginability of the dehumanization in the concentration camps, quoted above, and he concludes:

Yet this kind of imagination is of great importance. No longer for us, but for all of the people who come after us. Not for the sake of history, but for the sake of the future. The system has not ceased to exist after May of 1945. In many countries and under many regimes this cancer is still virulent. Oh God, may it stop!

*Met haat*, p. 17

Durlacher’s 1993 interview in connection with a literary soirée he had organized for a group of refugees, started out with words of empathy: “I can imagine only too well how displaced one feels in a country where one does not know the language, the culture. Refugees who are requesting asylum live in a totally separate world” (*Met haat*, p. 116). Open houses in the refugee centers when visitors are invited to watch the asylum seekers perform exotic dances or engage in foreign arts and crafts, were of no use. To Durlacher they were like a day at the zoo. It was demeaning and should be avoided. Instead, he wanted to do his part “to put the brakes on barbarism” (ibid., p. 119).

Violence is on the rise and conditions are deteriorating. The spiral has to be bent in a different direction. [Elie] Wiesel said: ‘The most deadly sin is indifference.’ This statement would be enough to earn him the Nobel Prize. There is a great danger that people resign themselves to what is going on: we think it is terrible, but we fail to comprehend the misery. It is a world-wide feeling.

*Met haat*, p. 119

He granted that it is difficult to stop the harmful process of privatization and individualization, but he warned that whoever locks his or her soul against what happens abroad will soon turn a deaf ear to people close by. Yet Durlacher saw glimpses of hope, as many Dutch high school students began to find his books on their reading list, and in Germany thousands of young people took to the street in order to protest against neo-Nazis and against racial violence (*Met haat*, pp. 116-119).

“Dezonde der onverschilligheid” (The Sin of Indifference), a recurrent Durlacher theme, is the title of a contribution he made in 1987 to a workshop on “Violence Against Children in South Africa.” In this presentation, he reminds people of the fact that indifference made the genocides of the twentieth century possible: the murder of over a million Armenians in Turkey, of twenty million Russians under Stalin, of over six million Jews and Gypsies under Hitler, of tens of millions of Chinese under Mao and his wife, of a million Ibos in Africa, of three million Bangladesh and two million Cambodians in Asia, and on and on, with an ever climbing number of deaths in South Africa even as Durlacher was speaking: “The word INDIFFERENCE gnashes between my teeth,” he continues, as he tries to fathom that propensity within himself and within others. He returns to the devastating Auschwitz experience, described so unforgettable in the title story of *Stripes in the Sky* and repeats his afterthoughts of 1982. Since that time, he said:

[M]uch, too much has passed by our eyes and ears, but also by our hearts. The stream of brutality that goes by via the media and via our own observation, numbs us by its very force, causes us to be hopeless and even apathetic[ …]. Nobody can be open to all of the injustice perpetrated on a daily basis, not even to everything one hears and sees day after day. Nobody has the ability of Atlas to carry the distressful world on his shoulders. Yet, this should not be seen as an excuse for doing nothing.

*Verzameld werk*, pp. 509-11

Quickly writing a check in order to appease one’s conscience only to hurry back to the order of the day would not do for Durlacher. What is needed, he pleaded, is active intervention, courageous resistance:

If we teach our children to raise their voices and demand respect for our fellow human beings, if we encourage them not to rest until they are being listened to, then the downtrodden will know that they are not alone and deserted, like we were at the time, and that will give them the strength to persevere in their call for justice.

*Verzameld werk*, pp. 512-14

In the text fragment “From Tivoli to Danang” Durlacher drew a personal conclusion with important ethical and political ramifications, one that may give pause to American readers. Like all of Durlacher’s stories, this text is built on his own experiences and narrated in the first person, mostly in the present tense (*Verzameld werk*, pp. 529-82). He told how in the early nineteen-fifties, in appreciation of the stand the majority of Danes had taken during the Nazi era, young Durlacher, then a student of medicine, hitch-hiked to Copenhagen. In the Tivoli Gardens he met an American couple en route to Wiesbaden, where the young man, just out of law school, would work as a counselor to the U.S. Air Force. The young American was robust and full of vitality, the narrator’s antipode. The lawyer’s wife was a rather sensitive musician. The three of them became fast friends and eventually Durlacher’s wife, Anneke, joined the warm relationship. As early as his first visit to Wiesbaden, the narrator noticed how, in the privileged military environment, his lawyer-friend gradually forfeited his progressive stance. After the Americans returned to the United States, a lively correspondence developed between the two couples. In the meantime, the war in Vietnam had started and raged on relent-
lessly. American Marines secured the Air Force base in Danang.

In the spring of 1969, shortly after the American bombardment of Cambodia, which escalated the war horrendously, the lawyer announced to his Dutch friends that he had an assignment in Europe and that he hoped to visit them for a few days. He added, as an aside, that he had become a high-ranking executive at Kaiser Aluminum, one of the major American warplane and armament manufacturers. Making a connection between his own war-time experiences and the current events in South-East Asia, Durlacher replied fiercely that the lawyer and his family would be welcome only as refugees from the Nixon-regime.

Mrs. Durlacher adds in her “Afterword” to the fragments that her husband wanted to show with this book as well as with everything else he had written, that the personal and the political are inseparable. She is convinced that if “From Tivoli to Danang” had been completed, it would have been a passionate plea for watchfulness lest history keep repeating itself (Verzameld Werk, pp. 507-86, esp. pp. 584 -86). That is why this reviewer deems it urgent that Durlacher’s books are read not only by students of the Holocaust but also by concerned citizens who want to learn from a thoughtful survivor.

Works by Durlacher:
The following titles are available in English: *Stripes in the Sky: A Wartime Memoir* (1991), *Drowning: Growing up in the Third Reich* (1993), and *The Search: The Birkenau Boys* (1998), all three of them translated by Susan Massotty and published by Serpent’s Tail Press (London, New York). Quotations from texts that have not appeared in English were translated by the present author. Readers of German can find Durlacher’s fourth book, *Quarantaine*, in an excellent German translation by Maria Csollány under the title *Wunderbare Menschen: Geschichten aus der Freiheit* (Hamburg: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1998). Durlacher’s Dutch publisher is Meulenhoff in Amsterdam.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Congratulations, Robert!**


Bernheim is a founding member of the outside advisory board of the Center for Holocaust Studies. Currently teaching at Middlebury College, he created and continues to run the summer course at UVM, “The Holocaust and Holocaust Education.”

**Summer Courses**

For the 12th year, Continuing Education at the University of Vermont offers:

**The Holocaust and Holocaust Education** for Teachers of Grades K-12. This year’s course will be held 27 June – 1 July. Although this course is primarily intended for teachers, it is also open to undergraduates and cross-listed under World Literature and Holocaust Studies

This year, for the first time, we offer a companion course for teachers who have already taken The Holocaust and Holocaust Education:

**Teaching the Holocaust.** This 5-day seminar for teachers and teachers in training offers an in-depth exploration of methodologies for teaching the Holocaust. This course will be held 11– 15 July 2005.

For more information on either course, visit Continuing Education’s website: http://learn.uvm.edu/.

Continued from page 3

_His Seventy-Fifth Birthday_ (Burlington, Vermont: Center for Holocaust Studies at the University of Vermont, 2001), pp. 223-237.

On Tuesday, 26 October 2004, the Center for Holocaust Studies presented the twelfth annual Raul Hilberg Lecture, delivered by Professor Jill Stephenson from Edinburgh University. Professor Stephenson's research has largely focused on women in Germany during the Weimar Republic and the Nazi era. When she started her research, she did not think that this topic would have substantial depth. Now she has written numerous publications and has even appeared on British television and radio as an expert on this area. I was privileged not only to listen to her lecture but also to briefly meet her.

For the Hilberg Lecture, Stephenson's topic was “Two Sides of the Coin: ‘Aryan’ Health and Racial Persecution,” an issue that is not studied enough when dealing with the Holocaust. She made an analogy between the racial persecution conducted by the Nazis and the behavior of a gardener. As she put it, a gardener discards weeds and unwanted or imperfect plants, in order to prevent them from inhibiting the growth of desired plants and flowers. “We eliminate these imperfect specimens to allow the perfect ones to flourish and prevail.” This is exactly how the Nazi party treated Germany and its society. The Nazi party had an obsession with “racial health.” They firmly believed that race and health determined a people’s health.

The Nazis planned to allow the “Aryan” race to prevail by eliminating and persecuting anyone who was not “Aryan.” Their mission was simple: “Retaliate first.” This meant that the enemy was to be weakened, while at the same time more resources were to be provided for those who were “valuable.”

Although one joke at the time said that to be an “Aryan” you had to be as tall as Hitler, as blond as Goebbles, as chaste as Röhm, and as thin as Göring, the definition of “Aryan” went far beyond the blond, blue-eyed stereotype to include the everyday habits and behavior of the people of Germany. Anyone who did not fit the Nazi ideal was “imperfect” and “defective.” This included the following groups: Jews, Blacks, homosexuals, gypsies, the feeble-minded, schizophrenics, chronic alcoholics, the blind, the deaf, manic depressives, those with any physical deformity, slobs, and many others. Anyone who fit into any of these categories was persecuted to the fullest extent, because such “imperfect” “non-Aryans” threatened to prevent the “Aryan” race from growing and prevailing.

These were the two sides of the coin: Side one) making sure the “Aryan” race, the “valuables,” and only they, always came first. This meant that almost all of Germany’s resources (food, supplies, etc.) were given to “Aryans” first, which made rationing of all resources extremely stringent. Side two) restricting all others. This meant that those who fit any part of the “non-Aryan” profile were discriminated against severely. Jewish assets were stolen and given to officers of the regime. Jews were excluded from the professions. In the 1930s, Jewish children were not allowed to attend schools with “Aryan” children. The persecution grew worse, and soon crossed into physical restrictions, such as giving Jews and workers from eastern Europe minimal food during the war.

Another class of people that was discriminated against was those who had “‘Aryan’ antecedents,” but refused to conform to the Nazi norm for behavior. These included petty thieves, prostitutes, habitual drinkers, and women who did not keep neat and orderly homes. Instead of taking away their businesses and assets, the Nazis dealt with this group by compulsory sterilization, ordering death through euthanasia, sending them to concentration camps, or ordering regular education sessions with social workers. Such people were treated as “worthless.” The odd part about this is that the Nazi Party now was not only discriminating against “non-Aryans,” but they were persecuting their own people—“Aryans” who were just not “good enough” to fit the mold set for the German people. The “worthless” with “‘Aryan’ antecedents” were persecuted because they, too, posed a threat to the “Aryan” race. Treating them equally to those considered “valuable” would have represented a waste of resources. If the “imperfect” people lived and thrived, they might threaten the power of the “Aryan” race. It was necessary to protect the “Aryan” race from anything and everything viewed as “bad.”

Over time laws were passed that made the persecution of all “non-Aryans” even more severe. On 15 September 1935 the Laws for the Protection of German Blood and Honor, (the Nuremberg Laws) were passed. Written because the “purity” of German blood was essential to the further existence of the German people, these laws included restrictions on marriage and sexual relations between the “valuable” and the “worthless.” On 18 October 1935 Germany published the Marriage Protection Law, which forbade people with hereditary diseases to marry. Couples wishing to marry had to submit to a medical examination to see if they had any genetically undesirable traits that could be passed on to any children. The “Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily Diseased Offspring,” passed even earlier, in July 1933, also affected the individual’s right to marry. Venerable disease, feeble-mindedness, and epilepsy are just a few of the diseases encompassed by that law; those with any of these traits were allowed to marry only if they agreed to be sterilized. Over 400,000 people had been sterilized under this law by 1945.

Although both men and women were sterilized, women were more often subjected to sterilization. Pregnancy might well result in compulsory abortion and sterilization if the woman belonged to one of the “worthless” groups. Indeed, pregnancy out of wedlock could be used as evidence that the woman should be designated “worthless.”

Because far more women were sterilized, it is not surprising that a greater number of women died due to the sterilization procedure. For instance, Stevenson cited the case of a twenty-one-year-old farmer’s daughter who died in 1937 as a result of being sterilized—her death was attributed to the fact that she tried to resist the operation. Sterilization was prescribed because she was diagnosed as “simply mentally backward,” further, she already had a child whose father was unknown, behavior that already made her unfit for “Aryan” society.

Stephenson offered another telling example of the way the Sterilization Law and the Marriage Law could operate. In 1942 a thirty-six-year-old housemaid and a thirty-seven-year-old shop-
herd were denied marriage twice and then, on the third appeal, finally allowed to marry. The reasons for the denials were those according to the Marriage Law. The woman had been classified as feeble-minded and sterilized in 1935. Because of her sterilization, the marriage application was denied the first time. The second time they applied, they were denied permission because the shepherd was devaluing his race by being prepared to marry a woman who had been sterilized. Following the third appeal, they were allowed to marry because, Stephenson speculated, the woman had just lost a brother in the war and had two other brothers still fighting. How could Germany deny the ability to marry to someone who had lost a family member in service to the Germany army? According to Stephenson, cases similar to this one were not uncommon.

Unfortunately, Germany was not the only country performing sterilizations at this time; between 1899 and 1941, 36,000 people were sterilized in the United States of America. The “weeding” the Nazis performed on Germany society by sterilizing those “imperfect” people occurred between 1934 and 1944, when an estimated 400,000 felt the impact of the “Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily Diseased Offspring.” We forget that the Nazis targeted and persecuted not only Jews but also many other innocent victims as they put into practice their sick and twisted views of a “perfect race.” There is no such thing as the perfect race and there never will be. The world is, and should be, diverse.

**ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS:**

**Melanie Gustafson** is associate professor and director of Graduate Studies in History at the University of Vermont. Her most recent publication is *Major Problems in the History of World War II*, co-edited with Mark Stoler. Her scholarly work has focused on women and political parties in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

**Loreen Nussbaum,** professor emerita of Foreign Languages and Literatures at Portland State University, is also the author of “Anne Frank and Gerhard Durlacher, Two German-Dutch Writers: Parallels and Contrasts,” due to appear shortly in Broos, Ton and Thomas F. Shannon (eds.), *The Low Countries: Crossroads of Cultures* (Münster: Nodus, 2005).

**Gabrielle Piscitelli** is a first-year student at the University of Vermont and the granddaughter of Holocaust survivors.

**Nicholas Saul,** professor of German at the University of Durham, in England, has published widely in modern German and comparative literature. Most recently he co-edited, with Susan Tebbutt, *The Role of the Romanies: Images and Counter-Images of ‘Gypsies/Romanies in European Cultures*.

**Irene Katzenstein Schmied** edits *Kinderlink*, the publication of the KTA (Kindertransport Association). A translator for many years, she has always written and has published essays, book reviews, and drama reviews. She lives in New York City.

Kerry Bluglass is a senior psychiatrist at the University of Birmingham, UK, who, late in her career, has come to address the issue of the emotional outcome for children hidden during the Holocaust. Excerpts from fourteen interviews conducted in 1997 with survivors from France, Holland, Belgium, and Poland provide the core of the book. Wisely, Bluglass emphasizes the significance of oral history of the Holocaust, as well as the difference between “unmediated” testimony and her narratives based on interviews. Her concern is to present child survivor narratives as a piece of Holocaust oral history and to draw conclusions based on her clinical assessments. Her overall conclusion attests to the resilience and positive emotional adjustment of her interviewees, a testament to the human capacity to emerge whole from adversity and trauma.

The narratives, while evidently abridged and edited, are similar in construct to those of many Holocaust survivors. That is, they present the facts of survival in largely chronological fashion, the efforts of adults to reconstruct the story of their lives. The Holocaust experiences of these child survivors vary, most especially in the number of rescuers and the degree of actual emotional and physical protection provided. Varied also is the degree to which the survivors maintained connection to their rescuers after the war. All the narratives focus on the crucial post-war psychological transition for survivors who still were negotiating childhood after having gone through separation, loss, and various degrees of physical and psychic trauma. What is not made entirely clear is the role of Bluglass as interviewer and editor in the shaping of the narratives. While this is part of a perennial issue in the depiction of the transformation of memory into history, what is significant is the theoretical framework informing the clinical purpose of the narrative presentations. In other words, what is the interpretive lens through which Holocaust experiences are evaluated?

In the 8 November 2004 issue of the New Yorker, Malcolm Gladwell’s Annals of Psychology article, “Getting Over It,” elucidates changes in clinical paradigms as applied to combat experiences during and since World War II and to childhood sexual abuse. The prevalent intuitive assumption may be that these experiences are of such traumatic nature that they always have long-term psychic repercussions. But what Gladwell reports is that recent research highlights the contrary, that in fact, people are more resilient than we (or they) assumed they would be in the face of trauma. The experience of attendance at the First International Gathering of Children Hidden During World War II, held in New York in 1991. Sharing enabled these “insiders and outsiders at the kingdom of Death” to contextualize their memories and experiences, to help overcome “survivor guilt, or, more usually, to negate a sense that they were ‘not really survivors’.”

While Bluglass imparts a mostly positive message about the power of resilience and adaptation, she admits that “we do not really know enough about these people in depth” and that it is “difficult to ‘cherry pick’ attributes and circumstances” in order to generalize (p. 247). Here we might question the depth of Bluglass’s psychiatric assessment, given that the parameters are not particularly well spelled out. We may also wonder about the evolution of interpretive lenses and their role in contemporary understanding of past events. That the capacity for psychic resilience in the human experience is countering our intuitive assumption of pathology in the face of trauma is worth noting in the context of Bluglass’s positive psychiatric conclusions.

What is striking emerges from the narratives themselves. Not one suggests any dose of “egotism” or “heroic struggle” contributing to ultimate survival. Other hidden child narratives are similarly modest and self-effacing, including that of Michael Bukanc in The Holocaust: Personal Accounts, published by the Center for Holocaust Studies at the University of Vermont in 2001. He concludes his account thus:

Finally, I would say that my successful rescue under these extraordinarily dangerous circumstances did not come without some lingering psychological and emotional effects that I have had to grapple with all my life. I believe, however, that the strengths and resilience of the people who were so intricately involved in my rescue and upbringing were imparted to me, thus enabling me to deal with and manage the difficult times, and to give something back in return.
Clearly, a convergence of psychological and non-psychological factors contributed to the survival of the most vulnerable of Holocaust victims—children, utterly dependent on the good will of others, and, ultimately, faced with the task of emergence from childhood into adulthood under severe disadvantage. That resilience played a role in a positive outcome is highly suggestive, although we will never be able to measure this factor relative to others in a truly substantive manner. That Michael Bukanc emphasizes the role of resilience, not in himself, but in his rescuers, reminds us of the crucial role of those who enabled survival during the Holocaust.

Carroll Lewin
University of Vermont


Peter Balakian opens the Burning Tigris: The Armenian Genocide and America’s Response with a love story. It begins in the summer of 1893 when Alice Stone Blackwell and Ohannes Chatschumian began translating Armenian poetry together. As the notable daughter of American political reformers and the poor theology student who had migrated from Russian Armenia learned each other’s languages, they pledged not only their love but their commitment to helping Armenians then living under the harsh conditions of the Ottoman Empire. Blackwell and Chatschumian formed the United Friends of Armenia and, with Julia Ward Howe, author of the “Battle Hymn of the Republic,” as its first president, launched “America’s first international human rights movement” (p. 19). This movement raised American awareness of the Armenian situation and helped “define American ideas about international human rights and responsibilities” (p. 19). These ideas included the need to raise money, to mobilize relief teams that would travel to places of disaster, and to lobby Congress and the President. In 1896, Americans “raised more than three hundred thousand dollars in an age when a loaf of bread cost a nickel” (p. 70) and the symbol of American humanity, seventy-five-year-old Clara Barton, led America’s first international American Red Cross mission to Turkey to help the “starving Armenians” (p. 75). From 1915 to 1929, the Committee on Armenian Atrocities raised $116,000,000 (which would be today more than a billion dollars) and engaged in more relief efforts. Americans understood that the stakes were high. The massacres of the 1890s, the Armenian public learned, resulted in the death of around 200,000 Armenians—100,000 were murdered and 100,000 died from disease or famine (pp. 5; 110). Worse was yet to come. After the Young Turks (the Committee of Union and Progress) took control in 1908, violence escalated under what Balakian calls “a government-planned genocide.” Between 1915 and 1922 the Armenian death toll reached over a million to a million and a half (p. 180). Henry Morgenthau, the American Ambassador in Constantinople from 1913 to 1916, was reported in a 1915 New York Times article as stating: “Turks admit that the Armenian persecution is the first step in a plan to get rid of Christians, and that Greeks will come next. Jews are also marked for slaughter or expulsion” (p. 284).

Balakian’s book builds on the work of earlier scholars of the Armenian genocide, especially that of Vahakn Dadrian, as well as the insights of scholars of the destruction of European Jews. Yet this book is also a political commentary on Turkey’s relationship to this history. This is evident in the introduction and the epilogue, which deal with the Turkish government’s continual denial of the genocide and its attempts to erase it from the historical record. Balakian also details the pressure the Turkish government has exerted in American political and academic circles, and the counter-efforts of Armenian-Americans, over the use of the word genocide and the presentation of this history. Balakian quotes Emory University professor Deborah Lipstadt; “Denial of genocide—whether that of the Turks against Armenians, or the Nazis against Jews—is not an act of historical reinterpretation. Rather it sows confusion by appearing to be engaged in a genuine scholarly effort” (pp. xviii and 389). While Balakian’s book is a scholarly effort, its introduction and epilogue frame it as a political morality tale. According to Balakian, Turks who participated in the genocide in the past and those who deny the genocide today are to be criticized. Both are perpetrators; both must be denounced for their actions.

Mining a rich lode of personal accounts, missionary testimony, and official reports, Balakian keeps the horrifying details of the massacres and genocide at the center of his narrative. He shows that what Armenians, diplomats, and foreign missionaries lived through and survived to testify about was later confirmed by Turkey’s military and diplomatic allies at post-war tribunals. Together these accounts contribute to a solid historical record of a situation that can clearly be termed a genocide. But Balakian is not content to simply string together statistics and individual reports. He wants readers to feel the emotions of the past, emotions that he clearly feels himself—grief, despair, anger, hope, and optimism. He uses numerous American newspaper reports to evoke the feelings of the day as Americans learned of the atrocities. They document the outpouring of sympathy and activism by Americans. Thanks to modern technology it is easy to access, read, and examine many of the articles that make up what Balakian calls the “beginning of modern human rights reporting.” I was especially interested in the New York Times article from 10 September 1895 because Balakian states that it was perhaps the first time the word “holocaust” was used “to describe a human rights disaster.” The article’s headline is “Another Armenian Holocaust” and, according to Balakian, it “describes the mass murder of more than five thousand Armenians by a force of one thousand Turkish troops in the Erzinjan district of eastern Turkey” (p. 11). After accessing the article I was shocked to discover that Balakian got the headline correct but not the facts. According to the Times, “1,000 Turkish troops were sent to Kemokh, and five villages were pillaged. Five thousand persons were rendered homeless.” The article goes on to report that “men, women, and children were tortured” but it does not describe a “mass murder.” If Balakian wants to suggest that “homeless” is a code word for “mass murder” then he needs to show that the Times did this consistently. In fact, Balakian states, the Times used “conclusive language” in its reports about “the Turkish slaughter of the Armenians”: “systematic,” “deliberate,” “campaign of extermination,” and “systematic race extermination” are words used in articles under headlines like “Eight Thousand Butchered” and “Denying
Armenian Atrocities” (pp. xix, 11). Therefore, if “homeless” is not a code word, why does Balakian begin his almost 400-page study with a misuse of facts, when so many other reports clearly show mass murders that were, cumulatively, a genocide? This “mistake,” “misreading” or whatever we might call it is a serious issue, most especially because of the way Balakian has framed his study. If he is concerned with the denial of the genocide then he needs to be absolutely precise in all his details. The facts need to balance the emotion.

There is much to be praised in this book but also much to question. For instance, Balakian describes and suggests that the Armenian genocide was a template for the German Holocaust but he does not fully engage the scholarship that looks at the range of influences on Hitler and Germany. Instead, Balakian consistently returns to the human stories. He helps us know better some well-known Americans, like Alice Stone Blackwell, and unknown Armenians, like Ohannes Chatschumian. And what of their love story? In the summer of 1894 Chatschumian returned to Leipzig to continue his studies there. After a long illness, he died in May 1896. Stone Blackwell never married, continued translating poems, and worked for Armenian relief and other political causes until her death in 1950.

Melanie Gustafson
University of Vermont

Book Announcement:


This useful and affordable volume of documentation covers a wide range of topics. The ten sections are: The Context of Christian Antisemitism; The Creation of Monsters in Germany: Jews and Others; The Nazi Attack on Jews and Other Undesirables in the Third Reich, 1933-1938; The Physical Assault on Jews in Germany, 1938-1939; The Perfection of Genocide as National Policy (by far the longest section); ‘Arbeit Macht Frei’: Work and Death in Concentration Camps and Ghettos; Assembly Lines of Death: Extermination Camps; The Aftermath; and The Holocaust in Contemporary Life.

TEN PRINCIPLES FOR THE CREATION OF GERMAN MUSIC
translated, with commentary
by David Scrase
University of Vermont

In his significant cultural-political speech on the occasion of the Reich Music Convention in Düsseldorf Reichsminister Dr. Goebbels stated, among other things, the following:

This festival of music is for the first time a review of musical culture in our time. It gives an account of what we have accomplished and sets forth the goals both for the immediate future and for the foreseeable future. May the fame of Germany as the nation of music be once again revealed and substantiated here on this occasion. And, above all, may the principles that have since time immemorial been the source and the driving force behind our German music again be set forth and recognized. They are:

1. The essence of music does not lie in a program or in theory, in experimentation or in structure. It lies in melody. Melody as such elevates the heart and revives the spirits; for this reason it is not trite or reprehensible because it is sung by the people on account of the ease with which it can be memorized.

2. Not all music is accessible to everyone. For this reason, the kind of popular music that appeals to a wide audience is to be preferred. This is especially so in an epoch in which the nation’s leaders are obliged to provide relaxation, entertainment, and refreshment for its people, who are confronted with today’s deep anxieties.

3. Like every other art form music has its origins in the mysterious and deep powers that are rooted in the people. It can accordingly be shaped and formed in a way appropriate to the people’s needs and to their powerful drive to make music only by those descendants who are steeped in their nation’s heritage. Judaism and German music are opposites that, by their very nature, stand in stark contradiction to one another. The struggle against Judaism in German music, which Richard Wagner, alone and without any help or support, once took up, is for this reason still our great task today. This battle is no longer the battle of a knowledgeable genius, standing alone, but one that is being fought by a unified people.

4. Music is the most sensual of the arts and for this reason appeals more to the heart and the emotions than to the intellect. But where does the heart of a nation beat more strongly than in the masses, where the heart of a nation is truly at home. It is therefore the unavoidable duty of our musical leaders to let the people share in the treasures of German music.
5. For the musical person, to be unmusical is more or less like being blind or deaf. Thank God that he graciously created music for us to hear, experience, and passionately love.

6. Music is the art form that moves the human spirit most; it has the power to soothe pain and to turn mere happiness into ecstasy.

7. If melody is at the source of music, then it follows that a music for the people may not be limited to pastorales or chorales. Music must always return to lively melody as the root of its being.

8. Nowhere are the treasures of the past so richly and inexhaustibly spread out as in the area of music. To hold them up and give them to the people is our most important and rewarding task.

9. The language of musical tones is sometimes more effective than the language of words. For this reason, the great masters of the past represent the true majesty of our people and are deserving of reverence and respect.

10. And as children of our people they are the true monarchs of our people by God’s grace and are destined to receive the fame and honor of our nation and to multiply.

Berlin. 28 Mai 1938

Reichsminister for the People’s Enlightenment and Propaganda
Dr. Goebbels

* * *

The Nazi Party Program of 24 February 1920 contains nothing explicit on the subject of the arts among its twenty-five points; it does state that Jews could not, for reasons of race, be German citizens. However, the arts and race were soon to be linked in Nazi policy. In 1929 the ideologue Alfred Rosenberg founded the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur (Fighting Association for German Culture), in which he constantly asserted the message that the decisive factor in all artistic creation was race. This same concept is to be found in his infamous book, published in 1930, Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts (The Myth of the Twentieth Century).

Futhermore, according to Rosenberg, the Jews had, through their religion, attempted to destroy the “Teutonic spirit” that underlay the thinking of the “master race.” The introduction of race into the arts automatically excluded Jews and the Jewish contribution to the arts in Germany when Hitler assumed power.

Once in control, Hitler made significant changes concerning the administration of the arts. As early as January 1933, he made the decision to have Goebbels head a Reich Chamber of Culture, which was established in November of that year. He then appointed Rosenberg the “Führer’s delegate for the supervision of the whole intellectual and philosophical education and teaching of the National Socialist party,” so that he continued to play a role in cultural matters.

The change of leadership from Rosenberg to Goebbels did not take place altogether smoothly. The two Nazi ideologues did not like one another; each wanted to be the leader of artistic policy in the Third Reich. The Reich Chamber of Culture, which was to control all aspects of the artistic world in the Third Reich, contained seven sections: the chambers for literature, the press, radio, theater, art, film, and music. As its head, Goebbels therefore had the upper hand over Rosenberg when it came to the arts.

Goebbels held a Ph.D. in German Literature from the University of Heidelberg. He had ambitions to become a writer, and indeed, had published one (unsuccessful) novel in 1926. Goebbels, along with most other Nazi functionaries, in general lost no opportunity to pontificate. It is therefore not at all surprising that he used the occasion of the Reich Music Convention to spell out his thoughts on German music.

Goebbels appointed the celebrated composer Richard Strauss to head the Chamber of Music, with Wilhelm Furtwängler, the famous conductor, as his deputy. Both Strauss and Furtwängler were to have difficulties during the de-Nazification process after the war and remain to this day controversial figures.

Goebbels’ knowledge of music was limited, and his relationship with Strauss was fraught with difficulty. Strauss tended to ignore the chamber’s bureaucracy and he worked only on matters that he considered worthwhile, such as copyright policy. The major area of disagreement, however, lay in the “Jewish question” as it pertained to music. Strauss refused to oversee the dismissal of Jewish musicians from their posts. Furthermore, the composer refused to end his fruitful collaboration with Stefan Zweig, the notable (and Jewish) writer who was his librettist. After several months of tense discussion, Strauss resigned from the Reich Music Chamber in July 1935 “for health reasons.”

The one somewhat beneficial element to emerge from the complex and sad picture of culture in the Third Reich lay in the readiness of the Reich Chamber of Culture to tolerate the formation of the Kulturbund deutscher Juden (Cultural Association of German Jews) in 1933. The title was soon changed to the Jüdische Kulturbund (Jewish Cultural Association), since (as we have seen) Jews could not be German citizens. The Jewish Cultural Association not only gave the dismissed Jewish musicians an opportunity to perform, but, above all, until the association was disbanded in 1941, gave those Jews who remained in Germany an opportunity to attend concerts, recitals, plays, and other cultural events.

**Recommended Reading**
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Susan Tebbutt
Mary Immaculate College
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