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Introduction

By the 1930s, Jews had been living in Germany for at least 1600 years. Although they faced tremendous persecution during the Middle Ages, their communities persisted, and German Jews were among the first to enjoy the fruits of post-emancipatory integration. Germany became a beacon for Jewish immigration, and the Jewish community of Germany was among the most culturally assimilated in the world. Most German Jews considered themselves at home in German culture and society, and their participation in the First World War is a testament to their devotion to Germany. Despite this high degree of integration – or possibly because of it – German Jewry still faced persecution. Conservative bastions of society, including the army and the professorate, remained largely impervious to Jewish participation before 1914. Throughout the nineteenth century, there were anti-Jewish riots, though they did not find state sanction until the advent of the Nazi regime.² In the 1930s and 1940s, Hitler and his followers unleashed an all-encompassing genocide designed to make Germany, and all of Europe, free of Jews. No aspect of European Jewish life or society was safe from Nazi supervision and destruction. The very nature of the genocide has caused some historians to term it "the war against the Jews."² Despite this overt goal, the Nazis failed, and Jewish life continued – even in Germany.


After social exclusion, concentration, and the ultimate decimation of German Jewry, not long after the war’s end, Germany witnessed a miraculous reemergence of Jewish life. A German Jewish population, comprised of those who had gone underground, emigrated, or survived the camps, refounded religious congregations and other Jewish institutions. Moreover, the renascent German Jewish community was joined by an influx of Eastern European Holocaust survivors who did not wish to remain in their homelands after their liberation from the concentration camps. Together, they formed a fractious community, divided on cultural, religious, and even political grounds.

This is a book about Jews, Jewish institutions, and Jewish issues in Germany in the critical first decade immediately after the Second World War. It tells a multifaceted story focusing on the reestablishment of the Jewish community in Germany, on the community’s interest representation, and on the manner in which German political elites related to Jewish issues — including the reconstruction of the community, restitution, and reparations — as German society rebuilt itself. Despite the Jewish community’s small size, the very presence of Jews in Germany had importance, both providing interlocutors for a reconciliatory dialogue and serving as reminders of Germany’s historic failings.

In the years immediately after the war — coinciding with the years of Allied occupation of Germany — instability characterized the reemerging Jewish community. The majority of the Jews living in Germany did not wish to remain there, preferring to settle in Palestine; however, a significant minority of Jews did wish to stay in Germany. Their enduring presence proved confounding and controversial to Jews around the world who felt that Germany was no place for a Jew to live after 1945, and especially not after 1948, when the establishment of the state of Israel permitted an exodus of Jewish refugees from Europe.

As a small group, acting largely without the support of Jews abroad, the community in Germany needed cohesion. Overcoming social and religious differences, Jews in Germany united for the purposes of political representation. Simply put, they needed a coordinated voice to advocate their interests, both to the German governments and to Jewish groups around the world. Two organizations took up this task. In West Germany, the principal representative was the Central Council of Jews in Germany (Zentralrat der
Juden in Deutschland). This group’s origins, internal structure, leadership, and relations with the Bonn government and Jewish groups abroad stand at the center of this study. In East Germany, the State Association of Jewish Communities in the German Democratic Republic (Landesverband der Jüdischen Gemeinden in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik) functioned as the Central Council’s equivalent or nominal subsidiary. Its struggle on behalf of the Jews of eastern Germany, showcased in chapters 3 and 5, forms an interesting contrast to the western experience. Despite the differing political conditions each faced, both groups relied heavily on personal ties between their leaders and influential Germans, a policy that had the potential for great success and catastrophic failure.

At the same time that the Jewish community was coalescing and organizing, non-Jewish Germans sought to rebuild their society. Starting in 1949, two German states came into being, and German administrations assumed most governmental functions previously under Allied control. In western Germany, winning support for liberal democracy, which had failed before 1933, was not easy. Politicians faced critical decisions regarding any confrontation with the legacy of Germany’s crimes against humanity, most particularly against the Jewish people of Europe. While dealing with these issues in an open and forthright manner would have reflected a renewal of civil society and progressive public discourse, it also had the potential to alienate millions of Germans who did not unqualifiedly reject the previous regime. The decisions made by state and party leaders regarding the Jews and Jewish issues are central to understanding the conditions under which the Jewish community developed.

In many ways, Germany’s break with its past and its official relationship with the Jews characterized its progress toward a democratic, liberal future. This study seeks to clarify the manner in which German politicians and political parties addressed Jewish-related issues. In particular, it examines Jews’ relationships with state and party leaders. Because of the recent German past, Jewish leaders, representing a small community (between 20,000 and 40,000), acquired an influence greater than their constituency would have merited under normal circumstances.

In the most overt sense, this study poses a number of questions. How did the Jewish community of Germany form after the tragedy
of the Holocaust? What was the nature of the community, and how did it regard itself? What were its relations to other Jewish groups in Israel and throughout the Diaspora? How did the state and individual German leaders deal with the Jewish community? How were Jewish or Jewish-related issues regarded by the political class in both German states? Was there a difference in domestic Jewish-German relations and Israeli-German relations, possibly colored by German Jewry’s own relations with Israel? This book attempts to answer these questions and to demonstrate their interconnectedness.

My examination begins even before the defeat of Nazi Germany, as Allied officials began considering the reintegration of Jews into German society and the fate of refugees after the war. Indeed, from 1945 to 1949, the Allied occupation governments were the primary focus of policy formation, including policy on Jewish matters. While German politicians certainly did consider and debate Jewish-related matters before the advent of German statehood, prior to 1949— even afterward to some degree— the Jews in Germany concentrated their lobbying efforts on the military occupation governments. Thus, as this study traces the reestablishment of the organized Jewish community, it also elucidates the relationship between that community and the Allies, and in particular the Americans, whose zone had the largest Jewish community.

In some senses, the years 1945 to 1949 were merely a prelude to the story of renewed Jewish life in Germany. In September 1949, a West German government formed; the following month, an East German government came into being. After the Israeli war of independence, tens of thousands of displaced persons left Germany for the new Jewish state. In 1950, the Jewish community, having been reduced to a core population, overcame its internal divisions and united for representative purposes under the Central Council of Jews in Germany. By the autumn of 1950, the community had a hierarchical organization and German partners for dialogue in the West German federal government and the government of East Germany. Therefore, after the pivotal transitional years of 1949–1950, explicated in chapters 1 and 2, this study focuses on the policies of the governments and leading political parties regarding Jewish issues and the relationship of those bodies with the western Central Council and the eastern State Association. Additionally, an examination of the Central Council’s troubled relationship with
Introduction

Jewish groups in other countries, including Israel, elucidates the challenges facing the community.

Concentrating on political and collective aspects, particularly on the national or federal level, my analysis reaches its terminal point in the year 1953. That year, West Germany established its policy regarding Jewish survivors of the Holocaust, ratifying a treaty for reparations to Israel and foreign Jewish groups and legislating reparations to individual victims of the Nazis. At the same time, the West German Interior Ministry began an institutionalized relationship with the Central Council, supporting it through regular subsidies. Finally, in 1953, with the goal of reparations achieved, the Central Council began an internal reorganization and reorientation. It sought to change from primarily a political advocacy group to the principal coordinator of Jewish social and cultural life in Germany. The year 1953 was also critical for East German Jewry. Following a precedent already established elsewhere in the eastern bloc, the Communist Party began a purge of Jewish and philosemitic members. Additionally, the regime harassed and arrested the leadership of the Jewish community. Ultimately, the community’s leaders fled East Germany, necessitating a state-supervised reorganization of the State Association and the individual Jewish communities in eastern German cities. The patterns of German-Jewish political rapport that were established by the end of 1953 prevailed for the next twelve to fifteen years, if not longer, as both Jewish communities settled into a routine of bureaucratized administration and institutionalized relations with the state.

As noted, during the era of Allied occupation, the largest segment of the Jewish population in Germany was comprised of displaced persons (DPs) from Eastern Europe. Many of these Jewish Holocaust survivors simply found themselves on German soil on 8 May 1945; others fled postwar conditions in Poland and Romania. Although they could not emigrate to British-occupied Palestine, they could stay in the Allied occupation zones of western Germany, where they felt relatively secure. While waiting for their final settlement status to change, these refugees recreated in Germany a version of Jewish Eastern Europe. Their DP camps eventually became loci of Jewish culture and education, and Zionist politics thrived in the camps. This refugee community, with its renaissance of Eastern European yiddishkayt, has become a popular topic
of examination for historians in America, Germany, and Israel. Among the earlier studies of the displaced persons in postwar Germany are works by Mark Wyman and Wolfgang Jacobmeyer. More recently, Jewish displaced persons specifically have received increased attention. Angelika Königseder and Juliane Wetzel have thoroughly examined the structure of political and social life in many of the different DP camps in the occupation zones. Their investigation looks at DP life until the dissolution of the camps. Angelika Eder deals with cultural matters. In contrast, Ze’ev Mankowitz examines many aspects of DP life and politics, but his analysis concentrates on the years 1945–1946, with later years receiving less attention. Additionally, his story, rich in detail, is primarily a Zionist one. Hagit Lavsky and Joanne Reilly have focused on the Belsen displaced persons camp, located in the British zone of occupation. In fact, Belsen was one of the most organized and successful camps, eventually becoming a locus of Jewish life in northern Germany—inside or out of DP camps. Lavsky also argues that it was the breeding ground for a grassroots-organized, Zionist civil society. Rather than focusing on a single camp or zone, Michael Brenner has incorporated the story of the DPs into the wider history of Jewish resettlement in postwar Germany. Using newspapers and other scholars’ works, which contain rich quotations, Ruth Gay has constructed a ground-level view of DP life in Germany. Atina Grossmann has examined the displaced persons and the question of gender as part of a larger project on the


displaced persons and debates on victimhood during the Allied occupation.\(^6\)

While most scholars dwell on the irony of traditional eastern Jewish culture thriving in post-Hitler Germany, their ultimate focus is not on the permanence of this Jewish life in Germany, but rather on its transience. As Hagit Lavsky has argued, this transitional phase of internment in Germany helped to rehabilitate these Jews, both physically and culturally. Restored to health, the DPs had the highest birthrate of Jews anywhere in the world after World War II. To a large degree, the population made the transition from Yiddish Eastern European culture to a more modern Hebrew, Zionist orientation. By the time the refugees left Germany, they were a lively, politicized population, eager to aid in the construction of the new Jewish state.

Although most DPs did depart for Israel after 1947, it is critical to note that many remained in Germany. The merger of the German Jewish community and the residual displaced persons community marked the real establishment of a new and enduring Jewish community in postwar Germany. Thus, with a focus on that new community and its political development, it is critical to regard the DPs, or at least some of them, as future constituents of the Central Council of Jews in Germany. However, their presence in Germany complicated the situation of the Jewish community. Though some eastern Jews had lived in Germany before 1933, these newcomers were culturally alien to Germany, and differences between them and German-born Jews manifested themselves as political tensions. Thus, in addition to examining some aspects of the DPs’ Zionist politics, relations between eastern Jews and German-born Jews require elucidation, both before the founding of the Central Council (chapters 1 and 2) and after the coalescence of the community (chapter 8).

The Jewish communities of both West and East Germany are the subject of a number of studies. Henry Maor’s dissertation,

written nearly thirty-five years ago, is generally considered the first scholarly examination of the topic; however, it is little more than a statistical and sociological overview of the community’s composition.\(^7\) Since the mid-1980s, there has been a profusion of sociological analyses. While many do address the history of the community’s politics and role in German society, few undertake a serious archival examination of the community’s origins.\(^8\) This study seeks to root its analysis in archival evidence. A number of scholars have looked at psychological or sociological phenomena related to being Jewish in Germany or to Jewish-Christian social relations, topics not surveyed here.\(^9\) More recently, Michael Brenner’s study provides an introduction to the renewed Jewish community, terminating its analysis in 1950, the year of the Central Council’s establishment, and Ruth Gay gives a view of the community’s genesis before quickly moving forward to the present day, with an emphasis on individuals and personal stories.\(^10\) My analysis reintroduces Jewish institutions, particularly political representative bodies, to the story of the renewal of Jewish life in Germany. Without these groups, the community could never have received the critical support it did from non-Jewish political leaders.

\(^7\) Harry Maor, “Über den Wiederaufbau der jüdischen Gemeinden in Deutschland seit 1945,” Dr.phil. diss., Universität Mainz, 1961.


\(^10\) Brenner, After the Holocaust; Gay, Safe among the Germans.
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Adding to the variegation of existing examinations is a host of local histories. German historians, in particular, have focused on the history of individual Jewish communities. While these studies add to the general understanding of the Jewish experience in the postwar years and illustrate the great difficulty in reestablishing Jewish life in Germany, they cannot address many of the wider issues relating to the survival of Jewish life in Germany. In a highly politicized atmosphere, replete with debates on victimhood and on the postwar state’s relationship with the past, the Jewish community of Germany only fared as well as it did because it organized on a nationwide level and sought recognition of Jewish demands from the West German federal government as well as the East German government. This study seeks to elucidate the supraregional and national coordination of the Jewish community in Germany to demonstrate the success of this model of organization.

Although there were some basic similarities between the Jewish community of East Germany and the community in West Germany (reconstitution of the community, centralizing organization, critical relations with state elites), the eastern Jewish community faced a unique set of difficulties. An increasingly centralized society and authoritarian government confronted it with serious challenges, not the least of which was regime-sanctioned antisemitism. This special circumstance has made the East German Jewish community

Jews in Post-Holocaust Germany, 1945–1953

a point of particular interest for scholars. Early studies of community did not have the advantage of the archival sources available since 1990, and they relied almost exclusively on interviews and memoirs. More recently, scholars have explored many aspects of the small Jewish community in the east. Despite a strong focus on relations with the state and Communist Party, the central role of the State Association and its internal debates have not figured as prominently as merited. In fact, even before the Jewish communities in western Germany united, the Jews of eastern Germany founded their umbrella organization, the State Association, under the politically active leadership of Julius Meyer. In chapters 3 and 5, the importance of the State Association to Jewish life in the east and the efficacy of Meyer’s leadership receive critical examination.

This is a story both about the Jews themselves and their relations with non-Jewish, German political elites. An important factor impacting these relations was the manner in which members of German society remembered the years 1933 to 1945. Naturally, those years had a very different meaning to Jewish Germans than to non-Jewish Germans. Moreover, interpretations of the recent past differed among various German social groups, and political leaders in West Germany viewed the legacy of the Nazi past differently from their counterparts in the east. Not only did the treatment of the past reflect German society’s self-image after 1945, it also had practical ramifications for German interactions with Jewish victims of the Nazi regime. The historiography of memory has clarified our understanding of politics and society in postwar Germany; however, my work concentrates on the importance of political
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institutions to postwar German Jewish life and the manner in which those institutions handled overtly Jewish or Jewish-related issues.

Both Germanys wrestled with the legacy of the Nazi years as they tried to build new governments and societies. The integration into society or into the government of Nazi fellow-travelers, not to mention actual party members, was a serious challenge for the Bonn administration. Even as West Germany dealt with the historical legacy it had inherited, a good number of individuals with questionable pasts were installed in positions of influence. Administrators frequently remained in their positions of authority without a significant change in personal attitude. For politicians, the dilemma of dealing with the Nazi legacy in practical terms (e.g., reparations to the Nazis’ victims, disposition of the camps, questions of architectural preservation after the wartime bombings, reinstatement of discredited officials, veterans’ affairs, the national anthem question) remained ever-present. Meanwhile, disputed


claims to victimhood and the instrumentalization of the memory of Nazi persecution had a critical impact on the East German government and, naturally, its relationship with Jews. As that state perceived itself to be the very antithesis of the Nazi regime, its conception of National Socialism and of the effects of Nazi policy were critical in defining what East Germany would be. Soon, the internal debate on memory adversely affected the Jewish community, and demonstrations of memory of the Nazi past ossified into a routine of so-called antifascist commemoration.

Not only governments, but also members of civil society engaged in debate over the meaning and legacy of the Nazi years. Reflecting on the inheritance of the Nazi era and the Second World War, many groups regarded themselves as victims and sought redress of grievances. In West Germany, a veritable competition over victimhood erupted, fueled, in part, by the desire for political influence and demands for material support. Germans living under occupation quickly forgot the war and characterized themselves as victims of an oppressive regime not unlike the Nazi regime. Women who lost their husbands in the war were considered victims. Those who had lost property in the war saw themselves as victims and were not inclined to support the victims of German aggression. This group of so-called war-damaged became an important constituency in West German politics. Even German industry considered itself to be a victim of the Nazi era, and it

---


19 Some of these issues are reviewed in the introduction and part 3 of Alon Confino and Peter Fritzsche, eds., *The Work of Memory: New Directions in the Study of German Society and Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002).

20 Josef Foschepoth, “German Reaction to Defeat and Occupation,” in *West Germany under Construction*, ed. Moeller; Marcuse, *Legacies of Dachau*, 63.


viewed Allied measures – including the trials of collaborationist industrialists – as an attack on German capitalism. In general, “Germans preferred to dwell on their own suffering at the front and during the bombardment at home, and on their expulsion from the eastern parts of the Reich.”

Considering the political and social climate that prevailed in the postwar years, the consensus that something had to be done for Jewish victims quickly evaporated. To represent their interests and to press their claims, Jews in Germany relied on the ties forged to political leaders by the leaders of the Central Council. In fact, this strategy did bear fruit. In addition to the official role played by Hendrik George van Dam, secretary general of the Central Council, Karl Marx, publisher of the community’s principal newspaper, slowly became something of an unofficial adviser to West German president Theodor Heuss on Jewish matters. Although Heuss has been considered the regime’s representative who was most receptive to Jewish needs, there has been no examination of his critical

---


24 Jarausch and Geyer, Shattered Past, 8. Debate over the meaning of the Nazi years continued long after the immediate postwar years. Scholars and philosophers, such as Theodor Adorno, asked just what “coming to terms with the past” meant. The issue is implicitly raised at every German commemoration of the Holocaust and of the war. At one such event in 1985, West German president Richard von Weizsäcker posed the question of whether the defeat of May 1945 was not also a liberation for the Germans. Popular reactions to recent examinations of the war and the Holocaust, notably to the German-language publication of Daniel Goldhagen’s Hitler’s Willing Executioners and to the so-called Wehrmachtausstellung, are strong indicators that there is no consensus on the issue of memory and responsibility. On the Goldhagen controversy in Germany, see, among others, Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, Hitler’s Willing Executioners (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996); Johannes Heil and Rainer Erb, eds., Geschichtswissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit. Der Streit um Daniel J. Goldhagen (Frankfurt: Fischer, 1998). On the Wehrmachtausstellung, which chronicled war crimes and atrocities committed by ordinary German soldiers during World War II, see, among others, Hamburger Institut für Sozialforschung, Vernichtungskrieg. Verbrechen der Wehrmacht 1941 bis 1944. Ausstellungskatalog, ed. Hannes Heer and Birgit Otte (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 1995); Hans-Günter Thiele, Die Wehrmachtausstellung. Dokumentation einer Kontrovers: Dokumentation der Fachtagung in Bremen am 26. Februar 1997 und der Bundestagdebatten am 13. März und 24. April 1997 (Bonn: Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung, 1997). More recently, there has been a new wrinkle in the debate on victimhood and memory of the Nazi years as some writers have raised the question of whether the Germans were victims of unnecessary or willful violence and atrocities by the Allies. Among the most notable exponents in this controversial debate are Günter Grass, Crabwalk, trans. Krishna Winston (New York: Harcourt, 2003), originally Im Krebsgang: Eine Novelle (Göttingen: Steidel, 2002); W. G. Sebald, On the Natural History of Destruction, trans. Anthea Bell (New York: Random House, 2003), originally Luftkrieg und Literatur (Frankfurt: Fischer, 2001); and Jörg Friedrich, Der Brand. Deutschland im Bombenkrieg 1940–1945 (Munich: Propyläen, 2002).
symbiotic relationship with Marx, nor has there been much written explicitly on Heuss’s philosemitism in forty years. Meanwhile, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer developed his own relationship with Jewish leaders, namely Israeli diplomats and Nahum Goldmann of the World Jewish Congress. The Jewish community also found strong support among the Social Democratic opposition, including party leader Kurt Schumacher. The decisively important relations between the Jews and Heuss, Adenauer, and Schumacher, among others, stand at the center of the following examination of German-Jewish political relations.

Much of the scholarship on Jewish issues in German political discourse focuses on West German relations with Israel, and in particular reparations to Israel and Jewish groups around the world. The importance of these reparations for Israel in material terms and West Germany in symbolic ones cannot be underestimated. This study reexamines some of those issues; however, with an emphasis on the Jewish community within Germany, I have also


investigated the role of German Jewry in making those reparations a reality. As it seemed increasingly likely that West Germany would pay significant reparations to Jewish recipients, the wider, international Jewish community did not remain immune to in-fighting and competition for compensation funds. The Jews in Germany did not always have cordial relations with their coreligionists and presumptive allies abroad.

In East Germany, the competitive cult of victimhood had more serious ramifications. As Jeffrey Herf has shown, the ruling Communist Party of the German Democratic Republic virtually predicated its claim to leadership of society on the legacy of victimhood under the Nazis. Moreover, it openly downplayed or denigrated the suffering of Jewish victims in comparison to the travails of Communist resisters. When the Jewish community pressed for reparations, many Communist leaders of East Germany regarded these demands as a potential threat. In their opinion, Jewish claims to victimhood and demands for reparations represented a rejection of the state’s assertion of no responsibility for the past and its self-characterization as antifascist – the antithesis of the Nazi state. Catherine Epstein has expanded on Herf’s analysis of intraparty competition and Jewish issues, and Karin Hartewig has specifically examined the fate of Jewish communists in the German Democratic Republic. Other scholars, including Michael Wolffsohn, Jutta Illichmann, Angelika Timm, and Thomas Fox, have looked at the manner in which East Germany used the memory of Nazi persecution of the Jews for its own political purposes, including the manipulation of the relationship with Israel.

Herf, Epstein, and Hartewig have looked at relations between Jews and the Communist regime in great detail from the perspective of the Communist Party’s internal workings. Wolffsohn, Illichmann, Timm, and Fox focus on the uses and abuse of Jewish history by the regime. Similar to the first group, this study examines East German debates on victimhood from the non-Jewish, governmental perspective, but it also integrates the Jewish community’s

Herf, Divided Memory; Catherine Epstein, The Last Revolutionaries: German Communists and Their Century (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003); Hartewig, Zurückgekehrt.

Jews in Post-Holocaust Germany, 1945–1953

perspective, relying on documentation from the State Association of Jewish Communities in the GDR.

Between 1945 – when it was not clear whether Jewish life would successfully continue in Germany – and 1953, a unified and organized Jewish community emerged, despite tremendous obstacles. Moreover, as both Germanys struggled with their own relationship to the past, they were forced to confront a vocal and needy Jewish community. Some political leaders repeated prejudiced patterns of behavior, while others engaged with the Jewish community and fostered its growth and stability. The unlikely and extraordinary series of events that laid the earliest foundations for the vibrant Jewish community of contemporary Germany is this story.