

**Abridged Excerpts from**  
***Resistance of the Heart:***  
***Intermarriage and the Rosenstrasse Protest in Nazi Germany***  
**by Nathan Stoltzfus**

W. W. Norton, 1996, © Nathan Stoltzfus, 1996

**Introduction** \_\_\_\_\_

**Berlin, February 27, 1943**

Hours before first light, a battalion of SS men, local Gestapo agents, and street policemen fanned out across Berlin in a fleet of 300 trucks,<sup>[1]</sup> to capture the city's last, unsuspecting Jews. Leading the charge was the *Leibstandarte* Hitler, an SS unit of select tall, blond soldiers whose small advances against the Red Army had briefly fanned hopes of German victory, in a time when the Wehrmacht was largely in retreat. Some of the SS troops on Berlin's streets this morning wore the decorations of valor in war.<sup>[2]</sup> But their mandate this Saturday was to make Berlin "free of Jews." Jews still working in armaments factories, as well as intermarried Jews, were the primary targets. In black uniforms and steel helmets, armed with bayoneted rifles and machine guns, the SS cast a grim image intended to put fear in the heart of anyone who might protest or complain about the arrest of these last, relatively well-connected Jews of Berlin. The Gestapo's code name for this massive arrest (which has often been called the Factory Action) was the "Final Roundup of the Jews," and for thousands, this was the beginning of the end.<sup>[3]</sup>

Without warning or explanation, the SS and Gestapo fell upon the work benches of the "Jewish crews," driving them without onto the waiting furniture trucks. The victims, clad in thin work aprons, were not allowed the time to pick up their winter coats or their homemade breakfasts and lunches. Clapping their hands and shouting 'Faster! faster!-- get a move on!', the SS drove the Jews forward with the butts of their guns. Pregnant women and men too old to jump on to the trucks were tossed or shoved.<sup>[4]</sup> Dozens suffered broken bones.<sup>[5]</sup> All over Berlin the Gestapo was seizing Jews from work, home or the street. Anyone wearing the Star of David was grabbed and put on the trucks. Even Jews who were just in Berlin to visit were taken.<sup>[6]</sup>

Crammed with dimly visible human shapes the trucks began rolling up in long columns at five makeshift collection centers in the heart of Berlin. The vast motor vehicle garage of the Hermann Goering army barracks in Berlin-Reinickendorf, and the riding stables of the barracks on Rathenower Strasse, had been temporarily emptied. The amusement center "Clou" on Mauerstrasse now also served as a grim holding center for arrested Jews, as did the synagogue on Levetzowstrasse, and the Jewish Community's public and youth welfare administrative center, at Rosenstrasse.<sup>[7]</sup> Some Jews were also brought to the

former Jewish Old People's Home on the Grosse Hamburger Strasse, a regular collection center for those newly arrested Jews about to be sent to the camps.

Every collection center was a theater of brutality and fear, hours of horror on this Sabbath never to be forgotten by survivors. One who escaped remembers that terrible moment as a truck rolled up to discharge its human cargo. The doors sprang open and "an older lady streaming with blood fell unconscious into our arms. Behind her a girl, perhaps seventeen, tumbled from the truck, blood streaming over her face. She was followed by a man bleeding from a leg wound. He supported his wife, whose dress was torn to shreds. They were people who had 'tried to defend themselves' the SS explained, laughing. A young SS rogue stood there laughing and photographing the scene."<sup>[8]</sup>

Panic reigned. Women shrieked for their children, who waited for them at home. Infants, plucked from homes while parents were away, screamed after their mothers and fathers.<sup>[9]</sup> Married partners who worked at different factories were taken to different collecting centers, half-insane with fear for their loved ones.<sup>[10]</sup> People begged to be transferred, for a swallow to drink, or a bit of straw to sit on. Freezing in their thin clothes, hungry, beaten, and without water or toilets, many sought the escape of suicide. An eyewitness reported that, "People plunged through windows, threw themselves under cars, or took poison (Vernal or Zyankali, which particularly cautious persons always had with them); it was horrible, an unimaginable chaos."<sup>[11]</sup>

In the midst of this anguish, the SS and Gestapo, some with horse whips, sorted out the Jews who were married to German non-Jews, along with their Mischling children (in Nazi Germany "Mischling" referred to anyone of mixed race, but it generally referred to persons of part German, part Jewish ancestry). These were shoved again onto the omnipresent trucks and removed to the four-story administration building of the Jewish Community at Rosenstrasse 2-4. Deportation Executive Adolph Eichmann had ordered these persons separated and sent to Rosenstrasse to make it appear as though they were not to be sent to death camps but to labor camps in Poland.<sup>[12]</sup>

On Saturdays Jewish workers normally got off work at around 2:00 p.m. When on this Saturday they did not return home as usual, those with German spouses began to worry and to call around for information to the police, the factories, each other. Some of them received information through a 'telephone chain' formed to alert one another of danger, and passed information along to other Germans in intermarriages.<sup>[13]</sup> Soon many knew their loved ones had been imprisoned at Rosenstrasse, and they hurried there, one by one or two by two, to get any further information or bring their loved ones bread, cheese, razors, and toiletries. Most of the Jews arrested were men, and the overwhelming majority of the Germans in search of them on Rosenstrasse were women.<sup>[14]</sup>

By the time Charlotte Israel arrived at the Rosenstrasse "there were already about one hundred fifty women there. Through a trick I determined that my husband was [interned] there," she recalled. "I asked the guard for the potato ration cards, which Julius had. Then I received them too! On the back he had written very lightly, so that I could read it when I held it up to the light: 'I'm fine!' Other women demanded a house

key, or food ration cards, to confirm that their husbands were there. The women began calling out their demands right there on the streets."<sup>[15]</sup>

Rosenstrasse was one of Berlin's oldest streets, one block of cobble stones that cut a narrow strip through the line of Berlin's downtown offices and residents.<sup>[16]</sup> The street car passed over Rosenstrasse on its way to the famed Alexanderplatz, several blocks away. By the early 20th-century Rosenstrasse was bordered by the Jewish *Sheunenviertel*, the center of poor, Orthodox Jews, recently immigrated from the East. Directly to the north was the main Jewish business section of town. Between Rosenthaler and Oranienburger Strasse, the home of Berlin's oldest synagogue, stretched shop after shop of Jewish department stores, textile and fabric shops, and other retailers.

For the Jewish Community, the building at Rosenstrasse 2-4 was the center of community social services, a barrack-like structure of five and one-half stories with little in the way of ornamentation, lined with evenly spaced, rectangular windows. Here the Jews clothed their destitute, fed their hungry, healed their sick. Here the relatives of the Jews deported suddenly to Buchenwald in June of 1938 gathered for solace and information; here the victims of the Kristallnacht Pogrom, returning home after terrible weeks in concentration camps in late 1938, were received by the Jewish Relief Committee, clothed, given medical care, and reunited with their families.<sup>[17]</sup> The Community held the public mikvah here.<sup>[18]</sup> Now on this Sabbath the narrow offices lining the long hallways were groaning under the weight of prisoners. Outside, five armed SS men in black uniforms lined the space between the arriving women and the building's only door facing the street.

As the first rumors of the arrests coursed through Berlin, Germans married to Jews flocked to Rosenstrasse. Arriving alone or in pairs they found themselves among a small but growing crowd. One woman appeared with her brother, who wore an army uniform, and was on leave that week. Three other soldiers joined him, and together with them he approached an SS guard. "If my brother-in-law is not released," he told the guard, "I will not return to the front." The SS man pushed him back and threatened: "If you don't leave on your own accord, you will be carried off."<sup>[19]</sup>

As the early darkness and chill of a Berlin February night descended, some women stood huddled together, miserable but seething. Some had known Rosenstrasse 2-4 over the years as one of the most important houses of the Jewish Community. Some came from old, even noble, German families who viewed SS men as upstart impostors.<sup>[20]</sup> Adamantly they demanded their husbands back. Several women boldly approached the SS intruders, and began to complain. Their words grew more and more angry. Who did the SS think they were? How did they come to separate them from their family members? What crimes had their husbands and children committed? After all, as racial German citizens, they were entitled to rights. "If you don't let us in we will come back and make trouble," someone said, "we will bring a battering ram and break through the door!" Before departing for the night, several women made a promise among themselves to meet at that same spot early the next day, to make a noisy public protest.<sup>[21]</sup> They knew that arrested Jews were customarily held for two days in collecting centers before being herded onto the trains from which

few, if any, returned, and they had to take action fast. It was to be an unprecedented demonstration of open German resistance to Nazi persecution of Jews.

Annie Radlauer reached the Rosenstrasse early Sunday morning. As she got off the train at Bahnhof Börse, she could hear a noise swelling up from the direction of Rosenstrasse, three blocks away. The closer she came, the louder it grew, until she could make it out: "Let our husbands go. We want our husbands back! Let our husbands go. We want . . ." Several women stood arm in arm in tight groups, others walked up and down in front of the house, hoping to see a husband or child show in front of a window. And again the crowd broke out in a chorus, "We want our husbands back!"<sup>[22]</sup>

Day and night, for a week, Germans married to Jews staged their protest. One witness wrote in 1945 that the crowd grew larger until the street was "crammed with people."<sup>[23]</sup> London Radio called the scene an ongoing demonstration procession, with women continuously arriving to join the protest or leaving to take care of other family or work matters. As many as 600 or more gathered at once, and thousands had joined in by the protest's end.<sup>[24]</sup> On different occasions armed guards commanded, "Clear the streets or we'll shoot!" This sent the women scrambling into surrounding alleys and court yards. But within minutes they began streaming out again. Again and again they were scattered by threats of gun fire, and again and again they advanced, massed together, and called for their husbands, who heard them and took hope. According to one witness, the "accusing cries of the women rose above the noise of the traffic like passionate avowals of a love strengthened by the bitterness of life."<sup>[25]</sup> One protester described her feeling on the street as one of strong solidarity. Normally people were afraid to show dissent, fearing denunciation, but in the square they knew they were among friends. A Gestapo man, impressed by the display of protest, was forced to see his unquestioning loyalty to the regime in a new light. "Your relatives are out there protesting for you," he told one Jew. "They want you to come back--this is German loyalty."<sup>[26]</sup>

By the fourth or fifth day of the protest a widening rift had developed within the RSHA, the agency responsible for the administration of the Final Solution, on how to handle the unruly crowd. A Gestapo chauffeur on duty during the Final Roundup reported to a post-war court that he had overheard conversations about the controversy. Rival centers of power (*Machtgruppen*) had issued contradictory orders to their subordinates.<sup>[27]</sup> More than forty years later this was also how Joseph Goebbels' Deputy, Leopold Gutterer remembered it in an interview. The SD (the intelligence arm of the Party within the RSHA that monitored civilian morale and played a key role in the administration of the Final Solution) had orders to deport the arrested Jews, Gutterer said, but "it wasn't united about whether they should overthrow the protest by force or whether they had to find another solution."<sup>[28]</sup>

Fearing the forced separation of intermarried couples would cause serious social unrest, the Nazi leadership earlier had "temporarily exempted" intermarried Jews and their children from the Final Solution, over the objections of the RSHA. In the fall of 1942, however, the regime made plans to complete the Final Solution in Germany. Most of Germany's remaining Jews were in Berlin, and most had been temporarily deferred from the deportations because they were from Jewish-German families, or because they worked in

the armaments industry. Goebbels, the Nazi Party's Gauleiter in charge of greater Berlin, planned a massive action at the end of 1942, that would forcibly deport intermarried Jews without children. He arranged for Hitler's Body Guard division of the SS, the SS *Leibstandarte* Adolf Hitler, to assist in this effort, and in advance of the action he forbade all the editors of the Swedish press in Berlin to report on it (as a neutral country, Sweden was still permitted to have its journalists in Germany, while Goebbels kept his eye on them).<sup>[29]</sup>

Outwardly, debate within the RSHA hinged on how to deal with the protest, so that the Jews from Jewish-German families could still be deported. In the background was a bigger rift. The top leadership--especially Goebbels, Hitler, and to a lesser extent Himmler--were afraid of domestic unrest, especially during war. Lower level officials generally lacked this perspective. At the RSHA, in fact, Eichmann had actually responded to Germany's plummeting military fortunes in early 1943 by expanding the categories of persons to be deported from Jewish-German families.<sup>[30]</sup> But now women had reacted to the arrests of their Jewish relatives with an around-the-clock street protest, and Goebbels, was under pressure.

Since 1926 Joseph Goebbels was the Party Gauleiter, or district leader, of greater Berlin, where he founded his own weekly newspaper, *Der Angriff*, to rail at the Weimar government and promote National Socialism. In public speeches Goebbels' deep, booming voice proved almost equal to Hitler's in spreading the cause. Greatly impressed, Hitler in 1929 appointed the slight man with a club foot and glittering eyes propaganda leader of the Party, where (replacing Heinrich Himmler) his efforts, particularly in the year preceding the Nazi takeover of power, were decisive, as he revitalized the party for each of its election campaigns.<sup>[31]</sup> Six weeks after becoming Chancellor, Hitler appointed Goebbels 'Reich Minister for Propaganda and Public Enlightenment', where he was a master of modern propaganda techniques, becoming in effect dictator over German press and cultural life, and spreading assaults against the Jews.

Joseph Goebbels' job was to generate total popular allegiance to National Socialism, a position that was strengthened during the war as the task of maintaining public morale became more critical. His position as Gauleiter placed him directly in control of the fate of Berlin's Jews, but his charge over public morale lent him influence over domestic Jewish matters in general. Goebbels was particularly influential in the sensitive matter of intermarriages, sharing as he did Hitler's concern with social unrest while also enjoying the Führer's close confidence.<sup>[32]</sup> He preferred to solicit voluntary rather than regulatory compliance with Nazi racial policy by presenting images of a citizenry so hostile to Jews, the regime was actually obligated to take extreme measures. Along with public propaganda, he employed street crowds to turn Germans against Jews and intermarriages.<sup>[33]</sup>

In his tireless struggles to align popular opinion with the will of dictatorship, the man who usually wore an oversized trench coat relied on deceptions, secrecy, and manipulations. Goebbels was especially adept at manipulating the images of National Socialism through the mass demonstrations and rallies. "No other party was so astutely aware of the unifying force of symbols in mass demonstrations and as an expression of solidarity."<sup>[34]</sup> Knowing the majority had little tolerance for standing out in a crowd, Goebbels used mass



gatherings to control behavior. In a crowd, he said, little persons feel powerful. At mammoth political rallies each person experienced "a kind of metamorphosis from a little worm into part of a big dragon."<sup>[35]</sup> And if worms joined together into a dragon, Goebbels could become the dragon master, creating unity under the swastika. Goebbels thought that "we cannot have too many demonstrations," for as a means of exhibiting and gathering mass support, demonstrations were "far and away the most emphatic way of demonstrating one's will to govern."<sup>[36]</sup>

Goebbels was a curious man, most interested in throngs. When he heard of the protests on Rosenstrasse he might have had his chauffeur drive him the half-dozen blocks from his gargantuan home at the Brandenburg Gate, across the River Spree, to the edge of the throng swelling outward from the center of Rosenstrasse. Under his organization, mass rallies and demonstrations had become a regular feature of the German state, used both to exhibit and recruit the public support of a mass, unified movement. This form of politics was so powerful the Nazis guarded it jealously. In May, 1933 a law (For the Maintenance of Public Quiet and Security) banned public demonstrations without prior police permission,<sup>[37]</sup> and in December, 1934, to further quell their fears of non-Nazi crowds, the dictatorship banned even all public gatherings other than "ancient, traditional. . . processions and pilgrimages."<sup>[38]</sup> Given his view that demonstrations were effective weapons in the struggles of power politics, Goebbels considered the law that banned mass, public gatherings in May 1933 an important cornerstone of the Nazi takeover and consolidation of power. The crowd of women calling out for their Jewish family members was an "disagreeable scene," Goebbels wrote in his diary. "The people gathered together in large throngs and even sided with the Jews to some extent," Goebbels complained in his March 6, 1943 diary entry.<sup>[39]</sup>

In March 1943, Goebbels had his eye on the war, and the fate of the Reich. The Sixth German army had just collapsed at Stalingrad, its entire range of equipment along with 209,000 soldiers totally lost.<sup>[40]</sup> What's the difference between Germany and the sun?, a joke circulating in Berlin asked. The reply was that the sun comes up in the East, while Germany goes down there. Nevertheless, the Propaganda Minister had appeared to whip up enthusiasm for and even harsher war. Just nine days before the Final Roundup of Jews Goebbels had delivered his infamous speech calling for Total War. In the cavernous Berlin Sports Palace Goebbels had repeatedly shouted out the question: Do You Want Total War, and the thunderous 'Yes!' of the audience echoed across the Reich via the omnipresent radio, the new mass media and propaganda mechanism Germany possessed more of, per capita, than any other country. In that same speech Goebbels had also railed long against the Jews. By deporting intermarried Jews, however, the regime risked antagonizing non-Jewish Germans, and injuring public morale. While not all Germans related to Jews were their friends (many, in fact, tried to avoid their Jewish relations in order to avoid trouble for themselves), there was nevertheless a circle of Germans closely related to Jews the regime worried about: they would complain and perhaps spread rumors about the disappearance of their own Jewish relations.<sup>[41]</sup> Thus the secrecy which the regime strove to maintain around the Final Solution would be threatened.<sup>[42]</sup>

In early 1943, the machinery of the Final Solution was operating at full capacity. In 1942, the year of

massive death, 2,700,000 Jews were killed (compared with 1,100,000 for 1941 and 500,000 for 1943). 7,978 Jews arrested in the Final Roundup had been or would be deported.<sup>[43]</sup> More than fifty percent of these were immediately gassed and burned. The hard labor alternative for those who lived was intended only as short step preceding death.

The rescue of Jews by their German partners demonstrates the courage—and the compromises—of a resistance limited to defending their own families. Who were the Germans married to Jews, and why did they openly disobey one of history's most ruthless regimes? Why did they choose to suffer the relentless persecution, uncertainty, and heavy stigmas of intermarriage? These Germans were part of the regime's Master Race, so-called *Aryans*.<sup>[44]</sup> What could have motivated them to risk even life itself, rather than divorce?

On the other hand, how are we to understand the decision of Joseph Goebbels, the Nazi Party authority for Greater Berlin, to relent to unarmed street protesters, and Hitler's concurrence with this decision? What Nazi concepts of power, what other incidents of opposition, and what historical circumstances help explain this release of some 1,700 to at most 2,000 Jews?<sup>[45]</sup> Why did they survive, officially registered with the police while receiving government food rations? Jewish-German intermarriages were continuous advertisements against Nazism's basic race creed, public figures of dissent. Their children were troublesome mixtures of 'Master Race' and Jew, for Nazism. Why, then, were they not the first Jews sent to death, rather than the ones to survive? By war's end, intermarried Jews comprised 98 percent of the surviving German Jewish population.<sup>[46]</sup>

### **Marriage versus Family, Marriage versus Regime**

The Rosenstrasse Protest was the singular incident of mass German protest against the deportation of German Jews. It is hard to imagine an act more dangerous for German civilians than an open confrontation with the Gestapo, on the Gestapo's very front doorstep. This book is the history of that brave confrontation, told through the stories of those who made it happen. It examines the protest as a climactic event in the lives of those who protested, and also as part of the complex of events and circumstances surrounding the protest during the climax of World War II. Thus, the book is a history of the regime's struggle against intermarried Germans, for the Rosenstrasse Protest was just the culmination of their hard struggles. For the ten years leading up to the protest, intermarried Germans openly offended the entire spirit of the regime and on occasion disobeyed its laws. The state was ruthless. Yet these intermarried couples, on the whole, were resilient. It was the resilience of the intermarriages that led Goebbels in 1942 to describe them as "exceedingly delicate questions."<sup>[47]</sup> How could he extract them from the social and economic fabric of Germany?

In the early twentieth century, intermarried Germans were individualistic and self-defining. Many of these couples were secular, living in big urban areas where norms were less restrictive, and lifestyle

possibilities more varied. Even as the trend toward intermarriage reached its peak, only a tiny minority of Germans married Jews. In many cases, these Germans braved the wrath of their families and other institutions, to marry Jews. The history of intermarriage in Nazi Germany is not one of family triumphing over regime, but of a regime forcing Germans to choose between their birth families and those they had built as adults. Losing family and social approval was wrenching, but continued marriage often led to strong unions and identification with the Jewish side of the family. As social and institutional pressures grew, intermarried couples learned to rely on themselves and each other to an unusual extent for their sense of meaning and identity.

By the time Goebbels and the Gestapo took their turns at trying to get intermarried Germans to abandon their Jewish husbands, they were already well-versed in resisting threats and sanctions from their own families, friends, neighbors and strangers. During the Holocaust, the Gestapo immediately arrested and deported any intermarried Jews whose German spouse died or requested divorce, and intermarried Jews suffered the taunts that their partners were about to divorce them. "Your wife might well divorce you, a Gestapo agent told one. "One doesn't pair a race horse with a work horse."<sup>[48]</sup>

In the decades leading up to the Third Reich, Jewish assimilation in Germany had taken the form of intermarriage. In 1904, 9.3 percent of Jewish men who married, and 7.7 percent of Jewish women, married outside the Jewish faith. Between 1910 and 1913, these averages increased, respectively, to 13.5 percent and 10.92 percent, while the war years, 1914 to 1918, saw further sharp increases to 29.86 percent and 21 percent.<sup>[49]</sup> In 1933, against the grain of the new politics, this trend was still strong, as 44 percent of the German Jews who married chose non-Jews. In 1934, with the tide of Nazi propaganda and persecution rising, this number fell to 15 percent,<sup>[50]</sup> and in September 1935 the Nuremberg Laws prohibited further intermarriages altogether, and nullified all marriage engagements between mixed couples. As of June 1935 some 500,000 persons stood on the membership lists of Jewish communities in Germany; approximately 35,000 of these lived in intermarriages.<sup>[51]</sup>

Up until 1941 and the ban on Jewish emigration, intermarried Jews left Germany in slightly lower percentages than German Jews in general. Two-thirds to three-fourths of intermarriages in pre-Nazi Germany consisted of Jewish men and non-Jewish women.<sup>[52]</sup> Men were more mobile than women.

Furthermore, most of the Jewish-German couples who married after Hitler took power were also German women and Jewish men.<sup>[53]</sup> As the persecution and propaganda against them spread, Jews had more reason to seek security in intermarriage. At the same time, however, the state added regulations to discourage any more Germans from marrying Jews. Most of these early regulations aimed directly at intermarried Germans levied sanctions against job opportunities, measures that affected more men than women. Beginning as early as June of 1933, the civil service began to discriminate against intermarried Germans, and industries and professional associations followed the state's lead by also prohibiting intermarried Germans from either taking employment or receiving promotions. Thus some intermarried German men faced career restrictions while others--entrepreneurs or those working for independently-



mind private firms--could largely escape these, and were more prone to stay in Germany than those who lost employment. The threat of losing a job or chance of promotion affected men more than women. Also because Jewish men who intermarried tended to be from the middle-class, they caught the brunt of state and private regulations that prohibited and expelled Jewish employees. Non-Jewish men with Jewish wives, however, were less vulnerable to this loss-of-income pressure to emigrate.

Thus after Hitler took power, fewer German men married Jews, while it was still possible, and more German men than women divorced their Jewish spouses under the Third Reich.<sup>[54]</sup> Because the large majority of intermarried Germans were women, and because these women were part of "Jewish households" --married to men subject to every measure of the anti-Jewish persecution--the story of opposition by intermarried Germans is largely (but not only) the story of German women married to Jewish men. "If ever the song of German loyalty has been justified then it applies to the Non-Jewish wives of Jewish husbands," wrote Ernst Bukofzer, a Jewish lawyer who survived the Nazis because of his wife.<sup>[55]</sup>

The Nuremberg Laws that had prohibited all further intermarriages had stopped short of nullifying existing intermarriages between Jews and Germans, in deference to the social and religious sanctity and privacy of marriage. Thus in 1939 there were still about 30,000 intermarried couples in the German Reich and its Czech protectorate area. Almost one in ten Jews was married to a non-Jew.<sup>[56]</sup> At the end of December 1942 the number of intermarried Jews was still 27,744.<sup>[57]</sup> By mid-1943 intermarried Jews were virtually the only officially-registered Jews still in Germany. As of September, 1944, there were 13,217 registered Jews in Germany; 12,987 of these lived in intermarriages.<sup>[58]</sup> Virtually all, if not every one, of these intermarried Jews survived.<sup>[59]</sup> Thus some 98 percent of officially registered "full" German Jews who outlived Nazism, did so in intermarriages (and intermarried Jews were more likely than other Jews to have escaped official registration altogether).<sup>[60]</sup>

These intermarried Jews were disturbing to Nazi power and propaganda as no other Jews were. National Socialism considered intermarried Jews as so-called Full Jews objects of extermination (full Jews according to the Nuremberg Laws were those with either three or four Jewish grandparents). German law made sexual intercourse between non-Jews and Jews a punishable crime called *Rassenschande* (racial shame, indicating racial pollution), but mixed couples actually lived together openly, in marriage. National Socialists claimed Jews were so inferior they should not be permitted to live among their fellow Germans. But intermarried Germans daily and publicly bore great sacrifices for their marriages, an open dissent troubling to the Nazi myth of flawless German unity. Their noncooperation threatened the social and political unity of nation. Furthermore, and especially during the later years of the war, the German leaders strove to increase the German birthrate.<sup>[61]</sup> The most radical Nazis claimed that a German woman who had sexual intercourse even once with a Jew, became infected, and was no longer capable of bearing a racially pure German.<sup>[62]</sup> And rather than producing children deemed of positive value to the Reich, they gave birth to an ambiguous mixture of Master Race and Jew-- the Mischlinge, or mongrels. Some Nazis thought the peculiar mixture of Mischling blood caused them to be especially threatening and politically unreliable; others argued

that the precious half of their blood that represented the Master Race entitled them to live side-by-side with racial Germans. So the repercussions of intermarriage even reached into the state's decision-making process, disrupting the rote obedience of official Germany with many tedious debates and discussions.<sup>[63]</sup>

Under the logic of Nazi race purification, intermarried Jews should have been the first Jews to be isolated and expelled from Germany, and the regime set out immediately to separate them from their German relatives. Beginning already in June 1933, with a law requiring candidates for the civil service to prove the German identity of their marriage partner, the regime took numerous steps to encourage Germans who had married Jews to get a divorce, and abandon Jewish family members.<sup>[64]</sup> A burgeoning number of laws and regulations restricted the rights and opportunities of intermarried Germans. The regime turned from mass propaganda to the social and economic pressures of career penalties, to legal restrictions and police threats, and arbitrary arrest. Intermarried Germans endured great uncertainty about the fate of their loved ones, especially during the deportations. As of April, 1939 intermarried female Jews without children who had been baptized as Christians, were required to move into houses occupied exclusively by Jews, indicating that their fate hung in the balance. Some intermarried couples thought they might actually starve on the reduced (already meager) rations for a household with Jewish members. Perhaps these great pressures and uncertainties increased the divorce rate among intermarried couples, during the first years of the Reich.<sup>[65]</sup> Some divorce was the norm and a few intermarried couples might have gotten divorce under old divorce standards, rather than under the racial difference reasons of the new regime. But on the whole intermarried German women did not divorce.<sup>[66]</sup>

At least since 1933, the Nazis saw intermarried Jews and Mischlinge as their "certain victims."<sup>[67]</sup> But by 1942 Goebbels described intermarried Jews and their *Mischling* children as "extremely delicate questions."<sup>[68]</sup> He referred to the complexity of extracting intermarried Jews from the German political and social fabric, family by family, without ruffling popular morale. In matters of delicacy the 'little doctor' fancied himself the expert, for delicate matters were often best handled by the lure or threat of propaganda--resulting in "voluntary" consent--rather than with the blunter instruments of law and force. Goebbels, like Hitler, referred to problems of public morale as "psychological problems"-- problems of aligning public morale with official policies through "sophisticated" propaganda.<sup>[69]</sup> But intermarried Germans had personal, everyday experience with Jews, and most did not fall victim to propaganda's abstract evil depictions. It was through intermarriage that Germans had developed feelings for Jews, Himmler complained near the end of the war.<sup>[70]</sup>

## 1 Hitler's Theory of Power\_\_\_\_\_

The regime encouraged the social isolation of Jews but only the German people could accomplish this. The Holocaust built on earlier phases of anti-Jewish measures achieved only with popular compliance

and assistance. Genocide was not the only possible result of Nazi race ideology, but popular participation in racial identification, denunciations, and expropriations encouraged the regime to introduce further more radical anti-Jewish measures. German Jews whose non-Jewish spouses died or divorced, were sent to death camps along with other Jews. German Jews the regime could not isolate socially, however, generally survived.

Intermarried Germans rescued their partners with noncompliance and protest, defenses that seem extremely weak in the face of Nazi terror. The regime did not use physical force, as part of any general policy, to control or punish intermarried Germans. Why?

Both the Nazi leadership's theory of power and its interpretation of Germany's military defeat in World War I are basic sources for understanding why the regime yielded to noncompliance and public protest in this case. The role of simple terror to explain both the consensus the Nazis achieved and the lack of resistance they encountered has been over-emphasized, as Robert Gellately has indicated in his groundbreaking work showing that the regime needed the everyday cooperation of the people in order to enforce its racial policies.<sup>[71]</sup> The arbitrary use of police force, the Gestapo, and the concentration camps were always the backdrop of the Third Reich, and yet the regime sought (and received) non-coerced mass support as the best means for achieving its ambitious goals. Brutality and repression, in fact, increased Hitler's domestic popularity if they seemed to promise 'peace and order'.<sup>[72]</sup> A diminished reliance on coercive terror to explain Hitler's domestic control reduces expectations that the dictatorship would use force against all types of opposition.

The Nazi Party recognized that in the age of the masses no government could survive long "without the consensus, whether forced or passive, of a broad social stratum."<sup>[73]</sup> Seldom if ever did National Socialists challenge the idea that all power derives from the conscious consent of the racial people.<sup>[74]</sup> In *Mein Kampf*, Hitler says that popular support is the primary foundation of political power: "The first foundation for the creation of authority is always provided by popularity." With this support in hand, political leadership must then employ force, "the second foundation of all authority," to stabilize its power. Political power established through popularity and stabilized with force, however, would never be enduring until it was supported by social traditions, that final cornerstone of power. A popular authority, stabilized by police force and aligned with popular traditions "may be regarded as unshakable," Hitler writes.<sup>[75]</sup> For the 1000-year Reich Hitler envisioned, neither political manipulation nor force could change social traditions quickly; one could not "suddenly take out of a briefcase the drafts of a new state constitution" and impose them by command.<sup>[76]</sup> The basic task, then, was to secure the conscious consent of the people. "The movement will have to direct its fight entirely to winning the broad masses," Hitler wrote in the mid-1920s. "No matter, therefore, from which standpoint we examine the possibility of regaining the independence of our state and nation, whether from that of the preparation of foreign policy, that of technical armament, or from that of battle itself, there remains the preliminary winning over of the great masses of our people for the idea of our

national independence as the presupposition for everything."<sup>[77]</sup>

*Mein Kampf* did not constitute a programmatic plan for the Third Reich, yet Hitler's theory of power did not change. Also, the theory of power in *Mein Kampf* was that of the Nazi party as well as of Hitler. The statement introducing the 25 Party's points (from April 1920) implied a direct correlation between mass support and political success, and indicated that the continued existence of the Party depended on whether it had carried out popular will. "We realized as early as 1919 that the new movement has to carry out, first, as its highest aim, the nationalization of the masses," Hitler writes.<sup>[78]</sup> In the years leading up to the Nazi takeover the Party leadership remained committed to winning power legally, at the polls. Outsiders tried to provoke the Party to attempt another coup d'etat, and Party organizations were eager to do so. But for the Party leadership, campaigning for power was not just a means of gaining the levers of state power, it was a means of gaining the support the Party knew it had to have in any case.<sup>[79]</sup>

Once in power, Hitler and the Party did not alter their basic notion of power. Hitler's search for a consensus continued after the Nazi Party made an alliance with the conservative elites, and it continued after that alliance was shuffled off in favor of fascism. Hitler trumpeted his reliance on the people in public speeches, especially as war approached in the late 1930s,<sup>[80]</sup> and he could not allow his image as Führer to deviate much from the one Germans wanted.<sup>[81]</sup> For war, Hitler (and Goebbels) thought the continuing support of the people was at least as important as the caliber of armaments.<sup>[82]</sup> Reich Minister Hans Rosenberg, the Nazi philosopher of race whose job was to govern in the conquered eastern territories, argued by mid-1943 that Baltic peoples must be wooed with good treatment and racial status approximating that of the Germans. Goebbels, ruing the way the German army had squandered its reception as liberator when it invaded in 1941, concluded that the regime had "hit the Russians and especially the Ukrainians too hard," adding that "if they are treated right, something can be done with them."<sup>[83]</sup> Hitler agreed with these pragmatic assessments. In mid-1943, after ten years as ruthless dictator and in the midst of barbarous warfare, Hitler reiterated his theory that "one cannot rule by force alone." Reflecting on the problem of German rule in the conquered eastern territories, Hitler continued that, "force is decisive, but it is equally important to have this psychological something which the animal trainer needs to be master of his beast. They must be convinced that we are the victors."<sup>[84]</sup>

In Nazi theory, terror was a means for controlling the fringe after the majority was amenable. In practice, Nazism benefited much more from Germans who cooperated voluntarily than from those who cooperated rather than face torture or the concentration camp. There was no general law requiring Germans to denounce Jews, and yet even the dreaded secret police relied extensively on unpaid collaborators, ordinary Germans, who chose to side with the police, although not coerced into doing so. The enforcement of racial policies "required the cooperation or collaboration of 'ordinary citizens.'"<sup>[85]</sup> Denunciations from the general public, in fact, were arguably more useful to the Gestapo than the regime's own spies.<sup>[86]</sup>

More common in achieving accommodation than death and imprisonment were pressures of economy and society, jobs and status. True, the regime maintained control not just through acts of terror, but through the "atmosphere of terror" surrounding the draconian, arbitrary use of terror. Even friends thought they must "betray each other in order to survive."<sup>[87]</sup> The desire to be good, rather than causing trouble and standing out in the crowd, however, was also behind this self-policing. Out of "Kind neighborliness" some Germans warned friends against standing out as nonconformists. It was not necessary for the party itself to tell others to fly the swastika, subscribe to the Party newspaper, or raise an arm in the submissive one-armed salute, because ordinary Germans did this, "'letting [others] in on what one had to do."<sup>[88]</sup>

Many Germans went well beyond what career interests or survival demanded to assist the regime. By September 1935, the regime prohibited sexual relations between Germans and Jews, and in October 1941, it prohibited all "friendly relations." In each case, however, the public had already been denouncing this behavior to the police, well in advance of the laws that prohibited them.<sup>[89]</sup> There was no law requiring the Germans to denounce Jewish-German couples for having sexual encounters, but in July 1935, the police reported "numerous denunciations, since "the public has been enlightened through the Nazi-press and is now keen of hearing, keeping a watchful eye out for Jews, who go around with blond girls."<sup>[90]</sup> In 1938, Reinhard Heydrich, the later executor of the Final Solution, argued successfully against establishing Jewish ghettos within Germany because "today the German population. . . force the Jew to behave himself. The control of the Jew through the watchful eye of the whole population is better than having him by the thousands in a district where I cannot properly establish a control over his daily life through uniformed agents."<sup>[91]</sup> When the regime made a trial deportation of German Jews in October 1940 (more than a year before the general deportations in Germany began), Heydrich had their German neighbors studied attentively. The main point of his terse two-paragraph report on the deportation was that the surrounding populations had hardly noticed.<sup>[92]</sup> Certainly, the regime was far more anti-Semitic and murderous than the Germans in general. Yet, in part for good reasons, the regime claimed the legitimacy of truly representing the racial people. As the prestige of the Führer expanded to encompass each of his great new achievements, the regime grew confident that, with such broad general support, the public would also support its anti-Jewish policies, or at least not oppose them.

Nazi propaganda also indicates that the regime preferred to convert Germans to its cause. Goebbels was in charge of winning the people, and force, in Hitler's language could only "stabilize" this consensus. Goebbels discontinued using reports of terror in propaganda when they found "no uniform reception among the populace."<sup>[93]</sup> At his inaugural press conference as Propaganda Minister, Goebbels made the lofty claim that "it is not enough for people to be more or less reconciled to our regime, to be persuaded to adopt a neutral attitude towards us . . . [the regime] will not be content with 52 percent [of the people] behind it and with terrorizing the remaining 48 percent but will see its most immediate task as being to win over that



remaining 48 percent."<sup>[94]</sup> Successful propaganda turned persons into fanatics, for according to Hitler, strong beliefs made strong soldiers, and a person who believed a lie fanatically was stronger than someone who held to truth tepidly.<sup>[95]</sup>

As the regime advanced, however, it adjusted to the banalities of everyday life, gradually accepting accommodation from the vast majority rather than fanatical support from everyone.<sup>[96]</sup> Despite the Nazi slogan claiming that the 'common good' took precedence over 'individual good' the regime did not change the Germans into a community of selfless persons.<sup>[97]</sup> Social practices circumscribed the dictatorship's actions. Because the Germans did not fully internalize Nazi norms, the leadership was "forced to settle for external compliance."<sup>[98]</sup> Both the regime and the people discovered that they could get along if the regime met the people's basic needs, material and otherwise.<sup>[99]</sup> If the people did what it required without complaining, the regime could carry on, an indication that passivity was also a form of complicity.

Social unrest and noncompliance, however, the regime tried to avoid like defeat. Goebbels as well as Hitler thought of mass disobedience as a force so powerful it could topple a government. Goebbels wrote in 1940 that "examples show that the public attitude can throw a government into misadventures, which in the end leads to the destruction of the state."<sup>[100]</sup> Hitler went so far as to claim that "a National Socialist, as a means of exercising power, has a duty to disobey those in authority who are unworthy of power"<sup>[101]</sup> (an insight unfortunately lost on Germans of the Third Reich). Hitler worried that trade unions could force approval of the demands of workers through repeated strikes, and wrote that any "economic concessions" to the working class would more than repay the regime, if this helped win the broad masses.<sup>[102]</sup>

Hitler's interpretation of the 1918 revolution and Germany's loss in World War I forged his fear of mass noncompliance and protest. His main source of anxiety were the German workers. Workers, he thought comprised the backbone of the home front unrest of 1918, stabbing the German army in the back.<sup>[103]</sup> This interpretation of revolution and unrest is key to Hitler's thoughts and actions.<sup>[104]</sup> The Party's theory of power flows naturally from it, and Hitler's commitment to "represent and promote the interests of the people" (especially the workers and not counting the Jews).<sup>[105]</sup> Hitler was convinced that the will to fight determined who would win in war, and his fateful decision not to retreat in the Battle of Stalingrad was influenced by his distaste for the damage to civilian morale that retreat would cause.<sup>[106]</sup>

Goebbels also believed Germany lost WW I after the people lost the will to fight.<sup>[107]</sup> He feared strikes so much he preferred not to publish reports on those in enemy territories. This was unusual, given his often shrewd exploitation of any evidence of domestic disaffection in countries at war with Germany.<sup>[108]</sup> Public protests or strikes, by showing that opposition existed and by offering an unambiguous way to express it, could gather momentum quickly. While still the outsider, the Nazi Party itself had benefited by causing unrest. According to Hitler, it was directly after the party had demonstrated its power to shake the status quo by throwing the entire city of Berlin into "extreme agitation" that the old ruling elite decided to make Hitler the offer to build a coalition government as Reich Chancellor.<sup>[109]</sup>



Once becoming the dominant movement and symbol of power, the Nazi Party would even compromise principles to prevent social unrest. Nazi leaders considered mass, public gatherings a unique, powerful form of politics that they must monopolize and exploit fully. German mass protest was the most effective form of arousing Hitler and Goebbels' fear of unrest. It is arguable that Hitler placed too much confidence in the strength of popular unity, and feared social unrest unduly. Yet his perception of power determined the kinds of actions he allowed to sway him. Mass protest, potentially powerful within any government system,<sup>[110]</sup> was forceful against Hitler for reasons unique to National Socialism.

At Rosenstrasse, protest stalled the machinery of deportation, a story that appears bright against the more common pattern of German compliance. Much compliance was due to passivity or social conformity. Some cooperation was coerced. Intermarried experience suggests the Germans did not fully exploit their chances for noncompliance, which might have slowed the regime's translation of race ideology into genocide. The standard of opposition set by intermarried Germans is a high one, well above that required during any ordinary time. And yet many Germans, far from standing out in opposition to the regime, were not even able to resist collaborating with the regime, at least when it coincided with their own interests. Like research on popular collaboration, the history of intermarried Germans helps correct the view that the regime extorted anything it wanted with terror.

The history of intermarried noncompliance and protest provides illuminating examples of social restraints on the dictatorship. They were not cowed by either the Gestapo or the social atmosphere of terror. Their most common, persistent noncompliance was refusal to divorce, despite enormous social and police pressures. Beginning in June 1933, laws and regulations directed specifically against these Germans prevented them from working or hobbled them on the career ladder. In 1938, the Gestapo began directly pressuring intermarried Germans to divorce with sundry threats and promises. To one Berlin Jew, it seemed like a "miracle" that Germans married to Jews "withstood with utmost strength of will and resistance the temptations, insults, and threats" heaped on them by the Gestapo in its attempt to have them divorce.<sup>[111]</sup> As members of "Jewish households," German women suffered in some ways more than some Jewish women married to German men, living in "Aryan" households. These German women bore administrative discriminations (like inferior housing) as well as police harassment such as random house searches, resulting from the Star of David having to be placed on the outside doorposts of Jewish households as of March 1942.<sup>[112]</sup> German men married to Jews were expelled from the military in April 1940, and by October 1944, intermarried women worked in separate forced labor task forces, while intermarried men were forced into hard labor for Organization Todt.<sup>[113]</sup>

Tragically, intermarried Germans feared their neighbors as well the police. They learned to live as outsiders, unable to celebrate Hitler and German military victories. Fear, whether of standing out in the crowd or of arbitrary Gestapo power, caused parents and siblings of intermarried Germans to expel them

from their homes. One Jew frankly admitted that, when it came to harassment from neighbors and others, his non-Jewish wife had endured more than he had.<sup>[114]</sup>

Yet as long as they remained married, they could generally reckon with a common fate. Public entertainment and social opportunities for intermarried couples dwindled, with the so-called Jewish Ban prohibiting Jews from concerts, theaters, moving-picture houses, museums, exhibitions, athletic fields, bath houses.<sup>[115]</sup> In a society where so much centered around marriage and family, it was problematic to exclude a Jew and continue professional and social relations with the marriage partner. A university colleague of an intermarried German wrote that because of "the particular circumstances in which you live, we will not be able to have you over any more."<sup>[116]</sup> For the non-Jewish spouse of an excluded Jew, it was even less tenable to retain active membership in social groups, such as clubs, than professional associations. And in Germany of the 1930s, especially in villages and small cities, "the real social cohesion was supplied by clubs."<sup>[117]</sup>

One of the earliest, most basic steps toward the separation and deportation of German Jews was racial identification. Germans might have refused the regime's questionnaires about "racial" identity. Instead, they researched their family trees and took to the regime's "Aryan Identification Cards" with alacrity. The churches, which possessed the essential records for this research made their records freely available. Entire congregations joined together in researching their ancestry, often out of pride to be so German than fear of noncompliance.<sup>[118]</sup>

Beginning in 1933, many German professional, social, and religious groups adopted the Civil Service's Aryan Clause expelling Jews, sometimes also imitating the government's lead by excluding or discriminating against intermarried Germans as well.<sup>[119]</sup> Even the massive Protestant Christian Faith Movement adopted the Aryan Clause and expelled Jews. On January 17, 1934 the Interior Minister wrote that the "very strong public interest" in eliminating Jewish influence had resulted in the wholesale appropriation of the Aryan Clause by cultural and, above all, private business organizations.<sup>[120]</sup>

This kind of "voluntary, preemptive acceptance" of the regime was prevalent.<sup>[121]</sup> Opportunism was just one of a whole range of motivations underlying popular accommodation, but Germans who actively denounced Jews or expropriated their property often acted out of self-interest. The regime tried to create and control social norms, but it was easier for it to begin controlling behavior through the coordination of its own goals with existing social behavior. Stereotypes identify Germans as sheep, citing unquestioning obedience as the basis for Nazi crime and aggression. Germans, however, were capable of following their own self-interest like anyone else.<sup>[122]</sup>

The dictatorship attempted to control all avenues to wealth, status, and even social survival. Jews were cut out, and the regime rewarded those who helped exclude them. Although there were no laws requiring pubs and other businesses to publicly prohibit Jews, many businesses across Germany banned Jews (in some cases because of threats of boycotts from Nazi Party organizations).<sup>[123]</sup> Entrepreneurs in

many places hung signs marking their businesses "Aryan." Following the official boycott of Jewish businesses in April 1933, German businesses proved so ready to continue boycotts that the Propaganda and Economic ministries tried to restrain them (for economic reasons). Nevertheless, they continued until the Interior Minister, nine months later, issued an order of restraint against them. <sup>[124]</sup>

Denouncing Jews or their German partners to the police was a common way for Germans to actively support and encourage Nazi racism. The regime, in fact, relied more on denunciations in the enforcement of racial policies than in other areas. Not content with holding the levers of state power, it pushed into traditionally private spheres and attempted to fundamentally rearrange social relationships. Regulating race and health required the control of day-to-day life and personal habits. The number of paid police officers and agents was especially inadequate considering the enormous variety of newly criminalized activities in Nazi Germany. The regime could never muster enough police voyeurs, for example, to patrol the streets and bedrooms for violators of its ban on sexual relations between Germans and Jews. Racial policies could be enforced only with the assistance of unpaid snoopers and denouncers. Nearly three-fifths of the Gestapo case files in the district of Würzburg were initiated by denunciations, tips from informants whose motives "ranged across the spectrum from base, selfish, personal, to lofty and 'idealistic.'" <sup>[125]</sup>

In the Frankfurt am Main region, Nazi authorities relied on denunciations in order to draw intermarried Jews into the destruction process. Following denunciations, intermarried Jews were arrested under so-called Protective Custody orders, prosecuted as criminals, and sent to hard labor camps where they died or were sent to the death camp at Auschwitz. The goal of these arrests in early 1943 was, as an integral part of the so-called Final Solution, to "clear the area of Jews," according to a post-war German court. <sup>[126]</sup> To "cloth [their deaths] in a form that appeared to be legal," these intermarried Jews were murdered as individual law-breakers. Even at this relatively late date, German authorities considered this appearance of legal procedure necessary, since these Jews had "relatives and friends among the *Volksgenossen*," the German people. <sup>[127]</sup> But initiating these cases depended on detecting breaches of petty regulations in the course of a Jew's everyday life, which required not just more uniformed police, but the denunciations from a wider public.

The desire to eliminate competition or acquire resources was a frequent motive for denunciations, especially among the old German middle class of self-employed shopkeepers, artisans, peasant proprietors, and professionals. <sup>[128]</sup> It was not unusual for German employees of Jews to position themselves for assuming their boss's business while watching it slide to collapse. In order to promote their own cause, "sales personnel, craftsmen, and factory owners did not shy away from denouncing their competitors as 'not Aryan.'" <sup>[129]</sup> Entrepreneurs generally did not lay off others until all Jews had been laid off (again in some cases party organizations had cowed them into doing this). The so-called Aryanization process depended on Germans willing to buy out Jewish businesses at a fraction of market value. Germany's largest bank, Deutsche Bank A.G., helped the regime expropriate Jewish businesses and secure economic control of conquered territories. To advance their careers, bank employees joined the Party and threatened to

denounce Jewish sympathizers.<sup>[130]</sup>

Discrimination against Jews and intermarried Germans in the work place was especially threatening to men who, more typically than women, sought careers or were family wage earners. Tragically, some men faced with either leaving their Jewish wives or leaving their jobs, divorced their wives (some claimed it was the only way they could support their children).<sup>[131]</sup> Women also were not above such behavior, as shown in the striking case of the leader of the League for the Protection of Motherhood, whose careerism led her to divorce her Jewish husband, so that nothing would "stand in the way of a brilliant future in motherhood services."<sup>[132]</sup> Considering their burdens, it is astounding that only a tiny minority of intermarried Germans got divorced (a mere seven percent, according to one recent calculation).<sup>[133]</sup>

Denunciations reached a peak in 1941 while there was still no sign of German defeat on any horizon. Hitler seemed unassailable. The regime's unprecedented successes legitimated it, in popular opinion<sup>[134]</sup> Many Germans never thought of noncompliance as a possibility. In the case of denunciations, it was not ideals, but Germany's falling fortunes that curtailed voluntary support for Nazism.

The Gestapo was not a force independent of the people, but was of the people, and relied on the people. Civilian cooperation with the regime provided early evidence of *Selbstgleichschaltung*, (voluntary integration). The Nazi takeover of power was initiated with "vigorous thrusts from the Party" but "completed voluntarily and spontaneously," according to one former member of the Gestapo.<sup>[135]</sup> "Seldom had a nation so readily surrendered all its rights and liberties. . . There were certainly many camps taken by force, but even more simply surrendered."<sup>[136]</sup> Hitler and the Party were greatly encouraged. It was only the great positive response "of the masses from below that lent fresh courage to the new rulers, strengthened their own drives, and inspired them with the ultimate audacity they needed to go all out."<sup>[137]</sup>

The Nazi regime built on popular accommodation and acclaim, and translated its race ideology into genocide in interaction with the German people. With the help of denunciations, social bonds between Jews and Germans were dissolved, and it became possible to enforce racial policies. Although the Nazi leadership later pursued its racism to the extreme of genocide that it did not trust the public to accept, support encouraged the regime to tighten the vice of anti-Jewish measures to the point of publicly dispossessing and expelling German Jews -- the point at which the state could better hide from popular opinion. The rescue of Jews married to Germans suggests that the regime's ideology might never have developed into genocide, had the German people not attained for the regime a social isolation of the Jews, the prerequisite for deportation and mass murder.

The problem of collaboration, by which the regime lived, points to the problem of dissent and resistance, which the regime encountered only rarely. If the regime's secret police depended so much on collaboration, to what extent could the regime's power have been challenged by noncompliance and public protest?

The historian William Sheridan Allen wrote that the regime, with all its means, could not convince German villagers to give up church-going, because “no matter what their Nazi leader told them, Northeimers would not stop going to church, because that was what they had always done on Sunday.” [138] In fact, popular actions in Northheim could actually determine the regime’s actions, even on that issue of fundamental importance, anti-Semitism. The reactions to the 1938 Kristallnacht Pogrom in the town of Northeim “was so openly negative that it was the last public anti-Semitic incident in the town.” [139] Thus the townspeople could not only express their dissent—their dissent also determined the regime’s course.

To maintain popular compliance the regime made numerous concessions, for Hitler thought that “to win the masses. . . no social sacrifice is too great.” [140] The dictatorship “tried to keep the morale of the people in the best possible state by concessions,” wrote former Nazi Armaments Minister Albert Speer. “It betrayed great concern over a loss of popularity which might develop into an insurrectionary mood.” [141]

Were violence and police force always effective, there would have been no need to abridge Nazi ideals and make concessions. Flushed with their success in resisting official efforts to remove crucifixes from schools, Catholic activists asserted among themselves “that every anti-Catholic action of the state must remain unsuccessful if the Catholic people stand united together.” [142] Catholics made this pronouncement in 1936, and yet the Rosenstrasse Protest and not a Catholic action is the best illustration of its truth during the Third Reich. [143]

A number of authors have focused on Catholic history to uncover the influence of popular opinion in the Third Reich, [144] while others have investigated the working class to show that Hitler's perceptions of unrest were key to his decisions. [145] The Rosenstrasse protesters, who assembled neither as workers nor as Catholics, indicate that the threat to public morale could be exerted outside of the church and working class, and that it was influential enough, once, to pressure the regime into releasing a limited number of Jews. Open, united German dissent was a (life-risking) challenge, spoiling the official image of consensus and showing that dissent was possible. Intermarried Germans showed that popular protest could still be successful during the time after 1941/42, that is, even during the period when popular trust in a final German victory had grown thin, and there was “an acceleration of violence and terror” [146]

Were the very few cases of public opposition successful only because they were rare exceptions, because they represented challenges to the regime that it could not meet with force, and because they did not oppose the regime itself, in its entirety? If “ample evidence shows that Hitler drew back whenever he met public resistance,” [147] how are we to know where the regime would have drawn the line had there been much more such behavior?

The regime made concessions when it calculated that the popular support it could thus maintain was more valuable than the immediate implementation of its policies and goals. Nazi leaders considered the politics of mass mobilization a peculiarly National Socialist form of exercising power, [148] they used mass

rallies to demonstrate and increase their party's support, they banned all other public demonstrations as a means of consolidating their power, and they gave way to mass, popular protests. The regime wanted persons to surrender their individual identities in exchange for an identity focused on Führer and state. With the aggregate energies of the people, the state would become something great. Each person could then in turn take pride in the state, and build a new identity around it.

But there were obstacles to this scenario of the state and a collectively subservient people. In Germany, there were institutions, and there were traditions. Each institution had its own self-interests—purposes and goals not always matching the interests of the regime. State power, Hitler wrote, can guarantee law and order only when laws coincide with the dominant world view and way of life.<sup>[149]</sup> The problem for Hitler was that the Nazi Party's radical program required deep social changes, fundamental reinterpretations of the value of human life and society hardly achieved with police force. Basic social values which had been accepted and reaffirmed over the course of hundreds of years were now to be changed. If the Nazi state could re-script society with Nazi values, asocial behavior would be that of the enemy of the state. A closely-knit community would shun asocial behavior, so that the state would ride the force of social norms. Propaganda would work more effectively here than coercion. Yet Nazi propaganda too—even during the regime's peak of popularity—worked best at emphasizing already existing norms and values, and could not push society quickly, if at all, in a direction it was not already heading. Attempting to define the nation racially, the regime encountered the opposition of partners in a venerable social institution: marriage.<sup>[150]</sup>

In the view of Nazi leaders, greater ambitions demanded greater popular support and, ironically, it was their most ambitious designs that cut most deeply against popular customs, habits, and traditions. This is the heart of the matter. The fundamental Nazi ideology and in turn the prized Nazi policies cut forcefully against the grain of social traditions the Germans could never part with. The regime had to hide programs it knew the people would reject—racial hygiene requiring divorce, maiming, and murder. Nazi "Euthanasia" divided families between victims and healthy Germans, causing protests that curtailed this racial hygiene program. The intimidation of dissent within a dictatorship so widely accepted and terroristic was offset by policies that cut into personal lives.

The historian Ian Kershaw concluded that popular pressures never hindered the overall effectiveness of the Nazis to govern. Hitler's popularity was so great that it neutralized dissent until 1944-45, when Hitler began to look like a loser, and the escalation of terror, in reaction to the crumbling popular consensus, limited resistance to those willing to expend their lives.<sup>[151]</sup> Furthermore, some historians in fact, have asserted that protests against just one aspect of the regime actually stabilized it, by letting off steam that might have otherwise built up to a level capable of a more general challenge to the dictatorship.<sup>[152]</sup> Yet the study of intermarriages in Nazi Germany sheds new light on the social limitations on Hitler's dictatorship.

The noncompliance of intermarried Germans, by the time the deportations of Jews in Germany



began, had caused a conflict between Nazi ideology and perceived policy options, influencing Hitler to hesitate. Hitler did not like to be publicly associated with divisive matters. Rather than making public pronouncements on intermarried Jews, he gave vague and contradictory orders on whether to include them in the deportations, from behind the scenes, and to his confidants only. Despite attempts by high Party and SS officials to include intermarried Jews and *Mischlinge* in the deportations, Hitler acted to "temporarily defer" them from the Final Solution in 1941 and 1942.<sup>[153]</sup> Perhaps by 1942 he had begun to think that deporting intermarried Jews should wait until after the war.<sup>[154]</sup>

But true to his style, the Führer awaited the right moment for including them—the moment when he sensed that this could be done without endangering morale.<sup>[155]</sup> Thus in 1943 his signals on intermarried Jews wavered. Had their German relatives not protested, the Jews imprisoned at Rosenstrasse would have been deported in early March 1943, and Hitler would have been happy to be rid of them so soon. Yet Goebbels reported that Hitler understood his response to the "psychological" conditions of unrest that caused him to release the intermarried Jews.<sup>[156]</sup> Three months later, however, Hitler gave a very different signal to Himmler. While meeting with Himmler at Obersalzberg, the Führer agreed with Himmler that the Jewish Problem would have to be resolved radically, regardless of the unrest it caused.<sup>[157]</sup> At the time of this meeting, in June 1943, Jews in intermarriages were the only group of remaining, officially registered Jews in Germany. Despite Hitler's pronouncement, intermarried Germans rescued their partners from certain death—and they pose a challenge to those who stood by or actively assisted a regime as it groped its way toward committing the greatest crime in history.

---

[1] Statement of Else Hannach (who escaped Germany in July 1944), July 26 and 31, 1944, Bovensiepen Trial, Supporting Document 30 (Dr. Wolfgang Scheffler Collection).

[2] On their field-gray army uniforms they wore a small band with the script "Leibstandarte SS Adolf Hitler." Two were officers. They were wearing war medals . Statement of Karl Hefter, October 28, 1955, in the trial against Josef ("Sepp") Dietrich, I P Js 3767.65, Staatsanwaltschaft Berlin.

[3] Walter Stock, the former head of the Judenreferat of the Berlin Gestapo, referred exclusively to the mass arrest action (which later became popularly known as the *Fabrikaktion*) as *Judenschlussaktion*, or derivatives of this, including *Abschluss der Juden Aktion* and *Schlussaktion gegen die Juden*. LB, Strafsache gegen Walter Stock (PkLs 3/52), Interrogation of Walter Stock, August 13, 1951.

[4] Statement of Dr. Martha Mosse, July 24, 1958, Bovensiepen trial.

[5] Warned that running meant getting shot, the Jews were crammed face-forward into the backs of the persons in front of them. Statement of Else Hannach , July 26 and 31, 1944, Bovensiepen Trial, Supporting Document 30.

[6] "Die Lage der 'Mischlinge' in Deutschland, Mitte März 1943," a four-page unpublished report from Berlin in mid-March 1943 by Dr. Gerhard Lehfeld, from the archives of Robert A. Graham, SJ, La Civiltà Cattolica, Rome, Italy. Dr. Lehfeld's source was Erich Gritzbach, Hermann Goering's personal adviser at the Office of the Four-Year Plan.

[7] Indictment, Trial of Otto Bovensiepen, 135, lists these, substituting the old people's home on Gerlachstrasse for the one on Grosse Hamburger Strasse Rosenstrasse 2-4 housed "*die Schulverwaltung, das Wohlfahrts- und Jugendamt, das Jugendpflegedezernat, ein Büro für Winterhilfe, ein Büro für Berufsumschichtung,*" according to a Berlin telephone book from 1942. The indictment gives a summary of the Final Roundup and Rosenstrasse Protest, based on court testimony from victims as well as the Gestapo, LBI, Anklageschrift [indictment] in der Strafsache gegen Otto Bovensiepen et al. (1969), Microfilm Reel 239, 207-217.

[8] "Das Ende Einer Gemeinde," an anonymous report from a former nurse at the Berlin Jewish hospital, reported from Lausanne at the end of 1943, in Gerhard Schoenberner, ed., *Wir Haben es gesehen* (Im Bertelsmann Lesering: n.d.), 313-317.

[9] Forty-three abandoned children called the Jewish Community in search of their parents, according to a statement of Dr. Martha Mosse, July 23 and 24, 1958, Bovensiepen Trial.

[10] Hysterical men and women, clamoring to reach a child or spouse in another corner of the building, pressed forward out of their designated category, only to fall back under the whips and curses of SS men, who cried out, "You damned Jews are supposed to stay in your group." Statement of Dr. Kurt Radlauer, November 10, 1966, Bovensiepen Trial, which reported that upon arriving at the synagogue, he was immediately received by two Jewish orderlies and a Gestapo man standing behind them. The twenty-five Jews from his truck was divided at once into groups. Radlauer went with intermarried Jews one flight of stairs up to the gallery, overlooking the huge first floor of the old synagogue.

[11] Hildegard Henschel, "Aus der Arbeit der Jüdischen Gemeinde Berlin, 16. Oktober 1941--1943," Leo Baeck Institute, New York, Max Kreuzberger Research Papers, AR 7183/box 13, folder A, 9.

[12] Lehfeld, "Die Lage der 'Mischlinge.'" Lehfeld reported that Eichmann planned to use nine thousand persons from intermarried couples to "build a wall" on the front, language that mirrors the language used later to describe the activity of Mischlinge and intermarried Jews later forced into hard labor under auspices of Organization Todt. Holocaust expert Raul Hilberg writes that hundreds of intermarried French Jews were sent to hard labor and that in 1945 "heavy work schedules were also in store" for intermarried Jews from Vienna and Frankfurt. Raul Hilberg, *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders: The Jewish Catastrophe, 1933-1945* (New York: 1992), 132.

[13] Interview with Vera Breitwieser, March 26, 1985, Berlin. Only privileged intermarried couples were allowed to have telephones, however, so this chain was probably of little use to most of the concerned families.

[14] Jewish women married to German men were considered "Aryan" households and were designated by Hitler in 1938 as privileged intermarriages. Jews in privileged intermarriages did not wear the Star of David, and very few were arrested during the Final Roundup. Jewish men married to Germans, on the other hand, were called Jewish households. These men from nonprivileged intermarriages wore the Star of David and were arrested.

[15] Interview with Charlotte Israel Freudenthal, February 1985, and statement of Charlotte Freudenthal in Bezirksverordnetenversammlung von Charlottenburg, *Schon damals fingen viele an zu schweigen* (Berlin: 1986), 197.

[16] On a map from 1648 Rosenstrasse is one of about two dozen streets pictured. In 1583 it was called Hurengasse (prostitute alley). "*Es klang ironisch und sollte erzieherisch wirken.*" Heinz Knobloch, *Meine Liebste Mathilde: das unauffällige Leben des Mathilde Jacob* (Berlin: 1986), 273.

[17] With the permission of the Gestapo, the Jewish men arrested during the Kristallnacht were received at Bahnhof Friedrichstrasse by the Jewish Welfare Committee (Jüdische Hilfskommittee) and brought to the Rosenstrasse to be clothed and given medical care. In Sachsenhausen the surviving Jews had witnessed deaths by freezing and heart attacks. Statement of Norbert Wollheim, July 6, 1966, Bovensiepen trial. The deportation to Buchenwald was the "first large scale action against the alleged anti-social elements among the Jews. . .persons who had been previously punished for a single, small misdemeanor." A "large number" left the camp, others languished for years and died there. Ernst Bukofzer, *Laws for Jews and Persecution of Jews under the Nazis* (Berlin, 1946), 6, 7.

[18] Moritz Henschel, "Die letzten Jahre der jüdischen Gemeinde Berlin," (a lecture given September 13, 1946), Yad Vashem, Jerusalem, 01/51.

[19] Statement of Charlotte Rosenthal from February 21, 1955, LBI, Wiener Library microfilms (AR 7187/Reel 600). This microfilm contains eyewitness statements and a list of women participants in the protest. I have interviewed twenty-one participants of the Rosenstrasse Protest, eight who were released from the collecting center because of the protest (including two sent first to Auschwitz and then released about two weeks later), Goebbels's chief deputy at the Propaganda Ministry, a former assistant to Adolf Eichmann, and two members of the Berlin Gestapo.

[20] Interview with Giesela Weigert, June 21, 1985.

[21] Interviews with Charlotte Israel Freudenthal, February 10 and 25, 1985.

[22] Annie Radlauer interviews, March 12, 1985; May 29, 1985.

[23] Georg Zivier, "Aufstand der Frauen," *Sie*, (December 1945).

[24] In the East German Communist Party newspaper Inge Unikower wrote that "foreign news sources reported at the time of 400 to 600 . . . including London Radio." Although she titled the article "Silent Protest," Unikower reported that protesters called out "Give us your husbands back. We want to have our husbands again." Inge Unikower, "Stummer Protest," *Neues Deutschland*, No. 46 (November 14, 1964), 2. Ruth Andreas Friedrich, whose diary was for years the most accessible reference to the protest, writes that there had been six thousand protesters, a possible sum total of persons who participated. Ruth Andreas Friedrich, *Schauplatz Berlin: ein Tagebuch aufgezeichnet 1933- 1945* (Reinbeck bei Hamburg: 1964), March, 1943. Considering that some two thousand Jews were imprisoned at Rosenstrasse, and that the vast majority of those who protested were their family members, this would indicate that each person imprisoned had been represented on the street by three family members sometime during the course of the protest. One interned Jew reported that seven of his family members participated in the protest (Interview with Gad Beck, January 28, 1985), but it was more common for a prisoner to be represented by just one or two protesters.

[25] Zivier, "Aufstand der Frauen."

[26] Interview with Rita Kuhn, April 26, 1989, Berkeley, California.

[27] Statement of Sartorius, December 13, 1965, Bovensiepen Trial.

[28] Interview with Leopold Gutterer, August 19, 1986. Gutterer, who made a career out of deceiving people, can hardly be taken at face value, and yet parts of his testimony are reliable because his self-justifications at points coincided with the truth. According

to the historian Peter Hoffmann, Gutterer was a relative of Maurice Bavaud, the Swiss student who tried to kill Hitler in 1938. See Peter Hoffmann, "Maurice Bavaud's Attempt to Assassinate Hitler in 1938," in *Police Forces in History*, ed. G. L. Mosse (London: 1975), 173ff.

[29] Leffeld, "Lage der 'Mischlinge,'" 4. I found no references to this arrest and protest in the Swedish Press.

[30] *Ibid.*, 2, 3.

[31] Hitler and the NSDAP hardly grasped power by votes alone. Jürgen Kocha and Hans-Ulrich Wehler, among others, have contended that still-powerful preindustrial forces in Weimar politics made possible the *Machtergreifung* (seizure of power). Hitler rose because of these "feudal remnants"—and the crisis of the Great Depression. Jürgen Kocha, "Ursachen des Nationalsozialismus," *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* (June 21, 1980), 9-13; Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *The German Empire, 1871-1918*, trans. Kim Traynor (Leamington Spa, England: 1985); A. J. P. Taylor, *The Course of German History: A Survey of the Development of German History since 1815* (London: 1945). Another school of thought has argued that economics alone—the crises inherent in capitalism—destroyed the Weimar Republic. See especially David Abraham, *The Collapse of the Weimar Republic: Political Economy and Crisis*. (Princeton: 1981). Karl Dietrich Bracher and Otto Kirchheimer emphasize errors in the Weimar constitution itself that were likely to produce a collapse into dictatorship. Karl Dietrich Bracher, *The German Dilemma: the Relationship of State and Democracy*, trans. Richard Barry, (New York: 1975), and Otto Kirchheimer, "Weimar and What Then?" in *Politics, Law and Social Change: Selected Essays of Otto Kirchheimer*, ed. Frederic Burn and Kurt Shell (New York and London: 1969), 33-74.

[32] Goebbels's six children, who called Hitler Uncle, were special favorites in the Führer's private circles. See Joseph Goebbels, *The Goebbels Diaries: 1939-1941*, ed. Fred Taylor (New York: 1984), including photographs, 174 ff.

[33] Some historians have emphasized the role of storm trooper violence and intimidation in the Nazi seizure and consolidation of power, while Richard Bessel has argued that the role of this SA violence against the German left in 1933 was not so much to bring the Nazis to power as it was to demonstrate that "no real battle still needed to be fought." Richard Bessel, "Political Violence and the Nazi Seizure of Power," in *Life in the Third Reich*, ed. Richard Bessel (New York: 1987), 6. See also Richard Bessel, *Political Violence and the Rise of Nazism: The Storm Troopers in Eastern Germany 1925-1934*. (New Haven: 1984).

[34] Karl Dietrich Bracher, *The German Dictatorship: The Origins, Structure, and Consequences of National Socialism*, trans. Jean Steinberg (New York and Washington D.C.: 1970), 87.

[35] Anthony Rhodes, *Propaganda The Art of Persuasion: World War II* (Seacaucus, N.J.: 1987), 16. These demonstrations usually took place at about 8:00 p.m., "when people's resistance was at its lowest ebb, and their minds most open to persuasion," writes Rhodes.

[36] Joseph Goebbels, *Final Entries, 1945: The Diaries of Joseph Goebbels*, ed. and introduction Hugh Trevor-Roper, trans. R. H. Barry (New York: 1978), xviii. Gutterer's title was *Reichshauptstellenleiter für Grosskundgebungen*.

[37] "Verordnung zur Aufrechterhaltung der öffentlichen Ruhe und Sicherheit vom 20. Mai 1933," excerpted in BA Potsdam, 50.01 (ProMi), 63, 2ff.

[38] Pr. GSta., Rep. 90 P, 12.

[39] Joseph Goebbels, *The Goebbels Diaries, 1942-1943*, ed. Louis Lochner (New York: 1948) entry for March 6, 1943, 276.

[40] Eleanor Hancock, *The National Socialist Leadership and Total War, 1941-5* (New York: 1991), 48.

[41] Officials at the Final Solution Conference of March 6, 1942 expressed concern that a compulsory divorce of intermarriages "would lead to considerable disquiet among non-German relatives." Summary of Conference, ND NG-2586-H. In 1942 the Interior Ministry when considering policies on *Mischlinge*, continued to express concern about the large number of German relatives each *Mischlinge* had, when considering policies on *Mischlinge*. Stuckart to Klopfer, et. al., March 16, 1942, ND NG-2586-I. And even in 1943 the regime was still tailoring its policies on intermarried Jews to the fact that they had non-Jewish relatives and friends. Hessisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Judgement against Heinrich Baab (51 Ks 1/50).

[42] The regime continued an effort to cover up the Final Solution, maintaining the secrecy of euphemisms, restricted correspondence on the matter, and prohibitions against speaking of it, etc. It is arguable that by sometime in 1943 segments of

the German population knew that "terrible things" were happening to Jews in the East. It is arguable that this knowledge tended to intimidate opposition, rather than stirring up dissent. The main point for elucidating the release of Jews at Rosenstrasse, however, is that regardless of what the Germans knew, the regime continued to strive to conduct genocide in secrecy. Awareness that Germany was acting barbarically against Jews might have stiffened the resolve of Germans to win the war, for those who feared losing would bring revenge for German atrocities. The case of Gustav Nosske and others, discussed below, however, indicates that some Germans were willing to commit atrocities for Germany only as long as Germany was winning the war.

[43] Out of 5,837 of these, fewer than half, about 2,500, were sent to the work camps.

[44] The Nazis used the term "Aryan" to identify a group of Indo-Germanic people, excluding, most prominently, Jews, and also Gypsies. For National Socialism, this group represented a race the Master Race. Aryan is thus a term as offensive as it is irrational, and I have used the word "German" to refer to those Germans the Nazis called Aryans. Jews were Germans too, of course, at least until the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 stripped them of citizenship. But given the Nuremberg Laws, the racial-nationalistic meaning Nazism gave to the term "Aryan," and the general usage patterns in histories of Nazi Germany, I have used the term "German" in the place of "Aryan" and contrasted with the term "Jew." Occasionally, however, to emphasize the racial implications of that word, I use the term "Aryan." By 1944 Himmler's office specifically stated a preference for using the term "German-blooded," in place of "Aryan," Report from Himmler's personal staff titled "Behandlung von Mischlingsangelegenheiten" (undated report from mid-1944), BA, NS 19/3335.

[45] An inmate at Rosenstrasse estimated that there were 2,000 imprisoned there (Statement of Ferdinand Wolff, 4 May 1951, Trial against Walter Stock, Landgericht Berlin, PkLs 3/52, hereafter cited as Stock Trial) while a police officer who spent one night there estimated only 1,000. Statement of former street policeman Anton von Kryshak, Bovensiepen Trial, 1968. Hauptscharführer Karl Krell, the unemployed baker turned Gestapo agent for Berlin's Jewish Desk, claimed at his "denazification trial" after the war that he had ordered the release of 2,000 intermarried Jews. Statement of Karl Krell, 4 SpLs 16/47 Bielefeld, BA, Koblenz. There is in any case a difference between the number of intermarried Jews and *Mischlinge* released due to the protest, and those released from Rosenstrasse, given that some *Mischlinge* and intermarried Jews arrested in the Berlin Final Roundup were released from other collection centers, during or following the protest. Thus some *Mischlinge* were released from the Clou collection center and an intermarried Jew, Walter Baron, was released from a collection center at Auguststrasse 17, a Jewish school. Interview with Baron's daughter, Mrs. Bieversdorf, May 24, 1985, who still has her father's certificate of release, dated March 13, 1943, and signed by Walter Dobberke. The number of intermarried Jews arrested would not exceed the number of officially registered Berlin Jews in nonprivileged intermarriages, but it would also likely be very close to this amount. On September 1, 1942, in preparation for plans to clear the Reich of Jews, the Berlin Jewish Community made a "final report" to the Gestapo on the number of Jews still in Berlin. "Final Report" of the Berlin Jewish Community's Registration Office (Kataster Verwaltung), BA Potsdam, R 8150, September 1, 1942. The Community's Office of Registration reported to the Gestapo on September 1 that there were 1,436 Jews in nonprivileged intermarriages (those who wore the Star of David). These Jews in the Community's "final report" were arrested, either at work or at home, during the Final Roundup. In its report to the Gestapo Community authorities admit that the number of intermarried Jews in their lists is "apparently too low, because in many cases" intermarried Jews remained "unknown" and unregistered. Subsequently, Jewish authorities under orders of the Gestapo printed in the Jewish newspaper *Jüdische Nachrichtenblatt* demands that all still-unregistered Jews in intermarriage must now register. These announcements apparently were of little use, however, since at the end of the war there were still 1,451 Jews in nonprivileged intermarriage--the same group, by and large, that was imprisoned and released at Rosenstrasse.

In addition to the 1,400-plus intermarried Berlin Jews who wore the star, a small number of Berlin Jews from privileged intermarriages wore the Star. The Community's "final report" of September 1, 1942 identifies 24 Jews from privileged intermarriage as wearing the Star of David, and in fact there were a number of Jews in privileged intermarriages who were arrested and then released from Rosenstrasse before the others, on the night of March 1-2, 1943.

In addition to intermarried Jews, some children of intermarried couples--*Mischlinge*--were also arrested in the Final Roundup. These were *Mischlinge* who wore the Star, those enrolled in a Jewish community or those married to Jews. This was the minority of the *Mischlinge*, since nationally only 11 percent of German *Mischlinge* were enrolled in Jewish communities. According to estimates from eyewitnesses, there were some 200 or more *Mischlinge* imprisoned at Rosenstrasse. On the basis of these figures, and considering that some persons arrested were released not from Rosenstrasse but from other collection centers, it is safe to estimate that about 1,700 *Mischlinge* and intermarried Jews were released because of the street protest.

[46] Statistics of the Central Organization of Jews in Germany (Reichsvereinigung der Juden in Deutschland) show that as of September 1944 there were 13,217 officially registered Jews in Germany. All but 230 lived in intermarriage. BA, Potsdam, R 8150, 32. (The archives of the Central Organization of Jews has been made public and reorganized at BA Potsdam since the author read them in the private O.D. Kulka collection). There were also Jews in intermarriage who had never been detected and officially registered as Jews, and other Jews survived in hiding.

[47] Ralf Georg Reuth, ed., *Joseph Goebbels, Tagebücher*: Vol. 4, 1940-1942 (Munich and Zürich: Serie Piper), entry for March 7, 1942, 1763.

[48] Statement of Helmut Brintzer, 18 August 1970, Bovensiepen Trial



- [49] Marion A. Kaplan, *The Making of the Jewish Middle Class: Women, Family, and Identity in Imperial Germany* (New York and Oxford: 1991), 81.
- [50] Bruno Blau, "Mischehe im Nazireich," *Judaica* (April 1948) 46. See also Monika Richarz, ed. *Jüdisches Leben in Deutschland: Selbzeugnisse zur Sozialgeschichte, 1918-1945* (Stuttgart/New York: 1982), 466.
- [51] Ursula Büttner, *Die Not der Juden teilen: Christlich-jüdische Familien im Dritten Reich* (Hamburg: 1988), 14, citing Herbert Strauss, "Jewish Emigration from Germany: Nazi Policies and Jewish Responses," in *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* vol. 25 (1980), 317.
- [52] Kaplan, *Making of the Jewish Middle Class*, 81, and 258n. 117. See also Der Preussische Minister des Innern an den Reichsjustizminister, October 28, 1933, BA Potsdam, 30.01 (RJM), BA Potsdam, 30.01 (RJM), 1389/1 ("Mischblütige Ehen"), 30. The Minister noted that intermarriages in 1933 were observed "particularly in Frankfurt/Main and Wiesbaden."
- [53] Regierungspräsident in Wiesbaden to the Prussian Interior Minister, October 28, 1933, BA Potsdam, 30.01 (RJM), 1389/1, 30.
- [54] Claudia Koontz, *Mothers in the Fatherland: Women, the Family and Nazi Politics* (New York: 1987) 192.
- [55] Bukofzer, *Laws for Jews*, 16.
- [56] Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York/London: 1985) 169.
- [57] Report by SS statistician Richard Korherr, April 19, 1943, ND NO- 5193.
- [58] BA Potsdam, R 8150, 32.
- [59] See Blau, "Mischehe im Nazireich," 52. According to an official Reich census of December 1942, there were 16,760 intermarriages in old Germany (Report by Reich Inspector for Statistics Richard Korherr, April 19, 1943, ND NO- 5193.) The discrepancy between the figures taken in 1939 and those recorded at the end of the war does not mean that 5,000 Jews in intermarriages were killed in the Final Solution. Jews could still emigrate from Germany until 1941; others died after being sent to hard labor camps on criminal charges; still others died in allied bombing raids or from ostensibly natural causes, or committed suicide.
- [60] This figure on German Jews who survived does not include the 1,499 *Geltungsjuden*, whom the Nazis counted as Jews in Germany as of the Autumn of 1944, nor does it count the 1,200 to 1,400 Jews who survived Hitler as *U-boots*, hidden in the underground. On underground Jews in Berlin see Carolin Hilker-Siebenhaar, *Wegweiser durch das jüdische Berlin: Geschichte and Gegenwart* (Berlin: 1987), 361-369.
- [61] See the discussion among top ministries from February 16, 1943 into early 1945, about changing divorce laws to increase births. BA Potsdam, 30.01, (Justice Ministry), 10118.
- [62] Bernhard Lösener, "Als Rassereferent im Reichsministerium des Innern," *Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, vol. 9 (September 1961), 278.
- [63] Jeremy Noakes has argued that the Nazi policy toward the *Mischlinge* was "formed by the contradictory pressures and changing priorities" of conflicts between ideology and politics. Jeremy Noakes, "Wohin gehören die 'Judenmischlinge'? Die Entstehung der ersten Durchführungsverordnungen zu den Nuremberger Gesetzen," in *Das Unrechtsregime: Internationale Forschung über den Nationalsozialismus*, vol. 2, ed. Ursula Büttner (Hamburg: 1986), vol. 2, 69, 70. Policies toward intermarried Jews represented an even greater conflict between Nazi ideology and policy, since these were not "half" but "full" Jews.
- [64] Many of the laws were concerned with blocking careers of Germans married to Jews. Ursula Büttner, "Introduction," *Die Not der Juden teilen*.
- [65] Dirk Blasius has speculated that this is the case. Dirk Blasius, *Ehescheidung in Deutschland, 1794- 1945* (Göttingen: 1987),



[66] Ursula Büttner estimates on the basis of statistics from Hamburg and Baden-Württemberg that 93 percent of intermarried Germans remained married. Büttner, *Die Not der Juden teilen*, 57. Some intermarried Germans did divorce, sometimes by common consent, if the Jewish partners felt they were too much of a burden -- see for example Irene Runge, *Onkel Max ist Jüdisch: Neun Gespräche mit Deutschen die Juden halfen* (Berlin: 1991), 102--even though in some cases the partners secretly remained together as a couple, and later remarried. Interview with Charlotte Steudel, August 8, 1985, Berlin.

[67] Lösener, "Als Rassereferent," 268." See also Büttner, *Not der Juden teilen*, 12, for further evidence that the Party leaders wished to eliminate *Mischlinge*. On the regime's *Mischlinge* policies in general, see Jeremy Noskes, "Nazi Policy towards German-Jewish Mischlinge," *Yearbook Leo Baeck Institute*, vol. 34 (1989), 291-354; John A. S. Grenville, "Die 'Endlösung' and die 'Judenmischlinge' im Dritten Reich," *Das Unrechtsregime*, loc. cit., 91-121; Uwe Dietrich Adam, "An Overall Plan for Anti-Jewish legislation in the Third Reich?", *Yad Vashem Studies*, vol. 11 (1976); and "Nazi Actions Concerning the Jews between the Beginning of World War II and the German attacks on the USSR," in *Unanswered Questions: Nazi Germany and the Genocide of the Jews*, ed. Francois Furet (New York: 1988).

[68] Reuth, *Joseph Goebbels, Tagebücher*, entry for March 7, 1942. Far from protecting their Jewish spouses, Goebbels wrote, intermarried Germans were incapable of understanding the basic tenet of National Socialism and should share the fate of those with whom they chose to associate.

[69] Goebbels ordered his ministers to address problems with solutions which were within the realm of what pleased the popular sentiment (BA Potsdam 50.01, 1d, 13 August 1940) and warned them against being "psychologically unrefined," which he defined as that which would "never find any understanding" among the people. BA Potsdam 50.01, 1h (undated). The attempt to orchestrate the public mood with the way in which he thought would lead to the most productive German effort in wartime led Goebbels into detailed directives about what composers should be played on which radio programs, and even into previewing the recipes read on the *Women's Program* (BA Potsdam 50.01 1d, 15 July 1940). Psychological problems would arise when overly celebratory music was played or recipes for which ingredients were not available during wartime were recommended. Goebbels also dealt with "psychological questions," such as how often to play the national anthem for maximum effect, taking into account such intricate considerations as not overplaying it for fear that it will become commonplace and thus ineffective (playing it too often depleted its value for "emphasis," and it should rather be saved for punctuating the highest victories). BA Potsdam, ProMi, 1g, April 11, 1941.

[70] Report by Himmler, 1944, Berlin Document Center, File 0.240 II.

[71] "There has been a tendency to suppose that the 'police state' relied on an extraordinarily large police force, which in turn could count on the collaboration of an army of paid agents and spies." Robert Gellately, *The Gestapo and German Society: Enforcing Racial Policy, 1933-1945* (Oxford: 1990), 5.

[72] Ian Kershaw, *The "Hitler Myth": Image and Reality in the Third Reich* (Oxford/New York: 1987), 52, 53.

[73] Marlis Steinert, *Hitler's War and the Germans: Public Mood and Attitude during the Second World War*, ed. and trans. T. E. J. de Witt (Athens, Ohio, 1977), 1. On the social bases of political power also see Barrington Moore, *Injustice: The Social Bases of Obedience and Revolt* (White Plains, NY., 1978), and the sociologist George Simmel, a German, expounded on this point and concluded that "even the most miserable slave. . .in some fashion at least, can still in this sense react to his master." Kurt H. Wolff, ed. and trans., *The Sociology of George Simmel* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950), 250, quoted in Gene Sharp, *The Politics of Nonviolence*, Vol. I, *Power and Struggle*, (Boston: 1973), 17. Sharp, in his influential work, lucidly describes the theory that governments rely on the support of those they pretend to govern. Although the Nazi Regime was concerned about popular mood and opinion, this does not indicate that each person acting alone could make a difference, or even that most people at the time perceived that the regime as very concerned about avoiding unrest.

[74] Franz Neumann, *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism* (New York: Octagon Books, 1963), p. 98

[75] Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, ed. John Chamberlain and Sidney B. Fay, (New York: 1939), 764, 765. This concept of power was an elaboration of an opinion characteristic of the Nazi Party. Hitler wrote that "as early as 1919 we [the Party] realized that the new movement has to carry out, first, as its highest aim, the nationalization of the masses." *Mein Kampf*, 465.

[76] Like a stillborn child, this attempt "will certainly not be able to live," Hitler concludes. *Ibid.*, 872-873.

[77] Hitler, *Ibid.*, 464.

[78] Hitler, *Ibid.*, 465.

[79] Goebbels urged restraint from illegal, violent activity because it would be fruitless, and implied that the natural affinity between the racial people and their true representative, the Nazi Party, pointed to the electoral path in any case. Hitler agreed, stating that "In these days, only one desire dominates the longing of the enemies of Germany: would that it could work out, so that the National Socialists get agitated, and in turn their masses loose their nerves and break the laws. The Emergency Decree must be obeyed by all party comrades and party officials, SA and SS members in the most precise and thorough way." Hitler supported the Emergency Decrees not only because he wanted to appear acceptable to decent society, and steer clear of damaging violations of law, but also because he considered SA violence counterproductive. SD police reports confirmed that SA violence alienated support for Hitler. Lagebericht (Nürnberg), October 21, 1932, ZSA 15.01 (RMdI) 26093, 335. One impression of SA rabble rousing was that the Nazis had turned to violence because they had gathered all the votes they could collect by other means. Henry Ashby Turner, Jr., in rejecting claims that big business was primarily responsible for the rise of Nazism, has made the case that it was grass roots volunteers that buoyed the successful Nazi campaigns. Fanatic devotion to the party, Turner contends, compensated for funds the party lacked. SA violence hurt the public image of the party, but orderly demonstrations were also welcomed for financial reasons. Henry Ashby Turner, Jr., *German Big Business and the Rise of Hitler* (Oxford and New York: 1985), 115-119.

[80] "What you are, you are through me, but what I am, I am through you." Adolph Hitler, June 1939 *Die Kunst im Dritten Reich*, vol. 2, no. 6 (June 1939), 163. See also Hitler's speeches from October 5, and November 6, 1938, in Max Domarus, ed., *Hitler: Reden und Proklamationen, 1932-1945* (Munich: 1991), 923-938. See Norman H. Baynes, ed., *The Speeches of Adolph Hitler, April 1922-August 1939* (New York: 1969), vol. 1, 616-636, on Hitler's continuing expectations for the role of the Nazi Movement, in undergirding his power.

[81] Ian Kershaw, "Hitler Myth."

[82] Fighting other ministries for funding, Goebbels addressed a meeting of Radio officials on March 25, 1933 and, comparing his task at propaganda with that of the Armaments Ministry, said that "the mobilization of the mind is as necessary as, perhaps even more necessary than, the material mobilization of the nation." Quoted in Jeremy Noakes and G. Pridham, *Nazism: A History in Documents and Eyewitness Accounts, 1919- 1945* (New York: 1983), 383. Not arms "but the forces of the will" are decisive, Hitler wrote. "The best weapon is dead, worthless material as long as the spirit is lacking which is ready, willing, and determined to use it," he added. "Therefore, the question of regaining Germany's power is not, perhaps, How can we manufacture arms? but, How can we produce that spirit which enables a people to bear arms? Once this spirit dominates a people, the will finds a thousand ways, each of which ends with arms!" Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 460. Hitler of course did not deny the significance of arms but rather proclaimed that "an ardent national will for self-preservation" was the primary attribute which would both produce armaments and lead to their use in acts of "heroic death-defying courage."

[83] Rosenberg, who had first ruled against this, argued by mid-1943 that German soldiers should be allowed to intermarry with Estonians. I am of the opinion, Rosenberg wrote in May 1943, "that under the current circumstances, due to general political reasons, [German-foreigner] marriages should not as a rule raise doubts." In the absence of a decision from Hitler, the burden of proof was now on those who wanted to forbid such marriages. Rosenberg (Leibbrandt) to Reichskommissar Riga, May 31, 1943, BA Potsdam, II.01 (Ostgebiet) 49, p. 182. As in the controversial decisions concerning German-Jewish intermarriages, Hitler stayed on the fence, for Rosenberg's rules apparently stuck, despite the anger they caused among SS and Party officials. Goebbels wrote already in mid-1942 that treatment in the eastern territories must change. "The inhabitants of the Ukraine were more than inclined at the beginning to regard the Führer as the savior of Europe and to welcome the German Wehrmacht most cordially," Goebbels wrote. "This attitude has changed completely in the course of months. We have hit the Russians, and especially the Ukrainians, too hard on the head with our manner of dealing with them. A clout on the head is not always a convincing argument." Goebbels, *Goebbels Diaries, 1942- 1943*, ed. Lochner, entry for April 25, 1942, p. 182. Goebbels continued that "if they are treated right something can be done with them [the Ukrainians]." There was no disagreement about goals, only about tactics, among the Nazi leadership. Reich Commissioner Hinrich Lohse was pressed to teach Goering a lesson from his own experience, at a meeting of Nazi notables in August 1942. Lohse was on the defensive about not having produced as many goods from his territory as he had initially expected. "I have no police and no other means of controlling the territory at all," Lohse told Goering. "When I want to use force or compulsion, the people laugh about it, for I have no means of getting through." Goering retorted, "But you are getting [police] battalions!" Lohse reminded Goering that there weren't enough police to compel each unwilling person in his territory: "Those few battalions in an area as big as Germany!" Goering then asked, "If you get police forces, do you believe you can get more out of [the region]?" Lohse responded by sharpening his point: "On the contrary. I believe, we will get still less if we use force." At an earlier meeting of his staff, Lohse had pointed out that the use of force was not only ineffective, it was also unsophisticated: "So long as a people is peaceful, one should treat it decently. To make political mistakes and to hit people over the head--anyone can do that." Quoted in translation in Alexander Dallin, *German Rule in Russia, 1941-1941* (New York: 1957), 187, 188.

[84] ND PS-739, cited *Ibid.*, 498.

[85] Gellately, *The Gestapo and German Society*, 7.

[86] Detlev Peukert, *Die KPD im Widerstand: Verfolgung und Untergrundarbeit an Rhein und Ruhr 1933 bis 1945*, (Wuppertal: 1980), 123, quoted in Gellately, *The Gestapo and German Society*, 64.

[87] William Sheridan Allen, *The Nazi Seizure of Power: The Experience of a Single German Town, 1925- 1945* (New York and London: 1965, rev. 1984), 189. According to Allen, Nazi terror worked for the Party before 1933 because even though the Party was a major cause of the street fighting and chaos characteristic of the late Weimar Republic the people saw Hitler as a strong figure who could impose order. By the time Hitler became chancellor, the public was "inured" to violence, and stood still as various Nazi Party organs used violence to consolidate Hitler's power.

[88] *Ibid.*, 189.

[89] Gellately concludes that denunciations from the public were in "many cases . . . well in advance of what the regime actually expected." Gellately, *The Gestapo and German Society*, 140.

[90] By the summer of 1935 these Nazi Party-instigated disturbances grew so large that observers described them as demonstrations. IML, Lagebericht (Allgemeine Übersicht über die Ereignisse im Monat Juli 1935), St3/673.

[91] Minutes of the meeting of officials following the Kristallnacht Pogrom, Nuremberg Trail Documents, PS-1816, quoted in Hilberg, *Destruction of the European Jews*, 168.

[92] Hannah Arendt described the deportation of seventy-five hundred Jews from Baden, Saerland, and Pfalz to the camp in Gurs, France as a sort of trial deportation to determine, among other things, "what the reaction of their neighbors would be." Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, (New York: 1963), 156. In late 1941 when the systematic deportations of Jews from all over Germany began, Heydrich's secret police continued to keep their ear to the ground. The secret police reported that the initial deportation of four hundred Jews from the area of Minden in December 1941 was "welcomed by a large majority of the population." Although the Gestapo carried it out in secret, the fact that the Jews were "sent away" was soon a topic of discussion in all parts of the population, the report continued. The advantage of this was the opportunity it gave the secret police to report on, rather than merely speculate about, public opinion on the overnight disappearance of Jewish neighbors and coworkers. Some expressed themselves to the effect that the Führer was surely to be thanked for "freeing us from the pest of Jewish blood." A worker said that deportations of Jews should have been done fifty years before, which would have saved the Germans from two world-wars! The only thing that "astonished" the townspeople was the Gestapo's bad taste in using the well-furnished, public city buses to transport the Jews to the train station! The report continues that the only dissenting voices, as the SD had "come to expect," came from religious circles: "One went so far in spreading wild rumors as to say that all the Jews were being pushed into Russia. . . where the workers were put into factories and the old and sick were shot." SD Main Branch Office (Hauptausstellenstelle) Bielefeld to RSHA, III B I (Central SD Office in Berlin), December 16, 1941, Heydrich to the Foreign Office, October 1940.

[93] BA Potsdam, 50.01 (ProMi) 1d, entry from September 30, 1940. Because secret police reports from September 1940 showed that publicizing cases of recrimination and threats of recrimination had found "no uniform reception among the populace," Goebbels suspended them until he could consult with Hitler. In this case, Goebbels was not concerned with whether a mere majority of the populace was sympathetic to his propaganda, but with the much higher standard of whether the public uniformly approved of it (this was early in the war, however, when it was still widely popular).

[94] Quoted in Noakes and Pridham, *Nazism*, 381.

[95] Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 467, 468, 485, 486. The flaw of democracy was the weakness of pluralism. As a characteristic of an uncomplicated focus, intolerance was good. "The future of [the Nazi] movement is conditioned by the fanaticism, even more the intolerance, with which its adherents present it as the only right one," Hitler wrote. Complexities were the "germs of an inner weakening."

[96] Noakes and Pridham, *Nazism*, 379, 409. Goebbels eventually abandoned the project of producing a National Socialist art, resigned instead to a pragmatic production of "innocuous and undemanding" entertainment rather than political indoctrination.

[97] The business closure program of Total War, measures beginning January 1943, showed the regime was far from achieving its

ideal of individuals sacrificing for the community. As a program which would help Germany win the war, the public in general welcomed business closures. But as soon as people personally were required to close shop or report for work, they grew restless, jealous and suspicious. Everyone seemed reluctant to make a greater sacrifice than the neighbor, and ready to believe the neighbor was doing less. Local leaders agreed that as a national measure, *Stillegung* was good, but were reluctant to close shops in their area. Their own shops, they claimed, were necessary to supply the people properly. Heinz Boberach, ed., *Meldungen aus dem Reich, 1938-1945 : die geheimen Lageberichte des Sicherheitsdienstes der SS* (Neuwied: 1984), vol. XII, entry for February 18, 1943, 4828, 4829 and entry for March 11, 1943, 4939.

[98] Allen, *Nazi Seizure of Power*, 301.

[99] Kershaw, "*Hitler Myth*" indicates that the Germans accepted Hitler as their great leader without necessarily internalizing the Nazi ideology.

[100] Goebbels, *Berliner Börsener*, April 26, 1940. Goebbels published this statement in response to criticism from a Swiss newspaper of April 1940. For Goebbels it was the press that would "bind the people and hold them in the right attitude."

[101] "In an hour when a national body is visibly collapsing and to all appearances is abandoned to the most serious oppression-- thanks to the activity of a few scoundrels--obedience and fulfillment of duty towards these people mean . . . pure lunacy, whereas by refusal of obedience and of 'fulfillment of duty' it would be made possible to save a people from its doom." Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 780, 781. The Nazis threw their support behind the German noncooperation with the French occupation of the Ruhr in 1923, and given the French failure, their popular emphasis in theater and elsewhere on Albert Schlageter, a victim of the French occupation, was not just the glorification of a martyr, but a celebration of actual power. See for example, BDC, file of Leopold Gutterer. Gutterer listed his activities on behalf of the "passive resistance" as part of his Nazi credentials. For more on Schlageter, see Jay W. Baird, *To Die for Germany: Heroes in the Nazi Pantheon* (Bloomington, Ind.: 1990), 13ff.

[102] Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 465.

[103] Hitler did not blame the working masses for their crippling lack of support so much as Marxism's heresies. Marxism taught internationalism and class unity, where it should have taught classless national unity. The Nazi ideology of national unity and national defense could have forced victory to Germany's side, Hitler brooded. "If, as regards matters of consideration of matters of self-defense, they [German Trade Unions] had acknowledged their German nationality just as fanatically [as the fanaticism with which they declared the international workers' interests] and with the same ruthlessness . . . then the war would not have been lost." Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 466.

[104] Mason has contended that Hitler was not always a strong dictator, and that a key determinant of the dictator's thought and actions was the lesson he took from the revolution of 1918 about the dangers of working class unrest. Timothy Mason, "Intention and Explanation: A Current Controversy about the Interpretation of National Socialism," in *The 'Führer State': Myth and Reality: Studies on the Structure and Politics of the Third Reich*, ed. Gerhard Hirschfeld and Lothar Kettenacker (Stuttgart: 1981), 35. For an analysis of Hitler's fearful interpretation of 1918 see Timothy Mason, "The Legacy of 1918 for National Socialism" in Anthony Nicholls and Erich Matthias, ed., *German Democracy and the Triumph of Hitler* (London: 1971), 215ff., and also *Sozialpolitik im Dritten Reich* (Opladen: 1978), 15ff. Walter Langer's wartime diplomatic report portrayed Hitler and the National Socialists as overwhelmingly concerned both with winning the confidence of a wide cross section of the people, and with identifying with the quotidian aspects of the everyday life ordinary people experienced. Every effort was made to present Hitler as "extremely human, with a deep feeling for the problems of ordinary people." Walter Langer, *The Mind of Adolph Hitler* (New York: 1973), 74, 58.

[105] "In the long run, government systems are not held together by the pressure of force, but rather by the belief in the quality and the truthfulness with which they represent and promote the interests of a people." Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 388.

[106] R. A. C. Parker, *Struggle for Survival: The History of the Second World War* (Oxford and New York: 1990), 108.

[107] Goebbels said that "in 1914 we had been mobilized in material terms as no other nation had--what we lacked was the mobilization of the mind within the country." Quoted in Noakes and Pridham, *Nazism*, 383.

[108] Records of Goebbels daily meetings with his deputies, where he met to form strategies for controlling the press and public opinion. BA Potsdam, 50.01 (Pro Mi), passim.

[109] Henry Picker, *Hitler's Tischgespräche im Führerhauptquartier* (Stuttgart: 1963 and 1976), entry for May 21, 1942, 325.

[110] Steinert, *Hitler's War and the Germans*, 342.



[111] Blau, "Mischehe im Nazi Reich," 47, 48.

[112] Wolfgang Benz, *Die Juden in Deutschland, 1933-1945: Leben unter nationalsozialistischer Herrschaft* (Munich: 1989), 751.

[113] Siegbert Kleemann, former Personnel Director for the Berlin Jewish Community, states in a report titled "Jüdische Organisationen in Berlin 1939- 1945," of June 2, 1957, that in Berlin German women married to Jews were forced into this *Mischehe Aktion* labor before men. Bovensiepen Trial, Supporting Document 30 (Dr. Wolfgang Scheffler Collection).

[114] Interview with Günter Grodka, August 25, 1985.

[115] Bukofzer, *Laws for Jews*, 8.

[116] Lotte Paepcke, *Ich Wurde Vergessen: Bericht einer Jüdin die das dritte Reich überlebte* (Freiburg im Breisgau: 1979), 24.

[117] Allen, *The Nazi Seizure of Power*, 16. Allen reported that Norheim had one club per every 60 residents, in light of the proverb, "Two Germans, a discussion; three Germans, a club."

[118] In 1938, for example, a newspaper in Danziger gave laudatory coverage to a congregation of Mennonites which collectively had done the ancestry research entitling each member to the Aryan ID. *Danziger Vorposten*, No. 134, June 11, 1938, in BA Potsdam, 62 DAF 3, 17372, 113.

[119] Benz, *Die Juden in Deutschland*, 739-741. On April 22, 1933 both the Teachers' Association and the German Association of Pharmacists adopted the Aryan Clause, and three days later so did the German Sports and Gymnastics Union. Other important associations like those of the medical and legal professions, as well as major employers like the German Railroad soon complied.

[120] Kurt Pätzold, *Verfolgung, Vertreibung, Vernichtung: Dokumente des faschistischen Antisemitismus 1933 bis 1942* (Leipzig: 1983), 72.

[121] Fritz Stern has pointed out that a range of motivations, and not just opportunism, was behind the German social support for Nazism. Fritz Stern, *Dreams and Delusions: The Drama of German History* (New York, 1987), 147ff.

[122] In Germany the primitive sociopsychic mechanism of playing favorites against an outsider had conditioned persons to accept the idea that some of their neighbors were second-class citizens, according to the eminent historian Hans-Ulrich Wehler. Bismarck's use of the "enemy of the state" category helped prepare the Germans psychologically for the physical destruction of the Jews: "Once Bismarck had established the technique of 'negative integration' in party politics, his successors continued to make use of the strategy." Wehler, *The German Empire*, 91, 93. Two generations before Hitler became Führer, Bismarck had attempted to strengthen his own domestic support as chancellor in the Second Reich by a vicious, mendacious campaign against Germany's small, newly formed Social Democratic Party. By inflaming the differences between those allegedly loyal to the Reich and those who opposed it Bismarck managed to maintain a majority while his base of support kept shifting in time to the changing coalitions thrust together to sustain him.

[123] Noakes and Pridham, *Nazism*, 547.

[124] Pätzold, *Verfolgung, Vertreibung, Vernichtung*, 57, 58, 72. This official boycott day was not popular among Germans in general.

[125] Gellately, *Gestapo and German Society*, 158.

[126] Hessisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Wiesbaden, Judgement against Georg Albert Dengler (2a Ks 1/49), 26. The judgement in a separate trial was that "in view of what we know today and the current sources of information, there is no doubt that these actions of early 1943 [against the Jews in intermarriages], though disguised as cases of criminal activity, were aimed against the remaining Jews in Germany." Only one of the twelve intermarried Jews taken into protective custody survived. Of the nineteen intermarried Jews from Offenbach arrested and sent to the labor camps, only four survived the war. Hessisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, sentence of Joseph Hedderich and Joushua Schmitz, 2, 29.

[127] Hessisches Hauptstaatsarchiv, Judgement against Heinrich Baab (51 Ks 1/50).

[128] Peter Hayes, "Profits and Persecution: Corporate Involvement in the Holocaust," James S. Pacy and Alan P. Wertheimer, *Perspectives on the Holocaust* (Boulder: 1995), 54. According to Hayes many such denunciations from 1933-1935 are to be found in Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv, Potsdam, Pr.Br.Rep. 60: Staatskommissar/ Staatspräsident Berlin, Akten 505-09.

[129] Büttner, *Not der Juden teilen*, 20. In a seventy-page introduction to a book about the writer Robert Brendel, Büttner has written on the Nazi persecution of intermarried couples. With his characteristic lucidity Raul Hilberg has also written a chapter on the special anxieties and vulnerabilities of intermarried couples, taking into account official policies toward them. Raul Hilberg, *Perpetrators, Victims, Bystanders*. This book, *Resistance of the Heart*, is concerned primarily with the political impact of intermarriages, and less so with questions about family bonds, assimilation, class, and religious identities and gender relations, which others have addressed. See Marion Kaplan, ed., *The Marriage Bargain: Women and Dowries in European History* (New York: 1985), and Monika Richarz, ed., *Bürger auf Widerruf: Lebenszeugnisse deutscher Juden, 1780--1945* (Munich: 1989).

[130] Lothar Gall, et. al., *Die Deutsche Bank, 1870-1995* (Munich: 1995), ch 1. Not only Germans are inculpated. The writer Dr. Claude Levy estimated that about one-half of those in Vichy France who denounced their Jewish fellow-citizens to the Germans, did so for career reasons. They were doctors or other professionals, he said, who did not like the professional competition of their neighbor Jews. Documentary film *The Sorrow and the Pity*, Part II.

[131] Büttner, *Not der Juden teilen*, 31.

[132] Koonz, *Mothers in the Fatherland* (New York: 1987), 240.

[133] Ursula Büttner makes an estimation of the number of divorces throughout Germany based on statistics from Hamburg and Baden-Württemberg. Ursula Büttner, *Not der Juden teilen*, 57.

[134] The merits for and problems of using the term 'popular opinion' in the context of the Third Reich, and the sources for judging it, were presented in 1970 (trans. 1977) by Marlis Steinert, *Hitler's War and the Germans*, 2-18. See also Ian Kershaw, *Popular Opinion and Political Dissent in the Third Reich: Bavaria 1933-1945* (Oxford and New York: 1983), 4, 5.

[135] Hans Bernd Gisevius, *Zum bitteren Ende*, vol. 1: *Vom Reichstagbrand zur Fritsch-Krise* (Zürich: 1946), 143. "mit rauhem Nachdruck, aber irgendwie doch freiwillig und spontan." (with raw pressure, but somehow indeed voluntary and spontaneous).

[136] *Ibid.*, 140, 147. "Gewiss, es wird viel erobert, aber mehr noch wird preisgegeben." (Certainly there was much conquest, but even more was simply surrendered.)

[137] *Ibid.*, 141. "Erst dieser plötzliche, dunkle Drang, der die siegreiche Bewegung binnen Tagen und Wochen unübersehbar anschwellen lässt, ist es, der den neuen Gewalthabern frische Impulse verleiht, ihre Kräfte verstärkt und ihnen jenen letzten verwegenen Wagemut einflößt, kurzentschlossen aufs Ganze zu gehen." (Primarily it was this sudden dark pressure, which within days and weeks undergirded the victorious movement in an incalculable wave, that gave those in power the impulse to strengthen their power and inspired them to dare quickly to ask for everything.)

[138] Allen, *The Nazi Seizure of Power*, 300. This refusal does represent a compromise, since the Nazi leadership did eventually abolish all church schools in Northeim.

[139] *Ibid.*, 290.

[140] Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 465.

[141] Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston, New York: 1971, 1st ed., 1970), 287. To maintain support and avoid social unrest, the Nazi Dictatorship made numerous concessions, Ian Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives of Interpretation*. London: 1985, rev. 1993), 76, 77. See also Ian Kershaw, "Social Unrest and the Response of the Nazi Regime, 1934-1936," in *Germans Against Nazism: Nonconformity, Opposition and Resistance in the Third Reich*, ed. Francis R. Nicosia and Lawrence D. Stokes (New York and Oxford: 1990), where Kershaw discusses at length the implications of the 'Provisions Crisis' and the priority Hitler gave food provisions over armaments, in 1935-36.



[142] Pr. GSta., Rep. 90 P, 16.

[143] Steinert attributed lack of protests to "blind trust in Hitler, lack of imagination, indifference and ignorance of the most elementary rules of politics [including ignorance of the potential of popular protest]," Steinert, *Hitler's War and the Germans*, 342.

[144] Guenter Lewy, *The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany* (New York and Toronto: 1964); John S. Conway, *The Nazi Persecution of the Churches* (New York: 1968), Ian Kershaw, *Popular Opinion and Political Dissent in the Third Reich*.

[145] Timothy Mason, *Arbeiterklasse und Volksgemeinschaft: Dokumente und Materialien zur deutschen Arbeiterpolitik* (Opladen: 1975).

[146] Martin Broszat, "A Social and Historical Typology of the German Opposition to Hitler," in David Clay Large, ed., *Contending With Hitler: Varieties of German Resistance in the Third Reich* (Cambridge, England: 1992), 26. Broszat classified the German resistance in three stages to support a claim that "acts and attitudes of opposition . . . were often dependent upon the rule played by the Nazi authorities at a particular time," and that "significant and fundamental resistance arose only in the initial and final phases of Nazi rule." The regime's response to the Euthanasia protests supports Broszat's conclusion that the regime while popular and winning could be generous, but the Rosenstrasse Protest does not.

[147] Hans Mommsen, *From Weimar to Auschwitz: Essays in German History*, trans. Philip O'Connor (Cambridge: 1991), 158.

[148] The Nazi Party district leader of Augsburg-Land suggested that the politics of mass support was distinctive of the Nazi movement when he accused the Catholic Church of going on the offensive against the Nazi removal of crucifixes from schools in Bavaria in 1941 by mobilizing public opinion and expressing it in demonstrations. He compared the mobilization of opinion and public assemblies which the church used to defeat the Nazi German state's 'crucifix decree' with the methods employed by the Nazi Party to extend its support. Kershaw, *Popular Opinion and Political Dissent in the Third Reich*, 354.

[149] Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 787.

[150] Franz Neumann, *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism*. (New York, 1963), 98.

[151] Ian Kershaw, "'Widerstand ohne Volk:' Dissens und Widerstand im Dritten Reich," in *Der Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Jürgen Schmäddeke und Peter Steinbach (Munich: 1985), 779-798. Kershaw prefers the word "dissent" to describe the whole spectrum of popular pressures on the regime.

[152] See for example Claudia Koonz, "Choice and Courage," in *Contending with Hitler*, loc. cit., 50.

[153] On August 13, 1941, in a final meeting before the beginning of the genocide of German Jews, officials--from the Party Chancellery, the SD in the Reichsicherheitshauptamt (RSHA), and the Office of Racial Politics agreed to expand the definition of Jews in occupied territories to include *Mischlinge*. Lösener, "Als Rassereferent," 297. See also Peter Longerich, *Hitlers Stellvertreter: Führung der Partei und Kontrolle des Staatsapparates durch den Stab Hess und die Partei-Kanzlei Bormann* (Munich: 1992), 220, 221. But immediately thereafter, at the time he was meeting with Goebbels, Hitler rejected the party chancellery's plan to count *Mischlinge* as Jews. Lösener heard of Hitler's decision on August 16. Lösener, "Als Rassereferent," 304. The Gestapo then received instructions to "temporarily defer" all German *Mischlinge* and all intermarried Jews from the Final Solution deportations, which began in mid-October, 1941

[154] Some historians have suggested that Hitler had decided already by 1942 to defer the deportation of intermarried Jews until after the war. They base this on a file of fragments from the Justice Ministry known as the Schlegelberger Minute (which is discussed further below). In part, this minute states that "Reichminister Lammers reported that the Führer had repeatedly told him he "wished to have the Solution of the Jewish question deferred until after the war." Thus the contention that Hitler had at this point already decided to defer deporting intermarried Jews until after the war rests on interpreting the phrase "Jewish question" in this case to mean only "intermarried-Jewish question." BA, "Behandlung der Juden," R 22/52. If the Schlegelberger Minute does refer only to intermarried Jews, it indicates how painstaking research on the matter is, given the subtle use of language. The term "Jews" here is interpreted mean only the "intermarried Jews," and elsewhere in Nazi documents intermarried Jews are classified under the category of *Mischlinge*, or, alternately, all intermarried Jews are referred to as "privileged," when formally only a part of them had this designation.

[155] Regarding intermarried Jews, Hitler was following his habit of waiting for his intuition to inform him of the opportune moment

for taking action: "You must understand that I always go as far as I dare and never further," he said. "It is vital to have a sixth sense which tells you broadly what you can and cannot do." Noakes and Pridham, *Nazism*, 550.

[156] Goebbels, *Goebbels Diaries*, ed. Lochner, entry for March 9, 1943, 288ff., and interview with Gutterer, August 17, 1986; December 10, 1989.

[157] NA, T-175/R 94/2615097. In Himmler's words, Hitler said that "the evacuation of Jews was to be radically carried out in the next three to four months, despite the still developing unrest." This is a small part of a larger memorandum, much of which concerns the East. Hitler's statement, however, should be interpreted as a general policy for Europe.