

The Conundrum of Complicity
German Professionals and the Final Solution

Konrad H. Jarausch

JOSEPH AND REBECCA MEYERHOFF ANNUAL LECTURE
11 JUNE 2001

The assertions, opinions, and conclusions in this occasional paper are those of the author. They do not necessarily reflect those of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council or of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

First printing, January 2002

Copyright © 2001 by Konrad H. Jarausch,
assigned to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

THE JOSEPH AND REBECCA MEYERHOFF ANNUAL LECTURE on the Holocaust has been endowed by a 1994 grant from the Meyerhoff family to promote excellence in and to disseminate Holocaust research. Lifelong residents of Baltimore, Joseph and Rebecca Meyerhoff were involved in philanthropic activities in the United States and overseas in music and the arts, Jewish learning and scholarship, and human services, among other concerns. Jewish history and education were a primary focus in their philanthropic efforts. This tradition has been upheld and enhanced by their children and their children's children. Their son, Harvey M. Meyerhoff, is Chairman Emeritus of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council. The annual lecture is held in the Joseph and Rebecca Meyerhoff Theater of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Educated Germans' appalling complicity with National Socialism has been both a personal and a professional problem for me. In order to escape the partial admissions and the evasions of my parents' generation I came to the United States as an eighteen-year-old exchange student. In Laramie I ended up working for a German emigrant, in charge of campus gardens. Still fondly remembered in Wyoming today, Herr Otto Dahl was a pleasant but meticulous man who managed to make the university grounds bloom in spite of an arid climate, high altitude, and short growing season. The puzzle of why an experienced professional would be doing a comparatively menial job was resolved when I heard that he had been trained as a landscape architect and once been in charge of all of Hamburg's parks, but allegedly was forced to leave his home because he had been too deeply involved with the Nazis. This surprising encounter raised a question that would inform my scholarly efforts for several decades: how could apparently decent, competent people such as he become Hitler's accomplices?

From the Nuremberg trials through individual scandals to recent research, evidence has steadily accumulated on a shocking contradiction between competence and cruelty among German professionals. While the brutality of lower-class concentration camp guards may not be surprising, it is the betrayal of the Hippocratic oath by murderous doctors such as Josef Mengele, that affronts moral sensibilities.¹ Perhaps this outrage is a result of disappointed expectations, based on the implicit

assumption that trained academics ought to be held to a higher ethical standard: they should not just possess greater competence, but behave in a more humane manner.² The emergence of the Holocaust perspective in the past two decades has cast the stories of educated involvement in the Third Reich into a cautionary tale, prompting much media moralizing that suspects virtually all professionals active in the Third Reich of being guilty until proven innocent. In a remarkable reversal of opinions, a younger generation of German intellectuals is no longer content to treat their predecessors as occasional accomplices but accuses them of being the actual “masterminds of mass destruction.”³

Though appealing, such a blanket condemnation does not quite square with the available documentary record. Interestingly, most survivors’ accounts rarely mention professionals, only sometimes referring to prison doctors, but hardly addressing the engineers who designed the camps or the lawyers who organized the genocide.⁴ For all his “shame over Germany” because it was suddenly turning back into a violent fourteenth-century Romania, Victor Klemperer noted among his colleagues a whole range of behaviors, extending from base opportunism to courageous resistance.⁵ Though remembrances of bystanders tend to focus more on their own suffering as a consequence of bombing, expulsion, or captivity than on the pain inflicted upon victims of the Nazis, literary reconstructions such as Christa Wolf’s *Kindheitsmuster* also portray a variety of relations to the NS regime.⁶ Similarly, the oral stories and written records of the Protestant professionals in my own family reveal not only a shocking amount of nationalist collusion, but also occasional opposition to war and repression.

Recent research on the relationship between the majority of the population and the Hitler regime has therefore sought to differentiate the monolithic picture of the “consensus dictatorship.” In contrast to the neo-totalitarian emphasis on the uniformity of state and party terror from above, social and cultural historians have started to examine the changing pattern of voluntary cooperation from below.⁷ Transcending the black and white categories of denazification, studies of everyday interactions between regime and population stress the ambiguity of individual roles that suggests a complex mixture of complicity and reluctance. Concurrent research on resistance is also pointing out the continuation of some Catholic or Socialist reservations against the regime, indicating shifts in timing and amount of popular support.⁸ Though new research reveals a stronger involvement of academics in Nazi crimes than had previously been realized, it leaves the exact role of the professions somewhat in doubt since, by

focusing on the perpetrators, it fails to establish the degree to which its conclusions apply to the group as a whole.⁹

For this reason the interpretative challenge consists of developing a differentiated understanding that more explicitly addresses the conundrum of professional complicity in the Holocaust. Perhaps the perspective of “critical historicization,” a viewpoint I have developed to resolve the contradiction between SED terror and everyday East German lives in the second German dictatorship, may help suggest a general direction.¹⁰ In order to assess the precise extent to which individual academics or the professions as a whole were involved in genocide, it is necessary to look both at perpetrators and bystanders as well as at opponents so as to capture their motivation and interaction. The following reflections will extend the time frame from the late Weimar Republic well into the post-war era, contrast prominent individual cases with broader group patterns, view the professions from the Nazi party and vice versa, and compare the Third Reich situation with that in other dictatorships. In short, this overview will address a series of specific issues such as the appeal of Nazism, support for Jewish exclusion, involvement in genocide, and the quality of post-war memory in order to determine how alike or different were professionals from ordinary Germans.¹¹

The Attraction of National Socialism

Due to the social distance between the cultivated *Bürger* and lower class rowdies, most members of the professions initially looked askance at the “crude anti-intellectualism” of the Nazi movement. In Weimar Germany the *akademische Berufe* consisted of largely male university or technical school graduates who were steeped in a neo-humanist tradition of the classics, oriented towards scholarly research, and initiated into the practical requirements of their later pursuits. Though they had much freedom to study, they were generally subjected to a rigorous set of state examinations that tested their theoretical knowledge as well as their practical competence. While many chose the independence of the *freie Berufe* such as law or medicine, even more gravitated towards state employment in the legally-oriented bureaucracy, neo-humanist Gymnasias, or proliferating research institutes. Graduates of the natural sciences, technical subjects, or commercial fields also flocked into the laboratories and board-rooms of the knowledge-based industries. Though only rarely wealthy, the some 350,000 German

Akademiker were well respected for their competence and often envied for their security.¹²

By exposing the shallowness of the post-war recovery, the Great Depression plunged these confident professionals into a material crisis that in many cases threatened their very survival. As a result of shrinking work opportunities, the number of students soared, overcrowding the universities and eventually also causing an oversupply of graduates desperately looking for jobs. Since the government had little revenue left to hire, most law probationers had no choice but to swell the number of attorneys, while several thousand teacher trainees such as my parents had to wait for up to a decade before they could find a position. Massive lay-offs in industry created an annually doubling pool of tens of thousands of unemployed engineers who had to get by on their shrinking savings, and who lost much of their self-respect. Even the more secure government bureaucrats were hard hit, since successive pay cuts, imposed by the Brüning government, reduced their previous income by about one-third. Though most established professionals also resented their longer work hours, shrinking remuneration, and declining social status, the Depression hit the younger generation especially hard, since it denied them entry into their chosen field.

No wonder that the result of such dislocation was a widespread “crisis of professional consciousness.” Overcrowding, unemployment, and impoverishment seemed to harried practitioners a betrayal of expectations and values for which not their individual mistakes but the failure of the system, i.e., the Weimar Republic, must be responsible. It hardly helped that the democratic parties were unable to offer any workable remedies, since the Social Democrats suggested spreading the pain among all affected by sharing poverty while the bourgeois Liberals counseled a redoubling of personal efforts to win the sharper competition for the few remaining positions. In this mental confusion over appropriate responses, the previously dismissed radical suggestions of various brands of volkish nationalists gradually began to seem more credible: Could the acute crisis not be overcome by eliminating unwanted competitors such as the newly admitted women, the all too studious Jews, or the often subversive foreigners?¹³ In effect, the suffering of the Depression discredited liberal conceptions of professionalism and made harried academics search for more drastic alternatives.

The chief beneficiaries of the inability of the professional leaders to resolve the crisis were zealous Nazi practitioners who founded competing associations. Fed up with the irrelevant customs of traditional corporations, volkish students established an

NS German Student League to promote an aggressively anti-Semitic platform. With campaigns against Leftist professors, brawls against their competitors, and alliances with other nationalists, the NSDStB managed to win enough campus elections so that it could take over the German student association in the summer of 1931!¹⁴ In order to provide legal defense for their embattled movement, Nazi lawyers founded a League of NS German Jurists, a vocal pressure group that had attracted about 1,500 members by early 1933. Similarly radical pedagogues created a Nazi Teachers League that preached the Nazification of education and mushroomed to about 11,000 adherents by the time of Hitler's seizure of power. More complicated was the establishment of an engineering organization, but eventually a "Fighting League for German Architects and Engineers" (later called NSBDT) coalesced, drawing several thousand technicians.¹⁵ By publishing their own journals, holding congresses, and spreading racism, these NS affiliates proselytized their professional colleagues for the Nazi cause.

Initially reluctant, professionals began to respond to NS appeals due to the electoral break-through of 1930, and to flock in increasing numbers into the party after the seizure of power, when thousands of opportunists joined. Among the various age groups, it was especially the cohort of pre-World War One children, born roughly between 1898 and 1912, who followed Hitler's message, since for them the material crisis was most acute. Protestants were over-represented, Catholics generally proved less willing, and Jews were excluded. Before 1933, interestingly, veterinarians, foresters, and technicians were more likely to enter the party than were the members of the more established professions, perhaps also due to legal prohibitions. Among the jurists, many modestly successful practitioners, many of them with a doctorate, joined the League; among teachers, primary pedagogues and trainees were the most likely Nazis. In spite of the prevalence of nationalist resentment, only a small but growing minority of German professionals, such as my aunt's brother Hermann Kauba, responded to Hitler before 1933, prompted by the rhetoric of volkish nationalism and the fear of becoming an "academic proletarian."¹⁶

The Expulsion of Jewish Professionals

The chief reason for the cooperation of professionals in the exclusion of their Jewish colleagues was the spread of a relatively new kind of anti-Semitism that had begun to infect the German universities in the late 1870s. Though Heinrich von Treitschke's declaration "the Jews are our misfortune" was rejected by Theodor Mommsen and

other liberal defenders of tolerance, the rantings of volkish outsiders such as Julius Langbehn and Paul de Largarde transformed older religious resentment into a quasi-scientific racial prejudice, acceptable to many of the educated. In this process, nationalist students played an important role as multipliers by founding the Vereine Deutscher Studenten in order to propagate Christian, patriotic, and imperialist ideas. Due to the patronage of the aged founder of the Second Reich, Prince Otto von Bismarck, as well as its ingenious agitation tactics, the VDSSt managed to compel prestigious corporations such as the Burschenschaft to accept anti-Semitism into their programs, forcing Jewish students to create their own associations in defense. After the First World War, anti-Semitic sentiment became part of the nationalist resentment against Versailles, dominating campus atmosphere and student self-government.¹⁷

The ostensible cause for the spread of anti-Semitism throughout the academic milieu was the charge of Jewish overrepresentation in German intellectual life. Racist propaganda fastened upon the discrepancy between the Jewish share of less than 1% in the population and the 9.4% proportion in the Prussian student body in 1894/5, ignoring its subsequent decline to 4.7% in 1931/2. Critics liked to point out that Jewish students concentrated in urban institutions such as those of Berlin (11.5% in 1926), Frankfurt or Breslau, that they preferred some disciplines like medicine (22.2% in 1911/2) or law (11.1%) over others and that in some institutions, such as those of Berlin, departments like medicine (37% in 1911/2) or law (20.2%) were heavily Jewish. Ironically, this uneven distribution was itself a product of the interaction between legal emancipation and social prejudice; these opened the free professions to Jewish practitioners, but restricted government careers in the military, the diplomatic service, and the bureaucracy, among other fields. As a result, about one-third of German doctors and lawyers came from Jewish backgrounds, though Jews continued to find it quite difficult to become professors.¹⁸

In the crisis atmosphere of the Great Depression, radical nationalists turned their social and cultural prejudices into a demand for legal exclusion of Jewish students, professors, and professionals. The difference in social habits between newly emancipated Jewish youths, eager to learn in order to advance, and Christian students, intent on enjoying student life, tended to create tension. The cultural resentments of guardians of traditional *Bildung* against modernist experiments and the advancement of mass entertainment, often associated with Jews, produced pessimistic warnings against decadence and decline. But it took the multiple threats of the World Economic Crisis to

turn these fears into demands for actual de-assimilation, barring the further entry of Jewish trainees or altogether excluding already established practitioners. In Berlin Nazi students loudly promoted a purge: “We demand the selection of students and professors on the basis of proof that they think in a German spirit.” At the same time NS professional associations called for the expulsion of experienced Jewish colleagues in order to make room for new Christian graduates.¹⁹

Though still fearful of foreign opinion, the new Nazi government was happy to oblige with an escalating series of legal discriminations that can be summarized only briefly. The first blow was a law “against the overcrowding of German universities”; it restricted Jewish matriculations to 1.5% over all and the Jewish share to 5% at any given institution, forcing the dismissal of hundreds of students.²⁰ The second strike was another law, euphemistically for “the restoration of professional civil service”; it purged political enemies on the Left and excluded non-Aryans from the bureaucracy as well as from the professions, doing so via a dubious legal construction that designated such positions as public office. The initial exceptions that covered those appointed before 1914 or who had served at the front in World War One were rescinded at the promulgation of the Nuremberg racial laws in 1935, while a myriad of petty edicts sought to squeeze Jews out of the universities through administrative practice.²¹ The final assault came with the disbarment of the remaining Jewish professionals in 1938, leaving only a few legal consultants and doctors to practice in the Jewish community alone.²² In the brief span of five years Nazi activists had legally reversed over a century of civic emancipation, ending Jewish contributions to German intellectual life, and precipitating their former professional colleagues into untold personal tragedies.²³

The ease with which racist zealots succeeded in overturning humanist traditions continues to puzzle. While a few courageous scholars such as physicist Max Planck protested against the illegality and stupidity of the exclusions, the majority reacted with deafening silence to the dismissals, making Victor Klemperer suddenly feel very alone: “An animal is not more outlawed or hunted down.”²⁴ Perhaps the noisy agitation of radical students kept some timid academics from speaking out; perhaps the illusion of national rebirth misled Eduard Spranger and some other respected figures to pardon Nazi measures as youthful excesses; perhaps some desperate practitioners saw the exclusion of competitors as the only way out of their personal crisis. But the lack of protest also points to the force of prior prejudice in the social isolation of the victims and the cultural stigmatizing of their difference. Moreover, even baser motives often

prevailed: frustrated Aryan rivals' envy of Jewish success, greed that sought to profit from taking over an abandoned practice, or cunning that hoped to open career chances by creating vacancies. These and similar motivations were rarely put down on paper, but were nonetheless quite real.²⁵ Even if some single academics such as my father sought to protect their Jewish pupils, the complicity of the majority could not but corrupt the ethical fiber of German professionals.²⁶

Professional Involvement in the “Final Solution”

To establish the precise manner and extent of professional collaboration in genocide, it is necessary to differentiate the general support for the Third Reich from its more specific anti-Jewish policies. The Nazi purge shifted even further to the Right the truncated political spectrum of the universities, a spectrum that during the Weimar Republic, after all, included only a minority of democrats as well as a few socialists. In the professional organizations, an obsequious self-coordination eliminated the pro-Republican leadership and silenced the voices of Leftist critics who might oppose Hitler's dictatorship. The remaining shades of nationalists agreed with the Nazi leadership on the need for domestic economic recovery and international resurgence through repudiating the restrictions of the Treaty of Versailles.²⁷ Conservative historians had no qualms about polemicizing against the “war guilt lie” or in buttressing calls for frontier revision, so as to return the lost provinces to the fatherland.²⁸ Carl Schmitt, among other legal theorists, began to elaborate justifications of German hegemony, while pastors among the Deutsche Christen preached a renewed volkish version of a national mission.²⁹ In short, most professionals were part of the radical nationalist consensus on national rebirth.

In contrast, the participation of professionals in the escalating series of anti-Semitic measures had a narrower base, since Nazi leaders themselves commented on the reluctance of many otherwise nationalist academics to proceed from discrimination to actual annihilation. Not surprisingly the most emphatic advocacy of anti-Jewish policies came from the fanatics of the NS professional auxiliaries such as the younger members of the NS-Dozentenbund or the leadership of the various leagues.³⁰ Nazi planners also used the funding of the German Research Council (DFG) to initiate research in racial science, ethnography, arms technology, and other ideological priorities.³¹ In the social sciences, archivist Albert Brackmann and other Nazified academics created a whole series of new working groups, such as the networks in *Ost-*

und Westforschung in which radical nationalists could join with outright Nazis in waging ethnic warfare and preparing schemes for racial cleansing or resettlement.³² The core of “Jewish research,” which sought to generate statistical information as well as propaganda support for the “Final Solution,” nonetheless, remained outside academe, but in new party institutes that were staffed by previously marginal academics.³³

It took therefore the unleashing of the Second World War and the attack on the Soviet Union to turn collaborators in anti-Semitic discrimination into accomplices in genocide. The outbreak of the fighting and the surprising extent of the initial victories transformed a noxious but limited nationalist revisionism into a much wider project of an ethnic reordering of Europe, creating a volkish *Grossraumordnung*. Moreover, the occupation of an increasing number of countries demanded area specialists to help in setting up a German administration, whether run by the military, civilian governors, or actual Nazi plenipotentiaries. The growing extent of German power allowed previously fantastic plans of a reconsolidation of ethnic *Volksdeutsche* into areas contiguous to the Reich to become a reality, an effort that was organized by specialists within the upper echelons of the SS. At the same time, the bloodshed and confusion of mechanized warfare provided the opportunity for creating an extralegal realm that permitted the infamous *Einsatzgruppen* to begin the process of killing of Polish elites and Jews, only thinly camouflaged as anti-partisan retaliation.³⁴ The support of the majority of professionals for the national war effort allowed the minority of radical anti-Semitic specialists to move from ethnic cleansing to actual genocide.

In a somewhat stylized typology three different levels of involvement may be distinguished between as well as within professions, clustered around a range of similar responses. Scholars have largely ignored the many *passive facilitators* who competently did their duty or enthusiastically supported the war effort. Into this category fall efficient managers such as the Krefeld industrialist Paul Kleinewefers who did his best to produce rare steel alloys, needed to build weapons.³⁵ Patriotic public officials who kept the state functioning and implemented the myriads of successive Nazi decrees were important also in maintaining a sense of common purpose in the *Volksgemeinschaft*. Similarly teachers who inculcated militaristic values, stressed past German greatness, and propagated racial distinctions helped prepare their youthful charges for service on the battlefield or behind the lines. Finally, Protestant pastors who preached a curious mixture of volkish superiority and Christian tradition also played an important role in promoting nationalist values and maintaining a fighting spirit.³⁶ Even

professionals, such as my father, who refused to join the party, created with their commitment to the war effort the precondition for more radical policies.

More involved but fewer in number were the *active supporters* of German hegemony over Europe, providing intellectual expertise for the projects of ethnic resettlement and racial cleansing. New research has shown an appalling degree of academic justification for Hitler's New Order that built upon older Pan-German dreams to found Aryan domination, beyond traditional annexations, upon a vast scheme of conquering and colonizing *Lebensraum* in the East. Whole new branches of research such as *Volksgeschichte* offered studies of ethnic or cultural patterns, upon which plans of population transfer or border "corrections" could be based. In the interdisciplinary effort of *Ostforschung* geographers, ethnologists, and historians cooperated in order to determine the extent of German influence and to suggest policies of consolidating the *Volk* in the future. Typified by a newly discovered memorandum of historian Theodor Schieder in the fall of 1939, such expertise isolated the Jews as a disintegrative factor who would have to be eliminated in one way or another.³⁷ While scholarly works like my uncle Franz Petri's research on the Franco-German language frontier only rarely influenced Nazi decisions, they created a general climate of opinion in support of *Umvolkung*, especially since they were amplified by ceaseless media propaganda.³⁸

Most heavily implicated were the minority of *killing professionals* who, as academically trained experts, directly participated in the process of annihilationist warfare or genocidal extermination. Recent studies of the *Einsatzgruppen* have revealed the importance of mobile police forces for the initiation of the mass murder, while the revised exhibits of the *Wehrmachtausstellung* have shown the large degree of complicity of the regular armed forces.³⁹ Equally disturbing has been the fresh evidence on the cool planning of genocide by an elite corps of young lawyers in the SS and Gestapo. Under the direction of the talented Werner Best, these dedicated Nazis transformed somewhat haphazard violence into an inescapable process.⁴⁰ Similarly, the admissions of managers such as those of my father-in-law Friedrich Flessa who exploited slave labor in arms production, and new analyses of the business backgrounds of engineers who built the concentration camps show a startling combination of rationality and ideology that served the dual goals of producing weapons and killing those perceived to be racial inferiors.⁴¹ Finally, the revelations on the role-reversal of doctors from healers to killers in preferring the eugenic goal of preserving the health of

the *Volkskörper* through sterilization, euthanasia, selection, and medical experiments document unspeakable crimes.⁴²

These increasing degrees of commitment to the Third Reich functioned as an *interlocking system* in which each level supported the next. Perhaps the image of a pyramid, resting on a broad base of apolitical expertise, but narrowing towards explicit racism at the top can illustrate this fateful interrelationship. Most widespread was the support for the war effort, stabilizing Nazi rule at home and making possible military conquest abroad. Such an outlook at least tolerated anti-Semitic discrimination by failing to protest in public against it. Less prevalent but still quite popular among professionals was a radical nationalist justification for ethnic resettlement and racial cleansing as a biopolitical base for ensuring German hegemony in Europe. This volkish mind-set singled out Jews and Slavs as racial inferiors to be expelled from the professions and displaced from Germany into some undefined Eastern ghettos. Least widespread, but most fatal was the direct participation of accomplished military, legal, technical, and medical professionals in the Final Solution. Whether acting from opportunist motives or ideological conviction, these experts narrowed their ethical outlook to service to their own *Volk*, oblivious or uncaring of the untold human suffering that their actions created in those excluded from its community.⁴³

Though well trained and widely respected, professionals raised few moral objections to their participation in a genocidal regime. Among my own family, only my father was so shocked by the systematic starvation of Russian POWs that he tried to distribute the scarce food more evenly and expressed human solidarity with the regime's victims.⁴⁴ While his brother-in-law Franz Petri clashed with the SS on specific issues such as the treatment of Flemish separatists, as a party member since 1937 and part of the Belgian military government, he failed to oppose the murderous policies of the Third Reich in general.⁴⁵ Similarly my father-in-law Friedrich Flessa may have treated his own slave laborers relatively decently, but he worked hard to keep the production of arms going in spite of increasing damage from Allied bombing.⁴⁶ Tied to service to the national cause rather than to universal principles of human rights, their conception of professionalism as neutral expertise provided no ethical grounds for objecting to participation in systematic killing. Based on lingering Christian precepts, some professionals may have developed private qualms about racist annihilation, but, a few exceptions like Jochen Klepper notwithstanding, these failed to coalesce into public resistance.⁴⁷

Living with Nightmare Memories

Once the killing stopped, the victims, perpetrators, and bystanders developed quite different recollections of what had actually transpired. To cope with their prior suffering, the few surviving Jewish professionals in Germany dedicated themselves to keeping memory alive so as to prevent the recurrence of such atrocities, even joining, like Victor Klemperer, the Communist Party as the most resolute anti-fascist group.⁴⁸ Those fortunate academics who had managed to flee in time and who struggled to continue their calling in a new country were understandably bitter about their expulsion, and demanded some restitution for their many material losses as well as psychological traumata.⁴⁹ In international opinion relief about the victorious end of the war overshadowed the shock over the racist genocide until the U.S. Army's discovery of the horrors of concentration camps such as Buchenwald or Dachau. It took the organization of the Leo Baeck Institute and of like depositories to preserve the scattered records of the persecuted and to overcome the reluctance of many members of the Jewish community to talk about the Holocaust.⁵⁰

In Germany the physical, photographic, and documentary evidence of mass murder forced the defeated population into a reluctant acknowledgement of the existence of such crimes. The trial evidence unearthed by the Nuremberg prosecutors, the gripping testimony of survivors and the vivid accounts of Egon Kogon and of other German anti-fascists made it impossible to deny that some officers, lawyers, doctors, or managers had been involved in terrible atrocities. Since the leaders of the re-emerging democratic parties in the West and of the Communists in the East had themselves been persecuted by Hitler, the successor states adopted competing versions of anti-fascism, with the German Democratic Republic emphasizing the Third Reich's structural roots in the power of the landed and business elites, and the Federal Republic of Germany instead stressing the criminal disposition of the Nazi leadership. Ironically, both interpretations opened the door to exculpation, since the former ignored the question of individual guilt while the latter held only a small minority responsible, thereby absolving the majority of accomplices.⁵¹ As long as professionals publicly conformed with these explanations, they could continue to practice and rewrite their curricula vitae for denazification so as to minimize their personal role.

The amnesia of the 1950s that allowed experts to suppress their own responsibility was largely a result of their indispensability for the occupation authorities

and the successor states. In a thoroughly devastated country the pragmatic needs of survival such as providing power, tending to the sick, restoring public order and so on required the reinstatement of previously dismissed specialists without dwelling too much on their tarnished record.⁵² The bureaucratic nature of the denazification process engendered so much resentment that the vetting boards eventually turned to reducing major crimes into minor misdemeanors, thereby becoming an infamous *Mitläuferfabrik*.⁵³ Caught up in the general plight of being POWs, flight and expulsion from the East, hunger and homelessness in the West, professionals focused on their own post-war suffering, and helped to elaborate a sense of German victimhood that fostered oblivion. While the public insistently debated the general question of responsibility, prominent academics were rarely willing to admit personal guilt, retreating rather behind a discussion of impersonal forces. Finally the ideological polarization of the Cold War spread a mantle of silence over the issue.⁵⁴

All the more surprising was the eventual return of a critical memory that transformed the recollections of the victims into the official public memory of the Federal Republic. Against the resistance of compromised judges, the litigation of anti-fascist critics forced the Federal Republic to create a central judicial clearinghouse in Ludwigsburg, while a series of well publicized court cases such as the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem and the Auschwitz trial in Frankfurt produced damning testimony of wider involvement. The media broadcast of radioplays and television documentaries on the Third Reich and the rewriting of teaching guidelines also improved public awareness of the magnitude of collaboration. Much of the generational conflict in the late 1960s revolved around the suppression of individual guilt in the parent generation, even if the accusation of fascism was used rather indiscriminately.⁵⁵ For the professions, it was crucial that a few committed individuals within their own ranks leveled accusations, created scandals, and mounted exhibitions that tore away the cover of silence. Precipitating a difficult process of soul-searching, such critical interventions broke through the barrier of denial and forced experts to confront their own complicity.⁵⁶

What does this brief sketch suggest about the painful subject of memory? Since Maurice Halbwachs already has pointed out that remembering is a social process, it should not be surprising that the recollections of the same atrocities differed fundamentally between victims and perpetrators.⁵⁷ Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's controversial joining of material restitution to Israel with the reinstatement of all but the most discredited specialists into their former positions illustrates that recollection is a

highly political process with enormous financial implications, not just a value-free scholarly enterprise.⁵⁸ The discrepancy between an officially critical stance towards the Nazi dictatorship and the survival of a private set of more positive recollections among many Germans of the older generation also shows the limits of imposing a minority memory onto an unwilling majority.⁵⁹ Critical remembrance can therefore not be enforced from above or from the outside, but must be the result of honest self-examination from below and within, which reflects on the consequences of complicity. The recent apology of the Max Planck Gesellschaft to the victims of the Auschwitz twin experiments and the invitation of the Humboldt University to its expelled students are small but important symbolic steps towards admitting guilt and reconciling divergent memories.

Explaining the Inexplicable

Analyzing the failure of the professions to live up to their presumed ethical standards is a daunting challenge, because the historian has to deal with highly educated people, finding himself implicated both in scholarly and personal ways. It is not easy to recognize that some of the most respected academic researchers as well as well-trained practitioners became “political soldiers,”⁶⁰ masterminding Hitler’s mass murder, while other competent colleagues actively promoted fantasies of German superiority and the rest at least supported the war effort almost to the bitter end. It is similarly difficult to deal with the various kinds of repulsive involvement of one’s own family members whom one has known as decent human beings. For many younger Germans this situation has produced feelings of intense ambivalence, alternating between shame and sympathy, not knowing how to relate to their own relatives.⁶¹ In wrestling with the dilemmas of her own youth in the Third Reich, the East German writer Christa Wolf has skeptically remarked “we shall not succeed in explaining why it happened thus and not differently.” But she nonetheless concludes correctly: “We ought not to shy away from at least doing preparatory work for future explanations.”⁶²

What then were some of the key reasons for the surprising degree of professional complicity in the Nazi seizure of power, expulsion of Jewish colleagues, and racial genocide? Among the various kinds of interpretations, the powerful pull of social factors can hardly be overstated: For professionals steeped in a culture of “academic illiberalism,” the loss of the First World War and the partly punitive peace of Versailles came as an unexpected shock that severely tested their identity. The

subsequent hyperinflation and the Great Depression created a pervasive professional crisis of overcrowding, pay cuts, and unemployment that threatened their future careers as well as their respected social position. The failure of the liberal leaders to provide adequate solutions to these problems made ordinary practitioners receptive to the more radical proposals of Nazi fanatics who promised a return of stability by purging the professions of undesirables. Neohumanist cultivation provided inadequate reservations against such inhumane policies, since competent practice rather than ethical commitment defined the core of German professionalism.⁶³

The effect of the professional crisis was especially pronounced in the generation who had grown up during the nationalist hysteria of the First World War. With fathers away at the front, they were prey to the chauvinist teaching of the Gymnasia, but unable to act out their aggressive feelings or to become disillusioned, since they were too young to serve at the front. Many entered the volkish Youth Movement, like the partly Jewish historian Hans Rothfels, or joined the post-war Free Corps, as did the writer Ernst Salomon, dedicated to reversing the humiliation of defeat.⁶⁴ Skeptical of the republican government, they engaged in various shades of right-wing politics at the university, united in their xenophobic and anti-Semitic beliefs, and were receptive to the appeals of the Nazi Student League. When many found their entry into their chosen career barred by the Depression, recent graduates were among the loudest to call for the expulsion of Jews, women, and Communists as well as foreigners. More than their skeptical elders, aspiring professionals like Albert Speer enthusiastically engaged in various kinds of volkish projects as well as racist research, linking their own future advancement to the national revival, proclaimed by the NSDAP.

A series of overlapping ideological commitments, narrowing from patriotism to racial fanaticism, also facilitated increasing levels of professional collusion. The majority of practitioners merely did their duty, and supported the war effort without participating in measures against their Jewish neighbors. More problematic were the radical nationalists who worked actively for German hegemony by military rearmament, or scholarly research on ethnic questions and racial propaganda, therefore taking anti-Semitic measures in stride. Their aims were closer to the Nazi project of restoring a national community and returning the country to predominance, although they retained some respect for professional standards and were not willing to resort to the same ruthless means. Most dangerous were those Nazi professionals who completely blended their expertise with racist ideology, growing unquestioningly ready

to kill whenever the Führer demanded it. These fanatical followers unhesitatingly instrumentalized their competence to maintain power and eliminate all presumed enemies. Since potential liberal or Marxist critics were purged from their ranks, hardly any professionals like Sebastian Haffner were left to challenge the “patriots” complicity with the NS regime, and the collaboration of radical nationalists with the fanatical racists who facilitated genocide.⁶⁵

It is also important to recognize that involvement in the Third Reich was an incremental process that deepened over time. In the beginning members of the conservative elite could support the national revival, since Nazi propaganda emphasized “peace and freedom” to a skeptical international community. Even a few eventual victims, like the famous lawyer Max Hachenburg, found some of the initial measures of discrimination not entirely inappropriate, since he himself had warned against a possible backlash, triggered by an excessive “Jewish forwardness.”⁶⁶ With each step the implications of the Nazi project became a little clearer, but Hitler cleverly bided his time, occasionally even reining in local zealots who had precipitated violence, such as in the initial anti-Semitic boycott. Moderates could therefore delude themselves about the final aims and hope that some form of order and legality would be restored.⁶⁷ Only the outbreak of the world war and the brutal partisan warfare in the Balkans and in the East stripped away the last Nazi reservations—but by this time there was no more turning back for accomplices, who had gotten ever more deeply compromised. Instead of viewing the process as being carried by unanimous consent, it might be more realistic to see it as a vortex into which people were drawn step by step.

My father’s war correspondence reveals that recognizing the terrible consequences of complicity was a difficult process that came too late to prevent the atrocities. While he was frustrated with the stupidity of the military routine, initially he embraced, as did many other *Bildungsbürger*, the goal of the war as the conquest of “living-space for future decades.” For this national aim, the plight of refugees, the hanging of partisans, the subordination of the defeated, and the exploitation of Jews seemed regrettable, but necessary. Only when, in the fall of 1941, he was put in charge of feeding a camp with thousands of Soviet POWs did he gradually realize that the systematic starvation of enemy prisoners violated not only the Hague convention but, more important, his own Christian ethics. Moved by their “horrible misery,” he began to meet with educated prisoners, to learn Russian, and to discuss how he might help, writing home: “The stupid dying around us is terrible.” The shock of a plight that he

was unable to reverse finally brought him to “doubt the purpose of the entire” war. “Here true humanity is needed between the peoples and races, if a better world is to arise out of this excess of blood and destruction.” Just when he started to denounce to his wife the futility and criminality of the carnage, he contracted typhoid fever, fell into a coma, and died.⁶⁸ It was tragic that all too few German professionals understood the full consequences of their complicity in time to prevent the untold suffering from the perversion of their ideals.

Notes

¹ Jay Lifton, *The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide* (New York, 1986), 337 ff.

² Konrad H. Jarausch, *The Unfree Professions: German Lawyers, Teachers and Engineers, 1900–1950* (New York, 1990), 226 ff.

³ Götz Aly and Susanne Heim, *Vordenker der Vernichtung: Auschwitz und die deutschen Pläne für eine neue europäische Ordnung* (Hamburg, 1991). See also Rüdiger Hohls and Konrad H. Jarausch, eds., *Versäumte Fragen: Deutsche Historiker im Schatten des Nationalsozialismus* (Stuttgart, 2000).

⁴ Elie Wiesel, *Night, Dawn, Day* (New York, 1986); Tadeusz Borowski, *This Way to the Gas, Ladies and Gentlemen and Other Stories* (New York, 1967); and Primo Levi, *Survival in Auschwitz: The Nazi Assault on Humanity* (New York, 1961).

⁵ Victor Klemperer, *Ich will Zeugnis ablegen bis zum letzten: Tagebücher 1933–1941* (Berlin, 1995), 1: 15 ff.

⁶ Peter Fritzsche, “Populäre Erinnerungen und Deutsche Identität nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg” in Konrad H. Jarausch and Martin Sabrow, eds., *Verletztes Gedächtnis: Erinnerungskultur und Zeitgeschichte im Konflikt* (Frankfurt, 2002).

⁷ Mary Fulbrook, *Anatomy of a Dictatorship: Inside the GDR 1949–1989* (Oxford, 1995), and Thomas Lindenberger, ed., *Herrschaft und Eigen-Sinn in der Diktatur: Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der DDR* (Köln, 1999).

⁸ Robert F. Gellately, *Backing Hitler: Consent and Coercion in Nazi Germany* (New York, 2001); and Eric Johnson, *Nazi Terror: The Gestapo, Jews and Ordinary Germans* (London, 1999).

⁹ Ulrich Herbert, *Best: Biographische Studien über Radikalismus, Weltanschauung und Vernunft, 1903–1989* (Bonn, 1996); Michael T. Allen, *The Business of Genocide: SS*

Business Administration, Slavery and the Concentration Camps (Chapel Hill, 2002); Michael H. Kater, *Doctors Under Hitler* (Chapel Hill, 1989).

¹⁰ Konrad H. Jarausch, Matthias Middell, and Martin Sabrow, “Störfall DDR-Geschichtswissenschaft: Problemfelder einer kritischen Historisierung,” in idem and Georg G. Iggers, eds., *Die DDR-Geschichtswissenschaft als Forschungsproblem*, Beiheft 27 of the *Historische Zeitschrift* (Munich 1998), 1 ff. The SED was the Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands (The Socialist Unity Party of Germany).

¹¹ Christopher R. Browning, *The Path to Genocide: Essays on the Launching of the Final Solution* (Cambridge, 1992), and *Nazi Police, Jewish Workers, German Killers* (Cambridge, 2000).

¹² Charles E. McClelland, *The German Experience of Professionalization: Modern Learned Professions and their Organizations from the Early Nineteenth Century to the Hitler Era* (Cambridge, 1991); Werner Conze and Jürgen Kocka, eds., *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1985); and Geoffrey Cocks and Konrad H. Jarausch, eds., *German Professions, 1800–1950* (New York, 1990).

¹³ Jarausch, *Unfree Professions*, 80 ff. Cf. also idem, “Die Not der geistigen Arbeiter: Akademiker in der Berufskrise, 1918–1933,” in Werner Abelshausen, ed., *Die Weimarer Republik als Wohlfahrtsstaat* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 280 ff.

¹⁴ Michael Kater, *Studentenschaft und Rechtsradikalismus in Deutschland 1918–1933* (Hamburg, 1975); and Anselm Faust, *Der Nationalsozialistische Studentenbund: Studenten und Nationalsozialismus in der Weimarer Republik* (Düsseldorf, 1973), 2 vols.

¹⁵ Literature in Jarausch, *Unfree Professions*, 92 ff. Cf. Stefan König, *Vom Dienst am Recht: Rechtsanwälte als Strafverteidiger im Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin, 1987), Willi Feiten, *Der Nationalsozialistische Lehrerbund: Entwicklung und Organisation* (Frankfurt, 1981), and Karl-Heinz Ludwig, *Technik und Ingenieure im Dritten Reich* (Düsseldorf, 1974).

¹⁶ Michael Kater, *The Nazi Party: A Social Profile of Members and Leaders, 1919–1933* (Cambridge, MA, 1983), 51 ff; and Jarausch, *Unfree Professions*, 100 ff. Hermann Kauba was killed during the last fighting in the Rhineland in the spring of 1945.

¹⁷ Konrad H. Jarausch, *Students, Society and Politics in Imperial Germany: The Rise of Academic Illiberalism* (Princeton, 1983), and Norbert Kampe, *Studenten und 'Judenfrage' im Deutschen Kaiserreich* (Göttingen, 1988).

¹⁸ Konrad H. Jarausch, "The Expulsion of Jewish Professors and Students from the University of Berlin during the Third Reich," in Larry E. Jones, ed., *Crossing Boundaries: The Exclusion and Inclusion of Minorities in Germany and America* (New York, 2001), 9 ff. Cf. also Fritz Ringer, "The German Academic Community, 1864–1938," *Central European History* 25 (1983), 251–80.

¹⁹ Theses against the un-German spirit, first published in Leon Poliakov and Josef Wulf., eds., *Das Dritte Reich und seine Denker* (Berlin, 1959), 117 ff., Geoffrey Giles, *Students and National Socialism in Germany* (Princeton, 1985).

²⁰ Goetz von Olenhusen, "Die 'nichtarischen' Studenten an den deutschen Hochschulen: Zur nationalsozialistischen Rassenpolitik," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 14 (1966), 175–206.

²¹ Andreas Fijal, "Die Rechtsgrundlagen der Entpflichtung jüdischer und politisch mißliebiger Hochschullehrer nach 1933 sowie der Umbau der Universitäten im nationalsozialistischen Sinne," in Wolfram Fischer, et al., eds., *Exodus von Wissenschaften aus Berlin* (Berlin, 1994), 116 ff. Cf. Jane Caplan, *Government without Administration: State and Civil Service in Weimar and Nazi Germany* (Oxford, 1988); and Jarausch, *Unfree Professions*, 130 ff.

²² Jarausch, *Unfree Professions*, 145 ff. and idem "Jewish Lawyers in Germany, 1848–1938: The Disintegration of a Profession," *Leo Baeck Yearbook* 26 (1991), 171–90.

²³ Mark M. Anderson, ed., *Hitler's Exiles: Personal Stories of the Flight from Nazi Germany to America* (New York, 1998); and Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews* (New York, 1997), 1: 41 discusses the churches and the university.

²⁴ Klemperer, *Ich will Zeugnis ablegen*, 1: 19 ff. Cf. Jarausch, "The Expulsion," 16.

²⁵ Günter Grau and Peter Schneck, eds., *Akademische Karrieren im "Dritten Reich": Beiträge zur Personal- und Berufungspolitik der medizinischen Fakultäten* (Berlin, 1993). Cf. Jarausch, *Unfree Professions*, 156 ff.

²⁶ Unsolicited testimony of one of his former students, 2000.

²⁷ Michael Grüttner, "Die 'Machtergreifung' als Generationskonflikt: Zur Lage der deutschen Hochschulen 1933–1936" (MS, Berkeley, 2001). Cf. also Peter Chroust, *Gießener Universität und Faschismus. Studenten und Hochschullehrer 1918–1945* (Münster, 1994), 2 vols.

²⁸ Ulrich Heinemann, *Die verdrängte Niederlage: Politische Öffentlichkeit und Kriegsschuldfrage in der Weimarer Republik* (Göttingen, 1983); and Wolfgang Jäger, *Historische Forschung und politische Kultur in Deutschland: Die Debatte 1914–1980 über den Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkrieges* (Göttingen, 1984).

²⁹ See the discussion about Raphael Gross, *Carl Schmitt und die Juden: Eine deutsche Rechtslehre* (Frankfurt, 2000) in H-Sozu-Kult, fall 2001. Cf. Doris Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill, 1996).

³⁰ Michael Grüttner, *Studenten im Dritten Reich* (Paderborn, 1995).

³¹ Notker Hammerstein, *Die deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft in der Weimarer Republik und im Dritten Reich: Wissenschaftspolitik in Republik und Diktatur* (Munich, 1999).

³² Michael Fahlbusch, *Wissenschaft im Dienst der nationalsozialistischen Politik? Die Volksdeutschen Forschungsgemeinschaften von 1931 bis 1945* (Baden-Baden, 1999). Cf. Ingo Haar, *Geschichtswissenschaft im Nationalsozialismus: Die deutschen Historiker und der 'Volkstumskampf' im Osten* (Diss., Halle, 1998).

³³ See the emerging work on this issue by Patricia von Papen and Alan Steinweis.

³⁴ Omer Bartov, *Murder in our Midst: The Holocaust, Industrial Killing, and Representation* (New York, 1996); Christian Gerlach, *Kalkulierte Morde: Deutsche Wirtschafts- und Vernichtungspolitik in Weißrußland, 1941 bis 1944* (Hamburg, 1999).

³⁵ Paul Kleinewefers, *Jahrgang 1905: Ein Bericht* (Stuttgart, 1977).

³⁶ Manfred Heinemann, ed., *Erziehung und Schulung im Dritten Reich* (Stuttgart, 1980), 2 vols; and Bergen, *Twisted Cross*, passim.

³⁷ Michael Burleigh, *Germany Turns Eastward: A Study of Ostforschung in the Third Reich, 1933–1945* (Cambridge, 1988); and Willy Oberkrome, *Volksgeschichte: Methodische Innovation und völkische Ideologisierung in der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft 1918–1945* (Göttingen, 1993).

³⁸ Karl Ditt, “Die Kulturraumforschung zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik: Das Beispiel Franz Petri (1903-1993),” *Westfälische Forschungen* 46 (1996), 73–176.

³⁹ Hannes Heer, *Vernichtungskrieg. Verbrechen der Wehrmacht 1941–1944* (Hamburg, 1995). See also Hamburger Institut für Sozialforschung, ed., *Verbrechen der Wehrmacht: Dimensionen des Vernichtungskrieges 1941–1944* (Hamburg, 2002).

⁴⁰ Herbert Ziegler, *Germany's New Aristocracy: The SS-Leadership, 1925–1939* (Princeton, 1939); Herbert, *Best*, 191 ff.

⁴¹ Allen, *The Business of Genocide*, chapter III ff. Except for spectacular cases such as that of Werner von Braun, the engineers have largely escaped public criticism.

⁴² Michael Kater, “Medizin und Mediziner im Dritten Reich: Eine Bestandsaufnahme,” *Historische Zeitschrift*, 244 (1987), 299–352. Cf. also Michael Greve, *Die organisierte Vernichtung des ‘lebensunwerten Lebens’ im Rahmen der ‘Aktion T4’* (Pfaffenweiler, 1998).

⁴³ Jarausch, *Unfree Professions*, 196 ff.

⁴⁴ Personal correspondence of Konrad Jarausch to his wife and brother, in the author’s possession. For further information see last paragraph of this text.

⁴⁵ Peter Schöttler, ed., *Geschichtsschreibung als Legitimationswissenschaft 1918–1945* (Frankfurt, 1997); and Winfried Schulze and Otto Gerhard Oexle, eds., *Deutsche Historiker im Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt, 1999). After losing his chair at Cologne and two years of internment, Petri was able to resume his career, culminating as director of the Institut für geschichtliche Landskunde in Bonn.

⁴⁶ Personal testimony and memory fragment by Charlotte Flessa. As part of “project paperclip” Fred Flessa was brought to the U.S. in the late 1940s and became a successful engineer and businessman on this side of the Atlantic.

⁴⁷ Theodore S. Hamerow, *On the Road to the Wolf’s Lair: German Resistance to Hitler* (Cambridge, MA, 1997). Cf. also Jochen Klepper, *Überwindung: Tagebücher und Aufzeichnungen aus dem Kriege* (Stuttgart, 1958).

⁴⁸ Victor Klemperer, *So sitze ich denn zwischen allen Stühlen: Tagebücher 1945–1949* (Berlin, 1999), 1: 7 ff.

⁴⁹ See Eric Kohler’s forthcoming study of Jewish refugee doctors in the U.S.

⁵⁰ Frank Stern, *Im Anfang war Auschwitz: Antisemitismus und Philosemitismus im deutschen Nachkrieg* (Göttingen, 1991), and oral testimony of Irmgard Mueller, an Auschwitz survivor.

⁵¹ Jeffrey Herf, *Divided Memory: The Nazi Past in the Two Germanys* (Cambridge, MA, 1997).

⁵² Christoph Klessmann, *Die doppelte Staatsgründung: Deutsche Geschichte 1945–1955* (Göttingen, 1982); and Peter Graf Kielmannsegg, *Nach der Katastrophe: Eine Geschichte des geteilten Deutschland* (Berlin, 2000).

⁵³ Lutz Niethammer, *Die Mitläuferfabrik: Die Entnazifizierung am Beispiel Bayerns* (Berlin, 1989).

⁵⁴ Norbert Frei, *Vergangenheitspolitik: Die Anfänge der Bundesrepublik und die NS-Vergangenheit* (Munich, 1996), is more persuasive than Manfred Kittel, *Die Legende von der 'Zweiten Schuld': Vergangenheitsbewältigung in der Ära Adenauer* (Berlin 1993).

⁵⁵ Konrad H. Jarausch, “Critical Memory and Civil Society: The Impact of the Sixties on German Debates about the Past,” forthcoming in a volume on confronting the German past in the 1960s. See also Peter Reichel, *Vergangenheitsbewältigung in Deutschland: Die Auseinandersetzung mit der NS-Diktatur von 1945 bis heute* (Munich, 2001).

⁵⁶ Alexander Mitscherlich, *Doctors of Infamy: The Story of Nazi Medical Crimes* (New York, 1949); Bundesminister der Justiz, ed., *Im Namen des deutschen Volkes: Justiz und Nationalsozialismus: Katalog zur Ausstellung des Bundesministers der Justiz* (Cologne, 1989); and Ludwig, *Technik und Ingenieure im Dritten Reich*, 515 ff.

⁵⁷ Manfred Hettling, “Die Historisierung der Erinnerung—Westdeutsche Rezeptionen der nationalsozialistischen Vergangenheit,” *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte* 29 (2000), 357–78; and Aleida Assmann und Ute Frevert, *Geschichtsvergessenheit—Geschichtsversessenheit: Vom Umgang mit deutschen Vergangenheiten nach 1945* (Stuttgart, 1999), 21–52.

⁵⁸ Frei, *Vergangenheitspolitik*, passim.

⁵⁹ Konrad H. Jarausch, “Zeitgeschichte und Erinnerung. Einleitende Bemerkungen,” *Verletztes Gedächtnis: Erinnerungskultur und Zeitgeschichte im Konflikt*, 1 ff..

⁶⁰ Allen, *The Business of Genocide*, Chapter I. Cf. also Wolfgang Bialas and Manfred Gangl, eds., *Intellektuelle im Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt, 2000), and Jonathan Petropoulos, *The Faustian Bargain: The Art World in Nazi Germany* (New York, 2000).

⁶¹ Niklas Frank, *Der Vater: Eine Abrechnung* (Munich, 1987) is typical of the children of perpetrators syndrome.

⁶² Christa Wolf, *Kindheitsmuster: Roman* (Berlin, 1976), 189.

⁶³ Jarausch, *Unfree Professions*, 196 ff.

⁶⁴ Ernst von Salomon, *Die Geächteten* (Berlin, 1935); and Peter Loewenberg, *Decoding the Past: The Psychohistorical Approach* (New York, 1983).

⁶⁵ Sebastian Haffner, *Geschichte eines Deutschen: Die Erinnerungen 1918–1933* (Stuttgart, 2000).

⁶⁶ Max Hachenburg, *Lebenserinnerungen eines Rechtsanwalts und Briefe aus der Emigration* (Stuttgart, 1978), ed. by Jörg Schadt.

⁶⁷ Marion Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany* (New York, 1998).

⁶⁸ “Aus den Briefen von Dr. K. Jarausch” to Dr. Korth, November-December 1941; “2. Folge von Auszügen aus den Briefen von Konrad Jarausch” compiled by O. Ziegner, in the author’s possession.

Konrad H. Jarausch is the Lurcy Professor of European Civilization at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and Co-director of the Zentrum für Zeithistorische Studien in Potsdam, Germany. He is the author of twenty-four books, including *The Unfree Professions: German Lawyers, Teachers and Engineers, 1900–1950* (1990), and many articles. His most recent book, edited with Rüdiger Hohls, is *Versäumte Fragen: Deutsche Historiker im Schatten des Nationalsozialismus* (2000), which explores previously unasked questions about the collaboration of historians with the Third Reich. Professor Jarausch is the recipient of numerous academic honors and grants, including a Rockefeller Humanities Fellowship, a National Endowment for the Humanities grant, a Fulbright Senior Scholarship, a German Academic Exchange Service Award, and American Council of Learned Societies grants. He has lectured extensively in the United States, Europe, Japan, and Australia. Professor Jarausch is president of the Friends of the German Historical Institute, chair of the Conference Group for Central European History and past president of the German Studies Association.

Available Occasional Papers

“The Conundrum of Complicity: German Professionals and the Final Solution,” by Konrad H. Jarausch, 2002

“Policy of Destruction: Nazi Anti-Jewish Policy and the Genesis of the ‘Final Solution,’” by Peter Longerich, 2001

“Holocaust Writing and Research Since 1945,” by Sir Martin Gilbert, 2001

“Jewish Artists in New York During the Holocaust Years,” by Matthew E. Baigell, 2001

“The Awakening of Memory: Survivor Testimony in the First Years after the Holocaust, and Today,” by Henry Greenspan, 2001

“Hungary and the Holocaust: Confrontations with the Past,” CAHS symposium proceedings, 2001

“Facing the Past: Representations of the Holocaust in German Cinema since 1945,” by Frank Stern, 2000

“Future Challenges to Holocaust Scholarship as an Integrated Part of the Study of Modern Dictatorship,” by Hans Mommsen, 2000

“Moritz Fröhlich—Morris Gay: A German Refugee in the United States,” by Peter Gay, 1999

“Jewish Resistance: A Working Bibliography,” by CAHS staff, 1999; expanded edition 1999; web version www.ushmm.org/research/jrbiblio/index.htm, 2000

“Profits and Persecution: German Big Business and the Holocaust,” by Peter Hayes, 1998

“On the Ambivalence of Being Neutral: Switzerland and Swiss Jewry Facing the Rise and Fall of the Nazi State,” by Jacques Picard, 1998

“The Holocaust in the Netherlands: A Reevaluation,” a USHMM-RIOD conference summary by Patricia Heberer, 1997

“Jewish Resistance: Facts, Omissions, and Distortions,” by Nechama Tec, 1997

“Psychological Reverberations of the Holocaust in the Lives of Child Survivors,” by Robert Krell, 1997

“The First Encounter: Survivors and Americans in the Late 1940s,” by Arthur Hertzberg, 1996

“The ‘Willing Executioners’/‘Ordinary Men’ Debate,” by Daniel Goldhagen, Christopher Browning, and Leon Wieseltier, 1996

“Preserving Living Memory: The Challenge and Power of Video Testimony,” by Geoffrey H. Hartman, 1995

“Germany’s War for World Conquest and the Extermination of the Jews,” by Gerhard L. Weinberg, 1995

Single copies of occasional papers may be obtained by addressing a request to the Academic Publications Branch of the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies.

A complete list of the papers is also available on the Museum's website at www.ushmm.org/research/center.