The past year (July 1951 through June 1952) has brought decisive advances in the economic and military integration of both the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic (Western and Eastern Germany, respectively) into the opposing power blocs of world politics. The growing competition for Germany's military potential between the Western powers and the Soviet Union has inevitably resulted in a strengthening of national self-confidence, of the influence of nationalist and militarist elements, and to some extent of Nazi elements on both sides of the increasingly rigid frontiers of partition.

The Bonn Conventions

In Western Germany the year opened with the formal termination of the state of war by the Western powers (July 9, 1951) and ended with the signature of the Paris Treaty creating the European Defense Community, and of the Bonn Conventions defining Germany's new international status as a partner in Western defense (May 26-27, 1952). It also saw parliamentary approval by the Bundestag of the Schuman plan for unification of West European coal and steel (January 11, 1952), which has since come into force, and the agreement on a settlement for German debts (London, August 8, 1952).

Under the Bonn Conventions, the Allies retain only the right to station armed forces on German soil in the common interest of the West and to take measures for their security in an emergency; the right to settle together with Russia matters affecting the whole of Germany, including the peace treaty; and their rights in Berlin. In all other internal and external matters the Federal Republic will henceforth be able to act like a sovereign state subject only to the specific obligations undertaken in these treaties. The occupation regime will end and the Allied High Commission be replaced by ambassadors of the Western powers.

Germany undertakes to furnish her defense contribution in the framework of an integrated European Defense Community (EDC). Under the Paris Treaty she will recruit complete divisions under German officers which are to be equipped and financed from a common pool and integrated into nationally mixed corps. In the executive body of the EDC, the commissariat, its general staff, and the higher military echelons, German officials and officers will be represented on a basis of equality.

Germany, like other members of the EDC, will be allowed to produce arms
under EDC licence and by specific order of its procurement organization, except for those arms listed in the treaty as not to be produced in "exposed areas," such as atomic weapons, V-weapons, military planes, battleships, etc. All other limitations on German production of military importance will end; restrictions on German heavy industry imposed under the Ruhr statute will expire in stages with the coming into force of the Schuman plan.

A convention on matters arising from the war and the occupation binds Western Germany to recognize the international obligations entered by the Allies on her behalf and the rights created by Allied legislation, to revise such legislation only in accordance with specific rules, and to continue and complete the programs for restitution and industrial deconcentration. Germany recognizes the confiscation of German assets abroad as valid where it has heretofore taken place. The Allies retain the custody of German war criminals sentenced by them. A mixed German-Allied Board will review the sentences, but in certain cases the custodian power retains the right of veto.

At the end of July 1952, the struggle over the ratification of the treaties was still in progress. Popular opposition, whose chief parliamentary spokesmen were the Social Democrats, drew its strength from three main sources: fear of deepening the partition of Germany and making it final, antimilitary opposition to the return to power of the military caste (particularly in the trade unions and among part of the young generation), and nationalist objections to the treaties as offering only incomplete equality and sovereignty. Though a first Bundestag debate on February 7-8, 1952 resulted in a majority for the principle of rearmament, ratification remained uncertain owing to the claim of the Social Democratic opposition that a constitutional change was involved and a two-thirds vote was required. The Social Democrats sought a decision to this effect from the Constitutional Court at Karlsruhe, but the court refused to rule on the constitutional issue until the proposals came before it after actually being passed by the Bundestag.

West German domestic politics during the past year were completely dominated by this struggle. Economic life showed a high degree of prosperity. Many German industries enjoyed an export boom because their foreign competitors were taken up with armament orders. The gradual absorption of the majority of the refugee population into economic life continued; the long promised Lastenausgleich (Law for the Equalization of Burdens) to compensate refugees for their losses was at last adopted by parliament and, though attacked by the refugee organizations as inadequate, seemed liable further to reduce the volume of refugee discontent. A major conflict arose between the government and the trade unions on the question of the Works Council Law. Despite a series of partial strikes, the unions were unable to extend their right to participation in management, gained early in 1951 for the coal and steel industries, to industry in general.

Eastern Germany

In Eastern Germany the main developments of the year were the conclusion of a four-year agreement with the Soviet Union for trade and technical
assistance, amounting to a decisive step in eastward economic integration (October 4, 1951); the adoption of a five-year plan for 1951-55 on that basis (Nov. 1, 1951); the gradual broadening of the disguised East German cadre army, the "people's police," into an open and fully equipped national army after May 1952; and the formal proclamation of Eastern Germany as a People's Republic by Deputy Premier Walter Ulbricht at the conference of the Socialist Unity Party in July 1952.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

From September 1951 onwards, the East German Government made repeated efforts to discuss all-German elections and a peace treaty with the West Germans, but proved unwilling to agree to free elections under international control. On February 13, 1952, the East German Government addressed a note to the four powers requesting urgent steps for a German peace treaty. This formed the basis for the Soviet note of March 10, 1952, to the Western powers—an attempt to fix the outlines of a peace treaty before all-German elections—which the Western powers rejected. The mention of a national army in the first Soviet note was followed by a change of East German propaganda from antimilitarism to the need for national defense against "Western aggression." Immediately after the signature of the Bonn and Paris treaties, the Inspector General of the People's Police was formally ordered by President Wilhelm Pieck to start mass recruiting and to equip his force with modern weapons.

Measures were also taken to seal off Eastern Germany from the West, including Western Berlin, as from a hostile country. A barred security zone, of the type used elsewhere along the Iron Curtain frontier was created along the demarcation line.

Neo-Nazism

In Western Germany, extremist neo-Nazism of the type represented by the Socialist Reich Party (SRP) of "General" Ernst Otto Remer and Bundestag deputy Fritz Dorls made little progress during the year under review. But the rehabilitation of Nazi personnel as "Neo-Democrats" and the revaluation of past service for Hitler as a meritorious struggle against Bolshevism proceeded apace.¹ At the same time, active resistance to this process, based on equal rejection of Nazi and Communist totalitarianism, became more pronounced, particularly among sections of the younger intelligentsia.

Neo-Nazi extremism was fought by the authorities of the Federal Republic because of its open rejection of the democratic state, its slanderous attacks on all who resisted Hitler—particularly the conspirators of July 20, 1944—and its undisguised readiness to play the East against the West and even temporarily to cooperate with the Russians if the latter would accept German nationalist terms. During the past year several SRP officials after leaving the party alleged that the SRP had received money from Communist or East German sources.

¹ In an American-sponsored public opinion poll conducted in October-November 1951, 42 per cent of the 1,200 persons polled considered that there had been more good than evil in Nazism, compared to 37 per cent who saw in it more evil than good. The remaining 21 per cent expressed no opinion.
In a number of states, SRP meetings were banned as endangering public order, or Remer and other leaders were forbidden to speak in public; but some Lower Saxony courts showed hesitation in punishing Nazi acts of intimidation and insults to the republican symbols. On November 6, 1951, the Federal Government called on the Karlsruhe Constitutional Court to outlaw the SRP as anti-constitutional, together with the Communist Party. The reason given was that the SRP by the composition of its leadership, its organization, program, propaganda, and methods of action had proved itself a successor organization of the Nazi Party. The court found itself unable to deal with the substance of the action for several months. But on July 15, 1952, it granted the government an injunction provisionally banning all meetings and publications of the SRP.

On September 12, 1952, the SRP leadership announced that the party would dissolve itself, apparently in an effort to forestall a ban by the Constitutional Court. Reports that the party had made plans for continuing its activities under a new name had previously appeared in the press and had led to quarrels among its leaders. On the day following the dissolution police banned a conference called at Detmold to found a new organization under the name of Nationale Opposition. When interrogated by the police, some delegates turned out to be representatives of various district organizations of the SRP. They admitted that the purpose of the conference had been to continue its activities.

On October 23, the Constitutional Court pronounced the dissolution of the SRP.

The SRP had concentrated its organizing work on areas adjoining its home ground of Lower Saxony, like Bremen and Schleswig-Holstein, and on building up isolated bases for future expansion elsewhere. It took part in two state elections and three by-elections for the Bundestag, without being able anywhere to repeat the successes achieved in the Lower Saxony elections of May 1951. In the state of Bremen, which forms an enclave in Lower Saxony, the SRP gained 7.7 per cent of the votes and eight out of one hundred seats on October 7, 1951; in the elections for the Constituent Assembly of the Southwest State, it failed to win a single mandate, receiving 66,000 votes—2.4 per cent of the total or 3.9 per cent of votes cast in North Wuerttemberg-Baden, the only part of the state where it put up candidates (March 9, 1952). Its centers of strength here were Mosbach district with 14.4 per cent and Heidelberg rural district with 9.1 per cent. In Bundestag by-elections on May 4, 1952, the SRP polled 11 per cent in Segeberg-Neumuenster (Schleswig-Holstein) and 9.5 per cent in Friedberg-Buedingen (Hesse), and on May 18, with Remer himself as candidate, 11.9 per cent in Bremerhaven. Thus typical results of 10-12 per cent at selected strong points in 1952 compare with a state average of 11 per cent in Lower Saxony in May 1951, when it gained pluralities of 20-30 per cent in its rural strongholds.

Of other extremist neo-Nazi groups, the Deutsche Block led by Karl Meissner became the second strongest party after the Social Democrats in Coburg and Neustadt in Franconia during the Bavarian municipal elections of March 30, 1952. But in the whole of Bavaria it polled only 0.7 per cent of the vote, with the now equally extremist Deutsche Gemeinschaft of August
Hausleiter polling another 0.4 per cent. Hausleiter, who had formerly been allied with refugee organizations in Bavaria and Wuerttemberg, but has since been disavowed by the Refugee Party Bund der Heimatlosen und Entrechteten (BHE: League of Expellees and Disinherited), received only 3 per cent of the poll at a Bundestag by-election in Nuremberg in December 1951, and 3.2 per cent, corresponding to 89,000 votes, in the elections to the Southwest State Constituent Assembly—making together with the SRP an extremist total of 5.6 per cent for the whole area.

Among a series of prosecutions for slander against neo-Nazi demagogues, importance attached to the trial of Remer for describing the men of the anti-Nazi resistance as traitors to their country. On March 15, 1952, the Brunswick criminal court established for the first time the principle that the anti-Hitler conspirators had acted from purely patriotic motives, in revolt against a state which had long abandoned the rule of law, and therefore could not be described as traitors even in a technical legal sense. Remer, only recently sentenced to four months' imprisonment for slandering Chancellor Karl Adenauer, got another three months.

In February 1952, an SRP Bundestag member known as Franz Richter who had been the German delegate to the International Fascist Congress in Malmö in May 1951, was revealed to be identical with the former Nazi district official Fritz Roessler from Saxony. He was subsequently sentenced by a Bonn court to eighteen months' imprisonment for various acts of fraud.

Among other neo-Nazi organizations, the remnant of the Bruderschaft under Helmut Beck-Broichsitter announced its intention to cooperate with the SRP, while a breakaway from the SRP youth organization, led by Herbert Muenchow, developed independently under the name of Reichsjugend. The Freicorps Deutschland, led by former Storm Troop corporal Hermann Lamp and former naval non-commissioned officer Karl Heinz Neumann in Hamburg, obtained some publicity, but is believed to have no more than five to six hundred members. Several attempts to start neo-Nazi groups in West Berlin, sometimes with covert Russian support, have proved abortive.

NAZI INTERNATIONAL

A rally of former members of the European Armed Storm Troop, called by former Storm Troop General Herbert Gille in November 1951 for the spring of 1952, was stopped by the Federal government's announcement that no visas would be granted. More important was the continued activity of former Nazi officials and officers in Spain and the Middle East. Ex-ambassador Eberhard von Stohrer in Madrid and former Storm Troop colonel Otto Skorzeny, moving back and forth between Germany and Spain, were reported to be acting as go-betweens in this connection.

At least twenty officers and thirty other experts on armament and organization were admitted to be working with the Egyptian army, including Lt. General Wilhelm von Fahrmbacher, Tank General Oskar Munzel, and the notorious Oskar Dirlewanger, one-time head of an extermination squad.

Hjalmar Schacht, having returned from a journey through the Islamic countries of Asia and the Middle East and a visit to Spain, where he was the guest of Skorzeny, applied at the end of June, 1952, in Hamburg for the
registration of a private bank to be known as Hjalmar Schacht & Co., specializing in foreign trade. The Hamburg Senate refused the application, but the Hamburg administrative court, to whom Schacht appealed, decided in his favor.

NAZI REHABILITATION

Among the democratic parties, the Deutsche Partei, which forms the right wing of the government coalition, set the pace in the political rehabilitation of former active Nazis. In April 1952 it elected the former Nazi police chief Alfred Richter as deputy chairman of its Hamburg organization. On the eve of the May 1952 municipal elections in Hesse it elected the former Nazi mayor of Frankfurt, Fritz Krebs, under whose regime 37,000 Frankfurt Jews had been deported, as joint chairman of its Hesse state organization, together with Bundestag member Heinrich Leuchtgens, a veteran anti-Semite and former cochairman of the extremist Deutsche Reich Party. Krebs immediately caused a scandal by stating in his speech of acceptance that "in the fur of democracy lice have settled which will have to be cracked so that the blood spouts." He was nevertheless presented as top candidate on the Deutsche Partei's list for Frankfurt city council and elected with six other candidates, including two additional notorious Nazi functionaries. In Offenbach, too, the former Nazi mayor Helmuth Schranz was elected to the city council at the head of the German Party list.

When the new Frankfurt city council met, the Socialist and Christian Democratic majority refused the Deutsche Partei all representation in committees and declared that they would not cooperate with them so long as the man who had ordered the Storm Detachment to expel the city councillors by force in 1933 was their representative. After protests by the German Party in the Bundestag had proved unsuccessful, Krebs resigned his seat in the City Council on the grounds that he had been excluded from participation in its work. Some of the more conservative leaders of the Deutsche Partei in Lower Saxony are understood to have misgivings about the policy of expanding to other areas by appealing to Nazi elements. Responsibility for this policy attaches chiefly to Federal Transport Minister Hans Christoph Seebohm, who caused an Allied High Commission protest by his Kassel speech of December 2, 1951, in which he declared that he "could not recognize the 1937 frontiers because they had been those of the Versailles Diktat" and said "I bow before every—I repeat every—symbol for which German soldiers have fallen." Seebohm later denied that this formula referred to the swastika, but it was this interpretation which won the applause of his audience. In a later speech at Munich on May 11, he declared that the chief aim of his party was the struggle against denazification, which he asserted had been "based on the meanest and lowest informers' practice," and for the rights of the German soldier.

In Lower Saxony, an openly pro-Nazi group emerged inside the Refugee Party (BHE). Although the state is governed by a coalition of Socialists and the BHE, a parliamentary majority against the ban on the public singing of Nazi songs was formed by the defection of BHE deputies.
THE VETERANS' LEAGUES

When a large number of Veterans' Leagues, hitherto banned, suddenly blossomed forth in the summer of 1951, they were at first welcomed by the Federal government as a possible aid in overcoming the antimilitarist mood of the front generation. After the first attempt at forming an all-embracing organization was made in September with General Hans Friessner as its president, it became clear that a minority sympathized with extremist views—notably paratroop General Hermann Ramcke, who in a speech at Brunswick proclaimed the German soldier's unwillingness to act as "gun fodder for degenerate democracies"; another minority, represented by such men as Ludwig Cruewell of the Africa Corps, was genuinely loyal to democracy and willing to cooperate with the West; and a large center group, including Friessner himself, favored cooperation with the West on terms favorable to Germany but was chiefly concerned to "restore the honor of the German soldier," i.e., to obtain the release of war criminals and to justify their own role in the war. A manifesto by Friessner proclaimed his loyal service to "the German state" without mentioning democracy; in a press statement, he described the German attack on Poland as an act of self-defense and expressed disapproval of the action of "the men of July 20," [who had attempted to assassinate Adolph Hitler] though respect for their motives. On October 2, 1951, the Federal government intervened with a warning against political activity by veterans' leagues and a solemn recognition of the deeds of the men of the anti-Hitler resistance. At the same time it started efforts to set up a rival over-all organization to Friessner's, with the result that both failed and that it became evident that the mass of the ex-soldiers were taking no part in the maneuvering for position of rival cliques of generals. By the summer of 1952, only leagues of the various units united by ties of tradition but with no avowed political aims remained.

Among these the "HIAG's," [Hilfsgemeinschaften auf Gegenseitigkeit] the "Mutual Aid Groups" of the former Armed SS, grouping 20,000 members and a similar number of sympathizers, officially aim at getting Storm Troop frontline veterans the pension rights granted to other soldiers, besides tracing missing comrades and finding jobs. Their first central conference, held at Arolsen in January 1952, was in fact confined to these questions. Nazi lectures are, however, delivered at some of the local meetings. Moreover, the Arolsen conference agreed to adopt the Viking Ruf ("Viking Call"), in which General Herbert Gille had launched his appeal for a European Storm Troop rally, as their central organ. Gille, the editor, does not attack the government and rejects the neutralist ohne mich attitude of the SRP, but praises the former European Storm Troop as the model for a European army and regards the present Western resistance to Soviet totalitarianism as a belated continuation of Hitler's struggle against Bolshevism.

CIVIL SERVICE RENAZIFICATION

The return of former Nazis to their civil service posts became a mass phenomenon in 1951-52 owing to the Federal law of May 1951 granting reinstatement or pension on the same level both to refugee officials and to dis-
missed Nazis who had later been denazified. The effect of the rule forcing each Federal, state or municipal authority to employ 20 per cent of such reinstated officials was particularly harsh in areas where the elimination of Nazis from office had been seriously attempted. There, many anti-Nazi officials lost their jobs, in some cases joining the ranks of "politically unemployables" together with the former judges and prosecutors of denazification tribunals. Cases were reported where children of former denazification officials attempted suicide because of the taunts of their Nazi teachers and classmates.

On Christian-Social initiative, the Munich city council introduced a ruling on February 21, 1952, that former city officials dismissed as Nazis should have priority in reinstatement over refugees, and the Upper Bavarian provincial authorities refused to declare it illegal until the Bavarian Minister of the Interior intervened and ordered its cancellation.

Outside the civil service, the Nazi comeback was most pronounced in organizations subsidized for anti-Communist propaganda. The manager of the Volksbund fuer Frieden und Freiheit (People's League for Freedom and Peace), Eberhard Taubert, is the former head of the Anti-Comintern Section in Joseph Goebbels' propaganda ministry. The producer of the subsidized film Crossroads of Freedom, which caused a scandal because it described the Russian invasion of Germany without any mention of what had gone before, turned out to be the former producer of Nuremberg Rally films, Richard Haeussler.

In contrast to the general picture presented by the present German administration, the office of Security Commissioner Theodor Blank, which is making the preparatory studies for the raising of a German contingent of the European Army, appears to be remarkably free of Nazi elements. The core of the staff officers employed there are men who took an active part in the military conspiracy against Hitler. They are under constant attack by German right-wing military circles, who claim that the bulk of the German officers corps would be unwilling to cooperate with them.

FOREIGN OFFICE

The one case where the question of Nazi influence in the government machine aroused the public conscience and was seriously taken up by parliament concerned the Auswaertiges Amt (Foreign Office). Public attention was first drawn to it by a series of articles in the independent Frankfurter Rundschau making detailed charges based largely on documents from the Nuremberg trials. The charges were first denied by the government as mischievous distortions; only when the newspaper threatened to sue the official responsible for the denial did Konrad Adenauer, as foreign minister, order an investigation by a retired judge Rudolf Schetter. As Dr. Schetter only heard the accused officials and examined no documentary or other evidence, this investigation amounted to nothing but a whitewash.

Meanwhile, however, the Bundestag had entrusted a committee of seven members (three Socialists, three Christian Democrats, one Free Democrat) with an independent investigation, and here the documentary evidence was examined. The committee's report, published on June 18, 1952, confirmed the fact that the Foreign Ministry "had employed some persons whose pres-
ence was apt to impair the confidence of people inside and outside Germany in her democratic development.” There had been a general tendency to re-employ people who had served the Foreign Ministry in Nazi times as “indispensable” without proper examination of their record; in the case of a group of higher officials of medium rank a clique had been deliberately at work to bring back their old friends and had almost succeeded in reconstituting the “corps of [Nazi] political leaders” inside the Ministry.

Specifically, the ambassador to Greece, Werner von Grundherr, was proved to have taken part in the organization of anti-Jewish measures in Denmark as wartime head of the Ministry’s Scandinavian desk. A member of the legal department, Minister Werner von Bargen, was proved to have played an active role in organizing deportation of Jews from Belgium, where he represented the Foreign Ministry with the German military commander from 1940 to 1943, and also to have carried on correspondence on the execution of hostages in France as chargé d’affaires in Paris in 1944. Curt Heinburg, still employed on contract as political counsellor in the Wilhelmstrasse although he had passed the age limit, had dealt with voluminous correspondence on the organization of deportations. Heinz Truetzschler von Falkenstein, counsellor for European Affairs and lately deputy leader of the Hague delegation negotiating on reparations to Jewry, had issued instructions to German embassies abroad on wartime propaganda, and had in 1944 been appointed secretary to the Ministry’s European Committee.

The head of the personnel department technically responsible for all appointments, Herbert Dittmann, was a former member both of the Nazi Party and of the personnel department of Ribbentrop’s Foreign Ministry—his appointment as personnel chief was contrary to the Federal government’s rules for all ministries. He was moreover proved to have sent an observer to the trial before a German court of the wartime Foreign Ministry official Franz Rademacher, with instructions to see to it that no names of former colleagues of Rademacher’s still employed in the Ministry should be mentioned. (Rademacher had been accused and was convicted of his share in the killing of 1,300 Serbian Jews.) Dittmann was further proved to have tried to mislead the committee on these facts.

On the other hand, a number of senior officials who had been publicly attacked were fully cleared by the committee, having furnished positive proof of resistance activity against the Nazi regime. Among them was Herbert Blankenhorn, head of the ministry’s political department and close assistant to Chancellor Adenauer.

Before the report was published von Grundherr and Heinburg had resigned. The report recommended that von Bargen and Dittmann should no longer be employed by the Foreign Ministry, but raised no objection to their being employed in another official capacity. It asked that Truetzschler von Falkenstein should not for the time being be promoted, as had been intended, nor be used in service abroad. It asked that none of the responsible members of Dittmann’s personnel department, nor his predecessor Wilhelm Haas (now ambassador in Ankara), should have any further share in personnel policy, and advised against the use abroad of two additional officials.
Finally, the report called for organizational reforms including the appointment of a personnel chief of undoubted democratic principles, for greater attention to the re-employment of officials victimized by the Nazis, and for further investigation of complaints about the rejection of candidates who had not belonged to the Nazi Foreign Ministry.

**East German Renazification**

The absence of free public discussion in Eastern Germany makes it impossible to give a similarly detailed picture of the role played by former Nazis and militarists there. But it is known that one party, the National Demokratische Partei (National Democrats) was created specially to attract ex-Nazi elements and provide a link with neo-Nazi elements in Western Germany. Its leadership includes General Vincenz Mueller, chief of staff of the militarized People's Police, which has now been reorganized as a national army. Former Nazi and Storm Troop leaders are also known to occupy important executive positions in the Ministry of State Security.

The underlying principle was publicly stated in the Soviet note to the Western powers of March 10, 1952, the same note which for the first time proposed the creation of a German national army: "All former members of the German army, including officers and generals, all former Nazis excluding those who are serving sentences passed by courts for the commission of crimes, must be granted civil and political rights on an equal basis with all other German citizens to participate in the building of a peace-loving democratic Germany."

**War Crimes and Nazi Trials**

On February 8, 1952, the Bundestag adopted a resolution asking that "all those Germans be released who have either been convicted on charges of war crimes by Allied courts or are still detained without sentence, except where individuals are to be called to account for crimes in the traditional meaning of the word. An impartial review of the individual cases must take place without delay." The resolution was voted for only by the government and right-wing parties, but the Social Democrats hastened to explain that they had only voted against it because it was one of a batch of resolutions intended as an endorsement of the government's foreign policy.

The setting up of a mixed Allied-German review board, as provided in the Bonn Conventions, is still not regarded as satisfactory by the German press, which now refers only to "so-called war criminals." Many leaders of the soldiers' leagues, as well as Free Democratic and German Party deputies, have made the release of imprisoned German military leaders their number one condition for cooperation in Western defense.

In fact, the great majority of sentences have now expired, since they were generally reduced by one-third for "good behavior." Famous generals still in prison have been repeatedly released on parole on compassionate grounds.
Meanwhile, though German denazification tribunals are now generally dormant, a Munich tribunal “tried” Field Marshal Albert Kesselring and “acquitted” him on April 2, 1952, of the same actions for which he had been sentenced by the Allies.

The German High Administrative Court for Lower Saxony and Schleswig-Holstein at Lueneburg has ruled that a German official sentenced by an Allied court for crimes against humanity does not by this fact lose his rights as a civil servant, unless he is sentenced by a German court as well (as reported in the *Neue Zeitung*, August 23, 1952). The Federal Minister of the Interior, Robert Lehr, has concurred with this ruling. The consequences include the payment of DM (marks) 44,000 ($10,500) back salary and DM 1,100 ($260) monthly pension to the former Gestapo chief in Belgium, Eggert Reeder, reprieved in 1951 from a twelve-year Belgian sentence for war crimes.

On the other hand, German courts continue to try Nazis for crimes committed both inside and outside Germany. A Dortmund court on April 4, 1952, sentenced a Gestapo agent to ten years’ imprisonment for his share in the murder of three hundred anti-Fascists in the last days of the collapse in 1945; there were twelve minor sentences in this case and fifteen acquittals. Five senior officials of the Reich Chancellery and the Ministry of Justice accused of having caused the death of two thousand people by sending three thousand to concentration camps, were acquitted by a Wiesbaden court on March 24, 1952, because their knowledge that the camps were annihilation camps could not be proved. On April 22, 1952, the Supreme Court at Karlsruhe rejected Ilse Koch’s demand for revision of the life sentence pronounced against her by an Augsburg court.

A trial of outstanding interest was that of Franz Rademacher, former Foreign Ministry counsellor on Jewish affairs, before a German jury at Nuremberg for his share in the killing of 1,300 Serbian Jews. After proceedings lasting six weeks the court ruled on March 18, 1952 that it was difficult to believe that Rademacher had no knowledge of the annihilation plan in view of his position, but sentenced him to no more than three years and five months’ imprisonment. Two years and three months of this were counted as already served during the investigation. The public prosecutor has appealed, as has Rademacher. A few months after the sentence was pronounced he was released by the court on the grounds that, having served thirty-one out of forty-one months, there was no danger that he would escape. However, when he was to be rearrested on September 15, he was no longer in Germany: it was assumed that he had fled to Argentina.

The Press Service of the German Social Democratic Party, demanding a strict investigation of what it called the “national scandal” of Rademacher’s release and flight, recalled that the murderer of more than a thousand Jews was freed on the same day on which Philip Auerbach, who had been sentenced to two years and six months’ imprisonment for minor offences, committed suicide. “For each Jew shot or hanged Rademacher had just served twenty hours in prison,” the press service said.
The Government and Jewry

On September 27, 1951, Federal Chancellor Konrad Adenauer made his government’s first official declaration to the Bundestag on its attitude towards the Jews. Recalling that the constitution rejected any form of racial discrimination, but that implementation of this principle would have to depend primarily on education, he proclaimed his government’s determination “to oppose all those circles that are still engaged in Jew-baiting” and announced that “recommendations for an amendment to the penal code have been submitted to the Bundestag under which propaganda inciting racial hatred is to be severely punished.”

While claiming that “the great majority of the German people abhorred the crimes committed against the Jews and had no part in them,” and that many Germans had risked their lives to help their Jewish compatriots, Adenauer admitted that “unspeakable crimes were perpetrated in the name of the German people which impose on us the obligation to make moral and material amends.” He announced the government’s intention to complete the restitution legislation and to implement it fairly, and its readiness to discuss a solution of the problem of material reparations with representatives of Jewry and the State of Israel.

Adenauer’s solemn declaration was supported by spokesmen of all parties except the Socialist Reichs Partei. For the Social Democratic Party Paul Loebe added that his party would have preferred this step to have been taken earlier and with greater determination. The Social Democratic Party had in fact on frequent occasions come out strongly against anti-Semitism and for effective restitution and reparation to the Jews.

At the end of March 1952 shortly after the German-Jewish negotiations at The Hague had started as a sequel to this declaration, bomb attempts by mail were made on Chancellor Adenauer and on Franz Boehm, the head of the German Hague delegation. In neither case were the culprits discovered, but a self-styled Organization of Jewish Partisans claimed responsibility for the outrages in letters dispatched to press agencies in Paris, implying that it wanted to prevent negotiations with “the murderer nation.” The Israel embassy in Paris and other Jewish organizations had no knowledge of a terrorist group under that name. German official spokesmen at once declared that, even if the culprits should turn out to be Jews, which was not proven, the Jewish people in general could not be held responsible for it, and the German press generally refrained from premature comment. At the end of September 1952 government spokesmen declared that it had meanwhile been established that both attempts were carried out by Jewish terrorists, though it had not been possible to find out the names of the culprits or any other further details.

---

1 No such law had been passed by the end of the summer session of 1952.
2 For a full account of German collective indemnity, see p. 471.
Anti-Semitism and Counteractions

Though all German parties, except for the SRP, have officially denounced anti-Semitism, incidents and remarks of an anti-Semitic nature show that popular anti-Semitism is if anything on the upswing in Germany, though probably still confined to a minority.

A public opinion poll, conducted in October 1951 by a German institute at the request of the United States High Commission, showed that 21 per cent of 1,200 people questioned considered that the Jews were partly to blame for what had happened to them under Hitler, 53 per cent took the opposite view, and 26 per cent had no opinion. Asked whether the remaining Jews should stay in Germany or emigrate, 26 per cent said they should stay, 27 per cent preferred them to emigrate, while the remainder gave qualified replies, did not care, or did not know. On the question of restitution 68 per cent expressed themselves in principle in favor of giving help to the Jews, 21 per cent against, and 11 per cent had no opinion. However, 17 per cent of those in favor would only help them last, after war widows, orphans, the bombed out, and the refugees.

Jewish cemeteries were again desecrated in various parts of Germany. In North-Rhine Westphalia and in Stuttgart the police placed special bureaus in charge of investigations, but only a very few cases were cleared up.

A crudely anti-Semitic leaflet produced in Sweden by Einar Aberg of Norrvigen found its way into Germany. One of the distributors was sentenced to six months' imprisonment. In Berlin, a number of shop windows were smeared with the words “Jew shop” in February 1952.

In December 1951, customs officials searched the synagogue in Bayreuth, Bavaria, including the Ark of the Law, “for black market goods.” The president of the Nuremberg Finance Office afterwards apologized, explaining that “the officials had made a mistake in the address.” The synagogue had to be rededicated.

On May 29, 1952, on the eve of Shevuot, the Feast of Weeks, the Displaced Persons camp at Foehrenwald in Bavaria was searched for black market goods by 150 policemen and customs officials on direct orders of the Federal Ministry of Finance. The raid, carried out in a brutal manner, was resisted by the inmates and violent clashes ensued. Not much of significance was found. The Bavarian refugee administration expressed regrets for the incident, stating that it had no advance knowledge of the raid.

Attitude of the Courts

A few German states have laws against race hatred, but in the majority anti-Semitic utterances can only be punished as slander, and many courts take the line that a collectivity cannot be slandered.

In 1951, a Brunswick court refused to deal with a slander action brought by the Association of Jewish Communities in Lower Saxony against the third chairman of the SRP, Ulrich Freiherr von Bothmer. Bothmer had said in a public meeting: “There will be no peace until the world unites to fight world
Judaism." When the public prosecutor appealed, the Brunswick High Court ruled in January 1952 that "the expressions used do not constitute slander since world Jewry cannot be slandered collectively; the slander is not directed against the plaintiff. Since the defendant has not called for the use of violence against the Jews, there are no grounds for action."

A cabaret entertainer, Oskar Paulig, who had called the Moehlstrasse in Munich, the center of Jewish DP life and of alleged black market activities, "Hitler's unfinished work" was acquitted by a Nuremberg court because his remark "had not caused tension and unrest in the population, as defined by the Bavarian law against racial hatred" (as reported in the Frankfurter Rundschau, December 12, 1951).

The Berlin Insurance Board was ordered by the Labor Court to reinstate an employee who had been dismissed for saying that "not enough Jews have been gassed," and to pay his lost salary. According to the court, there was "no important reason justifying immediate dismissal." On the other hand, the Berlin judge Prodehl, pronouncing judgment on a group of black marketeers, stated that the fact that the offenders were Jews justified higher punishment. He was removed from the criminal court by the West Berlin Senate.

In Giessen, Judge Breuer, pronouncing judgment on a Displaced Person, said that "the accused belongs by his origin and his way of life to the type of persons who, to the knowledge of the court, are chiefly occupied with black marketeering."

COUNTERACTIONS

Initiative in opposing manifestations of anti-Semitism and of neo-Nazism in general was taken chiefly by groups of students and writers who in West Berlin, Munich, and other cities combined with trade unionists and Socialist and Catholic youth groups to form local anti-totalitarian vigilance committees.

HARLAN CASE

The crystallizing issue for much of this activity was the showing of films by Veit Harlan, producer of the Nazi film Jud Suss. In November 1951, the High Court rejected the appeal of the press chief of the City of Hamburg, Erich Lueth, against an injunction preventing him from organizing a boycott of Harlan films. The court held that Harlan had not been an anti-Semite, had been forced to make this film against his will, had taken considerable risks in opposing Goebbels, and that in the end Goebbels had had to change the film materially without Harlan's collaboration to make it suit the purposes of Nazi propaganda.

Whatever Harlan's real views, the anti-Semites had by then taken up his cause. In January 1952, when 250 Freiburg students demonstrated against the showing of the Harlan film Hanna Ammon, they were brutally beaten up by the police to the applause of a crowd insulting them as "Jewish pigs" and "Jewish mercenaries." The university rector and the city council sided with the students and the press raised a public outcry. An inquiry by the Baden state parliament revealed that the instructions to the police had been issued by the personal secretary of the Baden Minister of the Interior, Hans
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Schneider—a former Jewish affairs adviser of the Nazi Gauleiter of Tyrol, Franz Hofer.

In Goettingen, an anti-Harlan demonstration of fifty students was received by a crowd singing Nazi songs and shouting Nazi slogans, and individual participants were pursued and beaten up by organized gangs for hours afterwards. Forty-eight professors of the University of Goettingen then issued a statement expressing solidarity with the attitude of the students. At a national conference of German students held in Berlin in May 1952 the Freiburg and Goettingen students were congratulated on their actions both in a resolution and in a message from anti-Communist students upholding the ideas of democracy in the Eastern zone, smuggled to the conference through underground channels.

In the Bundestag, the Freiburg and Goettingen anti-Semitic excesses were brought up by the Socialist member Adolf Arndt, who, to the applause of many members of the center parties, called them a shame for Germany. Federal Minister of the Interior Robert Lehr refused to take action, on the grounds that police and public order were the responsibility of the state governments.

In a number of larger cities the trade unions joined in the protests against the Harlan films, and the authorities were forced to stop the showing, notably in Frankfurt, Hamburg, Dortmund, Brunswick, Munich, and Berlin. The movement, however, was that of a minority. Where the films were shown they proved a great box office success.

Moreover, the legal situation remained unclear. The cinema owners obtained a decision from the Bavarian administrative tribunal that the ban by Munich on grounds of public order was illegal, and that the city was obliged to protect the showing of the film by armed force if necessary. A Hesse court, on the other hand, ruled that the Frankfurt ban was the only way of maintaining order, because the police could not effectively protect cinemas in all parts of the town at once.

The same Munich Committee for Democratic Action which took up the Harlan case there also forced the withdrawal of the reprint of Professor Hans F. K. Guenther's Gattenwahl ("Choice of Mates")—the Nazi classic on "racial eugenics" brought out by a reputable medical publisher. After a public protest by a group of writers, the majority of Munich booksellers refused to handle the book. Those who did had their windows painted with swastikas until the book was withdrawn.

Individual attacks on anti-Semitism and attempts to rouse the national conscience on the issue were made by a number of writers and scholars. Notably the poet Wolfgang Weyrauch appealed to German writers to cease keeping silent about the fate of the Jews; the author Luise Rinser attacked anti-Semitism in a speech on the anniversary of the November pogrom of 1938, and Franz Boehm, former rector of Frankfurt University and later head of the German delegation to the Hague, published an outstanding series of articles on Der Antisemitismus und die Deutschen ("Anti-Semitism and the Germans") in Die Gegenwart, September 1950.
Auerbach Case

On August 14, 1952, a Munich court sentenced the former Bavarian State Commissioner for Political Persecutees, Philipp Auerbach, to a term of two years and six months' imprisonment and a fine of DM 2,500 ($595) for attempted blackmail, embezzlement, accepting bribes, attempted submission of false statutory declarations, and illegal use of an academic degree. The same evening Auerbach took an overdose of sleeping pills, of which he died the next day. In his last letter to his wife Auerbach declared that he was innocent of any offenses committed for personal gain.

Auerbach had been arrested on March 10, 1951, when charges that he had defrauded the Bavarian state of millions of German marks were made by the then-Bavarian Minister of Justice, Josef Müller. The indictment was only published on November 21, 1951; the trial did not begin until April 16, 1952, and lasted for four months.

The verdict of the court acquitted Auerbach of the two most serious charges: it declared him not responsible for any damage the state had suffered from the credit operations of the State Compensation Office (Landesentschädigungsamt), and stated that his knowledge of the fraudulent transactions by which compensation was paid to a number of nonexistent Displaced Persons (DP's), could not be proved. In contrast, the former Chief Rabbi of Bavaria, Aaron Ohrenstein, was found guilty for his part in this transaction and sentenced to one year's imprisonment and a fine of DM 10,000 ($2,380).

The court recognized that Auerbach had successfully defended the interests of the Bavarian state, had been fully competent in his post, and had deserved well of Bavaria by speeding up the emigration of DP's. It considered, however, that the fund-raising methods Auerbach had admittedly used to finance the work of his office amounted to blackmail. Moreover, it found him guilty of profiting from some of the "gifts" thus procured. It was this latter charge, based on the evidence of a fellow-accused who had so profited, which Auerbach denied most violently in his last letter.

The defence had originally objected to the composition of the court on the grounds that the presiding judge, Joseph Mulzer, as well as the two other members of the bench, had been Nazis from 1933 on, and that Mulzer had been employed after the war in the legal office of Josef Müller who, as Bavarian Minister of Justice, had initiated the proceedings against Auerbach. However, the objections were overruled by another court, which took the line that "membership in a political party was not sufficient to justify an objection on the grounds of prejudice."

The court repeatedly rejected applications for Auerbach's release from detention, though the majority of medical experts had advocated it and though one of the two doctors who pronounced Auerbach fit for imprisonment was later rejected as prejudiced by a higher court. Thus Auerbach, who suffered from diabetes and kidney trouble as a result of his incarceration in a Nazi concentration camp, was kept under arrest in a clinic for over fourteen months. He was not released until May 29, 1952.
By then it had become clear that the major charges against him could not be sustained. Exploitation of the trial as a major "Jewish scandal" largely ceased and public interest faded correspondingly. The violent personal clashes between the presiding judge and the counsel for the defence, Joseph Klibansky, which had at first characterized the trial, also abated, and the conduct of the trial became more normal.

A few days after the verdict and Auerbach's death it was discovered that one important witness for the prosecution had been under a charge of perjury during the entire time, and had eventually been found guilty of it. Criticized for withholding this material fact, the prosecution claimed it had not known it, and was backed up in this assertion by the Ministry of Justice.

Press comment following Auerbach's suicide was more critical of the Bavarian Minister of Justice than of the accused. Most leading German papers considered that the original major charges had been trumped up for political reasons by Josef Müller, who later was forced to resign his post as Minister of Justice. Müller himself was not regarded as an anti-Semite, but it was felt that he had tried to exploit anti-Semitic prejudices to get rid of an opponent. The view was also widely expressed that the charge that Auerbach had profited from gift funds on which the prison sentence was chiefly based rested on doubtful evidence, while his remaining offenses were not committed for personal gain. The trial had established that Auerbach had held a position of great power but uncertain constitutional status; he had carried out a difficult administrative task without a regular budget during a period of postwar semi-anarchy and confusion before the currency reform, at a time when the use of irregular methods was almost inevitable if results were to be produced. In the circumstances it was felt that, though Auerbach had not been technically innocent on all counts, he had been treated with a cruel lack of fairness, and the sentence was generally regarded as unduly heavy.

Intercommunal Activities

The Peace with Israel campaign, initiated in the autumn of 1951 by Erich Luetth with the backing of President Theodor Heuss, has found considerable public support. Luetth's appeal for a gift of olive trees to Israel as a practical demonstration of the German desire for peace met with particularly good response at schools and universities. While newspapers in some parts of Germany were reluctant to publish the collection appeal for fear of offending their readers, the radio stations gave a good deal of support to it. The bulk of the proceeds will be used for the planting of olive trees in Israel, while a part will go to support destitute Jews in Germany.

A Brotherhood Week was organized in Western Germany from March 9 to 16, 1952, by the German Council of Christians and Jews in close cooperation with the United States National Conference of Christians and Jews. After an opening broadcast by President Heuss, meetings were held in many towns, radio talks and newspaper articles dealt with the ideas of brotherhood and tolerance, and many schools had special lectures delivered on the subject.

In Berlin, the Brotherhood Week took place between May 4 and 11, 1952, so as to enable university students from Eastern Germany to attend. The
mayor of West Berlin, Ernst Reuter, gave both the introductory and the final addresses. Previously a public meeting on the theme of Reconciliation with the Jews, sponsored by the Society for Christian-Jewish Cooperation and the Congress for Cultural Freedom, was addressed on February 17 by Erich Lueth, the writer Stefan Andres, and leaders of the three democratic Berlin parties.

Societies for Christian-Jewish cooperation are active in fourteen cities in Western Germany as well as in West Berlin. They are loosely organized in a coordinating council. The main functions of this council are to issue publications, to organize conferences, and to distribute funds which until June 30, 1952, were contributed by the United States High Commission and were the chief financial source for the work of the groups. From that date on they were required to raise their own funds. The work of the groups has been assisted by Hermann Ebeling, the representative of the World Brotherhood in Frankfurt.

Two conferences organized by the Protestant Committee for Service to Israel under the chairmanship of Professor Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, dean of the theological faculty of Muenster University, heard addresses by Christian and Jewish speakers on "The Religious Significance of the New State of Israel" and on "The Church and Judaism." The Jewish speakers were Rabbi W. Weinberg of Frankfurt and Professor Hans Joachim Schoeps of the University of Erlangen.

A Catholic circle centering around the Briefe zur Foerderung der Freundschaft zwischen den alten und neuen Gottesvolk ("Letters for Promoting Friendship between the Old and the New People of God"), edited by Gertrud Luckner in Freiburg, tries to promote understanding between Christians and Jews through lectures and publications. The group has kept aloof from the World Brotherhood in order to preserve its purely religious approach and not to become involved in "politics."

Jewish Population

As of the middle of 1952, about 21,000 professing Jews were living in Germany, compared to 600,000 before Hitler's rise to power. Of those, 14,000 live in the Western zones, 6,000 in Berlin, and an estimated 1,000 in the Russian zone.

About half the Jews in Germany are German citizens; the other half are chiefly Displaced Persons. Of just over one hundred communities in Western Germany, only three have more than 1,000 members: Munich with 2,750, Frankfurt with 1,100, and Hamburg with 1,050. Of the remaining communities, less than twenty have more than one hundred members, and many consist of only a few families.

During the year under review the Jewish population in Germany decreased by about 5,000, but it now seems to have reached its low point. Until the expiration of the United States Displaced Persons Act on December 31, 1951, emigration considerably exceeded immigration. Since then, emigration to the United States, which accounted for the bulk of visas issued, has come to an end. Very few visas were granted by other countries in the first half of 1952. On the other hand, the number of returnees, though still only about 1,500,
has tended to grow in the year under review. The largest number has come from Israel. Of those returning from other overseas countries or from Europe, part have come only for a limited stay—until they have used up or otherwise mobilized their blocked accounts resulting from restitution proceedings. But others have come back for good, not having succeeded in taking root in their new countries. These include a number of old people and persons such as lawyers whose training is not easily transferable.

The age composition of the Jews in Germany is extremely abnormal. The average age is fifty-five years, with almost 25 per cent over sixty-five, 60 per cent over forty-six, and less than 10 per cent below eighteen years of age. Thus only a minority are able to earn their living, while the majority depend on the small pensions granted to them as victims of Nazism or on the proceeds of restituted property.

Only about one hundred Jews were studying at German universities in the summer term of 1952, most of them near the end of their studies.

The Displaced Persons

Of the 170,000 Jewish Displaced Persons (DP's) left in Germany by the end of the war, all but 10,000 to 12,000 have been able to find new homes, chiefly in the United States and Israel. The majority of those remaining have become integrated into the German economy. There is one Jewish DP camp left, Foehrenwald in Bavaria. It houses almost 2,000 inmates, mainly sick people and invalids. Since the International Refugee Organization (IRO) ceased its activities at the end of January 1952 the camp has been under German administration.

The DP's are represented by the Council for the Liquidation of the Jewish DP Camps and Communities in Munich. A weekly in Yiddish, the Naye Yidishe Tzaytung, also appears in Munich.

Berlin Community

Berlin's Jewish Community with its 6,000 members is not only the largest in Germany but also the only one with an active community life. It has one Orthodox and one Liberal rabbi. The community has one office each in the Western and Eastern sectors of Berlin. So far it has succeeded in remaining unaffected by sector borders in its work. Its elected council and its administration function for the whole of Berlin. In the communal elections held in June 1952, 3,582 votes were cast as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List</th>
<th>No. of Votes</th>
<th>No. of Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberals</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zionists</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,582</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Organization in Western Germany

On June 1, 1952, the Zentralkommittee der Juden in Deutschland (Central Council of the Jews in Germany) moved its headquarters from Hamburg to Duesseldorf. The latter city is also the seat of the Vereinigung Juedischer Gewerbetreibende (Association of Jewish Businessmen), founded there on May 25, 1952, and of the Jewish Lawyers' Association, which met for the first time on December 15, 1951. The Allgemeine Juedische Wochenzeitung—the only Jewish weekly in German—is also published there.

Thus Duesseldorf with its community of 350 members has become the center of German Jewry's organizational life and its most frequent meeting place. On May 28, 1952, the directorate of the Central Council of Jews in Germany held its first joint meeting with the executive of the Central Council of Jews from Germany (headquarters London). The purpose of the meeting, presided over by Rabbi Leo Baeck, former president of the Reichsvereinigung der Juden in Deutschland (Association of German Jews), was to initiate closer cooperation between the two organizations. Restitution and the question of heirless Jewish property were discussed; a resolution expressed the view that the Jews in and from Germany should have priority in its use, and criticized the proposal of the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization (JRSO) that the proceeds should go to Israel.

Social Services

The Zentralwohlfahrtsstelle der Juden in Deutschland (Central Welfare Board of Jews in Germany), dissolved by the Gestapo in 1938, was refounded on February 14, 1952, with an office in Hamburg.

Owing to the large number of old and sick people unable to maintain themselves, the funds needed for homes for the aged, cash assistance, and other welfare expenses far exceed the resources of the communities. So far they have been dependent on assistance granted by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), but they hope to be able to stand on their own feet financially once a substantial share of heirless Jewish property is made available to them.

The JDC and Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) have also continued to assist in the emigration program. Despite the decline in numbers, the work involved has rather increased since the remaining "hard core" cases are extremely difficult to place. In the year under review, just over 4,000 people were helped to emigrate by the JDC and over 2,000 by HIAS. The ORT continued, though on a much reduced scale, to prepare people for emigration by vocational training courses. Four hundred students were enrolled in June 1952 in the four remaining training schools at Berlin, Munich, Foehrenwald camp, and Cologne.
Religious and Communal Life

The former Hamburg Rabbi Holzer returned to the British zone of Germany from Britain in November 1951. He is now the only rabbi for the 5,500 members of the fifty odd communities in the British zone. Altogether, there are some half-dozen rabbis in Western Germany.

On May 13, 1952, the Stuttgart synagogue, burnt down in the pogrom of November 1938 and rebuilt with the help of the state of Wuerttemberg-Baden, was dedicated. In Bremen the rebuilt burial chapel and a memorial for the 915 Bremen Jews murdered by the Nazis were dedicated on May 18, 1952. In Aachen a memorial was unveiled in the Jewish cemetery on May 5, 1952.

Munich opened a new home for the aged on June 1, 1952, while Frankfurt enlarged an existing one. A school for 165 Jewish children was opened in Foehrenwald camp in June. There are no other Jewish schools in Germany.

In a number of communities, Women's International Zionist Organization (WIZO) groups organized cultural and social activities.

In the Soviet zone, the Erfurt synagogue was rebuilt and dedicated on August 31, 1952.

Cultural Life

Several West German publishers reprinted books by Jewish authors who had emigrated or died, like Stefan Zweig, Franz Werfel, Franz Kafka, Else Lasker-Schueler, and Lion Feuchtwanger. Arnold Zweig's works were reprinted in the Eastern zone, where he now lives.

Otto Schrag's novel Die Antwort ("The Answer") deals with the problem of relations between a returned Jew and the Germans. It tells the story of a Jew who emigrated, bombed his home town as an American pilot, and returned after the war, showing his own reactions and those of his former compatriots.

Notable among translations were those of Chaim Weizmann's autobiography and John Hersey's story of the Warsaw Ghetto, The Wall.

A Jewish boy from Poland is one of the main characters in Hans Werner Richter's novel Sie fielen aus Gottes Hand ("They Fell from God's Hand"), describing the wartime fate of twelve people who met in a Displaced Persons' camp after the war. The book was awarded the René Schickele Prize for the best novel by a German postwar author.

Martin Buber received the Goethe Prize of the University of Hamburg. He accepted, stating that he did so because thousands of people in Germany had risked their lives under the Nazis to help Jews.

The former editor of the Frankfurter Zeitung, Bernhard Guttmann, was awarded the 1952 Goethe Prize of the City of Frankfurt. He also received the Federal Republic's Cross of Merit from President Theodor Heuss.

The Berlin publishing house of Ullstein, which had previously been re-
turned to its owners, resumed publication on September 26, 1952, of the Berliner Morgenpost, the German paper with the largest circulation in pre-Hitler days.

Yehudi Menuhin visited Germany and gave a concert to Berlin students. Oscar Strauss, who had emigrated from Austria to the United States, attended the world premiere of his operetta Bozena at Munich. Emigrated German Jewish actors and producers who returned to Germany, either permanently or for guest performances, included Fritz Kortner, Grete Mosheim, Ernst Deutsch, Lucie Mannheim, and Eric Pommer.

Relations with Israel

Israel maintained a consulate in Munich accredited to the Allied High Commission. On the signing of the Bonn Conventions, however, it was officially announced that the consulate would be closed down once the High Commission was dissolved and Germany became sovereign. An Allied assurance was given to the consul, Eliezer Livneh, that the interests of Israel nationals in Western Germany would continue to be safeguarded after the end of the Occupation Statute.

AUSTRIA

The year under review (July 1951 through June 1952) has brought no change in the international status of Austria. Although the Staatsvertrag (State Treaty) which is to restore Austrian sovereignty is complete except for a few minor clauses, the Soviet Government has rejected all Western initiatives either to resume negotiations on the draft treaty or to replace it by a short Raumungsprotokoll (Protocol of Evacuation) ending the occupation of Austria.

Following the election as Federal President on the second ballot of General Theodor Koerner, the Socialist mayor of Vienna, the government coalition of the Catholic Oesterreichische Volkspartei (Austrian People's Party) and the Socialist Party was renewed again with Leopold Figl (People's Party) as Chancellor and Adolf Schaerf (Socialist) as Vice Chancellor.

American aid continued to cover Austria's foreign trade deficit and the schilling counterpart funds financed a major part of the investment program. By the end of 1951, however, the inflationary wage-price spiral was recognized as a serious obstacle to Austria's ability to compete on the world market. Efforts made during the first half of 1952 to balance the budget and restrict credit have succeeded in stabilizing but not yet in lowering prices, and continued selling difficulties abroad have combined with credit restrictions to increase unemployment. By mid-1952, 6 per cent of the labor force was unemployed.
Neo-Nazis and Ex-Nazis

Active neo-Nazism continued to be a negligible force in Austria, chiefly because it is identified with Germany. The only openly neo-Nazi group, the Nationale Liga (National League) is believed to be linked with "General" Otto Ernst Remer's Socialist Reich Party in Germany and is accused of cooperating locally with the Communists, but so far few Austrians have heard of it.

Much stronger pressure is exercised on public opinion by the resentment of the large numbers of ex-Nazis against the "discrimination" to which they have been subject since 1945, and by their efforts to justify their past. Owing to the role played by ex-Nazis in the Austrian booksellers' organization and in some of the leading publishing houses outside Vienna, these efforts at self-justification color a large part of Austrian postwar literature, while ex-Nazi writers who have genuinely changed their views complain about difficulty in getting published.

The chief political expression of this ex-Nazi milieu is the Verband der Unabhaengigen (Association of Independent Voters) represented in parliament by 16 members out of 165. It obtained 12 per cent of the vote in the 1949 parliamentary elections. The continued occupation of Austria and the uneasy coalition of Catholics and Socialists, held together chiefly by external pressure, provide the Independents as the chief opposition party with easy targets for their criticism. This partly accounts for their increased poll of nearly 16 per cent in the May 1951 presidential election. However, beyond championing the rights of ex-Nazis—many of their spokesmen come from the Verband der Ruckstellungsbetroffenen (Association of People Affected by Restitution)—they have failed to develop any dynamic policy. It is characteristic that their voters split in the second presidential ballot in about equal parts between the Catholic and Socialist candidates and abstention. In Parliament, they usually try to be more anti-Socialist than the Catholics, while their groups among the unskilled steelworkers of Western Austria compete with the Communists in "radicalism."

The League's organ, Neue Front, achieved notoriety by attacking Chancellor Leopold Figl and Franz Jonas, the mayor of Vienna, during their visits to the United States in June 1952. Neue Front asserted that Figl and Jonas had not contacted "Christian emigrants as opposed to those who went when Hitler came to power" and had associated only with "Israelite emigres" in the United States.

Chancellor Figl's Austrian People's Party in its magazine Osterreichische Monatschrift retaliated by warning the League that its "near neo-Nazi methods" were interfering with the campaign to gain the restoration of full rights for former Nazi prisoners of war who had been repatriated (Jewish Telegraphic Agency, June 26, 1952).

More openly anti-democratic is the small Aktion zur Politischen Erneuerung (Movement for Political Renewal) led by Count Ernst Strachwitz, originally formed by a breakaway from the Catholic youth organization. Its influence has not yet been put to any electoral test.
Anti-Semitism

There were no violent anti-Semitic incidents during the past year comparable to the beating up in April 1951 of Jews who demonstrated against the showing of the Veit Harlan film The Immortal Beloved in Salzburg. Popular anti-Semitism, however, is in Austria widespread far beyond ex-Nazi circles and is much older than Nazism. Besides minor symptoms, such as the reintroduction of rules excluding Jews from membership in singing clubs in the Tyrol, it is visible above all in the "boulevard press"—particularly the Wiener Montag and occasionally also in the press of the People's Party.

An outstanding example is the article Nun Ist Es Genug ("Now It Is Enough") published in the (Catholic) Vienna Kleine Volksblatt on June 22, 1952. Defending the Catholic general manager of the nationalized Creditanstalt bank against Socialist charges of corruption, the paper said these charges had been concocted by "emigres" with "hatred known only among one particular group of people." Real banking corruption had been practiced in the old Austria when "there was no Christian general manager in the Creditanstalt and the percentage of non-Christians was extremely high also among other executives," because "the Christians for decades held only subordinate offices in the banks." Dismissed after the 1931 crisis, the article continued, the former directors had emigrated to the United States with their gold; some of them had since come back "in American uniforms" and were now instigating the attacks on their Christian successors. They were "people who were never Austrians, never Americans, only profiteers, agitators and instigators."

In reply to a formal protest by the Jewish community, both the chairman of the People's Party, Minister Julius Raab (a former Heimwehr leader), and Federal Chancellor Leopold Figl, denied the anti-Semitic intentions of the article, but admitted that some "ill-chosen expressions" might be "liable to misunderstanding"; Chancellor Figl promised to prevent a repetition.

Rehabilitation of Nazis

During 1952, a number of bills relieving various groups of Nazis from the effect of the Denazification Law were passed by the Austrian parliament. As the Denazification Law forms part of the Austrian Constitution, all these measures require a two-thirds majority in Parliament and unanimous approval by the Allied Council. The requisite majority—in all cases but one even unanimity—has always been obtained. The democratic parties as well as the Communists, intent on competing with the Independents for the ex-Nazi vote, proclaim the need for "internal appeasement."

The first Nazi amnesty bill, passed in May 1952, exempted all prisoners of war who returned home after April 30, 1949, from all consequences of the Denazification Law, including even registration, irrespective of what rank they had held in the Nazi organization. It was vetoed by United States High Commissioner Walter J. Donnelly on the two grounds that it would create
legal insecurity by annulling property transfers already carried out, and that
he was “disappointed to find legislation for the relief of ex-Nazis preceding
that for their victims.” In a public reply to a protest against “Allied inter-
ference in internal Austrian affairs” which the Austrian parliament had
adopted unanimously, Donnelly added: “While I do not question the hu-
manitarian impulses of the proponents of this law, I cannot help but wonder
why they continue to postpone enactments that would grant proper restitu-
tion to those whom the Nazis persecuted here. In simple justice we must
continue to urge Austria to comply with these obligations.”

The next three Nazi amnesty laws were presented to Parliament on July
18, 1952. The first grants complete amnesty to Nazis up to the rank of “cell
leader” in the party, corporal in the SS, captain in the SA, local group leader
in other formations, and to holders of party decorations up to the Golden
Badge, provided they had not been sentenced for specific crimes or postwar
underground activity. Fines imposed on them will not be returned, but con-
fiscated properties will. The second measure extends the return of confis-
cated property to higher party officials up to the rank of local group leader
and to SA and SS leaders up to the rank of major. (This was the only bill
against which the Communists voted.) Its cost to the state is estimated at
36,000,000 schillings (approximately $1,400,000). The third measure restores
the status, salary, and pensions of state officials classified as “minor offenders”
under the Denazification Law and amnestied in 1948—i.e., persons below the
Nazi ranks mentioned in the first law. Hitherto they have been set back in
promotion and seniority claims by three years; they are now to move up to a
position corresponding to their full length of service, but without any claim
to back pay, at an annual cost to the state of 42,000,000 schillings (approxi-
mately $1,650,000).

The Austrian parties have appealed in advance to the Allies not to disturb
this new attempt to “heal the wounds left by the German occupation.” The
organization of the Austrian Jews and the American Jewish Committee and
the World Jewish Congress, whose representatives had come to Vienna on
the eve of the passing of the laws in a vain attempt to prevent their enact-
ment, registered a strong protest on July 20, 1952. They have pointed out
that the laws were passed together with a retrogressive revision of restitution
legislation and that the new provisions for the victims of Nazism are still
inadequate.

**COMPENSATION TO NAZI VICTIMS**

The political and racial victims of Nazism in Austria have so far been en-
titled to public assistance in case of need, to some advantages in taxation,
and to preferential allocation of dwellings, but have had no legal claim to
compensation. An amendment to the *Opferfuersorgegesetz* (Victims Welfare
Law) adopted by Parliament on July 18, 1952, grants compensation for im-
prisonment to victims resident in Austria and holding Austrian citizenship,
or if they have died, to their near relatives. Compensation is to be at a uni-
form rate of 431 schillings ($17) for every month of imprisonment suffered,
at an estimated cost to the state of 200,000,000 schillings ($8,000,000). It is to
be paid in installments over a period of four years.
Under another law adopted the same day, former Austrian officials victimized between 1933 and 1945 on political or racial grounds and rehabilitated after 1945 will now receive partial compensation for their loss of salary or pension, in proportion to the period of victimization. Officials who left the state service after 1945 or who are no longer Austrian citizens do not lose their claim, but the money is not transferable abroad.

Restitution

By the middle of 1952, 85 per cent of all restitution claims filed had been decided by the tribunals of first instance. About half of them had been settled by agreement between the parties and about two-thirds of the remainder in favor of the claimants.

The long-promised law on restitution of apartments and business premises to Nazi victims had not been passed as of July 1952. In Vienna, some four or five hundred Jews who formerly had apartments still have to live in shelters for the homeless, while other Nazi victims who were billeted in confiscated Nazi apartments may now lose them as Nazi properties are restored.

The only new restitution law passed with the latest batch of legislation, the Wiederwerbgesetz (Restitution Law) of July 17, 1951, is concerned with restitution in reverse, permitting reacquisition of already restituted property at a purchase price corresponding to present value in two groups of cases: first, where the former holder is a farmer who received Jewish-owned land in compensation for the expropriation of his own by other Nazi measures, and where the Jewish owner has not returned to farm the land himself—a strictly limited group of genuine hardship cases; second, where the former holder can show that the Jewish property was indebted beyond its value before the Nazis annexed Austria, so that the sale would have had to take place in any case. This was already admitted as an objection to restitution under existing legislation; the new law, by giving the “Aryanizers” the chance to start new legal action for reacquisition on the same grounds, creates a high degree of legal insecurity.

Two more measures are pending to deal with hitherto unclaimed property. The one provides for the creation of a trustee administration of four government officials to take over the “religious” funds, confiscated by the Nazis at the dissolution of the organizations concerned. Allegedly, these funds are still regarded as “German property” pending an international settlement, and the trustees are to administer them in the meantime.

The second concerns Jewish property whose owners can either not be traced or have died without leaving any direct heirs (under the restitution laws, in contrast to general Austrian law, the right of inheritance is limited to near relatives). The claiming of all such property is to be left to a “collecting fund” administered by a board of seven trustees, whom the government will appoint after hearing the organizations of the victims. Distribution of the fund is left open for later decision. This contrasts with the practice in Germany, where heirless Jewish property is claimed, administered, and distributed by the organizations of the victims themselves. It has aroused among
the Jewish organizations the fear that eventually part of this inheritance of murdered Jews, estimated at 400,000,000 schillings ($16,000,000), might be used to finance some of the compensation for "hardships" now granted to amnestied Nazis.

The administration of restitution matters rests with the Ministry of Finance. The present minister, Reinhard Kamitz, was an active Nazi before Hitler's annexation of Austria.

**Jewish Population**

At the end of June 1952 there were about 14,000 Jews living in Austria, compared to 180,000 before Hitler. Of these, 11,560 were registered as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>9,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innsbruck</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in camps</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,560</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, an estimated two or three thousand Jews live in Austria, but are not registered with the communities.

**Displaced Persons**

By the middle of 1952 there were three displaced persons (DP) camps left: in Vienna, Salzburg, and Linz. Here live chiefly "hard-core" cases who have not been able to emigrate for medical reasons or for lack of manual skill. Since the liquidation of the International Refugee Organization (IRO) at the beginning of 1952, the camps have been administered by the Austrian authorities, with the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) supplementing public assistance with the contribution of $125 per capita per year. Since the expiration of the Displaced Persons Act on December 31, 1951, emigration has decreased to a mere trickle. The inflow from the Eastern countries has also been very much reduced as the result of stricter frontier control. In 1951 only 394 Jews arrived from East European countries; in the first six months of 1952 the monthly rate has averaged less than 20.

**Vienna Community**

The vast majority of the Austrian Jews live in Vienna. Of the registered members of the Vienna community, 7,851 are Austrian citizens and 1,696 are
foreigners. Between July 1951 and June 1952 the Vienna community decreased by almost a thousand persons. It lost 1,934 through emigration and death and gained 984 new members through repatriation, the influx of refugees, and births.

At the end of June 1952, of the registered members of the Vienna community, 27 per cent was over 60 years of age, 36 per cent between 45 and 60, 28 per cent between 17 and 44, and 9 per cent below 17. This abnormal age composition, together with the slow progress of compensation, has resulted in heavy welfare expenses for the Vienna community. The hope to cover the resulting deficit by means of the restitution of heirless Jewish property has become more remote since the presentation of the government bill indefinitely postponing the decision on the use of such property (see above).

**Social Service**

The chief items of expenditure are maintenance of the hospital, the home for the aged, and temporary shelters for repatriates; scholarships for Jewish students; and cash relief. At the end of June 1952 there were 169 persons living in the community's home for the aged and 151 in its shelter for repatriates. The hospital, opened in January 1952, has 120 beds.

One-third of the welfare budget of the Vienna community is contributed by the JDC. The JDC also grants direct cash relief to foreign Jews, supports a soup kitchen for former concentration camp inmates, and finances medical care and various cultural activities.

The ORT runs two training schools. One is in Vienna, and in April 1952 had 259 students; the other, in Hallein, had thirty-eight students at that date.

**Religious and Cultural Activities**

Vienna has one synagogue, rebuilt in 1946, and one rabbi, Akiba Eisenberg. There are no Jewish schools except in the Displaced Persons camp, but 232 children were registered for Jewish religious instruction for the first term of 1952.

In the summer term of 1952 there were 180 Jewish students at the University of Vienna. Over half of them received scholarships from the JDC or the Jewish community. There were another 30 Jewish students in Innsbruck and 20 in Graz. The number of Jewish students is constantly decreasing since there are very few new enrollments.

Two Jewish weeklies were published in Vienna in the summer of 1952: *Die Stimme* ("The Voice"), the official Zionist organ, and *Neue Welt und Judenstaat* ("New World and the Jewish State"), an independent publication. The Socialist Jewish paper *Demokratischer Bund* ("Democratic League") ceased publication at the beginning of 1952 but planned to reappear in the fall of that year.

On May 18, 1952, a tablet on the site of the Mauthausen concentration camp was dedicated to the memory of the Jews killed there.
Community Organization

On January 20, 1952, the Vienna Jewish community elected a new representation (Kultusvorstand). Sixty-two per cent of the members of the community went to the poll. The 5,250 votes were cast as follows:

**TABLE 2**

**RESULTS OF ELECTIONS TO KULTUSVORSTAND, VIENNA, JANUARY 1952**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zionist Confederation</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Bloc</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialists</td>
<td>2,501</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Unity&quot; (Communists)</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Zionist Confederation and Religious Bloc had an agreement on the use of remainder votes.

The Socialist Emil Maurer was elected president. The council is run by a coalition of Socialists and Zionists.

Relations with Israel

Israel maintains a consular office in Vienna but has no diplomatic representation. Trade relations between the two countries have been facilitated by a credit granted to Israel by Austrian banks for the purchase of prefabricated houses from Austria.