EPILOGUE

The struggle is over! Murder has an end!
I am now free! I raise my hands,
My heart to the eternal heavens,
Full of thanks that in the long anxious years,
Despite all the suffering that befell me,
I did not lose my faith in the future.

—Excerpt from “Nach dem Kampf,” composed by Martin Wasservogel in May 1945

The months following the end of the Second World War represented a new beginning for Berlin’s formerly submerged Jews, now perhaps better referred to as the “surfaced” (Aufgetauchte). That beginning, however, was fraught with difficulties, and the concept of liberation should not be viewed as an overnight, joyful process but rather, as Dan Stone reminds us, “something that happened over time—sometimes a very long time.” The National Socialist nightmare was over, but the countless emotional and physical consequences of submerged life and the war outlasted the Third Reich. Berlin was in ruins; it was, as Martin Riesenburger noted in his memoirs, a “world cemetery.” The initial months of freedom witnessed a sickly and largely penniless group of survivors struggling with the impact of years of physical deprivation as they sought out necessary food, clothing, and shelter through official recognition as “Victims of Fascism.” This was also a deeply emotional time, as the end of the war forced survivors to cope with the reality of what had befallen their loved ones. Still, some of the former divers seized on their newfound freedom with energy.
and great resilience. They went to work building a new, more tolerant Germany before the realities of the Cold War and a divided Germany set in. Yet many others left what had become a foreign land to start new lives abroad. Whether they stayed or left, however, they carried with them memories of their years submerged and often quite nuanced views on the nation that had been both the cause of their suffering and the site of their survival. The diverse experiences and reactions of those who had submerged did not simply reflect their varied identities and preferences; the individuality at the core of those wartime experiences shaped the varied postwar lives of the former U-boats.

Nearly three years of repeated diving and dashing around the city in an attempt to evade arrest and deportation had taken a tremendous physical toll on the U-boats. Years of malnourishment and unbearable stress had weakened many of the survivors. Helene Helft, who had fled a transport with her husband and made her way back to Berlin, lost over one-third of her body mass while living submerged and weighed only eighty pounds at the war’s end. In addition, she suffered from chronic bronchitis, spots on her lungs, and inflammation of the rib cage; she was immediately sent to a hospital after the cessation of hostilities. Nearly every survivor mentions the poor state of his or her health, from severe weight loss, frostbite, or rheumatism to heart and nerve problems. In a few cases, the individual never recovered and died soon after emerging. Sixty-three-year-old Franz Rogasinski had spent most of his underground years moving from acquaintance to acquaintance, in the process developing a severe case of heart disease. He died on 20 March 1946.

The survivors were also at a severe material disadvantage that was compounded by the fact that their poor health prevented many from earning a living. Most had lost their property, homes, businesses, and valuables to the Nazis. What few possessions people had brought with them when they submerged had been sold to procure food, shelter, and false papers or had been destroyed in one of the city’s numerous air raids. Obtaining basic necessities was the immediate and essential priority. Although a number of survivors were able to stay with their helpers after the war, many were not so fortunate. Applications to the OdF waste no time in illustrating their dire conditions: “I am requesting warm winter clothing, warm underclothes and shoes, and a coat, and an apartment, since I am very sick and cannot live in a completely destroyed garden cottage in the winter.” Although overall restitution was important, and some survivors did make a point of listing all of their lost property and goods, immediate survival in the form of food, shelter, and medical attention took precedence in most cases.
Despite these physical hardships, the emotional consequences of the war were often especially painful for the survivors. The majority of the city’s surviving dashers had been spared the horrors of the camps and ghettos, but most of their families had perished in the east. Although the murders in the camps were suspected by many former illegals by 1943 at the latest, many registered the full reality only after the war, when family members did not return. Some, like thirty-nine-year-old Lilli Steup, had resolved to maintain a “home” in Berlin for her deported father, sister, niece, and brother-in-law and had dived in the hope of seeing them again. She wrote to the OdF:

I had always believed at least one of them would return . . . I led a hounded, terrible life, only in the hope of seeing one of my loved ones again. I didn’t want to believe that humans were so barbarous and killed them. Unfortunately, I had to learn to see things differently.7

Indeed, the recognition that one’s family was dead, according to Frieda Seelig, who had lost forty-one family members during the war, was “the most ghastly” (das schrecklichste) experience.8

Almost all the former U-boats comment on having lost family in the camps, and the experience of liberation was colored by those losses.9 As one survivor remarked in autumn 1945, “But I cannot feel real joy, because the greater part of my relatives remained behind in the concentration camps, among them my mother.”10 In other cases, survivors waited in vain for the return of loved ones who had been caught while living submerged.11 Nor was the grief confined to family members. Lilli Steup, recognizing the likelihood that her family had perished, still held out hope that the man who hid her until his forced conscription in 1944 might be alive in a prisoner-of-war camp. She concluded her testimony on the following, grief-stricken note: “If this one person, whom I await, does not return, then my life has no purpose. No one awaits me, no joy.”12 Indeed, Steup’s grief, bordering on despair, was a common emotion in the years following the end of the war. Annelies B., who had survived with her twin sister Marianne, gave an interview in 1991 about her experiences. When asked if she was happy that she had survived, she responded, “I could not give you an unqualified yes.”13

Not all survivors focus solely on loss and grief, however, and the months following liberation witnessed a succession of weddings of former U-boats. Some of these weddings were more akin to reunions between loved ones. Isaak Grünberg, who had divorced his non-Jewish wife in order to protect their son and family business (see chapter 3), moved back in with his beloved on 2 May.14 Max Gamson had divorced his
non-Jewish wife in 1932, although they continued to live together until 1939 and had a son together. During his years submerged in the city, Gamson’s ex-wife was one of the individuals who helped him survive by providing food and clothing. They remarried in 1946 and remained together in Berlin until Gamson’s death in 1962. Some of the earliest marriages in 1945 and 1946 were between individuals who had found each other during the tribulations of the Third Reich and the years submerged. Ruth Arndt had met Bruno G. at a party in the early 1940s. They reconnected almost two years later, while Bruno was living submerged with his friend Erich, Ruth’s brother, and they married on 19 September 1945. In June of that year, Erich had also married his fiancée, a fellow U-boat named Ellen Lewinsky. A joint Jewish wedding was held for the two couples on 7 October 1945, one of the first in the city. After years submerged, the city’s surfaced Jews finally were able to declare publicly the unions that they had developed under the most dangerous and difficult of conditions.

The marriages were not just between formerly submerged Jews. A great number took place between the city’s former divers and dashers and the men and women who had helped them to survive. Kurt Michaelis, who had blamed himself for the death of his future brother-in-law (see chapter 4), married his helper and fiancée Else Lönser shortly after the war. Michaelis was one of dozens. Similarly, the Protestant Gertrud Wieczorek developed a friendship with her future husband Ludwig Katz in 1936. When Ludwig submerged in November 1942, he stayed with Gertrud. They entered into an unofficial “marriage of comrades,” as he termed it, and Gertrud provided Ludwig with food and other aid throughout his years on the run. The two married on 27 June 1945. Not all the relationships forged during the war were happy, though, and the end of the war did not lead to an automatic severing of ties. Lotte F. and her daughter spent the war sheltering with a non-Jew, Willi Bruska. After the war, Lotte decided to remain with Willi, and out of thanks allowed him to move in with her and her daughter in the apartment she had received as an OdF. On 14 June 1954, Lotte’s cousin Alice N., a fellow former U-boat, telephoned the East Berlin police. Bruska had stabbed Lotte to death, slashing her wrists and her carotid artery. Lotte’s fifteen-year-old daughter, with whom he had also been engaging in a sexual relationship, escaped after being beaten. Bruska turned himself in to the East German police the following day. In her statement to the police, Alice claimed that her cousin had remained with Bruska after the war because she felt obligated to him for the help he provided her in sheltering her and her daughter. What Lotte experienced while sheltering during her years submerged with Bruska is unknown, but their relationship formed during the war kept her tied to Bruska until her tragic death.
Even in cases of true love and mutual respect, happiness was cut short. The wartime struggles that had brought the U-boats together with their helpers continued to intervene after the war. Like the submerged, who suffered gravely through malnutrition and other physical and emotional challenges to their health, the non-Jewish men and women who had helped them survive often sacrificed their own health in providing for their illegal loved ones. Non-Jewish lovers of Jews sometimes had to submerge with their partners when the Gestapo caught wind of their relationship. Even if submerging had not been necessary, great hardship often followed these non-Jewish partners. Hans G. had submerged at the age of twenty in February 1943. He had dashed around the city almost daily, until he met his future wife Ursula. In May 1944, Ursula gave birth to a child under false pretenses (the origins and name of the child were altered). The couple finally married on 10 July 1945. Less than two months later, however, Hans brought Ursula to a hospital. According to Hans, the "stresses and strains" of the preceding years had been too great for her. Ursula died on 8 March 1946, and Hans emigrated. The bonds like those that had developed between Hans and Ursula continued, however, to find expression in dozens of other marriages during this time, a testament to the stubborn ability of love and fidelity to develop under the least conducive of circumstances.

Other survivors expressed their newly regained freedom not through marriage but by throwing themselves with almost startling energy into rebuilding their careers, thus contributing to the reshaping of what would become a divided Germany by the fall of 1949, a division that would last throughout the Cold War. The ophthalmologist Erich Weinberg, who had resisted the Nazis by injecting members of the Wehrmacht and Volkssturm with fever injections (see chapter 3), had already founded his own hospital by November 1945 in the Berlin suburb of Falkensee, and he also worked as head of the local health office. He later had a practice in the neighborhood of Spandau after fleeing to West Berlin in 1951.

Forty-five-year-old Alfons Wormann, who lived illegally for almost four years, found a job less than two weeks after the war's end in the Berlin Police Presidium. Thirty-eight-year-old Grete Bing, who had survived in hiding with her mother Lotte, found work as a masseuse and exercise therapist, a career for which she had trained in 1937. Similar to the importance of working while in hiding, work functioned in the immediate postwar era not only as a way of supporting oneself but also as a way of reasserting one’s identity and also one’s newly regained freedom.

Some of the former divers also used their employment as a means to seek justice for the victims, to punish the perpetrators, and to contribute to the rebuilding of a more accepting German nation. Twenty-three-year-
old Marie J. had come from an avowedly communist background. Her father had been a member of the Communist Party of Germany (KPD) and her mother a member of the auxiliary Rote Hilfe. For Marie J., a well-educated young woman who had worked in the resistance during the Nazi period and had decided to continue her studies after liberation, her path after the war was clear: “Now I would like to continue with my studies and as an educated academic strive to become a useful member for the reconstruction [of Germany], in our sense of the word.”

A number of survivors found work in the interallied government or with the local German authorities, employment that provided opportunities to eradicate Nazism in Germany. Forty-five-year-old Max Rautenberg, before 1933 a member of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), went to work with another unnamed Jew immediately after the war tracking down Nazis in the suburb of Bestensee. Although still quite sick from years on the run, Rautenberg had a mission. These now “submerged” and “camouflaged” Nazis, referring to them in a parlance he understood all too well, were everywhere trying to pass themselves off as civilians, and Rautenberg and his partner would not stand for it: “After all of the sorrows we underwent there may never and will nevermore be Nazism and militarism in Germany. To that end we have deployed our entire energies.” Rautenberg had some success in tracking down these Nazis, including members of the former SS. The Soviet command recognized Rautenberg’s work and provided him with the identification to prove it.

In a similar fashion, the survivor Georg Schiesser found work with the newly reconstituted Berlin criminal police less than three weeks after the war ended: “On May 27, 1945, I entered the service of the Berlin criminal police in order to assist in the eradication of fascism and the reestablishment of well-ordered conditions in my Father City.”

Nor was hunting down Nazis the only way that some of the former divers contributed to the reestablishment of law, order, and a new Germany. Werner Goldmann, a druggist by training who had survived with his wife and daughter in and around Berlin, served as mayor of the town of Brieselang outside of Berlin from the end of April 1945 until February 1946; the town’s website still remembers his service. Fifty-six-year-old Kurt Messow, winner of the Iron Cross First and Second Class during the First World War, who had married his helper after the war, was appointed an attorney for the city on 15 July 1945. By 15 October of that year, Messow had risen to the position of senior district attorney. Despite all that they had experienced in the preceding twelve years, and especially during the final three, the former submerged made their presence felt in ways that far outweighed their numbers.
Some of these individuals went on to have prominent and respected careers in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) after the official division of Germany in 1949, in which their actions reflected the ways their wartime experiences shaped their postwar visions for the nation. Charlotte Kaufmann, born in Hungary, had been an active member in the KPD and Rote Hilfe and a dedicated antifascist before the Nazi seizure of power. She submerged in the beginning of 1943 and survived the war by dashing between the cities of Jena and Berlin. Immediately after the war, Charlotte took a job as a clerical assistant with the women’s police and remained in what became the GDR. In 1958, she married the decorated antifascist Willi Kaufmann. Over the next two decades, Charlotte had an active career as a member of East Germany's Socialist Unity Party (SED). She served as a member of an arbitration commission for which she won two accolades in the 1970s. In addition, she won the Honor Medallion of the Committee of Antifascist Resistance Fighters, the Medal for Membership in the Party of the Working Class, and the Medallion for Exemplary Border Service, among many others.  

Günter Fabian, who was twenty-five years old at the end of the war, went on to lead a similarly illustrious career in the German Democratic Republic. He had submerged on the first day of the Large Factory Operation. His father had been arrested already in 1941, and the Nazis deported his mother the following year to Litzmannstadt. Even before submerging, Fabian had connections to resistance circles in the city. He was also aided during his years submerged by his future wife Ingeborg and her family; Günter and Ingeborg had become engaged in 1944. After the war, Fabian participated in the refounding of the SPD in the Berlin district of Weissensee. After his expulsion from the party in 1948, Fabian was asked to form a social-democratic faction within the “democratic” (that is, East German) block in Weissensee and serve as the faction’s head. Due to Fabian's postwar work in agriculture, he was asked to become a member of the Democratic Farmers Party of Germany in the GDR in 1951. Fabian also participated as a member of the Secretariat of the Berlin Committee of the National Front. In 1954, Fabian became a councilman (Stadtverordneter) in the Berlin city council. Among his many honors for service to the German Democratic Republic, Fabian received the Merit Medallion of the GDR, the Three Times Medallion for Outstanding Achievement, and the Medal of the Democratic Farmers Party of Germany.  

In the Federal Republic of Germany, Siegmund Weltlinger, a self-identified “German–Jewish Citizen,” saw the fulfillment of his personal and public evolution. Born on 29 March 1886, Weltlinger grew up in
a worldly, cultured home frequented by artists and intellectuals, Jewish and Christian alike. A well-educated and successful banker before 1933, he began his political life as a monarchist. After the abdication of the Kaiser, he dabbled in leftist and rightist politics before finally settling on the “democratic middle.” Weltlinger and his wife Margarete submerged on 26 February 1943 to avoid being caught up in the Large Factory Operation (see chapter 1). The ensuing two and a half years were difficult for the Weltlingers. Even before the existence of the extermination camps became known to him in April 1945, Weltlinger’s “faith in Germany” had been shaken through the immense difficulties he faced, first as a consequence of the two months he had spent in the Sachsenhausen concentration camp in the aftermath of Kristallnacht and then as a diver. Yet Weltlinger remained in West Germany for the rest of his life. Along with his upbringing, Weltlinger credits his wartime experiences with shaping his postwar relationship with his nation, claiming that his attitude would have been very different if it hadn’t been for the encounters with many opponents of the National Socialist domination from the concentration camps; moreover, the behavior of large portions of the population with respect to the wearers of the star; and, above all, the courage and willingness to make sacrifices on the part of many non-Jewish fellow citizens who took it upon themselves, often under threat to life to themselves and their family, to hide the persecuted.

Thus, when Weltlinger stepped forward to protect the non-Jewish residents accused of concealing weapons during the Soviet advance (see chapter 4), he was acting in a way that reflected a lifetime of experiences, including those while living submerged. The divisions of religion and class that Weltlinger had seen tear apart his country over the decades motivated him to work for a solution, to “build a bridge between the different peoples of Germany and to confront the understandable talk in the world that we were ‘a people of murderers.’” Weltlinger’s first opportunities to build the bridge he envisioned came in 1945 and 1946, when he accepted an appointment to the advisory committee for church affairs. In September 1945, Weltlinger became head of the committee’s division for Jewish affairs. Thus began an active and illustrious career for Weltlinger in West Berlin as peacemaker and public figure working to counter the mistrust and animosity that had developed between Jews and Christians. Among his many activities until his death in 1974, Weltlinger was a founding member of the Work Community of Churches and Religious Societies of Greater Berlin in 1947 and the Society for Christian and Jewish Cooperation in 1949, serving as chairman of the latter until 1970. In addition, Weltlinger joined the newly cre-
ated Christian Democratic Union (CDU) political party in 1946. He was elected to the Berlin House of Delegates (Abgeordnetenhaus) in 1958, serving there for almost a decade, and was awarded the Federal Republic’s Great Cross of Merit in 1966. To be sure, Weltlinger’s dedication to rebuilding a better and more tolerant West Germany was something of a rarity in the divided postwar nation. So, too, was his wildly optimistic belief in an interview given in 1951 that “Germany will become the greatest immigration center of Jews throughout the world. It is the heart of Europe, the natural exchange center between East and West.” Yet presumably this attitude also grew out of the same mindset that enabled him to declare toward the end of his life: “[I] have never regretted being a German Jew!”

Despite the initial contributions made by many of the former U-boats to the immediate postwar Berlin landscape and the successes they had in reestablishing their livelihoods, many of them, most likely a majority, ended up leaving Germany over the following decade. As of 1951, of the approximately 6,660 members of the Jewish community still residing in the city, more than 6,000 had applications to emigrate on file. Many who did stay were older and lacked friends or family abroad who could support them. The examples of Weltlinger, Fabian, and others, although powerful testaments to the potential for a vibrant postwar Jewish life in the two Germanys, were the minority; many of those who remained in East and West Germany led quiet lives. Some of those who initially remarked in their OdF applications that they wanted to stay and work to rebuild Germany eventually emigrated.

Indeed, many of the survivors had no interest in rebuilding Germany. Whereas the historical record asks us at that point in time to begin differentiating between what would become East and West Germany in 1949, survivors both at the time and in testimony given decades later generally do not. They speak of Germany and the Germans. Whatever the geopolitical consequences of the division of Germany and the respective paths that both the FRG and the GDR took to come to grips (or not) with the Nazi past, survivor attempts to wrestle with the disaster that befell them between 1933 and 1945 meant that their experiences with the gentile population in the late 1940s and early 1950s were still with “the Germans,” not West Germans or East Germans. Ultimately, the experiences of twelve years of Nazism had proved too traumatic and painful for them to ever consider staying in either West or East Germany; as the Cold War began to gather pace, even before the official division of Germany, they departed in the late 1940s to the United States of America, Great Britain, Australia, and the newly created nation of Israel, among others. Bruno G., his wife Ruth, and her family left after a few years for the
United States. In an interview given several decades after the war, Bruno remarked on his intense “dislike” of Germany; he had no desire to stay in the nation that had caused so much destruction and misery. Initial hopes among Jews that German criminals would pay for their transgressions against humanity and that the German people would openly and sincerely acknowledge their crimes proved baseless. The attitude of many Jews in occupied Germany can be summarized in the words of a rabbi, pronounced in the early 1950s at a sermon in Berlin: “A couple of years ago a Society for Christian and Jewish Cooperation was constituted. Between Jews and Christians in Germany there will never be a conversation; it will always remain a monologue.”

Yet despite such sentiments, the diverse, individual experiences of submerged life afforded many of the former U-boats distinct perspectives on an event normally constructed in a strict binary of German (read: Nazi) versus Jew. However much the survivors loathed the Nazis, however much they were angry at the Germans whom they once had considered friends, neighbors, and countrymen, many, if not most, of the former divers carried with them a remarkably subtle and nuanced approach to the German people. These men, women, and children had survived the Holocaust on civilian German soil. They certainly had many traumatic, indeed brutal, encounters with the Nazis and their supporters during the Third Reich’s twelve-year existence. However, they also could not have survived had it not been for the selflessness and loyalty of the non-Jewish Germans who helped them survive. Thus, in testimonies given decades later, former U-boats often attempt to differentiate between Germans and Nazis. This distinction played a vital role in the construction of their postwar identities, identities that often set them apart from camp survivors who generally viewed the Germans solely as perpetrators. Even Bruno G., angry as he was at the German people, recognized the need to distinguish. He remarked in his interview that a tendency exists to put all Germans in the same “box,” and he went to great lengths in the same interview to stress the help he received from non-Jews.

As Ruth W., another former U-boat, poignantly remarked, the relationship between her and her former nation was “a difficult conflict to resolve.” The difficulty of that conflict was a direct result of the individuality of surviving and living submerged in Berlin:

Maybe because we were not in the concentration camp, where you saw these bestialities really in front of you, that it was different with us. We had it hanging over us—maybe it happens to us—but we were not close to it, and that also made our outlook maybe a little different that we don’t . . . that the worst thing happened to our families and so, but on the other
hand there were people who were Germans, were decent, not just decent, terrific people, and so we cannot say as many do the hundred-percent hatred of everybody that has anything to do with Germany.\textsuperscript{47}

The nuanced attitudes of the city’s former divers and dashers, the U-boats who lived submerged for the final three, brutally destructive years of the Third Reich, the different paths they took to secure their survival, and the ways they pursued their postwar lives are clearly reflective of a different type of Holocaust experience. Approximately 1,700 individuals survived in hiding in the capital of Nazi Germany. That feat alone is a testament to their strength. That their experiences of survival were so diverse, however, indicates levels of agency and individuality not normally attributed to Jews during the Holocaust, and yet these played a crucial role in surviving submerged on the surface in Nazi Berlin.
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