

INTRODUCTION



Das war mein Kampf.
—Ludwig Leopold, a Berlin U-boat¹

On 4 February 1943, with deportation to Auschwitz and near certain death there looming, fifty-two-year-old Dr. Charlotte Bamberg vanished, submerging into the shadows of Nazi Berlin and diving into an extraordinary twenty-seven-month odyssey of survival. Several months after her escape from the “Gestapo’s murderous grasp,” Bamberg found herself, of all places, in the home of the German countess Maria von Maltzan, a vocal opponent of the Nazi regime who had already taken in two other Jews who, like Bamberg, had fled their deportation. The home was crowded, to be sure, for Maltzan was a veterinarian and an ardent lover of animals, and in addition to the people in the home, she had five Scottish Terriers, two cats, and a number of birds. She also worked three days a week at an animal shelter, and on those particular days, Maltzan enjoyed being greeted at the bus stop at the end of the day by her pets. Thus, the task fell to Bamberg to walk the five dogs to the bus station to greet the countess and also to bring one of the Persian cats for whom the countess had bought a leash. One day, on the way to the bus stop, one of the terriers lunged for the cat. Bamberg began to scream as the cat, meowing loudly, scratched and climbed its way on top her head while the dogs circled her, barking furiously. All along the street, window after window opened to afford the curious neighbors a better glimpse of this truly ridiculous spectacle. Collecting herself, Bamberg calmed the terriers, took the cat home, and then, with the five dogs still in tow, made her way to the bus station.

As she wryly noted years later, “This scene seemed ever so fitting for a submerged person.”²

Charlotte Bamberg was one of approximately 6,500 Berlin Jews who, between 1941 and 1945, attempted to escape the Nazis by going into what is usually referred to as “hiding,” and she was one of some 1,700 of them who managed to survive in this manner.³ Yet survivors seldom use the verb “to hide” (*verstecken*) to describe how they navigated and survived the final, murderous years of Nazi rule—and usually then only in cases of physical concealment—and they certainly do not describe themselves as the hidden. Rather, like Bamberg, they referred to themselves and were referred to by others by a variety of colorful monikers, all of which this book will employ. Some called themselves “illegals,” as did the postwar Berlin bureaucratic apparatus;⁴ others used the term *Geflitzte* (coming from the German verb to dart, dash, or hotfoot it, and perhaps best translated in this case as the “dashers”). Still others talk about living camouflaged (*getarnt*). Many, however, went by the terms *U-Boot* (submarine or U-boat) or *Taucher* (diver), and, very true to the city’s reputation for wry humor, they referred to the act of hiding as “diving” or “submerging.”⁵ Nor are these terms simply colloquial expressions for hiding. Rather, they express a particular reality and ways of existing and surviving in Nazi Berlin that *were not* hiding, at least, not as we have come to think of the act. Indeed, nothing delineates the experiences of Berlin’s divers from standard assumptions of hiding more than the story of Anne Frank and her attic mates, who still serve as the paradigm of the hiding experience.⁶ As opposed to the static and unvarying attic experience of the Franks, the Van Pelses, and Fritz Pfeffer, however, Charlotte Bamberg’s experiences of evading deportation were energetic, complex, and multivalent. In fact, this Berlin U-boat experience—itsself composed of hundreds of individual experiences—is so markedly at odds with what we call “hiding” that the concept of hiding will not suffice for understanding the intricate processes of flight and survival—and the resultant memories—that define the experiences of those Berlin Jews who decided to submerge. Bamberg’s story therefore ultimately is indicative of a much more accurate portrayal of so-called “hiding” in the city, one in which the word “hiding” is, at best, misleading and, at worst, woefully inaccurate.⁷ And although Bamberg was almost certainly the only fugitive Jew in the city to have to face down five Scottish Terriers and a Persian cat while evading the Gestapo and its informants, her story is unique only in the particulars. When examined together with hundreds of other survivor testimonies from the city, her experience cuts straight to the heart of the U-boat experience, an experience that for each individual, according one survivor, was “different, but the same.”⁸

What follows is a history of Berlin's submerged Jews. Its purpose is to present more than just the diverse experiences of Berlin's U-boats, divers, dashers, and camouflaged Jews who survived the Holocaust submerged in and around the city. More importantly, its aim is also to construct a history of those experiences by examining the seemingly unique stories of the survivors and asking what connects them, what, despite their tremendous diversity, they all have in common. Three main arguments underpin this book, which is itself based on an examination of over four hundred survivor testimonies (i.e., approximately 25 percent of all Berlin survivors in hiding) as well as data pertaining to the age and gender of over one thousand survivors (approximately 63 percent of all survivors).⁹ The appendix found at the end of the book provides the reader with a thorough discussion of the data I have compiled and analyzed to support the various statistical claims made in this study, specifically the number of Jews who submerged, when they submerged, and how many survived. The appendix also examines arrest rates in the city and the gender and age of Berlin's submerged Jews.

First, as already evidenced by the language of survivors such as Bamberg, Jews in Berlin did not hide in the way that the word implies (i.e., in the sense of keeping out of sight and physically concealing oneself for long stretches of time). Significantly, the survivors themselves employ a variety of phrases and expressions to describe their particular, individual experiences, experiences that destabilize standard notions of what hiding means. This is due to the fact that Jews in Nazi Berlin rarely hid in the usual sense of the word. Indeed, the title of Charlotte Bamberg's unpublished testimony is "Untergetaucht—An der Oberfläche—1941/1945" ("Submerged—On the Surface—1941/1945"), which serves as the inspiration for this book's title and suggests a surprisingly public illegal existence.¹⁰ If anything, Jews who attempted to evade arrest and deportation in and around Berlin during the final years of the Third Reich focused more on concealing their Jewish identity than on physical concealment. Second, surviving submerged in the city was both an individual and individualistic act, and it is remembered by survivors as such, both implicitly and explicitly. In part, this resulted from a relatively high degree of mobility and agency, central features of submerged life and often essential for survival. Berlin's divers frequently relied on their own ingenuity, resourcefulness, and knowledge of German society to navigate the dangers of Nazi Berlin, as numerous survivor accounts can corroborate; in this sense, submerged life was individual. However, they also took advantage of the individual and solitary nature of submerged life to act in ways that helped to ensure their own survival while simultaneously reaffirming their own unique identities. In this sense, hiding was individualistic.

Proceeding from these two arguments is this book's third argument and the overall basis for its structure: most unusually, especially when working with Holocaust survivor testimony, Berlin's divers have no collective memory. Traditionally, one of the primary challenges for historians working with survivor memory (usually, camp and ghetto survivor testimony) is to sift through collective memory to retrieve individual voices, personal experiences, and historical fact. In the case of Berlin's submerged Jews, the opposite is true. The dynamic and individual nature of hiding resulted in a staggering number of variables dictating not only how Berlin's dashers and divers survived but also how they experienced that survival. Of course, the context of surviving in and around the capital of the Third Reich means that survivor accounts often share a striking number of similarities, but the lack of a collective memory has prevented survivors from connecting these similarities. This absence of a cohesive "hiding narrative" has put me in an unusual and exciting position. The nature of submerged life in Berlin has prompted me to work against the grain, and this study turns conventional methodology on its head. Rather than starting with the collective to reach the individuals, it starts with the individuals and their many competing voices to establish a cohesive, but not collective, historical narrative of survival and submerged life in Nazi Berlin.

Hiding in Berlin—A Misnomer?

Hiding as a category of analysis in the Holocaust is a small, albeit growing, field, and studies of hiding in Germany are no exception to this trend.¹¹ It is also a highly fragmented field, due to the nature of the act. The ghettos and camps brought together Jews from across Europe, regardless of nationality, class, gender, or relationship to Judaism, and the visibility of these sites of concentration and destruction have allowed historians to examine them head on. This did not occur with hiding. Although, certainly, cases exist of Jews from one area of Europe hiding in another area, hiding remained, for the most part, nation specific, indeed, location specific. Moreover, due to the small amount of literature in the field specifically focused on hiding, as well as the nature of the word itself, the idea of hiding still conjures up images of physical concealment and immobility in basements, attics, hay lofts, etc., even though scholarship is well aware that Jews survived in "hiding" in an astonishing variety of locations through an equally noteworthy number of tactics. Still, we use the term "hiding." The result, understandably, is that the word "hiding" ends up serving a primarily rhetorical purpose, allowing scholars of the Holocaust to group together disparate experiences under a single concep-

tual framework. As an expedient, this approach certainly works, as the term is useful for situating and collectivizing the experiences of a diverse host of individuals scattered throughout Europe in much the same way that the ghettos and camps, which physically situated and collectivized Jews, also serve as sites of analysis. Yet experiences of hiding, based as they are on quite particular national, regional, and local differences (as well as the personality of the individual hiding), are so diverse that hiding as a category of analysis seems at once too broad and too specific to do the topic justice when focusing on a particular region, such as, in the case of this book, Berlin.

As mentioned above, Jews who survived in “hiding” in Berlin have employed a variety of terms to identify themselves. These terms of identification, however, are not simply a linguistic flourish. Rather, they are reflective of a tremendous diversity of experience. Indeed, whatever term is used by survivors, especially when read within the context of their testimonies, not a single one evokes traditional conceptions of hiding, physical concealment, silence, isolation, or immobility. Nor is current literature on hiding in Germany ignorant of the dynamic imagery that the language of the survivors evokes. Marion Kaplan explains: “‘Hiding’ could mean ducking out of sight for the duration of the war or removing the yellow star and assuming an ‘Aryan’ identity, with or without papers. Jews became fugitives, ‘submerging’ or ‘diving’ into the underground, to avoid detection by the Nazis.”¹² Other scholars have chosen to differentiate between “hiding and open hiding,” the latter phrase meant to suggest those who lived under a false identity among non-Jews.¹³ Certainly, some Jews in Berlin spent periods of time physically hiding in one place (a few even spent the entire war in one location), and in those instances, survivors use the verbs *verstecken* (to hide) and *verbergen* (to conceal). However, such complete immobility was an exception to the rule and was usually of short duration, as most survivor accounts from the city confirm. Jews moved around frequently, interacted with non-Jews, and participated in securing their own survival. In short, they did not physically hide in the way that both the word itself and our understanding of hiding during the Holocaust dictate they should have. This begs an important question: should the word “hide” figure at all prominently in discussions of U-boat survival in the capital of Nazi Germany?

Although problematic, the term “hiding” ultimately still provides a useful conceptual framework within which to operate, and this study will make use of the term now and again. As a category of Jewish response to the Holocaust, hiding has become too fixed in our minds to depart from it entirely. Moreover, relying solely on the rich language of Berlin’s submerged Jews to structure this study has the potential to alienate further

their experiences from the broader current of Holocaust history, when hiding in Berlin, indeed throughout Europe, should be integrated more fully into that history. In addition, the act of hiding in Berlin has multiple—and often quite personal—facets and means more than physical concealment. Therefore, the problem lies not in the term hiding per se. Rather, the problem lies in an uncritical adoption of the term and in a near total lack of contextualization, which render hiding almost useless as an informative category of analysis. However, situating hiding in Berlin and employing the specific terminology used by the city's Jews to qualify their experiences avoids generalizations and highlights a more meaningful, complex, and location-specific definition of the word hiding. Indeed, whether examining hiding in Berlin, greater Germany, or throughout Europe, historians need to engage in a careful and close consideration of the terms used by survivors and ask what those terms say about the nature of the act. Without such a close reading, a more general, pan-European narrative of hiding during the Holocaust threatens to overpower the highly localized nature of the act of evasion and to reinforce preconceived and often erroneous notions about daily life in “hiding.”

The U-boat as Individual and Individualist and the Lack of a Collective Memory

The fact that hiding was an individual act stems largely from the demands of the act and the circumstances of surviving in and around the capital of Nazi Germany. Although a significant number of the survivors examined for this study (over 40 percent) made the decision to go into hiding in consultation with family members, most could not stay together as a group.¹⁴ Logistics such as the size of the hiding place, the need to be on the move constantly, and the threat of denunciation required that people often act spontaneously and with little or no consultation with others. This does not mean that the city's U-boats had no contact with one another; on the contrary, they were well aware of one another's presence. However, many of the important decisions taken to ensure survival, from procuring food and shelter to finding work, were made individually or in consultation with only a few other people.¹⁵ As such, in their postwar accounts, survivors do not claim an experience greater than their own. At every turn in my research for this book, I was struck by how resistant these memories have remained to outside discourses and collective memory.¹⁶ This resistance is almost certainly the product of the individual nature of hiding, on the one hand, and the stark differences between the experiences of Jewish camp inmates and those of the U-boats, on the other.

This stands in marked contrast to the immense influence that collective memory has exerted on camp survivor testimony.¹⁷ In part a postwar phenomenon, collective memory also was the result of National Socialist extermination policies that reduced life to its most basic and inhuman form. The collective camp experience was the result of the forced subordination of the individual and most avenues of self-expression to the basic needs of survival and the near total deprivation of any real agency among the camp inmates. Although many camp survivors attempted to maintain some of their individual humanity, the exigencies of survival and the camp guards' relentless dehumanization of the inmates precluded any semblance of normality or the pursuit of avenues of self-expression. Conditions and experiences in the camps varied, but when the war ended and survivors began to bear witness, existence in the camps appeared to have been experienced almost uniformly. The sense of a collective experience developed, reinforced in the subsequent decades by scholarly approaches to "Jewry as a whole" during the Holocaust.¹⁸ The result is that "almost all [camp] survivors say 'we' rather than 'I.'"¹⁹ In contrast, there is no unified, collectively remembered experience of hiding in Berlin—nor could there possibly be one. As a result of the individual nature of hiding, the ways the U-boats remembered and recorded their time submerged defy a single experience akin to that formed in the camps. Two people with very similar experiences while living illegally in the city might interpret the event in different ways. Consequently, central to understanding survivor memories of submerged life in Berlin is the fact that the survivors almost never say "we" unless they are discussing a specific moment that they shared with others. Indeed, regardless of the nature of the account (i.e., restitution claims, postwar interviews, or personal memoirs), Berlin's surviving divers and dashers rarely speak for others.

Instead, what becomes evident through a close examination of survivor testimony is that the need for speedy adaptation, creative thinking, and problem solving in a world stuck between the ghettos and camps, on the one side, and the world of German civilian life in wartime Berlin, on the other, resulted in surprising degrees of personal agency among the city's divers, which, in turn, contributed to their survival. Such agency was not a constant, to be sure, among the U-boats. Nor was it experienced to the same degree by all. And, of course, that agency was highly circumscribed by the very real dangers of hiding. However, the unsettled and dangerous nature of hiding in Nazi Berlin, in forcing Jews to move around, frequently brought them into situations where their decisions mattered in determining not only whether they managed to evade capture but also, and of critical importance for their memories of submerged life, what the quality of their experiences was. This constant, forced interaction with

non-Jews and the city in wartime forced Berlin's illegal Jews to learn how to take advantage of the city and German society in ways usually considered off-limits for them during this time. Moreover, these interactions provided many of the U-boats with opportunities to act in ways that reaffirmed their individual identity, if only intermittently. Indeed, when the opportunity arose for Jews to be proactive, they took the initiative. In this sense, diving in Berlin was not merely an individual act; it was also an individualistic act, one that successfully rejected the dehumanization and destruction of the individual so central to experiences in the camps.

Surviving Submerged in Berlin—Literature and Testimony

Nearly seventy-five years have passed since the first accounts of Berlin's Jewish divers appeared. They comprise a motley collection: published and unpublished, written and oral, autobiographical as well as biographical, ranging in date from 1945 to 2015. Indeed, this study is highly indebted to the fact that the U-boats were never entirely forgotten in the city. Their stories received at least some public attention as early as the late 1940s.²⁰ Between 1956 and 1966, the West Berlin senate honored over seven hundred non-Jews for the indispensable aid they provided to the U-boats.²¹ In 1982, the reporter Leonard Gross published a journalistic account of the experiences of several Jews in hiding in *The Last Jews in Berlin*.²² More recent attention to Berlin Jewish life during the 1930s and 1940s has resulted in a small but growing amount of literature on Jews in hiding in the city, the history of the city's Jewish Hospital, the history of Jewish informants working for the Gestapo, and a number of personal memoirs.²³ The Gedenkstätte Stille Helden, a memorial and educational center dedicated to honoring the U-boats and their non-Jewish helpers, also is an invaluable educational resource and a testament to the city's efforts to remember its Jewish history.²⁴ Yet despite the relatively large amount of attention paid by scholars to hiding in Berlin and Germany, more generally, there often remains an unfortunate tendency for individual accounts of hiding to form the crux of analysis; indeed, biographical and autobiographical accounts still tend to dominate. In these accounts, one person's story is followed from beginning to end, and that particular individual's story is portrayed either as representative of a certain facet of hiding or else as representative of the general experience. While these accounts of and by particular individuals have much to offer, especially in a subfield of Holocaust history as new as hiding, a sustained analysis linking these varied individuals to a broader, shared history often is missing, thereby obscuring the commonalities of the U-boat experience.

In this study, the reader will encounter four key types of survivor testimony: published memoirs; unpublished written accounts collected by the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung at Berlin's Technical University, many of which were originally collected by the Wiener Library in London and Yad Vashem in Jerusalem; interviews conducted by the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies at Yale University; and, of critical importance, postwar restitution claims in Berlin to the Head Commission for the "Victims of Fascism" (OdF). This study aims to use these sources to portray the experience of hiding in Berlin within a framework of historical accuracy.²⁵ Literature on the advent, evolution, and purpose of survivor testimony has demonstrated the limits as well as possibilities associated with relying on such accounts.²⁶ Significant hurdles are the context in which survivors provided their testimony, factual accuracy, and the inevitable impact of Holocaust-survivor collective memory. Although this study has had to grapple with these challenges, I was surprised to find that analysis of U-boat testimony did not always reflect these difficulties to the extent I had expected. Indeed, these three problems associated with survivor testimony were either less severe or else expressed in markedly different ways than literature on survivor memory suggests.

Critical to reading the testimonies of Berlin's submerged Jews is recognizing that these are not Holocaust camp testimonies and should not be read as such; hiding is part of Holocaust history, certainly, but that history is multifaceted, and as the field continues to diversify, frameworks for analysis need to adapt to the particularities of the event(s) in question. Even still, with respect to hiding, there has been the tendency to analyze the potential and limitations of survivor testimony through the lens of camp survivors and marginalize or ignore testimonies that fall outside of this rubric.²⁷ Moreover, in her study *The Era of the Witness*, Annette Wieviorka rightly warns that "testimonies, particularly when they are produced as part of a larger cultural movement, express the discourse or discourses valued by society at the moment the witnesses tell their stories as much as they render an individual experience."²⁸ She argues that these discourses inevitably led individual Holocaust survivors to participate in the formation of a collective memory. As a result, Jewish witnesses were drawn into an inescapable circle in which their memories and experiences were subordinated to social, cultural, and political aims. She also argues that despite the tremendous value of survivor testimony, historians should not "look . . . for what they know is not to be found—clarification of precise events, places, dates, and numbers, which are wrong with the regularity of a metronome . . ."²⁹ Although Wieviorka is correct, scholars examining hiding should not assume that the same analytical pitfalls that apply to reading or listening to camp-survivor testimony can be neatly

applied to reading hiding-survivor testimony, because it unintentionally implies that time for Jews in hiding functioned as it did for those in the camps. In the camps, days blended into one another, and the horror and depravity found there, coupled with the powerful influence of postwar collective memory, blurred chronology and the experience of specific events. However, within Berlin, Jews lived in a world regulated by time. They listened to the radio, read newspapers, and were aware of the progress of the war, all of which had a direct bearing on their decision-making. In addition, the vast historical literature on Berlin during this period has allowed this author to corroborate survivor claims against established empirical data on the city.

As such, although this study's various primary source materials reflect broader issues confronting all historians working with survivor testimony, U-boat accounts present their own particular challenges. Published memoirs, for example, although enlightening and—quite frequently—verifiable through government documents and other survivor accounts, can come across as too singular and too misleading about the overall nature of hiding. As individuals writing about their own highly personal experiences, their memoirs often strike a particular tone: one of fear and loss and suffering, to be sure, but also often one of heroism, of individual will and agency in the face of overwhelming odds, of unwavering humanity in the face of bestial cruelty. They speak to the human desire for hope. Holding out the implicit promise of drawing the reader into “solidarity” with the survivor, memoirs of hiding often are motivated by the needs of the society receiving the message.³⁰ Moreover, the act of writing itself allows the author to choose carefully how they want people to interpret and view their memories of hiding.³¹ Many titles are designed to excite and inspire, for example: Gad Beck's *Underground Life: Memoirs of a Gay Jew in Nazi Berlin*; Cioma Schönhaus's *The Forger: An Extraordinary Story of Survival in Wartime Berlin*; and Larry Orbach and Vivien Orbach-Smith's *Soaring Underground: A Young Fugitive's Life in Nazi Berlin*.³² The result of these and other memoirs leaves the reader with the impression that experiences of hiding are singularly unique when, in reality, they are part of a much broader and more shared experience of hiding in the city.

Unpublished accounts, also incredibly informative, vary in length, style, and purpose, and they are also shaped by temporal distance from the actual event. The Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung at Berlin's Technische Universität, in particular, has collected hundreds of published and unpublished eyewitness accounts from Jewish survivors. These documents span seven decades and represent an incredibly diverse array of voices writing at different times and for different reasons. Only through careful attempts to corroborate one testimony by analyzing it against historical

documentation and other testimonies is it possible to document with reasonable certainty the claims made in these accounts. The Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies is yet another valuable resource, but not without its limitations. Created “to allow the survivor to speak,” the archive collects testimonies that function as a form of psychological and emotional catharsis.³³ As Lawrence Langer notes, oral testimony cuts through “literary artifice” and allows what he calls the “impromptu self” to shine through and provide insight into the conflict between the present self and the past self.³⁴ Although useful for the psychological and emotional insights that they provide, these interviews were conducted several decades after the war; factual accuracy sometimes is lacking and is not the primary goal of the project. In addition, interviewers for this project at times posed leading questions to survivors and occasionally projected their own, ill-informed understanding of hiding onto the survivors.³⁵ Ultimately, factual accuracy of survivor testimony remains an issue, but in the course of my research, although I have confronted misremembered dates and inaccurate identification of names, I still have mustered together a large enough collection of survivor accounts to verify survivor claims whenever possible.³⁶

Of all the survivor-testimony sources employed in this study, by far the most fruitful—if also the most challenging—is the collection of applications to the Head Commission for the “Victims of Fascism” (OdF), an organization sanctioned by the Soviet military government and established in May 1945 to coordinate aid and support for German victims of the Third Reich.³⁷ OdF recognition carried with it preferential rations and access to housing and was a necessity for the former illegals, many of whom were sick, homeless, and impoverished. Because the OdF initially was created for political victims of Nazism, the authorities at first rejected a number of the earliest Jewish applicants. Reasons for rejection, such as the following, were not uncommon for early applications submitted by Jews: “Only a short time as a Jew in the camp. No antifascist activity. Rejected.”³⁸ After some debate, however, in September 1945, OdF officials created a subcategory for Jews: *Opfer der Nürnberger Gesetze* (Victims of the Nuremberg Laws).³⁹

The structure of survivor testimonies submitted to the OdF reflects the demands of the application process as well as the more privileged status accorded to political opponents of Nazism. OdF applications asked for an individual’s name, birthdate and place of birth, current address, and address in 1933. They also asked for the applicant’s religion, whether one had worn the Star of David, whether one had been in a camp, whether one had engaged in antifascist activity, whether one had lived illegally (which was the term used by the OdF to mean submerged) and, if so,

for how long. They inquired into the names of organizations or political parties in which one had been active before 1933, veteran status, NSDAP party affiliation, whether one had been arrested or charged by Nazi authorities, and a host of other questions designed to assess the character and background of the individual claiming to be a “Victim of Fascism.” Applicants also submitted a résumé (*Lebenslauf*) along with three references to vouch for the veracity of their claims, and every claim was vetted. Although résumés submitted to the OdF are not free of error, the requirements for recognition as a Victim of Fascism strongly mitigate the dangers of widespread misremembering among survivors.

Almost all OdF *Lebensläufe* follow a similar format, as a result of the structure of the application. Although emphasis in the applications varied depending on age, gender, class, and, presumably, personality, the survivors generally included a brief description of their family background and career. Many pay special attention to the moment when the Nazis came to power in 1933, usually employing phrases strikingly similar to the following: “Until the Nazis destroyed everything.”⁴⁰ What follows then often is a description of particular indignities suffered throughout the 1930s, which, depending on the individual in question, includes loss of career or business as well as home or valuables, divorce from a non-Jewish spouse, various arrests or encounters with the authorities, if applicable, and forced labor, which nearly all U-boats of working age experienced. Because most Jews waited until the last possible minute to submerge, many testimonies also mention the infamous *Große Fabrik-Aktion* (Large Factory Operation) of late February/early March 1943, in which the Nazis deported the vast majority of full Jews remaining in the country who were not married to non-Jews. Almost all survivors mention their decision to submerge, even if only in one sentence. Most applicants also phrased their decision in a markedly similar fashion: “In order to escape the inhuman persecutions of the Nazis, my husband and I decided to live illegally.”⁴¹ What follows in many cases is then a description—albeit quite brief in some testimonies—of what they did and what happened to them while living submerged.

On the surface, then, the OdF *Lebensläufe* appear highly formulaic, with survivors even employing similar words and phrases to describe their encounters with Nazi persecution. This similarity in language reflects not only the standardized nature of the application process but also the political atmosphere in which these résumés were written. Perhaps as a result of the early rejections by the OdF, survivors likely learned to emphasize certain aspects of their experiences in favor of others. In particular, many of the former illegals highlighted and perhaps even exaggerated their “antifascist activities.” Some, for example, listed listening to foreign radio

broadcasts as evidence of antifascist activity. While the act was dangerous, it was no more so than illegal life, and categorizing it as an act of resistance was a stretch. In addition, applicants often emphasized their suffering over all other experiences, perhaps to stake out their place in a fast-developing “hierarchy of suffering” in postwar Germany.⁴² Sandwiched between the survivors of the camps and the favored political persecutees of Nazism, the city’s former divers focused on suffering, perhaps to avoid being overlooked. This certainly explains the attitude of one U-boat, who concluded his application by stating that if camp survivors could receive recognition as an OdF, then he certainly could; after all, at least the inmates “had a roof over [their] heads!”⁴³

Yet despite the superficially formulaic structure of many of these *Lebensläufe*, OdF testimonies are arguably the richest and most valuable source of survivor testimony available, due to their temporal and emotional immediacy to the end of the war. Temporally, that immediacy produced even in quite succinct accounts a richness of detail: specific and verifiable dates, names, addresses of helpers, hiding places, sites of near misses with the authorities, and other detailed insights, which might otherwise have faded over time or else been lost to record for those survivors who never recounted their experiences in subsequent decades. The accuracy produced by that temporal immediacy, however, so necessary in the construction of a history of hiding, is complemented and strengthened by the emotional immediacy of these testimonies. In his examination of Holocaust testimony, Lawrence Langer writes that “memory excavates from the ruins of the past fragile shapes to augment our understanding of those ruins.”⁴⁴ Yet what if one is still living among the ruins? Berlin was little more than rubble. Many former U-boats were still waiting to hear what had become of their family members who had been deported, and they were still plagued by illness, malnutrition, homelessness, poverty, and grief. Liberation, as Dan Stone reminds us, “was a process . . . sometimes a very long one,” and for the surviving U-boats the wounds of twelve years of persecution were still raw.⁴⁵ The war was over politically and militarily, but emotionally and physically, was it really?

This is the setting in which OdF testimonies were written. The war at the time was both over and not over, making the documents unique. As written sources, one might be tempted to conflate them with later written sources, both published and unpublished, and to critique them as such. As Langer notes, “Written memoirs, by the very strategies available to their authors—style, chronology, analogy, imagery, dialogue, a sense of character, a coherent moral vision—strive to . . . eas[e] us into their unfamiliar world through familiar (and hence comforting?) literary devices.”⁴⁶ While this is an apt critique of published memoirs, it has little bearing

on understanding an OdF testimony. Indeed, with the exception of a rudimentary chronology, the literary strategies put forth by Langer rarely appear in these testimonies. And in the few instances they do, their appearance is so noteworthy as to merit special comment and examination in this study. Instead, OdF testimonies need to be understood and read as existing—temporally, emotionally, and textually—in a liminal space. Temporally and emotionally, this is a space where the past, prewar self has been shaken to its very core, but the postwar self has not yet had a chance to develop and fully consider its experiences. Textually, this is a space that straddles the structural limitations of the OdF application process and the written word, on the one hand, and the “impromptu self” of oral testimony, on the other, a self in which one often witnesses “an estrangement between one’s present and past persona.”⁴⁷ Interestingly, however, that estrangement in this case was not between a present, late twentieth-/early twenty-first-century self and a past, wartime self but rather between a present, wartime/liberation self (1945/1946) and a past, prewar, even pre-Nazi Germany, self.

The liminal space in which these OdF *Lebensläufe* were written therefore can go a long way to explaining why, considering the dire circumstances under which these applications were submitted, a surprising number of *Lebensläufe* go so far beyond the requirements of the OdF application in the information they provide. In his examination of *Lebensläufe* statements of SA men written during the Third Reich, Bruce Campbell noted similar cases of deviation from and elaboration upon the standard résumé format, suggesting in such instances there likely exists “a strong desire or need to state it, illuminating either particularly strong or significant beliefs . . . [t]hus, when the writer of a *Lebenslauf* departs from the formula, the reader can assume that there is a reason and must pay attention.”⁴⁸ The many OdF testimonies that vary from the standard OdF application format suggest a similar need to speak and to express one’s experiences, especially in the immediate aftermath of twelve years of persecution, the last few spent enduring the indignities, deprivations, and dangers of illegal life. The result of that need to speak is a motley collection of applications whose résumés range in length from a few sentences to multiple pages rich in detail. Writing styles vary from handwritten, misspelled, phonetic *Berliner* dialect to typewritten, semidetached, almost academic parlance. Some survivors spend a great deal of time focusing on the prewar years and the loss of social and economic status, while others focus almost entirely on the act of going into hiding, or else all of the places they hid, or sometimes on one or two particular moments experienced while in hiding. In short, these seemingly standard résumés are often anything but that. They are personal insights channeled through

an impersonal, politicized, bureaucratic formula to which many survivors seem to have paid as little attention as possible.

Of critical note when dealing with OdF testimonies and for the construction of this book, then, is the presence of only the palest narrative arc in these particular survivor accounts, especially in comparison to later postwar accounts, most notably published memoirs. Certainly, while some OdF applicants attempted to provide an overall *Lebenslauf* (from childhood to the rise of the Nazis and through to liberation), not every testimony covers each facet. Even if they do, sometimes it is with one perfunctory sentence, the merest nod to the *Lebenslauf* structure. Rather, survivors focus on what matters for them, how they understand (or understood, prewar) themselves, and how, in such an abbreviated format, they could possibly begin to bring across the overall experience of living submerged in Nazi Berlin, a difficult (if not impossible) task, as one survivor reminds us: “What two and one-half years [in hiding] means can only be judged by someone who experienced it himself.”⁴⁹ The one or two anecdotes that survivors introduce into their testimonies are, I argue, more than just an example of what they experienced in hiding. Rather, due to the nature of the OdF *Lebenslauf* and the proximity of the testimonies to the end of the war, the stories shared by survivors are likely representative of their overall personal experience of living submerged in the city, that one instance or moment that must, by necessity, stand as representative for the entire experience. This is not to say that other experiences omitted from the OdF applications were not important. Indeed, some experiences were undoubtedly too painful or personal to share or else might have seemed irrelevant to achieving OdF recognition. Detailed testimonies given in later decades certainly testify to the incompleteness of the OdF applications but generally do not contradict them; rather, they elaborate upon them.⁵⁰ Ultimately, what was written must have stood out at the time to the individual applicant as the best and—perhaps, emotionally speaking—easiest way to express what in the immediate months following the end of the war was an experience beyond words.

If one focuses primarily on OdF testimonies, then, as this book does, one must be resigned to the lack of a firm, detailed, comprehensive narrative arc of experience for each survivor encountered in these pages. From a narrative perspective, this might seem frustrating; to follow an individual actor through a significant moment in their time submerged, only to see them fade once more into the shadows of the city when that moment has passed, toys with our human desire for resolution and connection to an individual that a sound literary arc generally provides. Naturally enough, this is why most discussions of hiding in Germany have worked with later testimonies, in which the survivor provides significant

detail and a generally solid chronological structure. Without question, later testimonies are useful and enlightening, and this book makes use of them throughout, especially where these later accounts can illuminate and confirm earlier OdF testimonies. However, it favors the OdF testimonies precisely due to their lack of a firm narrative arc. To invoke the metaphorical language of Berlin's divers, just as individuals in hiding submerged, resurfaced, and resubmerged again and again throughout the war, so, too, do their stories. In fact, one final reason the OdF testimonies are arguably the most enlightening of all survivor testimonies is due precisely to their lack of a clear narrative structure. They speak to memories of the experience and not to how collective memory and societal need want an experience to be related. Despite whatever gaps in information might exist in any given individual OdF résumé, when examining hundreds of OdF testimonies together, as this book does, the individual experiences work together to complement one another, with each story picking up where another has left off. As such, it is less any one particular individual whose experiences speak for or define the hiding experience in Berlin and its history than the necessary and complex interplay (sometimes complementary and sometimes contradictory) between individual voices struggling to be heard after years of persecution and silence.

Why Berlin? The Capital of Nazi Germany as a Site of U-boat Survival

Throughout Nazi-occupied Europe, some Jews made the decision to hide in order to evade almost certain death. Most did not succeed, although success varied from country to country, and the chances of survival still were better than in the camps. A host of factors, including location, nationality, Nazi policy, the attitudes of the local population, gender, and age, influenced when Jews hid, how many hid, and how many survived.⁵¹ Although more research is necessary to fully flesh out the similarities and differences of hiding during the Holocaust, the variations are intriguing. For example, in the Netherlands, approximately 16,100 Dutch Jews managed to survive in hiding; they had a survival rate of approximately 58 percent.⁵² In the Warsaw Ghetto, through which approximately 490,000 Jews passed, only 5 percent of Jews attempted to hide, but those who did had a survival rate of approximately 40 percent (11,500).⁵³ Within Germany's pre-1938 borders, somewhere between ten and twelve thousand Jews submerged during the Holocaust, at least half of whom did so in Berlin; at least five thousand Jews managed to survive in hiding nationwide.⁵⁴ Even still, less than 10 percent of Berlin Jews attempted to submerge,

and of those who did, only around one-quarter survived.⁵⁵ Clearly, whatever the common fears prompting Jews to hide and the factors influencing their chances for survival were, there is no single history of hiding.

Considering Berlin's position as capital of the Third Reich, it is perhaps surprising that the city is an important site of Jewish-German survival during the Holocaust. Yet despite that position, Berlin was not as hopeless a place for Jews to submerge as one might expect. Indeed, within the context of what remained of Berlin's Jewish community in the wake of the Holocaust, Berlin's submerged Jews were not a negligible presence. Of the roughly 8,300 Berlin Jews who survived the war, approximately 20.5 percent were U-boats and 22.9 percent camp survivors, with the remaining 56.6 percent individuals who survived having done so due to having been married to a so-called "Aryan" spouse or through their status as a "Half-Jew" (that is, as a *Mischling*).⁵⁶ On the national level, the former U-boats account for at least one-third of all Jewish survivors in hiding in Germany (at its pre-1938 borders). How, then, might we begin to account for their survival, beyond issues of luck or chance or individual initiative? In other words, was there something particular about Berlin that enabled one-third of all German Jews who survived in hiding to have done so in and around the city?

We should take care when considering this question to neither overstate nor understate the importance of the city, the structural realities of Nazi policy, and the course of the war in influencing chances for survival, thereby diminishing the agency of Berlin's U-boats or the bravery of those who helped them. On the one hand, these factors undeniably played crucial roles in shaping both chances for survival and expressions of individual agency while living submerged in the city; without them, survival rates in Berlin would have been much different. Of central importance therefore in determining rates of submerging and survival in Berlin are three main factors: (1) the sheer size of the city; (2) the city's sizeable and largely acculturated Jewish population; and (3) the evolution and expression of Nazi antisemitic policy in the city.

As a sprawling metropolis, Berlin offered a large degree of anonymity, important for evading capture.⁵⁷ Jews learned early on to avoid neighborhoods where they were known. By 1939, the city was home to approximately 4.5 million people spread across 339 square miles. In March 1943, when more than 6,000 Jews were living submerged, there was approximately one U-boat for every 69,200 non-Jews in the city. Even before the deportations began, Jews still could be found living in each of the city's twenty administrative districts.⁵⁸ Whether Jews specifically sought out reputed districts of anti-Nazi resistance (e.g., Wedding and Neukölln) and avoided neighborhoods with a higher concentration of Nazis (e.g., Steg-

litz) is unknown, yet such an explanation seems too simple. First, the socioeconomic–political divisions between individual neighborhoods were not always as rigid as they might seem. Even in largely well-to-do pro-Nazi neighborhoods, certain working-class streets harbored a number of former social democrat and communist voters.⁵⁹ Second, a concentration of fugitive Jews in any one area of the city eventually would have been discovered by the Gestapo. Enemies lurked everywhere, but research on resistance in Berlin’s neighborhoods demonstrates that help for Jews existed throughout the city.⁶⁰ Moreover, many survivors remark on having lived with dedicated Nazis who knew nothing of their true identity.

Another important reason why so many Jews submerged and survived in Berlin was that 44 percent of all German Jews (72,872) lived in the city when the deportations began there in October 1941.⁶¹ Although a number of future divers had relocated to the city during the 1930s in order to escape the hostility of smaller towns and lose themselves in the city’s anonymity, most either were native to the city or else had lived there for decades; they knew how life in the city functioned, and native Berliners also understood the nuances of its character. Remaining in the city provided a certain level of comfort and a known constant in the otherwise unstable and chaotic world of hiding. To leave Berlin for unknown territory was risky, and those Jews who did leave Berlin to hide elsewhere usually did so after securing a job or a place to stay. Of the 425 testimonies examined for this study, 92 survivors (or 22 percent) specifically reference leaving the city. The actual percentage is likely higher. However, most individuals who left Berlin did not spend the entirety of the war outside the city. And, of those who did, many stayed nearby, in towns and villages such as Rangsdorf, Barnim, Bernau, Stahnsdorf, and Strausberg, all less than forty miles away. Indeed, it is not uncommon to find testimonies such as that of Felix Z., who spent the majority of his time hiding outside Berlin but listed Berlin addresses for fourteen of his fifteen helpers.⁶²

The value of Berlin also lay in the fact that most of the city’s Jews were an integral part of the city’s character and had long since acculturated to non-Jewish society.⁶³ Until the Nazi seizure of power, Jews participated in all aspects of German life, living alongside, working with, befriending, and marrying non-Jews. Indeed, during the 1920s, 30 percent of all Jewish marriages in Berlin were to non-Jews.⁶⁴ In postwar interviews, survivors occasionally remark on having felt themselves once to have been a part of Germany, and we should not underestimate exactly how helpful their position as “German citizens of the Jewish faith” (as many viewed themselves) and their familiarity with German cultural and social mores were for ensuring their survival. Indeed, Jews’ knowledge of German and its

myriad dialects mitigated a significant cultural barrier to survival. Elsewhere in Europe, particularly farther east, lack of acculturation presented complications for Jews attempting to hide.⁶⁵ In Poland, for example, linguistic separation put a number of Jews in hiding at a significant disadvantage, as the Yiddish accent of many of them could betray them.⁶⁶ The result was that some Poles were unwilling to hide Jews, and when they did, cultural differences often forced hidden Jews to remain silent and out of sight. In contrast, Berlin's divers moved around more freely and blended in with non-Jews more readily; even before they dived, their knowledge of German served as a critical advantage.

Central to understanding why Berlin is the largest site of U-boat survival was the expression of Nazi antisemitic policy in the city. Jews in Berlin, even once the deportations began, never faced the same degree of social or physical isolation from non-Jews that they did in Eastern Europe. In fact, approximately 4,700 Jews married to non-Jews lived legally in the city throughout the war.⁶⁷ These couples often provided invaluable aid to Jews attempting to evade arrest and deportation. Also, the ghettos constructed in the east never materialized in the city, and despite segregated work areas and semi-segregated apartment buildings, Jews had valuable contacts with non-Jews; when the time came to submerge, divers often were able to turn to these contacts for help. Indeed, unlike in Poland, where non-Jews caught hiding Jews were executed summarily along with their entire family, non-Jewish helpers in Berlin did not face an automatic death sentence.⁶⁸ In Germany, there was no specific crime for hiding Jews, only the broader crime of *Judenbegünstigung* (aiding and abetting Jews), and the punishment for helping Jews varied considerably, ranging from incarceration in a concentration camp to shorter prison sentences to fines to sometimes nothing at all.⁶⁹ Finally, Jews living in Berlin when the deportations began benefitted from the relatively long duration of the major deportations (approximately sixteen months). Although the first deportations began in October 1941, the last of the major deportations did not occur until the beginning of March 1943, thereby giving Jewish Berliners more time to gather knowledge of what "resettlement" truly entailed.⁷⁰ Moreover, the Jewish population, in sheer numbers, remained significantly larger until that point than in other large German cities, meaning that when the last major roundups of Jews began at the end of February 1943, there simply were more people around to submerge, if they were able and willing. This simple yet essential explanation finds confirmation in Susanna Schrafstetter's recent study of Jews who went into hiding in and around Munich. Although Munich, too, witnessed its final major deportations at the same time Berlin did, the Jewish commu-

nity there had already been so devastated by earlier deportations that very few Jews were still left in the city to flee. To compare: at the time of the last major deportations in late February/early March 1943, some fifteen thousand Jews still worked as forced laborers in Berlin's massive armaments industry, jobs that had shielded them from the earlier deportations. In Munich, those Jewish workers numbered a mere 313.⁷¹

Finally, one note of caution: although Berlin's divers benefitted from the help of thousands of non-Jews, both through organized networks of resistance and instances of individual bravery and humanity from the city's population, we need to take care not to romanticize a city that only one decade before had had an international, progressive, cosmopolitan reputation that follows it to this day. Regardless of whatever Weimar Berlin's reputation had been for modernity, cabaret, a vibrant gay community, an avant-garde arts scene, or a place where, to borrow from the historian Peter Gay, the outsider became insider, antisemitism was already a growing force in the city.⁷² After Hitler's seizure of power in 1933, that force increased steadily until, by the time the deportations began in 1941, it was overwhelming. Indeed, however unpopular Nazism might have been in the city compared to other regions of the country, the Nazis still polled 34.6 percent of the vote in the March 1933 elections (compared to 43.9 percent nationally).⁷³ Antisemitic violence unleashed by the SA in the wake of Hitler's seizure of power was matched by the city's government issuing some fifty-five antisemitic ordinances by the end of 1934, which only increased in number as the years progressed. Although sympathy for the persecution of the Jews could be found throughout the city, even manifesting itself in vocal criticism during the wave of antisemitic violence that gripped the city in the summer and fall of 1938, the Nazis continued to ramp up their targeting of Jews.⁷⁴ Even the members of Berlin's non-Jewish population who exhibited individual bravery by attempting both before and during the deportations, and also in the years of submerging, to aid Jews as best as they could were outnumbered both by ardent Nazis and by those who looked away. Although perhaps as many as thirty thousand Berliners might have been involved in actively sheltering Jews who had fled their deportations, often with over one dozen individuals involved in helping a single Jew, that was still a miniscule percentage of the city's entire population (less than 1 percent), and all it took was one act of denunciation to destroy everything. Thus, while we should not forget the cosmopolitan reputation the city might once have had, and while its spirit might have lived on in any number of individual Berliners, we should not give the capital of Nazi Germany more credit than it deserves in explaining why so many German Jews managed to survive the horrors of the Holocaust submerged there.

Structure of the Book

This book is divided into four chapters: “Submerging,” “Surviving,” “Living,” and “Surfacing.” Each of these chapters deals with the major themes running through the lives and experiences of Berlin’s divers. Each chapter also is situated chronologically, in order to guide the reader through the complexity of submerged life in wartime Berlin. This juxtaposition of theme and chronology, however, should not be understood as limiting the various experiences covered in each chapter to any given year. Rather, this juxtaposition is necessary to convey the experience of living submerged in the city and the way those experiences were shaped by the broader forces of deportation, the war, and the Holocaust. Moreover, the thematic progression of the chapters is broadly indicative of the process of hiding, wherein Jews first submerged and then began the process of learning to survive. Once submerged, Jews then could and often did take advantage of their knowledge of the city to try to carve out a semblance of life-affirming tasks and activities. And, in the final months and weeks of the war, they began the slow, chaotic, and dangerous process of surfacing and reclaiming a public identity. These experiences, however, were directly influenced by the course of the war and Nazi policy: in other words, chronology and structural forces beyond the U-boats’ control.

Chapter 1, “Submerging,” covers the first deportations in October 1941 through the last major deportations in early March 1943. The chapter analyzes the three available responses to the deportations—compliance with the deportation orders, suicide, and submerging—and argues that although suicide and hiding were clear rejections of National Socialist policy, deportation was not only something that happened to Jews. Jews consciously and actively grappled with how to respond to the deportations. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the Large Factory Operation of 28 February–5 March 1943, an event that triggered the largest number of attempts to submerge.

Chapter 2, “Surviving,” chronicles the rest of 1943 and uses this first full year of submerged life for many of the U-boats as a lens through which to examine the challenges of securing food, clothing, and shelter while navigating the dangers of arrest and denunciation. This chapter argues that successfully coping with the challenges of hiding was a learning process throughout which the city’s divers and dashers developed a number of strategies to optimize their chances for survival. This first year in hiding also was the most dangerous and accounted for almost two-thirds of all U-boat arrests. As such, submerged Jews needed to adapt quickly to the threats facing them.

Chapter 3, “Living,” examines 1944 and builds off the previous chapter’s argument that survival was a learning process. The chapter argues that acclimation to the circumstances of illegal life and the establishment of valuable contacts and strategies for survival enabled many U-boats to focus some of their energies on developing a sense of routine and normality in their lives. The chapter also addresses how issues of friendship, employment, and recreation as well as darker issues of illness, death, and rape influenced how survivors remembered the quality of their experiences. The chapter argues that the emotional impact of these various experiences was as influential in the construction of survivor memories of living submerged as were the purely physical challenges associated with the act.

Chapter 4, “Surfacing,” covers the last months of the war in 1945. This chapter looks at the steadily declining availability of food and shelter for Jews, the increasing danger of arrest by the Gestapo, and the approaching Soviet Army and how it created new avenues for survival as well as new difficulties. This chapter argues that even in the chaos caused by the retreat of the German Army, Jews still were able to utilize the circumstances created by the war to continually develop new strategies for survival. This final chapter also analyzes the ways that the hopes and fears of the remaining Jews in the city at times intersected with those of the non-Jewish population and how those hopes and fears were reflective of a specific Berlin wartime experience.

Notes

1. “That was my struggle.” Landesarchiv Berlin (hereafter LAB), C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 38151.
2. Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung (hereafter ZfA), File of Dr. Charlotte Bamberg, “Untergetaucht—An Der Oberfläche—1941/1945.”
3. A full discussion of the empirical data underpinning this study (i.e., number of Jews submerged, arrest rates, and the gender and age of the U-boats) and how the author reached his conclusions can be found in the appendix in this book.
4. Despite the problematic nature of the terms “illegal” or “living illegally,” members of Berlin’s surviving U-boats also used these terms to describe themselves and their experiences. See Rudolf Frauenfeld, “Wir Illegalen,” *Der Weg: Zeitschrift für Fragen des Judentums*, 22 March 1946.
5. Anthony Read and David Fisher suggest that the self-chosen term “U-boat” was a direct reflection of the average Berliner’s outlook on life; in Read and Fisher, *Berlin: The Biography of a City* (London: Hutchinson, 1994), 236. See also Peter Gay, *My*

- German Question: Growing Up in Nazi Berlin* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 13–14.
6. See Alvin H. Rosenfeld, “Popularization and Memory: The Case of Anne Frank,” in *Lessons and Legacies: The Meaning of the Holocaust in a Changing World*, ed. Peter Hayes (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1991), 243–78; Zoë Vania Waxman, *Writing the Holocaust: Identity, Testimony, Representation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 136; Nicholas Stargardt, “Children,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Holocaust Studies*, ed. Peter Hayes and John K. Roth (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 227; and Marion A. Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 205.
 7. For more on the importance of survivor language in understanding the hiding experience in Berlin, see Richard N. Lutjens, Jr., “Vom Untertauchen: ‘U-Boote’ und der Berliner Alltag 1941–1945,” in *Alltag im Holocaust: Jüdisches Leben im Großdeutschen Reich 1941–1945*, ed. Andrea Löw, Doris L. Bergen, and Anna Hájková (München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 2013).
 8. Mrs. Ruth Gumpel, interview with author, 2 April 2008, Petaluma, CA.
 9. See appendix. The lists of survivors were published in the Jewish–German exile periodical *Aufbau: Reconstruction* over the course of two months, beginning on 2 November 1945, in a section titled “Neue Listen von Juden in Berlin” (from 16 November 1945, titled “Neue Berliner Liste”). The names of survivors in hiding were designated with the letter “b.” Although some discrepancies exist, the lists are generally accurate. They were published between November 1945 and January 1946. The lists may be found in the following editions. For the year 1945: Nr. 45 (p. 28); Nr. 46 (p. 26); Nr. 47 (p. 26); Nr. 48 (p. 36); Nr. 49 (p. 26); Nr. 50 (p. 27); Nr. 51 (p. 27); Nr. 52 (p. 37). For the year 1946: Nr. 1 (p. 26); Nr. 2 (p. 32); Nr. 3 (p. 27). These lists contain the names of over nine hundred former U-boats. The additional names were collected by the author from testimonies found in the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung at Berlin’s Technische Universität.
 10. ZfA, File of Dr. Charlotte Bamberg.
 11. Literature on hiding in Germany, although not vast, has received increasing attention from scholars, both in its own right and as part of larger narratives. Notable examples include Maren Krüger, Marion Neiss, Martina Voigt, Birgit Wagener, and Irina Wandrey, “Alltag im Berliner Untergrund,” in *Antisemitismus in Jüdische Geschichte*, ed. Rainer Erb and Michael Schmidt (Berlin: Wissenschaftlicher Autorenverlag, 1987); Wolfgang Benz, ed., *Die Juden in Deutschland, 1933–1945: Leben unter nationalsozialistischer Herrschaft* (München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1988); Marion Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany* (1998); Trude Maurer in Marion Kaplan, eds., *Jewish Daily Life in Germany, 1618–1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Wolfgang Benz ed., *Überleben im Dritten Reich: Juden im Untergrund und ihre Helfer*; Petra Bonavita, *Mit falschem Pass und Zyankali: Retter und Gerettete aus Frankfurt am Main in der NS-Zeit* (Stuttgart: Schmetterling-Verlag, 2009); Susanna Schrafstetter, *Flucht und Versteckt: Untergetauchte Juden in München—Verfolgungserfahrung und Nachkriegsalltag* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2015); Marnix Croes and Beate Kosmala, “Facing Deportation in Germany and the Netherlands: Survival in Hiding,” in *Facing the Catastrophe: Jews and Non-Jews in Europe during World War II*, ed. Beate Kosmala and Georgi Verbeeck (New York: Berg, 2011); also, Beate Kosmala, “Zwischen Ahnen und Wissen: Flucht vor der Deportation (1941–1943),” in *Die Deportation der Juden aus Deutschland: Pläne—Praxis—Reaktionen*, ed. Birthe Kundrus and Beate Meyer (Göttingen: Wallstein-

- Verlag, 2004); Beate Kosmala, “Überlebensstrategien jüdischer Frauen in Berlin: Flucht vor der Deportation (1941–1943),” in Löw, Bergen, Hájková, *Alltag im Holocaust*; and, Lutjens, “Vom Untertauchen.” For an excellent case study of a single act of hiding and survivor memory, see Mark Roseman, *The Past in Hiding* (London: Penguin, 2000). A notable exception and an excellent example of a comprehensive, location-specific study of hiding outside of Germany is Gunnar Paulsson, *The Secret City: The Hidden Jews of Warsaw, 1940–1945* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002).
12. Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 201.
 13. See Zoë Waxman, “Rape and Sexual Abuse in Hiding,” in *Sexual Violence against Jewish Women during the Holocaust*, ed. Sonja M. Hedgepeth and Rochelle G. Saidel (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2010), 16g.
 14. For a discussion on the difficulties of hiding with family members, see Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 204.
 15. Andreas Nachama, Julius H. Schoeps, and Hermann Simon, eds., *Jews in Berlin*, trans. Michael S. Cullen and Allison Brown (Berlin: Henschel Verlag, 2002), 215.
 16. Christopher Browning, in his study of the Starachowice labor camp, describes the testimonies he worked with in his study as having remained “relatively pristine.” See Christopher R. Browning, *Remembering Survival: Inside a Nazi Slave-Labor Camp* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2009), 234.
 17. See Annette Wieviorka, *The Era of the Witness*, trans. Jared Stark (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), xxii. Zoë Waxman’s recent work attempts to break through collective memory to reflect the “heterogeneity” of survivor experiences; see Waxman, *Writing the Holocaust*.
 18. See Moshe Zimmerman, “German Jews in the History of the Shoah,” in *On Germans and Jews under the Nazi Regime: Essays by Three Generations of Historians*, ed. Moshe Zimmermann (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2006), 108.
 19. Terrence Des Pres, *The Survivor: An Anatomy of Life in the Death Camps* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 29.
 20. See Eric H. Boehm, *We Survived: The Stories of Fourteen of the Hidden and Hunted in Nazi Germany* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1949), and Kurt Grossmann, *Die unbesungenen Helden: Zeugnisse der Menschlichkeit aus Deutschlands dunklen Tagen* (Hamburg: Furche, 1957).
 21. For more on this initiative, see Dennis Riffel, *Unbesungene Helden: Die Ehrungsinitiative des Berliner Senats, 1958 bis 1966* (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2007).
 22. Leonard Gross, *The Last Jews in Berlin* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982).
 23. See Reinhard Rürup, ed., *Jüdische Geschichte in Berlin: Essays und Studien* (Berlin: Druckhaus Hentrich, 1995); Nachama, Schoeps, and Simon, *Jews in Berlin*; and Beate Meyer and Hermann Simon, eds., *Juden in Berlin, 1938–1945* (Berlin: Philo Verlagsgesellschaft, 2000). Wolf Gruner chronicles the antisemitic measures taken against the Jews of Berlin in Wolf Gruner, *Judenverfolgung in Berlin, 1933–1945: Eine Chronologie der Behördenmassnahmen in der Reichshauptstadt* (Berlin: Druckhaus Hentrich, 1996). The protest of non-Jewish women against the arrest of their Jewish husbands in February and March 1943 received renewed attention in Wolf Gruner, *Widerstand in der Rosenstraße: Die Fabrik-Aktion und die Verfolgung der “Mischehen” 1943* (Frankfurt/M: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2005). For a history of the Berlin Jewish Hospital during the 1940s, see Danial B. Silver, *Refuge in Hell: How Berlin’s Jewish Hospital Outlasted the Nazis* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003). The histories of Jewish informants working for the Gestapo in Berlin and Vienna were the

- subject of Doris Tausendfreund, *Erzwungener Verrat: Jüdische "Greifer" im Dienst der Gestapo, 1943–1945* (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2006).
24. The Gedenkstätte Stille Helden is located at 39 Rosenthaler Straße in the former brush factory of Otto Weidt, an ardent protector of persecuted Jews during the Nazi period. In addition to their own publication, *Gedenkstätte Stille Helden*, the museum is currently compiling a large database on the hidden and their rescuers.
 25. In a similar fashion, Christopher Browning's recent microhistorical study of survivors of the Starachowice labor camp is guided by his twin goals of achieving "authenticity" as well as "factual accuracy." See Browning, *Remembering Survival*, 7.
 26. See Wieviorka, *Era of the Witness*. See also Waxman, *Writing the Holocaust*; Raul Hilberg, *Sources of Holocaust Research: An Analysis* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2001), and Lawrence Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991).
 27. Waxman recognizes, for example, that survivors in hiding often "lack many of the shared experiences to which concentration camp survivors appeal" in the reproduction of survivor memory. In Waxman, *Writing the Holocaust*, 165.
 28. Wieviorka, *Era of the Witness*, xii.
 29. Wieviorka, *Era of the Witness*, 132.
 30. Waxman, *Writing the Holocaust*, 129.
 31. See Lawrence Langer, "Redefining Heroic Behavior," in Hayes, *Lessons and Legacies*, 227–29. See also Waxman, *Writing the Holocaust*, 119. On the writing process, see Hilberg, *Sources of Holocaust Research*, 67–71.
 32. In addition to the above titles, see also, Inge Deutschkron, *Ich trug den gelben Stern* (München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1978); Margot Friedländer with Malin Schwerdtfeger, "*Versuche, dein Leben zu machen*": *Als Jüdin versteckt in Berlin* (Berlin: Rowohlt, 2008); Barbara Lovenheim, *Survival in the Shadows: Seven Hidden Jews in Hitler's Berlin* (London: Peter Owen, 2002), and, most recently, Marie Jalowicz Simon, *Untergetaucht: Eine junge Frau überlebt in Berlin, 1940–1945* (Frankfurt/Main: S. Fischer, 2014).
 33. Wieviorka, *Era of the Witness*, 108–10, 126–27.
 34. See Langer, "Redefining Heroic Behavior," 229, 235.
 35. Many of the interviews were conducted by non-specialists, and they attempt, for example, to elicit from survivors admissions of fear (when some survivors claim they were not afraid) or to contradict survivors on the dates of well-known events, such as the German invasion of the USSR.
 36. For a discussion of the challenges associated with ascertaining accuracy, see Browning, *Remembering Survival*, 7–8.
 37. Regarding the history of the Victims of Fascism and their treatment under the Soviet-controlled sector and later in the DDR, see Susanne zur Nieden, *Unwürdige Opfer: Die Aberkennung von NS-Verfolgten in Berlin 1945 bis 1949* (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2003); Christoph Hölscher, *NS-Verfolgte im "antifaschistischen Staat": Vereinnahmung und Ausgrenzung in der ostdeutschen Wiedergutmachung (1945–1989)* (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2002).
 38. LAB, C Rep. 118-01, Nr.: 39108. For more on the strict early criteria for obtaining Odf status, as first enacted on 23 June 1945 in the Soviet Zone of Occupation, see Ulrike Offenber, "Seid Vorsichtig gegen die Machthaber": *Die jüdischen Gemeinden in der SBZ und der DDR, 1945–1990* (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag GmbH, 1998), 43–45.
 39. zur Nieden, *Unwürdige Opfer*, 28–31, 45–49. See, also, Offenber, "Seid vorsichtig gegen die Machthaber," 45–48.

40. Centrum Judaicum Archiv (hereinafter CJA) 4.1., 2106.
41. CJA 4.1, 2971.
42. I am indebted to Sarah Liu, Judith B. and Burton P. Resnick Postdoctoral Fellow at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, for bringing this phrase and its implications for my research to my attention. Also, see Raul Hilberg, *Perpetrators Victims Bystanders: The Jewish Catastrophe, 1933–1945* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992), 187.
43. CJA 4.1, 3156.
44. Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies*, 128.
45. Dan Stone, *The Liberation of the Camps: The Holocaust and Its Aftermath* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015), 2.
46. Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies*, 19.
47. Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies*, 129, 143.
48. Bruce Campbell, “Autobiographies of Violence: The SA in Its Own Words,” *Central European History* 46, no. 2 (2013): 219.
49. CJA 4.1, 1846.
50. Christopher Browning also noted that the testimonies he examined for his recent study remained “remarkably stable and less malleable than [he] had anticipated.” See Browning, *Remembering Survival*, 9.
51. For an in-depth discussion of why survival rates of Jews varied so much throughout Nazi-occupied Europe, see Peter Hayes, *Why? Explaining the Holocaust* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2017), 218–258.
52. In Croes and Kosmala, “Facing Deportation,” 132–33.
53. Paulsson, *Secret City*, 231–32. See also, Croes and Kosmala, “Facing Deportation,” 138–39.
54. See Croes and Kosmala, “Facing Deportation,” 97, 115.
55. Croes and Kosmala estimate the number of Berlin survivors as anywhere between 1,700 and 2,000 in “Facing Deportation,” 124. See also, *Gedenkstätte Stille Helden*, 8.
56. Siegmund Weltlinger, “*Hast du es schon vergessen?*” *Erlebnisbericht aus der Zeit der Verfolgung* (Berlin: Gesellschaft für christlich-jüdische Zusammenarbeit in Berlin, 1954). See also Wolf Gruner, *Judenverfolgung in Berlin: Eine Chronologie der Behördenmassnahmen in der Reichshauptstadt* (Berlin: Druckhaus Hentrich, 1996), 94 [also cited as Wolf Gruner, *The Persecution of the Jews in Berlin 1933–1945: A Chronology of Measures by the Authorities in the German Capital*, trans., William Templer (Berlin: Stiftung Topographie des Terrors, 2014)]. The data first cited by Siegmund Weltlinger form the basis for the quoted figures and are used by scholars in their estimates of the number of Berlin Jewish survivors. Scholarly works still cite Weltlinger’s initial figure of 1,400 Berlin Jewish survivors in hiding, including Roger Moorhouse, *Berlin at War: Life and Death in Hitler’s Capital, 1939–1945* (London: Random House, 2010), 306; Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 228; and Trude Maurer, “From Everyday Life to a State of Emergency: Jews in Weimar and Nazi Germany,” in *Jewish Daily Life*, ed. Marion Kaplan, trans. Allison Brown (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 2005, 373. Recent estimates by researchers at the Gedenkstätte Stille Helden in Berlin now indicate that over 1,700 Jews survived in hiding in and around the city. This updated figure is the one this study uses. However, I am unaware of any changes made to estimates of the number of survivors from the camps and from mixed marriages. Accordingly, the statistics cited are a hybrid of Weltlinger’s original data on camp and mixed-marriage survivors and newer estimates on survivors in hiding.
57. Research suggests that elsewhere in Europe, the anonymity of cities tended to make them more conducive to hiding than small towns or the countryside. Benz,

- Überleben im Dritten Reich*, 12. For a history of Jews in hiding in Warsaw, see also Paulsson, *Secret City*.
58. Nachama, Schoeps, and Simon, *Jews in Berlin*, 139. For a statistical breakdown of Jewish Berliners by neighborhood, see Gruner, *Judenverfolgung*, 93.
 59. For example, the so-called “Arme-Leute-Ecken” in Steglitz had a fairly strong Communist contingent, even though over 40 percent of neighborhood voted for the NSDAP in the November 1932 elections. See Hans-Rainer Sandvoß, *Widerstand in Steglitz und Zehlendorf* (Berlin: Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand, 1986), 7.
 60. During the 1980s, a massive scholarly undertaking by the Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand resulted in the publication of *Widerstand 1933–1945*. Of the fourteen volumes detailing various resistance groups and individuals, all but four were the product of Hans-Rainer Sandvoß. See, for example, Sandvoß, *Widerstand in Neukölln* (Berlin: Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand, 1990); Sandvoß, *Widerstand in einem Arbeiterbezirk* (Berlin: Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand, 1983); and Sandvoß, *Widerstand in Steglitz und Zehlendorf*. See also, Croes and Kosmala, “Facing Deportation,” 121.
 61. See BA R 8150/26, 8150/27, ZIH 112/21b, StadtA Mainz NL Oppenheim 52/28, YVA 0.8/14, “Monatliche Entwicklung der jüdischen Bevölkerung in Berlin, 1941–1943.”
 62. CJA 4.1, 3156.
 63. On the diversity of the city and its sources of aid for Jews, see Croes and Kosmala, “Facing Deportation,” 122.
 64. See Avraham Barkai, “Jewish Life in Its German Milieu,” in *German-Jewish History in Modern Times*, vol. 4: *Renewal and Destruction, 1918–1945*, ed. Michael A. Meyer (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 57.
 65. Nechama Tec, “Helping Behavior and Rescue during the Holocaust,” in Hayes, *Lessons and Legacies*, 210–24.
 66. Tec, “Helping Behavior,” 213.
 67. Gruner, *Persecution of the Jews*, 53.
 68. Tec, “Helping Behavior and Rescue,” 211–12.
 69. See Croes and Kosmala, “Facing Deportation,” 123, 146.
 70. Croes and Kosmala, “Facing Deportation,” 117.
 71. Schrafstetter, *Flucht und Versteck*, 83.
 72. Among a host of excellent literature on modernity and the vibrant cultural and artistic milieus in the city and Weimar Germany, more generally, see, for example, the memoirs of Christopher Isherwood, *Christopher and His Kind* (London: Eyre Metem, 1997); Robert Beachy, *Gay Berlin: Birthplace of a Modern Identity* (New York: Vintage Books, 2014). Also, Peter Jelavich, *Berlin Cabaret* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993); Peter Gay, *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968); Katharina von Ankum, ed., *Women in the Metropolis: Gender and Modernity in Weimar Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); and Eric D. Weitz, *Weimar Germany: Promise and Tragedy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007). For more information on the city during the Third Reich, see Rüdiger Hachtmann, Thomas Schaarschmidt, and Winfried Süß, eds., *Berlin im Nationalsozialismus: Politik und Gesellschaft 1933–1945 (Beiträge zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus)* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2011).
 73. Wolfgang Ribbe, ed., *Geschichte Berlins: Von der Märzrevolution bis zur Gegenwart* (München: C.H. Beck Verlag, 1988), 2:934. See also Richard F. Hamilton, *Who Voted for Hitler?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), 476.

74. On the antisemitic measures taken against Jews in the city between 1933 and 1945 and the reaction of the Berlin population, see Wolf Gruner, “Die Verfolgung der Juden und die Reaktionen der Berliner,” in *Berlin, 1933–1945*, ed. Michael Wildt and Christoph Kreutzmüller (München: Siedler Verlag, 2013), 311–24.