

Chapter 3

LIVING



The first full year of living submerged took a horrific toll on the U-boats. At the start of 1944, approximately 2,300 Berlin Jews remained on the run. For these individuals, 1944 remained a dangerous extension of the previous year. The Allied invasion at Normandy and Soviet advances into Poland provided hope but no tangible benefits. Allied victories only hardened Nazi resolve to pursue the Final Solution. To that end, the Nazis increasingly sought to solve the question of the legal status of Germany's remnant Jewish population and ordered the deportation of Jewish widows and widowers of non-Jews. They also ordered the conscription of *Mischlinge* and Jewish spouses of non-Jews to work in forced labor battalions throughout the Greater Reich and France. The radicalization of the war effort thus led to a parallel radicalization of Nazi antisemitic policy and convinced some previously protected Jews in the city to submerge. Throughout 1944, the challenges associated with procuring food and shelter, surviving air raids, and avoiding denunciation and arrest remained at the forefront of the U-boats' experiences. Illness, death, and sexual violence also were widespread concerns, and despite differences in coping with the myriad challenges to survival, these were common to many divers. Yet as they adjusted to the demands of illegal life, survival came to mean more than just physical self-preservation, and experiences began to diverge. Crucially, in their pursuit of survival, submerged Jews began to establish basic routines in the search for some level of normality and self-affirmation in an otherwise chaotic world. The consequence of

the establishment of such routines in fact enabled some of the U-boats not simply to survive but to begin to create some semblance of an “everyday” life.

The notion that submerging could provide an operative space in which to pursue an everyday life in a time and place as dangerous, brutal, and bizarre as Nazi Germany is not as far-fetched as it might seem. The idea of everyday life need not and—in the case of Berlin’s divers—should not imply “ordinary” or “unchanging.” There was, to be sure, nothing ordinary or unchanging about U-boat experiences in Nazi Berlin or, indeed, the Jewish experience in Nazi Germany throughout the regime’s twelve-year existence. However, as scholars studying the history of everyday life (*Alltagsgeschichte*), especially during the Third Reich, have argued, there is no one definition of the everyday.¹ Nor is the everyday fixed or enduring. Rather, when considering what the idea of an “everyday” meant to Berlin’s dashers and divers, we should take note of the historian Dennis Sweeney’s understanding of the “transitory nature of the everyday,” of “everyday life as a series of unique places, each with its own particular temporalities and routines.”² Everyday life, even in times of peace and stability, is anything but fixed; it is a fragile and constantly shifting concept and therefore not at all incompatible with understanding that even amid the unstable terrain of submerged life in Berlin there was still the potential for an everyday life, one that held out the hope for a degree of relative safety and stability. Certainly, this life was ephemeral and often highly circumscribed. For the U-boats, it might last anywhere from a few days to a few months, depending on ever-changing circumstances: the threat of denunciation, air raids, illness or death, a hostile or frightened helper, and, ultimately, the Battle for Berlin could all too quickly bring an end to an everyday existence. And yet repeatedly in survivor testimony we find that the end of one everyday could, and often did, lead to a new everyday. In fact, the tenuous and fluctuating nature of a submerged existence does not negate the possibilities for pursuing and achieving a life characterized by everyday routine and an expression of individual agency. Rather, it highlights not only the extreme durability of the concept of the everyday but also the very malleability of the concept, for when speaking about the everyday for Berlin’s divers, we are in fact speaking of multiple “everydays” of varying duration, of “everydays” that due to the act of Jews living camouflaged as Aryans meant the balancing of dual identities within their own daily lives.

Despite the highly individual and complex nature of daily life for the U-boats, the refusal to simply vanish into the shadows and survive isolated, alone, and immobile, if at all possible, repeatedly shines through in much survivor testimony concerning the pursuit of an “everyday.” Even

if the act of submerging in Berlin had not necessitated frequent mobility, survivors often behaved in ways so out of keeping with standard ideas of hiding, in ways so public and, from our perspective, so risky and unnecessary that we must conclude that there was another factor at play: the stubborn desire to remain an individual and not merely to survive but live. This stubbornness (*Eigensinn*), so central to understanding the history of everyday life in German history, seeks to understand, in the historian Paul Steege's words, "both the liberating possibilities of stubborn independence in the midst of daily life and the often unintentional complicity in producing and sustaining structures of *Herrschaft* [authority]." Although utilized to great effect in understanding non-Jewish individual behavior during the Third Reich, testimonies by former U-boats about their behavior while living submerged also have an *eigensinnig* (stubborn) quality running through them.³ On the one hand, the stubborn desire to pursue a daily life—even at great risk—is made abundantly clear in many survivor testimonies. On the other hand, because pursuit of such a life almost always required the concealment of one's true identity and the public adoption of an "Aryan" persona, everyday life meant coming into frequent contact with ardent Nazis and their sympathizers. The result was that effectively camouflaging oneself as an Aryan often required a show of support for the regime, creating an ironic situation in which defiance was of necessity expressed as complicity. Consider the following photograph of the U-boat Eugen F.:

Dressing in a Hitler Youth uniform served as excellent camouflage in his attempt to survive. As discussed in chapter 2, uniforms proved especially effective in disguising men of fighting age in a wartime society where vocal and visual support for the regime were essential for deflecting suspicion. Eugen F. did not wear this uniform



Figure 3.1. The U-boat Eugen F.⁴

for a specific purpose; rather, this uniform allowed him to move freely when he walked down the street.⁵ Neither the benefit of wearing such uniforms, however, nor the appearance of complicity with the regime was lost on the city's divers, one of whom expressed this reality in the fall of 1945 in his Odf application:

It is unnecessary to point out that every camouflage during that time needed to avail itself of the features of National Socialism. Only those who outwardly clothed themselves in the garb of national socialist customs and characteristics could have the hope of not attracting attention and to continue living camouflaged.⁶

While certainly true, this outward support of Nazi authority was not limited to men in uniform. Whether it meant reading the Nazi daily newspaper, the *Völkischer Beobachter*, while riding the streetcar, giving the Nazi salute when in public, or simply lending a supposedly sympathetic ear to ardent Nazis and their hopes for a final victory, Jews who chose to surface during the war and camouflage themselves as non-Jews routinely were brought into situations that inadvertently reinforced the authority of the Nazi state, even among those Jews working with resistance groups to actively undermine it. Separating the true identity of camouflaged Jews from their assumed identity was not always easy, which was precisely the point, as a good camouflage was critical for survival; the full, true self could not be present on the surface at all moments. Yet in examining survivor testimony from those individuals who stubbornly struggled and succeeded in building some semblance of everyday life, we will see time and again in this chapter how the everyday in such situations, despite the superficial appearance of support for the regime, “work[ed] to create moments where experiences of the self [could] flash up in burst of recognition”⁷ and allow the prewar self to shine through.

It was absolutely critical to the creation of an everyday life, then, for Jews to build off of their original contacts and early experiences of survival and solidify social networks of support: “I gradually collected around me a large circle of people who mustered great sympathy for my situation and helped me.”⁸ These networks helped Jews handle the physical challenges of evading capture and opened up avenues of escape from the physical and emotional limitations of an illegal life. These experiences demonstrate the paradox inherent in living submerged in and around Berlin, which this chapter explores: although the dangerous and marginalized situation of the city's divers and dashers should have severed whatever remaining connections they had to German society, after years of discriminatory policies that had first isolated and then physically ejected Jews from German society, illegal life often brought Jews together with

German society in surprising and subversive ways. As a result, life in the city witnessed atypical levels of interaction and intimacy between Jews and non-Jews and afforded noteworthy levels of agency to Jews attempting to live illegally. Friendships and romances formed and matured, and many helpers formed strong emotional bonds with the U-boats who came into their lives. Employment, although difficult to secure, also created a sense of purpose and enabled reentrance into a world that had been distant and hostile for years. The dynamic and individualistic nature of submerged life aided them in their endeavors. Not every U-boat succeeded; denunciations and arrests continued, and feelings of comfort and security often were ephemeral or illusory. Moreover, while many divers built real and enduring relationships and were fortunate to find genuinely good people sympathetic to their plight, others were routinely surrounded by hateful and ardent supporters of the regime. Just as physical conditions varied greatly, so too did social interactions between Jews and non-Jews. In conjunction with physical challenges to survival, these interactions underscore the diversity of illegal life in the Nazi capital and the uncertain mixture of circumstance and conscious choice permeating the lives of the U-boats. Indeed, both their successes and disappointments demonstrate the centrality of the individual experience for shaping the quality of their submerged life as well as memories of that life.

“My husband left me after 14 years of marriage because of my Jewish descent”: Jewish *Mischlinge*, Widows, Widowers, Divorcées, and the Next Wave of Illegals⁹

In summer 1944, upward of two thousand Jews were living submerged in Berlin.¹⁰ In addition, some six thousand Jews resided legally in the city, forty-six hundred due to their marriage with non-Jews and the remainder due to their status as *Mischlinge*.¹¹ This figure shrank over the course of the next sixteen months as the authorities deported Jewish widows and widowers as well as certain *Mischlinge*. Out of a sample of 425 U-boats who survived the war submerged, this study identifies eight people (1.8 percent) who went into hiding at this time. Although this number is small, it reflects the increasing determination of the Nazi regime to solve the Jewish Question down to the last detail. With the last of the major deportations of most full Jews the previous year, the Nazis, under the leadership of Heinrich Himmler, turned their full attention to rooting out the remnants of the Jewish people in Germany.

Bureaucratic circles had been divided for years over how to classify and treat *Mischlinge*, a group of approximately 112,000 people.¹² These

divisions reflected both practical considerations (e.g., concern over a potential uproar from non-Jewish family members over the persecution and potential deportation of their loved ones) as well as ideological ones (e.g., how much “Jewish blood” disqualifies someone from membership in the *Volksgemeinschaft*?). They also exemplify the utterly confusing and capricious nature of the minutiae of Nazi race law in Germany. Broadly speaking, *Mischlinge* were any individuals who had a Jewish parent or grandparent(s). The treatment of these “half Jews,” however, varied according to ancestry and religious affiliation. Individuals with one Jewish grandparent (*Mischlinge* of the Second Degree) usually suffered in their careers and education but were exempt from deportation and wearing the Jewish Star.¹³ More problematic for the regime were the seventy-two thousand individuals who had one Jewish parent and one non-Jewish parent, so-called *Mischlinge* of the First Degree, many—but not all—of whom would be exempt from deportation until the final months of the war.¹⁴ If the couple remained childless and the husband was Aryan, the marriage was “privileged”; in this case, the Jewish spouse was exempt from deportation and not required to wear the Jewish Star.¹⁵ Similarly, a mixed marriage in which the children had been raised Christian was also privileged, an odd exception to National Socialist beliefs that religion did not affect race.¹⁶ Yet even among those categorized as a *Mischling* of the First Degree, a further distinction was made to determine which of these individuals would be classified as a so-called *Geltungsjuden* (“equivalent to Jews”) and be subjected to many of the same harsh measures as full Jews, often including deportation.¹⁷ This latter classification, affecting about seven thousand Jews in Germany in its pre-1938 borders, was applied to *Mischlinge* of the First Degree who either were married to full Jews at the time of the implementation of the Nuremberg Race Laws on 15 September 1935, were still a member of the Jewish Community at the time of said laws, or were born after 31 July 1936 from a relationship deemed as a consequence of those laws as *Rassenschande* (race defilement, that is, sexual intercourse between a Jew and a non-Jew). Yet many of these individuals had few or no ties to Judaism, and in some cases did not even know that they fell under this category until it was too late, thinking instead that they qualified as a *Mischling* of the First Degree. Indeed, ideological obsession with blood and race along with bureaucratic capriciousness came together to reflect what the historian Maria von der Heydt has aptly identified in Nazi Germany as the “arbitrariness of racial definition.”¹⁸

Yet with the outbreak of war, the often-convoluted official government policy toward those individuals variously classified as half Jews began to crystalize and take on an increasingly virulent form. Indeed, the radicalization of Nazi antisemitic policy culminated in February 1945 with an

order to deport all remaining Jews and *Mischlinge* from Germany's capital. Only the lack of adequate transport caused by the Reich's impending collapse prevented this order from being executed in Berlin.¹⁹ Already in April 1940, Hitler had ordered the dismissal of *Mischlinge* and non-Jews in mixed marriages from the Wehrmacht.²⁰ Despite the efforts of some individuals to disguise their status, most had been discovered and forced out by 1942.²¹ The hysteria and paranoia of Nazi officials only increased as the war dragged on. In 1943, official opinion coalesced around the idea of employing half Jews and couples in mixed marriages in segregated forced labor battalions in Germany and France coordinated by the Organisation Todt (OT).²² Himmler ramped up the conscription rate in October 1944 in what has been referred to as a "second Fabrik-Aktion."²³ The Nazis sent male *Mischlinge* and the non-Jewish husbands of Jewish women to work throughout the country. Female *Mischlinge* and those with physical impairments were conscripted into local outfits.²⁴ The physical conditions in these battalions varied exceedingly. The workers were technically free, could send letters home and receive packages, and were able to apply for leave.²⁵ However, many of the camps were little better than the concentration and labor camps endured by full Jews, and the removal of *Mischlinge* into these isolated battalions was a slippery slope that easily could lead to internment in a concentration camp.²⁶ By 1944, the knowledge of the genocide of Europe's Jews was widespread among Berlin's Jews, and any official promises concerning the treatment of OT workers rang hollow. As the war turned against the National Socialist regime and its policy toward the *Mischlinge* hardened, some Jews began to flee their battalions and submerge.²⁷

As part of the Nazis' attempt to resolve the question of the status of so-called half Jews and those in mixed marriages, on 18 December 1943 Heinrich Müller, chief of the Gestapo, ordered the deportation of divorced and widowed Jews of non-Jews to Theresienstadt. At that time, the future U-boat Susanne Hesse worked as a train car washer for the Reichsbahn in Berlin (see figure 3.2). She had moved to the city from Breslau three years earlier after her husband Hans separated from her because she was Jewish, a practice upheld by law since July 1938 but one that officials had encouraged since 1933.²⁸ To facilitate the separation, Hans had turned to the Breslau Gestapo. The Gestapo's threats persuaded Susanne to move to Berlin and live with her mother. In Berlin, Hesse clung to a precarious but still protected existence, because her marriage remained in effect until October 1943.²⁹ On 10 January 1944, the Gestapo finally arrived to arrest Susanne, but she was not at home.³⁰ As a result of this narrow escape, Hesse decided to submerge.



Figure 3.2. Susanne Hesse.³¹

Divorce on the grounds that one partner was Jewish was common in Nazi Germany, although evidence suggests that most non-Jews remained loyal to their spouses.³² Still, Nazi officials and their supporters encouraged the practice, particularly in cases involving someone of social importance.³³ Thus, German authorities “forcibly” dissolved Eva Kemlein’s marriage to the non-Jewish author Herbert Kemlein by withholding his wages.³⁴ Similarly, Ellen Reppel and her non-Jewish husband, a professional boxer, divorced, because “otherwise he would have had to give up his sport.”³⁵ Although life in a mixed marriage incited daily persecution in the forms of verbal harassment, destruction of careers, and a second-tier status within German society, these marriages were the only thing protecting the Jewish spouse from deportation. Indeed, some people resisted repeated demands from the authorities that they divorce.³⁶

In some cases, divorces resulted from antisemitic attitudes on the part of the non-Jewish spouse. Lissi Tessman’s husband divorced her in January 1943, “since between [them] considerable differences had arisen due to racial differences.”³⁷ However, the reasons for divorce varied, and many

cannot be verified. Herbert A., born in 1927 and baptized a Lutheran, mentions that his parents divorced “due to reasons of race politics” (*aus rassenpolitischen Gründen*). This rather ambiguous phrase leaves unanswered the question of whether the pressures of National Socialist anti-semitic policy crushed the parents or whether the issue tore apart the marriage from the inside.³⁸

People also divorced as a means of safeguarding the family structure.³⁹ Isaak Grünberg married his Christian wife Fried Hanke on 13 August 1918, and she gave birth to their son Erwin a month later. Isaak and his wife worked together in the tailoring business, and their marriage was a happy one “until the Hitler regime befell [the] Germans and tore us apart.”⁴⁰ By October 1940, the pressures and threats against the family had increased to the point that Isaak felt forced to leave home. The authorities gave his wife an ultimatum: either divorce her husband or the family would lose its domicile and business. The fate of their son was also a factor. By divorcing her husband, Grünberg’s wife could change her son’s status to *Mischling*. Otherwise, the child qualified as a *Geltungsjude*. The decision was a difficult one for the family, but the knowledge that his wife and family were safe gave him “satisfaction.”⁴¹ Despite the pain of divorce and the ensuing years in hiding—Isaak submerged on 2 June 1942—the Grünbergs reached the decision mutually, taking into account the challenges of staying together and weighing them against the pain of separation and the persecution of the Jewish spouse.⁴² The Grünbergs designed their decision to ensure the best outcome under a set of unfavorable conditions. At the time of their divorce, the deportations had not yet begun, and staying married seemed to pose a bigger threat to the family. Also, once the deportations started, some Jews worried that the Nazis might deport their non-Jewish spouses.⁴³ The Nazis’ convoluted attitude toward *Mischlinge* and the Grünbergs’ willingness to exploit the law allowed the family to hold on to their business and guarantee a protected status for the Erwin.⁴⁴ Ultimately, thanks to the unwavering love and fidelity of Fried, who provided for him during his illegal years, Isaak survived the war.

The emotional strain and social isolation of living in a mixed marriage sometimes was unbearable; the benefits afforded by such marriages were not always clear, especially to the non-Jewish partner. On 3 March 1943, less than a week after the Large Factory Operation, Gertrud Stephan, the Jewish wife of a non-Jewish district chimney sweeper, reported to police that her husband Walter had committed suicide in his Prenzlauer Berg workshop; he had hanged himself from his ladder. He left behind a note: “Farewell, you beautiful world.” The police report linked his suicide to

his wife: “Because his wife is Jewish, and he feared for her troubles, which he no longer wanted to experience.”⁴⁵ On 7 December 1943, the Nazis deported Gertrud on the forty-seventh transport to Auschwitz.⁴⁶ Walter Stephan probably was unaware that his death prompted the deportation of his wife nine months later. Nonetheless, his suicide had mortal consequences for her, and it highlights the importance of the non-Jewish spouse for ensuring the continued protection of their Jewish partner. Thus, beginning in January 1944, with the deportation of Jewish widows and widowers of non-Jews, a new—albeit significantly smaller—wave of submerging began. However, for reasons perhaps pertaining to the logistics associated with deportation, some people did not submerge until June 1944.⁴⁷ Others used a variety of tactics, including forged documents, to forestall submerging until the last few months of the war.⁴⁸ Yet by the beginning of 1944, most Jewish widows and widowers had only a small span of time between the death of their non-Jewish spouse and the moment of their arrest to consider submerging. Often, the Jewish *Fahnder* were waiting for the grieving spouse outside of the funeral.⁴⁹

Fifty-seven-year-old Eugenie Nase (see figure 3.3), widowed since 1934, had learned relatively early the dangers associated with Gestapo actions. The Nazis had arrested most of her family in 1938. From that date forward, she made a point of hiding during every Gestapo operation. In January 1944, however, Gestapo agents appeared at her door and asked her to accompany them to headquarters. The agents granted Nase’s request that her *Mischling* son be allowed to escort her. Despite countless examples in the previous two and a half years of Jews fleeing arrest, the agents relied on an aura of fear to ensure Nase’s compliance, and they left her and her son alone in the hallway at headquarters. Nase used the opportunity to back out of the hallway and flee the building. The appearance of her son with her enabled Nase to “bluff” the two police officers guarding the entrance into letting them leave. She and her son then headed straight to the nearest bank. A friend of the family returned to her apartment and packed a few of her possessions in a suitcase. Eugenie and her son then fled the city for two months.⁵⁰

The day before Eugenie Nase submerged, Lydia Haase also fled, leaving behind her mentally handicapped twenty-three-year-old son Falko. Although her non-Jewish husband had passed away in 1936, Haase had argued that she could not be deported because she had to care for her son. Yet when Haase went to the ration card distribution center a few days later, the workers at the center refused to issue her ration cards, a sign of her imminent arrest. Haase was fortunate not to have been arrested by a *Fahnder*, some of whom frequented Jewish ration card distribution centers



Figure 3.3. Eugenie Nase.⁵¹

to arrest illegal Jews and those, like Haase, who recently had lost their legal residency status.⁵² Haase therefore submerged and assumed a new name: Lucie Hoffmann. She did this in the hope of being able to look after her son, who was living in a health institution. Indeed, the head of the institution continued to allow Haase to visit her son for the remainder of the war and camouflaged her visits.⁵³

Jews who submerged in 1944 did so as a result of the radicalization of National Socialist antisemitic policy. As previously protected Jewish groups recognized too late, the nature of the party's ideology could never have allowed *Mischlinge* and *Mischehen* to retain even a marginal existence within the *Volksgemeinschaft*. Once most full Jews had been deported, any remaining vestiges of the Jewish community had to be purged. Although most Berlin *Mischlinge* and Jews in *Mischehen* did survive the war, the position of widows, widowers, and divorcées was far more precarious. Their best hope was to submerge. In doing so, they joined the city's other divers in the daily struggle for survival.

“Because I was bored . . . I decided to get a job”: The Experiences of Employment

In January 1944, fifty-four-year-old Charlotte Josephy lived in the small town of Rüdnitz bei Bernau, about twenty-eight kilometers outside of Berlin. She had moved to the town during the previous summer on the advice of a lady she had met in the city. Josephy’s false papers and a *Bombenschein* (a document proving one’s status as a victim of the air raids) enabled this flight from Berlin. Yet although she received a residency permit and ration cards, Josephy’s stay in Rüdnitz was distressing. The antisemitism of the town’s residents became too much to handle, and the *Fahnder* recently had begun combing the city’s nearby small towns for U-boats. These factors persuaded Charlotte to search for a change in venue, and on Saturday, 15 January 1944, she read the following ad in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*:

Reliable Nanny with good references sought for 3 children aged 1–7 in a quiet, rural villa household with family ties, as soon as possible. Mrs. Marg. Bender, Ostseebad Zoppot bei Danzig, Baedekerweg 3.⁵⁴

Josephy made the requisite inquiries, and Herr Bender interviewed her on the telephone. In April 1944, she moved to Zoppot bei Danzig.⁵⁵ Josephy’s case was not unique. Indeed, employment was a key factor in the survival of many U-boats and had a significant impact on how many of the survivors remembered their time in hiding. Certainly, not everyone worked. However, employment was a formative part of the submerged experience, and it illustrates the relative freedom of movement and action available to many Jews.

• • •

The primary purpose for the U-boats in having a job was to buy food and shelter or else contribute to the household caring for them.⁵⁶ Thus, working was a necessary part of survival and made the continued support of non-Jews more feasible. One woman, a seamstress, supported herself and her husband by sewing and cleaning for fourteen different acquaintances, many of whom also offered her shelter.⁵⁷ Similarly, to support his wife and child, another diver found work as a tailor and a wood chopper.⁵⁸ Yet despite the central role employment played in sustaining the U-boats materially, work was not solely a means to survival. Rather, survivor testimony indicates that employment served three valuable social functions for Jews, and furthermore had a fundamental impact on how male and female U-boats experienced and remembered their time in hiding.

First, with respect to the social functions of work, employment provided the U-boats with a release from the tedium and loneliness of hiding. Employment also allowed these individuals to escape from dangerous or unpleasant living conditions. Second, working brought Berlin's illegals into contact with broad sections of the non-Jewish population, enabling them to interact with gentile society, to observe the German home front, and to experience compassion and friendship as well as hatred and persecution. Third, work, even if unpaid, functioned as a form of resistance and self-expression. In some cases, work as an act of resistance manifested itself in real attempts to hinder the goals of the Nazi state, as evidenced by those who participated in distributing anti-Nazi literature or working with circles of resistance. In most cases, however, work functioned more as an act of stubborn self-expression, as personal resistance that afforded the city's divers opportunities to wield whatever agency still existed for them in a state bent not only on their physical destruction but also on the destruction of their individual spirit. Indeed, the resulting expressions of such agency provide insight into the talents and personalities of the U-boats that the Nazis were unable to squash.

Submerged life in Berlin, especially for those who physically hid, was not only dangerous but also often tedious and lonely.⁵⁹ Survivors thus tried to amuse and employ themselves in a variety of ways. One survivor knitted a dress and, once it was finished, took it apart to begin again. Her husband, meanwhile, read newspapers and novels.⁶⁰ Another U-boat busied himself by writing poetry, chronicling his experiences of hiding and his hopes and dreams for the future.⁶¹ Others, however, tried to escape the tedium through more public forms of employment. Konrad Latte, child of Breslau Jewish converts to Christianity—but still a full Jew according to the Nuremberg Laws—focused on his passion for music; indeed, he founded the famous Berliner Barock-Orchester after the war. Latte played music to take his mind off of the “boring and seedy” nature of hiding. Through an acquaintance, he found work playing the organ at funerals and thus funded his life underground; as the war dragged on, he became quite in demand. Another connection found Latte work at the State Opera, a job that once brought him face to face with Hermann Göring after a performance of Richard Wagner's *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg*. Later in the war, Latte even joined a traveling musical troupe. Yet as his chronicler notes, “It wasn't a thirst for adventure that drove and in the end saved him. It was simply that his ambition to excel in his profession was stronger than his fear of his persecutors, and that to reach his goal he had to crisscross Berlin everyday.”⁶²

Employment also enabled the U-boats to escape dangerous and intolerable situations. Charlotte Josephy responded to the advertisement in

the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* for this very purpose. Her new job allowed her to flee the intolerable antisemitic atmosphere in Rüdnitz and the dangers presented by the *Fahnder*. Having a plausible reason to move also made traveling, with its many pass inspections, somewhat safer. So did having the support of a prominent family. Josephy's new employers, the Bender family, moved in high circles of Nazi society, and Josephy recalled that Albert Forster, *Gauleiter* of Danzig, was one of the family's guests. The willingness and ability to relocate functioned as a valuable shield against the dangers of arrest and afforded the U-boats a chance to find safer living conditions.⁶³

In some postwar testimonies, work also functions as a representation of how camouflaged Jews remember their lives on the run, and it demonstrates a truly broad range of survivor encounters with German society. These personal interactions with German society influenced the emotional experience of hiding, resulting in diverse survivor memories and conflicting viewpoints. Indeed, survivor descriptions of work often provide the clearest insight into daily life and its emotional consequences. Moreover, of all experiences while living submerged, work is perhaps the least foreign to contemporary society. As such, postwar accounts likely discuss employment in order to convey more intangible impressions and feelings.

Ruth Arndt had a great time spending her days off in the summer of 1944 bicycling around the Harz Mountains. Since April of that year, she had been working as a nursemaid for an agricultural attaché from Spain, Dr. José Santaella, and she accompanied the family on their summer vacation. Ruth had found the position when another illegal recommended Ruth's services to the attaché. He met Ruth at the famous Hotel Adlon, mere steps from the Brandenburg Gates, hired her, and took her to stay with the family on their country estate. Ruth hesitated to leave her family behind; however, her new employers also hired Ruth's mother as their new cook. Although Ruth and her mother lived under different names and pretended not to know one another, being together under the same roof was a great comfort.⁶⁴ Compared to the dangers of Berlin, the five months between April and September 1944 were a positive time in Ruth's illegal life. The family, including the attaché's German mother-in-law, knew that Ruth and her mother were Jewish and treated them with respect and kindness. Ruth ate well, a great luxury. She also did not worry about air raids in the countryside and was able to sleep. Moreover, the family paid Ruth and her mother for their work. Opportunities to accompany the family on vacation and to ride a bicycle—privileges long since denied Jews—allowed Ruth to escape Berlin's dangerous conditions, physically as well as emotionally.

Escaping Berlin was not the only way to find comfort and moments of relative peace and freedom. Even within the city, employment could provide meaningful social interaction and a sense of normality. For much of late 1943 and early 1944, Dr. Charlotte Bamberg moved from town to town as new threats arose and new opportunities for work presented themselves. By late spring 1944, however, Charlotte was back in Berlin and running the store of a furrier who recently had mended her coat. Posing as the owner's cousin, Bamberg made the bomb-damaged but well-stocked store into her own "Paradise": "I had an open store, decorated the display windows, sold gloves, scarves, artificial flowers, and canes, and repaired umbrellas as the only store [of its kind] in the western part of the city."⁶⁵ Considering that civilian consumer-goods production in 1944 was between 50 to 60 percent of what it had been at the outbreak of war, Charlotte's store very well might have been unique, as she herself noted.⁶⁶ Furthermore, her account of this period is tinged with pride. She enjoyed decorating the display window. Her customers "streamed into the store." They liked her enough to bring her little presents, such as the occasional pear or *boulette*. In return, she put merchandise aside for these better customers, with whom she was friendly.⁶⁷ Bamberg enjoyed her job largely because of the "chatty clientele" she built up around her. She does not explicitly state how much she revealed to these customers, and considering the care that Jews went to fully mask their identities in public, we should assume that Bamberg remained aware of the precariousness of her position. Still, these interpersonal interactions, however superficial, appear to have brought her much joy. Indeed, with the exception of a brief mention of the air raids, all other indications of the time, place, and dangerous circumstances in which she was living, vanish; she might have been discussing her first job in a bygone era of peace and stability. It is also worth considering (although Bamberg does not comment on it herself) what this small store and her position in it represented for her. Certainly, the store itself served as a place of physical safety, shelter (along with food) being essential for ensuring that safety. However, her assumed identity as the owner's cousin in one of the last, remaining locations of its kind in the city seems to have imbued in this gregarious and amiable individual a degree of cool confidence. She was the face of the store, in many respects, a purveyor of increasingly scarce goods, and this conferred on her a degree of authority, which she exercised judiciously and to her advantage in her interactions with her customers. If the confidence and relative happiness with which she related her experiences in the store are any guide, this comparatively safe space appears to have reinforced her position and sense of self. Indeed, practitioners of everyday life remind us that "cultivating a certain kind of self presumes in turn a certain kind of

place in which that self can potentially thrive.”⁶⁸ Thus we see something perhaps resembling a tenuous, self-perpetuating cycle in Bamberg’s experience, in that the store represented security, security begat a confidence, and that growing confidence further increased Bamberg’s sense of security and self (if only temporarily).

Above all, Bamberg was not cut off from those who knew her true identity, undoubtedly a welcome and necessary feeling during a time when one more often than not was trapped in a false identity. The store then also operated as a place “where [she] could speak in all openness with good, true friends, who came freely into the store.”⁶⁹ Of critical note here is Bamberg’s use of the word “friends” (*Freunde*). This word has a much more specific use in the German language than it does in English, where “friend” and “friendship” can signify anything from a mere acquaintanceship to a platonic relationship of great endurance and depth. In German, use of the word “friend,” in particular during the last century, meant exclusively the latter idea. Germans generally do not use the word with abandon, and their language is rich with nuanced descriptions of personal relationships of varying levels of intimacy: acquaintances (*Bekanntes*), fellows (*Burschen*), comrades (*Kameraden*), and buddies (*Kumpel*) as well as a variety of verbs such as “to become chummy” (*anfreunden*) or “to befriend” (*befreunden*). Bamberg’s use of the word *Freunde* is therefore a telling indication that strong relationships between Jews and non-Jews could continue during this time. Her close relationships furthermore highlight the understandable pursuit of the “ordinary” during the “extraordinary” (to borrow from Andrew Bergerson) during this time. Indeed, the juxtaposition is striking. On one level, Bamberg and her friends met in an ordinary store in a neighborhood in Berlin to socialize, under any other circumstances a truly banal gathering. It is only when one remembers that Bamberg was a Jewish woman on the run from the Nazis, working in a bomb-damaged store in wartime Berlin that one sees the extraordinary double narrative occurring, one in which the seeming everyday comes head to head with the bizarre.

If discussions of work have the potential to illuminate positive experiences of submerged life, they can also underscore its more brutal and nightmarish facets. In its most positive form, steady work engendered a measure of much-needed stability and “normal” social intercourse. Opportunities for work allowed the divers to resurface from their submerged milieu and experience a part of Germany from which they had been excluded. As social creatures, humans often crave the company of others. In times of great distress and hardship, the value of such interactions is inestimable, as evidenced by the language Ruth and Charlotte use to discuss their jobs. However, employment also served as a reminder of the

cynicism and hostility of large segments of the non-Jewish population. Even in cases where a job provided relative safety and opportunities for movement, social interaction, and improved rations, a malevolent workplace exacerbated the emotional strains of hiding.

Annelies B.'s experiences were emblematic of such fear and misery. She and her blind twin sister Marianne spent much of the war running from one place to the next and holding a variety of jobs. Once, Annelies found work with her sister taking care of five children on a large farming estate near Breslau. Annelies secured the position under the guise of needing a vacation from the bombings in the city. She had hoped that the man would not be a Nazi. His name had a "von" in it, and her assumption demonstrates that the myth of aristocratic anti-Nazism existed well before the war's end. This man, in fact, was an ardent Nazi who monitored anti-Nazi sentiment among the local population. According to Annelies, the estate was a safe place to live; nobody would suspect a Jew of living there. Moreover, she had earned the man's respect one day by admitting that she was not really a secretary, as she had claimed. Instead, she led him to believe that she worked for the Gestapo, and he approved. Annelies and her sister stayed with the family for six weeks.⁷⁰ During this time, Annelies balanced her work on the estate with trips to Berlin to collect ration cards. She had developed an excellent system. Operating under the guise of an agent of the Gestapo, Annelies told the estate owner that she needed to return to Berlin every so often to complete a task for her "secret" job. In return, her Gestapo "boss" in Berlin granted her four extra days off for her vacation in the countryside. This lie ensured that Annelies and her sister could extend their stay in the countryside while simultaneously continuing to receive their ration cards and escape the dangers of Berlin. Yet the sisters could not prolong their stay forever, and soon they gave their notice. In gratitude for her excellent work, her boss gave her a gift: a bar of soap made of "Jewish bones" from a concentration camp that a friend had sent to him. Annelies took it, in her words, expressionless.⁷¹

In reality, the Nazis did not make soap from the fat of murdered Jews. Widely propagated after the war, Annelies's account, given forty-six years after her liberation, appears to reflect the influence of collective survivor memory on her own experiences. After the liberation of the city of Danzig (Gdańsk, in present-day Poland), it was discovered that the Anatomic Institute of the Danzig Medical School, under Professor Rudolf Spanner, experimented with the production of small amounts of soap made from the fat of human bodies. This experiment lasted approximately one year (February 1944–January 1945), and the manufactured soap was used for lubrication and cleaning purposes. The fat was taken from executed German prisoners as well as Poles and, in a few instances, Russian prisoners

of war. No individuals were executed specifically for the purpose of making the soap, and the Stutthof concentration camp located near Danzig, where Jews were held, did not provide any of the corpses for these heinous and ghastly experiments.⁷² However, evidence suggests that Annelies's memory still might be accurate. The soap myth did originate during the Third Reich, and the tale held some currency among the higher echelons of the Nazi leadership. The Nazis' sadistic utilization of Jewish hair and dental fillings suggests that they certainly would have had no moral compunctions about rendering fat from murdered Jews to produce soap. Also, the acronym printed on mass-produced soap lent itself to misreadings: R.I.F. (*Reichsstelle für Industriefette*) looks quite similar to the initials R.J.F. (*Reines Judenfett*). Another possibility is that the similarity of the two acronyms seemed a particularly funny joke to the most fervent believers in the Final Solution, thereby perhaps providing another basis for the myth. Annelies's employer was a fanatical Nazi, presumably one with important party contacts. Therefore, he might have given Annelies a bar of R.I.F. soap and explained to her, either in jest or in earnest belief, its supposed origins.

In contrast to the experiences of Ruth and Charlotte, for whom work engendered positive memories, Annelies's account of her employment serves as a vehicle through which to convey her dread and anguish. From a perspective of survival, Annelies's employment experience on the estate had been ideal. The estate owner's party connections and the fear with which the local populace seemed to regard him ensured her safety. The system whereby Annelies secured ration cards and prolonged her stay outside of Berlin was a clever example of the opportunities available for Jews evading arrest to manipulate the system. Yet Annelies remembers nothing emotionally positive or redeeming about her employment. Indeed, her work on the estate was but one of many negative moments during the war. In particular, the gift of soap is illustrative of the profound grief and horror that characterized her submerged life. In all three cases, however, memories of work suggest that the quality of the individual's personal interactions with non-Jews was essential for positive experiences while living submerged. Material concerns, although essential for survival, were only one factor in the struggle to keep body and soul together and thus remain an individual.

Employment also provided an opportunity for some U-boats to demonstrate their individual talent and initiative. Thus, Konrad Latte took advantage of his musical prowess to support himself and advance his own career interests. In a similar fashion, Jacob Gersten sustained himself by painting and selling watercolors to known antifascists. Gersten listed his profession as an advertising agent (*Reklamemakler*). He had worked from

April 1930 until the end of March 1936 as the sole drawer of advertisements for Hertie, a major department store. His clandestine occupation not only enabled him to survive, it also provided him with a valuable outlet for self-expression, as it was well suited to his talents.⁷³

Not all Jews engaged in paid work; yet occupying oneself without guaranteed pay also was a form of employment. Indeed, some illegals found numerous ways to employ their energies and talents, often through acts of resistance. These acts provided satisfaction and served as an opportunity to utilize one's strengths within a limited environment. In particular, survivors mention antifascist activities, such as distributing flyers or giving speeches to those who would listen.⁷⁴ Organizations such as the Community for Peace and Construction (*Gemeinschaft für Frieden und Aufbau*), founded by the U-boat Werner Scharff, and the Zionist youth group Chug Chaluzi are noteworthy examples of resistance groups in which Jews could and did play prominent roles.⁷⁵ On the whole, however, Jewish participation in organized resistance groups was limited. Large-scale acts of Jewish resistance, as seen in the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, did not transpire in Germany, and to look for parallels or similarities in Berlin obscures the importance of individual resisters in the city.⁷⁶

A large number of U-boats tended to focus their immediate postwar accounts on their own individuality in resisting.⁷⁷ In part, this might be the result of necessity; individuals who proved their participation in "illegal antifascist work" were more likely to receive favorable treatment in postwar Berlin. Yet in focusing on their antifascist work, survivors illustrate the relative freedom of action afforded them in the city. Nor does the focus on individual initiative disappear in later accounts and published memoirs by survivors.⁷⁸ Acts of resistance did not transcend the daily rhythms of submerged life; they were part of those rhythms, and they highlight the potential for personal initiative in the city. Life in Berlin was an individual affair, and when opportunities for action presented themselves, they provoked individualistic responses.

The ophthalmologist Dr. Erich Weinberg and his family fled the Gestapo on 26 February 1943. Like all Jewish physicians, Weinberg had lost the right to be known as a doctor in 1938.⁷⁹ However, he had continued to work as a "treater of Jews" (*Judenbehandler*) and as head of the Polyclinic for People with Eye Illnesses (*Poliklinik für Augenranke*) until 1942. When Weinberg fled arrest, he spent an unspecified part of the year hiding in a cellar in the suburb of Falkensee. In 1944, he resurfaced in Falkensee and began to engage in what he termed "sabotage." For the duration of the war, Weinberg worked to undermine the German war effort by giving members of the Wehrmacht and Home Army (*Volkssturm*) injections to induce fever.⁸⁰ Weinberg does not mention the source of

his supply of “fever injections”; nor does he mention how these soldiers found him. He also neglects to mention whether he received payment for his services. According to his testimony, Weinberg had connections with opposition groups; the first individuals to give him sanctuary when he submerged were reliable antifascists. Although he did not operate alone, he still pursued an avenue of resistance that reflected his educational background and personal talents. In doing so, he undermined the war effort and asserted his own identity.

In their search for employment, Jews also had to contend with Nazism’s views on “gender-appropriate” work. Nazi propaganda promoted the long-standing conservative ideal of *Kinder, Küche, Kirche* (children, kitchen, church).⁸¹ In this view, men were seen as the breadwinners of the family and women as stay-at-home mothers, raising children for the Fatherland and taking care of household duties. Although almost fourteen million German women were engaged in some form of employment related to the war effort by the middle of 1943, the safest work for female U-boats remained in domestic service.⁸² In turn, men labored as carpenters, tailors, wood cutters, or in similarly “male-appropriate” trades. The gendered nature of employment not only affected the types of jobs men and women found but also influenced how survivors remember their work. Women mention employment far more often than men do, and female survivors go to greater lengths in their testimonies to discuss the jobs they held while living camouflaged.

Male survivors possibly do not discuss illegal employment to the same extent as women because it did not stand out to them as sufficiently interesting enough to warrant comment. Even in the cosmopolitan and progressive atmosphere of 1920s Berlin, German society did not consider having a career to be as integral to female identity as it was to male identity. Society expected men to work; it merely tolerated women working. Yet, beginning with the Nazi seizure of power, a reversal began to take place in regards to gender and work, increasing subtly at first but accelerating greatly as Jews submerged in the early 1940s. Increasingly, women were called upon to be active and vocal advocates for their families, entering the workforce as their husbands lost their jobs and engaging in serious discussions surrounding the desirability and feasibility of emigration as the matter became more pressing.⁸³ Working, however, remained a continuation of male prewar or pre-Nazi “normal” life, and men perhaps were not as inclined to view their employment as an avenue of self-expression or as an indication of the vastly different world of hiding. Also, male U-boats often engaged in manual labor. Those among them who once had been white-collar professionals might have been indignant at the nature their underground work and thus chose not to mention it in their accounts,

especially in light of what, in her study of changing gender roles in Jewish families, Marion Kaplan has referred to as “men’s deep-seated identity with their occupation.”⁸⁴ Female U-boats, on the other hand, became the primary or sole breadwinners for the first time during their years in hiding, even if the 1930s had been a time when many of them had been unknowingly preparing for such future roles. Indeed, while the reality of women working while living submerged was not unique to Berlin, the social, political, and economic travails of the 1930s that had gradually required women to take on traditional male working functions speak to a parallel shift in gender roles that occurred at the same time. Thus, as the 1930s wore on, Jewish women increasingly entered the workforce to help make up for the husband’s lost income. This shift reflects economic changes specific to Germany in the 1930s that were not necessarily repeated elsewhere in Europe, where traditional gender roles often remained in place for Jews in hiding.⁸⁵ Women’s experiences of work therefore stood out to them as emblematic of submerged life, in which they were responsible for their own survival and sometimes that of their family. For some women, employment therefore undoubtedly was noteworthy, indicative not only of their submerged experiences but also reflective of broader changes that had already been occurring in Jewish–German life since the 1930s.

Interestingly, although most male survivors do not analyze their experiences during this time through the lens of paid employment, an exception arises for men engaged in the arts or in jobs that were risky or out of the ordinary. For example, Cioma Schönhaus’s memoirs devote several chapters to his work forging papers for illegal Jews. Similarly, Peter Schneider’s account of Konrad Latte’s life in hiding focuses on his passion for music and desire to pursue that passion against all odds. Latte’s “ambition to excel” and Schönhaus’s pride in his resistance and risk-taking suggest that work often receives ample commentary from male survivors only when it asserts a specific, self-selected, ego-driven identity. Yet even in these cases, a detailed discussion of paid employment was not immediately forthcoming after the war. Schönhaus waited almost sixty years to publish his personal account, and the journalist who interviewed Latte was looking to expose a hidden past.

Women also discuss paid employment more than men do, because more women worked. This was already a common trend by the late 1930s, as more jobs were open to them than to Jewish men, especially those formerly engaged in white-collar professions.⁸⁶ The prevalence of female employment almost certainly reflects the greater availability of work considered safe for female U-boats. The types of occupation most “suitable” for women in Nazi Germany often were not subject to regulation by the German labor authorities: nannies, housekeepers, cleaning women,

cooks, and, to a lesser degree, shop clerks. Thus, Dr. Charlotte Bamberg, when given a choice of false papers, chose the documents listing her occupation as house seamstress. Bamberg's reasoning: "Home seamstresses were completely undocumented, so that I had nothing to do with the work office; I stood, in some measure, in a free trade."⁸⁷ Indeed, employment in private homes remained relatively free from government interference, and because the circle of household contacts was small, the danger of discovery was limited.⁸⁸ Approval by one's Aryan employer also afforded a certain level of protection, especially if they were a party member: Charlotte Josephy's employer, the Bender family, was connected to high-ranking Nazis, including the *Gauleiter* of Danzig, Albert Forster.⁸⁹ In contrast, male divers rarely—if ever—found domestic employment, obtaining work instead in manual trades, factories, or sometimes in small businesses, areas of occupation subject to government regulation. Also, these jobs employed multiple people and increased the chances of denunciation. When men did work in factories or offices, they relied either on excellently forged papers or on the goodwill of their employers to keep their identity a secret.⁹⁰

Men who wanted or needed to work also had to contend with the fact that young German men were expected to be in the armed forces or engaged in essential work for the war effort.⁹¹ In October 1944, the German government conscripted all men between the ages of sixteen and sixty not yet in the military to serve in the *Volkssturm*, increasing the risks faced by male U-boats.⁹² Men, however, continued to brave the city streets, and false papers and a credible alibi became even more important. One evening on the S-Bahn, the Gestapo approached the teenage U-boat Bruno G. and demanded to see his papers. His friend Ruth Arndt sat a few seats away, uncertain of what would happen. Bruno presented his papers, which certified that he was a Czech forced laborer; he even spoke in the broken German accent he had been practicing. Czechs generally were paid laborers and allowed to move around the city, so Bruno's passport did not arouse suspicion.⁹³ The officer just reminded Bruno that his pass had expired and needed to be updated.⁹⁴ After this brief exchange, Bruno turned and gave Ruth a wink. Ruth, only three years Bruno's senior, had not warranted the Gestapo's attention; women were not potential soldiers. Bruno's presence of mind and stolen papers saved him, but the encounter nevertheless illustrates a particularly gendered challenge to survival.⁹⁵

The differences between male and female involvement in the workforce do not imply that men were less active than women were. Men engaged in a variety of activities, including working on the black market and engaging in acts of resistance. Moreover, one should not overestimate

the prevalence of Jewish employment; paid work was not easy to find, was dangerous to pursue, and was difficult to maintain for extended periods. For example, on 30 August 1943, the Gestapo undertook the search of a small firm and discovered, in addition to numerous goods subject to rationing, two guns and some ammunition. They also discovered that the firm's manager, a certain Kurt Jansen, was in reality an unregistered Jew by the name of Kurt Jacobson, and that Jacobson's secretary was also his wife; she was taken into immediate custody. His son Wolfgang was also present at the time of the arrest, but somehow father and son managed to flee. They were quickly apprehended, however. At that point, Jacobson, determined to fight back, suddenly turned on the arresting officer and pulled out a Walther pistol he had on his person. The officer, however, was quicker. Jacobson received a shot to the lung and died the following morning as a result of his wound. Police soon discovered that years before, the owner of the firm had been having financial difficulties and the work office had sent Jacobson to assist him. Jacobson apparently financed the firm and managed it under the pseudonym Jansen; he also secured his wife a position at the firm. Nobody besides the owner knew that Jacobson was Jewish. A hidden room, nicely apportioned, was constructed on one of the firm's floors to house husband, wife, and child. When the authorities in the past arrived to inquire about Jacobson's whereabouts, Jacobson (aka Jansen) simply lied and claimed that Jacobson had disappeared. And yet despite such elaborate and careful preparations, it all came to naught. Although police records do not elaborate further on the case, the fact that the Gestapo, Department IV D 1 (the section responsible for dealing with Jewish matters) had been called in to investigate strongly suggests a denunciation. It is unknown who made the denunciation, but Jacobson's case is illustrative of the host of unseen dangers facing Jews attempting to work, which even the best-laid plans sometimes could not avoid.⁹⁶ Still, the importance of the employment experience for Berlin's divers is hard to exaggerate. Its benefits often extended far beyond affording the essentials of food, clothing, and shelter. Indeed, having a job served a variety of personal functions for Jews evading arrest and attempting to live. The formative experience of work, for those who could find it, highlights the potential for and limits of Jewish self-expression and agency during this time.

Having a Social Life and Getting Out

Employment, while perhaps the safest excuse to leave one's place of hiding, was not the only reason to get out. Some Jews took advantage of their

mobility to enjoy themselves. Although more common among people in their teens, twenties, and thirties, divers of all ages surfaced on occasion and ventured out into German society. These social interactions provided a useful cover: no one expected Jews to insert themselves in German daily life. Moreover, many survivors enjoyed these forays into the open, which otherwise held few discernible benefits for physical survival. Indeed, in some survivor accounts, the omnipresent threats of discovery and arrest even seem to fade into the background, if only temporarily.

Moments of relaxation and lightheartedness were often quiet, small affairs. Dr. Arthur Arndt, father of Ruth and Erich, sheltered for the entire war in the pantry of a former patient. He had a bed and a night table and passed the time by reading.⁹⁷ Still, when possible, he left the apartment to visit his children, usually on Sundays. The family conversed and joked over card games. Ruth also wrote and recited poems to keep her mind occupied and relaxed.⁹⁸ Other survivors mention venturing out in public: to movie theaters (used for both pleasure and warmth), public baths (cleanliness being key to moving around inconspicuously in public)⁹⁹ cafés, restaurants, and billiard halls, all of which were popular ways to stretch one's legs and relax. The opera also was very popular among some divers, at least until the Gestapo and its Jewish informants caught on.¹⁰⁰ These locations, especially the restaurants and cafés, also served as places to purchase black market goods and make otherwise useful contacts, and therefore these sites served the dual aims of surviving and living.¹⁰¹

Jews living camouflaged often made efforts to socialize and ingratiate themselves in their new environment, and blending with non-Jews served a social as well as a practical purpose. Dr. Charlotte Bamberg traveled to the town of Perleberg, about one hundred miles outside of Berlin, after a new ordinance in the town of her previous residence required all "bombed out" citizens to register. The Hotel Berlin became her new home; the hotel also was a social gathering place for members of a Luftwaffe fighter squadron. In her recounting, this did not appear to bother Bamberg especially: "Escorted by a soldier, whom one got to know effortlessly over dinner, one radiated respect and trust, so that for some time peace descended."¹⁰² Whether at work or in social situations, earning the trust of non-Jews added a layer of protection. Assuming one's camouflage held, physically and socially speaking, fewer places could be safer for an intelligent, sophisticated woman who "effortlessly" met people over supper than a hotel hosting a Luftwaffe squadron. The language Bamberg used to describe these encounters suggests that she rather enjoyed the situation, while remaining cognizant of its gravity.

The pursuit of leisure occasionally took on even more ostentatious forms. Before his escape to Switzerland, Cioma Schönhaus bought a small

sailboat named the *Kamerad*. To better play the part of the experienced, recreational sailor, he even procured from a friend a white turtleneck sweater and white pants.¹⁰³ Yet he had almost no training, and Schönhaus's first foray alone was a minor calamity; he lost control of the boat on the Havel River, which wends its way through Berlin's western reaches, and wound up in the weeds. To prevent future disasters, Schönhaus bought an instruction book on sailing for beginners. After all, as a fellow diver reminded him, if the boat capsized, the authorities would be out there to inspect: "And, I suppose the watercolour stamps on your [fake] post-office ID card are waterproof?"¹⁰⁴ Yet despite the dangers, the desire to carve out moments of relaxation was a powerful motivator for some individuals.

Although many U-boats sought out moments of amusement, age played a role in their behavior. Schönhaus's sailboat purchase suggests that younger Jews—Schönhaus was only twenty years old—were more willing to take risks than older Jews who had entered maturity during the Weimar Republic or the Wilhelmine period. Of course, youthful behavior in pursuit of leisure and survival sometimes led to recklessness. Ruth Arndt spent part of 1944 working in a food store run by Nazis. To supplement her meagre supply of food, Ruth stole minute amounts of cocoa, coffee, and sugar and secreted them in small scraps of paper. In a moment of pride, Ruth confided in her father what she had been doing. Decades later, Ruth still remembered her father's response: "My God, I hope you children [will] get back to normal and stop all this once the war [is] over."¹⁰⁵ The struggle to survive sometimes prompted young illegals to take risks that frightened their elders, illustrating the age-old divide between generations. In the chaotic years of submerged life, when families were split up and youth were on their own, young people pushed boundaries with more confidence and recklessness than did their elders.¹⁰⁶

Dreary and tiring periods of confinement were a bore, and some divers, youth in particular, felt stifled. In pushing their boundaries, these individuals reveal a number of possibilities for action not usually associated with hiding. Yet illegal life in Nazi Berlin, however dangerous, still allowed for and sometimes even encouraged the perennial rebelliousness of youth. Thus, twenty-two-year-old Ingeborg E. found a job at a company as "office help" (*Bürokraft*), soon after submerging with her mother. Her mother's non-Jewish lover had secured this position for Ingeborg. The job served a few functions for her: "Since I did not want to be continually supported by my mother, and since I also wanted to have a few Marks for myself, and also because it was boring for me as a young person to stay at home, I went in search of a job."¹⁰⁷ Ingeborg's comment reflects the frustrations felt by many young illegals. The desire to escape the dual restrictions of parental

control and submerged life encouraged young people to forge their own paths to survival and self-development.

**“In March 1944 my mother died due to the many deprivations”:
Illness, Death, Pregnancy, and Sexual Violence in Hiding¹⁰⁸**

Many threats hung over the U-boats, a number of which they learned to avoid or at least mitigate. Illness and injury, however, were often unavoidable.¹⁰⁹ In these cases, ailing individuals examined the severity of their illness and, sometimes in consultation with others, determined the minimum amount of care necessary at a nominal level of risk. In May 1944, Ruth Arndt came down with a serious case of tonsillitis, complicated by an abscess in her throat. Ruth had been working for the Spanish attaché’s family for little over a month, and her illness introduced a hazardous complication into an otherwise safe environment. The doctor needed to lance the abscess, but Ruth was hesitant. She could not afford the procedure, and the thought of bringing a stranger into her illegal life, however strong her alibi, carried certain risks. In the end, Ruth’s employer asked Ruth’s mother (the family cook) to intervene and convince Ruth to have the procedure. That act alone was dangerous, as the other servants wondered why the cook was taking such an interest in the well-being of the nanny. Although Ruth’s employer offered to pay the costs himself, the doctor refused. Ruth believed he sensed something in the situation and performed the procedure gratis. Ruth made a full recovery.¹¹⁰



Deteriorating health is a recurring theme in a number of postwar testimonies, in which it is often described by survivors as resulting from their many *Aufregungen* (agitations) and *Entbehrungen* (deprivations).¹¹¹ Deaths also occurred, but survivors do not always mention the specific cause. For example, Annie Priester merely remarked that her “husband died on September 25, 1944, as a result of the agitations of our life of flight.”¹¹² The “agitations” and “deprivations” suffered by the U-boats were many. Along with physical illness and injury, psychological factors took their toll, and the stresses of illegal living led to heart and nerve problems. Yet as Priester’s comment indicates, the specific causes of death, even if they were known, occupied the minds of survivors less than general circumstances. What killed their loved ones was the condition of an illegal, hounded existence as a whole.

Many of the city’s submerged Jews suffered at one point from injury, illness, malnourishment, and even despair. Most struggled through, al-

beit often at the cost of significantly compromised health.¹¹³ The physical strains of dashing throughout the city for survival meant that malnutrition was the most common health affliction.¹¹⁴ Even before submerging, ration cards for Jews had not entitled them to fats, meats, or fruit. They subsisted largely on vegetables and starches and already suffered from the consequences of such a limited diet.¹¹⁵ The prohibitive cost of black-market food and illegal ration cards made food a valuable and uncertain commodity. One survivor recalled that her fiancé, shortly before his capture and deportation, had taken ill due to malnutrition.¹¹⁶ Another individual, who spent almost three years submerged, weighed approximately seventy-five pounds by war's end.¹¹⁷ Malnourishment not only sapped the U-boats' physical strength, it also took its toll on the ability to think on one's feet, to take calculated risks, and to blend in with the gentile population. The consequences of malnutrition, in conjunction with the physical and emotional traumas of illegal life, led to another common illness: despair. More than simply a period of depression or fear, despair signaled a complete loss of hope. In the camps, such despair was common; indeed, some camp survivors recall looking at an inmate and recognizing their imminent death.¹¹⁸ Submerged in Berlin, despair was not an automatic death sentence. In some cases, people recovered. Strong emotional support from helpers and other Jews was vital to that recovery. Yet despair was a vicious malady that threatened to overwhelm many people.¹¹⁹

Despair often plagued the twin sisters Annelies and Marianne B. Marianne's blindness left Annelies with the task of procuring food, ration cards, and shelter, thus requiring them to separate for short periods of time. In an interview given several decades after the war, Annelies recalled a particular trip she made to Berlin to collect new ration cards. She left Marianne at the farm where the two had been staying. She told Marianne to assume she had been captured if she did not return by a specific time. A chance meeting with a stranger on a train, however, delayed her return. Against all reason, Annelies confided in him her Jewish identity. She left the train with him, and he provided her with food and an official travel pass, certifying that Annelies worked for his office and that her position required her to travel. In the meantime, Annelies realized she had forgotten to send word to her sister. She raced back to find Marianne "close to insane." She had been preparing to turn herself in to the Gestapo. Only Annelies's last-minute return prevented this fatal decision.¹²⁰

In other cases, the moment of renewed hope never came. On 22 February 1944, the wife of Julius Rosenthal was involved in an accident on the street, resulting in a double cranial fracture. The police arrested her and took her to the Jewish Hospital to recover. Knowing that deportation now awaited her, she took her life on 12 October 1944.¹²¹ Despair

after arrest was not uncommon. However, the physical and psychological burdens of submerged life also proved too much for some individuals. In these cases, Jews preempted even the possibility of arrest and took their own lives.¹²² After the war, the diver Ellen Rathé remembered the case of Hannelore L. Hannelore had been taken in by a friend of Ellen's, but the rigors of illegal life in the city proved too much for her:

[She] poisoned herself on the street with pills. She was found on the Nicholsburgerplatz and taken to the Gertrauden Hospital where, without having regained consciousness, she managed to die an Unknown, since, in order to protect us all, she had destroyed her identity papers.¹²³

Not all Jews despaired. Not all who despaired died. Friends, family, love, recreation, employment, and the will to survive: these were some of the antidotes to one of the deadliest illnesses of the war. The key for one survivor and her family: "We grabbed everything that was a little bit light."¹²⁴

Despite the best efforts of the U-boats to survive, death was not always avoidable. Due to a lack of documentation, the number of people who died in hiding is unknown. At least 130 Jews perished in the air raids, if we are to peg the U-boat mortality rate to that of the non-Jewish mortality rate. However, we must also remember that lack of access to medical care and the exigencies of illegal life probably resulted in a higher-than-average mortality rate. The death of a U-boat, if they had friends or family, was a terrible emotional blow. Moreover, death put the living at risk.¹²⁵ Unlike Hannelore L., who planned the time and place of her death, most of the dashers who died did so unexpectedly, and the disposal of a dead body endangered the deceased's friends, family, and helpers.¹²⁶

Wiktor Pakman escaped from the Warsaw Ghetto with his wife at the end of September 1942, after the conclusion of the first large-scale liquidation measures in the ghetto that summer.¹²⁷ His sister Karola lived in Berlin in a mixed marriage. Karola effected the escape of her brother and sister-in-law by paying a bribe to an unspecified individual. Wiktor's two other sisters, Tania and Pela, along with Pela's daughter Mary, had been living in the city illegally since 1939.¹²⁸ Along with Pela's husband, who fled the ghetto in October 1942, the family lived together in Karola's apartment. In September 1943, the entire family contracted food poisoning, most probably through contaminated flour acquired on the black market. Wiktor died on 1 October 1943.¹²⁹ The family had to contend not only with the loss of Wiktor but also with his body. Burial was not an option. The sisters therefore rolled the body in a carpet and had two "trustworthy men" lay it along the banks of the Berliner Landwehrkanal. Authorities soon discovered the body and buried it in the Marzahn Cemetery on the outskirts of Berlin.¹³⁰

Disposal of the dead often followed similar lines. Despite the tragedy of loss, U-boats were unable to give their loved ones the proper burial and respect they deserved. Martin Wolff had been living submerged with his wife since August 1942. Frau Wolff suffered from cancer and amaurosis. However, due to the risk of capture, the couple was unable to seek out necessary medical care for her. Sometime in late 1943 or early 1944, Frau Wolff died. Martin had few options before him. With the help of an unnamed source, he put his wife in a small pull cart and placed her body in front of a police station. He was unable to ascertain the whereabouts of her remains after the war.¹³¹

Although Wolff was not alone in the difficulties faced when a loved one died, some Jews and the non-Jews helping them were able to go to great lengths to ensure that those who died in hiding received a proper Jewish burial. The cantor Martin Riesenburger, who, due to his marriage to a non-Jew, had been spared deportation and assigned by the Nazis in June 1943 to oversee Jewish burials at the Weißensee Cemetery, continued to provide Jews with a proper burial until the final days of the war. In his memoirs, he recounts the burial of a Jewish man who, in the parlance of both Jews and non-Jews at the time, had died while living in illegality. One early morning a non-Jewish woman who had been sheltering the man appeared in his office to report the death. Secretive and scared lest her Nazi neighbors catch wind of what was happening, she nonetheless asked Riesenburger if he could come that evening in his wagon (having removed the Star of David from his clothes, of course) and pick up the body for burial; Riesenburger complied. When the burial was held a few days later, the woman, along with several others who had helped hide the man, appeared at the burial to pay their respects.¹³² Riesenburger noted in his memoirs that all of the woman were Christian and wore crosses. Considering the myriad methods that submerged Jews used to camouflage themselves whenever they resurfaced into the non-Jewish world, it would be useful to consider whether all of the woman at the burial were, in reality, non-Jews. Riesenburger notes elsewhere in his memoirs that he always made a point of celebrating the High Holy Days in the Jewish calendar, if at all possible, and that he would even receive carefully worded phone calls from U-boats asking to know if they could attend services. Riesenburger knew that the Gestapo kept a lookout on these days, so he posted a watchman and planned an escape route should the dashers have to flee again. It is therefore logical for us to assume that if some Jews would risk their safety to attend services and maintain a sense of Jewish identity and faith, then something similar likely also occurred in cases where fellow U-boats (family and/or friends) wanted to pay their final respects to Jews who had died in hiding.

The birth of a child also posed problems for some women. As a matter of health, most female U-boats were malnourished and lacked regular access to a doctor. A newborn child also risked exposing the mother and her helper(s) to unwanted attention, and the act of giving birth sometimes led to denunciation and arrest.¹³³ Pregnancy resulting in birth among female U-boats, although not widespread, did occur. According to this study's sample, six children were born after the Large Factory Operation. The number of pregnancies almost certainly was higher; however, survivors rarely discuss miscarriages or abortions. Abortions were difficult to obtain, traumatic, and often carried out under unsanitary conditions. Survivor testimony suggests that most pregnancies resulted from consensual sex. Still, it is important to ask how consensual sexual intercourse could be during this time if it occurred between Jewish women and their non-Jewish helpers. Doubtless, some women became pregnant after falling victim to rape. There is also a nebulous and indeterminate gray zone of what could be termed "sexual barter." In her examination of sexual barter in the Theresienstadt Ghetto, Anna Hájková differentiates between what she terms "rational relationships" and "instrumental sex," both of which have direct bearing on the experiences of some female U-boats. Hájková argues that "rational relationships describe any instance or combination of social, sexual, and romantic relationships in which one or both of the partners engaged for at least partly pragmatic reasons. Instrumental sex . . . is a short-duration sexual encounter lacking, or possessing much less of, the social dimension."¹³⁴ While such examples of sexual barter also existed among some female U-boats and their helpers, and while consent likely was given in a number of cases, it is critical to remember the extreme power imbalance at work in many of these relationships, both in terms of gender and in the context of racial persecution in which the U-boats were operating. All too easily, what would begin as an instance of sexual barter could be shorn of its consensual nature and slide into the realm of rape. The psychological trauma associated with this act of violation during a period of already heightened stress further complicated survival. Although very few survivors mention rape, that omission does not mean rape did not occur. Jewish women on the run, especially if they submerged alone, often relied on strangers for help and were especially vulnerable to sexual predators. Likely, survivors omit this traumatic event out of a reticence to discuss such a painful and indescribable experience.¹³⁵

Annelies B. worked for part of her submerged life as a waitress in the Berlin suburb of Oranienburg, close to the Sachsenhausen concentration camp. One of her fellow waiters took a sexual interest in her, but she told him to keep away. However, his behavior became markedly more aggres-

sive after Annelies ran into a dishwasher from her former Jewish finishing school. In hindsight, Annelies suspected the woman of informing on her to the coworker, although she does not explain how this occurred. The man offered Annelies an ultimatum: sex with him or the Sachsenhausen concentration camp. Choosing, in her words, “the lesser of two evils,” Annelies had sex with him and soon discovered she was pregnant.¹³⁶ Through word of mouth, Annelies heard about a midwife who performed abortions by injecting soap into the uterus. She received two or three of these injections before the abortion succeeded. However, the afterbirth did not pass. Suffering from stomach cramps, Annelies convinced a *Mischling* friend to let her stay with him for one night. That night, Annelies began to hemorrhage. Sitting on a pail while the blood poured out, Annelies decided to call the hospital, but it refused to admit her until she first saw a doctor. Fortunately, the afterbirth passed, and the bleeding subsided. The next morning Annelies dressed and left; she did not see a doctor until after the war.¹³⁷

Rape and abuse constituted a physical and psychological threat to Jewish women. Although their non-Jewish rapists, if caught, faced prosecution for race defilement (*Rassenschande*), Jewish women could not turn to the authorities, as they would face certain deportation. Thus, men could degrade women repeatedly under their “protection.” These acts of sexual abuse, although a consequence of National Socialist persecution of Jews, were not necessarily acts of antisemites; in fact, many antisemites would not have engaged in sexual intercourse with a Jew on any account. Rather, rape often was the act of opportunists who took advantage of the social climate created by Nazism to exploit people with no recourse to justice. Yet it was also as much an “expression of anti-Jewish violence,” as Alexandra Przyrembel argues, as it was a consequence of an antisemitic and anti-Jewish system.¹³⁸ The prevalence of sexual blackmail and violence toward U-boats cannot be ascertained, but extant documentation demonstrates that some women were forced to trade sex for lodgings and/or money.¹³⁹ Although women were able to escape from these situations, as evidenced by Annelies, who never returned to her intolerable waitressing situation, the “safety” that these men provided from arrest and denunciation made some women feel as though they had no alternative.¹⁴⁰ In such situations, sexual abuse often led to something akin to sexual bondage, in which each rape reinforced the connection between rapist and victim.

On 30 November 1944, German officials charged the non-Jew Fritz Witt with race defilement. According to the report, Witt had engaged in sexual intercourse with Edith E. and her daughter Ingeborg E. After hearing the testimony of Edith and Ingeborg, the Gestapo was convinced

not only of Witt's guilt in the matter but that Witt "also did not shy away from exploiting the plight of the two Jewesses in order to consort with mother and daughter at the same time . . ."141 Indeed, Witt had raped both mother and daughter, alone and together. There is more to Witt's case, however, than the cruel act of a rapist taking advantage of two women under his "protection." Indeed, by all accounts, the relationship between Witt and the mother Edith initially was mutual. Witt had met Edith in 1937 in Königsberg in East Prussia; charged and cleared of race defilement in 1938 due to lack of evidence, Witt again met Edith in Berlin in 1942 and resumed a casual sexual relationship. Edith and Ingeborg submerged in December 1942, and Witt took them in. Some discrepancy exists between the testimony of mother and daughter on this point. Ingeborg claimed that she had to beg Witt to take them in, which he did because of his relationship with her mother. Ingeborg also stated that she and Witt did not get along. Through connections to two U-boats, mother and daughter were able to obtain false papers under the name Plester, and in October 1943, they registered with the police and received ration cards. During this time, Edith took care of Witt and his apartment, and Witt found Ingeborg a job as an office assistant.

According to Edith, her sexual relationship with Witt eventually included Ingeborg. She does not mention brute force per se, and her only reference to sex of a "perverse" nature concerns engaging with Witt in oral sex. Ingeborg is more specific and incisive during her interrogation, perhaps either as a result of her youth (she was twenty-two years of age at the time) or her relationship with her mother. According to Ingeborg, Witt and her mother argued frequently, and their incompatibility extended to the bedroom. Sometime in late fall or early winter of 1943, Witt approached Ingeborg and asked her to have sex. He explained that he wanted to start a relationship with her, being now fonder of her than he was of her mother. Ingeborg refused his advances multiple times, something that led to "dramatic scenes" (*Auftritten*). Her mother witnessed these episodes and had a talk with her: "Out of thanks to Witt, I had to make a sacrifice."¹⁴² Ultimately, Ingeborg began engaging in sex with Witt every four weeks or so. Witt also continued to have sex with Edith and, two or three times while Witt was intoxicated, with both mother and daughter at the same time.

The abusive and dysfunctional dynamic that culminated in rape of mother and daughter should be understood as the final phase in what, according to all sources involved, began as a somewhat "normal" and functioning relationship. The abusive situation that developed was not unique to Nazi Germany; however, it was doubtless a result of the system in which the three lived. In a free society, Edith and Ingeborg would

have been able to leave or report the situation; Witt would have had no claim over them. Instead, Edith, knowing the risks gentiles ran in illegally sheltering Jews (and perhaps even overestimating those risks), counseled her daughter to have sex with Witt out of gratitude for his help. Indeed, the mother's attitude is perhaps reflective of a number of such instances of rape in hiding, where the victim felt that this gross violation was the necessary price to be paid for survival. Also, the relationship might never have come to this point; where freedom of choice and movement are possible, once a relationship sours, often nothing holds a couple together. In Nazi Germany, however, laws against sexual intercourse between Jews and non-Jews tied Edith and Ingeborg to Witt in a form of sexual bondage. On the one hand, the mother and daughter were his to exploit until caught. On the other hand, once caught, Witt also became a criminal, albeit one without a death sentence. The exploitative situation that developed between Witt and Edith and Ingeborg demonstrates one of the many perverse and surprising morasses created as a result of the National Socialist system. Nazis and their sympathizers were not the only human threats to Jews. With no recourse to the law, Jews were at the mercy of the entire non-Jewish population. While Witt took sexual advantage of the situation, any form of conflict between Jews and the people sheltering them could lead to the U-boats finding themselves in danger.

Conclusion

For the submerged Jews of Berlin, 1944 was a continuation of the previous year's struggle. The fight for adequate food and shelter remained at the forefront of Jews' minds, and the threat of denunciation and arrest still loomed large. The radicalization of National Socialist antisemitic policy also drove previously protected Jews to dive. Over the course of the year, Allied advances certainly brought hope. On the western front, the failure of the Nazi High Command of the Armed Forces (OKW) to stem the western Allied advance in the Ardennes during Battle of the Bulge proved disastrous for Germany. On the eastern front, the Soviets had halted outside of Warsaw, and the city fell to them in January 1945. Hitler's claims of a Thousand-Year Reich, a possibility in the eyes of many only two years before, now seemed unachievable. Yet despite these victories, hope was only one aspect of survival, and for some U-boats, even hope was elusive. Illness, death, or sexual abuse at the hands of supposed helpers threatened many. In the individual world of submerged life, the U-boats often suffered alone.

Yet despite the challenging and dangerous nature of illegal life, many U-boats succeeded, however briefly, in developing routines in the search for a tenuous normality. They were aided in their endeavors by the mobility of their situation as well as frequent opportunities to express their individuality. Whether their routines included having a job, participating in resistance groups, biking in the countryside, or meeting with family members on Sundays to play cards, Jews stubbornly sought out stability and familiarity when at all possible, even when such behavior appears in hindsight to have been foolish and risky. Yet these developments were a powerful psychological and emotional tool, and the city's divers and dashers relied on them in the fight not only to survive but also to continue living as individuals with a sense of self. Indeed, survivor accounts suggest that emotional factors (both positive and negative) had at least as profound an impact on survivor experiences and memories as did physical factors, if not more. Although some of these routines and possibilities for social interaction lasted for only a few days at a time, others lasted for months. Yet as 1944 drew to a close, the approach of battle interrupted daily life with increasing frequency and ferocity. Hitler's war for domination came home to the Germans, and the possibility of normality, even one as fragile as that experienced by Berlin's U-boats, disappeared. Their tenuous and ephemeral routines collapsed, only to be replaced by new threats to their survival.

Notes

1. On the ability of *Alltagsgeschichte* to defy a single definition, see Paul Steege, Andrew Stuart Bergerson, Maureen Healy, and Pamela E. Swett, "The History of Everyday Life: A Second Chapter," *Journal of Modern History* 80, no. 2 (June 2008): 361.
2. These comments were given in a panel discussion moderated by Andrew Stuart Bergerson. The panelists included Elissa Mailänder Koslov, Gideon Reuveni, Paul Steege, and Dennis Sweeney. See "Forum: Everyday Life in Nazi Germany," *German History* 27, no. 4 (2009): 575.
3. An excellent example of the roles of *Eigensinn* and its relationship to *Herrschaft* in the daily lives of Germans living under Nazi rule is Andrew Stuart Bergerson, *Ordinary Germans in Extraordinary Times: The Nazi Revolution in Hildesheim* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 2004).
4. LAB, Landesbildstelle, Bestell-Nr. 254931
5. Eugen Herman-Friede, Interview 10112, Segment 38, *Visual History Archive*, USC Shoah Foundation, 1996, accessed 9 June 2018.
6. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 34292.
7. Paul Steege in "Forum: Everyday Life in Nazi Germany," 577.

8. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 30320.
9. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 31980.
10. See the appendix in this book for the number of U-boats at large at the start of 1944.
11. I am grateful to Maria von der Heydt for bringing these figures to my attention. See also Gruner, *Judenverfolgung*, 47. For more discussion on the categorization of *Mischlinge* and *Mischehen* and the persecutory measures taken against them, see Jeremy Noakes, "The Development of Nazi Policy towards the German-Jewish 'Mischlinge,' 1933-1945," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, no. 34 (New York: 1989), 291-354. In recent years, the fate of *Mischlinge* and *Mischehen* has benefitted from more sustained scholarly inquiry. See James F. Tent, *In the Shadow of the Holocaust: Nazi Persecution of Jewish-Christian Germans* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2003). Ursula Büttner and Martin Greschat focus specifically on the fate of Christians of Jewish heritage in *Die verlassenen Kinder der Kirche: Der Umgang mit Christen jüdischer Herkunft im "Dritten Reich"* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998). See also, Beate Meyer, "*Jüdische Mischlinge*": *Rassenpolitik und Verfolgungserfahrungen 1933-1945* (Hamburg: Dölling und Gallitz, 1999).
12. Tent, *In the Shadow*, 2. This figure includes an estimate of forty thousand *Mischlinge* of the second degree.
13. Tent, *In the Shadow*, 3.
14. Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, 1:149.
15. Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, 1:290.
16. Tent, *In the Shadow*, 3
17. Tent, *In the Shadow*, 4.
18. Maria von der Heydt, "'Wer fährt den gerne mit dem Judenstern in der Straßenbahn?': Die Ambivalenz des geltungsjüdischen' Alltags zwischen 1941 und 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), 65-66. In this article, von der Heydt provides an excellent overview of the daily experiences and challenges faced by this small, and therefore often overlooked, group within Germany.
19. Gruner, *Judenverfolgung*, 91.
20. Tent, *In the Shadow*, 63.
21. See the case of Georg Kamin in LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 34292, and the testimony of his wife Rosa in LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 30654. See also the case of Lance Corporal Rolf B. in Tent, *In the Shadow*, 121-22.
22. Gruner, *Jewish Forced Labor*, 89-90, 92.
23. Gruner, *Jewish Forced Labor*, 95.
24. Gruner, *Jewish Forced Labor*, 95.
25. Gruner, *Jewish Forced Labor*, 98.
26. Tent, *In the Shadow*, 149.
27. See, for examples, LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 34292; LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 35752; LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 33167; CJA 4.1, 2933.
28. Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, 1:121.
29. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 31980.
30. Gruner, *Judenverfolgung*, 47. See also Gottwaldt and Schulle, *Judendeportationen*, 461.
31. LAB, C Rep. 118-01, OdF Kartei, A-31980.
32. See Avraham Barkai, "Jewish Life under Persecution" in Meyer, *German-Jewish History*, 4:253.
33. Meyer, "*Jüdische Mischlinge*," 72-86. See also Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 190-91.

34. LAB, C Rep. 118-01, Nr.: 1792.
35. CJA 4.1, 1680. See Avraham Barkai, "Exclusion and Persecution: 1933–1938," in Meyer, *German–Jewish History*, 4:213.
36. LAB, C Rep 118-01, Nr.: 2246. In Dresden, the case of Victor Klemperer and his wife Eva stands as a particularly strong and well-known example of spousal loyalty and the hardships suffered by couples in mixed marriages during the Third Reich. See Victor Klemperer, *Ich will Zeugnis ablegen bis zum letzten. Tagebücher: 1942–1945*, ed. Walter Nowojski (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1995), 2:280. See also, Henry Ashby Turner, Jr., "Victor Klemperer's Holocaust," *German Studies Review* 22, no. 3 (October 1999): 388.
37. LAB, C Rep. 118-01, Nr.: 31492.
38. LAB, C Rep. 118-01, Nr.: 39108.
39. Barkai, "Final Chapter," 4:381.
40. LAB, C Rep. 118-01, Nr.: 30591.
41. LAB, C Rep. 118-01, Nr.: 30591.
42. See LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 31094.
43. See the concerns of Victor Klemperer in *Ich will Zeugnis ablegen bis zum letzten*, 2:280.
44. See also, Frederick Weinstein, *Aufzeichnungen aus dem Versteck: Erlebnisse eines polnischen Juden 1939–1946* (Berlin: Lukas Verlag, 2006), 373. My thanks to Martina Voigt for having brought this work to my attention. See also Meyer, "Jüdische Mischlinge," 87–88.
45. LAB, A Rep. 408, Nr.: 11. Tätigkeitsbuch Kripo. Rev. 64.: 1.1.1942–28.12.1944, #81 Selbstmord durch Erhängen. The suicide note reads, "Ade du schöne Welt." The police conclusion regarding Stephan's suicide reads, "Weil seine Ehefrau Jüdin ist und er für sie Unannehmlichkeiten befürchte, die er nicht mehr erleben möchte."
46. Freie Universität Berlin: Zentralinstitut für sozialwissenschaftliche Forschung (Hrsg.), *Gedenkbuch Berlins der jüdischen Opfer des Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin: Druckhaus Henrich, 1995).
47. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 30638.
48. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 32931.
49. See Tausendfreund, *Erzwungener Verrat*, 67.
50. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 31225.
51. LAB, C Rep. 118-01, OdF Kartei, A-31225.
52. Tausendfreund, *Erzwungener Verrat*, 100–103.
53. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 31209.
54. "Wirtschaftsblatt der deutschen allgemeinen Zeitung," in *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Sonnabend, 15. Januar 1944, Nr. 14.
55. ZfA, File of Charlotte Josephy, "Erlebnisse." See also Benz, *Juden im Untergrund*, 26–29.
56. CJA, 4.1, 2971.
57. CJA, 4.1, 2971. See also, CJA, 4.1, 2978.
58. LAB, C Rep 118-01, Nr.: 38153.
59. For example, see Maurer, "From Everyday Life," 370–71.
60. Maurer, "From Everyday Life," 370–71.
61. ZfA, File of Martin Wasservogel, "Gedichte aus der Illegalität."
62. Schneider, "Saving Konrad Latte," 17–22. See also Benz, *Überleben im Untergrund*, 25–26.
63. ZfA, File of Charlotte Josephy, "Erlebnisse." See also Benz, *Überleben im Untergrund*, 26–29.
64. Ruth G. Holocaust Testimony (T-1763), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust

- Testimonies, Yale University Library. See also Lovenheim, *Survival in the Shadows*, 132–35.
65. ZfA, File of Dr. Charlotte Bamberg, “Untergetaucht.”
 66. Kroener, Müller, and Umbreit, *Germany and the Second World War*, 2:519.
 67. See, for example, Moorhouse, *Berlin at War*, 83.
 68. Steege, Bergerson, Healy, and Swett, “History of Everyday Life,” 365.
 69. ZfA, File of Dr. Charlotte Bamberg, “Untergetaucht.”
 70. See Annelies H. Holocaust Testimony (T-276 AND T-1866), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
 71. See Annelies H. Holocaust Testimony (T-276 AND T-1866), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
 72. For an overview of the origins of this soap myth and a sound debunking of it, see Joachim Neander, “The Danzig Soap Case: Facts and Legends around ‘Professor Spanner’ and the Danzig Anatomical Institute, 1944–1945,” *German Studies Review* 29, no. 1 (February 2006): 63–86. Tom Segev traces the origins of the “soap myth” in *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), 183–84. See also Waxman, *Writing the Holocaust*, 168.
 73. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 34859.
 74. See, for example, LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 7436.
 75. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 8851. See Barbara Schieb-Samizadeh, “Gemeinschaft für Frieden und Aufbau,” in Benz and Pehle, *Lexikon des deutschen Widerstandes*, 213–15. For more on Jews in the Berlin resistance, see also, Wilfried Löhken and Werner Vathke, eds., *Juden im Widerstand: Drei Gruppen zwischen Überlebenskampf und politischer Aktion, Berlin 1939–1945* (Berlin: Druckhaus Hentrich, 1993); Arnold Paucker, *German Jews in the Resistance 1933–1945: The Facts and the Problems*, trans. Deborah Cohen (Berlin: Allprintmedia GmbH, 2005); Eric Brothers, *Berlin Ghetto: Herbert Baum and the Anti-Fascist Resistance* (Stroud: Spellmount, 2012); and Cox, *Circles of Resistance*. For an overview of Jewish resistance throughout Europe and its postwar legacy, see Hans Erler, Arnold Paucker, and Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich, eds., “Gegen alle Vergleichenheit”: *Jüdischer Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt/Main: Campus Verlag, 2003).
 76. For more information on the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising of 1943, see Israel Gutman, *Resistance: The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1994). With respect to the connection between the uprising and the instances of Warsaw Jews submerging, see Paulsson, *Secret City*, 165–98.
 77. That some of the illegals resisted as individuals also finds documentation in Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 214.
 78. See, for example, the work of the forger Cioma Schönhaus in Schönhaus, *The Forger*.
 79. Gruner, *Judenverfolgung*, 49.
 80. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 38247.
 81. This ideal predates the rise of the Nazis, and it was a popular theme in the Weimar Republic. See, for example, Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz, “Beyond Kinder, Küche, Kirche: Weimar Women in Politics and Work,” in *When Biology Became Destiny: Women in Weimar and Nazi Germany*, ed. Renate Bridenthal, Atina Grossmann, and Marion Kaplan (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1984), 33–65.
 82. Kroener, Müller, and Umbreit, *Germany and the Second World War*, 2:947.
 83. Marion Kaplan provides an excellent overview of these shifting roles over the course of the 1930s. See Kaplan, “Changing Roles in Jewish Families,” in Nicosia and Scrase, *Jewish Life in Nazi Germany*, 15–46.
 84. Kaplan, “Changing Roles,” 27.

85. Very little comparative research on Jews in hiding has been undertaken, and yet the reversal in gender roles that occurred in Germany was, for a variety of social and cultural reasons, not replicated elsewhere in Nazi-occupied Europe. Natalia Aleksiu's fascinating study of gender and daily life in hiding in Galicia indicates that quite unlike in Berlin, or Germany more generally, traditional roles remained largely unchanged for the hidden Jews of Galicia. See Natalia Aleksiu, "Gender and the Daily Lives of Jews in Hiding in Eastern Galicia," *Nashim: A Journal of Jewish Women's Studies and Gender Issues*, no. 27 (Fall 5775/2014): 38–61.
86. Kaplan, "Changing Roles," 34–35.
87. ZfA, File of Dr. Charlotte Bamberg, "Untergetaucht."
88. See also Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 203.
89. ZfA, File of Charlotte Josephy, "Erlebnisse." See also Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 208–9.
90. Bruno G. Holocaust Testimony (T-1764), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
91. See also Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 203; Maurer, "From Everyday Life," 370.
92. Moorhouse, *Berlin at War*, 350–51.
93. Moorhouse, *Berlin at War*, 122–23.
94. Bruno G. Holocaust Testimony (T-1764), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library. See also Ruth Gumpel, interview with author; Lovenheim, *Survival in the Shadows*, 170–71.
95. For more on the role of gender and submerged life, see the appendix in this book.
96. LAB A Rep. 408, Nr.: 4, #785. "Tätigkeitsbuch 17. Polizei-Revier Kriminalpolizei Weinbergsweg 12." From 1.Januar.1943–31.Dezember.1943
97. Ruth Gumpel, interview with author.
98. Ruth Gumpel, interview with author. See also Ruth G. Holocaust Testimony (T-1763), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
99. According to Kurt Lindenber, looking clean and well-kept was "one of the most important commandments" of underground life. In Lindenber, "Personal Report."
100. Wyden, *Stella*, 251–52. See also, Jalowicz Simon, *Untergetaucht*, 305–6.
101. Survivor testimony abounds with mention of these locations. See, for example, Ruth G. Holocaust Testimony (T-1763), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library; CAHS, RG-14.070M, Reel 1959, fr. 877–1007; LAB, B Rep 002, Nr. 4861, "Das Ehrengericht des jüdischen Gemeinde."
102. ZfA, File of Dr. Charlotte Bamberg, "Untergetaucht."
103. ZfA, File of Cioma Schönhaus, "Interview G. Rogoff," 14.3.89 Basel, Interview conducted by Neiss, Schieb, Voigt, 12.
104. Schönhaus, *The Forger*, 128, 126–30.
105. Ruth G. Holocaust Testimony (T-1763), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
106. See also Moorhouse, *Berlin at War*, 301–2.
107. CAHS, RG-14.070M, Reel 1959, fr. 877–1007.
108. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 31398.
109. See also Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 207–8.
110. Ruth G. Holocaust Testimony (T-1763), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
111. Poor health as a consequence of years submerged was certainly not unique to Berlin's U-boats. Jews who submerged in Munich, for example, faced similar health problems. See Schrafstetter, *Flucht und Versteck*, 219–25.

112. CJA 4.1, 1512.
113. CJA 4.1, 2086.
114. See also Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 207.
115. Barkai, "In a Ghetto without Walls," 4:335. See also, Moorhouse, *Berlin at War*, 83.
116. CJA, 4.1, Nr.: 486
117. CJA, 4.1, Nr.: 648.
118. See Des Pres, *Survivor*, 88–89.
119. See Moorhouse, *Berlin at War*, 302; also, Maurer, "From Everyday Life," 373.
120. See Annelies H. Holocaust Testimony (T-276 AND T-1866), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
121. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 31476.
122. See Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 211–12.
123. ZfA, File of Ellen Rathé, "Versicherung."
124. Ruth G. Holocaust Testimony (T-1763), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
125. See also Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 207–8; Moorhouse, *Berlin at War*, 299–300.
126. See the case of Ursel Reuber and Eva in Andreas-Friedrich, *Der Schattenmann*, 210–17.
127. The Pakmans were one of a few thousand Jews who managed to escape the ghetto at this time. See Paulsson, *Secret City*, 76–78.
128. Weinstein, *Aufzeichnungen aus dem Versteck*, 375.
129. The hunger suffered by U-boats sometimes led them to consume spoiled food out of desperation. For another case of food poisoning, see Bruno G. Holocaust Testimony (T-1764), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
130. Weinstein, *Aufzeichnungen aus dem Versteck*, 376.
131. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 38159.
132. Martin Riesenburger, *Das Licht verlöschte nicht: Ein Zeugnis aus der Nacht des Faschismus—Predigten* (Berlin: Union Verlag, 1984), 39–40.
133. LAB, C Rep. 118-01 Nr.: 30895. See also Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 207.
134. See Anna Hájková, "Sexual Barter in Times of Genocide: Negotiating the Sexual Economy of the Theresienstadt Ghetto," *Signs* 38, no. 3 (Spring 2013): 505–6.
135. For an explanation of rape and its infrequent use in survivor testimony, see Waxman, *Writing the Holocaust*, 137–40.
136. See Annelies H. Holocaust Testimony (T-276 AND T-1866), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
137. See Annelies H. Holocaust Testimony (T-276 AND T-1866), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
138. Alexandra Przyrembel, "Rassenschande" *Reinheitsmythos und Vernichtungslegitimation im Nationalsozialismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 475.
139. Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 208. Kurt Lindenberg is also quite clear on this point. See ZfA, File of Kurt Lindenberg, "Personal Report."
140. See Annelies H. Holocaust Testimony (T-276 and T-1866), Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University Library.
141. CAHS, RG-14.070M, Reel 1959, fr. 877–1007.
142. CAHS, RG-14.070M, Reel 1959, fr. 877–1007.