

Introduction



What is this Book About?

Perspectives

On 3 January 1941, 86-year-old Max Kulies left his apartment in the southern Berlin neighborhood of Kreuzberg and set off for the District Court in Wedding in the north. There he asked for the wholesale feather business he had run for sixty-six years to be removed from the commercial register.¹ For almost four years Kulies had been engaged in a dispute with officials at the Industrie und Handelskammer (IHK; Chamber of Industry and Commerce) and the District Court, battling the authorities' attempts to dissolve his business—his life's work.² The tenacity of this Jewish businessman and the success he had—albeit temporary—serve as a first key point of reference in this book. Research all too often depicts Jewish businesspeople in Nazi Germany solely as passive victims, seen only in the light of the predictable, violent end to their commercial activities. It is time to correct this shortsightedness, which historian Frank Bajohr criticized over ten years ago, and to ask how Kulies managed to stave off the liquidation of his business for so long.³ Was this elderly gentleman an exception, or were there other businesspeople in other trades who managed to hold on to their enterprises or firms even after the “Night of Broken Glass” in 1938, the three-day-long pogrom that historians generally agree marked the end of Jewish commercial activity? What strategies did these people pursue? Did they demonstrate solidarity toward one another? Did such a thing as a Jewish economic sector develop in Berlin after 1933? If so, which institutions supported it? To answer these questions, the structure of Jewish business activity in Berlin around 1933 needs to be considered. To return once again to Kulies, it is worth exploring how many Jewish feather wholesalers there were in Berlin in 1933. In what other economic

sectors, streets, and districts were Jewish owned businesses represented? Did the structure and type of Jewish commercial activity in the capital of the German Reich differ from that of other large Jewish communities on the one hand and what role did Jewish entrepreneurs play in Berlin's economy on the other?

In our present-day modern society based on the division of labor, businesses are an organized form of human coexistence. Exercising a trade is a way to make a living and to acquire property that has become a central reference point in our legal thinking and sense of justice. In this respect, business cannot be regarded in isolation from society's basic framework. This brings us to the second methodological approach taken in this book. Before we can begin to analyze Jewish owned businesses, we first need to reconstruct the relevant socioeconomic framework data. This involves briefly outlining the context—i.e., political and economic developments in Berlin at the time. The process of deliberate destruction of Jewish commercial activity that fully began in 1933 “represents the most radical and as such the most ‘successful’ change in the direction of the economy,” states the historian Ludolf Herbst.⁴ This analysis places the processes that are the focus of this book in a broader context and indicates that, in this case, “success” is an exceptionally complex category.⁵ What were the goals of this radical destructive process? Who were the perpetrators? How violent was it? What role did administrative measures play in the destruction of Jewish commercial activity in Berlin? How did non-Jewish customers, colleagues, and the general public react to the persecution of Jews? Did they try to benefit from it, did they demonstrate solidarity, or did they simply sit tight? How many Jewish owned businesses were openly forced into liquidation; how many of them were taken over by non-Jews, and when did this happen? This book sets out to contribute to research on the destruction of Jewish business in Germany by answering these questions. In the wake of Bajohr's pioneering study “Aryanization in Hamburg,” debates in Switzerland about old bank accounts and the extent of compensation and restitution of Jewish property, and studies on various major banks and large undertakings, a considerable amount of research on this subject has appeared in recent years.⁶ Even though the process was first summarized in 2008 by Martin Dean,⁷ our picture is far from being complete. Hence, the goal of the book is to shed light on unanswered questions by taking a microhistorical approach to deepen understanding of the destruction of Jewish commercial activity in Nazi Germany. Berlin promises to be an especially interesting case study, not only because of the size of the local Jewish population in 1933, but also because it was in the Reich's capital that, politically speaking, center and periphery overlapped.

If, in addition, in the following pages a contribution can be made toward bridging the division between economic and political history—a division also to be found in research into National Socialism—we must never lose sight of the specific fates of Jewish businesspeople. It is the human catastrophes rather than statistics that are pivotal to our understanding of the process of the persecution and murder of the Jews in Europe, as Saul Friedländer showed in his incisive study.⁸ For Max Kulies, being forced to give up his business was, as he himself wrote, much more than an economic sacrifice. It was a “tragedy.”⁹ Businesses were not only an integral part of family tradition; those running them saw themselves as “*ehrbare Kauflleute*,” reputable businesspeople, a term that implies a code of conduct and determined their perception of themselves. For many good will was more than a figure. A good reputation was priceless, and to see it destroyed was an immeasurable loss. Taking this sufficiently into account is the third perspective of this book.

This study focuses on small- and medium-sized businesses for three reasons. Firstly, these businesses made up the major share and backbone of Jewish commercial activity. Secondly, small- and medium-sized businesses were managed by a limited number of proprietors or partners. Decision making did not have to take place in committee, which allowed companies to react directly and immediately to changing circumstances. Thirdly, small- and medium-sized businesses were part of their environment in a way that large companies were not. This is best illustrated by the fact that the destruction of the business of larger Jewish companies, inasmuch as this was possible, was supervised by central bodies, the Reich ministries. An analysis of the fate of small- and medium-sized companies is therefore more likely to illustrate everyday socioeconomic patterns of coexistence as well as the daily experience of persecution and self assertion. In contrast to a study of large enterprises, this allows for a more differentiated depiction of both processes. But to focus on small- and medium-sized companies does not mean that large undertakings should be ignored, since they were vital to the overall significance of Jewish business in the economic development of the German capital.

It is common knowledge that the persecution of Jews in Germany began long before 1933. The mid-1920s saw a marked rise in the number of attacks on businesses believed to be Jewish, in particular in smaller cities and the provinces.¹⁰ The extent to which this early anti-Semitism was felt in Berlin, however, still needs to be researched.¹¹ For practical reasons, the core period I have examined begins in 1930, shortly before the Great Depression set in with full force, and ends in 1945, with only a brief look at the early postwar years and the launch of the restitution process, which

remains ongoing in Berlin and cannot therefore be evaluated yet. The history in particular of the early restitution that took place in Berlin, where the issue is especially interesting in the light of the division of the city, is currently the subject of a research project.¹²

The goal of my endeavours was not just to analyze a period of history, but also to document it. With few exceptions, the Jewish businesses that once existed in Berlin are forgotten and all traces of them have vanished from the cityscape. Yet the families involved have a right and German society the responsibility to know exactly where they were and what happened to them. This is why the basic data (the name of the company, its legal form, address, partners, managing director, sector, date of its entry in the commercial register and of its removal) relating to 8019 businesses regarded as Jewish have collected in the Database of Jewish Businesses in Berlin. In order to allow the general public access to this database, which also includes raw data on a further 44,000 businesses as well as sources and cross-references, it was made available to archive of the New Synagogue Berlin—Centrum Judaicum Foundation and the Berlin State Archive in 2012. Ahead of the English edition of this book, the database was also given to Yad Vashem, Jerusalem, and the Leo Baeck Institute, New York. An excerpt of the database with reduced information on the companies identified as Jewish can also be viewed at <http://www2.hu-berlin.de/djgb>.

Categories

The focus of this book is on small- and medium-sized Jewish owned businesses. How can we define those entities? The Handelsgesetzbuch (HGB; German Commercial Code) defines commercial activity as any continuing activity that is exercised for profit. Commercial activities take place at two levels, which can to be distinguished semantically. The first is that of a business, covering either a shop, an office, or manufacturing premises. The second is that of a firm, meaning an undertaking's bureaucratic structure, consisting of its name and legal status. Defining small- and medium-sized businesses is more complex. The tricky sociological category "Mittelstand" (mid-tier) has been deliberately avoided. Even at the time, the question of where to draw the line between large- and medium-sized companies was a controversial one. In general, the threshold was one thousand employees. However, given the dearth of information relating to the number of employees in many businesses in Berlin and the sheer number of companies to be taken into consideration, differentiation in simple but clear terms is required, so large undertakings are defined as all public limited companies and businesses with a partner or a managing director registered in the *Reichshandbuch der deutschen Gesellschaft*, the German "Who's Who."¹³

While the difficulty regarding large companies is one of definition, the problem with smaller ones is a lack of source material. The structure of the surviving files, forced me to concentrate on businesses listed in the commercial register. However, business persons were only required to list their companies if they were substantial enough to necessitate commercial procedures. These were outlined in the HGB as double-entry bookkeeping, a requirement of regular auditing and the filing of copies of all outgoing communications. When defining a business, the rule of thumb employed in the 1930s by officials at the Berlin IHK was whether the company's investment or working capital amounted to at least 4000 reichsmarks and its annual profits at least 30,000 reichsmarks.¹⁴ This meant that 80 percent of all the companies were simply too small to leave traces in the commercial register. Quite apart from missing data, small businesses often fell through the administrative cracks. Many businesses were never on record because authorities were unaware of them or because their owners either did not want to register their business for reasons relating to tax or criminal liability or persecution, or they simply never got around to it. In *Pünktchen und Anton*, Erich Kästner's wonderful children's novel published in 1931, the two young protagonists sell matches and shoelaces in the evening on the Weidendamm Bridge in Berlin and, as minors, would undoubtedly not have been able to apply for a trade license. Against that background, it is impossible to examine systematically all the small businesses operating in Berlin at the time. Nevertheless, wherever possible, I took them into account.

However difficult it is to distinguish between small- and medium-sized businesses, it is even harder to define "Jewish."¹⁵ Businesses were often said to be Jewish if one of the owners or top managers was identified as Jewish. This is illustrated particularly clearly by the case of Paul von Mendelssohn-Bartholdy. He was the great-grandson of the German-Jewish Enlightenment philosopher Moses Mendelssohn, but his father's family had been Protestant for more than two generations.¹⁶ This did not stop anti-Semites, such as the publishers of *Sigilla Veri. Lexicon der Juden—Genossen und Gegner aller Zeiten und Zonen*, an anti-Semitic encyclopedia of Jews, Jewish organizations, and practices, from denouncing Mendelssohn-Bartholdy as Jewish.¹⁷ The renowned private bank Mendelssohn & Co., of which he was a partner, was also generally seen as a Jewish bank.¹⁸ As a member of its managerial board, Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, together with a member of the Warburg banking family from Hamburg, had taken over the chairmanship of the supervisory board of Deutsche Waren-Treuhand Gesellschaft AG in 1920.¹⁹ Against the backdrop of increasing persecution, a meeting was held on 1 May 1933 to discuss the possible resignation of the supervisory board. The suggestion was rejected by Mendelssohn-

Bartholdy on the grounds that he saw himself “as Aryan,” as Max Warburg noted with some surprise.²⁰ But while von Mendelssohn-Bartholdy explicitly defined himself as non-Jewish, he was stigmatized by his persecutors as Jewish and consequently lost many of the positions he held on various supervisory boards before he died in May 1935. “One cannot be called Mendelssohn and not be Jewish,” sighed Eleonora von Mendelssohn after emigrating to New York.²¹

This attribution made about anyone named Mendelssohn—that exists to this day²²—applied to many other surnames too. In 1929 the publishers of the first edition of the *Jüdische Adressbuch* (Berlin Jewish Directory) wrote in the preface that “the present-day anti-Jewish movement is clearly inclined ... to designate anyone with a Jewish-sounding name as Jewish.”²³ Similar assumptions were also made about certain first names, and by no means only biblical ones. Even names such as “Siegfried” were seen as “typically” Jewish.²⁴ Moreover, there was a general suspicion that members of certain professions, such as banking, were necessarily Jewish.²⁵ The appearance of a surname widely considered Jewish at this time in a company’s name could have serious repercussions. Once again, the name “Mendels(s)ohn” lends itself as an example. Of twenty-four companies listed under the name in Berlin’s commercial register in 1933, six had been stroked off by 1935, and nineteen by October 1938. By the summer of 1939, the only one that remained was Mendelssohn & Co., and even this had been in liquidation since the previous January.²⁶ Businesses operating under a name with Jewish connotations clearly faced far greater persecution than other companies. It can therefore be assumed that market participants at the time usually had preconceptions about “Jewish businesses,” often based on hearsay and only a vague idea of what supposedly constituted a Jewish name. The latter is illustrated by an article that appeared in *Das Schwarze Korps*, the official newspaper of the SS, in November 1937, as a correction to a report about “the flourishing Jewish trade in Hitler postage stamps.” It referred to having mentioned the “Levys, Salomons and Guttmanns who had once again spotted a business opportunity,” and went on, “As it happens, there is indeed a postage stamp wholesaler we were not familiar with called Paul Guttmann in Hamburg ... whose owner is a member of the party [the NSDAP, CK]. We were not of course referring to him in our remarks, which were general comments relating to Jewish traders.”²⁷ The extent to which hearsay, attributions, and assumptions led to persecution and violence cannot be academically measured. But it is inherently obvious that persecution could often be based on subjective criteria and that, in retrospect, the term “Jewish” in the given context can be understood solely to mean “persecuted as Jewish.”²⁸

In fact, for a considerable amount of time, the Nazi regime itself struggled to arrive at a standard definition of a “Jewish business.” For a while it relied on trial and error: the decision lay with authorities within the party or the local administration, and it was left to the businesses involved to defend themselves. Initially, in the absence of alternatives, state authorities apparently referred to the extensive definition laid out in the First Regulation to the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service, introduced on 11 April 1933. Thereunder a person was deemed “non-Aryan” if at least one grandparent had been member of a Jewish congregation. Yet the First Regulation to the Reich Citizenship Law, introduced in November 1935, stated that “a Jew is anyone who is descended from two fully Jewish grandparents.”²⁹ While interpretation of the term “Jewish” as applied to natural persons thus was subject to modification, a definition of “Jewish business” was only published with the introduction of the Third Regulation to the Reich Citizenship Law in June 1938.³⁰

Using the jargon of the Nazi perpetrators at the time, historians have continued to term the processes discussed here as “Aryanization,” claiming that there was “no alternative.”³¹ However, the term became politically charged in the mid-1990s and has been employed in research in so many different ways and to such inflationary effect that it has lost any possible analytical usefulness. Even at the time, it was controversial and loosely defined.³² In August 1937, *Das Schwarze Korps* asked polemically, “What does it mean to say that a company has been Aryanized? Is it Aryan or non-Aryan? According to common parlance, it is non-Aryan, because something gold-plated is not gold, something electrified is not electric, and anything that has been Aryanized is essentially Jewish but has been given an Aryan whitewash. The word ‘Aryanized’ is a typically Jewish invention and amounts to Aryan camouflage.”³³ As a matter of fact, the term’s bureaucratic usage began relatively late. In the mid-1930s the term often used was “*Gleichschaltung*” (forcible bringing into line), which placed the process in the context of the Nazis seizure of vast state power. In 1938/39 the IHK applied the term “Aryanization” only to the sale of Jewish businesses to non-Jews, while describing the overall process of not only the sale but also the liquidation of Jewish businesses as “*Entjudung*,” or de-Jewification. Thus, the use of the term “Aryanization” suggests that all Jewish businesses were taken over by non-Jews. But as will be shown in chapter 7 this was by no means the case.

Hence, “Aryanization” and “de-Jewification” are used only as primary source terms in this book. Instead, I employ the terminology established in a research project on the history of the Commerzbank, presented in 2004. I refer to the “destruction of the economic existence of Jews” to cover the entire process, with reference to Raul Hilberg’s pioneering

analysis of the process of “the Destruction of the European Jews.” Interestingly, Alfred Wiener—the founder of the Wiener Library—described the process in almost identical terms in October 1936. Moreover, the “Deutschland-Berichte der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands,” or “Sopade” (Germany Reports of the German Social Democratic Party in Exile), shortly thereafter also used the phrase the “destruction of Jewish professional and commercial life.”³⁴

The destruction of the economic existence of Jews than can be divided into several overlapping processes: the expropriation and confiscation of assets of Jews, the expulsion of Jewish workers from offices, businesses, and practices, and the destruction of Jewish commercial activity. The third category consisted of either the liquidation or the sale of businesses to non-Jews, which is understood here only as a transfer of possession. The reason for this is a semantic distinction reflected in case law, albeit in refined terms. According to the German Civil Code, a possessor is the person who has actual control of a thing. An owner, on the other hand, is exclusively the person to whom the thing belongs in law. Describing the process as a transfer of possession underscores the fact that the person acquiring the thing has done so against the will of the owner. The seller who has been forced to sell remains the legal owner. After all, this retention of title played a key role in restitution claims.³⁵

“Boycott” is another term hijacked by the Nazis. In its original meaning, a boycott is a political, non violent means, by way of ostracizing or refusing to buy from persons boycotted, of forcing them to change their behavior. But since the Nazis, their accomplices, and fellow-travelers were neither non violent, nor seeking to bring about a change in the behavior of those they were boycotting but rather deliberately to destroy Jewish commercial activity, the term should only be used with caution, as a primary source term. Even the Reich-wide “boycott” of 1 April 1933 was not a boycott in the true sense, but a racist blockade—or embargo.³⁶

It is a basic premise of this book that those whose businesses were threatened defended themselves and developed strategies to mitigate the effects of those threats and even, temporarily, to stave them off. In this case “strategy” is taken to mean deliberate efforts based on analysis of the prevailing conditions. When conditions change, strategies are modified. If the changes are too drastic, it can lead to the abandonment of the strategy. This can of course happen if the path chosen proves unsuccessful. Using the term “strategy” in this case does not therefore imply that any deliberately chosen tactic was successful or held prospects of success.

I have attempted to use commercial terminology as little as possible in order to make this book more readable. However, it is essential to specify the legal forms of businesses precisely. A sole trader or one-person busi-

ness, therefore, was and is a business run by a sole proprietor with unlimited liability. A general partnership (offene Handelsgesellschaft, oHG) consists of at least two partners with unlimited liability, while a limited partnership (Kommanditgesellschaft, KG) consists of both general partners with unlimited liability and partners liable up to the amount of their contribution. Nineteenth-century Germany also saw the development of the public limited corporation (Aktiengesellschaft, AG) and limited liability company (Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung, GmbH), as well as the rare partnership limited by shares (Kommanditgesellschaft auf Aktien, KGaA), which is a hybrid. While partners, or shareholders, in GmbHs and AGs are liable only up to the extent of their contribution, KGaAs have both simple shareholders and partners with unlimited liability.

State of Research

Although research on the destruction of Jewish commercial activity in the German Reich has progressed in leaps and bounds in recent years, there has never been a definitive study specifically focused on Berlin, despite the exceptional status of the city. Previously, research has been restricted to major Berlin businesses³⁷ and well-known families,³⁸ whose members have, from time to time, published their own memoirs.³⁹ Small- and medium-sized Jewish businesses, with just a few exceptions, have long been ignored,⁴⁰ although individual cases are scattered throughout various studies on the history of Jews in Berlin's different districts.⁴¹ Not even the publication in 2007 of the collection "*Arisierung*" in Berlin managed to close this gap. Despite its title, it was conceived not as an exhaustive study but as a collection of case studies.⁴² However, given Berlin's paramount economic significance, businesses in the city were referred to in comprehensive surveys of the destruction of Jewish commercial activity—especially in the pioneering works of Avraham Barkai and Helmut Genschel,⁴³ as well as in recent studies on specific company histories.⁴⁴ In particular, Dieter Ziegler closely examined the expropriation of certain medium-sized Jewish businesses in Berlin in the light of the role played by the Dresdner Bank.⁴⁵ Subsequent to Ingo Köhler's research, published as *The Aryanization of Private Banks in the Third Reich*,⁴⁶ Henning Medert produced an in-depth analysis of Jewish presence in the Berlin stock exchange, also in the context of the research project this book is based on.⁴⁷ As a preliminary report to our research project we presented the exhibition "Final Sale. The End of Jewish Owned Businesses in Nazi Berlin."⁴⁸

The persecution of Jews in Berlin, especially post-1938, has been researched in meticulous detail, thanks to work by Wolf Gruner, Beate Meyer, and Hermann Simon.⁴⁹ Moreover, Martin Friedenberger completed

a pioneering analysis of the expropriation of Jewish assets by financial authorities.⁵⁰ Yet, as Berlin was all too often used as a mere cipher and not as a research topic, it wasn't until 2013 that a comprehensive study of the history of Berlin during the Nazi period was published.⁵¹ A few exceptions aside, such as the cases of the art trade and real estate companies,⁵² the economic development of Berlin during this time frame has not yet been analyzed in depth.⁵³ Although this study is, of course, a contribution to an economic history of Berlin, a lack of detail led to difficulties in making any statements on the specifics of the entirety of Jewish businesses compared to non-Jewish businesses.

What is the Study Based On?

A field of research this extensive inevitably relies on many sources. Of the information available, file records of medium-sized, not to mention small, Jewish businesses and personal testimony from Jewish businesspersons are the absolute exception. The Jewish Museum in Berlin has some bundles of files, but they are not complete, just small donations and legacies. The same applies to the archive of the Leo Baeck Institute, New York. Interviews with eyewitnesses, such as those stored in the Shoah Foundation Institute's Visual History Archive, have only limited evidential value. The people interviewed in the 1990s were generally the children of businesspersons with little knowledge of their parents' firms.⁵⁴ Unfortunately, few records have survived of Jewish private banks that would have shed light not only on the banking business but also on other Jewish businesses. A modest collection concerning Mendelssohn & Co. in the Berlin State Library⁵⁵ and files on M. M. Warburg & Co.'s Berlin business kept by the Hamburg-based private bank in the Warburg Archive Foundation in Hamburg are exceptions.

On the one hand there are structural reasons for the lack of records relating to Jewish businesses. The records of small- and medium-sized businesses are and were generally rarely retained longer than needed for tax reasons. On the other hand, given the circumstances that put an end to businesses run by Jewish entrepreneurs in Germany, the loss of company records appears inevitable. In Berlin it was common practice to refer liquidators who were legally obliged to store company books for ten years to trust companies. In January 1939 the IHK had to admit that this procedure was not feasible. However, plans to create a central archive for the records of liquidated Jewish businesses were never implemented. It must therefore be assumed that these records were destroyed.⁵⁶ In fact, little of note survived even regarding businesses that passed into the hands of

non-Jews. In most cases existing files were handed over to the new owners but, since files could have been used as incriminating evidence against them, they were rarely inclined to keep them. Even when new owners did take over existing files, they often ended up being destroyed in bombings along with the premises they were kept in.

While only remnants of the files of Jewish businesses have survived, the archives of Berlin's Jewish congregation are similarly "fragmentary."⁵⁷ Important insights into the processes in question from the perspective of the victims can, however, also be gained from the documents of the Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens (Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith) at the Russian Federation Military Archive (RGVA), which is also partially available on film at the Central Archive for the History of the Jewish People in Jerusalem, as well as the collection of the Reichsvereinigung der Juden in Deutschland (Reich Association of Jews in Germany) in the German Federal Archive. In addition, I also examined the collection of the economic expert, Cora Berliner, of the Reich Association, at the Leo Baeck Institute in New York, the eyewitness accounts recorded by the Wiener Library, London, in its database "Testimonies to the Holocaust,"⁵⁸ and essays submitted in a competition organized by the Harvard University.⁵⁹

Clearly, the fragmentary information available needed to be supplemented by alternative sources. The starting point was the history of persecution. The destruction of Jewish commercial activity was organized in a collaborative bureaucratic process that is bound to leave traces in files. However, there is also a lack of contemporary overviews of the "Altreich," of the sort that have been handed down as regards Austria.⁶⁰ Moreover, key documents were destroyed in Berlin, including the records of the Nazi Party's Gau economic advisers, of trade licensing offices,⁶¹ and of almost all tax offices.⁶² This was the result of instructions issued by the Reich Economics Ministry on 16 February 1945, which stated that files on "de-Jewification" should not be allowed to fall into "enemy hands" and should therefore be destroyed "in case disposal of the files is impossible on account of unexpected invasion by the enemy."⁶³ Against that backdrop, the Berlin police headquarters announced on 9 March 1945 that the files should be stored together on official premises in the district of Schöneberg.⁶⁴ Shortly after, the mayor ordered the destruction of "numerous files concerning the Aryanization of Jewish businesses so as to avoid their falling into Russian hands."⁶⁵ As well as the loss of the bulk of the administrative files in question, the files of the IHK in Berlin are also missing. Its main headquarters at Dorotheenstraße 8 survived the war relatively unscathed, but only a few remnants of its files could be traced in German archives. It seems that the majority of the files disappeared after 1945 and

that at least some were transported in 1945–1946 to the military archive in Tbilisi, Georgia.

Due to the lack of other sources, the files of the commercial register were of crucial importance. These date back to mediaeval guild registers.⁶⁶ The boom in commerce and enterprises ushered in by the industrial revolution made it necessary to standardize the register. Commercial registers were established on the basis of the General German Commercial Code, which entered into force in May 1861, in the states of the German Confederation, which would collapse just a few years later. In Prussia the registers were kept by District Courts.⁶⁷ While the function of the commercial register as a public record of local businesspeople in the various districts remains unchanged to this day, its structure has altered fundamentally over the course of time. Initially, legal agents were not listed with the companies that had granted them their powers, but on a separate page of the register.⁶⁸ It was only after the introduction of the HGB that the District Courts began in 1900 to link legal agents to their companies. For example, while the general banking partnership Mendelssohn & Co. and its members were originally listed in the company index under tab number 5, the company's legal agents, Hermann Döring and Arthur Fischel, were listed separately in the index under the numbers 7303 and 7579.⁶⁹ In 1900, the private bank and its legal agents were filed under the new number 1710 in section A (sole traders and partnerships).⁷⁰

As it became apparent that the register was no longer up to date, the Reich Ministry of Justice ordered in September 1937 that it could be transcribed onto new pages if that increased clarity.⁷¹ On the strength of that authority, the District Court in Berlin began examining and reentering all companies in the autumn of 1937. This involved the IHK writing to companies to inform them of the content of the register and to request them to check whether “the entry on the new register sheet corresponds to the previous entry and to the company's current legal position.”⁷² If the company failed to respond and the owner, shareholders, or management could not be traced, the IHK concluded that the company no longer existed and applied for its removal from the register. There was a standard procedure for this. The deletion of a company from the register would be publicized, giving owners, shareholders, and creditors three months to object. If no objection was lodged, the company was definitively removed from the commercial register once the deadline passed. In 1937 and 1938 such announcements took up considerable space in the state gazette, the *Deutscher Reichsanzeiger und Preußischer Staatsanzeiger*.

Those businesses that were not deleted were ascribed new sheet numbers. These did not, however, constitute a new number series—the authorities continued to use the old numbering system. As of mid-August 1937,

when new companies in section A were given sheet numbers starting at 85570 and companies in section B were given numbers from 50170, the subsequent numbers were allocated to existing companies that had been reentered. Companies were in principle examined on the basis of the old numbering, starting from the companies with low numbers and progressing to those with high numbers. Mendelssohn & Co., for example, was allocated the number A 86750. When there was any change in the shareholder structure that had to be reported, the company was given a new number while the authorities dealt with the case, resulting in significant discrepancies between the date on which companies were founded and their number in the commercial register.

In order to satisfy a legal requirement that records had to be retained for a period of up to thirty years, the authorities filed the individual records of companies removed from the register according to the year this occurred. However, entire years went missing as a result of various circumstances, such as relocation of offices. By 1940, the files on companies removed from the register between 1922 and 1926 were missing from the commercial register's records.⁷³ Later, the files on those removed between 1933 and 1935 were also lost. After 1945, the register court maintained that this was due to the war,⁷⁴ but it is possible that the files were simply left behind and forgotten when the court moved.⁷⁵ After World War II, the remaining files were kept in the District Court in Charlottenburg. Upon request, they were sent to Courts in East Berlin, where many then remained. Others were simply lost in transit through official channels.⁷⁶

In the mid-1990s, the commercial register files that had meanwhile been stored in the attic of the District Court in Charlottenburg were scheduled to be disposed of, apart from files for the years 1936–1945, which were of vital importance for compensation claims. Files on companies removed in the years 1950–1952 had already been destroyed when it was decided, in the wake of various protests, to hand over all the files to the Berlin State Archive, the Landesarchiv Berlin. When this had taken place it was apparent again that certain files had been disposed of without any fixed criteria being applied—which makes scholarly assessment of this material very difficult. After this book had been written, the files stored in the District Court on companies removed from the register between 1936 and 1945 were also handed over to the Landesarchiv, where they were given new index numbers.

Since 2004, the files of the Restitution Offices of Berlin have also been kept in the Berlin State Archive and are online index currently being prepared. Consisting of roughly 800,000 individual files, samples of the material revealed that only a relatively small number of the files pertained to businesses, so the files were used primarily to shed light on the fates of

individuals.⁷⁷ The files of the main tax administration in the State Archive were of enormous significance, comprising as they did of extensive lists of Jewish businesses as well as files from the offices of the chief of police and the mayor. The files of the public prosecutor's office contained important information concerning the fates of individuals as well as the plundering that took place during the November pogrom.

The state ministries of Prussia, with the exception of the finance ministry, ceased to exist in 1934/35. However, since the trade and economics ministry in particular had been involved in the destruction of Jewish commercial activity until that time its files were also examined in the Geheime Staatsarchiv, the Secret State Archives of the Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation. As well as ministry files, the files of the Prussian higher intermediate local authorities, kept in the *Brandenburgische Landeshauptarchiv*, the Brandenburg State Archive in Potsdam, were also of great importance. These include the inventory of the governor of the province and the Oberfinanzpräsident (chief finance president). The latter includes an extensive collection of reports compiled by the "foreign-exchange inspector" as part of the review of Berlin businesses. The Potsdam archives also house the files of the Assets Exploitation Office, which reported to the chief of finance. These files, compiled in the course of the deportations, are surely among the most disturbing sources of information on the destruction of Jewish economic existence. But since deportation was the final stage of this process, they shed little light on the deportees' former commercial activity. Moreover, the Brandenburg State Archive houses the remaining inventory of the Berlin Chamber of Commerce and Industry as well, which was examined insofar as the files have been registered.

Of the files kept in the Federal Archive in Berlin, the Bundesarchiv, above all those of the Reich Economics Ministry, the Reich Chancellery, the Enemy Property Administration, the Berliner Handelsgesellschaft, the Deutsche Bank, and the Reichskreditgesellschaft were examined. The files of the Nazi Party's Reich Treasurer in addition afforded a fragmentary account of the takeover of Jewish businesses approved by Berlin's Nazi Party economic adviser in the year 1938. The files of the German Foreign Ministry's Political Archive in Berlin also revealed important information on the fate of many Jews with foreign citizenship in Berlin. The *Historical Archive of the Commerzbank*, an index of Jewish-owned businesses potentially "for sale," compiled in the summer of 1938 by the Dresdner Bank, was also consulted. The compensation files of recent cases are still kept in the Entschädigungsamt (Berlin State Office for Citizens and Administrative Matters) and supply valuable additional information. Clearly, such administrative stocks of records are not an archive and it was therefore impossible to view all 200,000 of its files—not least because the process

of restitution remains ongoing and many files are out of bounds for reasons of data protection.⁷⁸ In individual cases it was possible in addition to view the files of recent restitution cases in the Bundesamt für zentrale Dienst (Federal Office for Central Services and Unsettled Property Issues) in Berlin.

After staff at the District Court in Charlottenburg suggested that further files might be found in one of the court's warehouses housed in the basement of a former prison, I was also able to locate files on bankruptcies that corresponded to the commercial register files. But since these files were not indexed or in any condition that allows for systematic perusal, I was only able to examine a few samples. The same warehouse, however, also housed the Old Registration Records of Cooperatives, in which valuable register files for Berlin's three Jewish cooperative banks could be tracked down. In the meantime bankruptcy and cooperative register files have been transferred to the Berlin State Archive, too.

I evaluated not only textual but also visual material. Although photographs are used all too often simply as illustration, they are also a first-class significant source of information, helping us to grasp context and supplying valuable perspectives. One image taken by photographer Abraham Pisarek, published in 1981 by Eike Geisel in the illustrated anthology *Im Scheunenviertel*, shows a stall owned by the father of the historian Avraham Barkai. Although passersby partially block the view, the photograph reveals that the stall, positioned in the entrance of Grenadierstraße 32, consisted of little more than a small kitchen table, the space available sufficing merely for a few books and some rolled palm leaves sold for the feast of tabernacles.⁷⁹ Specifically, I studied the photograph collections in the picture archive of the Foundation of Prussian Cultural Heritage, the Centrum Judaicum, the Berlin State Archive, and the databases of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and Yad Vashem.

Since economics are an integral part of public life—however this is defined—the history of businesses can always be traced to some extent by reference to reports published at the time. In 1966 Helmut Genschel demonstrated how much can be gained from a systematic examination of the contemporary press.⁸⁰ Shortly thereafter, David Schoenbaum published a social history of the Third Reich in which he suggested that the struggles of medium-sized businesses were a matter of public debate.⁸¹ Along with various economic trade publications—in particular, the *Mitteilungsblatt der Industrie und Handelskammer zu Berlin* and *Die Deutsche Volkswirtschaft*—I examined the newspapers *Der Angriff*, the *Berliner Tageblatt*, the *Völkische Beobachter*, *Das Schwarze Korps*, and, repulsed, also *Der Stürmer*. I also examined the *Berliner Lokalanzeiger* and the *Frankfurter Zeitung* for coverage of specific events such as the “boycott” and the November po-

grom. The *Jüdische Rundschau* and the *Gemeindeblatt der jüdischen Gemeinde zu Berlin* also proved useful. Since, however, censorship increasingly limited the actual news content of newspaper reporting, I also studied the *Pariser Tageblatt* (*Pariser Tageszeitung* after 1936), the *Washington Post*, and the *New York Times*. It soon became apparent that the *Times*—which has never been used for such purposes before—was the best-informed newspaper, publishing many detailed reports and insightful commentaries, all of which help shed light on the persecution of Jews in Berlin.⁸²

How Was the Data Collected?

Database of Jewish Businesses in Berlin

The parlous state of the files made it necessary to find a way to collate the scattered information and render it statistically manageable. The result was the Database of Jewish Businesses in Berlin, conceived as a framework for describing Jewish businesses as fully as possible. Its design is based on the premise that all Jewish businesses underwent considerable changes against the background of persecution after 1933. Sooner or later they changed their names, their legal form, their owners, shareholders, and managers, or went into liquidation. These changes can be relatively easily identified, since they were published in the Central Commercial Register Supplement (*Zentral Handelsregisterbeilage*, ZHRB) of the *Deutscher Reichsanzeiger und Preußischer Staatsanzeiger* inter alia. The importance of the *Reichsanzeiger* as a “first-class source” was already stressed when the “International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Emigrés 1933–1945” was drawn up.⁸³ However, its importance for economic history has not yet been recognized,⁸⁴ despite the fact that the Berlin Chamber of Industry and Commerce used it as a key source of information. A printed index of all the companies entered in the Berlin commercial register existed prior to this date and had been published since 1864 on an annual basis by the Registry Court officials. The sixty-seventh and final edition in the series was published amid the turmoil of 1931.⁸⁵ Supplements continued to be published until December 1932 that, in conjunction with the printed directory, give a reasonably accurate picture of the status of the listed companies. Taking the printed index as a starting point, my research team and I continued to process all vital information from the *Reichsanzeiger* until 31 December 1938. After that we stopped filing new companies into the database, since no new Jewish companies could be added to the Berlin commercial register after the Decree on the Exclusion of Jews from German Economic Life, which came into effect on 1 January 1939.

For 1941 and 1942 only information on companies deleted was taken from the *Reichsanzeiger*. Since, in Berlin, some forty companies were entered per day on over three hundred days of the year, the major incorporated companies as well as municipal, state, Christian, and charitable undertakings were not taken into account in order to limit the amount of data. Nor were undertakings that solely administered a single house, on the ground that they were, strictly speaking, not commercial enterprises.

Identification

Compiling a record of all the changes to the Berlin commercial register inevitably also brought into focus companies defined according to the aforementioned criteria as Jewish. However, it was often impossible to tell from the central commercial register's supplement alone which particular companies were specifically subject to persecution. Further sources were needed in order to identify those companies, such as the commercial register's files, which proved highly useful. Accelerated persecution and the introduction of a requirement that Jewish business names included the forenames of their owners was a painful signal. From the autumn of 1938 onward, the files regularly explicitly mentioned the fact that a business or business person was regarded as Jewish. It would have nonetheless been a mistake to make register officials' notes or the use of a compulsory forename—e.g., Israel or Sara—the sole criteria for identifying Jewish businesses. For example, if Jewish refugees in exile applied to have a company removed from the commercial register they did not, of course, have to use the compulsory forename. It was thus necessary, in the absence of conclusive proof, to find a workable compromise in order to avoid leaving out companies that were, in all probability, regarded as Jewish. I therefore also defined a company as Jewish if the commercial register file included a note on emigration and/or a compensation claim. Since, in particular, possible emigration was not always noted in the files of companies removed from the register prior to the autumn of 1938, these files were only consulted in individual cases, especially as the number of companies removed from the register in the years 1937 and 1938 was particularly high owing to the general revision of the register referred to above.

Besides the commercial register's files, information from other collections of files was systematically entered in the database whenever they contained clear evidence that specific companies were regarded as Jewish. That was the case, for instance, with the lists referred to above compiled by the Gau economic advisers, the commercial tax offices, Dresdner Bank, the collections of the foreign exchange inspection reports of the chief finance president, and the index of members of Jewish cooperative banks.

The advantage of the latter was the opportunity they afforded to go beyond the definition otherwise used and to assume that these members identified with the religious community, which was increasingly showing signs of being bound together by a shared destiny. The same applies to the printed lists of members of Jewish associations and societies, primarily the membership lists of the Association of Self-Employed Craftsmen of the Jewish Faith, which were published annually from 1935 both as an independent publication and in the Berlin Jewish Community's newspaper,⁸⁶ while 1936 saw the publication of the Index of the Reich Association of Medium-Sized Jewish Businesses.⁸⁷ Equally informative was the Directory of the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, which also listed the organization's members' professions and gave detailed information about the companies of businesspersons.⁸⁸ The handbook of the Cartel of Associations of German Students of the Jewish Faith similarly listed members who were businesspersons with their position within the company.⁸⁹

My research team and I also studied advertisements in Jewish newspapers, which became increasingly numerous after 1933.⁹⁰ However, a standard advertisement was not enough to identify a company with any certainty as Jewish, because non-Jewish companies also took out ads in Jewish newspapers up until 1938.⁹¹ Thus businesses were only identified in the database if they explicitly indicated their Jewishness, for example, by referring to membership of a Jewish association or a Jewish congregation. In compiling the database we examined not only contemporary material but also a search list of Jewish successor organizations, created in 1954, through which information was provided on companies in respect of which restitution claims had been lodged.⁹² We also processed Nazi newspapers—*Der Angriff* and especially *Der Stürmer*—which shed light on which businesses the persecutors specifically targeted. Once *Der Stürmer* opened a Berlin office in the summer of 1935, it proceeded to compile lists of Jewish businesses and regularly disparaged them.⁹³

In ambiguous cases, the Jewish Directory for Greater Berlin proved to be a great help. In the 1931 version it lists some 65,000 persons,⁹⁴ although only the heads of households and many persons of the same name, so that it is impossible to extrapolate definitively who was a member of the Jewish community or who later suffered persecution as a Jew.⁹⁵ A definitive identification was therefore only possible in cases when the private address of a businessperson listed in the Jewish Directory corresponded to the address of the business, give or take a maximum of two street numbers. Usually, however, businesspeople in the main commercial hubs of Stadtmitte and Kurfürstendamm no longer tended to live above their businesses. The result of these various factors is a certain imbalance. Nevertheless, the distortion is much less serious than it would be if every

company was automatically deemed to be Jewish if just one of its potential partners or managers was listed in the Jewish Directory. Apart from that directory, the Berlin Memorial Book of Jewish Victims of National Socialism was also a useful—albeit emotionally disturbing—aid in identifying individuals and establishing their fate, as it lists the last residential addresses of deportees.⁹⁶ Since research has rendered the information it contains in part out of date, I referred to the online version of the “Memorial Book of the Federal Archives for the Victims of the Persecution of Jews in Germany (1933–1945)” as well.⁹⁷

Scope of Data Collection

The number of businesses examined was immense. On the basis of the central commercial register supplements alone, 82,100 entries on approximately 51,800 companies were made in the database. Some companies were listed more than once. These entries were supplemented with information from the printed index of companies listed in the commercial register, referred to in the database a total of 7521 times. Information from some 4100 commercial register files and some 3000 files of other provenance was also included in the database. The database identifies about 1788 of the roughly 4500 businesses referred to in contemporary Jewish publications and membership lists, and another 612 that were named in Nazi publications. The search list of Jewish successor organizations yielded a total of 2691 matches. Studies on topics such as Jewish life in Berlin’s districts and Uwe Westphal’s study of dressmaking in Berlin led to the identification of 1422 Jewish businesses, while Henning Medert’s research on Jewish participants in the Berlin Stock Exchange led to 826 hits. All in all, the database includes a total of 8019 Jewish businesses, 3604 of which were identified on the strength of more than one source. In some cases identification was verified by up to nine separate sources.⁹⁸

The scale of identification was checked by reference to samples from commercial register files. After all essential lists and indexes had been entered into the database, files from five randomly chosen, as yet unexamined, shelves in the register on the top floor of the court in Charlottenburg from section 90 (Commercial register A, letters A–M) for year of removal 1939 were entered. It transpired that of the 207 companies in the sample, 147 were Jewish according to our criteria. Of these, 86 (i.e., 59 percent) had already been verified by other sources. At the same time, assessment of the commercial register files enabled a further 61 businesses to be identified in the sample alone. Since the inclusion of the commercial register files substantially boosted the scale of the data, it can be assumed that over 60 percent of all Jewish businesses entered in the register were covered.

This is confirmed by the following: the database includes 157 companies operating under the name Cohn that were liquidated or reregistered under a new proprietor. It can be assumed that, in general, these businesses had been the subject of persecution. The database identifies 105 (i.e., almost 68 percent) of those 157 businesses. With this in mind, my cautious estimate is that the database includes two-thirds of the businesses listed in the commercial register and persecuted as Jewish after 1933.

One of the reasons why many businesses could not, however, be identified is that the historical documents used as reference were partly inaccurate and incomplete. This is very well illustrated by a list drawn up at Police District No 17 in Invalidenstraße on 11 November 1938, which was handed over to the Reich Association of Jews. Police officers recorded how many shop windows were destroyed during the pogrom. Since the police officers were familiar with the businesses, they did not bother to record their full names. The company J. Pellot & Co. GmbH, for example, was listed simply as Pellot & Co. Many small errors crept into the list. W. Meyer, a purveyor of gentlemen's requisites, appeared in the list as Mayer Herrensartikel, while the leather goods shop M. Rector appears as Recktor. These errors only become apparent when the list is compared to the official Berlin Directory, which itself was not free of errors and did not necessarily list all the residents of a given street. The police lists include three stores plundered in Brunnenstraße (Brenner Ladies Clothing, Hartmann Shoes, and Samosch Lingerie), which did not appear in the Berlin Directory.⁹⁹ The same applies to the index of businesses listed in the Berlin commercial register, which was over one thousand pages long. In this case, its authors themselves conceded that "it might contain inaccuracies because companies fail to inform the IHK and the register court when they move into new premises."¹⁰⁰

Notes

1. Declaration by Max Kulies, 3 January 1941, Charlottenburg District Court (AGC), Commercial register (HR) A 90, 38139, 1941.

2. Letter from Kulies to the court, 4 December 1937, *ibid.*, see chapter 4.

3. Frank Bajohr, "'Arisierung' als gesellschaftlicher Prozeß: Verhalten, Strategien und Handlungsspielräume jüdischer Eigentümer und 'arischer' Erwerber," in Irmtrud Wojak and Peter Hayes, eds., *"Arisierung" im Nationalsozialismus. Volksgemeinschaft, Raub und Gedächtnis* (Frankfurt and New York, 2000), 15–30. See Benno Nietzel, Christoph Kreutzmüller, and Ingo Loose, "Persecution and Strategies of Survival: Jewish Entrepreneurs in Berlin, Frankfurt am Main and Breslau 1933–1938/42," *Yad Vashem Studies* (2011), 31–70, here 31–34; Avraham Barkai, *Erlebtes und Erdachtes. Erinnerungen eines unabhängigen Historikers* (Göttingen, 2011), 136;

Ludolf Herbst, "Banker in einem prekären Geschäft: Die Beteiligung der Commerzbank an der Vernichtung der jüdischen Gewerbetätigkeit," in Herbst and Thomas Weihe, eds., *Die Commerzbank und die Juden* (Munich, 2004), 74–137, here 93–106; Marion Kaplan, *Geschichte des jüdischen Alltags in Deutschland: Vom 17. Jahrhundert bis 1945* (Munich, 2003), 21; Christopher Kopper, "Wirtschaftliche Selbstbehauptung im sozialen Ghetto. Jüdische Wirtschaftsbürger im 'Dritten Reich,'" in Dieter Ziegler, ed., *Großbürgertum und Unternehmer: Die deutsche Wirtschaftselite im 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 2000), 204–214, here 205.

4. Ludolf Herbst, "Steuerung der Wirtschaft im Nationalsozialismus? Systemtheoretische Aspekte," in Dieter Gosewinkel, ed., *Wirtschaftskontrolle und Recht in der national-sozialistischen Diktatur* (Frankfurt, 2005), 3–13, here 9.

5. See Frank Bajohr, "Die wirtschaftliche Existenzvernichtung und Enteignung der Juden: Forschungsbilanz und offene Fragen," *Theresienstädter Studien und Dokumente* 13 (2006), 348–365, here 357f.

6. In 2009 Benno Nietzel produced a concise report: "Die Vernichtung der wirtschaftlichen Existenz der deutschen Juden 1933–1945. Ein Literatur- und Forschungsbericht," *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 49 (2009), 561–613. Apart from Frank Bajohr's "Arisierung" in Hamburg: *Die Verdrängung der jüdischen Unternehmer 1933–1945* (Hamburg, 1997), the following were particularly useful: Franz Fichtl et al., "Bamberg's Wirtschaft judenfrei": *Die Verdrängung der jüdischen Geschäftsleute in den Jahren 1933 bis 1939* (Bamberg, 1998); Alex Bruns-Wüstefeld, *Lohnende Geschäfte: Die "Entjudung" der Wirtschaft am Beispiel Göttingens* (Hanover, 1997). The following have been published after Nietzel's report: Christiane Fritsche and Johannes Paulmann, eds., *Arisierung und Wiedergutmachung in deutschen Städten* (Vienna, Cologne, and Weimar, 2014); Christiane Fritsche, *Ausgeplündert zurückerstattet und entschädigt. "Arisierung" und Wiedergutmachung in Mannheim* (Ubstadt, 2012); Maren Janetzko, *Die "Arisierung" mittelständischer jüdischer Unternehmen in Bayern 1933–1939, Ein regionaler Vergleich* (Ansbach, 2012); Bastian Blachut, "Arisierung" als Geschäftsprinzip? *Monopolisierung des deutschen Entzinnungsmarktes zwischen 1933 und 1939 durch die Th. Goldschmidt AG in Essen* (Essen, 2012); Benno Nietzel, *Handeln und Überleben: Jüdische Unternehmer aus Frankfurt am Main von den 1920er bis in die 1960er Jahre* (Göttingen, 2012); S. Jonathan Wiesen, *Creating the Nazi Marketplace: Commerce and Consumption in the Third Reich* (New York, 2011). However, despite its title, there is little concerning the destruction of Jewish business activity in Ulrich Sander, ed., *Von Arisierung bis Zwangsarbeit: Verbrechen der Wirtschaft an Rhein und Ruhr 1933–1945* (Cologne, 2012).

7. Martin Dean, *Robbing the Jews: The Confiscation of Jewish Property in the Holocaust 1933–1945* (Cambridge, 2010 [Cambridge, 2008]).

8. Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews. Vol. 1, The Years of Persecution* (New York, 1997).

9. A letter sent by Kulies to the court, 25 February 1939, AGC, HR A 90, 38139, 1941.

10. Hannah Ahlheim, "Deutsche, kauft nicht bei Juden": *Antisemitismus und politischer Boykott in Deutschland 1924 bis 1935* (Göttingen, 2011); idem, "Establishing Antisemitic Stereotypes, Social and Economic Segregation of Jews by means of Political Boycott," in *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 55 (2010), 149–173, here 151f.; Mi-

chael Wildt, *Hitler's Volksgemeinschaft and the Dynamics of Racial Exklusion: Violence against Jews in Provincial Germany, 1919–1939* (New York, 2011).

11. A first approach is presented in: "An den Bruchlinien der Volkswirtschaft. Jüdische Gewerbebetriebe in Berlin 1918 bis 1933," in Christina von Braun (ed.), *Was war deutsches Judentum?* (Boston/Berlin 2015), 237–247.

12. Eva Balz and Christoph Kreutzmüller, "Jüdische Unternehmen vor dem Obersten Rückerstattungsgericht in Berlin 1953–1957," *Forum Historiae Iuris*, April 2013, <http://fhi.rg.mpg.de/articles/1304balz-kreutzmueller.html>. The Active Museum, Fascism and Resistance in Berlin is currently preparing an exhibition on the restitution in the divided city. Eva Balz who's study on the early restitution in Berlin will appear in 2016.

13. *Reichshandbuch der deutschen Gesellschaft: Das Handbuch der Persönlichkeiten in Wort und Bild*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1930).

14. Erich Grasshoff and Kurt Röder, *Firma und Handelsregister: Aus der Auskunftstätigkeit der Industrie- und Handelskammer zu Berlin* (Berlin, n.d. [1937]), 10f.

15. In his study on Jews in the German economy in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Werner E. Mosse used a definition based on ethnic categories. Given the practices of racist persecution in the Nazi period this is, however, no longer possible. See Werner E. Mosse, *Jews in the German Economy: The German-Jewish Economic Élite 1820–1935* (Oxford, 1987), 1f. Paul Windolf, "The German-Jewish Economic Elite (1900 to 1930)," *Zeitschrift für Unternehmensgeschichte* 56 (2011), 2:135–162, here 143f., shows how problematic such an approach is today.

16. Thomas Lackmann, *Das Glück der Mendelssohns: Geschichte einer deutschen Familie* (Berlin, 2007).

17. Philipp Stauff, ed., *Sigilla Veri. Lexikon der Juden, -Genossen und -Gegner aller Zeiten und Zonen, insbesondere Deutschlands, der Lehren, Gebräuche, Kunstgriffe und Statistiken der Juden sowie ihrer Gaunersprache, Trugnamen, Geheimbünde usw* (Erfurt, 1931), vol. 4:451.

18. Ibid., 451f.

19. Memorandum on Brinckmann, Wirtz & Co., 24 March 1947, *Stiftung Warburg-Archiv, Hamburg* (SWA), C. 10602.

20. Memorandum by Max Warburg, 1 May 1933, *ibid.*

21. Quoted in Thomas Blubacher, *Gibt es etwas Schöneres als Sehnsucht? Die Geschwister Eleonora und Francesco von Mendelssohn* (Berlin, 2008), 18.

22. See, for instance, Christopher Kopper, *Zwischen Marktwirtschaft und Dirigismus: Bankenpolitik im "Dritten Reich"* (Bonn, 1995), 82.

23. Editor's preface to *Jüdisches Adreßbuch für Groß Berlin* (Berlin, 1929), no pagination.

24. Theodor Fritsch, *Handbuch der Judenfrage* (Leipzig, 1932 [Leipzig, 1907]), 31. See Marianne Awerbuch, *Erinnerungen aus einem streitbaren Leben: Von Berlin nach Palästina. Von Israel nach Berlin* (Berlin, 2007), 170; Peter Gay, *My German Question: Growing up in Nazi Berlin* (New Haven, CT, and London, 1998), 27. Cf. Claire Zalc, "Trading on Origins: Signs and Windows of Foreign Shopkeepers in Interwar Paris," *History Workshop Journal* 70 (2010), 133–151.

25. See Christoph Kreutzmüller, *Zum Umgang der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft mit Geld und Gut: Immobilientransfers und jüdische Stiftungen 1933–1945* (Berlin, 2005), 44.

26. My own conclusions from the Database of Jewish Businesses in Berlin (DjGB).

27. "Guttman, Hamburg, arisch", in *Das Schwarze Korps*, 4. 11. 1937.

28. See Nietzel, *Handeln*, 16f.

29. For a contemporary discussion on who should be persecuted as a Jew: Beate Meyer, "Jüdische Mischlinge," *Rassenpolitik und Verfolgungserahrung 1933–1945* (Hamburg, 1999).

30. *Dritte Verordnung zum Reichsbürgergesetz*, 14 June 1938, *Reichsgesetzblatt*. I, 1938, 246f.

31. Dieter Ziegler, "'Aryanization' and the Role of the German Great Banks: 1933–1938," in Gerald D. Feldman and Wolfgang Seibel, eds., *Networks of Nazi Persecution, Bureaucracy, Business and the Organization of the Holocaust* (New York and Oxford, 2005), 44–68, here 47.

32. Christoph Kreutzmüller, "Die Vernichtung der jüdischen Gewerbetätigkeit in Berlin. Begriffe und Blickwinkel," in Fritsche and Paulmann, eds., *Arisierung*, 45–64.

33. "Arisieren, ein neuer Sport," *Das Schwarze Korps*, 5. 8. 1937.

34. Jewish Central Information Office, ed., *Entrechtung, Ächtung und Vernichtung der Juden in Deutschland seit der Regierung Hitler* (Amsterdam, 1936), 38. Deutschland-Bericht vom Dezember 1936, Klaus Behnken, ed., *Deutschland-Berichte der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands (Sopade) 1934–1940*, reprint, 7 vols. (Frankfurt, 1980), here vol. 3, 1936, 1655. See Bericht vom April 1940, in *Sopade-Berichte*, vol. 7, 1940, 258.

35. See Ludolf Herbst, et al., "Vorwort," in Herbst and Weihe, eds., *Commerzbank*, 9–19, here 10–13.

36. Christoph Kreutzmüller, "The ban of Jewish owned businesses in Nazi Germany—a boycott?" in David Feldman, ed., *Boycott Past and Present*, Forthcoming; (London, 2015).

37. Ulrike Schulz, *Simson. Vom unwahrscheinlichen Überleben eines Unternehmens 1856–1993* (Göttingen, 2013); Nils Busch-Petersen, *Adolf Jandorf: Vom Volkswarenhaus zum KaDeWe* (Berlin, 2008); idem, *Oscar Tietz: Von Birnbaum/Provinz Posen zum Warenhauskönig von Berlin* (Berlin, 2004); Kilian Steiner, *Ortsempfänger, Volksfernseher und Optaphon: Die Entwicklung der deutschen Radio- und Fernsehindustrie und das Unternehmen Loewe 1923–1962* (Essen, 2005); Simone Ladwig-Winters, *Wertheim: Ein Warenhausunternehmen und seine Eigentümer: Ein Beispiel der Entwicklung der Berliner Warenhäuser bis zur »Arisierung«* (Münster, 1997); Petra Woidt, *Pankow und die Königin von Saba: Eine Firmen- und Familiengeschichte* (Berlin, 1997); Elfi Pracht, *M. Kempinski & Co.* (Berlin, 1994); Wilhelm Treue, "Das Bankhaus Mendelssohn als Beispiel einer Privatbank im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert," *Mendelssohn-Studien* 1 (1972), 29–80.

38. Comprehensive: Martin Münzel, *Die jüdischen Mitglieder der deutschen Wirtschaftselite 1927–1955: Verdrängung, Emigration, Rückkehr* (Paderborn et al., 2006); Martin Fiedler, "Die »Arisierung« der Wirtschaftselite: Ausmaß und Verlauf der Verdrängung der jüdischen Vorstands- und Aufsichtsratsmitglieder in deutschen Aktiengesellschaften," in Irntrud Wojak and Peter Hayes, eds., *»Arisierung« im Nationalsozialismus: Volksgemeinschaft, Raub und Gedächtnis* (Frankfurt and New

York, 2000), 59–83; Mosse, *Jews. Individual families or persons*: Olaf Matthes, *James Simon: Die Kunst des sinnvollen Lebens* (Berlin, 2011); Julius Schoeps, *Das Erbe der Mendelssohn: Biographie einer Familie* (Frankfurt, 2009); Regina Scheer, *Wir sind die Liebermanns: Die Geschichte einer Familie* (Berlin, 2006); Lackmann, *Mendelssohn*; Marina Sandig, *Die Liebermann: Ein biographisches Zeit- und Kulturbild der preußisch-jüdischen Familie und Verwandtschaft von Max Liebermann* (Neustadt and Aisch, 2005); Erica Fischer and Simone Ladwig-Winters, *Die Wertheims: Geschichte einer Familie* (Hamburg, 2004); Sven Kuhrau and Kurt Winkler, eds., *Juden, Bürger, Berliner: Das Gedächtnis der Familie Beer-Meyerbeer-Richter* (Berlin, 2004); Michael Dormmann, *Eduard Arnhold (1849–1925): Eine biographische Studie zu Unternehmer- und Mäzenatentum im Deutschen Kaiserreich* (Berlin, 2002); Olaf Matthes, *James Simon: Mäzen im Wilhelminischen Zeitalter* (Berlin, 2000); Elisabeth Kraus, *Die Familie Mosse. Deutsch-jüdisches Bürgertum im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1999); Fritz Stern, *Gold and Iron: Bismarck, Bleichröder and the building of the German Empire* (London, 1977); Naomi Shepherd, *Wilfrid Israel* (Berlin, 1985).

39. Fritz Valentin Grünfeld, *Heimgesucht—Heimgefunden: Betrachtung und Bericht des letzten Inhabers des Leinenhauses Grünfeld* (Berlin, 1979); Stefi Jersch-Wenzel, ed., *Das Leinenhaus Grünfeld: Erinnerungen und Dokumente von Fritz V. Grünfeld* (Berlin, 1967); Hans Fürstenberg, *Erinnerungen: Mein Weg als Bankier und Carl Fürstenbergs Altersjahre* (Wiesbaden, 1965); Oscar Meyer, *Von Bismarck zu Hitler* (Offenbach, 1948 [New York, 1944]).

40. Gesa Kessemeier, *Ein Feentempel der Mode oder eine vergessene Familie. Die Familie Freudenberg und das Modehaus "Hermann Gerson"* (Berlin, 2013); Celina Kress, *Adolf Sommerfeld—Andrew Sommerfeld: Bauen für Berlin 1910–1970* (Berlin, 2011); Karolin Steinke, *Simon Adler: Eierhändler in Berlin* (Berlin, 2011); Christoph Kreutzmüller and Bjoern Weigel, *Nissim Zacouto: Oriental Carpet Wholesaler and Miraculous Survivor* (Berlin, 2011); Hans H. Lembke, *Die schwarzen Schafe bei den Gradenwitz und Kuczynski: Zwei Berliner Familien im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 2008); Götz Aly and Michael Sontheimer, *Fromms: Wie der jüdische Kondomfabrikant Julius F. unter die deutschen Räuber fiel* (Frankfurt, 2007); Christoph Kreutzmüller and Thomas Weihe, *Eugen Panofsky (1855–1922): Berliner Bankier, Stadtrat und Stadtältester* (Berlin, 2007); Ferdinand von Weyhe, A. E. Wassermann: *Eine rechtshistorische Fallstudie zur »Arisierung« zweier Privatbanken* (Frankfurt et al., 2007); Michael Dormmann and Hellmut F. Braun, »Dem Deutschen Volke«: *Die Geschichte der Berliner Bronzegießerei Loewy* (Berlin, 2003); Henning Kahmann, *Die Bankiers von Jaquiers & Securius 1933–1945: Eine rechtshistorische Fallstudie zur »Arisierung« eines Berliner Bankhauses* (Frankfurt et al., 2002); Nea Weissberg-Bob and Thomas Irmer, *Heinrich Richard Brinn (1874–1944): Fabrikant, Kunstsammler, Frontkämpfer* (Berlin, 2002); Beate Meyer, "»Arisiert« und ausgeplündert: Die jüdische Fabrikantenfamilie Garbáty," in Meyer and Hermann Simon, eds., *Juden in Berlin 1938–1945: Begleitband zur gleichnamigen Ausstellung in der Stiftung Neue Synagoge Berlin—Centrum Judaicum* (Berlin, 2000), 77–88; Uwe Westphal, *Berliner Konfektion und Mode. 1836–1939: Die Zerstörung einer Tradition* (Berlin, 1992 [Berlin, 1986]).

41. Sonja Miltenberger, *Jüdisches Leben am Kurfürstendamm* (Berlin, 2011); Regina Girod, Reiner Lidschun, and Otto Pfeffer, *Nachbarn: Juden in Friedrichshain* (Berlin, 2000); Horst Helas, *Juden in Berlin-Mitte: Biografien, Orte, Begegnungen* (Ber-

lin, 2000); Gerd Lüdersdorf, *Es war ihr Zuhause: Juden in Köpenick* (Berlin, 1999); Kulturamt Prenzlauer Berg and Prenzlauer Berg Museum, eds., *Leben mit der Erinnerung: Jüdische Geschichte in Prenzlauer Berg* (Berlin, 1997); Thea Koberstein and Norbert Stein, *Juden in Lichtenberg mit den früheren Ortsteilen in Friedrichshain, Hellersdorf und Marzahn* (Berlin, 1995); Kunstamt Schöneberg, Schöneberg Museum, and Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz, eds., *Orte des Erinnerns: vol. 2: Jüdisches Alltagsleben im Bayrischen Viertel: Eine Dokumentation* (Berlin, 1995); Kulturamt Weißensee and Stadtgeschichtliches Museum, eds., *»Ich hatte einst ein schönes Vaterland«: Juden in Weißensee* (Berlin, 1994); Bund der Antifaschisten, ed., *Jüdisches Leben in Pankow: Eine zeit- geschichtliche Dokumentation* (Berlin, 1993); Berliner Geschichtswerkstatt, ed., *Juden in Kreuzberg: Fundstücke, Fragmente, Erinnerungen* (Berlin, 1991); Alois Kaulen and Joachim Pohl, *Juden in Spandau vom Mittelalter bis 1945* (Berlin, 1988); Dorothea Kolland, ed., *»Zehn Brüder waren wir gewesen ... «: Spuren jüdischen Lebens in Neukölln* (Berlin, 1988); Burkhard Asmuss and Andreas Nachama, "Zur Geschichte der Juden in Berlin und das Jüdische Gemeindezentrum Charlottenburg," in Wolfgang Ribbe, ed., *Von der Residenz zur City: 275 Jahre Charlottenburg* (Berlin, 1980), 165–228.

42. Christof Biggeleben, Beate Schreiber, and Kilian Steiner, "Vorwort," idem, eds., *»Arisierung« in Berlin* (Berlin, 2007), 7–12, here 11f.

43. Avraham Barkai, *Vom Boykott zur »Entjudung«: Der wirtschaftliche Existenzkampf der Juden im Dritten Reich 1933–1945* (Frankfurt, 1988); Helmut Genschel, *Die Verdrängung der Juden aus der Wirtschaft im Dritten Reich* (Göttingen, 1966). Cf. Johannes Ludwig, *Boykott, Enteignung, Mord: Die »Entjudung« der deutschen Wirtschaft* (Munich and Zurich, 1992).

44. Norbert Frei et al., *Flick. Der Konzern, die Familie, die Macht* (Munich, 2009); Johannes Bähr et al., *Der Flick-Konzern im Dritten Reich* (Munich, 2008); Kim C. Priemel, *Flick: Eine Konzerngeschichte vom Kaiserreich bis zur Bundesrepublik* (Göttingen, 2007); Peter Hayes, *From Cooperation to complicity: Degussa in the Third Reich* (Cambridge, 2004); Gerald D. Feldman, *Die Allianz und die deutsche Versicherungswirtschaft 1933–1945* (Munich, 2001); Harold James, *Die Deutsche Bank und die »Arisierung«* (Munich, 2001).

45. Dieter Ziegler, *Die Dresdner Bank und die deutschen Juden* (Munich, 2006).

46. Ingo Köhler, *Die »Arisierung« der Privatbanken im Dritten Reich: Verdrängung, Ausschaltung und die Frage der Wiedergutmachung* (Munich, 2005).

47. Medert, *Verdrängung*; Bjoern Weigel, "Vom deutschen zum »arischen« Theater: Vernichtung jüdischer Gewerbetätigkeit an Berliner Theatern," dissertation, Berlin, 2015.

48. Christoph Kreutzmüller and Kaspar Nürnberg, eds., *Final Sale: The End of Jewish Owned Businesses in Nazi Berlin* (Boston 2014 [New York and Berlin, 2010]).

49. Beate Meyer, Hermann Simon, Chana Schuetz (eds.) *Jews in Nazi Berlin. From Kristallnacht to Liberation*, Chicago and London 2009; Wolf Gruner, "Die Verfolgung der Juden und die Reaktionen der Berliner," in Michael Wildt and Christoph Kreutzmüller, eds., *Berlin 1933–1945* (Munich, 2013), 311–324; idem, "Die Berliner und die Judenverfolgung. Eine mikrohistorische Studie individueller Handlungen und sozialer Beziehungen," *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus* 27 (2011), 57–87; idem, *Judenverfolgung in Berlin 1933–1945: Eine Chronologie*

der Behördenmaßnahmen in der Reichshauptstadt (Berlin, 2009 [Berlin, 1996]); idem, *Öffentliche Wohlfahrt und Judenverfolgung: Wechselwirkung lokaler und zentraler Politik im NS-Staat* (Munich, 2002); idem, "Die NS-Judenverfolgung und die Kommunen. Zur wechselseitigen Dynamisierung von zentraler und lokaler Politik 1933–1941" *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* (VfZ) 48 (2000), 75–126; idem, "»Lesen brauchen sie nicht zu können ... «: Die Denkschrift über die Behandlung der Juden in der Reichshauptstadt auf allen Gebieten des öffentlichen Lebens vom Mai 1938," in *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung* 4 (1995), 305–341; idem, "Die Reichshauptstadt und die Verfolgung der Berliner Juden 1933–1945," in Reinhard Rürup, ed., *Jüdische Geschichte in Berlin: Vol. 2: Essays und Studien* (Berlin, 1995), 229–266; Meyer and Simon, eds., *Juden*. See also Susanne Willems, *Der entsiedelte Jude: Albert Speers Wohnungsmarktpolitik für den Berliner Stadtneubau* (Berlin, 2000); Zentrum für audio-visuelle Medien and Landesbildstelle Berlin, eds., *Die Grunewald-Rampe: Die Deportation der Berliner Juden*, assembled by Annegret Ehmman und Horst Neumann (Berlin, 1993).

50. Martin Friedenberger, *Fiskalische Ausplünderung: Die Berliner Steuer- und Finanzverwaltung und die jüdische Bevölkerung 1933–1945* (Berlin, 2008). Cf. Christiane Kuller, *Bürokratie und Verbrechen. Antisemitische Finanzpolitik und Verwaltungspraxis im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland* (München, 2013).

51. Wildt and Kreutzmüller, *Berlin*. Cf. Moritz van Dülmen, Wolfgang Kühnelt, and Bjoern Weigel (eds.), *Zerstörte Vielfalt/Diversity Destroyed, Berlin 1933–1938–1945*, (Berlin, 2013); Moritz Foellmer, *Individuality and Modernity in Berlin: Self and Society from Weimar to the Wall* (Cambridge, 2013); Stiftung Topographie des Terrors, ed., *Berlin 1933–1945: Zwischen Propaganda und Terror* (Berlin, 2010); Christian Engeli and Wolfgang Ribbe, "Berlin in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus," in Wolfgang Ribbe, ed., *Geschichte Berlins*, vol. 2, (Munich, 2002 [Munich, 1987]), 927–1024; Bezirksamt Wilmersdorf, ed., *Kommunalverwaltung unterm Hakenkreuz: Berlin-Wilmersdorf 1933–1945* (Berlin, 1992). See also Sven Felix Kellerhoff, *Hitlers Berlin: Geschichte einer Hassliebe* (Berlin, 2005); Gerhard Neuber, "Faschismus in Berlin: Entwicklung und Wirken der NSDAP und ihrer Organisationen in der Reichshauptstadt," Berlin, 1976. On resistance: Hans-Rainer Sandvoß, *Die »andere« Hauptstadt: Widerstand aus der Arbeiterbewegung in Berlin von 1933–1945* (Berlin, 2007); as well as the fourteen-volume set of documents on resistance in the various districts of Berlin between 1933 and 1945, published between 1983 and 2003 by the Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand. The authors of the individual volumes are Hans-Rainer Sandvoß and Heinrich-Wilhelm Wörmann.

52. Christine Fischer-Defoy and Kaspar Nürnberg, eds., *Gute Geschäfte. Kunsthandel in Berlin 1933–1945* (Berlin, 2011); Christoph Bernhardt, "Vom Terrainhandel zur Weimarer Städtebaukoalition: Unternehmen und Unternehmer im Berliner Eigenheimbau von 1900 bis 1939," in Heinz Reif, ed., *Berliner Villenleben: Die Inszenierung bürgerlicher Wohnwelten am grünen Rand der Stadt um 1900* (Berlin, 2008), 71–92.

53. See Christoph Kreutzmüller, "Die Wirtschaft Berlins," in Wildt and Kreutzmüller, eds., *Berlin*, 83–96; Christoph Kreutzmüller and Rüdiger Hachtmann, "Arbeiter und Arbeiterorganisation in Berlin 1930–1945," in Wildt and Kreutzmüller, eds., *Berlin*, 111–126.

54. See index of video interviews conducted by the University of Southern California, Shoah Foundation Institute for Visual History and Education. Various calls for contemporary witnesses, for instance via the Berliner Zeitzeugenbörse e. V., were unsuccessful. Only one former Jewish businessman could therefore be interviewed.

55. Hans-Günter Klein, "Das »Bankarchiv« der Mendelssohns," in *Mitteilungen der Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz* 16 (1983), 94–105; idem, *Das Mendelssohn Archiv der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin: Bestandsübersicht* (Berlin, 2003), 89f.

56. Protokolle der Vorstandssitzung der IHK, 3. 1. 1939, *Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv (BLHA)*, Rep. 70, IHK Berlin, Abgabe 2001, 171/56/7, 1.

57. Stefi Jersch-Wenzel and Reinhard Rürup, eds., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Juden in den Archiven der neuen Bundesländer*, 6 vols. (Munich, 1996–2001), here 6.1: 18. Cf. Elijahu Taratul, "Jüdisches Schriftgut im Moskauer Sonderarchiv," in Uwe Hartmann, ed., *Kulturgüter im Zweiten Weltkrieg: Verlagerung, Auffindung, Rückführung* (Magdeburg, 2007), 173–196, here 175.

58. See Ben Barkow, Raphael Gross, and Michael Lenarz, eds., *Novemberpogrom 1938: Die Augenzeugenberichte der Wiener Library*, London (Frankfurt, 2008). Further accounts can be viewed under: <http://www.tlmea.com.proxy.nationallizenzen.de/testaments/en/t3hbasic.asp>.

59. Margarete Limberg and Hubert Rübsaat, eds., *Sie durften nicht mehr Deutsche sein: Jüdischer Alltag in Selbstzeugnissen 1933–1938* (Frankfurt and New York, 1990); Uta Gerhardt and Thomas Karlauf, eds., *Nie mehr zurück in dieses Land: Augenzeugen berichten über die Novemberpogrome 1938* (Berlin, 2009).

60. See *Bericht von Walter Rafelsberger über die Entjudung der Ostmark*, per 1. 4. 1939, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Wien (ÖStA), 04/02, 102, 2160/00, Supplements.

61. Heike Schroll and Regina Rousavy, *Das Landesarchiv Berlin und seine Bestände, Teil I: Übersicht der Bestände aus der Zeit bis 1945* (Berlin, 2003), 192.

62. This applies equally to the Central Tax Office and to the Charlottenburg, Luisenstadt, Mitte, Oberspree, Schöneberg, Spandau, Wilmersdorf Nord, Wilmersdorf Süd Tax Offices: LAB, A Rep. 093-01-093–12. An exception was the Moabit-West Tax Office, which inter alia was of significance throughout the Reich as regards the persecution of Jews, the files of which have been partially preserved (LAB, A Rep. 093-03).

63. Reich Ministry for Economics circular, 16. 2. 1945, *Bundesarchiv Berlin (BArch)* R 3101, 9042.

64. Reich Ministry for Economics memorandum, 9. 3. 1945, *BArch* R 3101, 34409.

65. Anonymous testimony of a coworker (Frau F.) of the District Mayor of Horst-Wessel-Stadt (Friedrichshain) dated February 1945, in Volker Berghahn, "Meinungsforschung im »Dritten Reich«: Die Mundpropaganda-Aktion der Wehrmacht im letzten Kriegshalbjahr," in *Militärgeschichtliche Mitteilungen* 1 (1967), 83–120, here 110. I am grateful to Werner G. Fischer, Berlin, for kindly drawing my attention to this.

66. Konrad Cosack, *Lehrbuch des Handelsrechts* (Stuttgart, 1910), 33f.

67. Hermann Staub, *Kommentar zum Allgemeinen Deutschen Handelsgesetzbuch* (Berlin, 1894), 19–24; Otto Sobernheim, *Handelskammern und Handelsregister in der Rechtsprechung seit dem Jahre 1900* (Berlin, 1910).

68. Verzeichniß der in das Handels-Register des Königlichen Stadtgerichts zu Berlin eingetragenen Einzelfirmen, Gesellschaften, Genossenschaften und Prokuren, 1. Jg. (1864).

69. Verzeichniss der in das Handels-Register des Königlichen Amtsgerichts I zu Berlin eingetragenen Einzelfirmen, Gesellschaften und Prokuren, 33. Jg. (1897).

70. Handels-Register des Königlichen Amtsgerichts Berlin-Mitte. Verzeichnis der die Amtsgerichtsbezirke Berlin-Mitte, Schöneberg, Berlin-Tempelhof, Berlin-Wedding, Charlottenburg, Groß-Lichterfelde, Lichtenberg, Pankow, Rixdorf und Weißensee domicilierenden Einzelfirmen und Gesellschaften aller Art sowie deren Vertreter, 45. Jg. (1909).

71. Order of the Reich Minister of Justice, 23 September 1937, *Deutsche Justiz* (1937), 1519.

72. Cf. letter from the District Court to Fraenkl & Co., 2 April 1938, AGC, HR A 93974, 1939 (Fraenkl & Co.).

73. Letter from the Chamber of Industry and Commerce (IHK) to the District Court dated 16 May 1940, AGC, HR A 90, 62386, 1941 (Fritz Bock).

74. Draft letter dated 29 August 1963, marked Hille, in response to a letter from the Cologne Regierungspräsident (Chairman of the Regional Council) dated 14. 8. 1963, AGC, HR A 90, 74440, 1937 (Wilhelm Cohnheim).

75. The Registergericht (Registry Court) moved in 1933 from Neue Friedrichstraße (now Littenstraße) to the building on Tegeler Weg and from there, in 1935, to Gerichtsstraße in Wedding. The gaps in the stock of files held thus correspond to the time when the Registergericht was sited on Tegeler Weg. Despite various endeavours, the whereabouts of the files in question could not be traced.

76. Memo on the file of the Amtsgericht Charlottenburg, 23 September 1998, LAB, A Rep. 342-02, 13993.

77. The size of the stock of files can be explained by the fact that the office's work also involved in cases of compensation for the victims of deportation outside Germany where their property had been brought to Germany. In 2014 a database of records of the restitution office was put online: <http://wga-datenbank.de/en/search.html>

78. Cf. Christoph Kreutzmüller and Monika Sommerer, (eds.) *Finding Aids. Traces of Nazi Victims in Berlin Archives*, (Berlin, 2014).

79. Barkai, *Erlebtes*, 13.

80. Genschel, *Verdrängung*.

81. David Schoenbaum, *Die braune Revolution: Eine Sozialgeschichte des Dritten Reichs* (Cologne, 1968), 339.

82. Christoph Kreutzmüller, "Augen im Sturm? Britische und amerikanische Zeitungsberichte über die Judenverfolgung in Berlin 1918–1938" *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 62/1 (2014), 25–48. Stephanie Seul, "A mad spirit of revived and furious anti-Semitism. Wahrnehmung und Deutung des deutschen Antisemitismus in der New York Times und in der Londoner Times, 1918–1923," in Michael Nagel and Moshe Zimmermann (Hg.), *Judenfeindschaft und Antisemitismus in der deutschen Presse über fünf Jahrhunderte. Erscheinungsformen, Rezeption, Debatte und Gegenwehr* (Bremen, 2013), 499–525.

83. Richard Albrecht, "Exil-Forschung: Biographisch: Das biographische Handbuch der deutsch-sprachigen Emigration nach 1933," *Politische Vierteljahresschrift Literatur* 26 (1985), 120–130.

84. See Martin Schumacher, *Weimar-Index Deutscher Reichsanzeiger und preußischer Staatsanzeiger, Register 1918–1933* (Düsseldorf, 1988).

85. *Berliner Handels-Register. Verzeichnis der in den Amtsgerichtsbezirken Berlin-Mitte, Charlottenburg, Köpenick, Lichtenberg, Lichterfelde, Neukölln, Pankow, Schöneberg, Spandau, Tempelhof, Wedding und Weißensee wohnenden eingetragenen Einzelfirmen, Gesellschaften und Genossenschaften nach dem Stande vom 31. Dezember 1930*, 67. Jg. (1931).

86. Membership Register of the Verein selbständiger Handwerker jüdischen Glaubens e. V. (Berlin, n.d. [1925]).

87. Membership Register of the Verein selbständiger Handwerker jüdischen Glaubens und Reichsverband des jüdischen Mittelstands (Berlin, n.d. [1936]).

88. Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, Directory 1928/29 (Kassel, n.d. [1928]).

89. Handbook of the Kartell-Convent der Verbindungen deutscher Studenten jüdischen Glaubens (Alliance-Assembly of the Association of German Students of Jewish Faith) (Berlin, 1937).

90. "Im Spiegel des Anzeigenteils," *Gemeindeblatt der Jüdischen Gemeinde zu Berlin* (GBJGB) 28. Jg., Nr. 5, 22. 5. 1938. Cf. Christoph Kreutzmüller, *Unter Druck gedruckt, Zeitungsannoncen jüdischer Unternehmen in Deutschland 1933–1942* (Jerusalem, 2015).

91. Da hilft nur ... , *Das Schwarze Korps* 19/1938, 12 May 1938.

92. Jewish Restitution Successor Organisation, Jewish Trust Corporation for Germany, and Branche Française de la Jewish Trust Organisation for Germany, Berlin, eds., *Suchliste betreffend Berliner Firmen* (Berlin, n.d. [1954]).

93. See Christoph Kreutzmüller and Elisabeth Weber, "Unheilvolle Allianzen: Die Rolle des Stürmer bei der Vernichtung jüdischer Gewerbetätigkeit in Berlin," in *NURINST. Beiträge zur deutschen und jüdischen Geschichte* (Nürnberg, 2008), 81–98.

94. Reprint of the Jüdisches Adreßbuch für Groß-Berlin (Jewish Directory for Greater Berlin), (Berlin, 1994 [Berlin, 1930]).

95. Hermann Simon, preface to the reprint of the Jüdisches Adreßbuch für Groß-Berlin (Berlin, 1994).

96. Freie Universität Berlin and Senator für kulturelle Angelegenheiten, eds., *Gedenkbuch Berlins der jüdischen Opfer des Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin, 1995).

97. *Das Gedenkbuch des Bundesarchivs für die Opfer der nationalsozialistischen Judenverfolgung in Deutschland (1933–1945)*, www.bundesarchiv.de/gedenkbuch.

98. See, for instance, the entry for Adolf Brünn Nachf, DjGB.

99. Deployment, Police District No 17, 11 January 1938, *BArch* R 8150, 48.

100. Preface, *Berliner Handels-Register* 67 (1931).

