

Central Europe

DISPLACED PERSONS

THE PERIOD under review (July, 1949, to July, 1950) witnessed a progressive reduction in the number of Jewish displaced persons (DP's) remaining in the DP areas. From the standpoint of the ultimate resolution of the DP problem the most significant development was the liberalization of the United States Displaced Persons Act in June, 1950. The amendment to the Act and Israel's readiness to accept all Jewish DP's, including the "hard core," increased the probability that the Jewish DP problem would be solved during 1950.

Population

The unauthorized migration from Eastern Europe, which had risen to about 19,000 in 1947, continued on a somewhat reduced scale during the period between July, 1948, and July, 1949, leveling off to a total of 5,746 during 1949-50. In view of the decisions of the Soviet satellite countries in the spring of 1950 to reestablish legal migration to Israel, there was reason to believe that this unauthorized migration had run its course.

SIZE AND DISTRIBUTION

On June 30, 1950, the total number of DP's receiving care and maintenance from the International Refugee Organization (IRO) was 248,441, geographically distributed as shown in Table I.

TABLE I

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF ALL DP'S, JUNE 30, 1950

<i>Country or Area</i>	<i>Number</i>
Austria	16,890
France	24,693
Germany	
British Zone	76,357
French Zone	6,646
United States Zone	93,909
Italy	15,884
Middle East	2,799
All other	11,263
TOTAL	248,441

The major countries of citizenship, last habitual residence, or ethnic groups of these DP's are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF DP'S BY COUNTRY OF CITIZENSHIP, LAST
HABITUAL RESIDENCE OR ETHNIC GROUP

<i>Country or Ethnic Group</i>	<i>Number</i>
Poland	52,229
Baltic Countries	34,497
Jewish	23,031
Ukranian	27,307
All others	69,890
TOTAL	206,954 ^a

^a This figure does not include refugees in IRO control and transit centers. There were no Jewish DP's in these installations.

Table 3 shows the geographic distribution of 23,031 Jewish DP's and the reduction of their number from the peak month of December, 1946.

TABLE 3

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF JEWISH DP'S, DECEMBER, 1946-JULY, 1950

<i>Area</i>	<i>December, 1946</i>	<i>June 30, 1948</i>	<i>June 30, 1950</i>
Germany			
United States Zone	126,563	91,396	10,909
British Zone	12,809	8,208	488
French Zone	3,475	516	73
Austria	29,158	16,511	3,569
Italy	25,000	18,249	2,177
Far East	not available	4,256	754
Middle East	" "	20	11
Other Areas	" "	3,780	5,050
TOTALS	197,005	142,936	23,031

In addition to the 248,441 DP's receiving care and maintenance there were, as of June 30, 1950, 235,267 non-Jewish DP's and 55,871 Jewish DP's within the IRO mandate who were maintaining themselves in the local communities of the countries where they lived, and were registered with the IRO for legal and political protection and resettlement aid. The latter were distributed as follows: approximately 5,000 in Austria, 4,000 in Belgium, 900 in Shanghai, 25,000 in France, 17,000 in Germany, 1,000 in Italy, 1,000 in Netherlands, and the remainder in scattered areas.

Care and Maintenance

Early in 1950 the IRO increased the ration for the DP's by approximately 10 per cent of the existing caloric diet. The "normal consumer's" daily ration

rose from 2,000 to 2,230 calories, and diets for the special categories, including babies, children, pregnant and nursing mothers, and heavy workers increased proportionately. At the same time the diet also improved qualitatively by increased allocations of the protective foods, such as proteins, fats, vegetables, fruits, and sugars. The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) supplemented the rations of the Jewish DP's who, by reason of health, age, or other circumstances required additional help. Mass examinations of the Jewish DP's conducted during 1949-50 attested to their good health. The only exceptions were those whose health had been irreparably impaired during the Nazi regime. Even this group showed marked improvement, in response to the intensive IRO and JDC medical and rehabilitation programs.

DISCONTINUANCE OF IRO PROGRAM

On July 7, 1949, the IRO's General Council determined that the IRO would discontinue its care and maintenance program as of June 30, 1950, except for those DP's falling within two specific categories. These categories consisted of first, DP's then in the process of repatriation or resettlement and second, those DP's who because of advanced age or physical disability, required permanent assistance, and for whom no satisfactory arrangements had been made by that date. In line with this decision, the IRO dropped approximately 105,000 DP's from its care and maintenance rolls between May 30 and July 1, 1950. Simultaneously, the financial and administrative responsibility of these DP's, and of the "residual camps" to which the in-camp DP's were transferred, was assumed by the local government authorities in Western Europe and the Middle East. These DP's remained within the IRO mandate and continued to be entitled to the IRO's legal and political protection and to resettlement assistance. Any member of this group could, in addition, become eligible for reinstatement on the IRO care and maintenance rolls by bringing himself within a plan that presented a reasonable prospect of his resettlement by March 31, 1951.

The implementation of the Council decision did not affect the Jewish DP's, who continued to benefit from the IRO program. It was assumed that all Jewish DP's were in the process of resettlement, since they all possessed at least the one alternative of emigrating to Israel.

Emigration

The mass resettlement of the Jewish DP's continued at an impressive rate until the fall of 1949. This migration dropped precipitously in October, 1949, when the departures for Israel from all the DP areas numbered less than 250, and again in January, 1950, when, due to technical features of the United States DP Act, the number of Jewish DP's leaving for the United States declined sharply. As compared with 120,299 who were resettled in the preceding year, 42,765 Jewish DP's emigrated from the DP countries during 1949-50. The countries of destination of the latter group are reflected in Table 4.

TABLE 4

RESETTLEMENT OF JEWISH DP'S, JULY 1, 1949—JUNE 30, 1950,
BY COUNTRY OF DESTINATION

<i>Country of Destination</i>	<i>Number</i>
Israel	11,640
United States	25,323
Canada	2,434
Australia	1,897
Other countries	1,471
TOTAL	42,765

EMIGRATION TO ISRAEL

The mass migration to Israel came to an end while a substantial number of Jewish DP's was still awaiting resettlement. The DP's whose ambitions led them to Israel had had ample opportunity to immigrate there within the year following the emergence of the state in May, 1948. Their presence in the DP countries after that period signified that they preferred to wait until other immigration opportunities developed, either because of the hardships facing the new immigrant in Israel or for other, personal reasons.

The immediate appeal of Israel for the Jewish DP's is reflected in a breakdown of the 200,000 Jewish DP's who were resettled during the period from the end of hostilities in January, 1949, through December, 1949. It is estimated that of these DP's 145,000 migrated to Israel, 46,000 to the United States, and 9,000 to other countries. Approximately 1,500 DP's left for Israel during the first half of 1950, and a survey of the immigration intentions of the residual group showed that about 3,000 additional DP's would migrate to Israel by spring of 1951.

JEWISH AGENCY WITHDRAWAL

In the meantime, the Jewish Agency for Palestine, the organization charged with the administrative responsibility for moving the DP's to Israel, announced in the summer of 1950 that it would withdraw from the DP countries by October 1, 1950. Implicit in this decision was the Agency's belief that the mass migration of DP's to Israel had come to an end, and that migration from the DP countries after October 1, 1950, should be handled on an individual resettlement basis. The announcement was calculated to stimulate migration to Israel before the terminal date.

Not only had migration to Israel come to a near halt, but during 1949-50 there was a return of DP's who had previously immigrated into Israel. An estimated 700 returned to Germany, assigning as their reasons for quitting Israel the lack of housing, the failure to find suitable employment, and inability to cope with Israel's climate. Some entered the German economy while others found their way into the DP camps. In all they posed a problem to the United States military authorities, to the IRO, and to the Jewish voluntary agencies. In June, 1950, one of the "returnees" was tried by an American military government court in Stuttgart and was convicted of illegal entry into Germany. In July, 1950, about ten identical cases were pending

in the courts, awaiting final disposition. At first the IRO announced that it considered the DP's returning from Israel beyond its mandate, on the ground that they had been definitely resettled. The IRO was finally persuaded to register the "returnees" for legal and political protection and to provide them with documents for this limited purpose.

The plight of this group was underscored when both the United States and the Canadian missions in the DP countries ruled that the returnees were ineligible for their respective mass resettlement schemes. The only immediate resettlement alternative open to them consisted in returning to Israel at their own expense.

EMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES

In August, 1949, the United States overtook Israel in the monthly reception of Jewish DP's and retained this lead for the remainder of 1949-50. During the first half of 1950 the departures of Jewish DP's for the United States fell to a point far below the monthly averages that prevailed during 1949. This was due to adjustments that the United States DP Commission had to make in deference to the ethnic and occupational priorities established by the DP Act.

This Act, which was originally enacted on July 1, 1948, with certain objectionable features, was amended in June, 1950. [See article "Immigrant Aid," below.] The amendments removed the priorities extended to Balts and agricultural workers; fixed January 1, 1949 in lieu of December 22, 1945 as the qualifying date of entry into Germany, Austria, or Italy; and increased the over-all quota of refugees eligible under the Act from 205,000 to 341,000. Included among those upon whom eligibility was conferred were 4,000 DP's residing in China. Aside from making the Act applicable to these Jewish DP's, the amendments also extended eligibility to about 20,000 Jewish DP's who could not qualify under the original Act. By June 30, 1950, 37,617 Jewish DP's were resettled in the United States under the DP Act.

SHANGHAI DP'S

On May 23, 1950, 106 Jewish DP's of German and Austrian origin, who had fled from Nazism and taken refuge in Shanghai, came to the United States under IRO sponsorship, seeking to resettle there. Efforts to secure permission for these people to remain proved abortive. There was no law then in effect which made provision for the admission of DP's from China. In June, 1950, these refugees were deported from the United States, accompanied by instructions from the United States authorities that the group was to be kept intact in Germany; those who desired to emigrate to the United States were to be processed for such migration under the amended Act with the minimum of delay.

Camp Consolidation

The reduction in the number of DP camps and other DP installations was in line with the heightened tempo of resettlement. Table 5 shows this reduction.

TABLE 5

REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF JEWISH DP CAMPS,
DECEMBER, 1946-JUNE, 1950

<i>Date</i>	<i>Germany</i>	<i>Austria</i>	<i>Italy</i>
December 31, 1946	65	17	8
June 30, 1948	53	12	7
June 30, 1949	17	7	5
June 30, 1950	4	6	1

There were other developments which indicated that the Jewish DP problem had entered its liquidation phase. By June, 1950 all of the Jewish voluntary agencies had substantially reduced the size of their staffs; the JDC had closed its workshops in which the DP's were employed; the Central Committee of Liberated Jews, the organization which had served as the spokesman for the DP's and had furnished them with a vigorous pro-Zionist leadership, resolved to terminate its activities on October 1, 1950; ORT, which in early 1948 had operated 61 schools in the United States Zone of Germany, and 13 in Austria, had only 11 schools and 3 schools in these areas, respectively; all the Zionist parties among the DP's had ceased to function; and in the United States Zone of Germany, where 40 Jewish newspapers and other periodicals had been published during the peak of the DP population, one weekly *Unzer Weg* ("Our Way") was considered adequate to meet the reading needs of the remaining DP's. Finally, the Office of Adviser on Jewish Affairs, established shortly after the end of the war in 1945 to guide the United States military commanders in Germany and Austria in all problems related to the Jewish DP's within the United States areas of control, was discontinued on January 30, 1950. Major Abraham S. Hyman succeeded Harry Greenstein as the Adviser during the closing months of the life of this office.

Integration into Local Economies

It became increasingly apparent that a sizeable number of Jewish DP's would elect to remain permanently in the countries which they had originally regarded as places of temporary refuge. Approximately 3,000 former Jewish DP's had become identified with the Kultusgemeinde in Vienna, and showed signs of taking root in Austria. Similarly, in Germany many DP's, especially those residing in the communities, had become integrated in varying degrees into the economic life of the country. At least, they took no steps to enter into the immigration "pipeline." Most of these people engaged in some type of retail trade.

Attitude of Government Authorities

Under the guidance of High Commissioner John J. McCloy, the United States authorities in Germany continued to maintain a sympathetic attitude towards the Jewish DP's. On November 8, 1949, the technique of conduct-

ing mass raids on DP camps was abolished, yielding to the methods of law enforcement followed in the Anglo-American countries.

In general the attitude of Italy, Austria and England towards the DP's within their areas of control was good. France particularly continued to render the Jewish DP's an outstanding service by permitting them the right of unrestricted passage across the country while en route to Israel. However, neither France nor most of the West European countries showed any disposition to enfranchise the DP's to whom they had extended a haven and who had been residing in these countries since the end of the war.

The Medical "Hard Core" Problem

It was estimated that on December 31, 1949, there were 14,665 IRO supported non-Jewish and 1,485 Jewish DP's who, because of illness or old age, required permanent institutional care. The corresponding family members of these "hard core" groups numbered 7,949 and 778, respectively. In Germany, which contained the greater part of the remainder of the Jewish DP's, an exhaustive study completed by the JDC on July 1, 1950, revealed the presence of 2,255 "hard core" cases, both of an institutional and non-institutional character. Together with their families they numbered about 5,200 persons. The estimated number of Jewish DP's in Germany, Austria, Italy and Shanghai who constituted the "hard core" as of July 1, 1950 was 4,000 cases and 5,000 family members. The JDC medical and rehabilitation program was especially planned to reduce the number of such cases by treatment and special training designed to qualify the individuals for migration to the countries of their choice.

During 1949-50 the IRO made a determined effort to solve the "hard core" problem. The IRO appealed to the nations of the world to co-operate in the solution of the problem. It succeeded in effecting agreements with several West European countries and with the voluntary agencies of other countries under which they undertook to admit and assume responsibility for specific categories of the "hard core" cases. One of these agreements, consummated on October 29, 1949, was with the state of Israel. Under its terms the Israeli government received the sum of \$2,500,000 to provide permanent care for an estimated 1,600 aged, sick and handicapped Jewish DP's who would be admitted into Israel between July 1, 1949, and June 30, 1950. The agreement provided that the IRO would consider the further allocation of funds to Israel for the institutional program to the extent possible within the total sum of \$10,000,000 budgeted by the IRO for such purposes in all areas. The \$2,500,000 was added to the joint fund of \$15,000,000 previously established by the JDC, the Jewish Agency for Palestine, and the Israeli government, to care for all the "hard core" newcomers to Israel.

On March 22, 1950 the first "hard core" transport, consisting of thirty stretcher cases, left Munich for Israel. The hospital cars were secured from the British Army, which furnished a non-commissioned officer in each car, to insure the comforts of the passengers. The ship bearing these DP's arrived in Israel on the eve of Passover, 1950.

Israel's offer to accept all Jewish DP's did not, however, justify the con-

clusion that the "hard core" problem would be solved in one bold stroke. The reluctance on the part of the DP's to exchange the known for the unknown was as characteristic of the thinking of the "hard core" as it was of the other DP's. Thus, only 733 of the 2,255 "hard core" cases in Germany expressed a preference for Israel; of the remainder, 981 mentioned the United States as their first choice, 178 were undecided and 211 did not desire emigration

Termination of IRO

The decision reached in July 1949 to prolong the care and maintenance service of the IRO beyond June 30, 1950, left open the date of termination of this service. This date was fixed on March 22, 1950, when the General Council of the IRO authorized the Organization to continue after June 30, 1950, direct care of all refugees in DP camps who were likely to find new homes before March 31, 1951, which was the date set for the termination of IRO. However, subsequent discussions in Geneva, inspired by the current international scene, indicated that the IRO might continue to function beyond March 31, 1951.

UNITED NATIONS RECOMMENDATION

In anticipation of its own eventual dissolution, the IRO recommended to its parent body, the United Nations, that international assistance in the protection of refugees be continued beyond the life of the IRO and that this responsibility be discharged by an organ within the framework of the United Nations. This recommendation was accepted by the General Assembly on December 3, 1949, in its resolution calling for the creation of the Office of High Commissioner for Refugees as of January 1, 1951.

Under the resolution the projected office was to receive its budget for administrative expenses and its policy direction from the United Nations. All funds, other than for administrative needs, were to come from voluntary contributions from member and non-member nations. The duties of the High Commissioner would be to promote international conventions for the protection of refugees, to supervise their implementation, and to promote such measures, including the voluntary repatriation or the assimilation of refugees, as would improve the situation of the refugees. The refugees embraced by the plan were those within the IRO mandate and such others as the General Assembly might from time to time determine.

The plan had been subjected to criticism, chiefly on the ground that the resolution placed paralyzing limitations on the High Commissioner as to definition of eligible refugees, scope of duties and budget.

ABRAHAM S. HYMAN

GERMANY¹

IN JULY, 1950, the punitive phase of the occupation of Germany by the Allied forces appeared to be over, and the former enemy seemed on the threshold of becoming once again a member of the family of nations: the Federal Republic of Germany in the framework of the democracies (the United States, Great Britain, and France), and the German Democratic Republic in the framework of states dominated by the Soviet Union.

Federal Republic of Germany

The formation of the Federal Republic of Germany progressed rapidly. The election to the Bundestag (parliament of Western Germany) took place on August 14, 1949. Of the 402 seats in the Bundestag, the extreme right (composed of the German party, the German Rights party, the Economic Reconstruction party, and independent groups) occupied 37; the moderate right and center (composed of the Free Democrats, Christian Democrats, and the Center party), 201; the Social Democrats, 131; the Communists, 15; and the separatists (composed of the Bavarian party and South Schleswig Association), 18.²

From this election there emerged a coalition government, headed by the Mayor of Cologne, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, and composed of Christian Democrats, Free Democrats, and representatives of the German party. On September 12, 1949, Dr. Theodor Heuss, the leader of the Free Democrats, was elected president of the Republic.

Economic Conditions

Economic conditions improved during 1949-50. The index of industrial production in the French, British, and United States zones, which stood at 86 per cent of the 1937 figure in July, 1949, was 100 in March, 1950. The index in the mining industry was 96 per cent of the 1937 figure in July, 1949, and 108 per cent in March, 1950 (*Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, Statistical Office of the United Nations, June, 1950). Food rationing, except for sugar, ended at the beginning of 1950. On the other hand, the country suffered from unemployment. Nearly 2,000,000, or about 14 per cent of all wage and salary earners were unemployed in February, 1950 (*The Economist*, London, June 10, 1950). The situation improved during the period from February to June, 1950. In June, 1950, there were slightly more than 1,500,000 jobless (NYT, June 6, 1950).

¹ Periodicals frequently referred to in this article are abbreviated as follows:

AJY — AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK.

AW — *Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland*, Duesseldorf.

DG — *Die Gemeinde*, Vienna.

NYT — *The New York Times*.

SM — *The Christian Science Monitor*.

² *The Economist*, London, August 20, 1949; Otto Kirchheimer and Arnold H. Price, in the *Bulletin of the Department of State* (Washington), October 17, 1949.

The German refugees were the group most severely affected by unemployment. Seven million *Volksdeutsche*, or ethnic Germans expelled from Poland, the Balkans, Czechoslovakia, etc., as well as former inhabitants of the eastern provinces incorporated into Poland and Russia, were registered in the Western zones in 1946.³ Together with those whose homes were destroyed during the war and those who escaped from the Soviet zone of occupation, they formed a group of some 8,500,000 persons scattered throughout Western Germany (SM, January 12, 1950). There were districts, especially in Schleswig-Holstein, where the refugee population was larger than the permanent population.

The economic rehabilitation of Germany was due to a large extent to the support extended by the Western occupation powers, especially by the United States through the Marshall Plan. The policy adopted by the Western Allies opened the road to political independence to the German Federal Republic. In November, 1949, a conference of the foreign ministers of France, Great Britain, and the United States held in Paris approved a series of measures to implement this policy. Subsequently the Western Allies invited the German Federal Republic to send consuls general to London, New York, and Paris. Dr. Adenauer signed an agreement with the United States' Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) which granted the Federal Republic equal status with other countries in applying for aid from the Marshall Plan. The Bundestag decided to approve the decision of the federal government to accept an invitation to become a member of the Council of Europe. In July, 1950, the integration of Ruhr industry into a European pool of steel and coal under the Schuman plan was being discussed.

German Democratic Republic

In the Soviet zone, the German Democratic Republic was established on October 7, 1949. On this date the constitution previously adopted by the People's Council went into effect. Communists Wilhelm Pieck and Otto Grotewohl were appointed president and minister-president, respectively. Elections to the legislative body of the Republic were scheduled for October, 1950. In the meantime the governing Socialist Unity [Communist] party was busy preparing a single slate for this election. This arrangement would guarantee the predominance of Communists in the future East German parliament. Toward the end of 1949 Soviet military government was replaced by the Soviet Control Commission and the functions of the military administration were turned over to German authorities.

Political Scene

Articles published in *The New York Times* and information provided by other publications made it clear that de-nazification had failed⁴ and that

³ *Deutschland-Jahrbuch*, Essen, 1949.

⁴ See *Status of De-nazification Proceedings in Germany, 1947-1949*, Department of State, Washington, 1950, p. 111.

attempts had been made by the followers of the Nazi philosophy to revive and to spread fascist and chauvinist ideology in Germany.

Thus, for example, an American intelligence survey revealed that the Bavarian administration was largely in the hands of those who controlled it under Hitler. Over-all figures showed that 20,682 of the 49,445 *Beamten* ("officials") belonged to the Nazi party or its affiliates. A total of 14,443 of these were dismissed and later reinstated in the service, while only 5,780 new members were admitted to this privileged class. At the beginning of 1950 the Bavarian Minister of Culture announced that almost all the 11,000 teachers who had been removed for political reasons had been reappointed. This group represented roughly 60 per cent of the teaching staff employed by the Ministry. Sixty per cent of the 15,000 employees in the Finance Ministry were former Nazis, 77 per cent of the 1,918 in the Food Ministry, and 81 per cent of the 924 judges, magistrates and prosecutors in the Ministry of Justice. There were 6,947 burgomasters of Bavarian communities with less than 10,000 inhabitants. Of these, 1,589, or 22.9 per cent of the total, had been elected to office despite incrimination under the de-nazification laws. Moreover, the pensioning of officials who served Hitler's Reich appeared to be the rule rather than the exception. (*The Economist*, London, December 31, 1949.)

The newspapers of Bavaria reflected the "re-nazification" of that state. With the end of newspaper licensing [in September, 1949], the newspaper field was invaded by more than ninety papers, many of them owned and edited by the same men who owned and edited them under Hitler (Drew Middleton, NYT, December 1, 1949).

Even in the Bundestag there were more than fifty former Nazis. Forty-three of them belonged to the political parties supporting the government coalition: 21 of the 139 Christian Democrats, 16 of the 52 Free Democrats, and 6 of the 17 German party representatives (NYT, May 9, 1950).

Extreme right groups sprang up in large numbers when the Allied Military Government started to ease the licensing of political parties. Excluding the more-or-less underground partisans of Otto Strasser, head of the *Schwarze Front*, and brother of Gregor Strasser, the well-known leader of the Nazi party who was purged and killed by Hitler, there were dozens of parties with Nazi connotations which were active in influencing public opinion. Only a few of these were active on a nationwide scale, and many were not to be taken seriously. But their existence reflected the fact that many Germans, especially refugees and young people, were resentful of the democratic institutions and placed their hopes in extreme nationalism. On the other hand, there was an active German resistance to the vestiges of the Nazi spirit, and a readiness to oppose it mercilessly. [See below.]

Political conditions in Germany were very fluid, and subject to varied interpretations. (See Franz L. Neumann, *German Democracy*, 1950, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, 1950, and A. R. L. Gurland, "Why Democracy is Losing in Germany," *Commentary*, New York, September, 1949.) The election to the North Rhine-Westphalia diet on June 18, 1950, showed that the bulk of German voters did not support the totalitarian groups: Communists and fascists remained small minorities.

Jewish Population

There were no reliable data on German Jewish population. The available information dealt with two categories of Jews in Germany: those living in International Refugee Organization (IRO) installations, i.e., Jewish displaced persons (DP's); and those residing in *Gemeinden* (communities)—i.e., German Jews and "free-residence" Jewish DP's residing outside of the DP installations. With time the "free-residence" DP's were becoming an integral part of the Jewish population in Germany. The wave of emigration to Israel had already receded. The movement to the United States under the DP Act of 1948 had slowed down substantially. It was expected to increase after the revised DP bill had made its effects felt.

However, even after the departure of all eligible persons to the United States under the revised bill, a number of former displaced Jews would remain in Germany. Although they would be absorbed by the *Gemeinden*, they would constitute a separate group.⁵ Unfortunately it was not possible to ascertain the size of this group.

A survey conducted by the American Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) office in Munich showed that as of March, 1950,⁶ 27,634 Jews were residing in Germany outside of IRO installations, i.e., in communities.

These figures are not exact since it was impossible to eliminate duplication. Hence, the actual number of Jews in communities should be somewhat lower than the figures given.

The number of displaced Jews was known only in six localities in the United States zone. It amounted to 3,711 individuals, including 856 children, who constituted about 23 per cent.⁷ It is interesting to note that the percentage of children in this completely DP group was much higher than the percentage of children in Table 1.

TABLE 1
JEWISH POPULATION IN GERMANY, MARCH, 1950^a

Zone	Total Number	Children (through 17)	
		Number	Per Cent
United States . .	13,721	2,343	17.1
British	4,991	399	8.0
French	668	53	7.9
Soviet	1,244	112	9.0
Berlin	7,010	688	9.8
TOTAL	27,634	3,595	13.0

^a Residing outside of IRO installations; includes members and non-members of the *Gemeinden*.

⁵ Various reports indicated the arrival in Germany of a number of DP's returning from countries of their final resettlement, specifically Israel; but their number in July, 1950, was not significant.

⁶ The periodical *Unzer Weg* (2, January 27, 1950), published by the Central Committee of Displaced Jews in Munich, gave data on the German Jewish population in 1949 which cannot be checked.

⁷ For statistics of Jewish DP's in the United States zone in July, 1950, see *Displaced Persons*, p. 306.

The 27,634 Jews indicated in Table 1 lived in 148 localities. It is difficult to compare these data with the data published by *Juedisches Gemeindeblatt* on December 24, 1948 (see AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1950, Vol. 51, p. 328), since the latter refer to the Gemeinde membership only, whereas the JDC survey of March, 1950, computed the whole Jewish population—that is, both members and non-members of the Gemeinden. The 148 localities with Jewish population were distributed as follows: 82 in the United States zone, 51 in the British, 6 in the French, 8 in the Russian, and the locality of Berlin. Four localities had more than 1,000 Jews, two more than 500, and 24 more than 100; 118 counted less than 100 Jews. The localities with a Jewish population of over 250 are listed in Table 2.

TABLE 2
LOCALITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATION OF OVER 250

City	Zone	Number of Jews	
		March, 1950	May, 1939
Berlin.....		7,010	75,344*
Munich.....	U. S.	5,467	4,407
Frankfort-on-the-Main .	U. S.	1,485	13,508
Hamburg.....	British	1,100	8,175
Stuttgart.....	U. S.	879	2,164
Cologne.....	British	636	7,818
Hanover.....	British	382	2,214
Leipzig.....	Soviet	338	4,113
Regensburg.....	U. S.	330	226
Fuerth.....	U. S.	309	785
Duesseldorf.....	British	266	1,774
Erfurt.....	Soviet	259	246
TOTAL.....		18,461	120,774

* German census, May 17, 1939. The Berlin Jewish population was erroneously indicated by the writer in AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK, 1950, Vol. 51, Table 4, p. 328.

Restitution and Indemnification

All three *Laender* (states) in the French zone enacted indemnification laws similar to the General Claims Law promulgated in the United States zone on August 5, 1949—Baden on May 30, 1950, Rheinland-Pfalz on May 30, 1950, and Wuerttemberg-Hohenzollern on May 27, 1950. A Jewish restitution successor organization was authorized in the British zone on August 18, 1950.

Anti-Semitism

Very soon after his arrival in Germany, the United States High Commissioner, John J. McCloy, made the statement that the world would carefully watch the newly-established Federal Republic and that the yardstick by which the progress of the Republic was to be measured would be its attitude towards the Jews (NYT, August 1, 1949).

In a country where as late as 1945 the persecution of Jews had been government policy, where a whole generation had been reared in a spirit of hatred

towards Jews, and where a large percentage of the officialdom, especially of judges and teachers, consisted of former National Socialists, anti-Semitic incidents were inevitable. In fact, as a result of withdrawal of controls by the occupation authorities, anti-Semitic manifestations increased in comparison with the first postwar years.

THE MOEHLSTRASSE INCIDENT

In August, 1949, the *Sueddeutsche Zeitung* in Munich published in the letters to the editor column a letter expressing regret that not all the Jews were gassed by the Nazis. Several hundred Jewish DP's, infuriated by this letter, gathered spontaneously and converged on the *Sueddeutsche Zeitung* building to protest against the publication. The German police interfered and ten to twelve persons had to be hospitalized. (See Norbert Muhlen, "The Shooting on the Moehlstrasse," *Commentary*, October, 1949.) Later, a special commission headed by the mayor of Munich in which representatives of the Jewish community participated as interested persons investigated the incident. The commission stated that "no anti-Semitic tendencies had been evident in the activities of the Munich police force." (*Op. cit.*, p. 358.) The newspaper, which was known to be democratically oriented, explained that it had published this letter as one of a series expressing readers' attitudes toward the Jewish question.

OFFENBACH INCIDENT

Another incident which evoked many comments occurred in the city of Offenbach. The local municipal council appointed a Jewish doctor, Herbert Lewin, as chief physician of the woman's hospital. When the deputy mayor objected to Dr. Lewin because he was a Jew, the Council reversed its decision and chose a non-Jewish doctor. The United States Military Government suspended the latter appointment, and the case became widely known. Pressure of public opinion forced the municipal council to re-appoint Dr. Lewin. (AW, 31, November 11, 1949.)

HEDLER INCIDENT

A politically much more important incident occurred shortly afterward. Wolfgang Hedler, a representative to the Bundestag and member of the German party which was part of the government coalition, delivered a speech in Einfeld in November, 1949, in which he attacked Dr. Kurt Schumacher, leader of the German Social Democrats, for his criticism of Hitler's barbarism against Jews, and stated that there might be a difference of opinion as to whether the gas chambers were an appropriate way to solve the Jewish problem. This speech provoked a storm of indignation in Germany which increased when, in February, 1950, a court in Neumuenster declared Hedler not guilty of charges of slander and fomentation of hatred. Two of the three judges were former Nazis (NYT, February 16, 1950). The trade unions of Kiel called the workers out on a strike in protest against Hedler's acquittal (SM, February 16, 1950). The Diet of North Rhine-Westphalia passed a resolution protesting the decision of the court (AW, 47, March 3, 1950). The Central Committee of the German party expelled

Hedler in January, 1950, without awaiting the results of the court investigation of the case. The Bundestag group of the party did likewise (AW, 41 and 42, January 20 and January 27, 1950).

Anti-Semitic outbursts occurred in Hamburg in April, 1950, in connection with the acquittal for the second time of Veit Harlan, producer of the anti-Semitic film, *Jued Sues*. The police had to protect a witness who testified against Harlan. This witness had been threatened by a group of Harlan's partisans (AW, 2, April 21, 1950).

The desecration of Jewish cemeteries continued. The desecration of a synagogue in Marktredwitz (Bavaria) shortly before the Day of Atonement in October, 1949, was an especially revolting incident.

UNITED STATES CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Impressed by these facts, and disturbed by reports of the activities of extreme nationalist groups, Guy Gillette and seven of his colleagues in the United States Senate (Dennis Chavez, Paul H. Douglas, Robert C. Hendrickson, Irving M. Ives, Harley M. Kilgore, Herbert H. Lehman, and Claude Pepper) introduced a resolution requesting President Harry S. Truman to name an investigating commission to inquire thoroughly into all matters relating to United States foreign policy in Germany. Representatives John A. Blatnik, Emanuel Celler, Mrs. Margaret Chase, P. Eberharter, Foster Furcolo, Walt Horan, Henry Jackson, Jacob K. Javits, Hugh B. Mitchell, Barrette O'Hara, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., joined in this effort.

GERMAN LIBERAL ACTION

In Germany responsible statesmen and liberal leaders raised their voices against anti-Semitic utterances, which they considered a blow at Germany (SM, February 16, 1950). On the eve of the Jewish High Holy Days in September, 1949, Dr. Theodor Heuss, president of the Federal Republic, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, Karl Arnold, president of the Bundesrat, Dr. Erich Koehler, president of the Bundestag, and Dr. Kurt Schumacher, chairman of the Social Democratic party, addressed friendly messages to the Jews of Germany encouraging their efforts to take part in the intellectual, social, and political reconstruction of the country (AW, 24, September 23, 1949). On the initiative of the Social Democrats, a meeting was called at which the board of directors of the party discussed means of combatting anti-Semitism with representatives of the Jewish organizations. It is worthwhile mentioning that two German Jews were elected to the Bundestag on the Social Democratic slate (AW, 26, November 7, 1949).

In a special interview, President Heuss declared that the German people "do accept the view that the German people should feel collectively ashamed" for the Nazi atrocities against the Jews (NYT, November 27, 1949). In connection with the outbreaks of anti-Semitism in Hamburg and the Veit Harlan acquittal, Chancellor Adenauer issued a statement declaring that the great majority of the German population agreed with him that "as Germans and Christians we have a duty to repair the wrongs committed against the Jews and to oppose strongly the anti-Semitic outbreaks." The president of the synod of the Evangelical Church expressed himself in the same vein. The

Congress of the Catholic Center party denounced the desecration of cemeteries (AW, 2, April 21, 1950). The Social Democrats introduced in the Bundestag an amendment to the Gesetz zum Schutze der Republik ("Law to Protect the Republic") providing for severe punishment for discrimination against Jews and desecration of cemeteries (AW, 3, April 28, 1950). Finally, the action taken by a group of the outstanding scholars of the University of Heidelberg deserves mention. Under the leadership of the veteran German sociologist, Professor Alfred Weber, and with the participation of such well-known personalities as Marie Baum, Karl Geiler, and others, a Heidelberg Action Committee was set up to combat anti-Semitism (AW, 4, May 5, 1950). United States High Commissioner McCloy denounced all the anti-Semitic acts referred to above.

COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

The Council of Christians and Jews was active during the period under review. The Council held important conventions in December, 1949, in Wiesbaden, and in February, 1950, in Bad Nauheim. It started publishing an "inter-denominational organ to improve relations among men on the basis of the Old and New Testaments" under the title of *Zusammenarbeit*. In November, 1949, the Christian churches marked the date in 1938 when synagogues were set afire by the Nazis and the German Jews were put in concentration camps (the *Kristallnacht*). Cardinal Konrad von Preysing, bishop of Berlin, published a diocese message which read in part: "You know that the German government murdered five million Jews. . . . It was an unparalleled crime. I take occasion to speak about this because hatred against race and hatred against men have not yet fully disappeared in Germany. We have heard with consternation that even the quiet of the cemeteries has been disturbed. . . ." (AW, 32, November, 1949).

Community Organization and Communal Affairs

During 1949-50 two Laender implemented laws granting the Gemeinden public law corporation status: Rheinland-Pfalz in the French Zone and North Rhine-Westphalia in the British Zone.

On the initiative of the office of the adviser on Jewish affairs to the United States Army in Germany and Austria, efforts were made to establish an over-all representation of Jews living in Germany. A conference of all Jewish organizations held in Heidelberg on July 31, 1949, elected for this purpose a preparatory commission comprising delegates from the German Jews and displaced Jews residing in all the zones and Berlin. This attempt proved unsuccessful. However, another endeavor on the part of the office of the Jewish adviser did bear fruit. On January 25, 1950, a Co-ordinating Council of Jewish Organizations in the United States zone of Germany was set up to act as liaison between the Jewish population of the zone and the United States High Commissioner. In addition to representatives of the Gemeinden and of the Central Committee of Liberated Jews (displaced Jews), this council included representatives of JDC and of the Jewish Agency for Palestine. On one matter having political implications the Gemeinden of all the

Western zones acted together: The *Verbaende* (associations) of the Gemeinden in the British, French, and United States zones refused to accept the proposal of Chancellor Adenauer that a special service for Jewish affairs be organized within the federal government.

BERLIN GEMEINDE

The membership of the Berlin Gemeinde, numerically the most important, declined slightly from 7,035 in July, 1949, to 6,744 in April, 1950.⁸ The age structure of the membership may be seen from Table 3.

TABLE 3
MEMBERSHIP IN THE BERLIN GEMEINDE, BY AGE
(JULY, 1949, AND APRIL 1, 1950)

Age group	July, 1949 ^a		April, 1950 ^b	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
0-14	594	8.5	634	9.4
15-18	154	2.2	144	2.1
19-35	1,241	17.6	1,179	17.5
36-55	2,658	37.8	2,531	37.5
56 and over	2,388	33.9	2,256	33.5
TOTAL	7,035	100.0	6,744	100.0

^a *Der Weg*, 31, August 3, 1949.

^b JDC reports.

The Berlin Gemeinde included the Jewish population in all the sectors of Berlin. Not long before his departure for the United States in May, 1950, the Gemeinde Rabbi Stephen S. Schwarzschild conferred with the President of the [Eastern] German Democratic Republic about the religious needs of Jews in the Soviet zone (DW, 10, March 10, 1950). Rabbi Schwarzschild had been sent to Berlin on a temporary assignment by the World Union for Progressive Judaism and served for two years.

The Gemeinde elections were slated for March 26, 1950. Four lists were presented: the Liberal Jewish Group, the National Jewish Group, the Group for the Reconstruction of the Jewish Gemeinde, and the Independent Liberal Group. Due to election-day disturbances in one of the districts it was decided to hold another election in that district on June 4, 1950. (DW, 13, March 31, 1950, and AW, 3, April 28, 1950.)

The exclusive relationship between the Berlin Gemeinde and the Berlin German Jewish periodical, *Der Weg*, changed. The Gemeinde announced that it had been publishing Gemeinde news in both *Der Weg*, in Berlin, and the *Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland*, in Duesseldorf (AW, 1, April 14, 1950); the *Allgemeine Wochenzeitung* printed a special Berlin edition.⁹ In October, 1949, the Berlin Gemeinde appointed to its rabbinate Moritz Freier, who was the only rabbi in Berlin in July, 1950.

⁸ A survey of occupations among the Jews of Berlin may be found in *Visiting Expert Series 10*, Office of Military Government for Germany (U.S.), Manpower Division, August, 1949, p. 11.

⁹ The *Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland* was the former *Juedisches Gemeindeblatt*. In addition, there was a third German Jewish periodical—*Juedisches Gemeindeblatt der Juedischen Kultusgemeinde*, published in Mannheim.

OTHER GEMEINDEN

Very little was known about other Gemeinden. In the autumn of 1949, Rabbi I. Broch left the British zone and returned to England. The Gemeinde in Bad Nauheim established a convalescent home which was opened on March 1, 1950 (DW, 12, March 24, 1950). In Dortmund, the Gemeinde building had been reconstructed. The Jewish Reconstruction Bank was established in Frankfort-on-the-Main, and German Investment, a similar institution, in Munich. The Jewish organizations in Germany emphasized that they were in no way associated with these undertakings. (*Aufbau*, January 6, 1950, and DW, 1, January 6, 1950.)

The attitude of the official leaders of the Gemeinden toward Germany was perhaps more positive during 1949-50. The note of despair which had been typical of utterances about the Jewish situation in Germany did not appear so often in these publications as it had during preceding years. The tenor of the new approach was expressed in a statement by Norbert Wollheim, Gemeinde leader in the British zone: "We must erase the phrase 'liquidation of the Jewish Gemeinden in Germany' from our vocabulary" (AW, 50, March 24, 1950).

Social Services

During 1949-50, JDC continued to support German Jews. It distributed through the Gemeinden in Berlin and the United States zone an average of 8,600 rations a month during 1949. In addition, an estimated 3,125 rations were distributed monthly through the Gemeinden in the British and French zones. More than 300 Jewish students in Germany were assisted by JDC in December, 1949. The British Jewish Relief Unit had discontinued activities in Germany in March, 1949. The World Jewish Congress opened two offices in Germany: one in Frankfort-on-the-Main, and one in Berlin (AW, 4, May 5, 1950).

BORIS SAPIR

AUSTRIA

DURING 1949-50 the negotiations among the four occupation powers for a peace treaty with Austria arrived at a dead end. Negotiations were resumed in May, 1950, but were unsuccessful due to the intransigent attitude of the Soviet Union.

In the field of economic rehabilitation, Austria made remarkable strides. Industrial output during the second part of 1949 was above the 1937 level, and in January, 1950, stood at 114 per cent of 1937 production (*Monthly Bulletin of Statistics*, Statistical Office of the United Nations, June, 1950).

Unemployment reached a peak of 200,000 in February, 1950, then began to decrease and as of April, 1950, there were 147,000 unemployed (SM, April 21, 1950). At the end of 1949 there were some 300,000 *Volksdeutsche* refugees in Austria.

Political Scene

The election to the Austrian parliament which took place on October 8, 1949, did not affect the composition of the government. The country was ruled by a coalition of Catholics and Social Democrats. As a result of the election, however, there emerged a Nazi-tinged party called the Union of Independents, which received almost 12 per cent of the votes and occupied 16 seats of the total of 165. This party succeeded in gaining influence in provincial parliaments and in the municipal councils of such important cities as Innsbruck, Linz, and Salzburg.

Jewish Population

Emigration was offset by infiltration from Eastern Europe and by the repatriation of Austrian Jews from various countries where they had found asylum after the *Anschluss* (annexation of Austria by Germany) in March, 1938.

TABLE 4
JEWISH POPULATION IN COMMUNITIES
JULY, 1949, AND MARCH, 1950^a

Community	July, 1949	March, 1950
Vienna.....	12,519	12,450
Graz.....	420	286
Innsbruck.....	143	292
United States zone....	443	368
TOTAL.....	13,525	13,396

^a Based on JDC reports.

TABLE 5
NEW MEMBERS OF THE VIENNA GEMEINDE
JULY, 1949, THROUGH MARCH, 1950

Source	Repatriates	Refugees	Total
United States and Canada.....	37	—	37
Latin America.....	63	—	63
Israel and Cyprus.....	225	—	225
Western Europe.....	281	—	281
Czechoslovakia.....	36	483	519
Hungary.....	50	1,303	1,353
Poland.....	7	109	116
Rumania.....	51	129	180
China.....	227	—	227
Other.....	40	6	46
TOTAL.....	1,017	2,030	3,047
Infants, Austrian Jews from other cities, and persons returning to the Jewish community.....			201
GRAND TOTAL.....			3,248 ^a

^a This figure is incomplete because the data for November, 1949, were not available.

A large majority of the Jews living in communities were Austrian Jews, but there was a substantial group of foreign origin among them. The size of the latter group may be derived from Table 5, which shows the number and origin of the new members of the Vienna Gemeinde. This was really the only Jewish community in Austria, since 93 per cent of the Jews living outside the DP installations were concentrated in Vienna.

The numerical importance of non-Austrian Jews in the Gemeinde may also be gauged from the relatively high percentage of children among the Gemeinde population. The correspondent of the *New York Jewish Morning Journal* (February 9, 1950) reported that 15.4 per cent of the membership, or 1,965 persons, were children under nineteen years of age.¹⁰ Before the refugees started to join the Vienna Gemeinde the proportion of children was 4 to 5 per cent (AJY, Vol. 49, p. 377, and Vol. 50, p. 385). It had risen to 11.3 per cent by April 30, 1949 (AJY, Vol. 51, p. 334) and in 1950 approached the percentage of children among Jews living in the communities of the United States zone of Germany (see Table 1).

Community Organization and Communal Affairs

In August, 1949, the representatives of the Gemeinden of Graz, Innsbruck, Linz, Salzburg, and Vienna met and decided to unite all Jewish communities in Austria in a central body. A conference for the establishment of this body was scheduled for October, 1949 (DG, 7, September, 1949). It appears that it actually took place in February, 1950 (*New York Jewish Morning Journal*, February 9, 1950).

RESTITUTION

The *Siebentes Rueckstellungsgesetz* (Seventh Restitution Law) was promulgated on September 30, 1949. It dealt with claims submitted by persons who had lost employment in private business under the Nazi regime (*Informations-Dienst*, Zurich, 103-04, October, 1949).

As a result of negotiations started several years before (AJY, Vol. 51, p. 334), the government granted to the Gemeinde a loan amounting to 5,000,000 Austrian schillings under the guarantee of the Jewish heirless property.

VIENNA GEMEINDE

In December, 1949, a new election to the Community Council took place. In view of the success of the Nazi-tinged Union of Independents, the main Jewish groups—Zionists, Socialists, and left wing—decided to present a united slate (*Gesamt-Juedische Liste*). They were opposed by the Union of Jewish Merchants (DG, 8, December, 1949). The new Council which emerged from this election was composed as follows: left wing, eleven seats: Zionists, ten; Socialists, eight; and the Union of Jewish Merchants, one. Dr. Emil Maurer (Socialist) was elected president of the Council, and Wolf Herzberg (Zionist) and David Brill (left wing), vice-presidents (JTA, December 16, 1949, and January 6, 1950).

¹⁰ The correspondent reported on all Jewish communities in Austria, but his figures probably referred to the Vienna Gemeinde only.

Jewish Education and Religious Life

Four supplementary schools for religious instruction were organized for the academic year 1949-50 (DG, 7, September, 1949). About 400 university and professional school students (290 in Vienna and 110 in the provinces) received stipends from the JDC.

The Agudat Israel expanded its activities in Vienna. It maintained a talmud torah with an enrollment of 48 students, a yeshivah with an enrollment of 100 students, a school attended by 35 girls, and a home for 30 girls. A special committee was set up to form a Union of Orthodox Jews in Vienna. (*Stimme Israels*, Vienna, 12 and 13, April, 1950.)

Social Services

The JDC contributed some 55 per cent of the Gemeinde budget from July, 1949, through April, 1950. During the same period the relief load of the Gemeinde was 1,459 persons (1,297 of whom were Austrian Jews); the old age home had 155 residents, and the kosher kitchen served 155 persons.¹¹ In December, 1949, 252 children were sent for summer vacations to Switzerland, and 25 to Trieste; the Gemeinde organized a summer camp in Neulengbach where 239 children and 39 mothers spent their vacation. The medical program for the year ended September, 1949, comprised medical examinations of 3,115 persons; dental treatment of 1,340 persons; the maintenance of a Jewish hospital; the distribution of drugs and medicaments to 1,235 persons, glasses to 523 persons, and additional food to thousands of individuals. (DG, 7, September, 1949.) As of November 30, 1949, the Jewish Credit Co-operative had 241 members and had granted 64 individual loans amounting to 446,000 Austrian schillings. The periodicals, the *Gemeinde* (organ of the community), and *Der Neue Weg* (left wing), ceased publication. The press reported that the Zionists had started publication of *Neue Welt* and *Judenstaat*.

BORIS SAPIR

¹¹ All figures are monthly averages.