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Hannah Arendt, Eva G. Reichmann, Eleonore Sterling and Selma Stern-Taeubler are important female scholars throughout the course of twentieth-century German-Jewish scholarship. Their prominence is rooted in the juxtaposition of their study of German-Jewish history and personal experience. This thesis considers their self-assertion within the German-Jewish scholarly community as it changed in shape and focus from the 1920s to the 1960s. Three distinct periods in their intellectual careers are addressed as well as their repeated transition from the margins to the centre: as female intellectuals within male-centred intellectual spheres and as Jewish scholars in the German public domain.

Arendt, Reichmann and Stern mediated contemporary experience and gendered interests alongside their contribution to German-Jewish historical studies during the 1920s and 1930s. Following dispersion to new locations, their scholarship and employment contributed to the post-war reconstruction of diasporic German-Jewish life during the 1940s and 1950s, salvaging and reasserting its cultural heritage. Concerned for the post-war reconstruction of their former homeland, they forged reconnections with German society, academic life and intellectuals. Through their writings and international networking they laid the foundations for the institutionalisation of German-Jewish historiography. By exploring their contribution to the early work of the Leo Baeck Institute, the limitations of this institution for the intellectual questions and societal issues they championed are brought into focus.

The third phase of their careers during the 1960s shows new examples of continuity with German-Jewish scholarship of the Weimar period. As subject-specialist advisors they promoted the integration of German-Jewish history into West German academia. In parallel with their German-Jewish studies, they led discussion of Germany’s recent history among ecumenical and academic audiences. Reichmann and Sterling reframed the narratives of Vergangenheitsbewältigung away from secular sites of interaction, to encompass the impact of religious encounters and gender dynamics of Jewish/non-Jewish dialogue, thus offering further insight into the nuanced role of former Jews from Germany in these processes.
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Introduction

Hannah Arendt, Eva Gabriele Reichmann, Eleonore Sterling and Selma Stern played an important role in the field of German-Jewish historical studies, cultural and intellectual circles in Germany throughout the twentieth century, despite the fact that their lives and intellectual careers were bisected by the destruction wrought under National Socialism and the dispersion of the German-Jewish community. In the 1920s and 1930s and subsequently post-war they repeated a transition from the margins to the centre, as female intellectuals within male-centred intellectual spheres and as Jewish scholars in the German public domain. They occupied central positions in the marginal space of German-Jewish studies during the Weimar Republic in Germany; post-war they grappled with the meaning and legacy of German-Jewish traditions as members of the international intellectual diaspora of Jews from Germany.

Their biographies, intellectual character and careers were uniquely individual, however they were not the only German-Jewish scholars or female intellectuals to have survived the National Socialist period, able to resume intellectual careers post-war. Neither were they the only women to have had a public voice in the German-Jewish community and beyond, as writers and spokeswomen. Their singularity is that they came to be regarded as the key German-Jewish female scholars of the twentieth century by their contemporaries in the field of German-Jewish studies. Arnold Paucker, historian and former director of the London branch of the Leo Baeck Institute (LBI), has described Arendt, Reichmann and Stern as ‘this century’s three outstanding German-Jewish women scholars’. This appellation was rooted in the historical juxtaposition of their academic study of German-Jewish history and their personal experience of the German-Jewish twentieth century. As members of the Weimar generation and witnesses of the destruction of European Jewry this gave them a not unproblematic role as observers and mentors of the path West Germany took to democracy.

1 I refer to Selma Stern throughout this study using her maiden name Stern. Upon marriage Stern published a number of articles using the surnames Stern-Taeubler/Stern-Täubler, I have followed the authorship she used for these publications.

2 I use the term ‘male-centred’ rather than ‘male-dominated’ as the presence of these women and their female contemporaries within the infrastructure of German Jewry shows that the German-Jewish community was not necessarily male-dominated even if men formed the larger gender proportion within the leadership of its organisations.


4 The contribution of Stern and Reichmann to German-Jewish historiography was marked by the LBI on their deaths: Stern was regarded as ‘the doyenne of German-Jewish historians’ and a ‘great woman of German Jewry’; Arnold Paucker, ‘Preface’, LBI Year Book, vol. XXVII (1982), pp. vii-viii, here p. vii. Reichmann was described as ‘an inspiration to a whole generation of students’, see John Grenville, ‘Preface’, LBI Year Book, vol. XLIII (1998), pp. ix-x, here p. ix.
This study addresses three distinct periods in their lives and careers. Arendt, Reichmann and Stern were born during Imperial Germany, experiencing the First World War and establishment of the Weimar Republic. During this time they acquired university education entering German academia and subsequently German-Jewish cultural, political and scholarly circles. Stern began her publishing career during the First World War, Reichmann and Arendt followed suit in the late 1920s and 1930s, whereas Eleonore Sterling née Oppenheimer, born only in 1925, emigrated to the United States in 1938. The period draws to a close with the National Socialist reign in Germany and the Second World War. All four successfully emigrating from Germany, escaping internment and death.

The second distinct phase arose out of their experiences of displacement and loss. Transposed to new locations they re-established their lives and careers within the context of post-war German-Jewish cultural reconstruction during the 1940s and 1950s. Sterling took up German-Jewish historical studies at university in America, resuming contact with Germany at the same time as older colleagues were returning in the early 1950s. Her place alongside Arendt, Reichmann and Stern is validated by the course that her post-war career took. Publishing her doctoral thesis at the time of their first post-war monographs, her academic interests and personal concerns intersected theirs at many junctures. Personal intellectual responses to the Holocaust were mediated through their writings and personal participation in reconstruction.

The third period focuses on the 1960s during which their intellectual work took decisive turns. Whilst Stern and Arendt moved in opposite directions in relation to their engagement with German-Jewish historiography, the interactions of Reichmann and Sterling on behalf of the diasporic German-Jewish community diversified alongside their integration of German-Jewish historiography into the West German historical discipline, focusing upon West German interfaith and intergenerational dialogue.

The questions and arguments raised by the diversity of their academic work and involvements span from university days to the twilight years of their scholarship. I consider how these women asserted their intellectual capacities within the framework of the German-Jewish scholarly community as it changed in shape and focus from the 1920s to the 1960s. They responded to German-Jewish self-assertion of the 1920s, the persecution, displacement and destruction of the National Socialist years, post-war reconstruction, the academic institutionalisation of German-Jewish studies and intergroup, interfaith dialogue. I assess the impact of gender as a dimension shaping their career paths and personal interactions with the key German-Jewish intellectual
circles of the twentieth century. Reconstructing the details of their post-war academic and institutional roles, I trace the interrelations between their writings, public speaking and active roles and consider the impact this had upon their participation in public discourse and educational programmes.

By exploring their relationships with the discipline of German-Jewish historiography; the function and limitations of institutions such as the LBI and the Wiener Library (WL) to provide forums for the intellectual questions and moral issues they championed, are brought into focus. I question how they negotiated multiple roles; as female scholars in German-Jewish and mainstream German intellectual spheres, as members of the intellectual infrastructure within the diaspora, as well as spokespeople in West Germany representing former Jews from Germany, acting as mediators between Germany and the wider international Jewish community. Ultimately this study sheds new light on how they consolidated a reputation and standing which established them as key German-Jewish scholars of the twentieth century, reinforcing the role of former Jews from Germany in the processes of reconstruction in West Germany.

This study is firmly based on the textual analysis of the writings of Arendt, Reichmann, Sterling and Stern, drawing on published monographs, articles, reports and unpublished correspondence, manuscripts and personal reflections. I have reconstructed their active participation and intellectual involvements, in key German-Jewish community, cultural and academic institutions, around these texts, in order to highlight the interplay of cultural, political and social analysis, their personal standpoints and intellectual ambitions within their work.

There has been no attempt to explore the binding points between these four scholars and their interactions with German-Jewish traditions and historiography throughout the twentieth century. Despite the fact they approached these areas from diverse disciplinary perspectives, their research interests and shared concerns overlapped, yet gave impetus to distinctly individual involvements in the German-Jewish émigré communities within the various centres where they settled. On a personal level they shared varying degrees of acquaintance and knowledge of each other’s writings. The interrelation of Arendt, Reichmann, Sterling and Stern particularly during the post-war period had many layers created by their institutional roles at the LBI, WL and other academic institutions. Shared personal and academic connections were a common feature across the dispersed yet compact German-Jewish intellectual diaspora.
During the late 1920s Arendt and Stern may well have met in Heidelberg where they had studied and had connections with academics. Both are known to have frequented the intellectual tea circles of Marianne Weber, the wife of the sociologist Max Weber. Whilst sharing a common interest in the history of Jewish emancipation, their stances diverged, but due to the lack of academic apparatus accompanying their articles, the extent of bibliographic influence is unclear. Arendt had corresponded with Stern when looking for research funding in 1929. In the post-war period their contact continued in a more formal setting as both joined the editorial board of the LBI in New York, engaging with one another’s research as it came up for review and publication.

Their shared interest in antisemitism and German-Jewish historical relations constituted a significant proportion of the studies produced in these fields in the early 1950s. During the 1940s and 1950s the dispersed community of scholars and writers working on German-Jewish studies was relatively close-knit. The number of publishers producing their work was small and personal connections were an important means of circulation. Both the WL and the LBI functioned as pivotal institutions around which a web of scholars and research was organised across the German-Jewish diaspora, Germany and Israel. Reichmann and Stern exchanged information about the collections held by their institutions and scholars suitable for collaborative research projects.

5 Arendt transferred from Marburg to Heidelberg university in 1925, where she completed her doctorate under Karl Jaspers in 1928: Hannah Arendt, Der Liebesbegriff bei Augustin (Berlin: J. Springer, 1929). Stern registered as a student at Heidelberg in 1909, later transferring to Munich. She also accompanied her husband Eugen Taeubler during his appointment as Professor of Ancient History at the University of Heidelberg from 1929 until 1933.


10 For example see the appeals Taeubler and Stern made to fellow scholars, publishers, financial backers in order to try to get Taeubler’s literary work and poetry published in the 1940s and 1950s, see Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, and Nachlass Eugen Taeubler, NL 0078, Handschriftenabteilung der Universitätsbibliothek Basel (UBB).

11 See correspondence between Reichmann, the Wiener Library, Sterling and Stern in Wiener Library Archive (WLA) 358-360 Reichmann and 408 Sterling, Wiener Library (WL), London. See also correspondence between Stern and Reichmann in Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, UBB.
Sterling and Stern corresponded regarding their common research areas and Stern took an active interest in Sterling’s work, exchanging ideas and contacts with her particularly during the years she lived in Basel and Sterling in Frankfurt am Main.\(^1\)

Born in the Palatinate region they shared a strong sense of Heimat [home] for the region that had shaped their family history and younger lives. In Cincinnati Stern wished to return to Europe to be near her former homeland of Baden, she decided to settle in Basel on the Swiss side of the border with Baden Württemburg. Her research also points to her deep interest in the German-Jewish heritage of that region. Stern’s work highlights the fairer conditions in southwest Germany that shaped past interactions between the German elite and key German-Jewish historical figures, significantly influencing positive transformations in state relations with the Jews in the centuries before Jewish emancipation.\(^1\)

Sterling also returned to Baden to the family home in the early 1950s after twenty years in America. She considered her personal identity politics were strongly shaped by a regional German identity as much as her Jewish and American hybridity.\(^1\)

Collaboration between Reichmann and Sterling developed through the younger scholar’s work on behalf of the Wiener Library.\(^5\) Sterling had reviewed Reichmann’s monograph in 1952 whilst a student in America, but they only subsequently met and later became close colleagues through their work to promote theological and academic dialogue in West Germany in the 1960s.\(^6\) Reichmann and Stern as older, established scholars offered academic encouragement and friendship to Sterling whose parents had died following deportation to the detention camp in Gurs, southern France.\(^7\) These interconnecting friendships were consolidated through shared acquaintances with male colleagues such as Max Horkheimer the philosopher, sociologist and co-founder of the

---

12 See correspondence between Stern and Sterling in Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 18, 29-34, UBB. Stern and Sterling had ancestral connections through the Oppenheimer family.


15 See correspondence between the Wiener Library (written by Alfred Wiener and Reichmann) and Sterling regarding her collaborative work from the summer 1955, WLA 408 Sterling, WL, London.


17 See the account of Sterling gave of her 1952 visit to Gurs: Eleonore Sterling, ‘Im Camp de Gurs’ (circa 1952), Nachlaß Eleonore Sterling, EB 89/137, folder A 2, Deutsches Exilarchiv (1933-1945), Die Deutsche Bibliothek (DDB), Frankfurt am Main, and Robert Weltsch, ‘Introduction’, LBI Year
Institut für Sozialforschung [Institute for Social Research] in Frankfurt am Main and the rabbi and scholar Robert Raphael Geis, as well as further common personal friendships in London, Germany and Israel, linking family, synagogue and research connections.\(^{18}\)

In the post-war period connections between Reichmann and Arendt formalised through their institutional roles; personal contact was limited. Reichmann most notably took part in the public defence, staged in London, to refute the claims of complicity of the German-Jewish leadership which Arendt presented in her study of the trial of Adolf Eichmann.\(^{19}\) It was Rabbi Leo Baeck, the central figurehead of the German-Jewish leadership and perhaps the most significant personage, whose friendship Reichmann and Stern shared, who bore the brunt of Arendt’s accusations. Stern and her husband Eugen Taeubler had continued their close personal and intellectual relationship with Baeck at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati where both men worked following the war.\(^{20}\) Reichmann was also closely connected with Baeck throughout his life from the time he had served as rabbi in Oppeln, her childhood home.\(^{21}\)

Research into the lives and work of Arendt, Reichmann, Sterling and Stern is disproportionate: Hannah Arendt is by far the most widely known of the four and since the 1970s, the focus of a vast range of scholarship. The first monograph addressing Stern’s life and historical writings has recently augmented the increasing range of studies of her thinking and writing.\(^{22}\) In contrast, the lives and careers of Reichmann

---

\(^{18}\) Although little private correspondence still exists between Eleonore Sterling and Eva G. Reichmann, their close relationship and frequent communication is inferred by their collaboration and in their correspondence with another colleague Robert Raphael Geis: see Robert Raphael Geis Collection, AR 7263, box 2, folder 4, and box 3, folder 1, Leo Baeck Institute Archives (LBIA), New York. and Max Horkheimer: see correspondence in the Max Horkheimer Archiv (MHA), Horkheimer-Pollock-Archiv, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Frankfurt am Main. Overlapping academic and private acquaintances were numerous, such as Stern’s sister Anna in London who attended the same synagogue as Reichmann, see Eva G. Reichmann, letter to Selma Stern-Taeubler, 7 May 1972, Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 17, 8, UBB.


and Sterling have received almost no attention, beyond cursory outlines of their biographies and careers or limited reference to specific aspects of their output. Arendt is the subject of a prolific body of literature; her Jewish identity, German-Jewish involvements and interactions with key Jewish and German thinkers prior to emigration and post-war have become renewed areas of interest. Less noted however is the significance of her historical studies and her participation in the reconstruction of German-Jewish cultural life and heritage through key institutions such as the Jewish Cultural Reconstruction (JCR) and LBI. She is predominantly considered a philosopher and political theorist rather than a German-Jewish historian. The notoriety she later gained has eclipsed both her pre-war interactions and early post-war activities within the German-Jewish community, particularly her role in the institutionalisation of German-Jewish historiography.

The interconnections between Arendt’s biography, writings and thought have been made more accessible through the publication of her correspondence with key dialogue partners: her second husband Heinrich Blücher, scholars Karl Jaspers, Martin Heidegger and others. This presentation of her private voice is enabling a closer reading of key events in her life such as her intellectual relationships, political awakening, experience of emigration but also, the everyday exchanges with fellow scholars and colleagues, which illuminate the tasks and responsibilities she undertook as part of her employment with various institutions. The recent publication of Arendt’s notebooks – the Denktagebuch [thinking diary] provides valuable information about the intellectual provenance of her key writings. The impact of this remains to be seen,

---


25 The meaning of all foreign book titles referred to in this text have been translated by the author and
whether her institutional activities are marginalised further due to their incidental presence in this textual palimpsest.  

Inside the German-Jewish intellectual circles of the LBI and the émigré German-Jewish community in London, Reichmann’s key position during both the Weimar and National Socialist years, as well as post-war, has been acknowledged. She has been celebrated by former colleagues, for example Arnold Paucker who has authored a number of articles pointing to her formidable intellectual contribution during the 1920s and 1930s and to the discipline post-war. Lauding her ‘imposing intellect’, he has also drawn attention to her intellectual superiority amongst her male cohort both in the pre- and post-war periods, trying to redress the relative paucity of recognition for her work.  

Scholarship has continued to overlook her, despite the historian Peter Alter’s poignant remarks regarding his own omission of Reichmann from his assessment of refugee historians in post-war Britain. Beyond this, brief biographical and bibliographical information about her life and career has been included in a small number of publications; listed as one of few women among the German-speaking Jewish historians who emigrated to Britain after 1933.

In an institutional history of the Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens (CV) [Central Union of German Citizens of Jewish Belief], Avraham Barkai


refers to Reichmann as one of its main intellects during the 1930s, highlighting her contribution, as cultural specialist and editor of Der Morgen, to central polemics gripping the German-Jewish community particularly between the CV and Zionists over the complex issues of the diaspora and Palestine. Similarly Ben Barkow’s monograph on the Wiener Library only lightly sketches Reichmann’s role within this institution. I have expanded upon her activities, embedding her work at the library within the émigré community in London, tracing the projects she led and contacts she created with centres for scholarship in West Germany. On the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Association of Jewish Refugees’ (AJR) in 2002, Anthony Grenville raised the profile of Reichmann’s role in the British German-Jewish refugee community as a mediator of specialist knowledge on antisemitism, Jewish/non-Jewish historical relations and the state of post-war West Germany. This gradual retrospective reflection on the post-war German-Jewish refugee community in Britain, now that half a century has passed, should also consider its international context, exemplified by Reichmann’s participation in post-war reconstruction and re-education in West Germany for which she gained recognition from the West German state.

Despite Sterling’s public role as a mediator of Jewish/non-Jewish relations in the post-war period, the scholars Frank Stern and Shlomo Shafir have drawn attention to only two aspects of Sterling’s role as a critical observer and commentator on post-war West Germany; evidenced by her publications in the media and connections with the American Jewish Committee. The references they make to her writings uncover little regarding her wider contribution to German-Jewish scholarship in post-war West Germany as a publicist, academic and dialogue partner and point even less to the second key aspect of her career: her work as a political scientist and the impact which her training and teaching commitments brought to bear upon her analyses. Sterling’s

female scholars of the humanities who emigrated to Great Britain.

34 A research project is currently running at the Frankfurter Universitätsarchiv, Johann Wolfgang
premature death shortly after she had taken up a professorship was a great loss as it would have consolidated her standing within the academic field. Her work was posthumously praised, publicly and privately, by those who knew and worked closely with her, such as Reichmann, Stern, Dietrich Goldschmidt the sociologist and former director of the Institut für Bildungsforschung [Institute for Educational Research], Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Berlin; Max Horkheimer, the writer and intellectual Ernst Gottfried Lowenthal, and Hermann Maas, prelate of the Evangelical Church in North Baden and a leading figure for Christian-Jewish reconciliation. Her activities must be reconstructed, as must Reichmann’s, through her own writings, correspondence with colleagues and institutional archives.

To closely follow their careers, changes and continuities, this study proceeds in a chronological order. The first chapter entitled ‘Central Voices from the Margins’ focuses on the research and publications of Arendt, Reichmann and Stern during the Weimar and National Socialist period until emigration from Germany. Their experiences illuminate opportunities for employment available in the Jewish academic community for female scholars during this period. Female students who were beneficiaries of the gradual opening up of the universities found limited prospects for mainstream academic positions due to Habilitation restrictions and many took up posts teaching or in the welfare infrastructure of the German-Jewish communities following...
university. Others made their public voices heard through publications produced by the German-Jewish intellectual and scientific community, writing on historical themes bringing historical studies to popular audiences. By these routes intellectual women moved from the margins to the centre of Jewish scholarship during this period, as female participants in male-centred intellectual spheres and as German-Jewish scholars within German academia.

The two main areas of their scholarship I address are their contribution to German-Jewish historical studies and their analysis of current affairs. Separate yet entwined, I argue that the former helped contextualise and interpret contemporary experience, particularly the increased tension in German and Jewish relations during the 1930s. Stern was uniquely employed as a professional historian at the Akademie fUr die Wissenschaft des Judentums [Academy for the Science of Judaism], primarily dealing with German-Jewish symbiotic history from the Middle Ages to Jewish emancipation. Arendt and Reichmann addressed a much broader range of topics and combined a variety of disciplines and theoretical approaches in their writings. Reichmann’s direct mediation of contemporary experience was published in newspapers and periodicals placing her at the ideological forefront of German-Jewish defence.

During the 1920s and into the 1930s Jewish historiography strove for a legitimate position alongside mainstream German academia. As a sub-discipline, German-Jewish historiography gradually asserted itself through the work of individual scholars, including contributors to the re-established Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland, prominent historians and scholars such as Ismar Elbogen at the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums who published a history of the Jews in Germany in 1935 and Stern in the historical section of the Akademie. The historical writings published by these women in newspapers and periodicals also contributed to the gradual growth of a distinct German-Jewish historiography, which they revisited in the post-war period.

A third aspect of their careers and writings, which I explore, is their contribution to the gendering of German-Jewish historiography, particularly evidenced by their interest in German-Jewish women of the past. Their own gendered experiences as female intellectuals were strongly linked with this choice of research interest. Personal and institutional interactions highlight what impact, if any, gender had in shaping their intellectual contribution to the renaissance of German-Jewish cultural studies while

---

38 The Habilitation is required within the German university system as the post-doctoral qualification needed in order to be eligible to pursue a professorship.
asserting a German-Jewish historical legacy in secular and non-political German-Jewish organisations. Jewish cultural education drew heavily upon German-Jewish heritage and traditions. Their studies of women as historical agents of change show German-Jewish women of the past acting as an interface for cultural and intellectual exchange between German and Jewish cultures and communities. The studies of individual Jewish historical figures can be read as an exploration of role models for female intellectual activity and a personal search for legitimacy as female spokespersons and intellectuals. Consequently the marked lack of engagement with feminism in their writings is all the more intriguing.

Discussion of Arendt’s contribution to German-Jewish debates during the Weimar period has emphasised her research on Rahel Varnhagen, the so-called ‘salon’ culture and female historical figures of the Romantic period: popular research subjects among her female contemporaries. This phenomenon has been recently contextualised within the female self-assertion of the 1920s and 1930s by Deborah Herz and Barbara Hahn.39 Inroads into studying this work by Weimar women scholars have been made along political, ideological and religious lines, considering for example the extent to which their activities and engagement with women’s history constituted a positioning regarding feminism.40 However, I consider during the 1930s, the overriding concern for unity and cohesion within the Jewish community significantly impacted their gendered discourse. For Arendt and Reichmann, their pluralist and humanitarian concerns became focused not just on the Jewish people or one social, political or religious group but on the common good of mankind which transcended gender. A concern that remained unshaken by the Holocaust.

Current scholarship studying German-Jewish women’s history in the first half of the twentieth century has contributed to the wider understanding of community life, through the study of women’s roles in private and public spheres. The individual study of pioneering German-Jewish women of this period has developed into a broader comparative study of intellectual women within a range of contexts: welfare and education, religious and social community life, as well as intellectual and political activism. Through the work of Marion A. Kaplan in the late 1970s; revisited and

extended by the scholarship of Paula Hyman, Barbara Hahn and others from the 1990s onwards, this body of scholarship has assessed the role of gender in shaping careers and determining the object of their intellectual engagement. Areas that have received attention are the role of women in acculturation as carriers of Jewish cultural and religious traditions within the family sphere, the specificity of female Jewish experience and gendered responses to the National Socialist period. Within the main body of scholarship on German Jewry during the Weimar period, the experience of the woman is not yet well integrated, for example within studies which provide a comprehensive overview of German Jewry. These append but do not integrate a gendered dimension, providing little acknowledgement of the gendered experiences of either men or women.

The increasing number of case studies of individual women, presented in comparative publications or lexicons providing registers of notable female intellectuals present just the tip of the iceberg of output from Jewish women during this period. Oral histories, memoirs, university archives collections held in Jewish archives internationally continue to bring to light the biographies of a large number of intellectual women, as the work of Harriet Pass Freidenreich on Central European university women shows. Beyond this, the study of the female contribution to academic historiography in Germany during the first half of the twentieth century is developing along new lines which will illuminate further, the interaction between female Jewish students of history and their male academic mentors and how this shaped future employment prospects in and beyond academic spheres.

Rather than regarding the early decades of their intellectual careers as simply the


formative precursor to their later work, the training, research and employment which they undertook during this period ideologically grounded and shaped the course of their life-long work as scholars, intellectuals, educators and activists. Their academic interests, choice of approach, institutional positions and publication opportunities illuminate the significant female contribution to German-Jewish studies and intellectual life during the 1920s and 1930s. These shed light on the relationship between formal historiography and popular historical education whilst illuminating the course of Jewish/non-Jewish relations throughout the twentieth century in Germany.

The second chapter entitled ‘The Recovery of a Valuable Past’ seeks to establish the place of these four women within the post-war reconstruction of German-Jewish intellectual life in the diaspora; by tracing their participation in the recovery of a historical legacy and the institutionalisation of German-Jewish scholarship from the 1940s until the end of the 1950s. Viewed comparatively I identify and explore the nature of two distinctly parallel points of reference shared by these women during this period despite their different capacities and locations: the reconstruction of German-Jewish life and their former homeland of Germany. Reflecting upon the catastrophic events under National Socialism and observing re-establishment of post-war Jewish/non-Jewish relations in West Germany, they attained significant positions in important German-Jewish organisations. Opportunities to publish in the media allowed Arendt and Reichmann in particular to continue their former work as mediators of historical knowledge and analysts of current affairs. Their specialist study of German-Jewish history and first-hand experience of the breakdown in relations which deteriorated under National Socialism provided the background to their observations and analyses of the wider implications of recent history.

The early years of refuge which Arendt, Stern and Sterling found in the United States and Reichmann in Great Britain were radically challenging years, as the experiences of dislocation, statelessness and loss gave way to the everyday challenges of establishing themselves in new surroundings. By the mid 1950s the career niches they created through their publications and activities presented them as writers, institutional representatives and public speakers who moved between two spheres of engagement: in the German-Jewish international diaspora and West Germany, addressing academic and public audiences. Publishing their first major post-war studies within a few years of each other during the 1950s, Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling were among very few women within the small cohort of scholars working on the topic
of antisemitism. Stern resumed her private research interests, grappling with complex personal and ideological difficulties, returning to German-Jewish historical studies in the late 1940s after the publication of a historical novel. Many of the early post-war studies addressing antisemitism were written by German-Jewish refugee scholars whose analyses engaged politics, economics, sociology and psychology. Arendt’s study of totalitarianism has been approached and contextualised by scholars from a number of different perspectives, whereas the writings of Reichmann and Sterling have been overshadowed by the development of a genre of studies focusing on the Third Reich and the Final Solution produced by Sterling’s contemporaries in West Germany – Martin Broszat et al and subsequently the genre of Holocaust Studies. The study of antisemitism and the National Socialist persecution of the Jews since the 1960s has divided interpretations into two camps through the intentionalist and functionalist debates. This has overshadowed studies by the first post-war cohort of scholars, devaluing the specific temporal and personal context of their studies. They were neither members of the male guild of historians nor working within mainstream German historical studies. Nonetheless their writings, collaboration and influence on the discussion and treatment of past and contemporary German history contributes a diverse and specifically female element to discourses on the post-war West German historiographical treatment of the National Socialist period.


The complex role of autobiography and the problematics of objectivity versus subjectivity have been brought to the fore in deconstructions of the scholarship of preeminent historians such as Broszat or Hans Mommsen on the National Socialist period. The female scholars openly addressed this tension in their writings. In the first post-war decade they had begun to grapple with their own formative experiences and interpretations of recent history. By the late 1950s and 1960s this became most vocal and self-acknowledged as they received positive external validation through wider audiences and official support for their public speaking. This confirmed the value of their personal insight and effective impact upon a historically-interested audience outside mainstream academia.

Their work to preserve historical sources through their activities at the American Jewish Archives (AJA), JCR and the WL supported, I argue, the research of scholars working in the field of German-Jewish historiography and the subsequent institutionalisation of this research field. Stern was appointed chief archivist at the AJA in 1945, involved in the rescue of archival material from Europe which assisted new scholarly interest in German-Jewish emigration to the United States. Historiographical and cultural work outside Germany asserted a German-Jewish diaspora whose points of orientation were the past events of German-Jewish history, but also the preservation of a present and continuous culture and heritage. This was facilitated by strong networks linking the leading members of the dispersed intellectual community who had emigrated, survived in hiding or concentration camps to pick up the former threads of German-Jewish existence post-war. Connections and correspondence with intellectuals, scholars and readers throughout the diaspora created an infrastructure of foundations on which the new discipline of German-Jewish historiography could be established.

The contacts which they forged with scholars and publishers in West Germany, fulfilled personal and collective interests in testing German attitudes towards Jews and potential reconciliation, carrying forward renewed academic collaboration which would impact upon the emerging discipline in due course. Furthermore, the picture of disconnection between Jewish and non-Jewish historians in post-war West Germany which Nicolas Berg’s research presents, is shown to be more complex and contended. My study brings to this debate the peripheral interactions between West German historians and intellectuals and German-Jewish scholars outside mainstream
historiography during these decades within the wider international interdisciplinary context of the study of the history of the German twentieth century.\textsuperscript{50}

Arendt’s key work of salvaging and relocating artefacts of German-Jewish heritage took her to Germany. Like Reichmann and Sterling who also made poignant returns, this gave her opportunities to assess post-war moral and physical reconstruction first hand. These renewed contacts with Germany were highly formative, shaping the direction of subsequent work and redirecting their sense of audience. Personal writings and involvements during this period had a deeply individual nature which spoke to fellow refugees, as they initially directed their reflections to diasporic German-Jewish and international Jewish audiences. Gradually they turned to non-Jewish academic and public audiences in West Germany, developing a decisively pedagogic impetus. They demanded that their Jewish and non-Jewish readers and listeners make connections between past and present, to question and analyse the course of recent German history with the future of Jewish/non-Jewish relations in mind.

In the 1950s the historical study of German Jewry in the international field through the individual work of this cohort of scholars led to the establishment of an independent research body – the Leo Baeck Institute in 1955 located in Jerusalem, London and New York. Within this institution the four women played their part especially in shaping the initial course of German-Jewish historiography. The institutional histories contextualising the activities of Arendt, Reichmann, Sterling and Stern have not yet been completely written. With the fiftieth anniversary of the LBI celebrated in 2005, new scholarship commissioned for this occasion is stimulating interest in the internal and external connections of the LBI and individual work of its participant scholars and board members such as these four.\textsuperscript{51} The study of German-Jewish post-war historiography has begun to reflect on the body of scholars who established this field, to comparatively address the main debates they engaged with and explore the disparate nature of the cohort and the writings centralised under the


umbrella of this institution.\(^{52}\) There has been a bias in research towards deconstructing the work of leading male intellectuals which has overlooked other key male and female figures who, although distinguished by their own contemporaries and commemorated at their passing, have subsequently received little recognition or academic interest.\(^{53}\)

German-Jewish historiographical rebirth in the post-war period had strong ideological and methodological roots in the Weimar period, shaped by the generation of intellectuals who had been at the centre of German-Jewish intellectual life.

Interest in Arendt’s writings of the 1940s and early 1950s which dealt with concepts borne of her personal experiences, observations of emigration, the Holocaust, Jewish identity, persecution and dispersion, has given little consideration to the backdrop of her employment within the Jewish refugee community. In order to diversify the contextualisation of Arendt’s writings beyond the political field, since particular interest has been given to her critical analysis of Zionism and the establishment of the state of Israel, this study argues for a more detailed explication of the relationship between Arendt and the German-Jewish intellectual elite. Particular attention being given to her institutional employment and the impact of the experiences this brought to her thinking, writings and wider involvements during this period.\(^{54}\)

Scholarship, on the influence of organisations and individuals representing the international German-Jewish intellectual diaspora during the 1940s and 1950s on West German reconciliation and restitution efforts, is limited. Studies of the international Jewish community as post-war observers and agents in these processes tends to focus on key economic and welfare organisations such as the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee or the Jewish Material Claims Conference against Germany.\(^{55}\) The work of
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55 Such as Ronald W. Zweig, *German Reparations and the Jewish World. A History of the Claims*
the four women when read comparatively sheds light on several major axes by which dispersed German-Jewish scholars were able to take an active role in post-war West German reconstruction, as well as the reconstitution of the surviving German-Jewish community internationally.

At present, analysis of everyday interactions between Jews and non-Jews under Allied governance and following the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany in the late 1940s and 1950s, centres on the function of DP camps, their dissolution and the establishment of Jewish successor communities in many West German cities. The early post-war experiences of survivors in West Germany, particularly gendered experience and the struggle to sustain Eastern European Jewish culture have taken centre stage, highlighting the problematic interaction between the various Jewish communities.56 The research of Jael Geis focusing on German Jews living in Germany under British and American allied rule concludes with the dilemma of remaining or emigrating.57 However as restrictions on travel to post-war Germany gradually eased at the beginning of the 1950s, the diasporic German-Jewish community constituted a significant influx into West Germany. The presence of external insiders: former Jews from Germany as visitors, observers and permanent returnees in West Germany in the late 1940s and 1950s represented the diasporic community’s interests in post-war Germany. The nature of the intellectual work undertaken by this group is exemplified by these four women, through whose interactions this study explores certain functions of this sector of the diverse Jewish community in West Germany.

As a field of research, exile studies have steadily grown since the 1980s through a number of forums inside and outside Germany dedicated to the study of emigration and exile from Germany, represented by the periodicals Exil: Forschung, Erkenntnisse, Ergebnisse; Exilforschung: ein internationales Jahrbuch and later German-Speaking Exiles in Great Britain: Yearbook of the Research Centre for German and Austrian Exile Studies.58 This scholarship has developed its own sub-disciplines, such as
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58 Exil: Forschung, Erkenntnisse, Ergebnisse is produced by the Hamburger Arbeitsstelle für deutsche Exilliteratur, Universität Hamburg; the Gesellschaft für Exilforschung, Berlin publishes Exilforschung. Ein internationales Jahrbuch, and the Research Centre for German and Austrian Exile Studies, Institute of Germanic Studies, London, publishes German-Speaking Exiles in Great
women’s exile studies; exploring the role of gender in the experience of exile.\(^5\) The unifying term of reference for this field – ‘exile’ implies banishment and displacement, hinting at return. This does not point to the forced flight connoted by the term ‘refugee’, which was predominantly used by the German-Jewish community in Great Britain exemplified in the Association of Jewish Refugees. The complex construction of new communities and identities by German-Jewish refugees in the diaspora and the experiences of those who asserted their public presence in West Germany as intermittent returnees within a few years of displacement, have begun to be more comprehensively addressed in the field of German-Jewish historiography, as subsequent generations of scholars have turned their attention to the study of post-war diasporic German Jewry.

The third chapter centres on the decade of the 1960s, which provides the clearest picture of their challenge to the discontinuities they had personally faced, especially in their intellectual careers across the time frame 1920s/1930s into the post-war period. The caesura of displacement and loss caused by National Socialist persecution and the Holocaust did not however trigger a complete break with the past during the 1940s and subsequently. The changes in their lives that these events brought about were nonetheless far-reaching. The new beginning which their relocation and resumed careers enabled, on a personal and wider international and institutional level, produced significant outcomes in this decade. Whilst the first post-war decades had seen the consolidation of the dispersed intellectual communities and the institutional foundation of German-Jewish historical studies, the 1960s produced new examples of continuity with the German-Jewish scholarship of the Weimar period, evident in these women’s intellectual concerns and research, clearly visible when considered across time frames.

The focus of this chapter is twofold. Tracing the impact of their German-Jewish scholarship in the public sphere during this decade; their personal intervention as subject specialists began to seriously address the insertion of German-Jewish historical studies within German historiography by establishing a wider popular audience and readership in West Germany. Furthermore, they increasingly made strong reference to their own experiences and scholarship of the 1920s and 1930s and that of their generation, in their work around this time. The second element of their intellectual activity which had its apogee during this decade was the role they took as dialogue
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*Britain: The Yearbook of the Research Centre for German and Austrian Exile Studies.*
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partners, in private, academic and educational forums. In the case of Reichmann and Sterling, their Jewish/non-Jewish dialogue encouraged and supported the development of a nationalised interfaith encounter.

Within the German-Jewish historiographical community there came a number of decisive shifts in their positions, connections and orientations. During the period they contributed as subject-specialist advisors for events such as Judaica exhibitions and radio broadcasts, increasing public awareness of the rich and valuable cultural heritage of German Jewry. In this decade all four published their main works in German and keenly followed their reception in West Germany. The publishing industry also had a large part to play in sustaining a market and readership for the work of exiled German-Jewish writers. The strong relationships which these women had with supportive West German publishers and intellectuals highlight individuals who were committed to re-establishing dialogue and promoting reconciliation between Jews and non-Jews on a personal and national level.

This process of re-forging a place for German-Jewish heritage as part of West Germany’s attempts to come to terms with recent history was a two-way process. Whilst interactions between West German society and its Jewish communities were problematic; on an intellectual level, academic Jews such as these intellectual women were invited to represent former German Jewry and Jews in Germany through various channels such as the universities, the media and the Evangelical Church, rather than representatives of Jewish religious communities. In this way direct connections were sought with the German-Jewish generation and culture of the pre-war period which National Socialism had sought to destroy.

Generational changes to the German-Jewish historiographical discipline occurred during this period. A new generation of scholars publishing through the LBI and other new forums extended interest in German-Jewish historiography within West Germany. This meant that the discipline had both a future in the diaspora and in its former national setting. Stern and Reichmann, due to their age and position, were increasingly called upon to reflect on their own experience and understanding of German-Jewish life during the twentieth century and in particular the Weimar period. Their personal commemoration of scholars of their generation, whom they had worked alongside since the 1930s, revalidated the scholarship of this generation. This contributed to new research on German-Jewish intellectual life during the early decades of the twentieth century. Reichmann experienced her most involved collaboration with the London LBI. Her research on public opinion at the end of the Weimar Republic was published as the
first in a series of publications on German Jewry during key periods of the nineteenth and twentieth century.\(^{60}\) Stern worked solidly to complete her research begun in the 1920s and Sterling tackled the republication of Ismar Elbogen’s 1935 history of German Jewry.\(^{61}\) These projects provide evidence of the strands of continuity woven by scholars, particularly during this decade, with the nascent German-Jewish historiography of the Weimar period. Despite the women’s close involvement with the discipline, the LBI and the WL could only partially provide forums for the new directions the work of Reichmann and Sterling took, within public education and dialogue. Arendt more dramatically broke with many of her former associations in the German-Jewish intellectual elite, particularly the Council of Jews from Germany and the LBI, at the beginning of this decade.

Reichmann and Sterling continued to analyse the post-war West German path to democracy. Major public debates during this period also centre on the trials of former Nazi criminals and although Arendt’s work on Adolf Eichmann has been widely analysed, the work of lesser-known commentators such as Sterling’s articles on Nazi trials and German re-education, has not been integrated into scholarship on these debates.\(^{62}\) Reichmann and Sterling moved away from direct analysis of the details of National Socialist persecution and antisemitism into the contemporary study of the process of coming to terms with Germany’s past, at a time when scholarship on the Holocaust and National Socialism was developing its own dynamics as a sub-genre of German and German-Jewish historiography.

Yet despite their work as observers and commentators in post-war West Germany they remained outsider voices: as Jews, former German Jews not closely connected with the Jewish communities of Eastern European survivors and displaced persons, who made up the greater part of the Jewish community in post-war Germany, and in the case of Arendt and Reichmann, also as American and British citizens. As spokeswomen and female intellectuals they constituted an under-represented presence in Jewish
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62 Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*; see also Sterling’s reports published in *Evidences* (1957-58) and *World Jewry* (1958-62). The most recent study on Eichmann is the biography by David Cesarani, *Eichmann. His Life and Crimes* (London: Heinemann, 2004), this seeks to look beyond the mythologisation and misrepresentations of the man, which have become the legacy of his trial and its representation in the wider media, by for example Hannah Arendt.
intellectual circles in West Germany and mainstream academia. They belonged to the small number of prominent German-Jewish spokespeople who assumed a symbolic and representative place within German public space. In due course Reichmann and Sterling flagged up the problematic nature of philosemitism, which tended to idolise a positive stereotype of the Jew, a phenomenon which they themselves experienced. Research analysing Jewish/non-Jewish relations in the post-war period has begun to address this phenomenon: Frank Stern has analysed the political function of the Jew during this period and Anthony Kauders has evaluated the prevalence of antisemitism versus philosemitism as the dominant reading of Jewish/non-Jewish relations in post-war West Germany. It is significant however that these studies have not yet addressed the interactions and views of Jewish public figures such as Sterling and Reichmann who directly engaged with the phenomenon in the 1960s.

Developing the reputation they had established in the post-war German intellectual community further through their activities as academic dialogue partners, their educational work, at the universities and with non-academic groups, took on a more dialogic form, gaining a political and psychological imperative. Reichmann and Sterling also participated in national interfaith dialogue to promote reconciliation and understanding between Christians and Jews, through their involvement with the post-war inauguration of Christian-Jewish dialogue through the Deutsche Evangelische Kirche [German Evangelical Church]. Exploring their contribution to the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Juden und Christen [Study Group for Jews and Christians] established for this purpose, their shaping influence on the secular, political and sociological issues which the group brought to the debate becomes evident. They fulfilled a dual function: as agents of this work and mediators of its effect. Both were fully aware of the effect of the projects they represented, consciously directing echoes from the work to a broad public: as respected spokeswomen in the German and Jewish media in West Germany, broadcasting the achievements and reception of this work to the international Jewish community and wider national audiences abroad.

63 Of their generation there was an extremely small number of Jewish women with any national public presence. Jeanette Wolff, a Holocaust survivor, was a member of the West German parliament and representative of the Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland [Central Council of Jews in Germany]. Within the German-Jewish religious community there were a number of wives of rabbis and community leaders, such as Susanne Geis and Ruth Galinski; a new generation of spokeswomen emerged in the 1960s such as Edna Brocke.

64 See Frank Stern, Im Anfang war Auschwitz: Antisemitismus und Philosemitismus im deutschen Nachkrieg (Gerlingen: Bleicher, 1991), and Anthony D. Kauders, 'History as Censure, “Repression” and “Philos-Semitism” in Postwar Germany', History and Memory, vol. 15, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2003), pp. 98-111.
The chapter is entitled ‘Weltkind in der Mitten’ – worldly child in the midst of it all, a reflection made by Reichmann regarding the interaction of herself and Sterling interceding for Jewish-Christian dialogue.\textsuperscript{65} It points to the complexities of this experience and position as religiously observant German-Jewish women acting as secular academic specialists and spokeswomen amongst Jewish and Christian theologians. Particularly significant is the new light which this area of research sheds on the need to reframe the narratives of Vergangenheitsbewältigung – the process of coming to terms with Germany’s National Socialist past: away from the traditionally recognised secular sites of interaction, to encompass dimensions such as the impact of religious encounters in the media and engendered elements of Jewish/non-Jewish dialogue.

Scholarship on the interplay between religious and secular sites of reconciliation, between Germans and Jews and Christians and Jews during this period, has gained two important contributions: tracing the history of the Gesellschaften für Christlich-Jüdische Zusammenarbeit [Societies for Christian-Jewish Collaboration] and the overall programme of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Juden und Christen [Study Group for Jews and Christians] within the biennial Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchentag [German Evangelical Church Congress].\textsuperscript{66} Additional studies are broadening the picture of Jewish/non-Jewish religious and secular dialogue, such as work on the interfaith engagement of the Freiburger Rundbrief championed by Gertrud Luckner.\textsuperscript{67} The influence of religious organisations and individuals upon these dialogues in German secular society have been overshadowed by larger debates which dominated the post-war perception and discourse on West German Christian Vergangenheitsbewältigung.

\textsuperscript{65} All translations from German into English in this thesis, unless taken from published translations cited, have been translated by the author.


One example was the complicity of the Church during the Holocaust, re-triggered in the 1960s by the play Der Stellvertreter [The Deputy] written by Rolf Hochhuth regarding the role of the Roman Catholic Church during the National Socialist period. Theological debates regarding missionising to Jews erupted within Protestant circles during this decade; Sterling and Reichmann were concerned bystanders.68

Towards the end of the 1960s Reichmann restricted her activities in Germany due to age and health. Arendt’s research and teaching consolidated within the discipline of political philosophy. Stern, having returned to Switzerland in 1960, achieved the completion of her life’s work – the multi-volumed history of the Prussian State and the Jews which she had begun at the behest of her husband in the 1920s.69 Sterling’s protracted efforts to obtain an academic position as a political scientist in Germany eventually succeeded, however she passed away at the end of her first semester. So denying scholarship the development of her writings in untold directions which could have taken place had she been able to continue in her newly gained academic position.70

The 1960s were a crucial time in Germany’s ideological reconstruction after the years of physical and infrastructural rebuilding. The decade provided greater visibility of the state of German and Jewish rapprochement but also the apathy and disinterest which still needed to be countered. Reichmann and Sterling maintained their intervention for education and moral development of the young and spoke to audiences of religiously and politically engaged individuals. This period began to show the impact of re-education, carried out in the previous decade, this became apparent as the generation born after National Socialism reached maturity through the political radicalisation of the late 1960s. It was hoped that the reactions of this generation would confirm that ‘Bonn was not Weimar’: that West German radicalism could lead to positive social and political change which would starkly contrast the instability Germany had experienced following the First World War and prove that the democratisation of West Germany was durable.71


Chapter One
Central Voices from the Margins or Engendering the Past

1.1 Introduction
The lives and career paths of Hannah Arendt, Eva G. Reichmann and Selma Stern during the 1920s and 1930s until emigration from National Socialist Germany trace in general terms a transition from the margins towards the centre: firstly within mainstream German academia as female Jewish humanities students and later in German-Jewish intellectual society. In their experiences of higher education, employment and publication opportunities during this period of shifting stability and increasing antisemitism they belonged to a larger cohort of Jewish women who gained a public voice in non-Jewish and subject-specialist periodicals and at the heart of the vibrant but threatened German-Jewish intellectual community. During this period Reichmann and Stern held positions as high-profile representatives at two central German-Jewish institutions: the liberal-oriented organisation representing German Jewry – the Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens (CV) [Central Union of German Citizens of Jewish Belief] and the private Jewish historical research institute – the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums (Academy for the Science of Judaism) respectively. Within these two cultural and ideological hubs they joined a generation of Jewish scholars and community leaders fighting to defend the spirit, ethos and institutional infrastructure of German Jewry against increasing discrimination and marginalisation. Rather than championing feminist positions their interest in historical and contemporary female experience adjusted to address the pressing urgency of contributing to the self-assertion and defence of the whole German-Jewish community in the 1930s.

The first section of this chapter contextualises their early intellectual careers within the wider phenomenon of the opening up of previously male-dominated spheres of German academia to female students in the first decades of the twentieth century. As a result a gendered intellectual space evolved inhabited by women. This phenomenon carried over into Jewish community and cultural organisations where many found employment and publishing opportunities. The biographies and career paths of each

1 Eleonore Sterling née Oppenheimer, the fourth subject of this thesis belonged to a younger generation, leaving Germany as a teenager in 1938. Therefore I address her academic career from the first post-war decades in the second and third chapters.
2 The Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums (Academy for the Science of Judaism) is referred to hereafter as the Akademie.
woman show considerable differences in the choices they made and the opportunities they took as changing circumstances shaped their careers and concerns, shown diversely in their writings. Despite their individuality, various ideological positions, subject specialisms and spheres of influence, there is a high degree of commonality in certain patterns of their careers during this period. In particular it is visible in their transition from purely academic studies to the analysis of contemporary affairs; shifting from non-Jewish research to German-Jewish historical and contemporary studies and their progressive but limited engagement with engendered scholarship.

The second part of this chapter explores the place of their analysis of German-Jewish historical studies in relation to the contemporary experience of identity definition through cultural, historical and religious learning and self-assertion. All three women undertook historical studies at university, but Stern was the only professionally employed historian who worked according to an institutionalised ideology: asserting the German-Jewish synthesis. Arendt and Reichmann initially engaged with historical topics from the perspective of their major areas of training, Arendt in philosophy and Reichmann in economics and sociology, yet the period of German-Jewish history and events that prompted their greatest interest were nevertheless the same, extending from the Enlightenment to contemporary history. 3 Arendt and Stern tackled historical topics such as emancipation and assimilation which had direct relevance to the contemporary state of German – Jewish relations, publishing in periodicals and newspapers for Jewish and non-Jewish readers. 4 Reichmann’s methodological analysis of current affairs was firmly rooted in her well-developed historical education, to this end she aimed to encourage the reader. 5 She used historical perspective to contextualise her analyses and support her argumentation.

3 Of the three women Reichmann was the only one permanently employed in a journalistic capacity reporting on current affairs on a regular basis. The most comprehensive list of her early articles is provided by those collected in Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, Leo Baeck Institute Archives (LBIA), New York.


One strand of their historical research contributed to the growing body of engendered scholarship during the Weimar period. Their studies of Jewish women of the past provided a prism through which wider historical debates were refracted, particularly the critique of assimilation and the balance between the influences of Romanticism and Rationalism upon contemporary German ideologies. Stern’s study of female Jewish agency in Jewish and German history offers up a dimension of her analysis of the history of relations between German-Jewish communities and German society that was sidelined in her key publications for the Akademie.

The third area of their work that I address is their public role as mediators of contemporary German-Jewish self-assertion through cultural, political and historical self-awareness, projected in their writings and personal interaction on behalf of German-Jewish issues and institutions. Stern and Reichmann addressed a non-Jewish readership through their externally oriented publications. This contributed to the factual defence and justification of German-Jewish existence as a synthesis of German and Jewish elements, serving the enlightenment of non-Jewish and Jewish readers. Their response to key issues: antisemitism and the ‘Jewish question’, education and Jewish renewal, the diaspora, Palestine and Zionism, as well as the role of the modern Jewish woman, reflect both personal and theoretical stances and shared a fundamental concern for ideology and action in the private and public spheres.

The discussion of contemporary gender issues in the work of Arendt and Reichmann was overtaken by a broader humanitarian concern for Jewry and mankind as a whole rather than engendered selectivity, expressed by Reichmann under the rubric of ‘neutrality [Unparteilichkeit]’. The year 1933 brought major changes to Germany’s infrastructure and politics. The German-Jewish community responded by seeking closer ties between its component institutions representing the different sectors of the Jewish population. Unity was programmatised by the instigation of the Reichsvertretung der deutschen Juden [National Representation of German Jews]. Although this led to a reaffirmation of distinct positions, the call to unity encompassed gender, political and religious differences. This is reflected in the more universal concerns characteristic of

6 See Cora Berliner and Hannah Karminski (Jüdischer Frauenbund), reference, March 1939, pp. 1-2. Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBI, NY.
7 The Reichsvertretung der deutschen Juden [National Representation of German Jews] is referred to hereafter as the Reichsvertretung.
Reichmann’s writings of the late 1930s, rather than a clearly defined gendered position.⁹

The impact of the National Socialist rise to power in 1933 with the electoral success of the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (NSDAP) was a profound moment which decisively affected their lives and careers. The intellectual questions which the community addressed became more self-searching and the expression of self-assertion rallied spirit, strengthening the community; expressed through the flourishing Jewish cultural and educational programmes. Arendt, like many other German Jews, left Germany in 1933. The hope for a more secure future abroad fuelled a tide of emigration which steadily grew over the next five years. The violence unleashed on Reichskristallnacht in 1938 also proved a decisive moment, shaking what hopes Reichmann and Stern still held that circumstances might stabilise. Until that time, as members of the elite leadership they continued their intellectual work, despite increasing difficulties and dwindling prospects: Stern through her research and work for the Reichsvertretung and Reichmann supporting the threatened community through the ideological defence provided by the CV and its publications. Their eventual flight from Germany was accompanied by even greater insecurity and precariousness as countries were beginning to restrict their intake of refugees, especially for the Taeublers who crossed the Atlantic during wartime.

1.1.1 A gender cohort

The study of the careers of female German-Jewish university students during Imperial and Weimar Germany has been supported by research in two related areas: male Jewish university experience and the ascent of the intellectual German-Jewish woman within German-Jewish community life.¹⁰ Scholarship on academic women has received impetus in recent years from research into the twentieth-century history of many
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German universities, which is extending our comparative knowledge of the academic paths and hurdles for these generations. Female students were unofficially allowed to audit courses at selected German universities from 1896 onwards which paved the way for an increased acceptance of female students, supported by the women’s emancipation movement. For women such as Arendt, Reichmann and Stern who aspired to equal educational opportunities, parental backing and financial means existed for these daughters of urban bourgeois Jewish families. Female Jewish entrance into German academia has been commonly described as suffering from two-fold discrimination, firstly as Jews and secondly due to gender discrimination from male students and teaching staff. By the time Arendt was studying in 1924 circumstances were considerably less hostile than had been the case for the generation of Stern and Reichmann who began their university studies in 1909 and 1916 respectively in the wake of the first waves of female students.

Scholarship has moved from individual case studies to consider distinct forms of student engagement outside traditionally male-dominated academic spaces. This shift has been facilitated by a growing body of research that explores the experiences of female academics, particularly those of Jewish heritage. The academic environment for female students was shaped by a complex interplay of social, cultural, and historical factors. These studies emphasize the importance of considering the specific challenges faced by female students, particularly those from disadvantaged educational backgrounds. The experiences of Jewish female students, in particular, are often characterized by a double layer of discrimination.


12 One of the first female students enrolled in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Heidelberg was Rahel Gotein; see Rahel Straus, Wir lebten in Deutschland. Erinnerungen einer deutschen Jüdin 1880-1933, edited by Max Kreutzberger (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1961). More recent studies of female academics focus comparatively on individual patterns of female scholarship within specific disciplines. On the wider process see Ilse Costas, ‘Professionalisierungsprozesse akademischer Berufe und Geschlecht – ein internationaler Vergleich’, in Elisabeth Dickmann and Eva Schöck-Quinteros (eds.), Barri ren und Karri ren. Die Anfänge des Frauenstudiums in Deutschland. Dokumentation an der Konferenz “100 Jahre Frauen in der Wissenschaft” (Berlin: Trafo-Verlag, 2000), pp. 13-32. The studies in this volume give a broad overview of female academic experience from university entrance to the problems facing those wishing to gain the Habilitation. They treat German and German-Jewish female academics together, although the relatively high representation of the latter is acknowledged.


14 Baden, where Stern began her studies, was the first state to officially enrol female students commencing in 1899, followed by Bavaria in 1904 and Prussia in 1908. Jewish women were represented in significant numbers within university matriculation statistics, compared with both non-Jewish female and male Jewish students. For example in 1911, at a time when Jews barely constituted 1% of the total population of Prussia, Jewish women accounted for over 10% of female students enrolled; see Keith H. Pickus, Con structing Modern Identities, p. 142; also Marion A. Kaplan, op. cit., pp. 137-39. Compare also Marina Sassenberg, ‘Das Eigene in der Geschichte. Selbstentwürfe und Geschichtsentwürfe der deutsch-jüdischen Historikerin Selma Stern (1890-1981)’, PhD thesis, Martin-Luther-Universität zu Halle-Wittenberg, December 2002, pp. 52-54.
generations and cohorts of women who undertook university education. The model of categorising the experiences of women by generation alone only serves to illuminate their formal, engendered experience of university, whereas a more nuanced appreciation is gained by considering other factors such as regional and disciplinary differences, the influence of changing economic and political fluctuations and personal religious identity in the early part of the twentieth century. Following the First World War, the lower numbers of competing male academics and disruptions to the German social structure allowed new hopes for female Jewish graduates aspiring to an academic university career after graduation. Of the very few women who achieved academic positions, a number with Jewish backgrounds featured, however the restrictions imposed by increased discrimination against Jewish academics compounded the situation for male and female scholars as the Weimar Republic crumbled.

As a result of increased numbers of women graduating from university, new opportunities emerged which no longer limited Jewish women’s influence and actions to the domestic sphere, enabling them to develop public and political voices. Many women took up employment within central German-Jewish secular and cultural organisations such as the CV, Reichsvertretung, Kulturbund deutscher Juden [Cultural Association of German Jews], Zionistische Vereinigung für Deutschland (ZVfD) [Zionist Organisation of Germany] and Jüdischer Frauenbund (JFB) [Jewish Women’s Association]. They were not restricted to traditional gendered roles in education and welfare but experienced a full range of career and publication opportunities. From the time of the First World War female intellectuals who wished to continue researching and writing following university took advantage of opportunities to publish within the


18 A number of female intellectuals were employed by the CV in subject-specialist capacities alongside Reichmann as cultural specialist, including Margarethe Wiener, an economist who reported on the political and economic situation of Weimar and National Socialist Germany and Cora Berliner also an economics specialist. Two other women who took editorial roles for CV publications were Margarete Edelheim and Margarete Goldstein.
German-Jewish cultural apparatus, although publication outside this sphere was also possible as Arendt experienced. They wrote on topics from contemporary political debates to education, welfare issues, religious and secular family life and inner-Jewish ideological positions. Encompassing a full range of disciplines and publishing styles, female contributors researched, reported and advised on subjects newly populated by female specialists as a result of university training in disciplines such as economics, law, politics and the social sciences. The register of periodicals and newspapers to which they contributed ranged from those at the core of German-Jewish Wissenschaft to those dealing purely with politics and current affairs.\(^{19}\) As racial discrimination increased during the 1930s the possibility of publishing in non-Jewish newspapers and periodicals narrowed, affecting female and male Jewish writers, increasing the competition and pool of contributors in the Jewish sphere.\(^{20}\)

This relatively large female intellectual cohort whose names appear amongst contributors to German-Jewish periodicals included prominent female community leaders and intellectuals.\(^{21}\) Leading roles for women in Jewish ‘scientific’ institutions such as the Akademie, the liberal rabbinical seminary – the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums [College for the Science of Judaism] or academic publishing circles were however very limited.\(^{22}\) The biographies and careers of lesser-known women who pursued academic level research in humanities subjects during the Weimar period and achieved institutional employment in the 1930s are in many cases difficult to trace. Issues of retrospective visibility are complicated for those who did not survive the Holocaust, who married or emigrated and changed their names; these

\(^{19}\) See periodicals and newspapers serving the Jewish community and secular publications such as Blätter des Jüdischen Frauenbundes, Central-Verein Zeitung, Der Jude, Der Morgen, Der Orden Bne Briss, Jüdische Rundschau, Menora, Monatschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland, Ost und West: illustrierte Monatschrift für das gesamte Judentum, Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland.

\(^{20}\) If one looks at the increased number of female contributors to periodicals during the First World War, following the war there was not a great decrease in their numbers, furthermore as emigration increased in response to the uncertainties of Jewish life in Germany in the 1930s, the proportion of female contributors remained fairly constant. Studies of Jewish displacement during the 1930s have tended to assess immigration statistics in relation to age rather than gender, for example see Lucy Dawidowicz, The War Against the Jews 1933-1945 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1975), pp. 188-91.

\(^{21}\) For example Hannah Karminski and Paula Ollendorf; Margarete Susman, Gertrud Kantorowicz, Else Lasker-Schüler, Rachel Wischnitzer, Bertha Badt-Strauss, Else Christaller, Helen Rosenau, Hanna Cohn.

\(^{22}\) Stern gave occasional lectures at the Hochschule but the institution employed no female teaching staff. Another example which shows Stern’s singular position as an academic historian is the fact that she was enlisted to write a number of thematic entries for the 1927 Jüdisches Lexikon; one of only five women amongst the 244 contributors listed. See Georg Herlitz and Bruno Kirschnier (eds.), Jüdisches Lexikon. Ein enzyklopädisches Handbuch des jüdischen Wissens in vier Bänden, vols. I-IV (Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1927), see vol. I, pp. XXIII-XXXVI.
intellectual contributions will only come to light with continued research in disparate archives and family papers.23

Given the large numbers of female Jewish publicists, the few who have received scholarship’s interest have tended to be described in terms of their uniqueness or outsider status, either as Jews or women within male-centred intellectual institutions.24 Arendt, Reichmann, Stern and their contemporaries faced similar issues in their own studies of historical female figures dealing with the problematic issues of categorising and stereotyping individual experiences.25 Despite the variety and particularity of their stories, it is important to acknowledge that, as a collective but not homogenous group, these prominent intellectual women constitute a significant source of information regarding the broader female experience of leadership, public voice, engendered scholarship and gender relations within Jewish and non-Jewish intellectual spheres. Given the small number of high-profile women working in similar capacities and subject areas, focusing upon the three women at the centre of this chapter inevitably raises such questions regarding the significance, singularity or representative nature of their lives and work. Their association with an elite group of men and women, is a reading which is heightened retrospectively given the significant threads of continuity this group achieved throughout their lifelong careers. Surviving the Jewish catastrophe,

23 Tracking female historical scholars from the Weimar period into the post-war can yield some successful career developments, despite relative opacity and often no trace at all. For example Rosy Bodenheimer a student of history: Rosy Bodenheimer, ‘Beitrag zur Geschichte der Juden in Oberhessen: von ihrer frühesten Erwähnung bis zur Emanzipation’, Universität Gießen, PhD thesis (1930). Following emigration she took a post as a librarian at the Joseph Meyerhoff Library, Baltimore Hebrew University. Another historian was Sarah Schiffmann who, similarly to Stern, worked on German state relations with the Jews for her PhD thesis at the university of Berlin: Sarah Schiffmann, Heinrich IV. und die Bischofe in ihrem Verhalten zu den deutschen Juden des ersten Kreuzzüge (Berlin: Lichtwitz, 1931). She emigrated to Palestine in 1930, however it is unclear what career she subsequently pursued.

24 See Marina Sassenberg, ‘Der andere Blick auf die Vergangenheit’, in Marina Sassenberg, Apropos Selma Stern (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Neue Kritik, 1998), pp. 7-47, here pp. 9, 15-18, on Stern’s ‘outsider’ status; on the marginality and exceptionality of ‘university women’ within the wider Jewish communities see Harriet Pass Freidenreich, ‘Gender, Identity and Community: Jewish University Women in Germany and Austria’, in Michael Brenner and Derek J. Penslar (eds.), In Search of Community, p. 171; also Claudia Prestel, ‘Life Stories: The new Jewish woman in the dominant culture of the Wilhelmine Empire and Weimar Germany’, paper given at the ‘German History from the Margins’ conference held at the University of Southampton, 13-15 September 2002.

they were members of an elite that facilitated the establishment of the discipline of German-Jewish historiography in the early decades after the Second World War.

Unlike the ‘new Jewish women’ of the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth century who pioneered Jewish welfare initiatives and took prominent roles in both the mainstream and Jewish women’s rights movement, these later generations applied their public voice in diverse ways.\(^{26}\) It is significant that their contribution to the debates concerning German-Jewish identity politics that underpinned Jewish education and self-assertion subordinated gender specificity to the discussion of ideological differentiation between political and religious Jewish positions. The historical examples of female agency explored in some of their writings emphasised and served collaboration between men and women at a time when the Jewish community was divided along ideological lines.

Their belief in the joint responsibility of Jewish men and women for the future of the Jewish people was born out in their biographies.\(^{27}\) Arendt, Reichmann and Stern experienced close practical, methodological and ideological working relationships with their male partners as colleagues and reciprocating mentors.\(^{28}\) The existence of common interests, goals and employment shared by these husband/wife teams did not necessarily give rise to a strong dependency of one upon the other in the case of Arendt and Reichmann. Each woman was employed, wrote and acted with autonomous authority.

\(^{26}\) The ‘new Jewish woman’ is an identity or phenomenon which has begun to be explored within the last few years, in the light of wider studies on the ‘new woman’ of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century women’s emancipation. This identity has been applied by a number of scholars to describe a whole range of responses to the newly negotiated independence and self-assertion following women’s emancipation from the end of the nineteenth century within German Jewry. See Claudia T. Prestel, 'The “New Jewish Woman” in Weimar Germany’, in Peter Pulzer and Wolfgang Benz (eds.), Jews in the Weimar Republic. Juden in der Weimarer Republik (Tübingen: Mohr, 1998), pp. 135-55, furthermore a conference organised by the Institut für die Geschichte der deutschen Juden, Hamburg in October 2003 on ‘Gender in Modern Jewish History: Rethinking Jewish Women’s and Gender History’ addressed this phenomenon.

\(^{27}\) Reichmann contributed to a range of welfare and community organisations and Arendt engaged actively in political causes, assisting clandestines in Berlin and welfare work whilst in Paris. Stern’s involvements are less visible, she was associated with the work of the Reichsvertretung and cultural education, whilst supporting her husband who was lobbying to create a ‘resettlement plan’ for Jewish emigrants: see David N. Myers, ‘Eugen Taubler. The Personification of “Judaism as Tragic Existence”’, *LBI Year Book*, vol. XXXIX (1994), pp. 138-39. The lack of direct feminist engagement in the careers of these women coupled with relative parity of their own careers and close ties to the work of their partners contributes to the all-encompassing nature of their work for the Jewish community.

\(^{28}\) Eva G. Reichmann’s husband Hans Reichmann was also a key member of the CV as a lawyer, and Selma Stern’s husband Eugen Taubler was her direct employer at the Akademie für Wissenschaft des Judentums. Arendt’s relationships with her first husband Günther Stern and second Heinrich Blücher were marked by close collaboration and the mutual exchange of intellectual ideas. Theresa Wobbe discusses the problematic nature of intellectual parity and collaborative work between academic couples in the case studies of two contemporaries Marianne Weber and Mathilde Vaerting, in Theresa Wobbe, ‘Generation und Anerkennung: Wissenschaftlerinnen im frühen 20. Jahrhundert’. 
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establishing her own intellectual reputation. Stern’s working relationship with her husband was particularly close, taking encouragement and instruction, following his methodology and historiographical ideology even after both had left the Akademie. She adopted his working practices but never jointly published with Taeubler. Perhaps indicative of their assertion of independence was the fact that Arendt and Stern published mainly under their maiden names during this period. Reichmann also retained her maiden name, publishing generally as Reichmann-Jungmann.²⁹

In addition, both Reichmann and Stern were closely associated personally and institutionally with the male leaders of the German-Jewish organisations where they worked and many difficulties and opportunities they experienced were shared by male and female work fellows.³⁰ Other examples of intellectual husband and wife partnerships within Jewish organisations existed but sadly not all were able to both find refuge and employment abroad, such as Alfred and Margarethe Wiener.³¹ The interactions between male and female intellectuals shed light on gender dynamics in the central institutions of the German-Jewish community. These institutions have tended to date to be studied only in relation to the dynamics exerted by external and inner-Jewish politics, secular and religious positions.³²

The impact gender had in shaping the careers of Arendt, Reichmann and Stern is neither obvious nor necessarily detrimental. Their experiences illuminate the relatively progressive gender relations between male and female scholars found in the German-Jewish intellectual sphere. Stern asserted in one study that Jewish gender equality had

---

²⁹ More practically this also avoided confusion when for example both Dr Reichmann’s published in the C. V.-Zeitung.

³⁰ Arnold Paucker discusses Reichmann’s early career in relation to her position as a highly intelligent female colleague within the ‘men’s world’ of many of the Jewish organisations: see Arnold Paucker, ‘Eva Gabriele Reichmann (1897)’, in Hans Erler, Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich and Ludger Heid (eds.), »Meinetwegen ist die Welt erschaffen«. Das intellektuelle Vermächtnis des deutschsprachigen Judentums (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 1997), pp. 279-84, here pp. 279-80. The first female board member of the CV was appointed in 1917 only seven years before Reichmann took employment with the CV, see Avraham Barkai, “Wehr dich!”: der Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens (C.V.) 1893-1938 (Munich: Beck, 2002), pp. 150-51.

³¹ Alfred Wiener’s wife Margarethe remained in Holland when Wiener emigrated to London and was later deported: Ben Barkow, Alfred Wiener and the Making of the Holocaust Library (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1997), pp. 36-37.

³² The key example relevant to my argument here is the CV, the work of which has been addressed in a number of articles for example emphasising the role of its defence work or the larger political-ideological analysis of the polarisation of secular German-Jewish community organisations and self-defence along Zionist and non-Zionist lines: see Marjorie Lamberti, ‘The Centralverein and the Anti-Zionists – Setting the Historical Record Straight’, LBI Year Book, vol. XXXIII (1988), pp. 123-28; Jürgen Matthäus, ‘Deutschium and Judentum under Fire – The Impact of the First World War on the Strategies of the Centralverein and the Zionistische Vereinigung’, LBI Year Book, vol. XXXIII (1988), pp. 129-47. Only recently has the CV been comprehensively analysed in Avraham Barkai, “Wehr dich!”: der Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens (C.V.) 1893-1938.
followed an independent course from that of German women’s emancipation, highlighting in her own work historical examples of female parity within the Jewish tradition, in contrast to the way non-Jewish women were regarded by their male contemporaries.\textsuperscript{33}

Their biographies do not single out gender as a limiting factor to their careers within the German-Jewish infrastructure, although in German academia gender and racial discrimination played a role in blocking a university career.\textsuperscript{34} Stern’s reflection on her isolation and uniqueness as a female intellectual was not felt as strongly by Arendt and Reichmann.\textsuperscript{35} Of the three, Stern was the most obvious path breaker gaining employment in the sphere of a previously exclusively male elite studying \textit{Wissenschaft des Judentums} [the Science of Judaism]. By the 1930s the community and publishing spheres Arendt and Reichmann were working in had an established female contingent. The key positions these three women held within German-Jewish scholarship of the twentieth century have firm roots during these decades. Yet their activities during this period should not simply be regarded as precursors to the careers they developed post-war. The publications and scholarly reputations developed by Reichmann and Stern in this decade already gave them significant standing among the German-Jewish intellectual community.

1.1.2 Education, university and career
Selma Stern-Taeubler née Stern was born in 1890 in Kippenheim, Baden, one of three daughters of an acculturated bourgeois Jewish family.\textsuperscript{36} She was the first and only female student in 1909 to gain the \textit{Abitur} [school-leaving exam] at the Herzogliches Gymnasium, Baden-Baden completing her secondary education and one of a slowly increasing number of female students to enrol at Heidelberg university.\textsuperscript{37} Stern provides

\textsuperscript{33} Stern, remarking on the historical differences between German and Jewish gender relations, wrote that Jewish women had not experienced the same constraints as German women. She considered the idea of women’s emancipation was ‘less foreign’ to Judaism than Christianity; Selma Stern, ‘Die Entwicklung des jüdischen Frauentypus seit dem Mittelalter – IV, Die Jüdin der Gegenwart’, \textit{Der Morgen}, vol. II, no. 1 (April 1926), pp. 71-81, here pp. 71-72. See also her reference (p. 75) to the significant contribution of Jewish women to the German women’s movement – a common contemporary discourse. Compare here Henriette Fürth, ‘Die jüdische Frau in der deutschen Frauenbewegung’, \textit{Neue jüdische Monatshefte}, vol. 2, no. 20 (1918), pp. 487-96.

\textsuperscript{34} Barbara Hahn (ed.), \textit{Frauen in den Kulturwissenschaften}, pp. 7-25.

\textsuperscript{35} Marina Sassenberg, ‘Das Eigene in der Geschichte’, pp. 34-57.

\textsuperscript{36} Sassenberg describes this milieu as an ‘upwardly-mobile acculturated Jewish bourgeois class’, depicting her family’s Jewish and christianised German traditions, see Marina Sassenberg, ‘Der andere Blick auf die Vergangenheit’, in Marina Sassenberg, \textit{Apropos Selma Stern}, pp. 11-12.

\textsuperscript{37} At university Stern was less isolated among a larger number of female students enrolling particularly for humanities studies. In 1909 Stern joined 108 other female students as the first generation able to
many insights into her youth through her diaries from 1911 as well as correspondence relating to her student years.38 These convey her feelings of isolation as a female scholar and the unusualness of her career aspirations but also a feeling of pride that she was pursuing a ‘never before written path’.39

Studying subjects ranging from history to literature, philosophy and languages, she transferred from Heidelberg to Munich in 1911, specialising in history, particularly influenced by latent historicism but also newer historiographical trends such as the incorporation of economic, sociological and cultural aspects into the traditional genre of *Herrschergeschichte* [the history of state politics, rulers and elite] and regional studies. She gained a doctorate in 1914 under Professor of General History Karl Theodor von Heigel with a thesis on Anacharsis Cloots, a German diplomat at the time of the French Revolution. This inaugurated her interest in historical figures that crossed between distinctly separate but connected cultural and national spheres.40 Stern’s request to be considered for a *Habilitation* [post-doctoral research] in 1918 was still too early to be accepted, Reichmann did not embark on such a plan and Arendt’s studies during the late 1920s were set against a different political and economic backdrop which prevented her from completing a *Habilitation* in Germany.41

After Stern’s graduation in 1913 she worked as a private teacher and began freelance research. Early articles from 1914-19 tackled European political and economic subjects topically relevant at the time of the First World War, as well as studies of women from the past published in a variety of periodicals and newspapers.42 Stern

---

38 See diaries and correspondence for example with Max Breiherr, D 2, 121-192 (1911-19) and Adolf Büchle, D 2, 196-226 (1908-09) in Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, UBB.

39 Firstly Stern’s choice of research subjects which combined biography with historical studies and secondly her participation in Jewish scientific scholarship as a female scholar made her career path unusual in her opinion and that of her family, see Marina Sassenberg, ‘Das Eigene in der Geschichte’, pp. 56-57.


42 The range of Jewish and non-Jewish publications in which Stern was able to publish was not unusual if one compares them with Arendt’s publications. These included subject-specialist periodicals, women’s publications and broadsheet newspapers: *Braunschweigisches Jahrbuch*, *C. V.-Zeitung*, *Deutsche Rundschau*, *Die Frau: Monatsschrift für das gesamte Frauenleben unserer Zeit*, *Die Grenzboten: Zeitschrift für Politik, Literatur und Kunst*, *Der Morgen*, *Der Orden Bie Briss*. 
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pursued research aims, already envisaged on leaving university, characterised by her personal fascination with biographies of great men and women; she considered studying the ‘lives and suffering of other people’ provided succour to her own life. Her work on historical German and European women preceded her study of German-Jewish historiography but this biographical emphasis subsequently remained central to her German-Jewish research.

Stern wrote that during her university years she did not experience antisemitism and until the end of the First World War ‘belonging to the Jewish people’ had played no real role for her. The war and in particular the Judenzählung census ordered to count the number of combatant Jewish soldiers greatly affected Stern’s assessment of the deterioration in the way the Jews were regarded by the German state and population. She was among the generation of German Jews who took up the philosopher Franz Rosenzweig’s call for Jewish renewal; for whom the study of Jewish history and German-Jewish historical relations were central to their understanding of the present. A turn towards Jewish history followed with Stern immersing herself.

At the end of 1918 she was invited to take a post in the German-Jewish historical section of the new Berlin based Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums founded in 1919. This independent academic institute was to specialise in Jewish historical and literary research, initiated with the two-fold aim of bringing Jewish studies into line with the modern research standards of the universities and secondly to scientifically study organic unity within Jewish history across countries, periods and disciplines.


43 Stern’s diary entry is cited in Marina Sassenberg, ‘Der andere Blick auf die Vergangenheit’, in Marina Sassenberg, Apropos Selma Stern, p. 22.

44 Ibid.


48 On the foundation of the Akademie see Hermann Cohen, ‘Zur Begründung einer Akademie für Wissenschaft des Judentums’ Neue Jüdische Monatsshefte, vol. 11, 10 March 1918. These plans were modified by Taubler who shifted from the overriding didactic impetus for the education of wider German-Jewish society which Rosenzweig had envisaged. Under Taubler’s leadership these ideas
The director Eugen Taeubler’s vision for the historical research section was to trace the integration of Jewish and non-Jewish history: placing Jewish history within the context of the history of the non-Jewish community and nation, assessing the interconnection and reciprocal influences between them. Stern took on board this approach, which Christhard Hoffmann has called *Beziehungsgeschichte* – the history of relationships and connections. She applied this to underpin the history of Jewish emancipation presented in *Der preussische Staat und die Juden* [the Prussian state and the Jews] which she began and later works.

This post saw Stern as the only female scholar at the Akademie, somewhat isolated among the body of male scholars. She was a close adherent of Taeubler’s programme for German-Jewish historiography and later became his wife in 1927. Scholarship has begun to assess the dynamics and collective impact of the Akademie’s research and publications, these will hopefully shed light on the more complex aspects of Taeubler’s character, vision and Stern’s gender-isolated position. Although the Zionist historian and Akademie colleague Yitzhak Fritz Baer has depicted the monastic atmosphere of the institution, I suggest that on a day-to-day basis and particularly in the wake of Taeubler’s departure, the personal and ideological interconnections between its publications and scholars were much looser than imagined. Typically Stern’s research were replaced by plans for a specialist academic institute. See Eugen Taeubler, ‘Die Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. Ein Aufruf und ein Programm’, pp. 28-31, and ‘Das Forschungs-Institut für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. Organisation und Arbeitsplan’, pp. 32-43, republished in Eugen Taeubler, *Aufsätze zur Problematik jüdischer Geschichtsschreibung, 1908-1950*, edited by Selma Stern-Taeubler (Tübingen: Mohr, 1977). See also David N. Myers, ‘The Fall and Rise of Jewish Historicism: The Evolution of the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums (1919-1934)’, *HUCA*, vol. LXIII (1992), pp. 107-36.


51 I use the orthographic form Taeubler rather than Täubler, although Eugen and Selma used both variants of this surname; where a publication uses the latter I have retained this. Taeubler left the Akademie in 1922 to take up a university post in Greek and Roman history at Zurich, whereas Stern continued her research under the auspices of the Akademie.


took her to archives the length of Germany; therefore she was not permanently based in Berlin within a community of Akademie-scholars. It is possible that apart from reports published annually by the Akademie, scholars may not have had a detailed knowledge of other research projects until publication, which in the case of Stern’s second volume of Der preussische Staat und die Juden was delayed until 1962.

Once employed at the Akademie Stern’s publications shifted to address purely German-Jewish subjects. Her first research project covered the history of relations between the Prussian State and the Jews within its domain; the first volume was published in 1925 and the second volume was in the throes of printing in 1938 when the Nazis suppressed it. In 1929 Jud Süß [Jew Süß] her second German-Jewish monograph followed. In parallel Stern published numerous articles in a small selection of major German-Jewish periodicals, correlating with her Akademie studies on the interrelation of German and Jewish history as provisional drafts advertising her forthcoming work or spin-off studies from information gathered during her archival research. When Stern married, she loosened her connections with the Akademie but continued her research, moving to Heidelberg where her husband took up a post as Professor of Ancient History at the university, later returning to Berlin. The pursuit of her research became more difficult as restrictions increased for Jews. Although Jews

picture of a cohesive institution in Selma Stern-Taubler, ‘Eugen Taubler and the “Wissenschaft des Judentums”’, LBI Year Book, vol. III (1958), p. 53. The Akademie scholars were not based under one roof, but dispersed due to research demands. Besides attending meetings it is unclear how much contact they had with one another.

Stern extensive archival research throughout Germany meant that the move to Heidelberg in 1929 did not bring great changes to her working modus and her dismissal from the Akademie at its closure in 1933 did not stop her from continuing research.


Stern’s chief Akademie-based monographs of this period are Selma Stern, Der preussische Staat und die Juden, vol. I (1925). The subsequent volume Selma Stern, Der preussische Staat und die Juden. Die Zeit Friedrich Wilhelms I. was printed in 1938 but was suppressed by the National Socialists who closed the publishers Schocken. A manuscript was rescued and returned to Stern, who recounts the story in the introduction to Selma Stern, Der preussische Staat und die Juden. Die Zeit des Großen Kurfürsten und Friedrich I., vol. I, part 1 Darstellung (Tübingen: Mohr, 1962), pp. XIV-XV; see also ‘Die unbekannte Frau’, in Marina Sassenberg, Apropos Selma Stern, pp. 119-20.

Stern’s second monograph Jud Süß. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen und zur judischen Geschichte (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1929) was also blacklisted and publicly burned in May 1933, see Marina Sassenberg, op. cit., p. 30.


were banned from state archives and libraries, she managed to continue collecting sources. She could no longer publish after all Jewish cultural institutions were dissolved in 1938 but the couple did not leave Germany until March 1941.\footnote{Sassenberg considers that Stern made her career subordinate to that of Taeubler’s; demonstrated by her marriage and move to Heidelberg, see Marina Sassenberg, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 63 and 74. Heidelberg university was Stern’s former \textit{alma mater} where she had acquaintances.}

Eva Gabriele Reichmann née Jungmann was born in 1897 in Lublinitz, Upper Silesia into an observant Liberal Jewish family whose close family friend was the Rabbi, teacher and scholar Leo Baeck who later took leadership of German Jewry heading the Reichsvertretung.\footnote{Reichmann’s recollection of Baeck provides one of the few existing accounts of her early life: Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Die Juden in Oppeln. Kindheitserinnerungen an Rabbi Dr. Leo Baeck’, radio broadcast, Süddeutscher Rundfunk, Stuttgart, 1 August 1968, reprinted in Eva G. Reichmann, \textit{Größe und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz}, pp. 257-60. Little is known about Reichmann’s childhood since among her papers at the Leo Baeck Institute and elsewhere there is hardly anything of a personal nature relating to this period, see Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, LBIA, NY. She had a sister Elisabeth Jungmann who was secretary to Rudolf Brilling, Gerhardt Hauptmann and later Max Beerbohm whom she married shortly before his death in 1956 and one brother Otto who emigrated to Brazil.}

Reichmann was educated in Oppeln and Liegnitz passing the \textit{Reifeprüfung} [maturation exam] with distinction in 1916. An interesting snapshot of the aspirations and spirit of Reichmann and her contemporaries is presented in a valedictory magazine which Reichmann and fellow students created on the occasion of their school leaving.\footnote{Eva Jungmann \textit{et al.}, ‘Festschrift der O.I.’, 25 March 1916, pp. 1-11, here p. 3, Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBIA, NY.} Amusing anecdotes and poems celebrated their school years, alluding to Reichmann’s academic accomplishments, strong personality and love of food and adventure. At the top of one page is an illustration of a set of signposts pointing to typical future choices for these bourgeois daughters. In one direction the signs read: ‘In matrimonium [in marriage]’ and in other directions the names of German university towns, including Heidelberg where she was later to study.\footnote{Although one is unsure of the authorship of the various pieces, it seems that Reichmann had a large role in its production. The signpost may illuminate a decision already made regarding where she aspired to study, given the distance that Heidelberg stood from Oppeln and other popular universities in between such as Berlin and Breslau. Compare Eva Reichmann-Jungmann, ‘Von Heidelberg nach Oppeln’, \textit{C. V.-Zeitung}, 20 March 1931, p. 141.}

Information about Reichmann’s early career can be gleaned from the letters of introduction she took with her in 1939, when she and her husband emigrated, from the institutions she was affiliated to in the hope of securing future acceptance and employment abroad.\(^{65}\) Reichmann’s first employment from 1921 was voluntary in the chambers of commerce of her hometown Oppeln. Subsequently she worked as a secretary from 1923-24 in Berlin, carrying out duties such as translating, preparing reports and editing documents. In 1924 she began her career at the Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens (CV), as secretary to the director Ludwig Holländer, at one of the largest Jewish representative organisations dedicated to protecting the civil rights of the German Jews and spearheading the legal and journalistic fight against antisemitism. She later worked for the C. V.-Zeitung until 1938, where she was appointed leading specialist for cultural issues, writing on cultural events, community life, political and ideological viewpoints, legal defence and welfare work.\(^{66}\) Her affiliation with this institution deepened when she married Hans Reichmann a CV syndic in 1930.

Reichmann published mainly in the C. V.-Zeitung and the intellectual and cultural periodical Der Morgen, appointed editor of the latter from 1933, at first jointly with Max Dienemann and then autonomously.\(^{67}\) She openly authored the majority of her articles and she preserved copies of her work from 1931 in her personal papers; earlier articles and particularly her editorial work are not so easily identifiable. It is difficult to gain a picture of her responsibilities and influence in the 1930s given the low level of general knowledge about the internal machinations and interrelations between the organisations she worked for. Within these she held dual roles: in her own capacity often as a board member and at the same time as a CV representative.\(^{68}\) Her widespread involvement and familiarity with the work of the core German-Jewish cultural

---

65 See correspondence, \textit{curriculum vitae} and references in Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBI, NY.

66 Eva G. Reichmann, untitled undated \textit{curriculum vitae} in German, Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBI, NY.

67 She published few articles in other periodicals and newspapers; one in English in \textit{B'nai B'rith} magazine, in the \textit{Süddeutsche Monatshef} and \textit{Deutsche Rundschauf}. Der Morgen was a publication affiliated to the CV but independently instigated by Julius and Margarete Goldstein in 1925. Following the death of Julius Goldstein changes were gradually made to the format and direction of Der Morgen to which Reichmann had a decisive input, see Eugen Fuchs (CV leader), ‘Zeugnis’, 31 December 1938, pp. 1-2, Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBI, NY.

68 According to her colleagues Reichmann worked for the Freie Jüdische Volkshochschule, Jüdisches Lehrhaus, Jüdischer Kulturbund, Jugend-Aliyah, Jewish Agency, Reichsvertretung der deutschen Juden, Jüdischer Frauenbund; see Ernst Gottfried Lowenthal, 'Die “Allgemeine” stellt vor (I): Eine Frau von Rang', \textit{Allgemeine Wochenzitung der Juden in Deutschland}, 26 November 1954 and references in Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBI, NY.
organisations, including the CV’s chief Jewish and non-Jewish opponents enabled her to gain a comprehensive picture of community life, events and debates during the 1930s. Colleagues and opponents held Reichmann in great esteem and her high position at the CV meant that her working relationship with her husband was closely entwined and remained so throughout most of her career. She worked with a small number of leading women at the CV in the 1930s, for example Cora Berliner, a board member, with responsibilities for youth and Margarete Edelheim, an editor of the C. V.-Zeitung, as well as many other female journalists. Reichmann emigrated with Hans in April 1939 at short notice following his release from detention at KZ Sachsenhausen. They planned to stay temporarily in Great Britain en route to the United States.

Hannah Arendt was born in 1906 in Hanover and grew up in Königsberg within an acculturated bourgeois Jewish family, unaware of her Jewish identity until of an age to notice public opinions. Arendt began her studies in 1924 at Marburg where she studied theology, philosophy and literature, completing her doctoral thesis with Karl Jaspers at the philosophy department of Heidelberg university on the concept of love and Saint Augustine. From graduation in 1928 until her emigration to Paris in 1933 Arendt published a number of articles which showed a broadening of interests away from a unique focus on philosophy into areas spanning several disciplines. She mainly wrote on non-Jewish topics and published book reviews addressing political, sociological and philosophical concerns and studies of philosophers.
Her intellectual stimuli during these years were very mixed politically and ideologically, as was the milieu she became part of in Paris. Arendt’s poles of orientation were not communal institutions but an eclectic and influential group of Jewish and non-Jewish intellectuals, such as her university mentors the philosophers Karl Jaspers and Martin Heidegger and personal friends like the leader of the German-Jewish Zionists Kurt Blumenfeld. The group of articles she published on German and Jewish relations centred on the Romantic period and in particular the female historical figure Rahel Varnhagen and her contemporaries, the so-called salon Jewesses of the late eighteenth century. She began work on the Rahel Varnhagen monograph around the time of the publication of her doctoral thesis between 1928 and 1929. It was completed in two stages: prior to her emigration in 1933 she had written a large part, adding the concluding two chapters in 1938, however it remained unpublished until 1957. Arendt also made her debut on the German-Jewish historical scene in one of the main German-Jewish historiographical periodicals of the time, publishing an article which dealt with German-Jewish intellectual history addressing: emancipation, assimilation and the ‘Jewish question’. Arendt went on to address the complex contemporary legacy of Jewish assimilation in an article on the need for a new conceptualisation for Jewish schools, reflecting on the contemporary deterioration of Jewish life in Germany and the exclusion of Jewish students.

In 1933 following the seizure of power by Hitler and the National Socialists, the deteriorating atmosphere and attitude towards political opponents and the Jewish
population, adversely and decisively affected their working lives and personal biographies. Reichmann’s defence work stepped up a level through her editorial role; Stern experienced barriers limiting her historical output. Arendt hurriedly left Germany following her arrest and subsequent release. This significantly disrupted her research activities and from then until 1941, when she emigrated to the United States of America, she published very few articles. Some manuscripts have been preserved from this period, for example a lecture she gave in Paris around 1937 on ‘Die Judenfrage’ [the Jewish question]. This is not to say that Arendt did not think, formulate and write during her refugee years but that the fruits of this period were not published until later. Her working commitments took a new turn in Paris, employed as General Secretary for Youth Aliyah which organised emigration to Palestine, the Jewish Agency for Palestine from 1935-39 and a special agent for the rescue of children from Austria and Czechoslovakia between 1938 and 1939. She married her second husband Heinrich Blücher in Paris in 1940 and later that year they were interned at Gurs concentration camp in southern France, finally fleeing for America in 1941.

1.2 German-Jewish history

The publications of Arendt and Stern during the 1920s and 1930s which deal with German-Jewish studies are almost entirely of a historical nature. These studies served to historically contextualise contemporary debate. They broadened knowledge and understanding of the German-Jewish historical legacy through their study of the Enlightenment, emancipation, assimilation and the ‘Jewish question’. Arendt, Reichmann and Stern contributed directly and indirectly, to contemporary debate on the synthesis of German and Jewish cultural heritage in Germany in the modern period, by

analysing Jewish responses at challenging conjunctures throughout history. Acting as multidisciplinary mediators of German-Jewish cultural, economic, political and social transformations in the modern period, they also presented an engendered Jewish intellectual past which contributed to the blurring of the boundaries between Geschichte [history] and Zeitgeschichte [contemporary history].

The motivation for each woman’s engagement with German-Jewish history shows different concerns and stimuli. For Reichmann and Stern historical contextualisation provided legitimacy and defence of the German-Jewish symbiosis past and present, presenting history as a direct continuum from the past through the present into the future. For Arendt the study of German-Jewish history raised problematic questions regarding Jewish emancipation and the nature of German and Jewish relations. Her discussion of the ‘historylessness’ of the Jews in the post-emancipation period was made more complex given her own contribution to German-Jewish intellectual history through her work on the figure of Rahel Varnhagen.

Their work majored on social, economic and ideological analysis of Jewish and non-Jewish interaction, giving varied space for cultural, intellectual, political, psychological and religious factors in their historical interpretations, contributing to the history of the transmission of ideas between these two groups. Their studies of the impact of the Enlightenment upon the generation of Jewish and non-Jewish proponents of emancipation use terms such as Judentum [Judaism, Jewishness or Jewry], Emanzipation [emancipation], Assimilation and the Judenfrage [Jewish question] which had a range of meanings imbued with the inflections of the German-Jewish debates of their own period, whose ideological standpoints they well knew. This polyvalence was not limited to the work of these intellectuals but each term would have been received in particular ways depending on the context in which they were deployed and reader

82 See Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, Hannah Arendt, for Love of the World, pp. 113-58.
responses. Stern’s methodology and ideological standpoint bear traces of several formative stages: university, response to the First World War, the Akademie and Taeubler’s historiographical ideas and methods. Her undertaking incorporated constitutional, economic, intellectual, legal, political, psychological and social factors, aimed at illuminating the ‘problematic meeting of Jewishness and Germanness’. This bestowed German-Jewish historical studies with greater capacity to contextualise the present. She berated the Russian-Jewish historian Simon Dubnow’s limited exploration of intellectual and political factors in his historical work, yet although she incorporated a multi-factorial approach in her wider writings, later applying this to her major historical studies, the aspiration remained to a certain extent a partially fulfilled ideological aspiration since she was not able to address these factors with equal degrees of depth.

In her studies of historical women a multi-factorial approach was developed perhaps most successfully.

It has been argued that Stern displayed the influence of conservative and hierarchical genres of historicism and presented the history of the elite

86 For example the polarised meaning of the term ‘assimilation’ can be read in the C. V.-Zeitung and Jüdische Rundschau. The Zionists viewed non-Zionist German Jews as negatively assimilated to German society, whereas the CV described assimilationists as those who completely gave up Judaism in all its forms. See also David Sorkin, ‘Emancipation and Assimilation. Two Concepts and their Application to German-Jewish History’, LBI Year Book, vol. XXXV (1990), pp. 17-33, particularly pp. 22-23.


[Herrschergeschichte] in both her non-Jewish and Jewish studies. Stern developed a focus on state histories and an elite group of politically and financially powerful historical agents in her doctoral thesis and various subsequent articles. This was replicated in her work on an economically, intellectually and socially assimilated Jewish elite. The reason for this could be explained by the fact that the Akademie could only strive to position itself on a par with mainstream historiography if it produced work that adhered to accepted methodological and ideological standards and academic genres. A similar tendency was visible in the topics presented as doctoral theses by many female students of history during this period. Constitutional, administrative, diplomatic and state histories were subject areas greatly outweighing topics that raised gendered themes or pushed at disciplinary boundaries.

Discussion of how the scholarship of the Akademie could directly contribute to the renewal of historical knowledge and German-Jewish self-formation in the wider community is evident in Stern’s writings. The reception of her two major publications: the first volume of Der preussische Staat und die Juden and Jud Süß sheds light on the resonance of her projection of German-Jewish historical synthesis and Jewish agency within scholarly and educational circles. Major reviews in the leading German-Jewish


93 It is difficult to gain a comparative feel for the overall approach of the Akademie to traditional mainstream academic disciplines, especially regarding Stern’s work within the historical section of the Akademie as there was only one other scholar working within this section: Yitzhak Fritz Baer, who published Fritz Baer, Das Protokollbuch der Landjudenschaft des Herzogtums Kleve (Berlin: Schwetschke, 1922). See David N. Myers, Re-Inventing the Jewish Past. European Jewish Intellectuals and the Zionist Return to History (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 109-128.


96 For a comprehensive collection of reviews of Der preussische Staat und die Juden see Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, UBB: C 2; for example E. Jacobson, ‘Der Preußische Staat und die Juden,
historical periodicals generally did not take issue with the portrayal of synthesis and
gave due respect to the magnitude of her archival sources. Even at the very end of the
1930s her work continued to be supported and praised by leading members of the
community, such as Leo Baeck and Otto Hirsch, despite her problematic
marginalisation of Jewish religious heritage and the subordinate place of inner-Jewish
developments in her writings. She considered emancipation was a ‘great releasing
idea’ present since the Middle Ages, which she contrasted with the negative portrayal of
a backward-looking religious Judaism.

Her analysis of the historical consequences of emancipation and assimilation
appear on the surface to be positive. She pinpointed the separate agencies of the two
phenomena. Emancipation had been achieved by forces outside Jewry, promoted by
prominent Jews such as Moses Mendelssohn and maintained by subsequent generations
of assimilationists, depicted in her studies of historical male and female figures. She
considered assimilation however an inner-Jewish phenomenon, entailing a complete
integration into German society; through the approximation to the culture, language and
customs of the surrounding society.

Stern’s positive portrayal of a German-Jewish synthesis in her analysis of male-
orientated history becomes more problematic when read against her presentation of a
Jewish destiny which surfaces in her analysis of the Jewess. Her work points towards
emancipation as a release from oppressive Jewishness and legal bondage. At the same

---

97 See Otto Krauske, ‘Stern, Selma: Der Preußische Staat und die Juden’, Monatschrift für Geschichte
98 Compare Otto Hirsch (Reichsvertretung der deutschen Juden), letter to Selma Stern-Taeubler, 2
August 1940, D 8, 72, and correspondence from Leo Baeck (1949-59), D 2, 1-29, Nachlass Selma
Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, UBB; see also Selma Stern, Der preussische Staat und die Juden, vol. I
(1962), p. XV. Stern remarks on the superficiality of female religious instruction throughout her
series of articles on historical Jewish women, see Selma Stern, ‘Die Entwicklung des jüdischen
1925), pp. 327-28; II. Der Frauentypus der Romanik’, Der Morgen, vol. I, no. 4 (October 1925),
excludes a discussion of inner-Jewish religious movements within her studies.
99 Compare Selma Stern, ‘Die Entwicklung des jüdischen Frauentypus seit dem Mittelalter – I. Der
Frauentypus des Ghetto’, Der Morgen, vol. I, no. 3 (August 1925), p. 325, with the subsequent three
parts, which show the radical impact of Jewish emancipation and consequently women’s
emancipation on the life of the German Jewess.
100 Selma Stern, ‘Probleme der Emanzipation und der Assimilation’, Der Morgen, vol. 7, no. 5
(December 1931), pp. 423-39.
und die Juden in 1920, she set herself two primary tasks: to examine the process of emancipation,
and secondly to track the process of assimilation, see Selma Stern, Der preussische Staat und die
time she presents two counter-currents: one imposed by the surrounding German society, the other, from within the individual’s spirit. Furthermore the proactive self-emancipation of the Jewess that she presented is configured as assimilation to male German society.\textsuperscript{102} Unlike Arendt in whose view a real ‘Jewish question’ was linked to a historical moment which had passed once the German Jew received legal emancipation and assimilated, Stern considered that the emancipation process was not yet complete.\textsuperscript{103} Yet there were limits to Stern’s positive view of assimilation and she questioned the form it took amongst the women of the Romantic period who developed a highly critical response to society: a destructive element she saw emerging among her own generation.\textsuperscript{104}

It has been suggested that Stern’s positive presentation of a synthesis of German and Jewish history had become ‘obsolete’ by 1933, proven to have failed by the events of the period, although during the 1930s and post-war she continued to portray this historical symbiosis in her writings.\textsuperscript{105} With the aid of Stern’s private papers Marina Sassenberg has made a case for a reading between the lines of Stern’s historiographical approach which shows a hesitancy to fully present an unproblematic portrayal of synthesis.\textsuperscript{106} This counters the view that Stern was really only interested in the German side of the German-Jewish synthesis, avoiding the Jewish and that she gave no place to the discussion of the significance of antisemitism.\textsuperscript{107} I question the view that Stern retreated to the study of German-Jewish history as a place of refuge from contemporary events, since in broad terms Stern’s historical monographs and articles had relevance


\textsuperscript{106} Marina Sassenberg, ‘Das Eigene in der Geschichte’, pp. 80-106.

due to their central concepts being newly questioned at that time. A direct example of this is ‘Probleme der Emanzipation und der Assimilation’ [problems of emancipation and assimilation] given as a lecture at Heidelberg, which has the unusual feature of a list of dialogically posed but unanswered questions for writer, audience and reader to consider. Stern’s symbiotic approach to German-Jewish historiography also played a part in the realm of defence and enlightenment, giving examples of Jews as key contributors to German culture, economy and state history from the Renaissance and Reformation periods to women’s emancipation.

Her use of Jewish historical figures as role models, pioneers and legitimising antecedents can be seen as a response to contemporary circumstances, to defend German Jewry, serving to strengthen and guide her Jewish readers and counter anti-Jewish attitudes. She presents figures such as Joseph Süß Oppenheimer and the so-called mercantilist court Jews as agents who influenced the changing relations between the German state and the Jews during the centuries before the intervention of Enlightenment philosophy and intellectuals such as Moses Mendelssohn who championed Jewish emancipation. This ran counter to the popular tendency around the 200th anniversary of Mendelssohn’s death to elevate the agency of Jewish intellectuals. Stern’s historical studies de-accentuated philosophical and ideological factors, emphasising the social interactions of economics and trade as catalysts of change, preparing the way for the Enlightenment and emancipation.

---


112 Compare Stern’s writings on Moses Mendelssohn with other studies in the commemorative volume
thesis of Stern’s identification of Jewish precursors was to suggest inherent qualities and beliefs within the Jewish tradition which prefigured later German cultural, humanist and philosophical values. This is particularly visible in Stern’s representation of Jewish women as forerunners of women’s emancipation and Jewish emancipation in general.113

Arendt was critical of the misuse and misrepresentation of historical figures to give legitimacy to a contemporary cause or ideology, highlighted in an article on the appropriation of the work of the philosopher and political economist Adam Müller by contemporaries.114 Although Arendt studied historical figures as ‘examples’, she considered that historical ‘models’ [Vorbilder] could not be copied, as history was made up of unique occurrences.115 Reichmann’s work tended not to single out individuals as pioneers; the historical models she evokes were more general. She was not interested in individual occurrences but their ‘historical meaning’.116 Referring to epochs and communities throughout Jewish history, whose diasporic existence had been faced with dissolution, she compared for example the challenge of Jewish education and self-formation in the late 1930s with the task which had faced scholars to preserve the continuity of Jewish study in the ‘obscure and dark impenetrable period of Jewish history, in Jabne in the first Christian century’.117

The study of German-Jewish historical subjects developed concurrently, as Arendt grew more political from the late 1920s.118 The prime example of this is the inherent Zionist critique of assimilation which Arendt herself flagged up in her major historical research project on the Romantic social interactions of the Jewess Rahel Varnhagen within the sphere of Berlin salon society.119 There is a tendency however in interpretive

scholarship on this monograph to consider it simply as a precursor and sounding board for Arendt’s later philosophical and political ideas, developed during the early 1940s and extended in the post-war period.\(^{120}\) For example her use of the tropes: ‘pariah’ and ‘parvenu’, which later took shape as a result of her experiences of displacement and statelessness from the late 1930s.\(^ {121}\) This obscures the wider intellectual context of Arendt’s analysis of Rahel Varnhagen’s life; evident when read in parallel with the small number of other studies on German-Jewish historical and philosophical questions Arendt wrote at the time she was working on this project.

Arendt’s work on Jewish emancipation and the ‘Jewish question’ since the Enlightenment analysed the relationship between the historical and philosophical theses of Christian Wilhelm Dohm, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, Johann Gottfried von Herder and the course of emancipation.\(^ {122}\) Her analysis of the role humanist philosophy played in shaping the Enlightenment debate on the ‘Jewish question’ starkly contrasted with the irrational, unenlightened völkisch [nationalist] ideology of antisemitism of the 1930s.\(^ {123}\) Like Stern she emphasised the German Jew’s passivity during the emancipation process, locating the ‘Jewish question’ as one externally posed by non-Jews, whose ‘formulations and answers’ had determined Jewish behaviour and assimilation.\(^ {124}\) Despite this, her reading of the affinity between Rahel Varnhagen and the polymath Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and the positive recognition she gave the

---


\(^ {123}\) Compare ibid. with Hannah Arendt, ‘Die Judenfrage’, lecture manuscript, Paris (circa 1937), pp. 1-4, Speeches and Writings File, 1923-1975, Essays and Lectures, HAP, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. In the latter, Arendt stated that antisemitism in 1930s Germany (and Spain) no longer had any real historical basis unlike the ‘Jewish question’ during the emancipation period.

humanist philosophy of Lessing emphasised and reclaimed alternative German cultural traditions of the past which contrasted with the anti-Jewish philosophies of the day that claimed competing historical legitimacy.\(^{125}\)

She acknowledged the negative impact of Herder’s historiographical legacy on those who called for emancipation and assimilation. This brought Jewish history to bear on society’s view of Jewish difference, so that the historical foreignness of the Jewish collective was emphasised.\(^{126}\) Through the case study of Rahel Varnhagen she considered the way the assimilating Jew negotiated this fundamental historical problem within the context of the Enlightenment spirit of Bildung [self-formation]. Rahel’s struggle throughout her life shows a woman who sought to disassociate herself from Jewish history by assimilating the ‘foreign history’ of the surrounding society – German history. Arendt poignantly concludes the study however with Rahel’s realisation at the end of her life that she had, in fact, been unable to escape her Jewishness, instead she had become more strongly aware of the Jewish biblical heritage and historical traditions.\(^{127}\)

In Arendt’s view, the long-term effect of this desire to achieve such disconnection from Jewish history was present during the 1930s in the ‘division, atomisation and cut-off-ness of German Jewry from the rest of the Jewish people’.\(^{128}\) Four years into Arendt’s sojourn in Paris she directly addressed antisemitism. Her analysis critiqued the complex Jewish adoption of German ideologies, historical and philosophical traditions that she considered accounted for German Jewry’s apathy towards contemporary antisemitism. In her view the events of 1933 ‘hit numerous individual Jews but not a Jewry’; a collective Jewish identity had only come about due to being ‘confirmed and constructed by us, by the grace of the Nazis’. The main focus of her commentary was ‘T’schuwah’ – the return to Jewish cultural and religious identity which the events of 1933 prompted among German Jewry. She warned against the associated pursuit of ‘our

\(^{125}\) In 1933 on the occasion of the Jüdischer Kulturbund’s Berlin premier of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s play *Nathan der Weise* (published originally in 1779), it was remarked however that the decision to stage the play was in no way intended to teach the German people about ‘real German spirit’, see Herbert Freeden, *Jüdisches Theater in Nazideutschland* (Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, 1985), p. 27, quoting from *Jüdische Rundschau*, 25 July 1933.


own and completely independent history and culture’. Viewing this tendency as ‘an illusion, which was very understandable’ on two accounts: ‘because a stepping outside the European cultural community would be at the price of a rebarbarisation’ and secondly because she considered one’s own history could only wield fighting strength if it were formulated as a ‘political history’, although the ‘“airless room”’ which Germany had become made this a difficult task.

She recognised the historical implications of the heightened self-awareness of recent times, which had the potential to enable ‘the reconnection of German Jewry with the destiny of the whole Jewish people’. Arendt stressed the contemporary need to reclaim the Jewish past if the present was to be understood. She elevated Lessing’s concept of history over Herder’s as more useful and productive for German Jewry, specifically highlighting two functions of history which Lessing projected: its ‘eternal search for the truth’ and function as ‘the educator of mankind’. The view that history could act as an educator seems to underlie Arendt’s criticism of Jewish disconnectedness and apathy towards German antisemitism. In a key periodical for German-Jewish history she presented a survey of the historiographical background to the pressing contemporary problematics of Jewish ‘historylessness’, concluding that out of the ‘foreignness of history’ German Jewry had developed its own legitimate historiography since the later part of the nineteenth century. As an outsider to German-Jewish historiographical circles, in this single article Arendt launched herself onto the German-Jewish academic scene. She pointed to the beginnings of this process with the first generation of scholars of Wissenschaft des Judentums, under the aegis of the pioneer scholar Leopold Zunz, for whom history had become a ‘special and legitimate theme’ in Jewish thinking and most significantly a political act. Arendt’s footnoted reference to these scholars suggests she considered their scholarship had had the potential to reconnect German Jewry with world Jewish history. Reviewing the contemporary status of Jewish history Arendt observed that ‘we [Jews] in our own history are hopelessly dependent on the history of our surroundings’. She saw antisemitism as the ‘classic example’ of this.

---

130 Hannah Arendt-Stern, op. cit., p. 77.
131 Ibid.
The study of Rahel she produced shows signs of this two-fold tension: between studying German-Jewish history within the context of wider Jewish history and the need to study German and Jewish history in parallel. She focuses on the interaction between the inner-Jewish and external interactions of Rahel. Whilst reclaiming Rahel’s Jewishness, she depicted her relationship with German high-society through male salon figures.\textsuperscript{133} Arendt’s differentiation between the problematics of ‘Jewish assimilation’ and externally directed emancipation is not that far from Stern’s differentiation between ‘Jewish problems’ and the externally imposed ‘Jewish question’.\textsuperscript{134}

One benefit Arendt highlighted of pursuing German-Jewish history rather than mutually exclusive Jewish or German history was the fact that parallels became visible between former anti-Jewish sentiments and those of the present day, serving to alert German Jewry to contemporary insecurity and shake off apathy. She saw links between the anti-Jewish polemics of 1802 and those of the 1930s, whereby the Jews were accused of being bearers of Enlightenment, highlighting historical connections between assimilation and antisemitism.\textsuperscript{135} Arendt’s contribution to German-Jewish historiography combined both German and Jewish history in her treatment of Rahel and her generation of Jewish assimilationists. Her study is not an example of an isolationist Jewish history, but shows the tensions evident in her 1937 lecture, which promoted the reinsertion of the German-Jewish into international Jewish historiography. Her work contextualised Rahel within German society, whilst reclaiming her Jewishness from the de-judaising historical representations carried out primarily by her non-Jewish husband, who had edited out Rahel’s Jewish connections from her diaries and correspondence.\textsuperscript{136}

In the post-war publication of \textit{Rahel Varnhagen} Arendt contributed to the textual preservation of documents illuminating these relationships through the appended reproductions of correspondence.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{137} See Hannah Arendt, \textit{Rahel Varnhagen. The Life of a Jewess}, pp. 195-216. This selection of correspondence was amplified in later editions; see for example the collection appended to Hannah
Reichmann’s methodological and ideological formation stemmed from her broad university education, including sociology under Franz Oppenheimer, national economics, literature and history. Her study of German-Jewish history primarily arose from her observation of contemporary Jewish life, evident in her journalism, particularly on the ‘Jewish question’, to contextualise the present by exploring the historical influences on the worsening position of German Jewry in the 1920s and 1930s was vital.\(^{138}\) Her historiographical awareness however stretched beyond the Enlightenment and incorporated a discussion of the historical legacy of the Jewish diaspora since biblical times. For Reichmann the historical juncture in which German Jewry found itself in the 1930s demanded the search for the historical meaning of the present, which placed it in a continuum leading from the past to the future.\(^{139}\) An understanding of the significance and relevance of Jewish history strengthened Jewish identity and existence. Reichmann wrote:

we know again what it means to be a Jew and stay a Jew. Faith, pride and dignity – of course! But also knowledge, learning, historical consciousness and religion as life not as an additional ballast for ceremonies.\(^{140}\)

Although Reichmann’s view of Jewish existence was deeply historical, at the same time it transcended history by its eternal, metaphysical duty to ‘uphold the eternal values of human civilised behaviour’, epitomised in her quotation of Leo Baeck’s view that Jewry was ‘the unancient in the ancient world, the unmodern in the modern world’


and so it should remain

the weak one in the world of power struggles, the unpoltitical in the world of
politics [...] the great nonconformist in history [...] the great anachronism. 141

She considered the increasing realisation of what German Jewry had risked by trusting
the emancipation process and how attempts to reclaim Jewish culture and identity
confirmed the loss of Judaism. Both realisations in her opinion made German Jewry
‘shrewd regarding the curves of Jewish history’ and well placed to ‘observe the paths of
development taken by Jewries in other countries’. 142 Central to this awareness was the
acknowledgement that each generation was responsible for the continued existence and
the form of future world Jewry. 143

The concept of the German-Jewish community as a Schicksalgemeinschaft
[community bound by a common destiny] raised key questions for Reichmann’s
generation regarding Jewry’s passive and active role in its own history. 144 Despite the
encouragement to be found in the study of previously challenged diasporic
communities, a more personal insight into Reichmann’s view of Jewish existence in the
1930s is provided by reflections upon the apparent powerlessness and passivity of
human fate at the hands of ‘world history’ – not directed by the will of mankind but
subject to higher forces. 145 All three women personally and publicly promoted an active
intellectual engagement with the debates of the period and the exigencies of day-to-day
life. Reichmann’s personal contribution to these debates combined optimism and hope
with realism. 146 Despite the ‘searching, longing, suffering, trouble, fight, competition’

---

142 E. R.-L., ‘Judentum in der Welt’, Der Morgen, vol. XI, nos. 6/7 (September/October 1935), pp. 241-
44, reprinted in Eva G. Reichmann, Größe und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz, pp. 66-69,
here pp. 66, 68. See also Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Vom Sinn deutsch-jüdischen Seins’, in op. cit., pp. 57-
59.
143 Reichmann continually emphasised Jewish social responsibility which transcended party politics
enjoining diasporic German Jewry and Jewish settlement in Palestine. See Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Der
144 See Michael Brenner, The Renaissance of the Jewish Culture in Weimar Germany, p. 40; and Robert
vol. X, no. 42, 16 October 1931, pp. 495-96, written in response to an article published by
Brunner in the August volume of the Preußischen Jahrbücher, reprinted in Eva G. Reichmann,
Größe und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz, pp. 33-37, here p. 36; and Eva G. Reichmann,
Der Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens, in op. cit., pp. 22-32.
Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz, p. 48, and Eva Reichmann-Jungmann, ‘Diaspora als
146 See for example Reichmann’s analysis of the possibilities which Palestine provided for emigrating
German Jews, marked by a realism based on practical limitations: Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Diaspora als
she considered it was a ‘fruitful tension in competition with a differently directed environment’ which had ‘kept the will strong and the powers alive’ preserving Jewry thus far.\footnote{Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Vom Sinn deutsch-jüdischen Seins’, in Eva G. Reichmann, \textit{Größe und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz}, p. 56.}

In her writings she gave full support to the dual cultivation of Germanness and Jewishness at the centre of CV ethos and reflected on the history of the ideology and work of the CV over the 40 years since its establishment. A transition could be traced from spearheading justice against antisemitism to cultivating unswerving German consciousness, acting as a bulwark against falling away from Judaism.\footnote{Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Der Centra1verein deutscher Staatsbtirger jüdischen Glaubens’, in \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 22-32; Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Vom Sinn deutsch-jüdischen Seins’, in \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 48-49; also Eva Reichmann-Jungmann, ‘Am Quell der Ideologien’, \textit{C. V.-Zeitung}, vol. XVI, no. 18, 6 May 1937, p. 6.} She saw the ‘historical meaning’ of the CV as keeping non-Zionist German Jewry, German and Jewish considering it a unique organisation within Western Jewry for nurturing Jewish self-consciousness in conjunction with a sense of patriotism and belonging to the country of residence.\footnote{Eva G. Reichmann-Jungmann, ‘Die Ahwehr einer “Ahwehr” Gemeindezionismus gegen C.V.’, \textit{C. V.-Zeitung}, vol. IX, no. 11, 14 March 1930, pp. 133-35, here pp. 134-35.} She described her vision of the dual German-Jewish path as one not just taken for a ‘Jewish reason’ but in order to ‘maintain our Germanness’ which is an ‘indestructible, invaluable heritage’.\footnote{M. A. Loeb and Dr. Eva Jungmann, ‘Die Abwehr einer “Abwehr”’, \textit{C. V.-Zeitung}, vol. IX, no. 11, 14 March 1930, pp. 133-35, here pp. 134-35.} Just as she railed against giving up Judaism, she considered to give up one’s Germanness meant also to give up a valuable part of oneself.

Reichmann’s view of assimilation had a number of levels. She shared the CV’s opposition to the Zionist anti-assimilationist critique. In her work there was also a strong repudiation of assimilation as a total rejection of Judaism through the adoption of alternative philosophical and political ideologies, exemplified in the arguments of opponents such as the German-Jewish philosopher Constantin Brunner.\footnote{Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Größe und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz’, p. 56.} Reichmann

pinpoints some common negative results of Jewish assimilation to bourgeois values: the desire to know how things will turn out, coupled with an unwillingness to sacrifice comfort. This 'spiritual attitude' she labelled as 'most bourgeois and unhelpful' and disassociated this 'self-satisfaction and immovability' from the CV.\textsuperscript{152} Her insistence on fighting apathy towards anti-Jewish feeling and developing self-criticality amongst her readers was sharpened by her reading of German-Jewish history in which she questioned whether Jewry had become 'too dull, too satisfied and self-conscious' having seen 'the development of history too one-sidedly that we could believe in any shake-ups'.\textsuperscript{153} For Reichmann, emancipation's 'failures' occurred from both sides: through German society's inability to foster social emancipation following Jewish legal emancipation and Jewry's struggle to find a balance between assimilation to German culture whilst maintaining Jewishness.\textsuperscript{154} In her view there was a correlation between the move into 'bourgeois freedom and away from Jewish normative life [...] wherever Jewish strife [Judennot] ends, the strife of Judaism [Not des Judentums] begins'.\textsuperscript{155}

She saw 'our Judaism' as the constant element of Jewish existence giving 'an inner support' and hope for a continued existence, even in German Jewry's situation of 'inner uprootedness' amidst the turmoil of the 1930s.\textsuperscript{156} The precise signification of 'Judaism' is undefined by Reichmann. She hints at various constituent elements in her writings and maintained a broad meaning in order to maintain a wide appeal among German Jewry.\textsuperscript{157} However the significance which two elements held for Reichmann: religious Jewish identity and cultural heritage seem to surface frequently in her work, despite the fact that throughout her career she always deferred the discussion of theology and religious matters to those who were trained specialists.\textsuperscript{158} She reproached

\textsuperscript{156} Eva G. Reichmann, 'Vom Sinn deutsch-jüdischen Seins', in Eva G. Reichmann, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{157} The only description Reichmann gave of Judaism was a collective rather than a personal definition: "our concept of Judaism incorporates more [...] we affirm in it all its religious, ethical and spiritual content", in Eva G. Reichmann, 'Der "Untergang des Judentums"', in Eva G. Reichmann, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{158} See her reference to her lack of theological expertise in her review of Ignaz Maybaum, \textit{Parteibefreites Judentum – Lehrende Führung und priesterliche Gemeinschaft} (Berlin: Philo Verlag, 1935), in Eva Reichmann-Jungmann, 'Wegweiser zur Gemeinschaft', \textit{C. V.-Zeitung}, 22 November
German Jewry for forsaking Judaism since emancipation, questioning:

who still knew something of our holy books, who knew our Jewish history,
who still kept our beautiful, intimate, old customs? Who carried his Judaism
other than as an un abandonable tired destiny, who experienced it still as a
loving, too structuring, creative force? 159

Sensitised to the ideological uses of Jewish history by different Jewish factions, Reichmann herself employed the historical relationship between diaspora and Palestine to support the CV call to German and international Jewry, to support the establishment of Jewish society in Palestine. 160 In refutation of assimilationist and Zionist revisionist arguments she asserted that the ‘highest intellectual heritage’ had been achieved in the Jewish diaspora and not in a Jewish nationalist state, citing the example of Babylonian exile which enabled Jewish life to be replanted in Palestine through Ezra and Nehemiah. 161 This challenged the Zionist reading of diaspora history which used the present situation in Germany to prove the ‘general destiny of galuth [exile]’, stating that ‘everywhere and always in Jewish history periods of advancement and fall took turns’, placing all periods ‘in connection with a return to Zion’. 162

A second area of Zionist historical interpretation she challenged was the ‘unanimous defamation of the emancipation period’ in order to ‘save the Jewish person from shock by devaluing what has been lost’. 163 She considered the view in certain Zionist circles that emancipation was an ‘aberration’ said much about the spirit of the moment. Such attitudes were ‘only too comprehensible’ due to feelings of ‘disappointment and helplessness’. Reichmann considered however that ‘feelings are not good as evidence of historical philosophies’; especially when used to make ‘unscientific’ judgements about emancipation. 164

Alongside her defence of the positive achievements of emancipation and German-
Jewish synthesis, Reichmann engaged in another significant area of historical analysis:

163 Ibid.
the origins and development of antisemitism in Germany. Interpretations she made during the 1930s remained central to the analysis put forward in her major post-war study of antisemitism Hostages of Civilisation. She highlighted the impact of changes to state politics at the end of the nineteenth century: nationalism, the turbulent experience of the First World War, economic crises, political confusion and fragile stability bought at the price of ‘gigantic employment expenditure by the individual and the whole of society’ and the soulless industrial and economic rationalisation which she considered had been detested for its dehumanising effects. Humanist ideals had been overthrown in the turn from state-political spirit and natural law to a ‘new ideal of national unity’. The individual and humanity had failed and now demanded a ‘materially founded crutch’: this crutch being the ideology of Volkstum [German national traditions]. Both German and Jew were affected by those changes and Reichmann unquestionably considered that, the more the Jew’s adherence to the German people was being challenged, the more closely ‘they turned to their love of the German homeland, to the German language and to the German intellectual heritage’. The CV response to the direct challenge of nationalist antisemitism which questioned how the ‘foreign [volksfremd]’ Jew was to be integrated within the German people, pointed to the ‘century-long rootedness on German soil’ and German-Jewish achievements in all areas of German culture. Uncovering the forces within nationalism which demanded the exclusion of German Jews as evidence of social, political and moral degeneration.

Reichmann emphasises examples of active Jewish historical agency such as
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166 The analyses of antisemitism and National Socialism she gave did not explicitly utilise or cite contemporary academic studies. This cumbersome approach was out of place within her writings which were first and foremost journalistic opinion pieces. When one considers, however, the bibliography which accompanies the report she and Hans Reichmann made in the 1940s, forming the basis for her later monograph, it is clear that she drew on a large established body of scholarship produced in the 1920s and 1930s. See Hans and Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Preliminary Bibliography of the Second Part: The Causes of the Catastrophe’, 1-7, Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 9, LBJA, NY and Eva G. Reichmann, Hostages of Civilisation. The Social Sources of National Socialist Anti-Semitism (London: Victor Gollancz, 1950), pp. 268-77.
168 Ibid., p. 28.
169 Ibid., p. 29.
Jewish achievements in the political realm and suggests reactivity rather than passivity as a dominant force in Jewish history.\(^{170}\) Jewish interaction with the philosophy of the Enlightenment and intervention for the emancipation cause are key historical moments in her depiction of the contribution of German Jewry to German culture, society and politics. She pointed to the intellectual Gabriel Riesser, whose dual activities included his work as a member of the Frankfurt parliament pioneering a united German Reich alongside promoting the ‘liberation of the Jews in Germany’ and other Jewish intellectuals and politicians engaged with Jewish concerns, humanist and democratic values; men engaged in narrowing the gap between ‘legal and social constitutions of the Jewish question’.\(^{171}\) Male Jewish proponents of German and Jewish values were not however the only historical agents who caught the attention of these female scholars.

### 1.3 An engendered past

Increasingly throughout the first decades of the twentieth-century female historical figures, women’s emancipation and contemporary issues affecting German-Jewish women became topical subjects of scholarly publications, opinion pieces and lectures. Female agency was presented by female and male writers for a wide readership.\(^{172}\) In the work of Arendt, Reichmann and Stern their approach to gendered subjects and female historical figures came from very different perspectives, yet the issues which their female protagonists grappled with were often close to those of their own generation; exploring the possibilities for a female cultural, intellectual and political contribution to Jewish and women’s emancipation.\(^{173}\) Arendt and Stern shared a common interest in historical figures whose sphere of influence and public voice reached beyond the home, illuminating the historical gender dynamics of Jewish and

---


172 For example Heinrich Berl, ‘Judentum und Feminismus’, *Menorah*, vol. 9 (1931), pp. 363-73, and ‘Aus der Geschichte der jüdischen Frau’, *Menorah*, vol. 9 (1931), pp. 119-24. See also work on the women of the Romantic period by Bertha Badi-Strauss, *Jüdinnen* (Berlin: Goldstein, 1937) and Margarete Susman, *Frauen der Romantik* (Jena: Diederichs, 1929). Periodicals dedicated to a female readership such as *Der Frau* and *Blätter des Jüdischen Frauenbundes* contained articles on all nature of women’s issues, also publications such as the multi-confessional *Die Kreatur* and Martin Buber’s *Der Jude* frequently published the work of female scholars.

non-Jewish relations. Reichmann’s brief treatment of the contemporary role of women was rooted in the wider discourse regarding the agency of Jewish men and women and the German-Jewish community’s ability to withstand and constructively respond to marginalisation, persecution and emigration.

In ‘Originale Assimilation’ an article evolved from Arendt’s Rahel Varnhagen studies, she drew a direct parallel between her historical subject and the problems of German Jewry in 1930s Germany. She discussed the viability of assimilation through the lens of a group of Jewish women of the Romantic period. The collective focus prompts a gendered questioning of the beneficiaries of legal emancipation – men. Although the assimilation of all Jews was called for, the most frequently considered case studies of problematic assimilation have tended to focus on the Jewess, as Arendt’s own study affirms. She made a simple distinction between the different social and economic status of the Jew and Jewess in the aftermath of emancipation:

In the salon the men step back […] it is the women who achieve real social assimilation as they have time, the men are too busy with the economic side of business.

The Jewess remained subject to the economic and political inequalities of patriarchal German society and Arendt’s examples highlight the only sphere in which they could assimilate, through social interactions with non-Jewish men, shaped by gender and their

174 Sassenberg suggests that Stern was also searching on a personal level for role models of marriage that combined love and intellectual parity: see Marina Sassenberg, ‘Das Eigene in der Geschichte’, p. 74.
175 Reichmann did not study women of the past and only really engaged with the contemporary woman’s role in conjunction with the establishment of Palestine. See for example: –m, ‘Die Lehnitzer Tagung des J. F. B.’, C. V.-Zeitung, vol. XVII, no. 14, supplement no. 3, 7 April 1938, pp. 11-12.
177 Female historical subjects, in particular the women of the Romantic period were widely studied among this generation of female scholars, for example: Margarete Susman, ‘Rahel’, Der Morgen, vol. 4, no. 2 (1928), pp. 118-38; Margarete Susman, Frauen der Romantik (Jena: Diederichs, 1929); Bertha Badi-Strauss, Jüdininnen. This phenomenon is discussed in detail in Barbara Hahn and Ursula Isselstein, (eds.) Rahel Levin Varnhagen. Die Wiederentdeckung einer Schriftstellerin (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987) and Barbara Hahn, Die Judin Paullus Athene, pp. 75-98. A number of male writers also began to address women’s roles in Jewish history, for example Salomon Schechter, ‘Die Frau im Temple und in der Synagoge’, Der Jude, vol. VIII (1924), pp. 523-39, and Max Freudenthal, ‘Die Mutter Moses Mendelssohns’, Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland, vol. I, no. 3 (October 1929), pp. 192-200.
178 This is most evident in the condensed article written from Arendt’s manuscript on Rahel Varnhagen: Hannah Arendt, ‘Originale Assimilation. Ein Nachwort zu Rahel Varnhagens 100. Todestag’, Jüdische Rundschau, nos. 28/29, 7 April 1933, p. 143.
179 Hannah Arendt, Rahel Varnhagen. Lebensgeschichte einer deutschen Jüdin aus der Romantik, p. 41.
Jewish identities.

Although emancipation was granted the Jews as a collective, Arendt addressed female Jewish emancipation through her discussion of the citizen’s dilemma during the Romantic period and Rahel’s identification with Goethe’s literary figure Wilhelm Meister. 180 Arendt wrote that the male ‘citizen [Bürger]’ was no longer a member of a class, therefore he could no longer represent something, only present what he had; not a public man but a ‘private individual [Privatmann]’. 181 In this way Wilhelm Meister feared he was no longer publicly visible, so he learned to present himself by becoming a public person through self-formation and instruction from people who stood outside society. 182 Arendt thereby emphasised the ‘duality’ of ‘bourgeois existence’: at the same time he was a ‘citizen of the state’ and ‘private individual’. The Jewess was neither and Arendt’s reference to Rahel’s identification with this literary figure serves to emphasise the more complex situation of Rahel: a Jew, a woman but not a ‘citizen’. 183

Arendt appears to make two readings of Goethe’s figure. In ‘Originale Assimilation’ she seems to imply that Rahel like Wilhelm Meister assimilated socially through salon life, whereas in the monograph Rahel Varnhagen, The Life of a Jewess the subject of that literary comparison appears to be Count Finckenstein rather than Rahel. This emphasises a different form of assimilation, that of the nobility who learned like Wilhelm Meister how to become citizens ‘through those who stand outside of society’. 184 In the context of the marginal space of the salon Rahel became a catalyst enabling Finckenstein and others to learn how to present themselves publicly. This points to the central thesis of her interpretation of the life of Rahel which was not fully explored until the completed work was published in 1958: Rahel’s realisation that her Jewishness was inescapable and that salon life only provided short-term social

183 Ibid., p. 44.
acceptance. \(^{185}\) Arendt presented the salon as a ‘chance and justification’ for the protagonist, albeit a fleeting and contended social forum in which she found temporary secure ground and recognition. \(^{186}\) As the cultural phenomenon of the salon faded she had to find other ways not to be ‘passed over by history’. \(^{187}\)

Arendt noted that the ‘Women Problem’, which she described as ‘the discrepancy between that which men expect of women and that which they can give or expect’ was irreconcilable among Rahel’s generation. \(^{188}\) Rahel’s fear of being passed over by history had as much to do with being a woman as a Jew, yet Arendt makes the sole focus of her study the inescapability of Rahel’s Jewishness not the inescapability of female inequality. \(^{189}\) For Arendt the salon Jewess is treated first and foremost as a Jew by society, whereas in Stern’s work the historical Jewess is primarily treated according to gender. Rahel’s sense of her own lack of history made her strive for a place and voice in German history with the only tools she had: her intellect, character and originality. Arendt wrote: ‘To have an opinion in the world was a factor of assimilation’; this presumed an audience and was a highly active rather than passive social and public interaction. \(^{190}\) Rahel was a woman who sought to share herself with others, just as intellectuals in Arendt’s time were using their voices in the public sphere. There was certainly proximity between Arendt and Rahel, especially in their intellectual questions. Arendt expressed this in the statement that Rahel was her ‘closest friend, though she has been dead for some one hundred years’. \(^{191}\)

Arendt offers a strongly gendered reading of Jewish assimilation. Despite this she did not explicitly explore the interrelations between non-Jewish men and Jewish women of the salon milieu using gender as an analytical criterion. She emphasises the point that although assimilation was an individual process, the form this took amongst the
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185 See the concluding two chapters of Rahel Varnhagen on the end of Rahel’s life following the demise of the salons: Hannah Arendt, Rahel Varnhagen, The Life of a Jewess, pp. 162-85.
186 Hannah Arendt, ‘Originale Assimilation. Ein Nachwort zu Rahel Varnhagens 100. Todestag’, Jüdische Rundschau, nos. 28/29, 7 April 1933, p. 143. Hahn has recently queried the existence and form of the salon world within which Rahel moved, which she has argued was a mythical construction: see Barbara Hahn, Die Judin Pallas Athene, pp. 75-98.
187 Hannah Arendt, ibid.
daughters of wealthy and leading intellectual Jewish families of the Romantic period was shaped by non-Jewish men. Stern also elevated Jewish women to the archetypal position of mediators of culture, although limiting the social sphere of Rahel and her generation, describing it as a private world of ‘relatives, friends and acquaintances’ rather than a fully public domain.\textsuperscript{192} Arendt’s analysis followed Rahel’s internalisation and original creation as she responded to male-driven ideologies and culture.\textsuperscript{193} For her the salon women acted not just as recipients of those influences but as agents by which cultural and intellectual mediation of the worldview of the period, created by male intellectuals, was transmitted within salon circles and beyond to those in the margins of German society. The response of Rahel Varnhagen and Pauline Wiesel to the writings of Goethe sheds light on his reception during this period and on the way women from the Jewish tradition received and legitimised their assimilated German heritage by identifying with contemporary German literary culture.\textsuperscript{194}

Each salon figure achieved assimilation by different means: Henriette Herz through education, Dorothea Schlegel through her assimilation to her husband Friedrich von Schlegel’s personal ideology, rather than that of the Romantic movement and the Meyer sisters who tried to integrate themselves into high society.\textsuperscript{195} Arendt saw proof of their success in the common fact that they knew how to erase their Jewish traces. Arendt’s omission of a similar discussion of Jewish male assimilation left unanswered, comparative questions regarding gendered identity formation and social acceptance. Besides baptism which was an option for both genders, intermarriage was an additional means by which the Jewess could exclusively change her Jewish identity and social standing.

The title of Arendt’s essay ‘Originale Assimilation’ might well have had a question mark added to it. Although she primarily focused on the bankruptcy of assimilation, Arendt suggested that Rahel was not typical of the assimilationists of her


generation, yet she was 'exemplary of a situation which was not just her own'.

Arendt's subjects all wanted to leave Judaism, Rahel differed from her contemporaries in that she did not achieve this and remained an outsider, conscious that as a pariah she had lived an authentic life. Arendt judged Rahel's 'originality' positively, as an example of her critical awareness of the problematic of her assimilation. Redeemed from destructive individualism by focusing on the positive originality and independence of Rahel as a pariah rather than a parvenu, concepts which Arendt developed once she had left Germany. Arendt's critique of the individuality of each woman's assimilation, referring to them as 'unique cases', is made clearer when read alongside her criticism of the disunity and unconnectedness of German Jewry voiced in a 1937 lecture.

Stern's historical studies incorporated her research interest in the biographies of great men and women following her doctoral study. As well as her work on statesmen and rulers: Anacharsis Cloots and Herzog Wilhelm von Braunschweig, she produced shorter studies on lesser-known female and male historical figures in which the tension between male and female centred histories was balanced. She contributed as a freelance writer to Die Frau, a periodical devoted to a female readership until her post at the Akademie began. The articles she published reflected her academic specialisms: European relations and German state history in the modern period, presenting subjects similar to those explored in articles she published in mainstream academic periodicals. In addition she contributed further historical studies on female figures to
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201 Stern's diary entry is cited by Marina Sassenberg, 'Der andere Blick auf die Vergangenheit', in Marina Sassenberg, Apropos Selma Stern, pp. 18, 22.
202 Stern published a number of articles in Die Frau from 1914-19. See the articles collected amongst her papers in Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, UBB for a fairly comprehensive bibliographic list of publications during this period.
203 Selma Stern, 'Der britische Imperialismus', Die Frau: Monatsschrift für das gesamte Frauenleben unserer Zeit, vol. 21 (November 1914), pp. 95-104; Selma Stern, 'Sophie Kurfürstin von Hannover:
non-gender specific periodicals. The subject of Stern’s first historical women’s study addressed Sophie Kurfürstin von Hannover [Electress of Hanover] who ‘commanded for herself a place in the pantheon of history’ and whom Stern placed alongside ‘the great personalities, who shaped the seventeenth century’; listing Ludwig XIV, the great elector princes, Oliver Cromwell, Peter the Great, William III of Orange and Charles XII.

In 1919 Stern’s Akademie appointment provided a decisive shift from non-Jewish to German-Jewish historical topics. A continuous biographical thread remained present in her academic studies: in her study of Joseph Süß Oppenheimer and research into the lives of the so-called court Jews for example. At the same time there was an exclusive shift to Jewish subjects in her women’s studies, although these were published independently from her Akademie work. Stern studied renowned female figures and uncovered archival sources on the lives and activities of female Jewish figures whilst working on Prussian state history and German-Jewish history from the Middle Ages through the Renaissance and Reformation period to her own generation.

In a number of respects Stern’s work on female historical figures flags up the paradigmatic shifts which shaped her ideological approach to Jewish historiography, repeated in her transition from non-Jewish to Jewish scholarship. One example in her early research is the influence of the Enlightenment on women’s emancipation which prefigured her work on Jewish emancipation. Moreover her gendered studies provide a more nuanced appreciation of the influences of her formative university training, research methods and historiographical approach present in her writings prior to and


206 Independent biographically based studies published following her appointment in 1919 include a monograph and article on Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand, Duke of Braunschweig and Lüneberg: the two series on the German Jewess from the Middle Ages: ‘Der Wandel des jüdischen Frauentypus seit der Emanzipation in Deutschland’, parts I-II, Ost und West, vol. XXII (1922), and Selma Stern, ‘Die Entwicklung des jüdischen Frauentypus seit dem Mittelalter’, parts I-IV, Der Morgen (1925-26). This biographical thread continued in the post-war period in her novel and historical monographs.

following her work under Taeubler. Influenced by nineteenth-century historicism, Stern’s initial book-length studies explored the genre of *Herrschergrgeschichte*, focusing on the history of privileged economic and political groups. This conservative genre became disrupted through her counter-focus on female members of the nobility and intellectually dominant upper middle class; women who by birth were able to obtain an education and develop an active role in state politics. On a par with their male counterparts – fathers, brothers and husbands, they gained authority outside the private sphere and attracted recognition from their contemporaries and subsequent generations.\(^{208}\)

The contextualisation of Jewish history within that of the host community pursued by Stern at the Akademie was present, albeit in a nascent form, in her pre-1919 writings on non-Jewish female historical figures. Stern contextualised individual women’s stories in their surrounding private and public spheres, illuminating personal relations with male counterparts, the economic, intellectual and political interactions of wider society.\(^{209}\) Contextualisation was effective in Stern’s studies of the Jewess, highlighting the gendering of female economic power, public recognition in German society, active and passive responses to male-generated culture.\(^{210}\) She presented interaction between Jewish women, German culture and society as a successful example of German-Jewish symbiosis.\(^{211}\)

Regarding the relationship between Jew and Jewess in Stern’s work, Barbara Hahn notes that Stern implied the Jewess had experienced a separate history of gender and identity formation.\(^{212}\) In Stern’s texts the male Jew increasingly ceases to be the mediator of experience for the Jewess, as she interacts independently within wider
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208 Subjects include Sophie Electress of Hanover, her female relatives, Juliane von Krudener and Princess Augusta of Württemberg.


211 A synthesis between male and female Jewish history appears to be more problematic for Stern than her view of the symbiosis between Jewish and German history.

society and responds autonomously to its intellectual and philosophical influences.\(^{213}\)

Given the degree of Stern’s interest in the interactions of historical women it is surprising that she does not differentiate between the historical experiences of the Jew and Jewess in her main research and writings. She commonly used the terms ‘the Jew [der Jude]’ or ‘the Jews [die Juden]’ to describe collective Jewish communities and representative historical agents, thus appearing to predominantly address male Jewish experience.\(^{214}\)

For Stern’s choice of female biographical subjects one criterion was their representative qualities as pioneers in two areas. In Stern’s representation of women of the Enlightenment period and subsequent generations, she is careful to identify those women – Jews and non-Jews, who showed a natural affinity with and support for Enlightenment values. This presented humanism and tolerance as inherent female characteristics. For example she wrote that the Hanoverian Electress Sophie was ‘a pioneer for real tolerance and pure humanity’.\(^{215}\) Secondly Stern’s Jewish female figures are shown as pioneers or agents of emancipation, in particular women’s emancipation. This is presented as a chain of tradition, from the Middle Ages to her own generation; tracing developments and changes set in motion by external factors but perpetuated by both individual female agents and female collective agency. Stern fends off critics however who might jump to dismiss her study as simply a legitimisation of Jewish participation in the women’s emancipation movement.

This series seems to suggest that Stern considered women’s emancipation, rather than the emancipation of the Jew, as a major continuum in Jewish women’s history during the modern period.\(^{216}\) She represents female emancipation as enabling fulfilment
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213 Stern depicts the prime example of this taking place within the generation of salon Jewesses.
216 Stern states that her intention was however to show how the typology of Jewish women had changed through the intellectual and spiritual revolution of women’s emancipation; Selma Stern, ‘Die Entwicklung des jüdischen Frauentypus seit dem Mittelalter – IV, Die Jüdin der Gegenwart’, *Der Morgen*, vol. II, no. 1 (April 1926), pp. 75-76. Women’s emancipation as a driving force in Jewish women’s history is evident in the first series of articles in 1922, developed further in the second in 1925-26, where the main study of the interaction between the Jewess and women’s emancipation comes in the third and fourth section: Selma Stern, ‘III, Die Frau des Bürgertums’, *Der Morgen*, vol. I, no. 6 (February 1926), pp. 648-57, and ‘IV, Die Jüdin der Gegenwart’, *Der Morgen*, vol. II, no. 1
through action, bringing the Jewess out of the family domain and fully inserting her into the public sphere for the first time in German-Jewish history. Stern points to Jewish emancipation as an ideological influence on the Jewish women leading the movement for equality and society's response to female emancipation. Her depiction of Jewish emancipation, as an externally directed process in male society with little direct impact therefore on the status of the Jewess, contrasts with the practical changes she showed ensuing from women's emancipation and the impact of external factors such as industrialisation. Furthermore Stern's example of the Jewess of the Romantic period who strove for equality by means of assimilation and social parity, rather than political and legal equality, underlined Jewish emancipation for the Jewess as primarily a gender specific experience. Women had to become their own agents of change if their status was to alter.

Throughout the series, Stern highlights the independent spirit of her subjects and Jewish female agency within wider society. In addition to female intellectual engagement, the economic role of the Jewess in the sphere of trade, employment or a profession is a recurring example. Read in conjunction with her evaluation of female employment opportunities and the impact of industrialisation, she singles these out as dominant factors influencing the changing status and role of the Jewish woman, giving financial independence and greater intellectual autonomy; central dynamics which impacted her own career path. In a similar way Stern shows Jewish economic agency


218 See for example the influences from German philosophy which shaped Fanny Lewald's position regarding women's emancipation: Selma Stern, 'Die Entwicklung des jüdischen Frauentypus seit dem Mittelalter - III, Die Frau des Bürgertums', *Der Morgen*, vol. I, no. 6 (February 1926), pp. 653-54.


Assimilation is a central element of Stern’s symbiotic approach to German-Jewish historiography. For Stern it was an inner-Jewish phenomenon, described as the approximation to the customs, language, values, ideas and lifestyle of the surrounding culture and society.\footnote{222}{Selma Stern, ‘Probleme der Emanzipation und der Assimilation’, \textit{Der Morgen}, vol. 7, no. 5 (December 1931), p. 424.} Stern presents the ability Jewish women had to ‘absorb the spirit and thoughts of the time’ not simply as Jewish assimilation to German culture, but also the assimilation of Jewish women to male society and values.\footnote{223}{Examples are Fanny Lewald and Jeanette Strauss-Wohl in Selma Stern, ‘Die Entwicklung des jüdischen Frauentypus seit dem Mittelalter – III. Die Frau des Bürgertums’, \textit{Der Morgen}, vol. 1, no. 6 (February 1926), pp. 650-53, and the Jewess of her own day whom she considered ‘a product of her century’: see Selma Stern, ‘IV, Die Judin der Gegenwart’, \textit{Der Morgen}, vol. II, no. 1 (April 1926), p. 76.} Examples of this were evident in her non-Jewish female subjects such as Sophie Electress of Hanover whose life was shaped by the philosophy and politics of the time and Juliane von Krüdener whose ‘soul mirrors all the great appearances of the time’.\footnote{224}{Selma Stern, ‘Sophie Kurfürstin von Hannover: zu ihrem 200. Todestag am 8. Juni 1914’, part II, \textit{Die Frau}, vol. 21, no. 10 (July 1914), p. 681, and Selma Stern, ‘Juliane von Krüdener: Eine Erinnerung an die Tage der Heiligen Allianz 1815’, \textit{Deutsche Rundschau}, vol. 42, no. 2 (1915/16), p. 260.} There are two historical movements which Stern suggests her female historical figures had a particular affinity with and which feature repeatedly in Stern’s female studies. Firstly female figures of the Romantic period are shown to embody introversion, emotions and self-centred individualism, whilst the Enlightenment period, is more positively valued. This is characterised by women representing intellect, rationalism, humanism and collective outlook.\footnote{225}{Figures who embodied the Romantic era are Rahel Varnhagen, Henriette Herz, Dorothea Schlegel, Frau von Staël, Juliane von Krüdener and Sophie Electress of Hanover’s stepdaughter, presented in contrast to those who characterised Enlightenment thinking: Sophie Electress of Hanover, Madame Roland and Madame Robert and many of the bourgeois Jewesses and women’s emancipationists Stern comments on.} Her female case studies show different layers of female agency. The women of the French Revolution actively engaged with the ideas of their time by internalising them and working alongside men in a supporting role. Not yet fully free to act independently in the intellectual public sphere. Stern wrote:

They didn’t create any of the centuries ideas but with intuition they worked on these ideas and carried them out to their logical end […] they are the
flames that carry the men along when theirs go out. 226

Similarly the supporting work of Stern’s women of the early nineteenth-century Biedermeier period seemed ‘quiet melodies’ alongside the male-driven negotiation of German and Jewish identity. 227

In particular Stern’s depiction of female assimilation raises significant questions, which were relevant for her own intellectual cohort, about the female contribution to Weimar society. Assimilation suggests a one-way process, however the evidence of reciprocity undermines or at least confuses the standard reading of Jewish assimilation in Stern’s work. The influence of male thinkers upon women remains unquestioned, however, the influence of women’s responses upon male intellectuals and society is shown as an engendered reciprocity, shaping the ideas of their male contemporaries, supporting and furthering their intellectual careers. Examples are the relationships between Dorothea Mendelssohn and Friedrich von Schlegel, Jeanette Wohl and Ludwig Börne. 228 The ability to directly influence the course of history and the development of a female public voice, reaching beyond the private sphere, is shown by Juliane von Krüdener, who influenced the Russian Tsar Alexander I through her prophetic teachings and guidance around the time of his writing the Holy Alliance and by Electress Sophie, who almost attained the throne of England. 229 Stern presents the first collective public voice for the Jewess, created through the fight for women’s emancipation, amongst the generation of the 1890s and contemporary intellectuals, the direct successors. Both groups sought an equal and influential place in German society beyond the Jewish community. 230

Stern used the term ‘mediator [Vermittler]’ to describe the active agency of her female subjects in the development of the cultural and intellectual fabric of society. 231


231 Selma Stern, ‘Die Entwicklung des jüdischen Frauentypus seit dem Mittelalter – II, Der Frauentypus
One example was the writer and intellectual Madame de Staël whose study of German philosophers made her a ‘mediator’ of German culture to wider Europe. In particular Stern’s Jewish Romantic women are presented as interpreters and mediators of ‘up till then strongly divided worlds’. Stern wrote, quoting an unidentifiable source: for the “first time in modern society they fulfilled a cultural mission” [...] fully influenced by the ideas of the time. In addition to their personal qualities and female characteristics which enabled them to ‘recognise eternal values in literature’ through their ‘warm, pure humanness’, Stern makes an even more radical claim. She suggests they are also mediators of Jewish values to the non-Jewish world; the true source of their enlightened and emancipated thinking. During the Romantic period Stern considered the skill with which Jewish women could capture the spirit of their time 

lay in their inner beings. [...] From their own depths they gave the sociability of that period an appeal which Germany had never seen before or after.

By depicting the Jewess as a mediator of both German and Jewish elements she becomes the embodiment of German-Jewish synthesis.

The claim Stern makes reveals an ambiguous attitude towards Jewish identity when read alongside her emphasis on superficial Jewish female religious knowledge highlighted in her women’s series. Although female religious life and traditional Judaism are criticised as unfulfilling for Jewish women, Stern’s figures are aware of the inextricable nature of their Jewishness. The ghetto Jewess reminds Stern of key biblical women in the way they respond to events as divine emanations. She saw the Jewess of the Romantic period inherently shaped by her unacknowledged Jewishness, citing the example of her ability to draw strength out of suffering. Stern considered for the Jewess of the Biedermeier period ‘whilst belonging to “Judaism” is stronger, it is still external and empty’. Jeanette Wohl did not give up her Jewishness, in contrast with the Romantic trend and did not regard her identity as fateful or destiny-laden. The German Jewess in the following period of restoration could only suppress their Jewish nature in

---

order to become almost fully determined by characteristics of their German homeland. Stern pointed to similarities between the ghetto Jewess and the contemporary generation of the 1920s, suggesting that the Jewess was the bearer of an even higher inner-Jewish duty than acting as a mediator within non-Jewish society.

There is an additional thread throughout this four-part series besides antisemitism, persecution and the drive to emancipation which have been identified by Hahn: that is, the God-sent destiny of the Jewess, as bearer of the ‘destiny [Schicksal]’ of her people. In the final section of the series Stern identifies the historically and spiritually rooted destiny of Jewish women to bear the suffering of the Jewish people, rooted in a Jewish tradition with biblical and historical antecedents; a theme she later developed in her post-war novel *The Spirit Returneth*. Stern appears to view female Jewishness as a private inner essence, perhaps captured by the ambiguous ‘spirit of the old Jewess’ which she recognises amongst contemporaries. Hahn suggests that this figure emerges in Stern’s work as one who ‘stands outside time and history’, yet Stern concretely contextualises each new appearance of this inner characteristic within different periods of German history. Perhaps therefore her interest is not in how the Jewess has historically developed and changed, as the title suggests, but in identifying a core of values which remained constant, in a personal search for security and continuity.

The fact that Stern concludes her final treatment of women’s history with an analysis of her own generation, reveals a self-awareness of her role as an active mediator of German-Jewish identity politics. In this series Stern joins the search for secular female antecedents who gave form to a public and politically active existence and for whom their Jewishness was experienced as a cultural, ethical and spiritual force, if not a religious activity. She repeatedly sought to highlight women’s power to shape

---

243 The overarching title to this four-part series is ‘Die Entwicklung des jüdischen Frauentypus seit dem
the course of historical events, most explicitly brought into contemporary focus in her wake-up call to German-Jewish women during the Weimar period.244

There is a correlation between the intellectual engagement of Arendt, Reichmann and Stern with German-Jewish historical scholarship and the contemporary events which shaped the German-Jewish experience during the 1920s and 1930s. This is evident on a number of levels: in terms of their own careers and publications, which provided public, pedagogic and intellectual opportunities to shape the German-Jewish community. Their motivation to deal with contemporary and historical issues of German-Jewish identity, ideology, German and Jewish relations stemmed from their experience of the period in which they lived. Recourse to historical contextualisation served to enlighten, interpret, re-affirm and defend the ideological position of German Jewry against increased antisemitism and inner-Jewish opposition. This is articulated implicitly in the majority of Stern’s writings; Arendt drew more explicit parallels in her treatment of Jewish emancipation and assimilation but Reichmann was the most direct in her contemporary observational work.

As female intellectuals the public voice they achieved was initially used to establish their position as mainstream subject specialists rather than proponents of women’s studies. The activities Arendt, Reichmann and Stern undertook during this period did not easily fit into the gender-oriented female involvement with the welfare and feminist movements in which Jewish women took prominent roles. However, their interest in historical and contemporary examples of female agency can be regarded as a gendered exploration of female self-assertion within the discourses which dominated the German-Jewish society during the Weimar period. Reichmann marginally addressed contemporary women’s issues, whereas Arendt and Stern explored the historical experiences of emancipation and assimilation through the figure of the Jewess. There are two factors which placed limits on a strongly feminist orientation in the work of Reichmann and Stern in particular. The positions they held through their employment at the CV and the Akademie had a substantial ideological impact on the content and direction of their writings. Furthermore the foreboding political and societal shift which the National Socialist success in the elections of 1933 ushered in, pushed to one side individualist and partisan positions, demanding community-wide unity. In the post-war

period the specificity of gender becomes marginalised further in their work, as the
interpretation and mediation of collective German-Jewish contemporary and historical
existence faced even greater challenges, in response to communal experiences of
destruction, discontinuity and the possibilities of re-establishing the German-Jewish
community in the diaspora.

1.4 Contemporary studies
In the 1920s and 1930s a sizeable body of women were visible as employees and vocal
members of German-Jewish community and cultural institutions. In the spheres of
journalism and intellectual discourse, prominent women occupied key posts such as
Margarete Muehsam, an editor at the C. V.-Zzeitung, Margarete Goldstein and
subsequently Eva G. Reichmann as editors of Der Morgen. Reichmann was directly
involved with current affairs on behalf of the CV. As their cultural specialist she
addressed a broad spectrum of topics on German-Jewish identity and symbiosis,
education, practical intervention, ideological positions, defence and the ‘Jewish
question’. Arendt and Stern published relatively little on contemporary issues, primarily
centered on German-Jewish history in the eighteenth and nineteenth century.
Reflection on the relationship between the central historical issues they addressed and
contemporary Jewish life however would not have been far from their minds or their
readers’. They published and gained a reputation as scholars in their respective fields of
philosophy and European history before they turned to German-Jewish history or
considered contemporary Jewish issues. For Reichmann this happened in reverse, her
interest in ‘contemporary history [Zeitgeschichte]’ evolved from her focus on German-
Jewish current affairs, gradually incorporating historical elements in order to
contextualise, contrast and support present actions which would determine the future.245

Evident in all three women’s work is a scholarly level of research and
argumentation supported by historical and textual evidence, which aimed for a high
degree of critical distance and objectivity. Whether presenting articles and reviews to

245 See texts which show her historical contextualisation and use of historical case studies: Eva
Jungmann, ‘Spontaneität und Ideologie als Faktoren der modernen sozialen Bewegung’, PhD thesis,
Universität Heidelberg (1921); Eva Reichmann-Jungmann, ‘Die Judentfrage neu gestellt?’
Kritisches zur Rede Kurt Blumenfelds beim Zionisten Delegiertentag in Frankfurt a. M.’, C. V.-
Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens’, in Eva G. Reichmann, Grösse und
Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz, pp. 22-32; Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Diaspora als Aufgabe’, in
1937, p. 6.
academic readers or writing in a journalistic capacity for newspapers, their academic scientific training was equally evident when addressing contemporary and interdisciplinary topics. The emphasis on factual truth and historical contextualisation countered the misrepresentation of Jews and Jewish history as part of the armoury of defensive German-Jewish scholarship during this period. Reichmann frequently highlighted the misappropriation and misinterpretation of sources in her deconstruction of opponents’ discourses.246

Until Arendt’s emigration she was the least institutionally affiliated of the three women, tending ideologically towards Zionism or at least the Zionism of Kurt Blumenfeld for whom she worked without ever formally joining the ZVfD, the main Zionist organisation. Influenced also by communist theoreticians through her first husband Günther Stern’s associations, Arendt remained on the edge of both political factions and had little institutional involvement with Jewish community groups or cultural organisations whilst in Germany.247 Her publications were of a freelance nature, published where opportunities arose due to connections and requests.248

In 1933 Arendt was arrested; the work she had been carrying out for Blumenfeld in the Prussian State Library was considered suspicious. Upon her release she quickly arranged to leave Germany via Prague and Geneva, arriving in Paris in the autumn. The employment she undertook in Paris situated her within crucial organisations working specifically for the Jewish refugee community there. Firstly employed by Agriculture et Artisanat [Agriculture and Handicrafts], then as a secretary to Baroness Germaine de Rothschild, taking up positions with Youth Aliyah and the Jewish Agency.249 Her involvement with specific humanitarian causes was motivated first and foremost by her Jewish identity. These experiences decisively impacted on the types of activities she undertook in the early post-war years to salvage European Jewish cultural heritage.250


247 See Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, Hannah Arendt, for Love of the World, pp. 70-106.

248 In the post-war period Arendt became a regular contributor to a large number of intellectual and popular publications in New York, her choice of subjects and analyses continued to be marked by independent ideas and authorial autonomy.

249 See Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, op. cit., pp. 117-49.

Stern had begun her publishing career with freelance contributions to a number of different periodicals and newspapers. Following her appointment at the Akademie she fully embraced the institution’s ideological pursuit of a synthesis between German and Jewish history. Throughout her Weimar work she maintained her conviction of a viable German-Jewish dual identity, although never in direct relation to contemporary circumstances. In the early 1930s she had the opportunity to publish in the C. V.-Zeitung and Der Morgen among other places, however her choice of historical subjects and reviews of scholarly historical publications predominantly shows a temporal distance from the present, consolidating her primary position as a historian.

In contrast Reichmann’s position at the CV enabled her to observe the state of German and Jewish relations, as well as the course of inner-Jewish debates. These observations were in turn contextualised, evaluated and subsequently mediated to a general Jewish readership of the C. V.-Zeitung and non-Jewish readers through its monthly publication – the C. V.-Zeitung Monatsausgabe, also through her editorials from 1933 in Der Morgen. Reichmann’s work bears representative traces of the main ideological positions held by the CV. Whilst synthesising the arguments and views of its opponents, her work contributed to the generational shift, characterised by a less dismissive stance regarding Zionist goals, in contrast with that taken by the older

251 These included Die Frau: Monatsschrift für das gesamte Frauenleben unserer Zeit; Die Grenzboten: Zeitschrift für Politik, Literatur und Kunst; Braunschweigisches Jahrbuch; Berliner Abendpost; Neue Zürcher Zeitung; Frankfurter Zeitung; Ost und West: illustrierte Monatsschrift für das gesamte Judentum.


254 Stern contributed to these cultural and non-subject specific publications primarily in her capacity as a historian of the modern period, adjusting to focus on more popular and cultural historical subjects than she presented in academic periodicals. Both publication arenas gave her an opportunity to advertise the larger studies she was working on and many of her articles were early forms of later publications, for example Selma Stern, ‘Joseph Süß Oppenheimer’, Korrespondenzblatt des Vereins zur Gründung und Erhaltung einer Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums, vol. 7 (1926), pp. 23-40. Stern published reviews such as Selma Stern, ‘Hans Delbrück’, C. V.-Zeitung, vol. VIII, no. 31, 2 August 1929, p. 404.

255 Although Der Morgen was affiliated to the CV, its subscriptions never topped more than 1000, see Herbert A. Strauss, ‘Das Ende der Wissenschaft des Judentums in Deutschland: Ismar Elbogen und Eugen Taeubler’, in Hartmut Walravens (ed.), Bibliographie und Berichte. Festschrift für Werner Schochow, p. 287.
generation of CV leaders. In addition Reichmann’s participation in a number of institutions such as the JFB, the Jüdischer Kulturbund and the Jüdisches Lehrhaus movement consolidated links between the CV and other Jewish community organisations. Despite or perhaps because of her multiple allegiances to the CV and other institutions, she aspired to ‘neutrality’, formulated with a high degree of self-reflection and continual re-evaluation of the values of the institutions she represented and those she opposed and challenged.

The Jewish identity and values Reichmann projected throughout her CV publications remained essentially undefined so as to encompass the broadest spectrum of readers amongst German Jewry; accommodating disparate strands of cultural, ethical, political, religious and secular Jewishness. She praised those who were able to withhold ‘the temptations’ of falling away from Judaism when presented with the post-emancipatory synthesis of ‘Jewish and German forces’. Reichmann’s identity politics were imbued with the co-existence of Germanness and Jewishness combined in the CV’s full title: the Central Union of German Citizens of Jewish Belief. She considered German-Jewish identity to be a ‘united bifurcated nature [geeinte Zwienatur]’ which created a ‘really fruitful synthesis’. Reichmann drew support for her position from the


257 The Freies Jüdisches Lehrhaus [Free Jewish House of Learning] movement was conceived by Franz Rosenzweig to facilitate adult education which would underpin Jewish renewal, founded in 1920. The Jüdischer Kulturbund was founded in 1933 originally to give work and economic support to Jewish artists but evolved into a national organisation, presenting art, music and theatre. On these institutions see Michael Brenner, The Renaissance of the Jewish Culture in Weimar Germany, pp. 69-99 and pp. 216-29; Herbert Freeden, Jüdisches Theater in Nazideutschland (Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein Verlag, 1985), and Michael A. Meyer (ed.) German-Jewish History in Modern Times, Vol. 4, Renewal and Destruction: 1918-1945 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), pp. 137-43.

258 See Cora Berliner and Hannah Karminski (Jüdischer Frauenbund E.V.), reference, March 1939, pp. 1-2; also Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Lebenslauf’, p. 1 (covering 1897-1938/39); Eugen Fuchs (Vorstand des Jüdischen Central-Vereins E.V.), ‘Zeugnis’, 31 December 1938, pp. 1-2; Leo Baeck, reference, 14 November 1938, p. 1; Dr L/A (possibly Werner Levie, head of the Jüdischer Kulturbund), letter to Eva Reichmann-Jungmann, 24 February 1939; Benno Cohn (Palästina-Amt Berlin der Jewish Agency for Palestine), reference ‘an die jüdischen Instanzen in England’, 24 February 1939, p. 1; Dr Herzfeld (Vorsitzender des Centralver eins E.V.), reference, 12 February 1939, pp. 1-2, all in Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBIA, NY.


words of the nineteenth-century historian Leopold Ranke:

The connection of all coincides with the independence of each part. [...] A mixing of all would destroy the essence of each. From distinction and pure education harmony will proceed.²⁶²

For Reichmann, German and Jewish identities would lose their distinctiveness and mutually enriching value through complete assimilation to each other, yet she was convinced of the combination of these two distinct elements. She considered that one could take pride in

living Jewish consciousness at a high intellectual level; [and] a high standing for Jewish scientific study which has made Germany the intellectual-Jewish centre of the world in association with German and general education.²⁶³

The two central tasks of the CV’s work she highlights, are the active support of Jewish renewal through the CV’s central role to defend the German-Jewish community and ‘the unswerving cultivation of German views [deutsche Gesinnung]’.²⁶⁴

Reichmann’s publications contributed to the broad programme of Jewish education, increasing knowledge of both German-Jewish and Jewish heritage whilst encouraging Bildung – schooling and upbringings in German culture and history. This didactic impetus within the CV’s mediation of a symbiotic German and Jewish identity was also applied to the factual and unprejudiced enlightenment of non-Jews.²⁶⁵ One strategy Reichmann employed was to uphold an image of the German cultural traditions that elevated humanist and tolerant philosophies. For example she reflected on German

²⁶⁴ These were the two central aims of the CV, see Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Der Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens’, in Eva G. Reichmann, op. cit., p. 23.
²⁶⁵ Alongside the weekly C. V.-Zeitung, the Monatsausgabe monthly edition was published aimed at a non-Jewish audience. See Arnold Paucker, Der jüdische Abwehrkampf gegen Antisemitismus und Nationalsozialismus in den letzten Jahren der Weimarer Republik, 2nd ed. (Hamburg: Leibniz-Verlag, 1969), pp. 45-61, particularly pp. 50-52.
and Jewish historical figures who had worked for Jewish emancipation and the
democratic constitution of the German state in the nineteenth century.266 This served as
a reminder that Germany had a pluralist cultural heritage besides a nationalist one,
whilst shedding light on the historical, ideological and political developments in
German and European society which had enabled antisemitism to gain such a
stronghold in recent times.

Reichmann valued but did not take for granted the right to German and European
education; alert to the educational restrictions imposed on German Jewry.267 She was
concerned by the general educational crisis amongst German Jews, which threatened
German Jewry’s claim to represent the highest form of German citizenship.268 She
wrote that despite guarding against ‘unallowed crossings of boundaries’; the continued
education of ‘Jewish humanity’ must be striven for through the engagement with ‘as
much European educational heritage, as is necessary in order to remain a person of
these times’. She considered that ‘[w]ith the highly problematic shape of the present
Jewish cultural life, a “splendid isolation” is not sustainable’. German Jewry should
work against internal tendencies to withdraw into its own communities shutting out
cultural and intellectual surroundings; instead it should actively ‘face them and
encounter them as Jews’.269 The Jewish symbiosis was fundamentally brought into
question with the rise of National Socialism, prompting the re-evaluation of German
historical and cultural heritage. This ostracised the Jewish contribution further, but also
necessitated that Jewry clarify which elements of German heritage it wished to
synthesize with.270

Reichmann’s concept of Jewishness may well have been all-encompassing,
however there is evidence that she personally experienced its religious dimension and

266 See for example Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Der Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens’,
in Eva G. Reichmann, Größe und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz, pp. 26-32. She regarded
National Socialism as a threat to the stability of the German state, see Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Die
deutsch-jüdischer Existenz, pp. 79-82.
responded to the weakening pursuit of Jewish education and self-assertion, compounded in the wider
context by the restrictions imposed by the NSDAP, particularly the dismissal of higher teachers at
the end of 1934.
deutsch-jüdischer Existenz, p. 81.
456-57, and Selma Stern, ‘Probleme der Emanzipation und der Assimilation’, Der Morgen, vol. 7,
no. 5 (December 1931), pp. 423-39.
sought to uphold these values.\footnote{Reichmann refers to the religious timing of the appearance of Ignaz Maybaum, \textit{Parteibefreites Judentum – Lehrende Führung und priesterliche Gemeinschaft} (Berlin: Philo Verlag, 1935) which she reviewed in Eva G. Reichmann, 'Wegweiser zur Gemeinschaft', in Eva G. Reichmann, \textit{Große und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz}, pp. 70-71. Cilly Neuhaus pointed to the spirit of a lecture given by Reichmann where the 'mood was the Sabbath-idea itself', in Cilly Neuhaus, 'Eine Lernstunde mit Eva Reichmann-Jungmann', \textit{Blätter des Jüdischen Frauen Bundes}, vol. XIII, no. 4 (April 1937).} Although she never personally defines ‘Judaism’, she was conscious that in this ‘hour of rebirth’ the ‘consciousness of re-won Jewish community is oppressed and darkened by the consciousness of lost Judaism’, admitting that ‘immediate feelings of connection are long since gone for us Jews in Germany’.\footnote{Eva G. Reichmann, 'Judentum in der Welt', in Eva G. Reichmann, \textit{Große und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz}, p. 66.} The terms ‘Judaism’ and ‘connection’ have a spiritually unifying dimension, which places German Jewry within a disparate transnational Jewry. Reichmann is also suggesting that these triggers for rebirth, came of inner-Jewish causes and were more pressing than the external circumstances challenging German Jewry. Questioning the relationship between the ‘external ascent of [the] Jewish people and inner-Jewish collapse’, she analysed assimilation solidly within the historical context, relating it directly to contemporary circumstances.\footnote{Op. cit., p. 67.} Her questions addressed the spiritual implications of ‘Jewish self-loss’: whether it weakened ‘religious strength’ or dissolved ‘extra-religious connections like custom and tradition, national characteristics, physical and intellectual hereditary factors’.

Throughout the 1920s and 1930s Stern’s book-length studies and articles documented the historical existence of a German-Jewish symbiosis through the synthesis of German and Jewish history, rather than dealing with the present. Although she briefly addressed the contemporary situation for Jewish women in the mid-1920s, later contemporary references were veiled.\footnote{See for example Selma Stern, ‘Probleme der Emanzipation und der Assimilation’, \textit{Der Morgen}, vol. 7, no. 5 (December 1931), pp. 423-39. Stern reflected on the optimistic mood with which she had undertaken her Akademie research, at a time when ‘a rebirth of Judaism through the spirit and methods of modern scientific study and meaningful symbiosis of German and Jew could be believed in’, see Selma Stern, \textit{Der preussische Staat und die Juden}, vol. I (Tübingen: Mohr, 1962), p. XII.} This can be read either as an irrefutable belief in a historical status quo which centres upon a successfully completed Jewish emancipation, or as a visible rupture of her ‘historical worldview [historisches Weltbild]’ which she could no longer apply to contemporary life as she had begun to in her most direct contemporary study: ‘Die Jüdin der Gegenwart’ [the Jewess of the present day].\footnote{Sassenberg has suggested that Stern retreated into the study of German-}
Jewish history so as to avoid present realities. 276 Others consider she was only concerned with aspects of history that supported her representation of an unproblematic historical German-Jewish symbiosis, in which the discussion of antisemitism or Jew-hatred was avoided. A number of her studies suggest this is not entirely the case however. 277

Although Stern's work mainly dealt with the discussion of the Enlightenment, emancipation and positive changes in German state relations with the Jews, the contemporary relevance of her historical studies functioned as an aid to understanding the present circumstances of German Jewry. In a public lecture Stern juxtaposed her historical studies with contemporary circumstances, bringing the discrepancy between the two into stark comparison. 278 The long list of questions Stern poses but does not answer in the essay, points to her awareness of the insecurity of contemporary life and the questionability of using historical models, such as her study of emancipation as a guarantee of continued existence. By leaving the questions unanswered she prompts the reader to explore the connections between past and present and perhaps following the lecture some tentative answers were formulated in discussion with audience members. 279

In Stern's study of the history of the yellow demarcation worn to identify Jews, she appears to totally sidestep a direct reference to the relevance or parallels between her study of past measures to separate and distinguish the Jews and contemporary

---

276 Marina Sassenberg, 'Das Eigene in der Geschichte', p. 287. It is unclear from Stern’s papers whether she became involved in the day-to-day activities of the Jewish community or if she remained solely engaged in academic pursuits, teaching and lecturing from 1933 until emigration in 1941. After Taeubler left his post at Heidelberg in 1933, the couple returned to Berlin where he resumed teaching at the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. Stern published a number of articles in 1935 following the long stay the couple made in London in 1934.


Nevertheless this article raises interesting questions about Stern’s perspicacious evaluation of the situation of German Jewry in the 1930s. Her discussion of this demarcation came several years before Jews were to wear the Judenstern [the yellow star] at the beginning of September 1941 and one might wonder what the prompt for this essay was. Her study accentuated the Jew as an object at the mercy of the external forces of religion, politics, economy and concluded with the liberation of the Jew from these restrictions during the period of Rationalism, where the piece ends without making any direct connection to the present.

The German-Jewish contribution to German society and the importance of German-Jewish emancipation as a role model for other diaspora Jewries are historically rooted topics which Reichmann and Stern presented to contemporary debates in the Weimar period. In contrast Arendt became increasingly critical of the apologetic streak she saw in the emphasis on the German-Jewish contribution, most evident in her post-war review of Stern’s The Court Jew. Both Stern and Reichmann saw emancipation as predominantly motivated and affected by the surrounding society, however Reichmann considered that real emancipation had never been achieved. Although legal emancipation had come about, social emancipation had not. 1933 saw the dissolution of legal emancipation under the National Socialists. Reichmann opined that society rather than German Jewry should call for a second emancipation and Jewry should make itself ready for this as Jews. Reading between the lines Reichmann was convinced of the positive influence of the enlightenment work carried out by the CV, Der Morgen and publishers at the Philo Verlag, directed to a non-Jewish

281 Compare for example the direct political response to the order that Jews should wear the yellow Judenstern in Robert Weltsch, ‘Tragt ihn mit Stolz, den gelben Fleck!’; Jüdische Rundschau, vol. XXXVIII, no. 27, 4 April 1933, pp. 131-32.
readership among the democratically minded sector of the German public.\textsuperscript{286} This view of emancipation bears similarities to Arendt’s post-war view that former emancipation had been bought at the price of assimilation and could only be fully achieved when the host community accepted the Jew as a Jew.\textsuperscript{287}

Whilst in Paris Arendt’s former treatment of the historical ‘Jewish question’ became more contemporary and politicised. The greater distance from Germany, her experiences dealing with Jewish refugees from Germany and Eastern Europe and deeper connections with Zionist organisations, gave opportunities to refine her analysis of German – Jewish historical interrelations. She identified the relationship between the historical ‘Jewish question [Judenfrage]’ and contemporary German antisemitism as a key aspect which had been overlooked. In the manuscript of a public lecture she gave on the ‘Jewish question’ , Arendt began by stating that Jewish disinterest in grappling with antisemitism was the most significant element of the Jewish contemporary response to the ‘Jewish question’.\textsuperscript{288} She was critical but not dismissive of the response in many Jewish camps to the ‘catastrophe of 1933’: ‘Tschouwah’, ‘return’, ‘back to the ghetto’ was the ‘political word of the times’. However she was wary that the path of ‘return’ tended to result in isolation, which she considered a factor contributing to the ‘Jewish question’.\textsuperscript{289} Arendt considered the word ‘return’ to mean politically and morally an admission of one’s own blame, through the process of ‘taking stock of oneself’.\textsuperscript{290}

Similar to Reichmann she noted that the ‘strange fruit of this return is in fact apathy’; citing the marked downturn in numbers and disinterest which the \textit{Jüdische Rundschau} – the main Zionist publication reported, regarding the work of the Kulturbund and Jewish education centres, which until 1935 were virtually sites of pilgrimage.\textsuperscript{291} Arendt advocated both ‘know your opponent’ and know yourself, because ‘exclusivity […] has clouded our vision to the greater historical connections in which we are also placed’.\textsuperscript{292} She viewed the avoidance of any form of attempt to deal

\textsuperscript{286} At one stage the C. V.-Zeitung distributed annually 60000 weekly editions and 50000 monthly copies that targeted a wider non-Jewish readership, see Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Der Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens’, in Eva G. Reichmann, \textit{Größe und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz}, p. 24.


\textsuperscript{289} \textit{Op. cit.}, pp. 1 and 3.

\textsuperscript{290} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 1.


\textsuperscript{292} Hannah Arendt, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 1, 3.
with antisemitism as very similar to a political avoidance of defence and questioned the
recourse to ‘the old Jewish attitude of the punishment of God’, which she heard
amongst the ‘most enlightened Jewish leaders’.293

In Arendt’s view the German Jew was unavoidably connected with the Jewries of
the world and non-Jewish German society; an indissoluble responsibility. She elevated
German Jewry’s responsibility to counter antisemitism for the benefit of world Jewry,
pointing out that:

Polish and Rumanian antisemitism imports its arguments from Germany,
even Franco, in a land where there are no Jews and therefore no Jewish
question, fights against the Spanish government’s troops with antisemitic
words.294

The events of 1933 she considered had reconnected German Jewry, which had become
internally fragmented and cut off from world Jewry: for her ‘1933 hit numerous
individual Jews but not a Jewry’.295 Similar to Stern’s Beziehungsgeschichte, Arendt
acknowledged that ‘we in our own history are hopelessly dependent on the history of
our surroundings’, but went further calling antisemitism the ‘classic proof’. According
to Arendt, Germany had no ‘Jewish question’ in 1933 but nevertheless the ‘antisemitic
slogan’ had gained success and Germany was a ‘classical country of antisemitism’
although ‘neither socially nor economically to be justified’. Due to the ‘ever decreasing
number of German Jews’ she considered ‘ridiculous’ the impression that the ‘Jewish
question’ was ‘first and foremost a political question’.296

Although both Stern and Reichmann were engaged in the ideological defence of
German Jewry, they were personally motivated to shape German-Jewish cultural life:
Reichmann, through her writings, personal representation of institutional causes and
Stern, through public lectures and her part in education work organised by the
Reichsvertretung.297 Arendt also actively engaged in illegal practical work for both the
Zionists and the Communists, hiding and aiding people leaving Germany and collecting
at the Prussian State Library evidence of antisemitism within non-governmental

297 See Otto Hirsch (Reichsvertretung der deutschen Juden), letter to Selma Stern-Taeubler, 27 May
1935, p. 1, D 8, 69; see also Otto Hirsch, letter to Selma Stern-Taeubler, 2 August 1940, D 8, 72,
Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, UBB regarding her public lectures. Compare Marina
institutions for Blumenfeld to be used at the 18th Zionist Congress.\textsuperscript{298} In Paris she was influenced by the philosophy of a number of individuals she met and worked alongside, impressed by the need to actively contribute to assisting others.\textsuperscript{299}

There is a close alignment between the deep concern of Arendt and Reichmann for the coexistence and viable balance between theory and praxis at an individual and community wide level which Arendt formulated from the late 1930s, evident also in Reichmann’s writings of the period.\textsuperscript{300} Through their use of the same vocabulary they convey their belief in individual responsibility for the collective benefit and suspicion of purely abstract ideologies that jar with their own presentation of hard realism.\textsuperscript{301} Reichmann was particularly alert to the danger of programmes and ideologies which were utopian in their dislocation from reality and offered no personal intervention or concrete practical solution.\textsuperscript{302} Reichmann taught that

> intellectual work does not present something abstract but that the taking of a position was a matter of will and that one was duty bound to work towards its completion.\textsuperscript{303}

She noted that the relationship between work and ideas at the CV had always been closely intertwined.\textsuperscript{304}

Reichmann promoted a high degree of education and intellectual criticism

\textsuperscript{298} Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, \textit{Hannah Arendt, for Love of the World}, pp. 102-6.
\textsuperscript{303} Cora Berliner and Hannah Karminsiki, reference, March 1939, pp. 1-2, Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBJA, NY.
alongside active intervention. She cited examples of individuals who modelled both, evident in her reflections on the hard task of developing a viable society in Palestine, where she praised the ‘chaluzim [pioneers]’ who made time to engage intellectually through reading and learning after the practical day’s work was completed.\textsuperscript{305} Reichmann herself strove to be a role model in this area, not just a woman of words. She took part in conferences and courses which offered instruction in responsible thought and action, developing an outward and collective concern among men and women.\textsuperscript{306} Her discussion of intellectual positions and practical solutions is a strong feature of her study of Palestinian society which she considered needed to be developed on all levels. She emphasised the strong role the university in Jerusalem should play in dealing with general problems which faced the establishment of a functioning society in Palestine, by strengthening the middle ground between the worker and the intellectual.\textsuperscript{307}

Her choice of contemporary and ideological topics and the manner in which she addressed them shows the strong didactic elements in the enlightenment and defence work her writings contributed to. Her awareness of the risks associated with the inappropriate application of methodology, demonstrated the need for correct identification of the real targets and selection of the most appropriate means for effective counter approach and re-education. She explicitly noted the positive results gained by the flexibility of the CV in identifying and changing methodology to suit newly arising goals.\textsuperscript{308}

Reichmann was also an untiring proponent of education for the renewal of Jewish consciousness. She observed that rebirth had fallen flat and the fruits of the recent return to Judaism did not show a real return. In this area new strategies were required, just as the tactics and efficacy of CV’s defence work were reviewed during the 1930s, so too the strategy of the Jüdisches Lehrhaus should reflect the needs and goals of the Jewish

\textsuperscript{305} Op. cit., p. 55.
leadership and people. She was aware of the early success of the programme offered at the various Lehrhaus schools despite the use of ‘tricks’ and ‘attractions’ to encourage participants, but noted that times had radically changed:

Jewish learning is not a case of free will, but the only thing left. One feels Jewish-saturated today as one felt saturated with the educational heritage of the Western European surroundings before.

She warned that the inner response to the political and social changes following 1933 described as the ‘storm wind of forced Judaism’ was waning. The former goals which had brought the ‘revolution of Jewish rebirth […] are now the platitudes and phrases in the mouth of too many’. Reichmann was troubled by the political and moral apathy evident among German Jewry. She saw it as one of the tasks of the CV, to shake up the ‘great sleepy mass within German Jewry’ that did not recognise the threats. Since she observed that ‘many remained oblivious’ she was grateful for the ‘support which comes unexpectedly from other camps’. An example of this is evident in the way she deconstructed a critical open letter to German Jewry written by Gaston Heymann regarding apathy towards the increasing threat of antisemitism.

The active defence that the CV offered German Jews included personal representation and legal support for discriminated individuals, as well as the lobbying of political parties and politicians. Reichmann’s writings highlight the function of publications in the C. V.-Zeitung and CV events as part of this ideological defence. Her early work as assistant to CV director Ludwig Holländer meant she was well positioned to observe and report on defence work in all its breadth. Later as cultural specialist, her knowledge of the public sphere enabled a development of her own

310 Ibid., pp. 79-80.
311 Ibid., p. 80.
rhetoric of rebuttal. The ideological and factual defence of positions held by the CV against internal and external opposition is prevalent in her written work and active challenge through public lectures. She tackled individual and ideological opposition in opinion pieces and reviews, including Jewish interlocutors such as Zionists, the completely assimilated and the indifferent, but also non-Jewish opponents and ideologies: National Socialist supporters, Bolshevik Communism and the radical Left.

Despite the original CV goal to defend legal rights and counter prejudice, National Socialist opponents were not Reichmann’s chief target. She did not tackle National Socialist publications or party leaders and referred simply to the Zeitgeist or ‘völkisch’ ideas when commenting on National Socialism and antisemitism in public opinion and the press. There are two examples of her indirect analysis of National Socialist ideologies: a review of several sociological studies of National Socialism and a manuscript not widely circulated in which she challenged Dr Margarete Adams, a philosemitic journalist who had voted in support of the NSDAP. Analysis of antisemitism appeared incidentally in various articles alongside her study of German and Jewish cultural and political heritage in the period since the Enlightenment to contextualise the origins of ‘völkisch’ ideology and nationalism. Reichmann’s analysis of antisemitism incorporated new interdisciplinary trends in historical,

315 Active legal and later ideological defence was the main field of her husband’s activities at the CV, he had also been involved in the covert work of the Büro Wilhelmstraße, an agency run by Jews and non-Jews which circulated political counter-propaganda. See Arnold Paucker, Der jüdische Abwehrkampf gegen Antisemitismus und Nationalsozialismus in den letzten Jahren der Weimarer Republik, 2nd ed., pp. 110-28. On the general defence work of the CV see Avraham Barkai, ‘Wehr dich!’, der Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens (C.V.) 1893-1938, and Alfred Wiener, ‘The Centralverein Deutscher Staatsbürger Jüdischen Glaubens – Its Meaning and Activities’ (undated manuscript copy probably written post-war), pp. 1-2, Wiener Library (WL), London.


317 Reichmann’s readiness to engage with opponents bears traces of the ethos of Martin Buber whom she was influenced by in many respects, see Martin Buber, ‘Gespräche mit dem Gegner’, in Martin Buber, Zweisprache (Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1932), pp. 89-101.


sociological and psychological scholarship and some of the analyses she made during the 1930s remained central in her post-war evaluations.\(^{320}\)

Critical analysis was applied to male and female subjects alike. Questioning and testing were methods she advocated one should apply to all opinions and interpretations as well as one’s own beliefs. Reichmann took seriously the criticisms and beliefs of opponents and considered: one’s analysis of others should be constructive not destructive, by acknowledging rather than dismissing their values at the outset one could start to analyse them.\(^{321}\) Her evaluations were presented in a broad manner, so as to target a readership that had not yet fixed its own opinions. I shall draw attention to four methods Reichmann used. Firstly she responded point by point to each accusation, opinion or fact raised against German Jewry or CV standpoint; pursuing the underlying ideologies and taking the arguments to their logical conclusion.\(^{322}\) Secondly Reichmann often subverted the criticism of the opponent so that they were shown to legitimise and sometimes support the CV cause.\(^{323}\) Her tactic of initially conceding that the views of the opponent might stand up to scrutiny heightens the impact of her final assessment, after a detailed dissection of their evidence, suggesting that their sources did not lead to the analysis or conclusion drawn.\(^{324}\) Thirdly Reichmann valued the opportunity each attack gave for self-reflection. By not initially dismissing the opponent, she retained readers, who might otherwise have switched off, by firstly outlining the opponent’s position to draw readers in and then gradually unfolding her counter-argument. This strategy was intended to prompt her readers to think along more nuanced lines.\(^{325}\)

---


\(^{321}\) Her critical approach contrasted with Stern’s who appears ambiguously negative about the destructive nature of the ‘revolutionary spirit’ which led to hyper-criticality, see Selma Stern, ‘Der Wandel des jüdischen Frauentypus seit der Emanzipation in Deutschland’, part I, vol. XXII, no. 3-4, *Ost und West* (March-April 1922), p. 64.


\(^{324}\) Look at the process by which she deconstructs Heller’s argumentation and methodology, in Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Der “Untergang des Judentums”, in *op. cit.*, pp. 38-45.

Fourthly, she knew her enemy and her responses to both Communist and Zionist opposition show her specialist knowledge of their ideologies and internal problematics. 326

The response she advocated in the mid 1930s to the CV’s main Jewish sparring partners, the ZViD and the *Jüdische Rundschau* was not limited to reformulating the CV position:

What we turn ourselves against is the claim to totality, with which Zionism does down all other Jewish viewpoints as un-Jewish, second-class and characterless. 327

She called for unity between Zionists and non-Zionists and worked to minimise antagonism, establishing increasing mutual understanding. The CV increasingly sought to reduce anything which ‘could serve to split the Jewish forces, whose working together is today more necessary than ever’. 328 Reichmann repeatedly admitted that she did not wish to judge which of the approaches, represented by the Jewish factions, polarised by the CV and Zionists, contained the greatest truth or offered a long-term solution for the German Jew who was undecided where his or her allegiance should lie. In her opinion, only the future would tell. Future generations and those outside Germany would only be able to judge how German Jewry had dealt with the challenges of the day. 329

Unity was a contentious but central drive within the major German-Jewish

---


organisations from the time of the First World War and throughout the Weimar period. The fact that Reichmann was audibly calling for unity following the establishment of the Reichsvertretung in 1933 shows the continual challenge this created for the German-Jewish leadership and people.\textsuperscript{330} If unity implied a dissolving of the differences between the Zionists and CV which contravened the Rankian invective Reichmann appropriated, then the more nuanced call to ‘neutrality’ which she supported shows a transition in ideology and methodology of the CV after 1933.\textsuperscript{331} The CV leadership recognised and praised her attempts to transcend ideological confines and critically approach all ideas, freed from party politics. They considered she ‘was not bound to any Jewish party, she taught whole Jewish thinking’.\textsuperscript{332}

She found a kindred spirit in Rabbi Ignaz Maybaum, whose book \textit{Parteibefreites Judentum – Lehrende Führung und priesterliche Gemeinschaft} [party-neutral Judaism – educative leadership and priestly community] she reviewed, striking a chord with her own ideology of ‘whole Jewish teaching’.\textsuperscript{333} She heartily supported his call to ‘Judaism freed from partisanship’, advocating a Jewry free of subjectivity and factions. Reichmann was keen to point out the difficulties in understanding the implications of Maybaum’s proposed overcoming of the parties:

\begin{quote}
It has nothing to do with tactical compromises, as made frequently in the community rooms of today. They may be practically necessary, but certainly they have no right to claim intellectual appreciation.
\end{quote}

One particularly resonant area of Maybaum’s argument was his affirmation of the positive tension in the twin movements towards Zion and the fatherland (Germany) which could coexist within the German-Jewish community.\textsuperscript{334}

The traditional assessment of the CV is that it stood in opposition to the German-


\textsuperscript{332} Cora Berliner and Hannah Karminski, reference, March 1939, pp. 1-2. Regarding the valuable nature of Reichmann’s criticism, see Dr Herzfeld (Vorsitzender des Centralvereins E.V.), reference, 12 February 1939, pp. 1-2, in Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBJA, NY.


\textsuperscript{334} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 72-73.
Jewish Zionists. Looking at Reichmann’s work this reading is challenged. Reichmann was a key contributor to CV debates on the subject of Zionism and emigration to Palestine. She was also a member of the Palästina-Amt [Palestine Office] of the Jewish Agency, the chairmanship of Keren Hajessod [Palestine Foundation Fund] and the Promoters Circle of Child and Youth Aliyah. Discussion of the extent to which she was proto-Zionist is complicated by anecdotes and second-hand observations such as Benno Cohn, head of the Palästina-Amt, who regarded her a non-Zionist. Further still her interpretation of the mutually beneficial relationship between the diaspora and Palestine emphasised joint responsibility for the establishment of Palestine and continuation of the diaspora. She considered Palestine inextricably connected to world Jewry; providing a common goal uniting disparate Jewries. German Jewry could be a significant player in the construction of Jewish society in Palestine through a two-fold contribution: German Jews who emigrated to Palestine constituted a bridge, but the ‘supporting column’ of that bridge was formed by Jews who remained in Germany. In order to prevent the collapse of a ‘Jewish chance’ in Palestine, she specifically advocated the intervention of ‘German-Jewish intellectuality’ as ‘a guarantee against Jewish dissolution’.

In 1935, as the editor of Der Morgen, she issued a volume dedicated to ‘Jewry in the World’ which discussed the diaspora as the means by which Jewries served the nations and communities in which they lived. Although the articles were not directly about Germany or Palestine, she conceded that the ‘idea of Palestine’ provided hope for a re-strengthening of Jewish consciousness: a ‘binding force’ to those who are falling

---

337 Reichmann took part in the annual JFB conference in Lehnitz from 27-30 March 1938, reporting on her trip to Palestine the year before, see Hannah Karminski, ‘Judentum als Lebensgrundlage. Von unserer Arbeitstagung in Lehnitz’, Blätter des jüdischen Frauenbundes (April 1938), pp. 2-5, here p. 4; see also the reference to a letter from the absent Paula Ollendorf to the JFB leadership imploring them to join the Jewish Agency, so that Zionists and non-Zionists could work effectively in unison.
away. 341 In response to the real influence of Zionist support for the ‘idea of Palestine’ amongst world Jewry, the volume discussed the counter-question of how the diaspora could live in a Jewish way. Despite her adamant belief in a German-Jewish future, she omitted a discussion of German Jewry, presenting the experience of Jewries in other countries which might be considered viable destinations for those forced to emigrate. She also frequently warned of the realistic limitations of Palestine in the face of the numbers of emigrants leaving Europe.

Although the Jewish diaspora’s active participation and support for the establishment of Palestine was a humanitarian attempt to secure a Jewish future, it had implications for other groups also. 342 She was wary of the utopian elements in the goal of a Palestinian ‘Jewish homeland’ and the tension between ideological and practical motivation promoted by Zionist revisionists, who favoured the ‘pure intellectual form of existence’. 343 She considered their idea of building up a nationalist state diverged so far from the embodiment of Jewish spirituality, that ‘in the end only its name is Jewish and not its form’. She was particularly concerned about sociological and economic development, calling for ‘Umschichtung’ — a change in class status for emigrants who needed to take up different occupations to build a strong society on all economic and professional levels. In addition she called for a realistic thinking through of sociological implications. 344 She continued to stress these points even after her trip to Palestine in 1937. 345

In many of Reichmann’s responses to opponents, she openly acknowledged that


German Jewry was facing a critical situation of life and death, pinpointing their calls for the decline of German Jewry. Decline was being justified either by the promotion of a substitute ideology, such as those put forward by Otto Heller and Constantin Brunner regarding communism and assimilation, or by marginalisation, as in the case of National Socialist and völkisch opposition.\textsuperscript{346} The discourse these attacks provoked were dominated by the words ‘death’ and ‘decline’, countered by Reichmann’s emphasis on ‘life’, ‘future’ and personal, cultural, existential and religious ‘affirmation’.\textsuperscript{347} Her response to Brunner’s ‘demand’ for ‘Jewish self-emancipation’ and view of the Jewish responsibility for ‘overcoming Jew-hatred’ was ‘to keep ourselves alive’ without reformulating Jewish identity; she deemed the dissolution of religious affiliation and community as ‘suicide’.\textsuperscript{348} She also rejected Heller’s description of the decline of Jewry in Soviet Russia as ‘not the necessary result of the soviet-Russian Jewish politics but the desired result’, pointing to ‘contradictory proof’ of ‘the Jewish community’s traceable desire to live’, affirming ‘religious, ethical and spiritual content’. She defined this in the statement: ‘For us there is a Jewish future so long as the Jewish people profess a Jewish spirit’.\textsuperscript{349} Reichmann questioned whether present reactions were ‘strong enough to keep off decline’. She also questioned opponents’ evidence of decline, describing a different reality to their observations, which showed Jewry working ‘for life not for death’.\textsuperscript{350} Both German Jewry and Jewish life in Palestine were critical components for that future, yet practical questions remained open, such as the number of refugees from Europe Palestine would be able to shelter. She warned that with years of mass relocation to Palestine, German Jewry would be severely diminished.\textsuperscript{351} Her reading of the events of 1933, when the Jews were renounced by the National Socialist state, brought the realisation that German Jews must ‘strive for a new German future […] as Jews’.\textsuperscript{352} Her view that Jews should live ‘consciously historically’ had for her eternal


\textsuperscript{347} \textit{Ibid.} See also E. R.-J., ‘Lüge der Statistik’, \textit{Der Morgen}, vol. 10, no. 4 (July 1934), pp. 149-51.


\textsuperscript{352} \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 61.
dimensions. She wrote:

A feature of the present, not only that bit formed by Jewish people, contains its meaning precisely through the fact that it struggles, thinks and creates for the future. [...] In this present, which points to the future, the Jew, to whom the wavering history of his community [...] has bequeathed an inheritance of continual spiritual turmoil, also finds his place.

Reichmann’s consciousness of the pluralism of the Jewish people, in combination with its transcendentally binding elements, was encapsulated in the unity her generation of leading intellectuals promoted within German Jewry, especially after the creation of the Reichsvertretung for that purpose in 1933. This not only sought to unite politically, religiously and socially different Jews but also encompassed the discussion of engendered roles for men and women among these organisations and wider society.

1.5 Gendered interests and roles

Gendered studies took an increasingly visible place among the research interests and publications in Jewish and non-Jewish periodicals, written by this generation of German-Jewish women. Arendt and Stern focused predominantly on historical analyses of key Jewish and non-Jewish historical women who were active publicly, economically, socially and politically. In contrast to many female colleagues who wrote on topical women’s issues, neither projected a programmatic analysis of the role of the contemporary woman. Their writings that did engage with gender themes primarily focused on women’s multiple interrelations within the social context: between men and women, Jew and non-Jew, public and private, such that gender was just one of many


factors influencing female experience.

Rather than the pioneering feminist activism which fuelled previous generations of intellectual women, for this cohort, the political pressures exerted upon them by the increasing restrictions of the 1930s shifted their concern to the wider community. Their tempered engagement with women’s issues stemmed from their peripheral association with representative women’s organisations and political feminism. Arendt was critical of the restricted focus of the women’s movement on female issues and its ineffectiveness due to the lack of politicised goals. 356 Stern used early publication opportunities in Die Frau to establish her reputation as a scholar of constitutional and state history before subsequently turning to historical female figures. Her later series of articles on historical Jewish women only briefly concluded with a limited analysis of the contemporary Jewish woman in 1920s Germany. 357 Reichmann was more directly involved with women’s organisations, in particular the JFB and worked closely with its leaders in two capacities: as a CV representative within the JFB and as an advisor at the JFB on cultural questions. 358 Taking part in conferences and teaching days for women’s groups, her work was often publicised in the JFB’s Blätter des Jüdischen Frauenbundes. 359 Cora Berliner and Hannah Karminski, leaders of the JFB, wrote that she had been ‘one of the most active and creatively imaginative people within our circle’. 360 Her involvement in the work of the JFB remained in line with her wider intellectual role, limited to culture, politics, institutional and social issues rather than religion, feminism, or family issues. 361

An isolated albeit indirect example of Arendt’s analysis of contemporary concerns

360 Cora Berliner and Hannah Karminski, reference, March 1939, pp. 1-2, Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBIA, NY.
361 There is a marked contrast in the degree of gender-specific instruction offered by leading female publicists such as Margarete Goldstein, ‘Frauen, hinein in den C.V.!', C. V.-Zeitung, ‘Die C.V.erin’ supplement, vol. X, no. 48, 27 November 1931, pp. 541-42, compared with Reichmann in her writings.
facing the German woman appears in a review of Alice Rühle-Gerstel’s book *Das Frauenproblem der Gegenwart* [the women’s problem of the present day]. This review allowed Arendt to engage with current affairs and discuss the role of political, sociological and psychological ideologies in relation to contemporary issues. Through Arendt’s reading of the writings of Karl Marx and Leon Trotsky, she grappled with Rühle-Gerstel, an Adlerian psychologist whose theses highlighted the discrepancy between the achievements of women’s rights and conditions of working women. Arendt disagreed with Rühle-Gerstel seeing the central problem for the modern woman as the family, rather than employer-employee relationships as Rühle-Gerstel argued. Arendt’s interpretation envisaged two alternative consequences for the modern woman: either enslavement within the family or the dissolution of the family; suggesting the woman’s experience of modern life was still strongly governed by traditional gender roles within the family structure. Both Rühle-Gerstel and Arendt addressed the women’s question in relation to wider society rather than a specific focus on the situation of the Jewish woman.

The critical analysis of the contemporary circumstances facing German and European Jewry in the 1930s which Arendt voiced bore similarities to Reichmann’s awareness of collective responsibility and emphasis on ideological, political and gender-neutral collaboration between men and women for a strong, unified response. Arendt discussed the historical reasons for Jewish indifference towards antisemitism and unwillingness to get to grips with opposition, suggesting this was born of inner-Jewish division, atomisation and separation from external cultures and societies. Her comments in 1937 appear a fairly damning interpretation of the consequences of elevating the destiny of the individual above that of the gender-inclusive collective. Arendt implies that these are the negative result of post-emancipatory assimilation when read in conjunction with her articles on Rahel Varnhagen, which emphasised the individualist attempts of the Romantic Jewesses to gain a place within male non-Jewish

---


363 Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 95-97.


Unlike many members of Jewish women's organisations Reichmann was not primarily concerned with gender issues but focused on problems facing the whole German-Jewish community, the individual and humanity in general, beyond a purely feminist cause. Berliner and Karminski wrote that Reichmann 'always succeeded in tying the experience of women into the whole Jewish question'. In this context her 'whole Jewish' approach can be read as a political stance against gender specificity.367 Reichmann's contextualisation of the experiences of the Jewish woman within those of German Jewry and wider German society makes the woman's role, a subsidiary concern to the larger causes she discussed, such as the establishment of Palestine or the individual’s responsibility to society as a whole.368

Reichmann noted that there was a constant need to 'strive to replace the caricature of the German Jew which exists in the minds of German citizens'.369 She considered the existence of innumerable individual characteristics, challenged the use of stereotypes and generalisations, consciously avoiding terminology which could play into the hands of opponents, countering the 'undue formulation of types'.370 In contrast with Reichmann's stance, Stern appeared to use typologies to categorise male and female Jewish historical figures without question. Her criticism of the 'luxurious' and decadent 'type' of Jewish woman of her own generation bore similarities to an established male Jewish critique of female behaviour.371

The focus of Reichmann's study of Jewish emigration to Palestine presents a


367 Cora Berliner and Hannah Karminski, reference, March 1939, pp. 1-2, in Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBIA, NY.


370 Reichmann railed against such generalising in ibid. Like Stern she had studied at Heidelberg, through her sociological training she was familiar with the problematics of Max Weber's typologies. See Barbara Hahn's critique of Stern's use of this terminology in the two series published in Ost und West and Der Morgen; in Barbara Hahn, Die Judin Pallas Athene, pp. 173-82. See also Stern's use of 'types' in her work on male-centred German-Jewish culture in Selma Stern 'Eine kulturgeschichtliche Skizze', Der Morgen, vol. 9, no. 1 (April 1933), pp. 30-41. In other writings Stern referred instead to 'generations' and 'groups' at key historical transitions.

broad sociological analysis of the development of communities, society and nation. Travelling to Palestine in 1937 with the Reichsverband der Jüdischen Kulturbundes [National Union of the Jewish Cultural Associations] and the Berliner Zionistische Vereinigung [Berlin Zionist Organisation] she observed many facets of Palestinian society focusing on the German-Jewish contribution. She reported in the *C. V.-Zeitung* on welfare initiatives, industry, economics and relations between Jews and Arabs in the section dedicated to Palestine. Visits to various institutions were arranged for the group, in order to provide an understanding of the breadth of the work already undertaken. A central aspect of Reichmann’s observations was her awareness of the hard task ahead; to establish a strong society set against the fragility of existence in the region and the hope for a future carried through by the younger generation.

Shortly after her return she took part in the annual Lehnitzer conference of the JFB, leading a study group which looked at the interpersonal role of the Jewish woman in Palestine alongside broader issues such as the relationship between Arabs and Jews, Palestine and the diaspora. Although she had seen the work of Women’s International Zionist Organization and institutions run by women or devoted to specifically gendered causes, women’s work was not the central theme of the lecture, rather she integrated it within the wider Jewish and in particular German-Jewish contribution to the establishment of Palestine.

One point which Reichmann made about the position of women in Palestinian

---


373 Eva Reichmann-Jungmann, ‘Palästinafahrt’, *C. V.-Zeitung*, vol. XVI, no. 45, supplement no. 5, 11 November 1937, pp. 17-18, describing her first impressions of Haifa, visits to Naharia, German-Jewish communities including the Ludwig Tietz Schule (supported by the CV) in Jagur, settlements, institutions, a Women’s International Zionist Organization (WIZO) girls’ school, the Russian settlement Haschermer Hazair, the work of Jugend-Aliyah, Ahawa in Kirzat Bialik and the Ruthenberg-Elektrizitätswerk in Tel Or. In Eva Reichmann-Jungmann, ‘Palästinafahrt III’, *C. V.-Zeitung*, vol. XVI, no. 45, supplement no. 4, 19 November 1937, pp. 13-14, she wrote that the group was also received by the Jewish Agency, Keren Kajemet, Keren Hajessod in Rechavia, Ben Schemen, a children’s village, the vineyard Rishon le Zion, the Daniel-Sieff-Institut, an agricultural experiments station and the WIZO in Tel-Aviv.


society raised an important issue: she considered the ‘new social form’ evolved in the settlements resolved the problems which had given rise to the women’s movement in other countries.\(^{376}\) In support of this Ernst Simon and Ignaz Maybaum added to the discussion that the position of women was particularly emancipated in Palestine since they considered it a matriarchy. Reichmann subtly challenged this however by adding that ‘although this was not entirely the case in the settlements, if women wanted to say something they could’. She emphasised that developments in Palestine needed to be supported practically and ideologically on all levels by people with strongly religious or consciously Jewish convictions.

In this way Reichmann’s mediation of being a Jew and a woman in the 1930s did not highlight the experience of women in isolation. Her ideological concern for ‘neutrality’ incorporated gendered dimensions to prompt a united response from men and women. The promotion of unity and ‘neutrality’ during this period has been identified by Claudia Prestel as central concerns in the gendered politics of women’s group leaders, as a means to strengthen unity within their own ranks in the face of gender discrimination, inner-Jewish and external opposition.\(^{377}\) Prestel highlights the impact of the stance taken by Paula Ollendorf, a leading political figure in the liberal Jewish community of Breslau and board member of the JFB, whose approach was ‘never [...] petty party-political [...] her life was a service to the whole of Jewry’; evidence of the serious contribution of leading women who strove for unity across political, religious and engendered divides. This bore striking similarities to the description of Reichmann’s approach.\(^{378}\)

Reichmann’s work for the CV was always directed at a mixed readership in all senses. The CV prided itself on its high membership and readership numbers, pointing to the fact that although the majority of subscribed members were male, the CV was read by a significant number of female household members.\(^{379}\) Reichmann always drew the disparate readership into a collective community whether addressing male or female readers, through the use of the pronouns ‘we’ and ‘our’, echoing Martin Buber’s

\(^{376}\) There is no other information regarding the content of the discussions Reichmann led, other than her acknowledgement that marital and family problems were ever-present, see Hannah Karminski, \textit{ibid.}


analysis of collective society.\textsuperscript{380} The problematic relationship between the individual and the collective was a topic that Reichmann addressed in a discussion at another JFB conference, responding to Buber's study of the individual and collective responsibility.\textsuperscript{381} Questions and problems associated with the opposing tensions between individualism and collectivism were important to the JFB particularly regarding its claim to 'non-partisanship'. Buber stressed it was most important to realise that a community was not made up of similar people, but demanded the overcoming of differences, whether religious, political or engendered.\textsuperscript{382} Reichmann too advocated that in times of growing personal danger German Jews should draw closer together in order to help one another understand the meaning of the times.\textsuperscript{383} A stance modelled in the working relationships of leading men and women of the Jewish community in particular at the Reichsvertretung.

By the second half of the 1930s Arendt and Reichmann were predominantly involved in activities which took their lead from the contemporary situation facing German Jews in Germany and abroad. In these vulnerable circumstances, as National Socialist oppression grew, both historical interests and gendered concerns became sidelined by the pressing exigencies of the day. Stern experienced difficulties continuing her historical research, the restrictions upon Jewish scholars quashed opportunities to pursue her personal interest in the biographies of great men and women and severely hampered the continuation of her research into Prussian – Jewish relations. Gender specificity remained absent in the writings she managed to produce during this period, as she struggled to see a future for her historical research.

Despite the profound rupture and uncertainty experienced by Arendt, Reichmann and Stern as they fled Germany, they aspired to the continuation of former personal activities, concerns and interests. Their strong attachment to German-Jewish intellectual traditions provided a constant point of reference which bound them to fellow émigrés

\textsuperscript{381} Reichmann referred to the recent publications: Martin Buber, Die Frage an den Einzelne (Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1936) and Martin Buber, Die Stunde und die Erkenntnis – Reden und Aufsätze 1933-1935 (Berlin: Schocken Verlag, 1936).
\textsuperscript{382} This collectivity is also emphasised in Reichmann’s quotation from Ranke in Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Der Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens’, in Eva G. Reichmann, Größe und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz, p. 32.
\textsuperscript{383} Cora Berliner and Hannah Karminski, reference, March 1939), pp. 1-2, Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBIA, NY.
from Germany and provided a ‘spiritual home’ as Reichmann put it. Reichmann took with her letters of recommendation addressed to Jewish institutional leaders in Great Britain, hoping to gain employment which might bring her specialist knowledge and experience to bear on contemporary affairs. Stern and her husband had made provision for their writings and scholarly apparatus to be looked after in Germany until such time in the uncertain future when they would be able to ship their possessions from Germany and continue their historical studies. Following the illegal and clandestine activities to assist the Zionists which Arendt undertook in Berlin, she developed a deeper involvement with community and welfare work through various institutions assisting refugees and emigrants in Paris. She also made provision for the safe passage of her work and that of fellow émigrés, in the hope that it might one day be published.

Having moved from the margins as female Jewish graduates to assert their intellectual acumen as publicists and leading members of high-profile German-Jewish intellectual institutions, their reputation, position and activities had a direct bearing upon the timing of their flight from Germany. Arendt’s close connection with Kurt Blumenfeld and her dangerous work placed her at risk of arrest and incarceration. Following her escape from custody in 1933 she was compelled to leave Germany. As editor of Der Morgen and Reichmann’s high position on the staff of the C. V.-Zeitung put her in a challenging position. These publications continued under National Socialist observation until November 1938, when they were closed down and the staff arrested. When Reichmann and Stern finally prepared to leave Germany, as members of the elite leadership their risky predicament gave them at the same time access to contacts abroad and visas. Although Taeubler was offered employment opportunities abroad from the mid 1930s, the couple’s late emigration in 1941 was partly due to their close connections with Leo Baeck and community leaders. They experienced great difficulty, however, obtaining visas at that late stage, even though an academic post was awaiting Taeubler in Cincinnati.


Chapter Two
The Recovery of a Valuable Past

2.1 Introduction
Throughout the 1940s and 1950s Arendt, Reichmann, Sterling and Stern participated in the reconstitution of German-Jewish community and intellectual life within representative German-Jewish organisations following dispersion from National Socialist Germany. They also took roles in the establishment of the diasporic discipline of German-Jewish historiography, as an academic field with an international footing, during these two decades. The Leo Baeck Institute founded in 1955 provided the central focus for the institutionalisation of this discipline, however groundwork carried out by these women and their male contemporaries since the Second World War shows the range of aims and visions for this scholarship, pursued in dispersed locations across the German-Jewish diaspora and West Germany. The construction of this discipline evolved slowly from the late 1940s into the 1950s. Male colleagues took key leadership roles, however during this period these four women created niches in the German-Jewish intellectual sphere for their research, publications and personal contribution to German-Jewish studies.

A two-fold concern was central to their individual contributions. Its primary form had understandably deep and personal roots, focused on the reconstruction of German-Jewish life and community, salvaging its cultural and religious heritage. The second element, which ran parallel to the primacy of German-Jewish issues, was their focus on Germany itself: past and recent German history and post-war society, expressed through their historical analysis of Jewish and non-Jewish relations and observation of German Vergangenheitsbewältigung.¹ Both these focal points were combined in their advocacy for a Jewish role in German reconstruction and re-education and their function as messengers and bridge builders across the abyss caused by the breakdown in German and Jewish relations and the Holocaust.² A complex bond connected these two concerns. The recovery of German-Jewish scholarship in fact needed this reconnection with Germany on a number of levels. The audience and interest which their work found within the wider international field, outside a German-speaking environment, was limited but given the analysis of German and Jewish historical relations in their

---
¹ The term Vergangenheitsbewältigung describes the process of coming to terms with Germany’s National Socialist past.
² The use of the term ‘abyss’, to describe the destruction, loss and distance from Germany and Germans experienced by former Jews from Germany in the aftermath of the Holocaust, was a common concept in the writings of this generation of scholars.
writings, they could potentially impact the re-education of post-war German society and reshape historical consciousness.

The German-Jewish intellectual diaspora was initially fragmented, with individual scholars and leading cultural and community figures seeking personal means of survival through employment immediately following emigration. Gradually organisations were established to represent the refugee communities. Personally and publicly the constellations of former community organisations were reconvened, oriented around a surviving elite of leading spiritual, community and intellectual figures. These constellations were reshaped into new organisations and associations born of the exigencies of refugee life in the diasporic centres; addressing the pressing realities of the post-war restoration of German-Jewish heritage and rebuilding of Jewish life in Germany. Alongside the reconstructive spirit of the work they undertook, the commemoration of the great human and material losses, which European Jewry had suffered under the National Socialists, was a central motivating force. This drove the institutional establishment of German-Jewish historical scholarship, aided by individual and group initiatives which many German-Jewish intellectuals participated in alongside their own efforts to re-establish, continue and maintain their own careers and research projects during the 1940s and early 1950s.

There was no real option to break completely with Germany given their research interests, nor did they personally promote such action, motivated as they were by a supra-institutional agenda of critical re-engagement with German-Jewish traditions and German history, culture and society. Based outside Germany their work to reclaim the cultural fabric of German-Jewish cultural heritage brought them directly into contact with Germany. Their efforts to relocate and access documentation for historical and contemporary research necessitated professional and personal contact. Thus their reworking of the German-Jewish past was inextricably linked to their re-engagement with Germany. Alongside institutional commitments, these four women displayed an independence and autonomous agenda in their active involvements and scholarship, building on personal experience and working relationships dispersed over many locations. Deep personal ties helped foster connections and opportunities for historical research projects and enabled their analysis of German current affairs.

2.2 Identity
One of the key overarching, internationally constituted bodies representing the German-Jewish diaspora was the Council for the Protection of the Rights and Interests of Jews
from Germany founded in 1945 under the leadership of Leo Baeck. It unequivocally defined itself in relation to Germany but distinctly outside Germany, whilst continuing to assert its former dual historical and cultural heritage.\(^3\) The German-Jewish diaspora struggled to define itself in relation to two poles: West Germany and the international diaspora which included communities located in Palestine. Hence by the 1950s, networks of scholars were working to establish German-Jewish historical studies across boundaries marked by different ideological positions, national and international frameworks. For example the three centres for scholarship established by the LBI in Jerusalem, New York and London worked for common goals but at the same time reflected the different ideological and political standpoints, subject specialisms and interests of the German-Jewish scholars in each centre.\(^4\)

Among the German-Jewish intellectuals who engaged in the study of German-Jewish history during these two decades are few female scholars besides the four subjects of this study who attained an international reputation as historical, cultural and political specialists in wider international and West German spheres.\(^5\) Their decision to settle in the German-Jewish diaspora, outside Palestine, had many influencing factors. Although this suggested a predominantly assimilationist response to emigration, rather than explicitly Zionist, which favoured settlement in Palestine, a dichotomous positioning of diaspora versus Palestine was not so clear cut within their personal views on Zionism, Palestine and later the state of Israel.

Arendt was closely linked with Kurt Blumenfeld and leading Zionist intellectuals and politicians. She had engaged with the politics of Zionism and its critique of Jewish assimilation in the 1930s and in the 1940s worked alongside Judah Magnes founder of the Ichud or ‘Unity’ party which advocated a bi-national state for Palestine.\(^6\) Reichmann


\(^5\) A comparative study of the post-war international careers and reception in West Germany of German-Jewish literary writers, such as Nelly Sachs, Hilde Domin or Ilse Blumenthal-Weiss, might also show the layers of public engagement with the historical and emotional subjects of their writings.

\(^6\) Upon the death of Judah L. Magnes in 1948 Arendt continued to support the work of the Judah Magnes Foundation which lobbied support for a bi-national resolution for Palestine, under which Jews and Arabs would have parity. See Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, Hannah Arendt, for Love of the World, pp.
had been a close observer of the Zionist counterparts of the Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens (CV) [Central Union of German Citizens of Jewish Belief] during her employment and work for the C. V.-Zeitung. She had influenced the CV’s later, more positive position regarding immigration to Palestine which she had visited in 1937, reporting on the German-Jewish contribution to the construction of the social and economic infrastructures of Jewish life.

Their involvement in the preservation of the German-Jewish legacy did not preclude a critical interest for Jewish settlement in Palestine, evident for example in Arendt’s critical analysis of Jewish – Arab relations, the politics of Zionism prior to the establishment of the state of Israel and in the writings and thinking of Reichmann in the mid 1960s and later. Although Stern’s emigration to America was determined by her husband’s employment, Taubler’s relationship with Zionism was complex. Stern did not engage with the politics of Zionism in her published writings, she chose to return to Europe in 1960 rather than emigrating to Israel. Sterling categorically asserted ‘I am indeed no Zionist’. The decision to emigrate to America may have primarily stemmed from her family’s connections there, however the decision to return permanently to West Germany was singular amongst this group of women and entirely her own.

Central to the early post-war activities undertaken by these four women were issues of identity and refugee status. These functioned at times as determining, limiting and motivating factors affecting their choices and opportunities. Depending upon the sphere they were engaged in, their multiple identities enabled them to assume various roles and perspectives on the reconstruction of West Germany and German-Jewish scholarship.

Both decades were strongly shaped by the ongoing process of coming to 225-33, in particular pp. 232-33.

7 The Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens (CV) [the Central Union of German Citizens of Jewish Faith] was founded in 1893 to defend German Jewry against antisemitism and politically and legally support civil and social equality.


10 A family tree amongst Sterling’s papers shows two cousins who emigrated to the US, Nachlass Eleonore Sterling, EB 89/137, folders A 2 and I, Deutsches Exilarchiv (1933-1945), DDB, Frankfurt am Main.

11 The case of Sterling is perhaps the most complex of the four: a German-Jewish refugee in the United
terms with personal discontinuities and the possibilities for rebuilding their lives. Their communal experiences prompted reflection on the psychological and social implications of the refugee status of German Jewry, the vulnerability of Jewish life in Germany and the difficult path ahead for West German society in the multi-layered process of Vergangenheitsbewältigung. The experience of leaving Germany had forced them to reconsider their identity as German Jews, emigrants and refugees, part of a distinct group. This reflection underwent complex readjustments as new formal national identities were adopted. Arendt considered the common predicament of the refugee and railed against the injustices of statelessness. Reichmann associated herself with the refugee community in Great Britain through her participation in the programme of the Association of Jewish Refugees (AJR). As ‘Jews from Germany’ their identity was continually renegotiated during the late 1940s and 1950s as they reflected on issues of Heimat [home] and return, resuming physical contact with Germany and developing their careers and reputation in new host communities. Even though Arendt, Reichmann and Stern visited Germany (mainly the new West German state but also the Eastern sector of Berlin) for extended periods, only Sterling made the decision to return permanently. Stern’s return to Basel, situated on the border with West Germany, constituted a partial return: to European society, if not...
German. Yet the subtle distinctions of their self-identification as émigrés, refugees or individuals in exile, belong to a debate that was complicated further by their reconnection with Germany. Their multiple and interrelated identities as Jewish women, former German Jews, Jews from Germany, members of a German-Jewish diaspora and citizens of America and Great Britain were also underpinned by regional German affiliations which remained strong. All of which shaped their standpoint on German-Jewish issues as well as their relationship with West Germany.

Studies of the role of external agents and Jewish interaction in the layered processes of West German Vergangenheitsbewältigung have dwelt on an analysis of the political and economic agency of Allied and foreign organisations. This has ignored the nuanced diasporic contribution of prominent German-Jewish activists and intellectual institutions, not to mention the role of gender upon the dominant historical narratives of these decades. It is a determining characteristic of the dynamics of German-Jewish historical studies, contemporary affairs and intellectual exchange during this period that the location for this activity was transnational. Yet, there were strong connections with the inner events of West German political and public life. Although German historiography in the early post-war decades tends to be viewed as categorically defined by inner-German historical debates and intergenerational tensions, an international cohort of scholars outside Germany marked out their participation in these debates, negotiating their own approach to contemporary history and the recent past.

2.3 Gender and the re-establishment of their careers

The ability to re-establish their careers as scholars and writers was all the more exceptional given additional barriers caused by issues of gender. Obtaining a university post was a difficult prospect for male refugee scholars. For female scholars teaching posts were doubly hard to obtain in competition with a higher proportion of male scholars teaching.

17 I do not think that the term 'exile' adequately describes their status following emigration from National Socialist Germany. For example, this term is often used to describe Arendt's time in Paris before emigrating to the United States. Due to the circumstances of their emigration these women did not envisage returning to Germany, believing this to be a permanent move. Their new lives were shaped by their collective identity as refugees in the first instance, belonging and associating themselves with a wider émigré group of German-Jewish and Jewish individuals.

18 There are a number of institutional studies charting the relationship between Jews internationally and post-war West Germany. See Ronald W. Zweig, *German Reparations and the Jewish World. A History of the Claims Conference* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1987) and Shlomo Shafir, *Ambiguous Relations. The American Jewish Community and Germany Since 1945* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999). New research also presents wider interactions which incorporate a consideration of the role of religious, as opposed to purely secular, factors and agents contributing to West German Vergangenheitsbewältigung, see for example Tom Lawson, 'Constructing a Christian History of Nazism. Anglicanism and the Memory of the Holocaust, 1945-49', *History & Memory*, vol. 16, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2004), pp. 146-76.
competitors in the predominantly male spheres of American Jewish academia, American and German university spheres, despite the personnel changes which denazification brought to the latter in the immediate post-war years. Gender however proved less of an obstacle to the employment of these three scholars within the German-Jewish infrastructure for specific personal reasons. Arendt, Reichmann and Stern were already regarded as established intellectuals and scholars at the time of emigration and continued to be closely associated with leading male figures in scholarship and community life in their immediate intellectual and institutional environs in New York, London and Cincinnati, particularly in the case of Reichmann and Stern. Their academic calibre in their own fields was proven and enabled an independence of direction and motivation for their research although limited by financial needs. Although they did not achieve the highest leadership roles in these cultural and intellectual institutions, their experience, expertise and opinions were greatly valued, such that their high-level involvement was sought after.

Public involvement in the German-Jewish refugee community took form as they contributed to community publications, cultural and political newspapers and periodicals, alongside the presentation of their academic research in subject-specialist publications. For Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling, their ability to engage on an intellectual and personal level with contemporary issues facing the refugee communities provided employment, financial support and intellectual activity so vital to personal survival for this generation of émigrés; illusive for many purely academic scholars. Their experiences following emigration from Germany do not present unique struggles to reshape personal lives and intellectual interaction with the German-Jewish legacy in


20 See for example correspondence between Stern and LBI leaders Robert Welsch and Max Kreutzberger, Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D12 and 14, Handschriftenabteilung der Universitätsbibliothek Basel (UBB). On Reichmann’s role within the Wiener Library (WL) see Wiener Library Archive (WLA) 358-360 Reichmann, WL, London. On Arendt’s work at the JCR see MS 137 (Records of the Anglo-Jewish Association (A-JA), AJ95/ADD/21 (Jewish Cultural Reconstruction Inc. 1948-52), Hartley Library Special Collections, University of Southampton; R. G. 1-F-86-15, Jewish Cultural Reconstruction (1950), Records of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Joseph and Miriam Ratner Center, Jewish Theological Seminary of America (JTSA), New York, and Salo W. Baron Papers, M580, box 232, folder 5, Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford. On Sterling’s employment as a foreign correspondent for American Jewry and advisory role to the American Jewish Committee, see AJC Records, FAD-1.
the light of the National Socialist destruction of European Jewry.21 Bearing in mind that these scholars were female, the research which Christhard Hoffmann presents regarding the proportion of contributing scholars to the Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland to successfully re-establish an academic or publishing career following emigration, puts their accomplishments into perspective.22 Arendt, Reichmann and Stern achieved three central elements of their former careers: institutional employment in the Jewish and German-Jewish cultural infrastructure, the continuation of German-Jewish historical and contemporary research interests, alongside publication in periodicals, newspapers and monographs all within a few years of resettling; unusual even amongst male scholars of the Weimar period. Many of their male colleagues had trained at rabbinical seminaries while studying at German universities. This gave them additional career options, enabling them to gain employment as rabbis and community leaders.

The public voice the women established in non-Jewish academia and public spheres in Germany was characterised as a Jewish rather than a female voice. Within the predominantly male-led Jewish organisations gender inevitably shaped the dynamics of their interactions, moulding their working relations and career opportunities. However, their engendered identity seems to have been subordinated to their identity as established German-Jewish scholars and intellectuals of the Weimar generation, which positively determined the inner-Jewish and wider public reception of their scholarship.

During the post-war decades, as during the Weimar period, a politicised concern for feminist issues was not central to the argumentation or scholarly interests of all four women. Earlier interest in historical and contemporary female experience was replaced

in the work of Arendt and Reichmann, by elevating instead the wider concern for humanity as a whole and the reconstruction of European Jewry and German nation in the wake of the Holocaust. Reichmann, as one of few surviving members of the representative committee of the Jüdischer Frauenbund (JFB) [Jewish Women’s Association] who had worked alongside the founding generation in the 1930s, resumed contact with this organisation in post-war West Germany. The concerns that she expressed in her public speaking for the JFB continued to focus, as they had in the 1930s, on wider society, rapidly broadening to encourage Jewish participation in Christian and Jewish dialogue in West Germany. Arendt rarely represented feminist causes publicly but observed the attitudes towards female intellectuals, responding with chagrin at being considered the token woman, what she called the ‘feminini generis’ in the predominantly male American university faculty at Berkeley when she was invited to give a series of lectures. A central development in her writings and lectures promoted the moral responsibility of human action and thought regardless of gender.

In the case of Stern it could be argued that although her husband obtained an academic post facilitating their emigration to the United States, she was the more successful in resuscitating her publishing career. Arendt and Reichmann too found intellectual and academic employment more easily than their husbands, partially due to their better grasp of the English language. Noticeably, although Stern indulged her interest in female biography in the novel she produced as her first post-war publication, her later historical studies show the primary focus upon male figures and their agency, contributing to the more dominant historiographical narratives of German state history and relations between Germans and Jews.

---


25 Both Stern and Taeubler sought publishers for their post-war literary work but only Stern successfully published, although she made many efforts to assist her husband. See correspondence with various publishers and contacts in Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler. NL 0120, UBB. She also facilitated the posthumous publication of a collection of many unpublished essays by Taeubler: Eugen Taeubler, Aufsätze zur Problematik jüdischer Geschichtsschreibung, 1908-1950, edited by Selma Stern-Taeubler (Tübingen: Mohr, 1977).

26 I refer to Stern’s determined interest in ‘the biographies of great men and women from history and literature’, expressed in a diary entry around the time of the First World War, cited by Sassenberg in Marina Sassenberg, ‘Der andere Blick auf die Vergangenheit’, in Marina Sassenberg, Apropos Selma Stern (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Neue Kritik, 1998), p. 22. Stern wrote a large number of articles on historical female figures and the typology of the Jewess between 1914 and 1926. Compare the prominence of female characters in Selma Stern, The Spirit Returneth...A Novel (Philadelphia: The
Sterling, as well as being one of relatively few female returnees of her generation, counted among a minority group of female students pursuing university education in West Germany in the 1950s. Whereas scholarship has readily focused on established male returnee academics who took a critical position in West German secular and intellectual culture, such as those of the Institut für Sozialforschung [Institute for Social Research] in Frankfurt am Main, little attention has been given to the experiences of the younger generation of returnees and survivors in West German academia.

2.4 Reconstruction: career, community and cultural life
The individual reconstruction of their lives and careers post-war began in the communities of Jewish refugees from Germany. In 1941 Hannah Arendt settled in New York with her husband Heinrich Blücher, where there was already a well-established German-Jewish community and large refugee population, after fleeing the concentration camp at Gurs and crossing the Atlantic. She quickly found opportunities to publish the results of her newly politicised thinking on refugee issues, social and political questions which had been formulated during her sojourn in Paris from 1933-41 and following emigration to New York, regularly contributing to Aufbau, the main German-Jewish newspaper until 1945. Arendt’s public engagement with German-Jewish issues in America combined her personal observations of recent history and refugee experience, prompting her involvement in discussions during the remaining war years regarding the future of Jewish politics, the crisis of Zionism and the creation of a Jewish army. She subsequently built up a portfolio of English and German articles on political, scholarly and political questions.

---


28 See Rolf Wiggershaus. Die Frankfurter Schule. Geschichte, theoretische Entwicklung, politische Bedeutung (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1986), which illuminates the post-war careers of Max Horkheimer, Theodor W. Adorno, Friedrich Pollock and others. A small number of other returnees have been written about, see for example Gary Lease, ‘Hans-Joachim Schoeps settles in Germany after eight years of exile in Sweden’, in Sander L. Gilman and Jack Zipes (eds.), Yale Companion to Jewish Writing and Thought in German Culture (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), pp. 655-61; other examples are provided by autobiographical accounts such as Ruth Klüger, weiter leben. Eine Jugend (Göttingen: Wallstein-Verlag, 1992).

philosophical and topical issues in Jewish and non-Jewish periodicals and newspapers in the United States including Partisan Review, Review of Politics, Commentary, Commonweal, Jewish Social Studies, Menorah Journal and Jewish Frontier.\(^{30}\) Arendt’s first major post-war study *The Origins of Totalitarianism* was begun in 1945 out of her reflections on contemporary events and political debates on statelessness and the future of a Jewish homeland in Palestine; sections of the monograph appeared in early draft form in these journals.\(^{31}\)

Neither, Elisabeth Young-Bruehl’s picture of the intellectual spheres Arendt participated in, through her critical contribution to the intellectual circles of publications such as *Partisan Review* and *Commentary*, nor the wider fascination in her salonesque relationships with fellow writers and intellectuals, depict the broadening of Arendt’s involvement in Jewish academia and community organisations in the later half of the 1940s. During this time she contributed to scholarly Jewish publications such as *The Menorah Journal* and *Jewish Social Studies*, community and academic institutions.\(^{32}\) Arendt was employed as a research director by Salo W. Baron for the Conference on Jewish Relations, later named the Conference for Jewish Social Studies (CJSS) from 1944 to 1946. The articles and reviews, which she published in Jewish Social Studies edited by Baron, gave her academic exposure, yet she also sought employment with more far-reaching effect.\(^{33}\)

Appointed editorial director at Schocken Books, she worked towards the publication of a number of German-Jewish texts from 1946 to 1948.\(^{34}\) During the late 1940s and 1950s this publishing house provided a bridge between the ‘old country’ and

---

30 Key publications were: *The Review of Politics* (1942, 1944, 1945); *Jewish Social Studies* (1942, 1943-46); *The Menorah Journal* (1943, 1945); *Contemporary Jewish Record* (1943-45); *Partisan Review* (1944-45); *New Currents: A Jewish Monthly* (1944); *Chicago Jewish Forum* (1944); *Nation* (1945-46); *Jewish Frontier* (1945); *Commentary* (1945-46); *Sewanee Review* (1946). See bibliographical lists of her early publications in the German language in Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 164-262, and Hannah Arendt, *Ich will verstehen*, pp. 255-327.


33 Lotte Köhler (ed.), *Within Four Walls. The Correspondence between Hannah Arendt and Heinrich Blücher 1936-1968* (New York: Harcourt, 2000), p. 99; Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *Hannah Arendt, for Love of the World*, pp. 168-67 and 467, Arendt was later invited to rejoin the editorial board of the *JSS* when Jeanette, Baron’s wife later assumed the presidency.

the new for displaced European writers. Arendt’s role in bringing the work of European refugee authors to an American public had the additional effect of acting as a ‘cultural ambassador’ for the German language and European Jewish culture. This role as mediator between cultural worlds evolved from the private sphere, since she and her husband counselled émigré friends seeking publication, such as the writer Hermann Broch. Most notably Arendt intervened for the posthumous publication of the work of the literary critic and philosopher Walter Benjamin. She also assisted the publication of the work of two eminent German academics, her close friends and intellectual mentors Karl Jaspers and Martin Heidegger, in America.

Despite the critique of Jewish bourgeois traditions, mainstream institutions and certain attitudes held by émigrés Arendt had developed whilst living and working for Jewish welfare organisations in Paris in the late 1930s, she again took up work with key Jewish organisations in New York. Whereas Arendt’s articles placed her engagement within politically oriented secular American Jewish culture, her work for the publishers Schocken, CJSS and Jewish Cultural Reconstruction (JCR) was concerned with the preservation of a cultural, literary and historical European tradition of Jewish Wissenschaft [science]. Although she corresponded with international Jewish scholars, such as Gershom Scholem, her relationship with Salo Wittmayer Baron who held the first chair in Jewish history at an American university was particularly significant. It underpinned Arendt’s most active involvement with mainstream Jewish academic circles. As an institutional and personal relationship it was typical in some ways of

37 Arendt contributed to Broch’s posthumous publication within the German sphere: see Hannah Arendt, ‘Hermann Broch und der moderne Roman’, *Der Monat*, vol. 1, nos. 8-9 (1948-49), pp. 147-51; Hermann Broch, *Dichten und Erkennen: Essays*, edited by Hannah Arendt, in Gesammelte Werke, vols. 6 and 7 (Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1955). In Arendt’s correspondence, particularly with Jaspers and Blücher, one can note her concern regarding the reciprocal possibilities of publishing her own work in West Germany and finding German publishers for key works by friends in the United States, alongside her work as a kind of literary agent for Heidegger and Jaspers. With the assistance of Jaspers and others, she published a number of articles in *Die Wandlung, Merkur, Der Monat, Die neue Rundschau*. See correspondence in Lotte Köhler and Hans Saner (eds.), *Hannah Arendt Karl Jaspers: Correspondence 1926-1969*, translated from the German by Robert and Rita Kimber (Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch: New York, 1992), and Lotte Köhler (ed.), *Within Four Walls*.
39 Michael J. Kurtz, ‘Resolving A Dilemma: The Inheritance of Jewish Property’, *Cardozo Law Review*, vol. 20, pp. 625-55; see also Cecil Roth’s article on the urgent task in hand, written prior to his involvement with the Commission on European Jewish Cultural Reconstruction which became the JCR: Cecil Roth, ‘The Restoration of Jewish Libraries, Archives and Museums’, *Contemporary Jewish Record*, vol. 7 (1944), pp. 253-57.
40 Salo Wittmayer Baron held the chair as the Nathan L. Miller Professor of Jewish History, Literature
Arendt’s select, intellectually stimulating friendships. Living in the same neighbourhood, she and Baron were ‘walking partners’ in Riverside Park during the years when Baron lived permanently in New York. Arendt spent many summers at the Baron family home in Canaan, Connecticut and was visiting them the evening she died. Her intervention for the salvaging of the German-Jewish legacy was facilitated by her work together with this established academic figure.

Arendt worked on the Commission for European Cultural Reconstruction, later named the Jewish Cultural Reconstruction in a research capacity, appointed executive secretary from 1949-52. Her activities in this role add a further dimension to her relationship with the Jewish establishment in America during this period, whilst serving the wider international Jewish community. She often referred to this work for these Jewish organisations in the 1940s as motivated solely by the need to earn a living, at a time when she was the main provider for the household including her mother, prior to the establishment of her husband Heinrich Blücher’s academic career in philosophy. Yet these activities are significant, as they contributed to a higher profile within the Jewish public sphere, bringing new audiences such as an invitation from Louis Finkelstein, director of the Jewish Theological Seminary (JTS), New York, to address...
the Jewish religious community via radio – ‘The Words We Live By’ program of the Eternal Light radio station (JTS). Arendt gave a commentary and led discussion on the biblical book of Ezekiel.45

Stern was more restricted in the range of publication openings available to her given her academic research area. In the immediate post-war period she and other German-Jewish scholars in America like Guido Kisch faced the disinterest of publishers and lack of public and academic interest in their German-Jewish historical studies.46 Living in Cincinnati, at a distance from New York, hampered her involvement with Jewish academic circles based there, such as the CJSS and Historia Judaica among other institutions. The contact she developed with many scholars during this period was mainly by post.47 The academic surroundings of Hebrew Union College (HUC) – the rabbinical seminary and institution of Jewish higher education in Cincinnati where her husband Eugen Taeubler was appointed Research Professor for Biblical and Hellenistic Literature provided him with a problematic integration into the academic corpus.48 Stern was further restricted by her lesser position as an untenured female scholar.49

Stern relates the impact of displacement and the Holocaust on her historical writings, which had dramatically altered her ‘historical worldview [Weltbild]’ in the 1950 preface to her first post-war historiographical monograph.50 She used this phrase as a signifier pointing to the profound historical and existential understanding of the German-Jewish experience in the modern period which she had developed prior to the advent of National Socialism. The caesura she had experienced was recurrently evoked in texts accompanying her later historical studies.51 Yet in the 1940s she had pursued alternative modes of expression other than historical writings in response to these

---

45 Arendt had met Louis Finkelstein through the JCR. See Finkelstein, letter to Hannah Arendt, 16 August 1949 and her reply of 20 August 1949: ‘it was not only an honour to be invited by the Eternal Light Program but a very great delight to have once again the opportunity and even “the duty” to read the Bible and to think about the few essential matters in life’, R. G. I-E-64-60, Jewish Cultural Reconstruction, Records of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, JTSA, NY.
46 See Stern’s correspondence with Guido Kisch, legal historian and editor of the journal Historia Judaica (NY), in particular Guido Kisch, letter to Selma Stern, 20 December 1942, Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 11, 45, UBB.
47 See correspondence between the editors of the JSS and Stern: Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 14, 24 and 25, UBB.
49 Heike Scharbaum, Zwischen zwei Welten, pp. 54-55.
50 Selma Stern, The Court Jew, p. xii.
experiences. Turning to literature she embarked on writing a novel with the central theme – medieval Jewish martyrdom. This became a vehicle to express her grief for the loss of family, homeland and the apparent end of the historically rooted German-Jewish symbiosis. Stern’s personal papers show there was mutual support and interchange of ideas with other displaced scholars during this period, some who had achieved employment and publication, others who had not yet made the successful transition into American Jewish academic spheres. The response which her novel prompted from fellow émigrés and subsequently from individuals in West Germany following its translation into German attests to the deep layers of loss and commemoration which made the process of re-engaging with German-Jewish history so complex for Stern. She remained ever mindful of the post-war status of her research subjects, reflecting on contemporary relations between Jews and non-Jews in Germany, the absence of a German audience and the dispersion of German Jewry. The first opportunity to publish excerpts from her historical studies in America came in 1949 when Salo Baron invited her to contribute to *JSS*; a year later she published her only article in the *Hebrew Union College Annual*.

Reichmann arrived in Great Britain in 1939 with her husband Hans, originally intending to transfer to the United States, however with the onset of war and his internment on the Isle of Man they remained. From London they were evacuated to Bedford, moving to Cambridge towards the end of the war where Reichmann worked for the BBC’s wartime Listening Service. The Reichmanns took an active role in the regional work of the Association of Jewish Refugees (AJR) which was founded in 1941.

---

52 Selma Stern, *The Spirit Returneth... A Novel*; Stern wrote about the consolation writing this novel had given her in a diary entry dated 2 June 1944, see Marina Sassenberg, *Apropos Selma Stern*, pp. 38-39. Stern first expressed the difficulties she had experienced returning to her research in Selma Stern, *The Court JeVi*, pp. xi-xv.

53 Stern’s novel was published before she found employment. The first academic articles she was able to get published in America came two years after her appointment at the American Jewish Archives on the campus of Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati: Selma Stern-Taeubler, ‘The Jews in the Economic Policy of Frederick the Great’, *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2 (1949), pp. 129-52, and Selma Stern-Taeubler, ‘Der literarische Kampf um die Emanzipation in den Jahren 1816-1820 und seine ideologischen und soziologischen Voraussetzungen’, *Hebrew Union College Annual*, vol. 23, no. 2 (1950/51), pp. 171-96.


to represent the wider Jewish refugee community in Great Britain displaced by Nazi persecution, meeting welfare needs but also addressing cultural, political and social issues. Returning to London the employment they gained was closely associated with the community of former Jews from Germany, whose leadership comprised former colleagues and acquaintances. They were respected for their knowledge and expertise as former leading figures of German Jewry's cultural elite at the CV. Hans Reichmann took leading roles at the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, the Council for the Protection of Jews from Germany and later as head of the British section of the United Restitution Office. A strong strand of continuity was evident in the work of the Reichmanns, who continued to work closely with one another throughout their post-war careers as they had during the 1930s. 56

In the early 1940s Reichmann took up research work within the intellectual circles associated with the Council for the Protection of the Rights of Jews from Germany. 57 She regularly contributed from the earliest volumes until the 1980s to the main AJR publication, the AIR Information. This monthly publication strengthened her profile by the poignant articles and literary reviews being publicised within its pages. 58 Her association with the Jewish Central Information Office (JCIO), later known as the Wiener Library (WL), a private institution brought from continental Europe in 1939 by Alfred Wiener, a former lawyer and official of the CV, turned into a permanent appointment as research director from 1945 until 1959. Her responsibilities extended


57 Eva G. Reichmann, 'The Years Between', 27 June 1967, pp. 1-5, Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 1, LBJA, NY.

into the 1960s on a part-time basis making room for her writing and public speaking.\footnote{See Jewish Central Information Office, \textit{The Wiener Library: Its History and Activities 1934-45} (London: JCIO, 1946), also Ben Barkow, \textit{Alfred Wiener and the Making of the Holocaust Library} (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1997), p. 37: Reichmann’s sister Elizabeth Jungmann had worked for the WL during the war before Reichmann joined the staff.}

The study of the administrative and financial survival of this institution, dedicated to creating a comprehensive bibliographic collection on Jewish persecution under National Socialism, which Ben Barkow presents, highlights the work of its male figureheads, the director Alfred Wiener and C. C. Aronsfeld. Reichmann’s official role may well have been subordinate to the work of Wiener and Aronsfeld, however it is clear that in addition to managing the Wiener Library’s research projects, her expertise and high- standing enabled her to publicly represent the library in Great Britain and abroad. She advised on internal matters, managed staff and gave valued editorial advice to established and younger scholars. The details of the work of another key female employee Ilse Wolff and the behind-the-scenes collaboration of numerous researchers in London and abroad remain obscured.

The function of the Wiener Library was always closely associated with refugee life in Great Britain. It not only served an academic purpose but provided avenues and sources through which Jewish refugees, the British government and media, could obtain information during and following the war, about the extent of the Holocaust and the state of post-war Germany. This information service could directly impact refugee life, post-war attitudes and interaction with Germany in Great Britain. Reichmann was able to present her subject-specialist knowledge of German recent history, antisemitism and post-war West Germany through the \textit{Wiener Library Bulletin}, the \textit{AJR Information} and public speaking. Wider audiences included non-Jewish refugee communities, Anglo-Jewry and the German-speaking community of London. She addressed groups such as The Hyphen, Club 1943, the B’nai B’rith Lodge, the Society for Jewish Study, student and religious groups and the German YMCA.\footnote{See WLA 358-60 Reichmann and WLA 446 Leo Baeck, WL, London; see also the \textit{Wiener Library Bulletin}, which regularly publicised the work of their ‘research director’ in the 1940s and 1950s and to which she contributed reviews, articles and reports, also the \textit{AJR Information} (1947-81). Reichmann’s specialist insight reached even wider audiences, such as the German-Jewish community in Argentina: Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Das Erziehungswesen in Deutschland’, \textit{Jüdische} 123
Jewry within West German society. As the youngest of the four women, born in Heidelberg in 1925, she returned to live there after 15 years in the United States, whilst her brother settled in England. The motivation and circumstances of her remigration are unclear as there are hardly any personal documents or reflections relating to this period of her life. Unlike Arendt, Reichmann and Stern she received her higher education in the United States, marrying A. Cecil Sterling at the age of 18. She gained a scholarship to study social science at Sarah Lawrence College in 1943 and from 1946 studied political science in the evenings at Columbia University, NY, gaining a Masters degree in 1949. She began a doctorate with a major in political science and minors in philosophy and sociology within the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research from autumn 1950 until spring 1951. Subsequently a fellowship from the John Hay Whitney Foundation enabled her to return to Germany for one year’s research from February 1952, gathering sources for her work on ‘the Jewish Question in Germany (1800-1850)’.


62 See also Dietrich Goldschmidt, ‘In Memoriam Eleonore Sterling’, in Eleonore Sterling, Kulturelle Entwicklung im Judentum von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart (Wuppertal: Theologischer Verlag Rolf Brockhaus, 1969), pp. 1-4. An alternative account of Sterling’s years in the United States but one which does not correspond with the version given in her official papers, is related by Wilhelm Hennis, referring to a letter to the author from Hennis, 6 December 2003, who was Carlo Schmid’s first assistant prior to Sterling’s additional appointment. According to this version Sterling had been interned in the Gurs concentration camp and had escaped to America via Spain and Portugal. Her marriage to a boxer is supposed to have facilitated her gaining a visa. This unsubstantiated account is recounted in Petra Weber, Carlo Schmid. Eine Biographie (Munich: Suhrkamp, 1998), p. 519.

63 Sterling is listed as being in the Class of 1946, however it is unclear whether any degree was conferred. Subsequent Sarah Lawrence College Year Books do not list her as being in attendance nor does she have a student file in their archives; see correspondence between the author and Valerie Park, archivist at Sarah Lawrence College Archives, Esther Raushenbush Library, 17 and 22 October and 4 November 2003, and correspondence with Carmen Hendershott, archival reference librarian, New School, NY, 16 October 2003, regarding student records. Eleonore Sterling, ‘Anti-Semitism in Germany from the French Revolution to the Decrees of Karlshad (1789-1819)’, MA dissertation, Columbia University (1948), pp. 1-79, Nachlaß Eleonore Sterling, EB 89/137, folder C 1a, Deutsches Exilarchiv (1933-1945), DDB, Frankfurt am Main.

64 From correspondence between Carmen Hendershott, archival reference librarian of the New School, NY, and the author, 16 October 2003. Sterling enrolled under the name of Eleonore Orland Sterling. Orland was the surname that her brother Frank S. Orland took when he emigrated to Great Britain. It was a name that Sterling occasionally used as her pseudonym – E. M. Orland in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Following Sterling’s divorce in 1955 she continued to use her marital surname as well as her maiden name and pseudonym.

Sterling had little financial support to carry out her educational plans and worked during her studies from 1946-51 as an educator for disadvantaged children for the Jewish Care Association and social services. Her first academic article in America was published in *Historia Judaica*, based on her Masters dissertation. Other publications followed, showing the direct links she saw between past history and present society that constitute a recurrent motif in her work. During the early 1950s she wrote on political issues of race, spanning Black American discourse and questions of Jewish ethnic and religious identity for academic and intellectual publications.

Following her return to West Germany in 1953 she wrote on contemporary Jewish life as a journalist, regularly contributing to several newspapers as a source of income. This set the tone of her future efforts to bring scientifically researched historical issues into contemporary public debates. Towards the end of her doctoral research, from 1954 until mid 1956, she published in the *Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland*. The main topics which she addressed in the ‘Lebendige Vergangenheit’ [living past] column were closely linked to her own research, with a contemporary relevance as the title suggests. She wrote on the historical significance of the *Judengasse* [Jewry lane] in Frankfurt am Main during its contemporary transformation in 1954. She addressed antisemitism from the late nineteenth century and relations between Jews and Germans in two multi-part studies directly taken from her own research on the Christian image of Jews and the blood libel.

She also took an editorial role with the new monthly publication for the Jewish communities in the region of Hessen – the *Frankfurter Jüdisches Gemeindeblatt* in

---

66 See Eleonore Sterling-Oppenheimer, ‘Die Anfänge des politischen Judenhasses in Deutschland: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der christlich-jüdischen Beziehungen von der Restaurationszeit bis 1848’. PhD thesis, Universität Frankfurt am Main (1954). Nachlaß Eleonore Sterling, EB 89/137, folder C 1h, p. 1, Deutsches Exilarchiv (1933-1945), DDB. Frankfurt am Main. See also Werner Röder and Herbert A. Strauss (eds.), *Biographisches Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration nach 1933*, pp. 1121. Her activities are somewhat differently reported according to details supplied here: from 1947-50 she was employed as a group-worker at the Edenwold School for Boys, New York, studying in the evenings for an MA at Columbia University, then from 1950-51 she was employed as a social worker for the Department of Welfare, New York.


1955 as a financial exigency, alongside other work such as translation. Sterling had always been highly conscious of a distinction between journalism and academic writing. She differentiated between the values of their content and was concerned for the negative implications of her journalism upon her academic aspirations. Later this would change when she cited her work on current affairs in the curriculum vitae she wrote to support her application for a post as lecturer and again for a professorship in the 1960s. When Sterling was being considered as a co-worker for the Wiener Library in 1955, her journalism and editorial work for the Frankfurter Jüdisches Gemeindeblatt and other Jewish community newspapers were noted, as evidence of her knowledge of contemporary German and Jewish life, an important resource for the Wiener Library. A strong interrelation between historical and contemporary analysis was established in her thinking even prior to her return, she wrote: 'strange how the religious developments in Germany in the last months have given me a much broader scientific perspective'. In substance there was an increasing crossover between the content of her academic research and her journalistic writings. As experienced by Arendt and Reichmann, she presented herself and was received as an academic specialist within the public sphere.

2.5 The recovery of German-Jewish heritage

An important element of the reconstruction of German-Jewish life in the diaspora carried out by this generation of émigré scholars was the part they took in the recovery of cultural, historical, intellectual, religious and social heritage which had been denigrated and displaced under National Socialism, in order to preserve its memory and material substance for future generations. German Jewry’s heritage was being ‘rescued’ and returned to rightful owners or heirs according to negotiations within the Jewish diaspora. Through the organisations they worked for: the JCR, AJA and WL, they assisted the salvaging of Jewish cultural property, which included the retrieval of manuscripts, documents, monographs and periodicals from the allied sectors of

Antisemitismus 1881, Allgemeine Wochenz.eitung del’ ludell ;11 Deutschland (1956).
70 Co-editors were Ewald Allschoff and Leopold Goldschmidt. See Ellie Sterling, letter to Karl Thiene, 18 April 1955, Nachlass Karl Thiene, ED 163, 83, Institut für Zeitgeschichte-Archiv (IIZ-A), Munich.
71 Report from Alfred Wiener, 2 June 1955, regarding his hour long discussion with Eleonore Sterling on 20 June 1955; also Alfred Wiener, letter to Eleonore Sterling, 9 May 1955, and Ilse Wolff, letter to Eleonore Sterling, 26 October 1955, WLA 408 Sterling, WL, London. Sterling wrote also for the ‘Düsseldorfer Wochenblatt’, an unidentifiable Jewish community publication, most probably Unsere Gemeinde published at the time for the Jewish community of Düsseldorf.
Germany and their transfer and transmission to new centres of German-Jewish life in America, Great Britain, Israel and diaspora-wide. This recovery of the material and textual artefacts of German-Jewish religious ritual was a prerequisite for continuity in the religious life of diasporic German Jewry. In the secular domain the recovery of papers and publications underpinned the establishment of German-Jewish historiography within the international academic field outside Germany.73

From the end of the 1940s until the mid 1950s links were forged through this work between individual German-Jewish scholars and institutions throughout the diaspora who were concerned for the historical and cultural traditions of German Jewry and the future of Wissenschaft des Judentums [science of Judaism]. Individually and communally the reconstruction of German-Jewish cultural, historical and literary life in the diaspora was both backward and forward looking. Rooted in the German tradition of Bildung and German-Jewish Wissenschaft des Judentums it looked towards a new future for a dispersed German and European Jewry. The prospects for many German-Jewish scholars’ publishing careers were dependent on the physical salvaging of surviving sources and products of this dual historical and cultural heritage. The fate of these artefacts served as evidence of persecution; their preservation and transfer were bound up with the processes of post-war restitution, justice and commemoration. This work contributed to public discussion and intellectual debate regarding German-Jewish cultural identity in the immediate post-war years, whilst the analysis of recent history and the rejection of Jewry from National Socialist Germany, influenced the discussion of viable forms of integration within new national contexts.

Arendt’s role at the JCR promoted communication and connections between Jewish academic and community institutions around the world, forging bridges between the former and new worlds of German and European Jewry.74 The JCR initially worked to locate collections of Jewish ritual and textual artefacts, archives and libraries, gathering information about what they had contained and the owners. As head of the commission she was at the centre of this investigative work, collating initial information gathered by individuals working for the JCR and supplied by third parties to create several ‘Tentative Lists’ of findings.75 Her experience as a historical researcher

73 See for example the discussion regarding future centres of scholarship in ‘Minutes of a Special Meeting of the Board of Directors’, 21 December 1950, pp. 3-4, MS 137 (Records of the A-JA). AJ95/ADD/21 (JCR Inc. 1948-52), Hartley Library Special Collections, University of Southampton.
74 Lotte Kohler (ed.), Within Four Walls, p. 99.
75 Young Bruehl attributes Arendt as the main editor of two of the lists: ‘Commission on European Jewish Cultural Reconstruction, Tentative List of Jewish Cultural Treasures in Axis-Occupied Countries’, Jewish Social Studies (Supplement), vol. VIII, no. 1 (1946), pp. 5-103; and ‘Tentative List of Jewish Educational Institutions in Axis-Occupied Countries’, Jewish Social Studies
reinforced the importance of relocating valuable historical documents on German and Jewish relations for future historians. With the connections this work gave her she privately tried to find the papers of Romantic socialite Rahel Varnhagen, presumed lost, by which she had written her first and at that time unpublished German-Jewish historical monograph.76

Arendt’s trip to Europe from November 1949 to April 1950 on behalf of the JCR mainly centred on the German Federal Republic. She held official meetings with Allied, governmental and military authorities in Paris, London, Germany and her activities fulfilled many different purposes. She gathered basic information about what collections were being held in various locations including the eastern sector of Berlin. Negotiations were carried out with current owners and guardians, working with resident Jewish community leaders and German regional and local museums, archives and libraries to track down specific and valuable collections. She liaised with JCR representatives in Europe such as Ernst Gottfried Lowenthal who managed the Wiesbaden central collection depot, organised the microfilming of contested collections and helped coordinate the centralised collection of documents prior to redistribution.

The pressure of time and results weighed on her expectations of the potential outcome of her research and negotiations. She wrote:

It was a hell of a lot of work gathering in such a short period of time enough information for us to know what we can and cannot do. Almost every day I’ve been in a different city – Wiesbaden, Frankfurt, Würzburg, Nuremberg, Erlangen, Heidelberg and had appointments literally from morning to night [...]. Still I’m not sure if I sent him [Baron] the kind of information he was expecting.77

Arendt submitted five full-length reports during the trip, which were relayed concurrently to board members whilst she was in Europe.78 Despite lapses in


76 See Hannah Arendt, Rahel Varnhagen: the Life of a Jewess, edited by Liliane Weissberg, pp. 79 and 52. The study was first published as Hannah Arendt, Rahel Varnhagen. The Life of a Jewess (London: East and West Library, 1957).


78 Field reports during this period were submitted by Arendt and other JCR representatives such as E. G. Lowenthal: Hannah Arendt, ‘Field Report No. 12, December 1949’, pp. 1-7, Salo W. Baron Papers,
communication and her constant moving around she worked in close consultation with
Baron in New York. \(^79\) Alongside reporting her official work, her schedule allowed little
time to relate personal reflections on her trip. The additional information her
correspondence with Baron and Blücher provided was generally exchanged between
them. \(^80\) The reports show the level of responsibility she bore for the successful outcome
of the sensitive and difficult negotiations she led and the future of the collections at
stake. \(^81\) Although she was not solely responsible for ultimate decisions, her
investigations to uncover major collections in many respects decisively shaped their
preservation and transmission. She was rather surprised at the possible result of her
persecution with the authorities in West Germany. It appeared that the Ministry for
Culture would instigate at her behest a new national policy for dealing with issues of
ownership of holdings in state-owned archives, libraries and museums; sadly this
potential breakthrough for restitution and relocation was never brought into effect. \(^82\)

Arendt faced difficulties convincing oppositional German bureaucrats as well as
Jewish community leaders whose successor status was being questioned. The latter
brought to the fore issues surrounding the rapport between Eastern European Jewish and
the proportionately smaller German-Jewish communities of survivors and returnees and
their relationship with former German-Jewish heritage and traditions. \(^83\) These tensions
also point to the position of the Jewish communities who chose to live in post-war

---

\(^79\) See Arendt’s correspondence during her trip with Heinrich Blücher in Lotte Kohler (ed.), *Within Four
Walls*, pp. 169-228.


\(^81\) See in particular Hannah Arendt, ‘Report of my Mission to Germany respectfully submitted to the
Board of Directors for the meeting on April 12, 1950’, pp. 1-6, Salo W. Baron Papers, M580, box 232, folder 5, Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford.

\(^82\) Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 26 December 1949, in Lotte Kohler (ed.), *Within Four
Walls*, p. 111. See also Michael J. Kurtz, ‘Resolving A Dilemma: The Inheritance of Jewish
Property’, *Cardozo Law Review*, vol. 20, p. 653, and Edith Raim, ‘Wem gehört das Erbe der Toten?
Die Jewish Cultural Reconstruction’, *Tribüne. Zeitschrift zum Verständniss des Judentums*, vol. 135

\(^83\) Heinrich Blücher, letter to Hannah Arendt, 8 December 1949, in Lotte Kohler (ed.), *Within Four
Walls*, p. 103; see also Michael J. Kurtz, ‘Resolving A Dilemma: The Inheritance of Jewish
Germany, feeling isolated and shunned by the wider Jewish world and Arendt’s observations touched on these issues, conveyed in her reports.\textsuperscript{84}

It is significant that her personal views on the more problematic aspects of the JCR’s work: relocating heirless property, redistributing library and archival collections, also religious artefacts, which resulted in their removal from Germany to Jewish institutions abroad, are not visible in her reports. Her views are also not evident in her correspondence with JCR representatives and institutions whose requests for future ownership of relocated collections she dealt with. For example correspondence with Gershom Scholem concerning the proportion of materials to be relocated to Israel in relation to the proportion sent to other institutions in the diaspora.\textsuperscript{85} Many of the difficulties she encountered with Jewish community leaders and representatives of cultural institutions in Germany related precisely to the conflict of wishes regarding ownership.\textsuperscript{86} Given her central role she appears to have supported the JCR’s work to relocate and disperse.

In London the Wiener Library was committed to the collection of material relating to German-Jewish cultural heritage and in particular the twentieth-century persecution of the Jews. The bibliographic collection of secondary material was carried out alongside a programmatic and researched collection of primary historical and contemporary texts, to serve as a testimony to the recent historical events, comprising monographs, periodicals, newspapers, official documentation and personal testimonials. This work was led by the library’s director Alfred Wiener, assisted by the librarian Ilse Wolff who prepared bibliographic catalogues of the library’s holdings.\textsuperscript{87} Eva Reichmann as research director was responsible for the development of projects which the library undertook to gather and evaluate sources on specific historical events and

---


\textsuperscript{86} Arendt certainly made criticisms such as her comment on the response of the communities of the ‘so-called German Jews’ with whom she negotiated, whose wish to retain ownership prompted her ire that they were ‘bands of robbers’, Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 26 December 1949, in Lotte Kohler (ed.), Within Four Walls, p. 111.

\textsuperscript{87} Wiener in his spare time privately worked for individuals who wished to obtain books from Europe, see correspondence with James Parkes in WLA 333 Parkes, WL, London; Otto Kurz and the Warburg Institute, in Warburg Institute Archives, General Correspondence, Letters 1951 A-Z, Warburg Institute, London. During the 1940s and 1950s the Wiener Library published: The Wiener Library Catalogue Series, vols. 1-3.
topics. One major project, the collection of eyewitness reports of the persecution of Jewry under National Socialism from survivors around the world had its origins at the immediate end of the Second World War, when her husband employed by the WL and the Association of Anglo-Jewry drew up lists of individuals to be tried for war crimes.\(^{88}\)

To this end the WL received funding from the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany, working with Yad Vashem established in Israel in 1953, to document the history of the Jewish people during the Holocaust.\(^{89}\) They began to source reports from the Jewish refugee community in Great Britain, posting advertisements in the Wiener Library Bulletin and AJR Information.\(^{90}\)

Reports were also collected abroad, overseen by coordinators responsible for the employment of specialist interviewers and transcribers.\(^{91}\) As a result of Sterling’s meetings with Wiener and Reichmann during their trips to West Germany, she began to work on the collection of eyewitness reports in West Germany.\(^{92}\) She subsequently visited the WL in 1955 to discuss her permanently joining their staff in London and was offered a probationary research post at the WL. This she turned down, however she was appointed on a part-time basis as a research assistant in West Germany.\(^{93}\) One of her main tasks was the collection and coordination of eyewitness reports on the ‘history of National Socialism and the Jewish catastrophe’, as an interviewer and administrator, establishing a network of personnel to collect and transcribe reports in West Germany.\(^{94}\)

---

\(^{88}\) Hans Reichmann was appointed as a researcher on behalf of the A-JA at the Wiener Library to gather materials for the UN Commission on War Crimes, see Hans Reichmann (JCO), letter to S.D. Temkin (A-JA), 7 January 1946, regarding the ‘collection of memories’ held by victims of National Socialist persecution, MS 137 (Records of the A-JA), A317/15/26 (JCO, 1945-46), Hartley Library Special Collections, University of Southampton.


\(^{90}\) A headline article by Reichmann flagged up the ‘great narrative’ which these reports would provide for ‘future historians’; Eva G. Reichmann, ‘We All Bear Witness’, AJR Information, vol. IX, no. 11 (November 1954), p. 1. See also ‘Letters become History’, AJR Information, vol. VI, no. 12, December 1951, p. 5.


\(^{93}\) See correspondence between the WL and Sterling in WLA 408 Sterling, WL, London, in particular Ellie Sterling, letter to Alfred Wiener, 31 July 1955, in which she states that she could ‘not decide to change my place of residence again’.

\(^{94}\) See ibid. The names of other collectors and interviewers procured by Sterling in the region are occasionally mentioned, such as Carl Sardemann, Hermann Schweppe and Justus Fuerstenau, see Eva G. Reichmann, letter to Eleonore Sterling, 6 October 1955 and 17 December 1956, WLA 408 Sterling, WL, London.
This activity enabled the WL to establish contacts with individual German Jews and other Jewish groups living in West Germany: private individuals, scholars and community leaders who gathered reports or interviewed and transcribed accounts. There were a number of specific initiatives to organise report collection, for example during Reichmann’s visit to Berlin in 1954 when she was hosted and assisted by various members of the German-Jewish community such as Grete Weltlinger and Ruth Galinski of the JFB. Many of the people she spoke with wanted to retell their experiences and she was eager to have these committed to paper and sent to the WL. 95

This collection of factual information was to serve as a record and evidence of persecution, prior to the outbreak of war and during, addressing the commonplace and everyday experiences of discrimination, very much in line with the practical and methodological defence work of the CV, in which both Wiener and Reichmann had held leading positions. 96 These reports were catalogued and indexed according to key names, events and places, so they would be accessible to researchers, historians and sociologists. Reichmann gave a lecture in 1955 about these collections to a Jewish student group in London, highlighting their significance as historical documents and sources for the interpretation of recent German history.97

In Cincinnati, the AJA and the rabbinical seminary HUC were among the American recipients of materials relocated from Europe by the JCR, such as books, microfilms of cultural and historical documents and manuscripts. 98 Stern herself was concerned about the location of historical documents and sources she had consulted during the 1920s and 1930s, for her research on the historical relationships between the German state and the Jews. Anticipating a return to Europe in order to progress research for her publications on Josel of Rosheim and Prussian-Jewish relations, she

corresponded with local and regional archives in search of sources. Her correspondence like that of many fellow refugees reveals the communications which travelled around the world in the early post-war years between individuals and organisations to recall, commemorate and relocate surviving remnants of past communities, personal and national heritage, which would be transmitted to future generations of German Jewry.

Document collection for the centralised archives of American Jewish communities which the AJA undertook also included sources relating to German-Jewish immigrants in the United States. The genealogical value of the AJA’s holdings emerged as an additional aspect to the collection of personal and communal documentation, which the AJA set as its goal. This grew as the realisation of the scale of the destruction of European Jewry under National Socialism became apparent to the emigrated survivors of those destroyed communities. Stern herself addressed personal issues of family heritage when she undertook to write her literary novel, becoming involved in a genealogical project to gather historical and contemporary information on the associated families among the descendants of the novel’s main protagonist Eleazar of Weil.100

2.6 Concerns and contact with post-war Germany

For these women reconnection with their former Heimat – Germany gradually evolved on several levels. This process was initially subject to the slow re-establishment of postal communications with Germany and visa restrictions affecting travel. The loosening of regulations regarding travel from ‘business visits’ to tourist traffic was closely followed in the AJR Information which reported on facilitating changes, such as the movement of money to and from Germany, enabling individuals to start the difficult process of locating and reclaiming their property, belongings and savings.101 The leadership of diasporic German Jewry was closely involved in obtaining and monitoring information about the Jewish persecution, contemporary Germany and survivors’ circumstances. Since the individuals and organisations representing the fairly homogenous German-Jewish refugee community shared the bourgeois values of

---

99 See correspondence with the archives cited in her historical monographs, such as Selma Stern, Josef von Rosheim, p. 223, among her papers: Nachlass Selma Stern-Taebuler, NL 0120, UBB.
100 Selma Stern, The Spirit Returneth...A Novel. See for example Stern’s correspondence with a Weil descendant Ernest B. Weill, Nachlass Eugen Taebuler, NL 0078, E II 35-37, UBB. Stern was planning to write a history of the Weil family and circulated a ‘Sponsor Information Slip for the Weil, Weill, Weyl & Wyle Family Tree’ to interested correspondents.
101 One finds regular updates regarding postal connections, travel and currency regulations in the AJR Information between 1949 and 1954.
Weimar German society in which they had lived and worked, they also held a shared concern for their former homeland. 102

As the first formal visits on behalf of governmental and community organisations were made by former Jews from Germany, the discussion of German political and social culture in the transition from National Socialism to Allied rule took centre stage alongside assessing responses to the realisation of the destruction of European Jewry. Many of the first return visits to Germany made by German-Jewish intellectuals at the end of the 1940s combined official meetings with the observation of German society. As avenues for contact, restitution and remigration developed, personal reconnections with former homes and non-Jewish acquaintances in Germany were slowly re-established. More often than not these sprang from old friendships and academic contacts.

Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling all visited the newly founded West German state in the capacity of scholars and representatives of German-Jewish interest groups and institutions in the diaspora. Their personal concerns overlapped with official duties, guiding their activities and focus on West German current affairs, society and politics. The first hand observations which Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling made of contemporary West German life assessed the denazification process, public responses to recent German history, the social role of ideologies and the re-emergent National Socialism. Issues of guilt and reconciliation illuminated the foundations on which the new West German state was being established in pursuit of democracy. Their role as outside observers and reporters gradually shifted to publicly address current affairs regionally and nationally within West Germany, through academic forums and less formal talks and lectures, taking part in public discussions and radio broadcasts.

Concomitantly they pursued a public voice for their own scholarship in West Germany, contributing to an engaged Jewish and specifically former German-Jewish voice within the German intellectual and public landscape of the 1950s. 103 On the one hand Arendt and Reichmann were German-Jewish émigrés who had been forced to leave their homeland. As such they returned as diasporic representatives of German-Jewish and Jewish interest groups but they also spoke as erstwhile German citizens concerned for the future of their former homeland. It was precisely their personal

102 An example of this is evident in the records of Club 43, the AJR and the PEN Club in London, see AJR Information from 1946 onwards; see also Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), Exile in Great Britain. Refugees from Hitler's Germany (Leamington Spa: Berg Press, 1984); Steffan Pross, In London treffen wir uns wieder: Vier Spaziergänge durch ein vergessenes Kapitel deutscher Kulturgeschichte nach 1933 (Berlin: Eichborn, 2000).

103 Arendt and Reichmann visited West Germany almost annually during this decade.
identities and experiences as former German Jews which gave them authenticity and assisted their profile as spokespeople within the West German public sphere. As representatives of the generation of German Jews who had perished under National Socialism, they provided a reminder of liberal, democratic and ‘other’ German traditions which were being reclaimed and recalled as part of West Germany’s political and moral rehabilitation. When Sterling permanently settled in West Germany, locating herself among the reconstructed German-Jewish and wider Jewish community, her identity as a German Jew and an American citizen in West Germany gave her a complex position as both insider and outsider for the observing role she created for herself.

In 1951 Reichmann travelled to West Germany for the Wiener Library with a specific task: to observe the rate of growth and popularity of nationalist political groups. The resulting report – *Germany’s New Nazis. Impressions from a Recent Journey through Germany’s Danger Zones* was conveyed shortly after her return in a German lecture she gave to an audience of German and British notables, German-Jewish and refugee community members in London. Her observations on the resurgence of nationalism and antisemitism stemmed from the very specific focus of the WL but was also a prevalent concern within central Jewish institutions in Great Britain such as the Anglo-Jewish Association (A-JA), Association of Jewish Ex-Servicemen and Women (AJEX), the Council of Jews from Germany and the United Restitution Office (URO) who gathered reports on post-war antisemitism. Given the networks between the WL, A-JA, the British Foreign Office and the BBC this information had the potential to reach a much wider audience, although the WL did not pursue a direct and regular outlet in the non-Jewish press in Great Britain. This information contributed to the debate surrounding the feasibility of renewed Jewish life in Germany and informed wider public opinion on the difficult practicalities of Jewish community life and the state of post-war West Germany. An increasingly important element of the observations of German society and politics that Reichmann and others made at the beginning of the 1950s, was their analysis of public opinion expressed in the German press and demographic studies. She also personally presented her reports to mixed audiences,


105 See for example reports contained in MS 137 (Records of the A-JA), AJ95/ADD/21 (JCR Inc. 1948-52); MS 137, AJ95/1/32 (Germany 1957-66); MS 137 (Records of the A-JA), A137/6/4/16 (Germany 1949-51), Hartley Library Special Collections, University of Southampton.
highlighting the various levels of public discussion of the German-Jewish catastrophe in West Germany which she observed at first hand. 106

Reichmann, her husband Hans and Alfred Wiener undertook a number of joint visits over the following years, which served multiple functions on behalf of scholarship and community, gathering information about West German reconstruction as well as the sites of Jewish loss. 107 Although the observation of post-war Germany and reports she gave to audiences in Great Britain on her involvements continued to be a significant element of her work, Reichmann’s visits from the mid 1950s shifted emphasis to participation in intellectual discussion and support for academic and public interest in recent history in West Germany. This included the promotion of links between diasporic German-Jewish scholarship and German institutions and scholars working on German and Jewish twentieth-century history.

Arendt’s work for Jewish Cultural Reconstruction gave her many opportunities to reconnect with Germany. In November 1949 she began a four-month visit, her first return to Germany. As well as the JCR’s objectives for her trip she also re-engaged on a personal level. It was a time of encounter: in her formal capacity with German officials and Jewish community leaders, and through personal re-acquaintance with the landscape and social fabric of her former home country. 108 The personal aspects of reconnection with her former life in Germany came with the collective awareness of the destruction of German and European Jewry and the moral, physical and political state of Germany following the Second World War.

She reflected on the Germany she found, in letters to Blücher, which convey how strongly she wanted to write about what she was seeing and experiencing, yet the lack of time due to her work schedule meant that she sent only few longer accounts to Blücher, who conveyed these on to close friends. 109 Following her return from Germany in 1950, she published a report in an American Jewish publication Commentary, posed as a tentative and initial response to the question which she had discussed with Elliott

106 For example Reichmann gave a lecture in 1953 in German, drawing on the Wiener Library’s specialist research into public opinion presented in German newspaper articles and presenting an evaluation of recent election results, see Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Hat Deutschland Hitler überwunden?’, 23 November 1953, pp. 1-5, Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 10, LBI, NY.
107 One example is a lecture given by Eva G. Reichmann and Alfred Wiener, ‘In Warschau und Auschwitz 1957’, see WLA 450 LBI, WL, London.
108 See correspondence between Hannah Arendt and Heinrich Blücher during her first return to Germany, letters dated 14 December 1949 to 9 March 1950, in Lotte Köhler (ed.), Within Four Walls, pp. 103-43, and during subsequent trips.
109 Longer reflections besides accounts of her JCR work are given in a letter from Hannah Arendt to Heinrich Blücher dated 14 December 1949, 14 and 19 February 1950, in Lotte Köhler (ed.), Within Four Walls, pp. 103-43.
Cohen the magazine’s editor: ‘does Germany still exist?’ This was an on-going debate for which Arendt wished: ‘Someday I will have an answer worked out’. She presented her reflections on responses in post-war West Germany to the Holocaust, denazification and political direction in the aftermath of the totalitarian dictatorship, as well as questions of German identity. These were topics which she discussed at length with the German philosopher Jaspers and in due course she helped him find an American publisher for his work on the moral state of West Germany and questions of guilt.

Immediately following the war Arendt had published an article addressing the existence and promulgation of a ‘German Problem’. She discussed its political function and influence on the way Germany was being dealt with by the Allied victors, promoting discussion of the viable options for post-war restoration of Germany and Europe. Her concern for post-war Germany was political and personal. Among Arendt’s private reflections two areas of concern repeatedly stand out, firstly the state of post-war Germany – physically and morally and her understanding and reflection on the impact of the National Socialist dictatorship, war, the Holocaust and the chances for reconstruction.

The private dialogues she resumed with old friends and acquaintances, as well as new contacts and strangers that she met during her travels, such as the Zilkens family, significantly shaped her reflections. There were two central figures in this process of revisiting her former life in Germany and reliving the experiences of displacement: Jaspers, her doctoral supervisor and Heidegger her former mentor, with whom she also made contact during her first trip to Germany. Although scholarship emphasises


113 See in particular Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 18 May 1952, Lotte Köhler (ed.), Within Four Walls, p. 173. For correspondence between Zilkens and Arendt, see Correspondence (1938-1976), General: Johannes Zilkens and family (1951-), HAP, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Arendt’s relationship with these two scholars as pivotal for her grappling with the concepts of Germanness, Jewishness and her interaction with German responses to its Nazi past, it is through her exchanges with less prominent individuals, during this and later trips to Europe, that Arendt developed her view of the potential scope for her contribution to intellectual life in West Germany.

Arendt used her knowledge of the German cultural scene, gained whilst working for the JCR, as well as contact and insight into the library infrastructure, book trade and academic, cultural and political acquaintances, to probe opportunities for public speaking and publication. Through Dolf Sternberger, editor of Die Wandlung, Melvin J. Lasky, editor of Der Monat and Gottfried Bermann-Fischer, editor of Die neue Rundschau she found opportunities to publish articles.115 Arendt was keen to gain a German audience for her work on totalitarianism, German and Jewish relations and human action, bound up as they partly were with her analysis and reflections on German recent history. During June and July 1952 she gave numerous lectures during a trip to Germany.116 Arendt wrote to her husband regarding the orientation of her publications and public speaking:

It is funny that you’re turning out to be the more American of the two of us, while I time and again keep letting myself be pulled back into the German sphere. I can’t help it.117

She sought publishers who would accept work by writers from outside Germany, in particular German-Jewish writers on Jewish themes, as Arendt explicitly wished to be identified.118 Through Jaspers she became acquainted with Klaus Piper, his German publisher and many of her subsequent German editions were published with this

---

115 Correspondence between Sternberger and Arendt began in 1946 regarding articles she had published in America, see Correspondence (1938-1976), General: Dolf Sternberger (1946-), HAP, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. For a list of articles which Arendt published in the three publications cited see Hannah Arendt, Ich will verstehen, pp. 265-331.

116 She gave a lecture on ‘Ideologie und Terror’ to an audience at the university of Heidelberg among other locations, based on extracts from her publication on totalitarianism, see Ursula Ludz (ed.), op. cit., pp. 278-79.

117 Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, St Moritz (undated, 1952), in Lotte Kohler (ed.), Within Four Walls, p. 213.

Alongside her new research and writings in the 1950s she was doubly engaged in the major task of translating her three existing monographs: *Elternente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft, Rahel Varnhagen. Lebensgeschichte einer deutschen Jüdin aus der Romantik* and *Vita activa oder von tätigen Leben*. Shortly after arriving in America Arendt had raised concerns regarding the state of German historical studies under National Socialism. This assessed the impact upon the discipline since the almost exclusive focus on the scientific study of the ‘Jewish question’ instigated by the National Socialist regime through the Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des Neuen Deutschland [Reich-Institute for the History of the New Germany]. Her thesis was unequivocal: that the Jew had been placed at the centre of German history and in this way National Socialist antisemitism had rapidly dismantled German historiography. During later trips to Europe she keenly observed German and European intellectual and academic reconstruction, and although she published a number of articles which addressed recent historical topics, for example the concentration camps and National Socialism, her new writings were not intended to sit within the discipline of historical studies and she had little contact with its proponents. Concerned as she was for the academic and intellectual reconstruction of Germany, she observed the post-war teaching of recent history across the academic board, commenting little on the rebuilding of the historical discipline. She oriented herself more fully in her primary discipline: philosophy and political philosophy.

Her engagement with the post-war writings of her philosophical mentors Jaspers and Heidegger focused her interaction with that discipline. Yet her role in the academic dissemination of both men’s work in West Germany and abroad was inextricably linked to the formation of her own analysis of the intellectual and collective responses to recent

---


121 Concerned as she was for the academic and intellectual reconstruction of Germany, she observed the post-war teaching of recent history across the academic board, commenting little on the rebuilding of the historical discipline. She oriented herself more fully in her primary discipline: philosophy and political philosophy.

history in West Germany.\textsuperscript{124} Her official work for the JCR terminated in 1952 but she continued to journey to Europe for research and pleasure. Sometimes she had used this work to cover for her visits to Heidegger and his wife.\textsuperscript{125} During trips she often attended academic lectures and was increasingly called on to speak herself.\textsuperscript{126}

One forum, which highlights Arendt’s views on the ideological bases for international intervention in German political and public spheres, was her participation in the work of the Congress for Cultural Freedom.\textsuperscript{127} Convened by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) the Congress held a conference for intellectuals of the non-Communist Left attended by Arendt in Berlin in June 1950. It was envisaged as a covert extension of the intellectual and cultural dimensions of the Cold War carried out by an international delegation of 118 scholars, artists and writers from 21 countries. Participants also included intellectuals resident in West Germany such as Max Horkheimer and Carlo Schmid, the American Jewish journalists and intellectuals Elliot Cohen, Sidney Hook and writers Arthur Koestler and Ignazio Silone.\textsuperscript{128} Arendt was highly critical of the political and ideological motivations and approaches presented by key speakers in response to the issues facing post-war West Germany. Her evaluation of the problems of rapprochement between German and Jew were expressed in her private response to Elliot Cohen’s speech made at the conference.\textsuperscript{129} She was openly sceptical.

---

\textsuperscript{124} The level of Arendt’s discussion with Jaspers and Heidegger about their writings post-war is evident in correspondence between them and with Blücher. see Lotte Köhler (ed.), \textit{Within Four Walls}; Lotte Köhler and Hans Saner (eds.), \textit{Hannah Arendt and Karl Jaspers: Correspondence 1926-1969}; and Hannah Arendt and Martin Heidegger, \textit{Letters: 1925-1975}.


\textsuperscript{126} Arendt commented on the state of post-war university education in Hannah Arendt, ‘The Aftermath of Nazi Rule. Report from Germany’, \textit{Commentary}, vol. 10, no. 4 (October 1950), pp. 342-53, here pp. 344-45. She particularly observed the responses to recent history within the discipline of philosophy, see for example Heinrich Blücher, letter to Hannah Arendt, undated (1952), in Lotte Köhler (ed.), \textit{Within Four Walls}, pp. 210-11. Arendt spoke at a lecture given by Ernst Tillich in Berlin following which she was offered a guest lectureship and then a professorship at the Hochschule für Politik: Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 19 February 1950, in \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 136-37. Two years later, following the success of her articles in \textit{Die Wandlung} she addressed audiences in a programme of lectures which took her to Tübingen and Frankfurt am Main among other places: Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 13 May 1952, in \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 186-87. Again in 1955 she spoke in several locations, see Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 21 November 1955, in \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 292-93.

\textsuperscript{127} Arendt had already voiced her concern for the external intervention of the Allies in the process of Germany’s coming to terms with its past in Hannah Arendt, ‘The Aftermath of Nazi Rule. Report from Germany’, \textit{Commentary}, vol. 10, no. 4 (October 1950), pp. 348-53.\textsuperscript{128}


\textsuperscript{129} See Arendt’s description of the invitation issued via Cohen to the Jewish participants of the Congress for Cultural Freedom to discuss questions of restitution. Displaced Persons and ‘a few other banalities about “Old Injustice and New Misunderstandings”’: Hannah Arendt, letter to Karl Jaspers, 4 October 1950, in Lotte Köhler and Hans Saner (eds.), \textit{Hannah Arendt Karl Jaspers: Correspondence 1926-1969}, p. 157. See also Frances Stonor Saunders, \textit{Who Paid the Piper? The
about the potential achievements of the Congress in Europe. She felt her contribution had been marginalised, as she did not share the prevalent neo-Marxist ideas of some of her colleagues, from whom she distanced herself.\textsuperscript{130}

She was also highly critical of the German contributors, who represented on the one hand official willingness to atone and reconstruct West Germany democratically. In her opinion they held problematic political standpoints, pointing to what she considered were the limitations of their concept of moral regeneration.\textsuperscript{131} Critical of sycophancy, compromise and power relationships, Arendt expressed her irritation in engendered terms at the fixation of the ‘gentlemen’ on ideological problems and solutions. She favoured instead a ‘pariah’ engagement, a stance she promoted in many of her writings on Jewish political and social life. Arendt wrote in one of the very first post-war letters to Jaspers:

\begin{quote}
Everything does depend on a few, but the few mustn’t become too few. We have all seen in these years how the few constantly became fewer still. That was essentially as true among emigrants as it was in Germany. There are many routes to accommodation with the powers that be. The only people who will count are those who refuse to identify themselves with either an ideology or power.\textsuperscript{132}
\end{quote}

Following Sterling’s year-long research trip in 1952 to West Germany when she was based in Heidelberg and Frankfurt am Main she considered returning permanently. Her return to Germany for academic and personal reasons was fundamentally grounded in her desire to contribute to the ideological and educational reconstruction of West German society. An ambitious mission for a 28 year-old German-Jewish woman returning to a homeland in which she had no immediate surviving family and very little financial security.\textsuperscript{133} The reasons for her decision to return may have been similar to

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{130} Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 9 December 1955, in Lotte Kohler (ed.), \textit{Within Four Walls}, p. 299.
\item \textsuperscript{132} See Hannah Arendt, letter to Karl Jaspers, 18 November 1945, in Lotte Köhler and Hans Saner (eds.), \textit{op. cit.}, p. 23.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Sterling’s archival papers: Nachlaß Eleonore Sterling, EB 89/137 were given to the Deutsches Exilarchiv (1933-1945) at the DDB, Frankfurt am Main in 1989 by a cousin Max Oppenheimer who lived in Wiesloch bei Heidelberg, see Die Deutsche Bibliothek (ed.), \textit{Inventar zu den Nachlässen emigrierter deutschsprachiger Wissenschaftler in Archiven und Bibliotheken der Bundesrepublik Deutschland}, vol. 2 (Munich: Saur, 1993), pp. 1141-42, here p. 1141.
\end{itemize}
those of fellow remigrants, however as a woman and a member of a younger generation of returnees she was unusual within this already heterogeneous group. Her university education in New York had brought her into contact with an older generation of émigré scholars, particularly as the disciplines and institutions where she had studied had been populated with a proportionately high number of prominent émigré intellectuals in the 1940s and early 1950s.134 She explicitly wished to continue her doctoral studies in Frankfurt am Main under Max Horkheimer on her return.

Sterling’s reflections on her personal circumstances and modus operandi reveal at times an overriding tenacity of spirit, despite the tensions within the task she had set herself as a representative of a minority group of intellectual German Jews seeking to play a decisive role in post-war West German reconstruction. Intense academic study and research were interspersed by times of subdued spirit, as courage in the face of the challenges to her moral convictions was weakened by prolonged periods of chronic ill health. Fluctuations in confidence regarding her academic abilities and potential efficacy of her convictions were set against her concern for the difficult moral and political issues facing West German society.135

Through the medium of journalism she addressed two specific Jewish audiences. The semi-historical articles she published in the German-Jewish press served to remind readers of the historical achievements of emancipation and illuminate the historical tensions between Germans and Jews, Christians and Jews. Initially her writings on current affairs were limited to local events and issues of the Jewish community and relations with wider society. The Frankfurter Jüdisches Gemeindeblatt, which she co-edited, often flagged up Christian and Jewish cooperation.136 Secondly her observations


135 Regarding Sterling’s health see correspondence with Max Horkheimer: Max Horkheimer Archiv (MHA), Horkheimer-Pollock-Archiv, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Archivzentrum, Frankfurt am Main; correspondence with Guido Kisch: Guido Kisch Collection, AR 787, folder 7/13, LBA, NY, and with Stern: Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, VBB.

136 Sterling was a member of the Jüdische Gemeinde [Jewish community], Frankfurt am Main from 1954 until her death in 1968. See correspondence with the author from Susanna Keval, Jüdische Gemeinde, Frankfurt am Main, 12 January 2004. An article kept and possibly written by Sterling publicises events to further contemporary Christian and Jewish relations, involved as she was in the work of the Gesellschaft für christlich-jüdische Zusammenarbeit in Frankfurt: ‘Die “Woche der Brüderlichkeit”’, Frankfurter Jüdisches Gemeindeblatt, vol. 2, no. 3 (March 1956), pp. 1, 3. See also Max Horkheimer, letter to Eleonore Sterling, 12 December 1955, MHA V, 159, 102, Horkheimer-Pollock-Archiv, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Archivzentrum, Frankfurt am Main.
of current affairs in East and West Germany were directed to an external audience when she began writing for the American Jewish press from 1955 as a foreign correspondent: an ‘American doing research in Germany’. She contributed to *Congress Weekly* and *World Jewry* on denazification, German guilt and resurgent antisemitism. \(^{137}\) Besides articles in these publications she also extensively reported on these issues from this time to Zachariah Shuster, the European representative of the American Jewish Committee in Paris. \(^{138}\) Scholarship to date has focused on her contribution to the AJC during the 1960s; however, lengthier reports were already being published in *Évidences* the periodical produced by the AJC’s European office during the late 1950s. \(^{139}\)

Stern first returned to West Germany in the first half of 1955 in order to carry out research for her project on Josef of Rosheim. She had been awarded a grant from the Department of Cultural & Educational Reconstruction of the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany, funding several months of archival research in Europe. \(^{140}\) During this period she consulted archives in Belgium, Germany, Austria and travelled to London to visit her sister Anna, making contact with friends and transatlantic colleagues at the Wiener Library and the LBI. \(^{141}\) Unlike the other three


\(^{140}\) See correspondence between Judah J. Shapiro, Director of the Department of Cultural & Educational Reconstruction, Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany and Stern, in Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 14, 11-15, UBB. On the work of the Claims Conference to provide a cultural programme supporting research and publications to commemorate the Holocaust see Ronald W. Zweig, *German Reparations and the Jewish World*, pp. 84-86, 129-38 and 147-53.

women during this period Stern almost exclusively devoted herself to the historical study of German-Jewish subjects and did not engage publicly in discussion or analysis of recent history and post-war German life. She was keen however to gain a German readership for her historical studies and novel. Most significantly the private responses she received from German-Jewish and German readers of The Spirit Returneth, had shown her how this work could function didactically as a catalyst for reflection on the twentieth-century destruction of European Jewry for both readerships. 142

During the 1950s there was limited opportunity for her literary or historical work published in America to reach a wider German public until she produced the study Josel von Rosheim [Josel of Rosheim]. Her decision to publish it in German rather than English first provided a way back into the German academic book market. 143 Following her permanent return to Europe in 1960 she pursued the completion of her multi-volumed opus on the history of the Prussian State and the Jews. From this time on her new work was solely published in the German language, asserting a place for her research within the frameworks of both German-Jewish and German historiography. 144

2.7 Towards a new international discipline for German-Jewish studies

The niches which these four women gradually created for themselves as scholars of German-Jewish history were underpinned by the major publications they launched to international acclaim in the early 1950s. 145 The portfolio of publications which Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling constructed, including articles published in newspapers and periodicals, explicitly analysed aspects of German and Jewish relations, encompassing

142 Selma Stern. The Spirit Returneth...A Novel. This publication reached a small number of English-reading German scholars and many German-Jewish émigrés in its first edition. It was not published in German until much later as Selma Stern, Ihr seid meine Zeugen. Ein Novellenkranz aus der Zeit des Schwarzen Todes 1348/49 (Munich: G. Müller, 1972).


144 Published under the auspices of the Leo Baeck Institute, these volumes and other publications were reviewed in the Historische Zeitschrift, one of the longest standing, internationally renowned history periodicals published in Germany; Heinrich Schnee, ‘Der Preußische Staat und die Juden, von Selma Stern’, Historische Zeitschrift, vol. 197 (1963), pp. 402-4; Monika Richarz, ‘Selma Stern: Der preußische Staat und die Juden, Dritter Teil’, Historische Zeitschrift, vol. 222 (1976), pp. 198-201.

past and recent history and related issues relevant to contemporary affairs. Their work pushed at the temporal boundaries of the historical discipline, demanding that connections be made between historical factors, events and contemporary actions. They also applied analytical models drawn from other disciplines such as sociology, philosophy and political science. In contrast, Stern’s internalisation of recent history and contemporary events only emerged in the forewords she wrote accompanying her historical studies, brief authorial interventions, dedications and epigraphs. In her historical studies *per se* she only hinted at the tragic events of recent Jewish history.\(^{146}\)

Their first major post-war monographs were the result of their own motivation rather than the commissioned product of an institution in accordance with a set ideological remit, unlike the studies on antisemitism produced by the Institute for Social Research for example. Arendt’s work on totalitarianism was researched and written during her employment with intellectual Jewish organisations during 1940s and 1950s. Arendt and Stern worked on the fringes of the university system in America, whilst Reichmann and Sterling undertook their research within academia as doctoral studies. There were significant elements of continuity in the publications Reichmann and Stern produced, linking both content and approach with their work during the Weimar period. Despite the fact that they were no longer institutionally commissioned by the CV and the German-Jewish historiography of the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums [Academy for the Science of Judaism], the ideological framework of the cultural and political defence of antisemitism continued to shape their respective writings.

Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling belonged to the first generation to publish major studies on antisemitism following the end of the Second World War, analysing antisemitism within the context of the historical course of Jewish and German relations. These monographs are frequently cited in relation to each other and in association with the work of historians Gerald Reitlinger and Paul W. Massing but rarely considered comparatively alongside other publications in distinct disciplinary fields such as the Studies in Prejudice series.\(^{147}\) The work of Reichmann and Sterling was critically

---


acclaimed by their contemporaries who could contextualise the significance of these studies within pre-existing and concurrent historiography. Their studies were less widely received than Arendt’s and as a generation of scholars, their work was later superseded by the vigorous debates within Holocaust Studies regarding the ideological role of antisemitism in the National Socialist policy of destruction.

These studies constituted personally motivated attempts to gain greater understanding of the origins, causes and implications of the radical events of the 1930s and 1940s, totalitarianism and Jewish persecution in Germany. This was a demanding task given their emotive proximity to the subject, which necessitated a highly objective approach. Yet it was precisely their closeness and personally wrought understanding which gave currency to their work in the Jewish field of reception and authority in the non-Jewish sphere. The former belief in the power of objective and scientific scholarship for the enlightenment of German society in the face of racial opposition, which had driven the work of Reichmann at the CV and Stern at the Akademie, remained a highly relevant tool for the challenges German-Jewish studies faced in the post-war years. Revisiting the ideological remits of their work in the 1920s and early 1930s, resonance with a non-Jewish audience and specifically a German audience was again a critical issue they actively pursued, particularly directed at the younger generations. Although their studies of Jewish and non-Jewish relations were originally published in English, they were ultimately intended for a German readership. By the time this happened Arendt and Reichmann had already made appearances as German-

---

148 See reviews of Reichmann’s Die Flucht in den Hals and Sterling’s Er ist wie du collected in Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folders 21-22, LBIA, NY.


151 In the early post-war period and thereafter, the work of the Wiener Library to gather information on National Socialism and resurgent antisemitism in West Germany was regarded as a bulwark of defence. On the Wiener Library’s important role see opinions held by A-JA leaders in MS 137 (Records of the A-JA), AJ37/15/26 (JCIO, 1945-46), Hartley Library Special Collections, University of Southampton.
Jewish representatives and subject specialists in West Germany and the publication of their monographs in German gave a decisive boost to their opportunities for public speaking.\footnote{Arendt and Reichmann published translations of these monographs in West Germany: Hannah Arendt, \textit{Elemente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft} (Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1955) and Eva G. Reichmann, \textit{Die Flucht in den Haß: die Ursachen der deutschen Judenkatastrophe} (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1956). Although Sterling’s monograph was renamed and republished, it was never translated into English: Eleonore Sterling, \textit{Er ist wie du. Aus der Frühgeschichte des Antisemitismus in Deutschland (1815-1850)} (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1956), later published as Eleonore Sterling, \textit{Judenhaus. Die Anfänge des politischen Antisemitismus in Deutschland (1815-1850)} (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1969). Stern’s \textit{The Court Jew} was originally written as a German manuscript translated by Ralph Weiman, not published in German until over fifty years later; Selma Stern, \textit{Der Hofjude im Zeitalter des Absolutismus: Ein Beitrag zur europäischen Geschichte im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert}, edited by Marina Sassenberg (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).}

Arendt’s study of specific elements of German-Jewish history during the Weimar period such as emancipation, assimilation and the impact of the Enlightenment on German and Jewish relations were mirrored in the post-war period through her concern for ongoing issues facing Jewish and non-Jewish relations: immigration and statelessness, antisemitism and Jewish – Arab co-existence in Palestine. Her first post-war monograph \textit{The Origins of Totalitarianism} had as its starting point her intellectual reflections on twentieth-century antisemitism, which broadened into a comparative analysis of imperialism and totalitarianism. Her second post-war monograph directly revisited her scholarship of the Weimar period. She published \textit{Rahel Varnhagen. The Life of a Jewess} in 1957: focused on the life of one historical female figure and her assimilation, within the context of social, political and philosophical discourses, current in German and Jewish high-society during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries that prepared the way for Jewish emancipation.\footnote{Hannah Arendt, \textit{Rahel Varnhagen. The Life of a Jewess} (London: East and West Library, 1957).} Although mostly written by the time Arendt left Germany in 1933 and completed in Paris in 1938, the study did not conform to any historiographical school of thought, rather it was underpinned on one level by Arendt’s affinity at that time with a Zionist critique of assimilation and pointed to her engagement with key grand narratives of post-emancipatory German-Jewish experience.\footnote{Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, \textit{Hannah Arendt, for Love of the World}, p. 91; and Karl Jaspers, letter to Hannah Arendt, 23 August 1952, pp. 193-94, and Hannah Arendt, letter to Karl Jaspers, 7 September 1952, p. 200, in Lotte Kühler and Hans Saner (eds.), \textit{Hannah Arendt and Karl Jaspers: Correspondence 1926-1969}.} \textit{Rahel Varnhagen} is not completely distinct from Arendt’s other publications following immigration addressing the Jewish past. Many of the themes and issues it broached had become even more central to her thinking in the first post-war.
decade: the Jew as pariah or parvenu and Jewish immigrant integration in new diasporic societies and Palestine. 155

The extent of Arendt’s intellectual engagement with Jewish history is not solely represented in her early post-war writings and first post-war monographs but provided material for subsequent essays and acted as a springboard for her later philosophical studies such as The Human Condition. 156 Her editorial work for JSS and contribution to Jewish cultural reconstruction were supported and consolidated by regular dialogue with Salo W. Baron from the mid 1940s, which addressed historiographical themes as well as contemporary issues and business matters. 157 Arendt’s intellectual criticism ranged widely across disciplines, evidenced in her book reviews, articles and open letters but rarely engaged with contemporary German-Jewish historiography. However she did take issue from a philosophical perspective however with the new moral bases for the study of history following the Holocaust. In ‘The Moral of History’ Arendt wrote that scholars were estranging ‘history from the people’ thereby suppressing the concept of ‘human progress’ which had been considered an incontrovertible dimension of history. 158 To forget the past had become ‘a holy duty’. Therefore, she argued, if the moral aspect of studying history is ignored, the world is unable to be understood, promoting ‘unreason’. 159 She considered human reason to have been replaced in her lifetime by the advent of the ‘automatism of events’ which had culminated in the catastrophe of the twentieth century. 160

Arendt had received a general historiographical training as part of her university studies rather than a specific schooling in German-Jewish historiographical traditions.


157 Arendt’s wider intellectual interaction with Jewish historiography would be illuminated through an assessment of her editorial work for JSS and discussions with the Barons throughout the post-war period, at present only evidenced in incidental biographical notes such as her support in 1975 for the posthumous publication of the work of the historian Philip Friedmann, see Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, Hannah Arendt, for Love of the World, pp. 467-68.


as Stern had. She was highly critical of the apologetic character of assimilationist scholarship which she saw represented by many Jewish scholars during the Weimar period, including Stern, expressed in Arendt’s review of The Court Jew. Considered alongside her review of Gershom Scholem’s Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, these two texts constitute the only printed examples of Arendt’s engagement with the work of leading Jewish historians. She emphasises Scholem’s innovative focus on counter traditions far removed from Jewish apologetics. This was akin to her intention that her own work should reveal the ‘hidden traditions’ in Jewish intellectual thought which were not bound by disciplinary confines, ideological or methodological approaches, which can be read in her focus on Jewish historical figures whose counter-cultural actions she deemed those of the pariah.

Arendt flagged up the implicit challenge to Jewish diasporic historiography in Scholem’s book which reinstated the historical significance of Jewish mysticism and Kabbalah which had been largely ignored within the historical study of European Jewry. Arendt criticised the predominant German-Jewish historiography of Wissenschaft des Judentum which saw Jews not as ‘history-makers but history-sufferers’. Her approach to Jewish history, although expressed in philosophical and political terms, turned towards the opposite formulation: present ‘history’ informed the future; therefore Jews should become ‘history-makers’. Despite this, her assessment of the danger of ‘overvaluing human will as a determining factor in history’ shows a more ambivalent view of human agency and the interpretative ability of the historian.


There are two particular aspects of Stern’s post-war historiography which illuminate the problematic role she assumed as an intermediary for the future of the former traditions of German-Jewish historiography and particularly for Taeubler’s symbiotic approach to the history of Jewish and non-Jewish relations described as Beziehungsgeschichte. Stern’s struggle to preserve some form of continuity with the methodological and ideological basis of Wissenschaft des Judentums was closely bound up with the commemoration of two leading German-Jewish scholars in this field, her husband Eugen Taeubler and Leo Baeck, rabbi, community leader and the couple’s close friend, figureheads for many among her generation of scholars. 167 Taeubler and Baeck were the most significant intellectual and personal role models for her career as a historian of German Jewry and the memory of these two men is never far from her post-war publications or scholarly involvements. 168 Stern bore not only her own task of representing a German-Jewish historiographical tradition but also her commitment to her husband’s academic legacy. Following her husband’s death she became increasingly involved in the posthumous perpetuation of his work and reputation. 169

Meanwhile her academic-related employment as chief archivist at the American Jewish Archives in Cincinnati sheds a different light on her coming to terms with the changes enforced on her historiographical worldview by recent historical events. 170 From 1947 Stern devoted a considerable portion of her intellectual activity, until her retirement from this post in 1957, to the work of the AJA; founded by the director Jacob Rader Marcus and Nelson Glueck, president of HUC. This appointment was an opportunity which came at a time when Stern was experiencing an emotive reception of her novel The Spirit Returneth and contemplating resuming her own historical research which she then pursued in parallel. 171


169 See Selma Stern-Taeubler, ibid., and Eugen Taeubler, Aufsätze zur Problematik jüdischer Geschichtsschreibung, 1908-1950, edited by Selma Stern-Taeubler, which she compiled once she had fully completed Der preußische Staat und die Juden.


171 Work as archivists and librarians were academic-related jobs which could provide female scholars
Stern brought elements of early twentieth-century German-Jewish *Wissenschaft des Judentums* to the organisation of American Jewry’s first comprehensive archives of Jewish life and communities. The mission to take up the baton of European Jewish intellectual and academic traditions was adopted by many Jewish institutions in the United States who had competed concurrently during the war years to obtain valuable resources from Europe and recruit the few displaced scholars which emigration quotas allowed into the United States.\(^{172}\) Her historiographical training under Taeubler had benefited from his experience as the first director of the 1905 Gesamtarchiv der deutschen Juden [General Archives of the German Jews] and this was combined with her shaken but not relinquished symbiotic approach to the study of Jewish and non-Jewish coexistence. This she transferred to the study of the immigration and integration of diasporic Jewries within American Jewry and wider non-Jewish society in America. No doubt the direction she took this work was also shaped by discussions with her husband prior to his death in 1953. One should not allow Stern’s later decision to return unequivocally to the study of German-Jewish history which coincided with her retirement, nor Taeubler’s views on the primacy of her German-Jewish research however, to play down her contribution to the methodological and ideological workings of the AJA.\(^{173}\)

Her contribution to a number of projects within the wider international field of Jewish historical studies shows the respect her strong former ideological and methodological academic training and standing, as a scholar of German-Jewish historiography, commanded internationally. Stern was approached for her contribution to various Jewish encyclopaedic works and multi-volumed collaborative studies such with financial stability. Specialised knowledge could be applied, given the restricted opportunities for tenured academic teaching and research posts in the early post-war period. Two female academics who turned to this career path were Margarete Edelheim-Muehsam at the LBI Library and Archives in New York and Rosy Bodenheimer at the Baltimore Hebrew University Library, see Daniel Schifrin, ‘Graduating a Better Jew’, *Baltimore Jewish Times*, vol. 205, no. 5 (1992), p. 30. Stern worked on two monographs during her time as archivist at the AJA: *The Court Jew* and *Josel von Rosheim*. Two other articles were published during this period: Selma Stern-Taeubler, ‘Der literarische Kampf um die Emanzipation in den Jahren 1816-1820 und seine ideologischen und soziologischen Voraussetzungen’, *Hebrew Union College Annual*, vol. 23, no. 2 (1950/51), pp. 171-96, and another which presaged the third volume of *Der preussische Staat und die Juden. Die Zeit Friedrich des Großen*, published in 1971: Selma Stern-Taeubler, ‘The Jews in the Economic Policy of Frederick the Great’, *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2 (1949), pp. 129-52.


\(^{173}\) See Eugen Taeubler, letter to Jacob Rader Marcus, 8 October 1950, pp. 1-2, MS 210 (Stern-Taeubler), American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati, and Nelson Glueck, letter to Selma Stern-
as later volumes of Salo W. Baron’s *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. She also grafted her academic experience and skills into the fibres of American Jewish historiography at the AJA, although her writings mainly catalogued and publicised its growing holdings. Stern considered her contribution to the AJA as specifically German-Jewish and acknowledged the duty to American Jewry, shared by her generation of émigré scholars of European and more specifically German training, to take up the task of continuing the ‘rich inheritance of the European science of Judaism’. In this way she promoted the AJA’s role in the transmission of the German-Jewish historiographical legacy as a continuation of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* which had been uprooted from Europe. According to Marcus the AJA was:

committed to preserving a documentary heritage of the religious, organizational, economic, cultural, personal, social and family life of American Jewry […] in the aftermath of World War II and the Holocaust […] created at a time when the Jews of America […] faced the awesome responsibility of preserving the continuity of Jewish life and learning.

These words echo Stern’s own in a survey of the work of the AJA, in which she cited:

the upheavals of the last decades, the destruction of European Jewry, the struggle for the formation of a Jewish state, the revolutionary transformation of political and social, economic and religious conceptions

as central catalysts in awakening the desire to understand Jewry’s ‘fateful destiny’ and in particular to study ‘the forces which went into the creation of the American Jew’.

The American Jewish Tercentenary launched on 12 September 1954 prompted the detailed study of resources that had been gathered on the different Jewish immigrant
histories in the United States. Herman Muller of the American Federation of Jews from Central Europe had asked Stern to prepare and provide archival materials for a projected publication on the subject of ‘German Jews in America’ to coincide with the Tercentenary celebrations.\textsuperscript{179} He envisaged this not as ‘an apologetic text’ but one that would ‘show what the German Jews contributed to the cultural, economic and Jewish life of America’. Stern selected sources held at the AJA to be used by participating scholars and her essay in the resulting volume provided a comparative study of early eighteenth-century Jewish emigration to America. She also addressed historiographical factors inherent within the study of American Jewry during that period which posed difficulties for the study of the processes of integration.\textsuperscript{180} In essence Stern’s typological modelling of the Jewish immigrant in this study showed traces of her identification of the changing ‘type’ of Jewish women throughout history published in the 1920s. Her use of typologies, problematic for their proximity to stereotypes, was partially salvaged by the resemblance to sociological models for the classification of social action into ‘ideal types’ developed by the sociologist Max Weber.\textsuperscript{181}

Stern wrote only one other article on the topic Jews from Germany in America. This focused on the causes of German-Jewish emigration to the United States in the nineteenth century, in which she highlighted again the problems caused by the paucity of sources in the US and Germany.\textsuperscript{182} Despite the impetus which the American Jewish Tercentenary had given to the study of distinct subgroups among American Jewry, research devoted to German-Jewish integration in American Jewish life only emerged from the late 1970s onwards.\textsuperscript{183} Although Stern’s writings in this research field

\textsuperscript{179} Herman Muller (American Federation of Jews from Central Europe Inc.), letter to Selma Stern-Taeubler, 1 February 1954. Nachlass Selma Stern-Tæubler, NL 0120, D 14, 8, UBB.
\textsuperscript{180} Ibid. See also Selma Stern, ‘Problems of American and German Jewish Historiography’, in Eric E. Hirschler (ed.), Jews from Germany in the United States, pp. 5-7.
\textsuperscript{183} From the work of Rudolf Glanz, \textit{The German Jew in America: an annotated bibliography including
remained limited, her work for the AJA promoted research questions and shaped methodological approaches to the study of German-Jewish integration within American society, such as the place and contribution of German Jewry within American Jewry, the influence and application of German-Jewish historiographical, philosophical and political models within the United States.

It cannot really be said that Stern ever saw the introduction the AJA gave her into mainstream American Jewish historiography as an alternative career path to her German-Jewish historiography. From early on during her tenure as archivist she had resumed her German-Jewish research in private.\textsuperscript{184} This fact was not kept a secret nor carried out in competition with her AJA duties, an impression one might gain from Taeubler’s attitude to the precedence of this research. Stern states that Marcus took an interest in her work, having himself published on German-Jewish historical topics and both the HUC and AJA supported her publications. She cites Marcus as the originator of the idea for the ‘court Jew’ study.\textsuperscript{185} For her research project on the historical figure Josel of Rosheim she required a period of prolonged research in European archives and the AJA granted her sabbatical leave for this purpose. Stern was aware however that the two spheres of scholarship were not completely separate and that her encounter with the very different historical contexts and intellectual concerns of American and American Jewish historiography helped her to grasp, through her work on German Jewry in America, the ‘deeper meaning’ of the ‘encounter between Germans and Jews at the time of [Gotthold Ephraim] Lessing and Moses Mendelssohn’.\textsuperscript{186}

In Great Britain Reichmann and her husband planned to scientifically develop their insight into the collapse of German-Jewish life in Germany in a joint two-part study on ‘The Causes of the Catastrophe of the Jews in Germany’.\textsuperscript{187} The outline they put together was circulated among leading German-Jewish intellectuals in 1940 but


\textsuperscript{184} Both \textit{The Court Jew} and \textit{Josel von Rosheim} were published during the period of Stern's AJA employment.


received a mixed response despite the subject’s immediate resonance. Reichmann subsequently continued her projected section on ‘The Social Sources of Anti-Semitism’ with the assistance of a grant from the Research Institute on Peace and Post-War Problems of the American Jewish Committee. It was completed in 1945 as the subject of her second doctorate under the sociologist Morris Ginsberg at the London School of Economics, published as Hostages of Civilisation (1950) and later in German as Die Flucht in den Haß [the flight into hatred] (1956). Since Reichmann’s research addressed the politics, economics and sociology of relations between Germans and Jews from the nineteenth to the mid twentieth century, she shared the ideological and temporal focus of the Wiener Library, supporting its specialisation as an institute researching Zeitgeschichte [contemporary history]. Her historical research was interwoven with personal experience which compelled her, like Arendt and Sterling, to address the contemporary legacies of post-war antisemitism and National Socialism. She formalised her critical engagement with the historical genre of Zeitgeschichte from the end of the 1950s and her intellectual commitment to the study of recent history squarely addressed German history during the 1920s and 1930s rather than purely Jewish topics.

Her place in post-war scholarship within the German-Jewish refugee community in Great Britain built on her own respected position during the Weimar Republic and late 1930s. Reichmann was perhaps the most closely integrated of the four among the surviving male leadership of the Weimar years. In particular her relationship with the figure of Leo Baeck stands out, whose accomplishments and humanity she celebrated time and again in lectures and articles during the 1950s and in commemoration of his life. Given her ideological proximity to Alfred Wiener, a former Centralverein

188 See Thomas Mann, letter to Hans Reichmann, 9 June 1940, p. 1, Hans Reichmann Collection, AR 236, folder 1, LBIA, NY, regarding the Reichmanns’ manuscript. He replied that it ‘will remain a document and shocking report of these times of sunkenness and shame’.


190 Outside the field German-Jewish historical studies, Reichmann kept abreast of sociological research as well as new historical studies in her field. Her monograph was received by both disciplines, reviewed for example by the sociologist Norbert Elias: ‘Inquest on German Jewry’, AJR Information, vol. V, no. 4 (April 1950), p. 5, in the British Journal of Sociology and The American Historical Review. See reviews collected in Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folders 17-19, LBIA, NY.

colleague and her employer at the WL, Reichmann’s practical approach echoed her work for the CV. The former atmosphere of emergency had given way to a modified spirit of defence which aimed to secure sources that would help to deconstruct and teach about antisemitism so that any future repetition of persecution and genocide could be avoided across humanity.\textsuperscript{192}

Her role as research director gave her responsibility for formulating projects and organising the collection of unique sources, such as official documentation, eyewitness reports of Jewish persecution and German war crime trial documents.\textsuperscript{193} Not only was Reichmann able to draw on this range of material to support her own work but she also advised and guided younger scholars through the sources available which were made accessible for general education and specialist consultation.\textsuperscript{194} This body of evidence would support future research and has ever since proved a vital resource for the study of German-Jewish history and antisemitism in Great Britain and internationally, as these collections were made accessible to scholars abroad and in West Germany.\textsuperscript{195}

The knowledge of the staff and access to sources and scholarship provided by the WL were comprehensive. The volumes of the Wiener Library Catalogue Series compiled by Ilse Wolff show the thematic areas the library specialised in during these decades: \textit{Books on Persecution, Terror and Resistance in Nazi Germany; From Weimar to Hitler: Germany 1918-1933 and German Jewry}. In particular the third volume was very popular, copies of which were requested internationally as a bibliographical aid and source for identifying core acquisitions other institutions should make.\textsuperscript{196}

\begin{flushright}
\textit{des Gedenkens für Leo Bœck} (Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1959).
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{192} During the Second World War the JCIO (later WL) provided a vital service to the British Foreign Office supplying information on Germany. The spirit of the CV was evident in the nature of this new ‘defence work’ carried out by some of its former officials (Wiener and the Reichmanns), see correspondence between Louis Bondy (JCIO) and S. D. Temkin (A-JA) in MS 137 (Records of the A-JA), AJ37/15/26 (JCIO, 1945-46), Hartley Library Special Collections, University of Southampton.


\textsuperscript{194} Holdings were publicised through the \textit{Wiener Library Catalogue Series} in particular, and made available to those who visited the library. See also Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Germans Discuss Antisemitism’, \textit{Jewish Chronicle}, 27 December 1957, pp. 22-23.

\textsuperscript{195} Unique and limitedly available resources housed at the WL have been widely consulted for this very study at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

\textsuperscript{196} Ilse R. Wolff (ed.), \textit{The Wiener Library Catalogue Series}, vol. 3: \textit{German Jewry: Its History, Life and Culture} (London: Wiener Library, 1958). See the exchange of correspondence between Alfred Wiener and Selma Stern regarding the holdings of the WL and AJA, 15 and 24 November 1955, WLA 410 Stern, WL, London; and Eleonore Sterling, letter to Ilse Wolff, 5 January 1958, WLA 408 Sterling, WL, London, thanking her for bibliographic details from this volume sent before it came to print to assist the research project she and Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich were working on entitled ‘Die jüdischen Gemeinden in Deutschland (1920-1945)’. 

156
The choice of language that Reichmann wrote in had a direct bearing on the accessibility of her work. Her readership fell into three distinct groups: Jewish refugees from Germany, non-Jewish interested parties and German-speakers in West Germany and abroad. Increasingly she addressed a German readership from the mid-1950s. The translation of Reichmann’s monograph gained responses from many readership sectors, frequently reviewed with a discreet number of studies on German antisemitism and National Socialism published around the same time by Adler, Reitlinger, Sterling, Weissberg and Arendt. The introduction that Reichmann wrote to *Die Flucht in den Häß* accentuated, in stark contrast to the preface of the English version, her complex personal connection with the period she was writing about and the problematics of writing personally experienced history objectively. This personal identification as a survivor and witness marked her increasing confidence and conviction of the potential of her scholarship and mediatory role. She closely followed German reviews of the publication with the assistance of the newspaper clipping agencies which were vital for the Wiener Library’s own work. A seven-page list she made of reviews from various journals and newspapers and an additional two pages of references made in radio broadcasts extended over time to encompass five archival folders tracking German responses to her writings.

Within West Germany itself Reichmann and Wiener were involved supporting collaborative projects with German scholars, these would contribute to academic and public discussion of recent history and antisemitism but also initiate the commemoration through research projects of German Jewry in the German-Jewish diaspora and their former Heimat. This commemoration of Germany’s Jewish heritage in new scholarly studies was also given financial support and moral backing by the

199 One example of the significance of the reception and reviews of Reichmann’s *Flucht in den Häß* in West Germany is evidenced in an article entitled ‘German Views of Dr. Eva G. Reichmann’s Book’, *Wiener Library Bulletin*, vol. XI, nos. 1-2 (1957), p. 6. See reviews collected in Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folders 20-24, LBIA, NY.
These scholars naturally constructed and developed networks with researchers and writers through the institutions where they worked. This provided a web of interconnections and intercommunication linking the dispersed centres of German-Jewish community and cultural life which also incorporated German academic and cultural institutions, private individuals and Jewish community members located in West Germany. During Reichmann’s regular trips to West Germany on behalf of the WL she established contacts with intellectuals and scholars, facilitating the collection of primary and bibliographic materials. On two separate visits in 1954 Reichmann and Wiener carried out a programme of collecting resources for current research projects across several cities. Her summary of activities included research into the holdings of the US Documents Centre, consultation with scholars and lawyers regarding trial documentation and visits to the Institut für Politische Wissenschaft [Institute for Political Science], Berlin; the Institut für Zeitgeschichte [Institute for Contemporary History], Munich; the International Tracing Service, Arolson; the Bundesarchiv Koblenz [Federal Archive in Koblenz] and the Forschungsstelle für die Geschichte Hamburgs [Research Centre for the History of Hamburg]. Her findings specifically supplemented primary sources for a projected study of the Kristallnacht pogrom of November 1938, in addition she followed up the ‘Interview-Aktion’ for the collection of eyewitness reports.

On the whole the WL’s research projects aimed to collect, catalogue and preserve, making available documents for independent research, rather than commissioning the systematic analysis of their holdings. Reichmann did however contribute an essay, which had been given repeatedly as a public lecture, to a publication commemorating the pogrom. Similar to the experiences of Arendt, her return brought deepening knowledge of the extent of the National Socialist persecution of the Jews and

---

200 See Alfred Wiener, letter to Leo Baeck, 13 April 1954, WLA 446 Leo Baeck, WL, London.
201 In 1954 Reichmann and Wiener gave a number of public lectures in Germany about the research work of the Wiener Library, one at the invitation of the Jewish community in Berlin. See Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Reisebericht’, 2 December 1954, pp. 1-6, WLA 360 Reichmann, WL, London.
confirmation of the death of family members and friends, interwoven with personal re-
encounters with her former home city Berlin and acquaintances.205

Perhaps most striking was the supporting and facilitating role Reichmann and the
WL staff played for collaborative research and publication projects between German-
Jewish researchers inside and outside West Germany and German scholars in the fields
of historiography, political science, sociology and theology whose track record under
National Socialism was uncompromised. For example a joint project on German Jewry
under National Socialist persecution was discussed with German historian and
theologian Karl Thieme and the Institut für Zeitgeschichte in Munich. Meetings with
other scholars in Munich such as Helmut Krausnick took place almost annually, to
discuss projects that brought together Jewish and non-Jewish scholars there and in Great
Britain.206 1958 also proved a record year for Reichmann’s work in West Germany with
at least three separate visits.207 In March 1958 she met publishers and lawyers, making
contacts and gathering materials in Frankfurt am Main and Heidelberg.208 In May she
accompanied Wiener who had been invited to speak in Berlin at the Hochschule für
Pädagogik [College for Education] and the Friedrich Meinecke Institut of the Freie
Universität. She worked on the collection of eyewitness reports in Berlin which was to
contribute to a research project on ‘Resistance in Berlin 1933-1945’ convened by
Senator Lipschitz.209 In June she visited Frankfurt am Main and Kiel and towards the
end of the year attended conferences including one organised by the Friedrich-Ebert-
Stiftung [Friedrich Ebert Foundation] in Cologne.210 Increasingly Reichmann’s public
speaking and participation in discussions developed her personal contribution to debates
that drew on her own experiences and professional skills beyond her representation of
the WL.

206 Sterling and Robert Raphael Geis were involved in these discussions representing German-Jewish
scholarship, see correspondence in WLA 359 and 360 Reichmann, see also Alfred Wiener, letter to
207 A humorous depiction of Reichmann’s work for the Wiener Library, particularly her frequent taking
off to ‘distant lands’ is presented in a poem written possibly by Ilse Wolff, undated but from the
references given originating from the late 1950s. [Ilse Wolff], Animals That Live Together,
uncatalogued document NB 261, WL, London, brought to my attention by WL librarian Kat
Hübschmann.
209 Alfred Wiener, letter to the Bank of England for foreign currency request, 6 May 1958, WLA 359
Reichmann, WL, London.
210 Eva G. Reichmann, letter to Alfred Wiener, 12 June 1958, and 11 pages of notes reporting on
activities in Kiel, in WLA 359 Reichmann; Eva G. Reichmann, letter to Alfred Wiener, 12
November 1958, and Alfred Wiener, letter to Eva G. Reichmann, 13 November 1958, in WLA 359
Reichmann, WL, London.
In the 1950s Sterling made the transition from refugee to returnee, from doctoral student to international journalist and published scholar on German and Jewish historical relations.\footnote{Sterling was concerned for the emotional, physical and psychological welfare of returnees and survivors as well as students of other minority groups in West German and personally intervened to offer assistance to some individuals, see correspondence with Karl Thieme, Nachlass Karl Thieme, ED 163, 83, IIZ-A, Munich.} Often a very private individual she was somewhat aloof from acquaintances among her academic cohort but had closer contacts with returnees and scholars more senior than herself.\footnote{Helga Haftendorn recounts Sterling’s absence from Friday evening social gatherings following the weekly lectures that Carlo Schmid gave in Frankfurt am Main, see correspondence between Haftendorn and the author, 30 November 2003.} Among these inter-generational relationships with older German-Jewish and German scholars who shared her concern for the reconstruction of both German-Jewish scholarship and post-war society in West Germany, she had close personal and academic contact with Stern and Reichmann, underpinned by their related research interests.\footnote{See correspondence between Sterling and Reichmann in WLA 408 Sterling, WL, London, also between Sterling and Stern in Nachlass Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 18, 29-34, UBB.} There were very few returnees in her age group who were involved in the academic study of German and Jewish relations, Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich was the most prominent who worked closely in an academic capacity with German-Jewish institutions in the diaspora whilst pursuing an academic career in the West German university system.\footnote{By 1960 Ehrlich was a guest lecturer at the university of Frankfurt am Main and a member of the advisory board for the Germania Judaica library in Cologne. See Esther Seidel, *Women Pioneers of Jewish Learning. Ruth Liebrecht and her Companions at the “Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums” in Berlin 1930-1934* (Berlin: Jüdische Verlagsanstalt, 2002), pp. 78-79, and Rolf Vogel (ed.), *Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich und der christlich-jüdischer Dialog* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht, 1984).}

Although the general academic interest of German-Jewish topics in America had improved in the decade following the Second World War, Sterling felt that in West Germany her work might have a ‘lively affect’ on an engaged audience, given its contemporary relevance beyond the purely ‘theoretical and academic worth’ it would have in the United States.\footnote{Eleonore Sterling, letter to Herr Dr. Teubruch, 27 January 1953, MBA V, 159, 193-4, pp. 1-2, here p. 2.} Following her remigration to Frankfurt am Main in 1953 she enrolled for her doctoral research at the Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main and submitted her doctorate in 1954, conferred in 1955 by Max Horkheimer and Joseph Kunz.\footnote{Eleonore Sterling-Oppenheimer, ‘Die Anfänge des politischen Judenhasses in Deutschland: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der christlich-jüdischen Beziehungen von der Restaurationszeit bis 1848’, PhD thesis, Universität Frankfurt am Main (1954), Nachlaß Eleonore Sterling, EB 89/137, folder C 1h, Deutsches Exilarchiv (1933-1945), DDB, Frankfurt am Main. Published as Eleonore Sterling, *Er ist wie du. Aus der Frühhgeschichte des Antisemitismus in Deutschland (1815-1850)* (1956), later republished posthumously as Eleonore Sterling, *Juda haß. Die Anfänge des politischen*}
this study was highlighted during her search for a publisher. Max Horkheimer, Carlo Schmid, Thieme and other intellectuals, whose advice she solicited, suggested publishing houses and possible foreword writers. Their suggestions represented various competing ‘other German’ positions to be promoted within the post-war intellectual landscape of West Germany, attracting various readership groups.217

Sterling’s position can also be contextualised through the results of a survey of Jewish historical studies listing doctoral theses presented in Germany and Switzerland, from 1922 up to the first decade following the end of the Second World War.218 The scope of the subjects covered by this study was broad in terms of discipline and specialism, relating loosely to the ‘History of the Jews’ but not limited to historiography. Theses were grouped thematically and by discipline, including Jewish and non-Jewish authors but excluding National Socialist and antisemitic texts.219 The conclusions Guido Kisch and Kurt Roepke drew from their survey focused on the contemporary state of scholarship post-war. They ventured that the dwindling academic study of German Jewry and Jewish historical topics would have to be promoted in the German-Jewish diaspora, given the picture they had gained of the limited research within comparative subject fields on a national level in post-war West Germany. Although the authors granted a margin for omissions, the number of doctoral studies in the German language on Jewish topics and by Jewish scholars was so limited post-war that they called for a new impetus among non-Jewish scholars if this research area was to have a continued future at German institutes of higher education.220

Of the 396 theses listed from 1922-55, 61 were submitted in the decade following the Second World War.221 Furthermore, compared with the overall total of 38 by female students throughout the whole period, only four fall within the post-war decade. Besides

218 Guido Kisch and Kurt Roepke, Schriften zur Geschichte der Juden (1959), published in the LBI’s Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts.
220 Ibid., pp. 9-10.
221 I have analysed only the theses dating between 1946 and 1955.
Sterling, the other three did not deal with the history of German and Jewish relations nor contemporary topics, addressing a comparative literary study of Disraeli’s writings (1949), Disraeli’s political thought (1952) and a third, the history of Jewish hygiene and medicine (1955). Sterling’s thesis features within the section containing studies on: ‘Jewish Problem before 1933’, one of two areas under the umbrella heading ‘History of Antisemitism in Germany’. Her work appears with only two other post-war theses, by Martin Broszat and Hans Engelmann. The related section entitled the ‘Jewish Problem 1933-1945’ had almost three times as many entries, of which none were post-war and there was no category for theses dealing with Jewish life and intellectual thought following 1933. This highlights a significant lacunae which established scholars in the German-Jewish diaspora and West Germany recognised in the early 1950s and began to address, during a period in which silence and repression have typically been regarded as paradigms of the West German response to recent history.

As a scholar of German and Jewish Beziehungsgeschichte, to apply Stern’s genre of studying the history of relationships and connections, Sterling pursued her research with the support of German-Jewish returnee scholars who themselves worked outside the field of German-Jewish historiography. Given the multiple influences this created, her approach to historical topics bore the traces of the theoretical rigours of other disciplines: philosophy, sociology, political science and negotiated the influential theoretical and political stances of key mentors Horkheimer and subsequently Schmid. At the end of her doctorate there was already a tension between the two directions – Jewish and non-Jewish subjects within her career plans. Aware of the academic pigeon-holing which might confine her to the study of Jewish topics and limit her career prospects, as a woman and Jewess she faced certain additional challenges.

What followed was a period of testing the various employment opportunities and career

225 Only two theses in this section were by female scholars, both dated 1943, op. cit., pp. 33-35.
226 Sterling worked on her doctoral thesis under the supervision of Max Horkheimer, outside the theoretical parameters of the Institut für Sozialforschung. Later as an assistant to Carlo Schmid, who at the time was a leading member of the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschland (SPD), she worked closely with him on a project comparatively studying the political forms of state government.
paths open to her, during which she built up a varied portfolio of experience and connections. Questioning whether to pursue an academic teaching career or remain in research or journalism she participated in projects which challenged her academic competence and helped to crystallise her pedagogic approach to German-Jewish historiography and contemporary topics. In the midst of this her academic career was given new direction from 1956 when she was appointed an assistant to Carlo Schmid, professor and head of the Institut für Politikwissenschaft [Institute for Political Science] in Frankfurt am Main, leading member of the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands (SPD) [German Social Democratic Party] and vice-president of the Bundestag [lower house of the West German parliament]. This also temporarily defined her disciplinary and research interests.

If one regards the research activities and employment opportunities which Sterling took up towards the end of her doctoral study and subsequently continued in tandem simply as career prospecting and a source of academic experience and financial support, this would overlook her participation in the international subject-specialist networking between scholars in the diaspora and West Germany which grew throughout the 1950s. Sterling exchanged ideas and information with a large number of senior scholars whose academic advice she sought. Stern for example had shared her knowledge of sources and German archives with Sterling who had first approached her regarding material prior to her first research trip to Germany. Sterling had also corresponded with Alfred Wiener and his team in search of material for her thesis, before her negotiations and visit to the WL, London in July 1955 to discuss future collaborative projects. As a ‘helper in Germany’ she facilitated the collection of eyewitness accounts and augmented the library’s holdings with primary and secondary sources, press articles and official documentation of war crimes trials. Reciprocally the WL was able to supply her with unique source material and secondary literature. For example Reichmann had sent materials to support Sterling’s research on the history of the persecution of the
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229 Sterling continued as Schmid’s assistant until 1962.
231 Alfred Wiener, letter to Eleonore Sterling, 25 March 1955 and 9 May 1955, WLA 408 Sterling, WL, London. Wiener may also have heard about Sterling’s capabilities through his contacts with Max Horkheimer. See also Eleonore Sterling, letter to Eva G. Reichmann, 24 May 1955, and Eva G. Reichmann, letter to Eleonore Sterling, 31 May 1955, WLA 408 Sterling, WL, London, regarding the collection of documents pertaining to the trial of Gerhardt Peters, former head of Degesch (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Schädlingsbekämpfung), which had produced the chemical Zyklon-B, he was unsuccessfully retried in 1955 after a five year imprisonment.
Jews of Frankfurt am Main. \textsuperscript{232} Sterling was only one of many individuals, from tenured professors to post-doctoral researchers, civilians, lawyers and politicians who were linked to the WL but her working partnership, particularly with Reichmann, continued into the next decade, mediating between the strong interaction of German-Jewish diasporic intellectuals and German academic and public spheres.\textsuperscript{233}

Besides the WL, Sterling contributed to collaborative projects carried out jointly by German and German-Jewish émigré scholars, working as a research assistant for several senior academics. Opportunities which she readily accepted but which often needed careful handling, since the results of her ‘spade work’ would be pieced together, adapted and in some cases appropriated by another scholar. For example she authored a joint article with the Roman Catholic journalist and intellectual Walter Dirks on race, belief and Judaism and undertook research for a comparative regional study of the National Socialist persecution of the Jews in collaboration with Ehrlich. She also provided groundwork locating documents and preparing sources for a project being organised by Francis L. Carsten and Helmut Krausnick.\textsuperscript{234} Sterling and Ehrlich were also considered alongside the established Weimar cohort as contributors to the updated post-war \textit{Philo-Lexikon} to be published in German as \textit{Lexikon des Judentums} [lexicon of Judaism]: a key publication which, it was anticipated, would become a widely consulted authority for non-Jews.\textsuperscript{235}

Although today the protection of intellectual property would have shaped these collaborative projects, issues of funding and commissioning decisively influenced who contributed to these studies and whether they would successfully reach the publication stage. In some cases research was transferred between projects with different emphases, for example the historian Paul Kluke at the IfZ oversaw a study of Jewish communities during the Third Reich, being researched by Ehrlich and Sterling. Sterling had enquired

\textsuperscript{232} Eva G. Reichmann, letter to Eleonore Sterling, 6 October 1955, WLA 408 Sterling, WL, London.
\textsuperscript{233} See correspondence with the many contacts and co-workers in WLA 408 Sterling, and WLA 358-60 Reichmann among other folders.
of relevant materials held at the WL and both had begun to gather information on
German-Jewish community life under National Socialism through questionnaires sent to
former community members, such as Max Horkheimer in relation to Frankfurt am
Main. It would appear that this study was not published in its proposed form.
However in 1963 Sterling and city historian Dietrich Andernacht published a
documentary study of the Frankfurt community drawing on this earlier research. The
open exchange of research that took place during this period was spurred on by a shared
concern for the post-war rehabilitation of the history profession as well as in some cases
the personal careers of those involved. For many participants, Sterling and Reichmann
included, their actions were underpinned more importantly by their sense of the urgent
task of historical re-education.

As a result of the various work Sterling was offered during the second half of the
1950s, she addressed a broad range of topics within the general area of Jewish history
and German-Jewish relations. Balancing a crossover between historical and
contemporary topics, she consolidated her analysis of the links between past and
present. She dealt with topics which pushed the boundaries of her nineteenth-century
specialism. For example one piece of research for the Zentralrat der Juden in
Deutschland [Central Council of the Jews from Germany] evaluated primary and
secondary sources on the number of Jews who perished during the Holocaust. This was
a research area which she had tentatively addressed in discussion with Guido Kisch
whilst working on another challenging project: two weighty entries for the 1955 edition
of Der Grosse Brockhaus encyclopaedia on Jews and Judaism, an experience that
forced her to consider the new problematics of representing Jewish life and culture in
post-war Germany.

---

237 Dietrich Andernacht and Eleonore Sterling, 'Vorwort', in Dietrich Andernacht (ed.), Dokumente zur
Geschichte der Frankfurter Juden (Frankfurt am Main: Kramer, 1963), pp. 11-15. It is possible that
this was the end product of the project she had begun working on with Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich.
238 I employ the term 're-education' rather than 'reorientation', as used in Tom Lawson, 'Constructing a
Christian History of Nazism. Anglicanism and the Memory of the Holocaust, 1945-49', History &
Memory, vol. 16, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2004), pp. 146-76, here pp. 150-51, due to the pedagogic
aspect of knowledge transfer in these women's transmission of German and Jewish historical
understanding.
239 Ellie Sterling, letter to Guido Kisch, 23 May 1954, p. 1; compare this with Eleonore Sterling, 'Zur
Frage der Zahl der getöeteten Juden 1933-1945' (Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland, 1957). See
Eleonore Sterling, Kulturelle Entwicklung im Judentum von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart, p. 52.
Kisch and Sterling had discussed the work of Hans Lamm on the death toll of the Holocaust in Ellie
Sterling, letter to Guido Kisch, 23 May 1954, pp. 1-2, and Guido Kisch, letter to Mrs Sterling, 26
May 1954, pp. 1-2, Guido Kisch Collection, AR 787, folder 7/13, LBIA, NY. Eleonore Sterling,
'Juden' and 'Judentum', Der Grosse Brockhaus, vol. 6, pp. 97-100 and pp. 100-3.
Prior to the establishment of the Leo Baeck Institute (LBI) in 1955 as an international umbrella institution for the study of German-Jewish history, early networks were forged by this generation of displaced scholars from the 1940s promoting German-Jewish historiography. These provide a broader perspective on the historiographical context that the LBI became part of and benefited from. The research and connections pursued by the Wiener Library and Reichmann, as well as the institutional and academic interactions of Arendt and Stern throw light on the complexity of activities that contributed to the establishment of German-Jewish historical studies, as a significant part of the work to salvage, preserve and commemorate German-Jewish cultural and historical heritage within the German-Jewish diaspora. This in turn contributed to the establishment of the LBI and the late 1950s became a key moment in the maturation of historiographical hopes, dreams and research projects that had been in preparation since the end of the war.

Certain prerequisites had been set in place for the central institutionalisation of German-Jewish studies in the diaspora, such as the work of the JCR to locate and redistribute library, archival and museum collections, to gather artefacts, documents and publications which would illuminate German and Jewish relations from the earliest times to the present. The LBI built on these foundations, set in motion by many scholars and intellectuals who took up positions within its leadership as board members, whilst presenting itself as the institutional embodiment of this movement. It is a remarkable and overlooked achievement that these female scholars and their male contemporaries pioneered an academic re-engagement with German-Jewish history and culture before the assistance of a centralised body such as the LBI. They had struggled to achieve publication and assert their position within the dispersed intellectual elite of the community of Jews from Germany; through their support for this institution they aimed to encourage future generations of scholars who would benefit from the networks and infrastructure they were creating.

The LBI was instituted outside Germany around three boards: in Jerusalem, New York and London. The research which it supported and commissioned in the first decade was carried out by scholars throughout the diaspora, either individuals who were established scholars of German-Jewish history associated with the LBI leadership and boards or individuals with a German-speaking Jewish background who were not
necessarily trained in historiography but from a range of professional backgrounds. Many were former members of the elite leadership of German Jewry, for example in New York the president Max Gruenewald had been a rabbi and the secretary Max Kreutzer had been the director of the Zentralwohlfahrtstelle der deutschen Juden [Central Welfare Agency for German Jews]. In contrast, the elected board members were primarily historians and cultural scholars, already established and published intellectuals during the Weimar period who had successfully pursued their specialisms as émigré scholars.

It is my opinion that from the outset this gave the LBI a diasporic character which balanced distinct tensions caused by disparate German-Jewish interests and newly nationalised identities of the émigré scholars, working within very different political and cultural settings, such as Great Britain and the emerging state of Israel. The foundation of the LBI negotiated between the public and private tensions across dispersed German-Jewish academic circles regarding the potential and limitations of German-Jewish historical studies. To a certain extent the personal re-engagement with post-war Germany carried out by intellectuals who were associated with the LBI, throws new light on the problematics underlying its task to represent and unite a German-Jewish historiographical community that held very varied views on post-war relations with East and West Germany. Although there were a number of objections to reconnecting German-Jewish scholarship with German scholars, academia and the cultural field, this process had an inherent dynamic due to the fact that many German-Jewish scholars needed to consult sources in West Germany.

The LBI represented an evolving forum for a heterogeneous research field. Each centre commissioned, supervised and promoted scholarship that would represent their particular programme, not without issues of competition and parity. The Jerusalem branch which was the central seat produced the *Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts* in German from 1957, whereas the New York branch oversaw the establishment of the LBI archives and library under the leadership of Margarete Edelheim-Muehsam which was to serve German-Jewish scholarship in the United States and internationally. The
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241 Margarete T. Edelheim-Muehsam, ‘Ein Gang durch die Bibliothek des Leo Baeck Institute, New
London branch was charged with the publication of the *LBI Year Book* produced annually from 1956. Supported by the work of the WL and ethos of its staff, the London branch particularly promoted the relationship between scholars in and outside Germany. This provided a strong basis from which Robert Weltsch the director of the London board could work to support German-Jewish scholarship in West Germany. For example he pursued tentative relations with the West German Freunde und Förderer des LBI [Friends and Supporters of the LBI] established to pursue an intellectual and cultural programme to raise funds for the LBI in West Germany. Weltsch observed the study of German-Jewish history by Jewish and non-Jewish scholars in West Germany, such as the efforts of Horkheimer in Frankfurt am Main to introduce Jewish studies into the university framework through the Loeb lecture series and commissioned German scholars such as Karl Heinrich Rengstorf for specific projects.

In the first *LBI Year Book* published in 1956 Siegfried Moses, the chairman of the board wrote regarding the institute’s foundation:

A remarkable number of scholars, such as historians, philosophers, sociologists and economists, as well as men who ideologically or practically had a leading part in German Jewry and its spiritual movements, serve on the Board of the Institute.
The emphasis this evokes suggests the male domination of German-Jewish scholarship and the continuity of personnel. The issue of female board members and associates seems ignored here but was contested from the outset. The eleven strong New York editorial board was in fact relatively ‘emancipated’ with three female representatives: Hannah Arendt, Julie Braun-Vogelstein, Selma Stern-Taubler and in addition Margarete Edelheim-Muehsam as librarian and archivist. The ratio of approximately one quarter of the editorial board being female members hardly increased as the board grew throughout the first half of the 1960s. By the beginning of the 1970s still only 4 of the 25 members were female. In the 1960s this female line-up shifted to include women who were not published scholars of German-Jewish culture or history. The London board reflected the more closed circles of the German-Jewish refugee elite established in Great Britain. Like the Jerusalem board, it could wryly be described as a Männerverein [men’s club]. Reichmann had participated in early board meetings alongside Alfred Wiener and Hans Reichmann who shared the chair and she was a significant shadow member until after her husband’s death in 1964 when she was elected onto the board.250

The contribution of female scholars in the first decade to the publication portfolio of the LBI: the LBI Year Book, Bulletin des Leo-Baeck-Instituts, the German-language scientific publication series of the LBI – Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts and other LBI supported publications suggests that only a discrete number of female scholars had their research promoted. In the case of the Schriftenreihe established in 1959 around twenty volumes were published, four written by female authors.251 Prior to the creation of the Schriftenreihe published by Mohr in Tübingen, the LBI had intended supporting a small number of individual studies for publication, providing funding and organising publishing contracts. Among

248 See Siegfried Moses’ comments regarding the inclusion of female scholars within the LBI’s Jerusalem board or advisory committee, from which women were to remain absent for some time. ‘Protokoll der Sitzung des Councils of Jews from Germany – Israel – Section’, 31 May 1955, Archive of the London Leo Baeck Institute.
249 If one looks at the first decade of the New York branch’s editorial board Stern and Braun-Vogelstein remained members throughout but after Arendt’s departure Charlotte Levinger was elected, later succeeded by Edith Hirsch and Mrs George Manasse.
this first group of publications were Stern’s study *Josel von Rosheim* and Arendt’s work on Rahel Varnhagen. Stern’s subsequent scholarship has continued to be supported by the LBI through the *Schriftenreihe*, even posthumously with the recent publication of Stern’s court Jew project in German, its original language. The contribution which Arendt, Reichmann and Stern made to the London and New York branches of the LBI during its first years is testament to the singularity of their positions in this particular niche which they held as female scholars.

In New York Hannah Arendt participated in the LBI’s work and contributed to its publication programme alongside fellow acquaintances and female board members Stern and Braun-Vogelstein. As a result of the drawn out publication of *Rahel Varnhagen* she became more critical of the LBI’s ideological programme. Displeased with the way its publication had been managed, with poor distribution and low sales figures, the criticism she expressed to Kurt Blumenfeld questioned the ‘vision’ of the LBI regarding German-Jewish studies. This episode highlights the LBI’s mediation of differing opinions, intentions and working practices for its publication programme among the board members and executives prior to the establishment of the official *Schriftenreihe* publication series. As one of the first monographs supported by the


254 Arendt and Stern were in contact with one another through their institutional affairs throughout their careers: during the late 1920s, their respective post-war work for Jewish Cultural Reconstruction and the American Jewish Archives; Hannah Arendt, letter to Karl Jaspers, 28 January 1929, pp. 4 and 690, and Hannah Arendt, letter to Karl Jaspers, 28 January 1949, pp. 129-30, in Lotte Köhler and Hans Saner (eds.), *Hannah Arendt and Karl Jaspers: Correspondence 1926-1969*; also Hannah Arendt (JCR Inc.), letter to Selma Stern-Taeubler (AJA), 12 February 1951, Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 14, 21, UBB. Julie Braun-Vogelstein had been a neighbour of Arendt’s mother Martha in Königsberg and assisted Arendt, Martha and Heinrich Blücher when they first arrived in New York. See Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *Hannah Arendt, for Love of the World*, pp. 164, 171, 231; Arendt holidayed at the Vogelstein’s from the mid 1940s and was later involved in various projects of the Vogelstein Foundation, see Lotte Köhler (ed.), *Within Four Walls*, p. 77.

LBI, Arendt’s perhaps proved a test case for the LBI’s publishing plans. Two other studies: Stern’s *Josel von Rosheim* and Scholem Adler-Rudel’s study of East European Jews in Germany received early support from the LBI but unlike Arendt’s, both works were published in German and the latter became the first volume in the *Schriftenreihe* series.

Arendt stepped back from her board membership in the first half of 1960. The shift in relationship between Arendt and influential members of the LBI had therefore already taken place before she reported on the Eichmann trial and published her problematic evaluation of the role, during the Holocaust, of the Jewish leadership and in particular of Leo Baeck. This chiefly contributed to her terminal break with a number of key LBI representatives and general ostracism from German-Jewish and Jewish community organisations and intellectual circles.

A full picture of Reichmann’s contribution to the work of the London LBI in the first decade whether formal or informal is difficult to define, she is not listed as a board member after the first year and it appears that she was not re-elected until after the death of her husband. Both directly and indirectly the work of the Wiener Library supported the programme of the London branch. Reichmann’s facilitating exchanges of information about scholars, projects and sources between institutions, engaged in German-Jewish scholarship in Great Britain and West Germany, certainly played its

---


257 Arendt’s monograph was among the first studies to be published under the auspices of the LBI, see *ibid.* The other two works were Selma Stern, *Josel von Rosheim. Befehlshaber der Judenschaft im Heiligen Römischen Reich* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1959) and Scholem Adler-Rudel, *Ostjuden in Deutschland 1880-1940* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1959), *Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts*, no. 1.


part but her knowledge of LBI business through Hans Reichmann and Wiener was at times intimate and at others incomplete.

The specialist foci of the WL and the LBI meant that there could be a complimentary and mutually beneficial co-existence for the two institutions. Wiener pursued a formal association between the two institutions. It was intended that the WL collections would support LBI research for the *Year Book* and projected monographs, such that the London board would be able to contribute significantly to the overall research programme of the LBI without having to rely on the resources of New York’s in-house library and archives. The WL assisted the London board with materials and the close association between the two institutions which existed on a personnel level came a step closer in 1959 when the LBI took up residence upstairs from the WL in Devonshire Street, London. A closer integration of research and publishing was never achieved however.

Reichmann’s ideological proximity and contribution to the LBI’s publications were not simply the result of the strong connections of the WL. It was underpinned by her personal affinity with the scholarship and person of Rabbi Leo Baeck, the central spiritual and community leader of German Jewry within National Socialist Germany and the figurehead of Jews from Germany in the post-war period. He had encouraged and provided a model for her own post-war re-engagement with German scholars and Jewish life in Germany: interactions which were perpetuated by his close friends and colleagues after his death. Her intellectual mettle and long-standing place within German-Jewish leadership circles was corroborated in the key editorial and advisory role she took in the commemoration of Baeck. Her inaugural publication in the 1957 *LBI Year Book* addressed his life and she edited various commemorative publications, she also spoke publicly at memorial events held in Britain and gave radio broadcasts in West Germany on his life and work. Reichmann particularly supported the
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262 *Ibid.* and ‘Memo’ of meeting of the Wiener Library Board of Directors with the London Leo Baeck Institute director Robert Weltsch, 16 April 1959, pp. 1-2, here p. 2, MS 225 (Papers of the *Jewish Chronicle*), 3/84, Hartley Library Special Collections, University of Southampton.
263 See correspondence between David Kessler (chairman of the *Jewish Chronicle* and chairman of the executive committee of the WL) the Wiener Library, Robert Weltsch and the London LBI Board, during 1959, MS 225 (Papers of the *Jewish Chronicle*), 3/84, Hartley Library Special Collections, University of Southampton.
transmission of Baeck’s scholarly and humanitarian legacy to both German and Jewish audiences in West Germany. Baeck’s place within German-Jewish life in Germany was remembered in 1957 when a stamp was issued to commemorate his life and the Leo-Baeck-Preis [Leo Baeck prize] was instituted by the Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland. Reichmann participated as a member of the judging panel and the prize winners Sterling and Schalom Ben-Chorin in 1959 reflected the diasporic contribution to German-Jewish life in West Germany. 265

Stern’s contribution to the LBI was sought as a respected leading scholar whose specialism corresponded with the central objectives of the LBI: to research and publish ‘the history of German Jewry’. 266 However she was also closely associated with the history of the foundation of the Leo Baeck Institute. Stern like Reichmann was personally connected with Leo Baeck, deeply rooted in the personal friendship she and her husband shared with Baeck before emigrating. Taeubler had known Baeck from his youth and they had worked together at the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums [College for the Science of Judaism] in Berlin before the war and subsequently at HUC in Cincinnati. Stern took part in the laudations on the occasion of Baeck’s eightieth birthday, like Reichmann she commemorated his life through various publications and dedications. 267 In many respects Stern’s decision to continue her...
historical studies in the late 1940s was not only bound up with the memory of Baeck but also in great part with the commemoration of her husband’s leadership and ideological influence on the broad field of Jewish historiography in Germany in the first half of the twentieth century. Her involvement with the LBI provides another example of her posthumous efforts to bring his historiographical aspirations and life’s work to fulfilment.

Her mediation of Taeubler’s vision for an academic successor institution following the break-up of German-Jewish scholarship under National Socialism, associated with and carried forward under the name of Leo Baeck, points to the multiple origins, purposes, aims and programmes for the institutionalised post-war study of German-Jewish history. Max Kreutzberger was keen to raise the profile of Taeubler’s role in the pre-history of the LBI, which reinforced the significance of Stern’s future ‘collaboration’ with the LBI. She had drawn his attention to Taeubler’s ‘sketch for a “Baeck-Warburg Foundation”’. This plan, which originated from the uncertain days of the late 1930s, was just one of many Taeubler had worked on for the creation of a secure future home for *Wissenschaft des Judentums* outside Germany. Early in 1945 at a time when it was unclear whether Baeck would survive Theresienstadt, Taeubler wrote to Baeck’s son-in-law about his work on the fulfilment of their joint ‘Cambridge plan of 1939’ and the hope that his life and work would remain closely connected to Baeck’s. This proposed the affiliation of a research library to hold the biblical and theological collections of the Gesamtarchiv der deutschen Juden with the university of Cambridge. Taeubler also wrote to Salo W. Baron that year regarding another scheme to re-establish the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Basel, as an institute for research and teaching rather than a rabbinical seminary of the Berlin
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268 Max Kreutzberger, letter to Selma Stern-Taeubler, 26 April 1956, Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 14, 144, UBB. The Warburg Institute and library which relocated to London in 1933 served as a model of a successfully transplanted German-Jewish institution, albeit with different specialisms to the Wiener Library and the LBI’s library and archives. See in particular Eugen Taeubler, letter to Hermann L Berlak, 4 January 1945, pp. 1-2, Nachlass Eugen Taeubler, NL 0078, E IV 0006, UBB; Eugen Taeubler, letter to Dr Stein, 27 January 1945, pp. 1-3, Nachlass Eugen Taeubler, NL 0078, E IV 037.1, UBB. See also Ben Barkow, *Alfred Wiener and the Making of the Holocaust Library*, p. 92. Alfred Wiener had been familiar with the Warburg Institute and had corresponded with its director Aby M. Warburg since the early part of the twentieth-century. See Alfred Wiener, letter to Aby Warburg, 12 October 1926, Warburg Institute Archives, General Correspondence, 17829, Warburg Institute, London.


270 Taeubler’s correspondence with the son-in-law of Leo Baeck: Eugen Taeubler, letter to Hermann L Berlak, 4 January 1945, pp. 1-2, Nachlass Eugen Taeubler, NL 0078, E IV 0006, UBB.
Taeubler did not live to see the fruits of his shared dreams with Baek, who also died not long after the foundation of the LBI.

Stern was encouraged to publish an article in the LBI Year Book to commemorate Taeubler’s scholarship and illuminate his vision for an institute in Baek’s name. The LBI however was not envisaged as the direct successor of any specific ideological school of Wissenschaft des Judentums such as Taeubler’s, rather it was a vehicle for divergent historiographical and ideological standpoints represented by dispersed scholars. The LBI selection process for publications by established researchers tried to incorporate a range of ideological and methodological approaches present within the German-Jewish intellectual diaspora. This meant absorbing what others might have regarded as apologetic or contested approaches to the history of German and Jewish relations.

The work of the LBI has so far been considered by scholarship for its role in the perpetuation of twentieth-century German-Jewish historiography but also as an act of commemorating German Jewry of the Weimar period in the light of the persecution and destruction of German-Jewish communities under National Socialism. The scope of its original programme was ambitious and never fully achieved but developed in areas

---

271 Eugen Taeubler, letter to Salo W. Baron, 30 April 1945, pp. 1-6, here pp. 3-6. Nachlass Eugen Taeubler, NL 0078, E IV 003, UBB.


273 Founders and leading scholars in the LBI in its first decade including Robert Weltsch in London, Gershom Scholem and Ernst Simon in Jerusalem and Stern as a representative of the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums came from diverse academic backgrounds and held divergent political and philosophical approaches to German-Jewish identity and historiography.

274 The LBI Year Book is published with the disclaimer regarding the opinions expressed by individual contributors. Stern’s symbiotic approach to German-Jewish history was by no means universally shared. It is unclear how Stern responded to Arendt’s criticism of the apologetic nature of The Court Jew in her review: Hannah Arendt, ‘Selma Stern. The Court Jew. A Contribution to the History of the Period of Absolutism in Central Europe’, Jewish Social Studies, vol. 14, no. 2 (1952), pp. 176-78. See also Christhard Hoffmann, ‘Between integration and reflection: the Jewish community in Germany, 1914-1918’, in John Horne (ed.), State, society and mobilization in Europe during the First World War, pp. 271-72, who identifies a common focus in early articles in the LBI Year Books on German-Jewish historical figures and their contributions as an apologetic tendency arising from the need for positive self-representation, citing examples from Stern’s work. It has been a feature of the LBI Year Books that historical topics such as Jewish emancipation, acculturation, assimilation and identity were keenly addressed from the outset. However, besides references to the ‘German-Jewish symbiosis’ embedded within individual studies, the subject has only been framed as a historical debate since the late 1990s, in the 1996 and 1998 LBI Year Books.

where scholars, sources and interest were available.\textsuperscript{276} Stern shared the common goals of education and commemoration which took centre stage in the LBI’s mission:

[to] convey the panorama of German Jewry [...] and to] carry a message to the generations of our children and grand-children, as well as those in whose midst we now live.\textsuperscript{277}

As members of the generations who had grown up in Imperial Germany and worked during the Weimar Republic and under National Socialism, the LBI’s scholars personally provided a bridge to the history of that period. The challenge and hope embedded within her continued research was summed up in her quotation of the phrase: ‘What one can understand he can endure’.\textsuperscript{278} This first-hand knowledge demanded absolute objectivity. The poignant realisation that the insights gained as a result of the historical events experienced, enabled them to view the past ‘more objectively’, went directly to the core of Stern’s historiographical struggles.\textsuperscript{279}

One can see these tensions within Stern’s first article in the inaugural volume of the \textit{LBI Year Book}, eagerly included as a benchmark of the quality of scholarship it wished to present. She brought the Reformation period into direct comparison with the post-war period due to the affinity in ‘spiritual climate’ and ‘actual situation’ between the two periods.\textsuperscript{280} The article is linked in substance and spirit to the monograph on Josel of Rosheim, which was yet to appear and sub-textually with the figure of Leo Baeck and theme of Jewish martyrdom which were also central in her novel \textit{The Spirit Returneth}.\textsuperscript{281} Her personal correspondence, collections of reviews and responses to her work suggest a scholar who was keenly concerned with her academic reception but also her popular reception among fellow émigrés, who similarly found their assumptions and hopes challenged by recent history, now engaged in a reconsideration of German and Jewish relations throughout the modern period.

\textsuperscript{276} See the full outline of topics which the LBI programme aimed to address: Siegfried Moses, ‘Leo Baecck Institute of Jews from Germany’, \textit{LBI Year Book}, vol. I (1956), pp. xv-xviii.
\textsuperscript{278} Selma Stern, \textit{The Court Jew}, p. xv.
\textsuperscript{279} See for example remarks on Reichmann’s ‘almost breathtaking objectivity’ in ‘Bemuhren - Begreifen - Bewältigen. “Antisemitismus und die deutsche Geschichte” - Arbeitstagung in der Evangelischen Akademie Loccum’, \textit{Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland}, 27 September 1957. Compare Selma Stern, \textit{The Court Jew}, p. xv: ‘the tragedy and inexorableness of our present experiences should lead us to view our past more objectively than before, so that we may understand those forces of our history which once formed and eventually transformed us’. See also Selma Stern, \textit{Ihr seid meine Zeugen}, p. 291.
\textsuperscript{281} Compare \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 26-27, with Selma Stern, \textit{The Spirit Returneth...A Novel} and Selma Stern, \textit{Josel von Rosheim}.
The LBI branches in both New York and London courted Stern’s editorial input and writings as a key board member for their own separate projects.\(^{282}\) Her theoretical analysis of the historical formation of the German Jew as a ‘unique and distinct’ type, unlike any other diasporic Jew, shaped by the formative tension between ‘the surrounding world and his own substance’, was used to underpin Robert Weltsch’s rich depiction of the developments in German-Jewish life in the modern period, presented in the introduction of the first *LBI Year Book*.\(^{283}\) This piece culminated in his reflections on the Nazi era, posed as a challenge to the idea that German Jewry in the post-war period was a *tabula rasa*. Instead he asserted that German Jewry’s long heritage demanded critical analysis in order that German-Jewish life should continue, cognisant of past illusions that had obscured the threats to its existence.

Following Stern’s return to Europe her senior position was honoured as a ‘Fellow’ and, like Reichmann, her high-standing increasingly developed as scholarship focused on the legacy of the Weimar German-Jewish intellectual elite, commemorated as its leaders passed away. Stern continued as a board member, although more closely associated with the London board, with which she had been in direct contact from 1955 when she had attended a London board meeting during her research trip to Europe.\(^{284}\) In London dissatisfaction had grown with the feeling that it was playing second fiddle to New York in terms of financial support apportioned from the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany and in relation to research which was being decided and delegated from New York. Stern’s name was put forward when the London board appealed for more autonomy in their projects, to be formulated in direct consultation

---

282 One example of the editorial work Stern was involved in was her evaluation of material collected by Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich in 1959 who had been assigned a research project by the LBI New York to compile a documentary volume on the ‘history of the German Jews from the beginning of emancipation to the destruction’. Robert Weltsch, letter to Selma Stern, 31 July 1957, Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 12, 33: ‘You have to be represented in the third volume. Our group is very small and we cannot forgo our best co-workers’. Also Max Kreutzberger, letters to Selma Stern-Taeubler, 3 August 1960 and 8 November 1960, Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 14, 71 and 74, UBB.


with historians on the New York board. Her 'intensive' collaboration continued to be sought concurrently by both London and New York, not only for her contribution to their publications but also for her editorial and specialist advice on future projects.

When considering the micro-interactions of scholars such as Arendt, Reichmann and Stern with the LBI during its initial years and more broadly in the German-Jewish intellectual and institutional hubs of New York, London and Cincinnati, the problematics related to two elements of the LBI's mission become rapidly evident. Firstly the LBI's commemorative and historically bound programme did not initially address the history of Jewish persecution under National Socialism, the Holocaust or contemporary post-war history; subjects Reichmann, Arendt and Sterling increasingly focused on in their scholarship, contextualised and illuminated with the assistance of their historical research. Secondly the location of German-Jewish historiography as a diasporic and transnational discipline, which even prior to the foundation of the LBI was not exclusively undertaken outside West Germany.

Both these positions were renegotiated by the organisational networks and scholarship of the LBI in its early years, since it was precisely Jewish persecution and the destruction of German-Jewish life following 1933 which were the implicit points of reference for the LBI's commemorative agenda. It was with the ever-growing knowledge of the Jewish catastrophe that scholars resumed their research, set against the challenges of personal loss and objectivity. Dynamics evolving within the nexus of diasporic German Jewry, continually, individually and collectively reformulated relations with post-war West Germany, shaping the ideological and organisational basis of the LBI. The work of relocation and reconstruction of German-Jewish heritage outside the former site of German-Jewish culture and history, which had been a central goal whilst the future of Germany was in the balance of the Allies, experienced a reversal. From the beginning of the 1950s West Germany featured increasingly as the dominant historical landscape within new scholarship. Contact with archives, scholars and the indices of German-Jewish life remaining in post-war West Germany provided the concrete means to produce this new scholarship.
There were limits to the importance of the overall role of the LBI for the post-war scholarship of Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling, as present and future-minded intellectuals whose scholarship bridged the disciplinary and temporal confines of historiography. Arendt, Reichmann and Stern served the LBI in their role as subject-specialist consultants, offering their editorial skills and own research for publication, assisting the creation of a support base for the next generation of scholars. Stern and Reichmann were instrumental in sourcing new scholars, including Eleonore Sterling who published one article in the *LBI Year Book* in 1958. This was her only publication under the LBI: a condensed presentation of her doctoral research and the only introduction to this work ever published for an English readership: a fact which reinforces its place within German historiography. Her position as one of the small group of German-Jewish scholars working in West Germany meant that her collaboration was considered for research projects associated with the London branch, such as the project commissioned by the mayor of Frankfurt am Main on the history of its Jews and the republication of the single volume, compact history of the Jews in Germany published in 1935 by Ismar Elbogen, doyen scholar of German-Jewish history and the literature of Judaism.

Given the LBI’s programme, it could only provide subsidiary opportunities for publication and research for Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling, with the exception of Stern. All four scholars independently forged collaborative links between German-Jewish scholars in the diaspora and academics in West Germany from the 1940s throughout the 1950s. This served to reinsert German-Jewish heritage and scientific studies back into the history and historiography of West Germany itself. Beyond the LBI and their historical writings, they also began to intone a public voice for former German Jews in West German society, which developed from the late 1950s, growing more assertive in the public sphere through the following decade. Their personal participation developed from academic to popular educational discussions, giving lectures and guiding interfaith and intergenerational dialogue as Jewish interlocutors and former German citizens. In the 1960s Reichmann and Sterling were increasingly...

---

invited by interfaith, educational and political groups to contribute to public discussion on recent German history and contemporary citizenship.

For Arendt, Stern and Reichmann almost twenty years had passed since they arrived as refugees in America and Great Britain. The difficulties they had faced beginning new lives and contending with the painful realities of the Holocaust, gave way to the prospects of new employment and continued publication. Amidst these experiences they strove to continue former interests and activities. Their intellectual reputations and personal connections bridged many of the hurdles fellow refugees faced. Gradually their work became inextricably entwined with the institutionalisation of German-Jewish historical studies and its reconnection with West German academic spheres. Activities undertaken by the institutions, for which they worked, supporting the preservation of German-Jewish cultural heritage created opportunities to reconnect with Germany. The personal relationships they resumed with individuals in Germany and new connections with their former homeland were extended over time by these women in distinct directions. These grew as they saw the significance of their presence and outreach to West German society as former Jews from Germany.

The positions that they achieved at the centre of the diasporic German-Jewish intellectual community may well have been singular due to the presence of few female colleagues. What is more significant however was their key presence as representatives in West Germany. Alongside a small number of German-Jewish writers publishing for West German readers and as public speakers observing at first hand post-war moral and educational reconstruction, they allowed personal experience to shape their intellectual plans and guide their continued work in West Germany during the following decade.
Chapter Three
‘Das Weltkind in der Mitten’¹

3.1 Introduction

By the 1960s Arendt, Reichmann and Stern had successfully rehabilitated their intellectual careers, on a trajectory that intersected local, national and international spheres. The distinct niches which they had created through their institutional involvements, scholarship and subject specialisations during the 1940s and 1950s were, as I have elaborated in the previous chapter, characterised by common elements: the historical study of Jewish and German relations, particularly the junctures at which this relationship had real potential or failed; and on the contemporary scene, a heightened concern for civil and historical re-education in West Germany, addressed through their publications and public speaking.

From these niche positions the four inserted themselves in West German intellectual and academic circles, which they otherwise would not have gained access to. This contribution took on strongly locational dimensions, which demanded a thorough questioning of identity, their relationship with historical subjects, as well as issues of audience and language. In contrast to the initial establishment of the German-Jewish historiographical discipline created through the Leo Baeck Institute (LBI), as an international body set outside a specific national framework, much of their writing was directed at a West German readership and audience throughout the 1960s. The LBI could only provide a restricted forum for engagement with historical, political and civil re-education and I assess the shifting relationships with this institution into the decade, by looking at their writings in the specific contexts of each woman’s approach, interest and publication of German-Jewish historical studies during this period.

Their activities took on a greater confidence, through the more risky and assertive pursuit of individual intellectual interests and a more personalised hands-on approach to the communication of knowledge and facilitation of discussion. Founded on their scholarly reputations secured during the 1950s, they took roles as subject-specialists in West German academic and cultural domains contributing to specific debates in

German-Jewish and West German historiography and public life. Opportunities were created for them to play a role in the integration of German-Jewish historical topics, themes and debates in mainstream academic discourse. As ‘outsiders’ contributing to the development of West German post-war historiography, they worked to re-introduce the German-Jewish past into the study of German history beyond accentuating state politics, persecution and antisemitism. However their ‘outsider’ contribution has tended to be overlooked in the reconstruction of the course of post-war West German historiography.

Reichmann and Sterling in particular promoted the communication of historical knowledge through discussion and dialogue. The part they took in theological, historical, political and sociological discussions increasingly addressed a national public audience, directed at the young, politically and intellectually critical. They participated in public discussion of German history and contemporary life not only as learned experts but also as German-Jewish spokespeople, addressing National Socialism, antisemitism, post-war denazification, the status of nationalist and extreme right-wing political groups, as well as the place of Jewish culture and history in post-war German historiography and post-war attitudes towards Jews. Work to promote democratic citizenship and a new historical consciousness made use of public discussion and the model of dialogue to address historical and post-war relations between Jews and Germans. It was a dialogue engaged with the past, a significant dialogue between Jews and Germans and an interfaith dialogue between Jews and Christians promoting reconciliation, pursued by academic and confessional members of the public as interlocutors. This important facet of their work bound together their private and academic persona.

They raised the profile of German-Jewish scholars in West Germany as spokespeople for German-Jewish culture and history. As secular scholars but also religious Jewish individuals Reichmann and Sterling supported the opening up of the religious and theological discussion of Christian and Jewish values and beliefs, to reframe future relations between Jews and Christians in West Germany. This aimed to redress some of the failings, misunderstandings and misrepresentations previously promulgated by Christian leaders which their historical studies of the 1950s had highlighted. The remit of their re-educative work was extended to challenge the social and psychological formulation of stereotypes and prejudice. This was transposed in their work to address wider issues of integration and tolerance of other minority groups but highlighted at times the complex and problematic aspects of their roles as mentors.
of West Germany’s path to democracy. Stern pursued personal dialogue with West German intellectuals and publishers in the private sphere, whilst Arendt took up new areas of discussion on philosophical and political concepts.

All four observed and commented on the continuing public discourse on old and new antisemitism and the increasingly prevalent expression of philosemitism. The study of philosemitism to date has overlooked the fact that these women intentionally presented themselves as German-Jewish interlocutors in the West German public domain and consequently became the object of these phenomena. They worked to deconstruct the underlying attitudes, contemporary and historical misconceptions, behind the antisemitism and philosemitism they witnessed.

Their biographies and intellectual careers post 1945 show broken continuity but not clean-cut discontinuity with their former lives in Germany. Much debate has taken place regarding the almost mutually exclusive existence of continuity or discontinuity of a German-Jewish literature and culture, in and outside Germany and in the German-Jewish diaspora, between the first and second half of the German twentieth century. Undoubtedly there were profound caesuras in their private lives caused by emigration and bereavement. However activities, contacts and intellectual frameworks were not so radically different in the post-war period and they could draw on their pre-war experiences, methodological and ideological resources for the scholarship and careers they later pursued.

There are distinct and intended examples of direct continuity with the scholarship of the Weimar period in their academic work. This is very clearly demonstrated in Sterling’s personal grounds for reworking and republishing the historical study of Jews in Germany that the German-Jewish historian Ismar Elbogen published in 1935 and Stern’s resuming her Akademian research projects.3 In the second chapter I have shown how their activities laid the groundwork for the development of German-Jewish historiography as a new discipline. The rebirth of German-Jewish community life across the diaspora, reclaimed and affirmed a religious and cultural heritage of Jewish life in

---


Germany alongside a historiographical heritage, directed by the intellectual elite of the generations who had been displaced from Germany. This chapter shows the continuation of their work in the 1960s; how these women maximised their positions as members of the surviving Weimar intellectual elite and drew even more deeply on their personal experiences of that period. In the case of Reichmann and Sterling these were the foundations for constructing their most personally committed mediation of Jewish and non-Jewish relations in West Germany.

3.2 Points of orientation: the sites of German-Jewish historiography

An émigré community of scholars located across the diaspora and Israel had shaped the character and programme of the emerging international discipline of German-Jewish historiography in the 1950s. Between the 1950s and 1960s the location of German-Jewish historiography gradually shifted. The intersecting relationship which emerged from the end of that decade between historiography written by dispersed German-Jewish scholars and studies carried out by Jews and non-Jews in the former Heimat [home] – Germany; highlights the progressive outlook of many scholars who shaped this discipline. The primary impulse to preserve and record had established the discipline outside a national framework. The independent nature of the activities of scholars such as Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling worked in combination with the infrastructure of the multi-sited LBI and other private and state-run academic institutions. In parallel the voices of these female scholars and a small group of colleagues were heard in West German academic and intellectual circles as guest speakers, visiting scholars and collaborative researchers who subtly worked towards the integration of German-Jewish studies within West German historiography.

The existence of a body of projects and publications on German-Jewish history in the German language and the growth of academic and popular audiences raise important questions about the location and dynamics of German-Jewish historiography from the late 1950s. Audience and readership were key factors shaping the direction and format of their scholarship on historical and contemporary themes. Consequently the German and Jewish historical studies undertaken by Reichmann, Sterling and Stern, to a lesser extent Arendt, were directed at a West German readership more than any other during this decade, as a catalyst for the re-education of German society. The pedagogic imperative that underscored their post-war historiography meant that the LBI could only provide a restricted forum and circulation for their work.
Research published in English in the *LBI Year Book* was mainly written for the surviving German-Jewish community. By the 1960s the LBI had gained academic standing as a sustainable, dedicated institution for the development of German-Jewish historical studies. As circulation of the *LBI Year Book* increased, publications were planned and executed under the *Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts* [scientific publication series of the LBI] in order to reach a wider German-speaking readership. This change was partially prompted by renewed connections between German-Jewish scholars and their sources, located either in archives situated outside Germany, where they had been transferred during the cultural salvage-work of the 1950s, or in Germany, opening the path for renewed interaction with German academia. This shift in language and audience orientation underpinned the beginning of the integration of German-Jewish historiography within German historical studies. Wider collaboration with non-Jewish German scholars was undertaken through research projects carried out between individuals associated with the Institut für Zeitgeschichte (IFZ) [Institute for Contemporary History] in Munich, the university of Frankfurt am Main, the Wiener Library and the LBI in London.

By the 1960s questions of personal and academic orientation were given new impetus in the thought and writings of Arendt, Reichmann, Sterling and Stern as they directed considerable aspects of their intellectual output at a West German audience and readership. Based within the German-Jewish diaspora, Arendt and Reichmann frequently visited West Germany, joining in academic and public discourses in their former *Heimat*. They reflected on identity and the significance of their roles as German-Jewish spokespeople and scholars, as well as the complex simultaneous appearance as representatives of the German-Jewish diaspora and international Jewish community. Sterling now permanently settled in West Germany, with an academic career in her sights, shifted to observe and address inner-German debates for a German audience.

Since Sterling’s remigration, personal feelings regarding her decision to remain in Germany rarely came to the fore in her written work, yet wariness was discreetly evident. Personal doubts about the duration of her return to West Germany are suggested by brief anecdotes: the use of her suitcase as a bedside table, a reminder of her emigration, remigration and the continual reconsideration of renewed flight, or her analysis of holidaying outside Germany as a subconscious desire to leave. Following
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her return to West Germany she took up membership of the Jewish community in Frankfurt am Main from the beginning of 1954. Her writings only privately point to a strong consideration of her Jewish religious identity, often brought into focus through her reflections on Jewish and Christian relations. On occasion Sterling hinted at her sometimes sceptical observation of Christian attempts at reconciliation and the personal isolation she felt.

Although she associated herself by her use of the collective ‘we/us’ with a German-Jewish intellectual circle represented by older returnee intellectuals such as her doctoral supervisor Max Horkheimer, oriented around the Institut für Sozialforschung in Frankfurt am Main, she privately took a critical stance towards the theoretical positioning of this group of scholars. Pointing to this tension she wrote:

there’s a great fight going on concurrently because they say I’m “entirely too religious”. They have their own conceptions about Christianity and Antisemitism which appear in “Dialektik der Aufklärung” and are final, but do not appeal to me very much.

In the public sphere her presence grew as a journalist and teacher, culminating in her participation in Christian-Jewish dialogue and contemporary debates during the first half of the 1960s. In parallel her ambitions in the field of political science gradually crystallised and she finally gained a professorship in political science at the Pädagogische Hochschule [Institute for Pedagogy], Universität Osnabrück in 1968.

Reichmann and Stern chose to continue their academic commitments, research and writing during the 1960s although formally of retirement age. From the end of the 1950s Reichmann altered the pace of her work, continuing to input Wiener Library research projects, working frequently from home. She undertook more independently directed activities, in particular public speaking in West Germany. She visited often but remained resident in Great Britain, even after the death of her husband in 1964. Stern’s retirement from her post as archivist at the American Jewish Archives in 1956 enabled

Nachlass Karl Thieme, ED 163, 83, Institut für Zeitgeschichte-Archiv (IfZ-A), Munich.
5 Susanna Keval, Jüdische Gemeinde, Frankfurt am Main, correspondence with the author, 20 November 2003.
6 See 1953 and 1965 correspondence between Eleonore Sterling and Max Horkheimer, MHA (Max Horkheimer Archiv) V, 159, Horkheimer-Pollock-Archiv, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Archivzentrum, Frankfurt am Main.
8 The Wiener Library is hereafter referred to as the WL. during the period under discussion this institution was most commonly called by this name, although formerly known as the Jewish Central Information Office and later additionally entitled the Institute of Contemporary History.
her to think about relocating to Europe, to be closer to her historical sources and remaining family. In 1960 she transferred to Basel to live near one of her sisters Margarete Horovitz-Stern, dedicating the majority of the following decade to the completion of her research project Der preussische Staat und die Juden [the Prussian state and the Jews] which she had begun in 1920.

Arendt, Reichmann and their contemporaries addressed pressing questions regarding German-Jewish statelessness immediately following immigration and dispersion. They debated issues of how to adjust to the loss of Heimat and relations with the emerging states of West and East Germany, Israel, and the viability of returning to Germany or residing in the diaspora. For them living in the Jewish diaspora had a specific meaning. They belonged to a German-Jewish diaspora which increasingly oriented itself around West Germany, rather than Israel. Personal and collective issues of identity, orientation and involvement shifted during the 1960s. Faced with developments on the international scene, new concerns were prompted by their engagement with West German politics and society and in response to new exigencies in Israel such as the Six-Day War in 1967.

Arendt had moved away from her public commentary on Israeli politics during the 1950s, although she continued to observe internal developments with concern. In 1955 she visited friends and family there, remarking on two particular situations. Firstly the positive contribution of German-Jewish immigrants to the infrastructure of society and secondly the lack of political and social opposition to Israel’s Prime Minister David Ben Gurion. This she considered could be compared with the situation in 1920s Germany, as could the state of intergroup relations in Israel typified by the ‘galut [exile] and ghetto mentality’, which she saw exerting a hold over civil freedom. Arendt visited Europe regularly in the 1950s and considered the time she spent there researching and writing gave her the space she needed to formulate her ideas, particularly through her contact with former academic mentors Karl Jaspers and Martin Heidegger.


Sterling visited Israel for the first time in 1966. She compared her view of the country to that held by orthodox Jews. She considered Israel 'too early' as the 'messianic kingdom'. She felt nevertheless 'historically bound' to a Heimat, although she considered 'after what has happened, for a Jew there is only life without a “Heimat”' but acknowledged that Israel made 'human life possible for many again' as it symbolised 'hope, really concretely'.

Sterling reported on political and economic factors shaping West and East German relations with Israel in her capacity as a 'correspondent' from Bonn for World Jewry. Like Arendt and Reichmann, in the light of her historical study and experience of intergroup relations, Sterling was concerned for the state of Israel, relations between Jews and Arabs living there and their rights as co-citizens.

Committed to living in West Germany Sterling still experienced a sense of 'homelessness'. She positioned herself both as an outsider and insider, continuing her association with American Jewry into the first half of the 1960s through her journalism for an American readership, but at the same time participating as a German-Jewish intellectual in German society and the Jewish community in West Germany. Sterling’s self-identification, which she described as her 'Badish-Jewish-American character', asserted a multiple identification, omitting mention of a 'German' identity. The phrasing of her self-identification conveys an inherent connection and distinction between these elements and parallels Sterling’s own activities which constantly moved between geographical and intellectual spheres. In her written work Sterling manipulated

---


15 Eleonore Sterling, letter to Selma Stern-Taeubler, 11 March 1966, pp. 1-4, here p. 3, NL 0120, D 18, 33, UBB.

her authorial identity in order to consolidate the objective value of her work. For example publications in the German-Jewish press following her return were signed using her maiden name Oppenheimer rather than presenting herself as an American in West Germany via her married surname Sterling. In the American Jewish press she used Sterling or occasionally the pseudonym E. M. Orland. Her academic writings in Germany were signed Sterling, which she settled upon, ironically following her divorce in 1955.17

Reichmann addressed the complex formulation of her post-war identity in a lecture given in Bonn in 1960. She wrote:

I am no longer a German; I will never be an English woman, although England has given me the right to live since my homeland denied it me. I am a former German Jewess of British citizenship.18

This formulation echoes the self-assertion of identity expressed by Reichmann’s former employer the Central Union of German Citizens of Jewish Belief (CV) [Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens]. England was not a Heimat but a ‘new country of residence’ where she took citizenship, identifying with the community of refugees led predominantly by German-Jewish individuals, living as an active member of that minority group.19 For Reichmann German Jewry was and always would be her ‘spiritual home’.20

Occasionally publishing in the Anglo-Jewish press, Reichmann’s public appearances in Britain mainly addressed refugee and German-speaking audiences, including community and youth groups, to whom she presented her research and reported her activities in West Germany.21 She rejected the common view of Jewish life
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17 Orland was the surname her brother Franz had taken upon emigration to Great Britain. Sterling divorced her American boxer husband A. Cecil Sterling in 1955.
21 Unnamed correspondent [Eva G. Reichmann], ‘Dangers of Revival of Nazism’, Jewish Chronicle, 17 August 1951 and ‘Germany’, Jewish Chronicle Supplement, 1 December 1961, pp. 2, 4; see WL archives for information on her public appearances, WLA 358-60 Reichmann, WL, London; also
in Germany as a 'symbolic existence' compared with former German-Jewish life during the Weimar period and 'passionately' continued her participation in the 'development of things in Germany'. During her frequent visits to West Germany she worked together with German and Jewish intellectuals rather than community leaders. Her optimistic participation in Jewish reconstruction was accompanied by mixed feelings and mourning, yet she affirmed this movement because she considered that Jewry in Germany could again constitute a significant group within the diaspora.

Speaking on German Jewry as an integral part of the diaspora, Reichmann said in a 1973 interview:

I have always interceded to find an opportunity to ameliorate the Jewish problematic not only in Israel, because I take the view that, Jewish existence lies in two poles, circling like an ellipse around two foci, Israel and a Jewish diaspora.

In one of her last texts she returned to this metaphor, drawing on the long perspective provided by her fifty year survey of German-Jewish and Zionist positions which since the 1950s had shifted to address the relationship between diaspora Jewry and the state of Israel. The two oppositional standpoints on the Jewish diaspora, she reviewed in this article, considered Jewish life in the diaspora to be 'condemned to death'. She dissected the argumentation of its opponents with the same directness she had used in the 1930s, acknowledging that nothing would persuade those in opposition to the 'mutual dependence' of Israel and the diaspora. Instead she addressed readers who were undecided on the matter, promulgating support for a 'new consciousness of the
diaspora’ giving the example of the Nahum Goldmann Museum of the Jewish Diaspora Beth Hatefutsoth which had opened in Tel Aviv in May 1978. She explicitly positioned herself amongst those who saw ‘a Jewishly conscious diaspora as a justified and necessary existence’.  

Reichmann’s writings on Zionism for the CV had shown her to be an astute observer of the contemporary movement. She was suspected of harbouring compromising sympathies for the Zionist cause, yet in the late 1930s she had been influential in altering the stance of the CV towards their Zionist counterparts.  

Reichmann’s post-war correspondence and intellectual exchange with Robert Weltsch, editor of the LBI Year Book sheds light on their mutual reflections regarding the positions they had represented. Reichmann as editor of Der Morgen and Weltsch as editor of the Zionist Jüdische Rundschau.  

Post-war Reichmann continued her observation of the difficult task facing the state of Israel, to establish a society and government which would serve the inhabitants of that land, at the same time addressing its place within international Jewry and relationship with the Jewish diaspora.  

Despite Stern’s relocation to Basel, the regional heritage of her former homeland Baden held a particular place, as it did for Sterling, in her personal and academic topography. This did not lessen but continued in her private concern for social and political developments in West Germany. She increasingly observed the effects of world politics on Israel when she visited close family and friends, observations which she restricted to correspondence. She wrote of her concern for the state of humanity, 

30 Correspondence with Hermann Maas and Gotthold Müller show few examples of her epistolary discussion of current affairs: Selma Stern-Taubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBIA, NY and Nachlass Selma Stern-Taubler, NL 0120, UBB. Stern’s interest in her former home region in southwest Germany is evident in her studies: Sterling also engaged with the regional Jewish history of Frankfurt am Main and the Rhineland.
Jewish existence and international attitudes towards the Jews, Israel and America which had ‘become a kind of Heimat’ for her. Arendt took American citizenship in 1951, but spent much time abroad, particularly in the locations where her former life had been based. Personal feelings of homelessness and statelessness were attenuated by this new citizenship. With her observation of the reconstruction of Germany and France, the lost Heimat became more and more distant as she took stock of the absence of friends, family and the communities which had made the cities she had formerly lived in the places they once were. In 1958 Arendt described herself as ‘a woman and a Jew and a non-German, i.e., an emigrant’. Heimat had become a metaphysical location; all the more so for Reichmann and Arendt, whose childhood homes were no longer situated within Germany: Reichmann’s Oppeln (now Opole) was located in territory seceded to Poland and Königsberg (Kalingrad) was within the USSR. The transnational dimension of their engagement with German-Jewish historiography resulted not only from their hybrid identities and orientations, but also from the framework of the discipline itself. This remained evident in the 1960s, alongside the move to reach a German audience as well as the dispersed community of German Jewry, which they supported.

3.2.1 Scholars and subject specialist advisors
From the end of the 1950s into the first half of the 1960s in West German political and public life, a greater degree of freedom and willingness to discuss and probe Germany’s National Socialist past and Jewish persecution was evident on a number of levels. Whilst this was not a comprehensive movement and did not lead to a more radical working through of West Germany’s National Socialist past, key events did contribute to a visible shift. Discontentment with Adenauer’s politics grew over matters of foreign policy as the divisions between East and West became more entrenched and concretised with the erection of the Berlin wall in 1961. The government faced challenges concerning internal affairs, regarding for example the relocation of displaced German refugees from territories along Germany’s former eastern boundaries. The presence of

31 Stern’s republication of Jud Süss came at a time, she considered, when the Jewish people were ‘in distress and in need of friends’. She hoped her writings might attenuate antipathy towards the Jewish people: Selma Stern-Taeubler, letter to Gotthold Müller, 26 November 1973, p. 1, and Selma Stern-Taeubler, letter to Gotthold Müller, 28 January 1980, p. 1, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBI, NY.

former Nazi officials and followers [Mitläufer] in the government came under renewed attack from inside West Germany and beyond. This led to the 1960 resignation of the Minister for German Refugees [Bundesvertriebenenminister] Theodor Oberländer due to his National Socialist activities and heightened criticism of Permanent Secretary [Staatsminister im Bundeskanzleramt] Hans Globke, an influential advisor to Adenauer, for his role in drafting the commentary to the Nuremberg Laws. Relations between West Germany and Israel took a major new turn following the compensation and reparations programmes of the early post-war period, after a secret meeting between West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and the President of Israel David Ben-Gurion in New York in 1960 which addressed West German military and political support for Israel.\(^{33}\)

The desecration of Jewish cemeteries in 1957, 1959 and the 1960s met with calls for official action, as concerns were deepened by the increased occurrence of antisemitic attacks on synagogues such as Cologne in 1959. Public discussion of persecution and war crimes was kept on the agenda with the instigation of new war crime trials, through the Central Office of Land Justice Administrations for the Prosecution of Nazi Crimes of Violence [Zentrale Stelle der Landesjustizverwaltungen zur Aufklärungen von NS-Verbrechen] in Ludwigsburg, founded in 1958. Key trials followed such as the 1961 trial of SS-Obersturmbannführer Adolf Eichmann, the key figure in the deportation of millions of Jews as head of Jewish affairs and evacuation at the Office for Reich Security [Reichssicherheitshauptamt] and the Auschwitz trials which began in Frankfurt am Main in 1963.\(^{34}\)

Towards the end of the 1950s a shift also became evident in West German cultural production consolidating the more critical treatment of denazification, complicity and responsibility raised in current affairs and politics. This is evident in the work of writers, dramatists and film producers at a time when there was a marked growth of media infrastructure, with new radio and television stations improving national communication of current affairs and new openings for cultural programmes. In the first half of the following decade other cultural and literary expressions of political and moral critique followed, such as Rolf Hochhuth’s play Der Stellvertreter [The Deputy] (1963), Der Ermittlung [The Investigation] by Peter Weiss (1965) or the dramas of

---

Heinar Kipphardt produced in the 1960s. New publishing opportunities arose in West Germany for German-Jewish topics as politically and historically resonant issues. These developed as a result of greater interest and openness in the German public and the publishing industry. This was due in part to the efforts of the generation of former German Jews, since the late 1940s to publish in West Germany and develop close working partnerships with scholars and publishers, enlisting assistance from those willing to engage with historical and contemporary topics concerning German and Jewish history and relations.

Arendt was party to the hesitations of the publisher Piper, which were eventually overcome, regarding the viability of publishing her study of the German Jewess Rahel Varnhagen, given its Jewish themes. Sterling keenly observed the opening up of publishing opportunities and growing levels of public interest. Reichmann also reported on the state of the German book trade in a review of two bibliographies of ‘Jewish interest’ publications in the two Germanies between 1945 and 1961. She observed positive signs within the book trade whose trade fairs provided ‘visible symbols of the new era’, citing their annual peace prize as one example, reflecting also on the high number of sales of Das Tagebuch der Anne Frank [The Diary of Anne Frank]. From the late 1950s there were annual reprints of the diary and many dramatised performances. Reichmann noted publications by both Jewish writers and non-Jewish writers and highlighted the inclusion of reprinted books written by Jewish authors before the catastrophe. Particularly significant was the ‘rediscovery’ of three Jewish authors, rejected under National Socialism, whom she now judged were...
‘extolled and all but sanctified’. These examples of changing attitudes and interest in German-Jewish subjects accompanied the wider changes in West German political and public life around this time. Opportunities opened up for academic experts whose input played an important role in directing the presentation and treatment of German-Jewish history but also critically addressed the National Socialism and post-war developments.

Some of the earliest cultural events which contributed to public discussion of German-Jewish culture and history took place around the time of the rededication of prominent Jewish religious sites such as the Fasanenstraße synagogue in West Berlin in 1959 and the Rashi synagogue in Worms in 1961. The privately run Germania Judaica library in Cologne was founded in February 1959 with the support of leading German intellectuals such as the writers Heinrich Böll and Paul Schäfluck, dedicated to creating a comprehensive collection of literature on German-Jewish history and antisemitism. The WL supported and followed its establishment, contributing to the early volumes of the periodical Germania Judaica the library produced from 1960, drawing attention to the scholarship of the diasporic German-Jewish historiographical community to German readers. Furthermore the WL enthusiastically heralded the significance of the Germania Judaica to its own supporters and regularly commented on the library’s work in the Wiener Library Bulletin.

Two cultural exhibitions in particular combined the display of religious and cultural artefacts with the presentation of the written and scholarly heritage of German Jewry. They offered a new role for German-Jewish scholars outside and inside West Germany as subject specialist consultants in the public cultural sphere and were regarded as signs of an increased openness among influential sectors of German society to re-encounter Germany’s German-Jewish history. The Synagoga exhibition of Jewish ritual objects and works of art at the Städtische Kunsthalle in Recklinghausen was collaboratively created by Israeli and West German scholars, opened in November 1960 by President Lübke and later presented in Frankfurt am Main. The objects displayed

42 Ibid. These authors were Else Lasker-Schüler, Lion Feuchtwanger and Kurt Tucholsky, whose renaissance she commented on in Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Die Lage der Juden in der Weimarer Republik’, in Eva G. Reichmann, Größe und Verhältnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz, pp. 183-93, here p. 191.
44 The library’s periodical was published as Germania Judaica. Bulletin der Kölnner Bibliothek zur Geschichte des deutschen Judentums from 1960 to 1969.
were lent by museums in Israel and Europe, a fact regarded as a "sign of beginning reconciliation" that constituted an underlying intention of the exhibition's organisers. 47

A second prominent exhibition entitled *Monumenta Judaica* presented the two thousand year history and culture of the Jews in the regions of the Rhine, from Emmerich to Basel, which ran at the Kölnisches Stadtmuseum from 15 October 1963 to 15 February 1964. 48 Many of the ritual objects displayed provided examples of German Jewry's material heritage which had been salvaged and relocated outside Germany through the work of the JCR a decade earlier. In the introduction to the two-volume catalogue, Konrad Schilling highlighted the 'art historical' value of this highly visual object-based exhibition, in particular the influence of the 'Old Covenant' upon Christian art. 49 Increasingly the Christian churches in Germany were promoting a deeper understanding of the roots of Christianity in Judaism. When the Deutsche Evangelische Kirche [German Evangelical Church] formally put sociological, historical and theological discussion between Christians and Jews onto its national programme, it began to challenge Christian anti-Judaism, centring new teaching upon their reading of the unbroken covenant between God and the Jewish people expressed in the New Testament in Romans 11, 1-2. 50

Many dispersed Jewish scholars were enlisted for the selection and procurement of loaned Judaica and Hebraica through international organisations and private collections. Scholars at many German-Jewish diaspora institutions including the WL were brought in for consultation on the content and presentation of the exhibition. 51 Reichmann commented on the impact of the exhibition following her visit: as a sign of intellectual dialogue, 'not only due to the range and exceptional competence of its

---


composition, but almost more due to the touching attitude’ with which the ‘unique phenomenon of the German-Jewish symbiosis’ was presented. The accompanying catalogue was an important component of the exhibition, providing an afterlife to the experience of the exhibition as a spur to deeper interest and knowledge. The first volume contained the detailed exhibition catalogue with many reproductions. The second was conceived as a handbook containing a series of extended essays written by specialist scholars to contextualise the history of German Jewry within the Rhineland and introduce its readership to a pre-existing body of scholarship on German-Jewish history. Sterling contributed a chapter on German Jewry during the period from the Enlightenment to the foundation of the German Empire in 1871.

The exhibition opened by the president of the West German parliament Eugen Gerstenmaier, like the Synagoga exhibition before it, cast a decisive imprint on public discussion about the German-Jewish history of Germany. Although this exhibition presented a range of German-Jewish cultural and intellectual traditions, it is significant that this exhibition demanded visitors’ interaction with the products of German-Jewish culture rather than German Jewry itself. It prompted awareness of the destruction National Socialism had wrought on the fabric of German-Jewish culture but only indirectly brought into focus the destruction of the German-Jewish community. These cultural events were directed at a non-Jewish public, supported by sections of the Jewish community, contributing also to the consolidation of Jewish cultural heritage in Germany during this period. Whilst the inclusion of ritual objects supported the growing public affirmation of Jewish religious identity, asserted also by the theological dimension of Jewish-Christian dialogue, the Jewish scholars who contributed had

53 For example, studies written during the Weimar period, such as the work of Adolf Kober, ‘Aus der Geschichte der Juden im Rheinland’, *Zeitschrift des Rheinischen Vereins für Denkmalspflege und Heimatschutz*, vol. 24, no. 1 (1931); see Konrad Schilling (ed.), *Monumenta Judaica. Handbuch*, p. 7.
57 Alongside the Loeb lecture series run by Max Horkheimer at the university of Frankfurt am Main and the work of the Zentralrat, the Synagoga exhibition and the Germania Judaica library were listed by Sterling as prominent ‘Cultural Activities’ of the ‘Jewish Community’ in E. M. Orland, ‘West Germany’, *American Jewish Year Book*, vol. 63 (1962), pp. 334-55.
opportunities to act as interpreters of secular Jewish heritage and contemporary life. Within this context the discipline of German-Jewish historiography received new interest from the non-Jewish population of West Germany.

3.2.2 Stern’s publications and reception

Stern’s relocation to Europe at the beginning of the 1960s marked her almost exclusive focus on the completion of Der preussische Staat und die Juden, working on the third volume alongside the republication of the first and second volumes.58 She was spurred on by the support of the LBI, which published the entire set of volumes in its Schriftenreihe publication series. Although shifting her membership to the London board, she was made a Fellow and continued advising on research projects, publishing only one further article in the 1970 LBI Year Book. During the completion of her multi-volumed opus she oversaw the republication of new editions and translations of her published monographs, publishing only two other articles based on earlier research.59

Whilst approaching her symbiotic reading of the history of relations between the Prussian state and Prussian Jewry more cautiously, she was convinced of the perennial value of this comprehensive study, in particular the access it provided to reproductions of documents which had been destroyed or lost.60 Stern looked back on the atmosphere in which she began this project as a ‘witness of the brave inner resistance’ and ‘religious and cultural renewal’, in order to ‘save an important inheritance of my people from certain destruction’, to ‘keep the memory of a reverently preserved common tradition alive’: intentions overlaid with new contemporary urgency.61 Referring to the words of the historian and political philosopher Friedrich Meinecke, she acknowledged: ‘every


serious historical work reflects the time of the writer as much as it depicts the epoch of the past.62

Gotthold Müller, her German publisher, remarked that he had ‘rarely met an author’ in his 40 year publishing life, who ‘put their life’s work so completely responsibly under the rule of heart and mind’, such was the urgency in accomplishing what she had set herself to achieve.63 Working on the correction of documents for the second volume she was overcome by fear and melancholy. Following a period of convalescence from this unsettling experience she began to work on the next volume, having already carried out preliminary research whilst in Germany in 1955.64 After 25 years and given her altered view of history and opinion of relations between Germans and Jews, this was a difficult task.65 At times Stern doubted she had the ‘physical and mental strength’ needed to complete the Prussia opus. She had experienced these emotions whilst completing Josel von Rosheim [Josel of Rosheim] in the mid 1950s, but she found the task in hand more objective and less affecting than the personalised life of Josel.66

Her career provides a case study of the attempts to overcome the discontinuity, Christhard Hoffmann highlights as the prevalent trend in the post-war experience of German-Jewish displaced scholars, which his study of Stern’s writings seems to confirm.67 It is beyond doubt that many elements of Stern’s post-war scholarship have significant connections with her interests and research of the 1930s: similarities of title, re-use of sources, cross-over of subjects, republication of analyses and texts; however Hoffmann acknowledges and draws attention to the implicit shifts visible in her texts.

---

63 Gotthold Müller, letter to Frieda Hebel. 11 May 1973, p. 1. Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/11 Addenda, LBIA, NY. Compare Stern’s correspondence to Gotthold Müller and his wife throughout the 1970s in which she spoke candidly about her writings and opinions, see Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBIA, NY.
He identifies Stern's 'completely changed view of historical perception' in her emphasis on the presentation of 'destroyed' German-Jewish history, in which 'suffering and tragedy' are the main characteristics of Jewish life. He considers Stern's understanding of a 'meaningful unity between the past, present and future' had been replaced by 'the hope, that precisely in the absurdity of suffering one fulfils one’s destiny'. The example he gives to illustrate Stern's revised approach to her former German-Jewish Beziehungsgeschichte [history of relationships and connections] singles out a new emphasis on specifically 'anti-Jewish motives' such as the fate of the court Jews and martyrdom. This interpretation of Stern's post-war scholarship sits uneasily with the driving force behind her work as well as the spiritual and intellectual sustenance it gave her. It is challenged by the emphasis on rebirth in her historical novel and the fact that the source of her presentation of such suffering was not solely born of 'self-experienced past' nor her reflection on the recent catastrophe, but was rooted within the Jewish historical accounts and chronicles of the period.

Certainly the Leidensgeschichte or history of suffering evident in the martyrdom depicted is a new feature in Stern's writings. I consider however that the dénouement of Stern's novel attenuates this strong element of Leidensgeschichte. At the end of the novel the safe passage of Judah the grandson of Eleazar of Weil can be read as the expression of Stern's ultimate hope in the perpetual rebirth of the Jewish people. Furthermore, historical and personal experiences from Stern's family life are combined: played out in the efforts of the non-Jewish maid Katharina to rescue Judah and return him safely to the Weil family, from whose ancestral lineage Stern herself descended. The figure of the maid mirrors the benevolence of her family's own non-Jewish maids. These also parallel the actions of non-Jewish individuals who had risked

---

70 Yosef H. Yerushalmi, *Zakhor. Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1989), pp. 27-52, offers a useful framework to compare Stern's treatment of these historical events with the use of biblical rituals for commemoration available to contemporaries recording the destruction of Jewish communities around the time of the Black Death.
71 This historiographical approach to Jewish history was highly contended. Salo W. Baron had first railed against the 'lachrymose conception' of Jewish history in Salo W. Baron, 'Ghetto and Emancipation', *Menorah Journal*, vol. 14 (June 1928), pp. 515-26.
72 The fictional Katharina in the novel was loosely based on one of the Stern family maids of the same name. See Selma Stern-Taeubler, letter to Gotthold Müller, 27 January 1973, p. 1, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBIA, NY. Compare the response of Frieda Hebel to this aspect of the plot: Frieda Hebel, letter to Gotthold Müller, 1 May 1973, pp. 1-2, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/11 Addenda, LBIA, NY.
themselves to assist the Taeublers and alleviate the experience of Jewish refugees and clandestines during the Third Reich. Hoffmann suggests that Stern could no longer apply Eugen Taeubler’s model of Beziehungsgeschichte that addressed the symbiotic nexus of Jewish and non-Jewish life, so central to the scholarship of the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums [Academy for the Science of Judaism]. I consider that by presenting a non-Jewish character as mediator of Jewish rebirth, Stern tentatively rejected the view of a total breakdown in Jewish and non-Jewish relations in Germany during the 1930s and 1940s.

The symbolism of Stern’s literary figure Judah presents the concept of divine ‘chosenness’ as a factor shaping Jewish destiny. This evokes a traceable continuity with Taeubler’s view of the role of the historian in enabling the Jew to understand his fate as an ‘inevitable consequence of the uniqueness of his religion […] to admit the tragedy of his existence as an expression of his chosenness’. He had formulated this historiographical responsibility in the 1938 manuscript ‘Judentum als tragischen Existenz’ [Judaism as tragic existence]. Her final publication in 1977, an edited volume of her husband’s historical essays and unpublished manuscripts included this text and highlighted the significance of Taeubler’s approach for twentieth-century Jewish historiography, specifically commemorating his academic contribution to the field. Stern’s publication of these writings not only reaffirmed her post-war recommitment to Beziehungsgeschichte, however problematic, but also revalidated the wider legacy of the German-Jewish historiography of the Weimar period.

---

73 Stern and her husband had many non-Jewish friends who supported them in different ways from the 1930s and into the post-war decades, in particular Erhard Oeverdieck who looked after their library and possessions and pursued material claims compensation on their behalf. See correspondence between the Taeublers and Erhard Oeverdieck. Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 15, 1-4, E 33-37 and F 70-71; Nachlass Eugen Taeubler, NL 0078, E III, 82 and E IV 30, UBB.


77 See also Selma Stern-Taeubler, letter to Gotthold Müller, 27 January 1973, pp. 1-2, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBI, NY.
Following the completion of the novel, Stern returned to her historical writings with only marginal reference to the personal and intellectual problems this presented following the Holocaust. One gains a broader picture of the implications of Stern’s renegotiated perception of Jewish history by looking beyond her texts at her wider historiographical involvements and institutional frameworks. For example her contribution to the discipline of American Jewish historical studies and her role in directing the work of the LBI affirms the new educational, historiographical and moral engagement with German-Jewish history as well as the commemorative aspect of her writings from the 1950s.

Stern’s friendship with Müller and his encouragement and interest in her ‘work and fate’ since their first meeting in 1958 helped her to return to writing in the ‘beloved German language […]’, the only one in which I can really express and be myself’. Gotthold Müller and another German intellectual Hermann Maas became symbolic representatives of the ‘other’ Germany for Stern. Through their exchange of correspondence she found the ‘security’ which provided her with ‘a way back into a past’ she had tried to forget. Through the publication of *Josel von Rosheim* in 1959, she had reconnected with ‘German scholarship and historical studies’, confident of a German readership; in the 1960s she was further encouraged to publish a new edition of *Josel von Rosheim* and republish *Jud Süß* [Jew Süß]. Her original desire to rehabilitate the historical person of Joseph Süß Oppenheimer had been provoked anew by the distorted representation of this figure as it resurged in the press, due to popular interest

---

79 Selma Stern-Taeubler, letter to Gotthold Müller, 28 March 1973, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBIA, NY. See other testimonies to the friendship between Stern and Müller in Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBIA, NY and Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, UBB.
in the trial of the director Veit Harlan in 1949 and proposals to make a new ‘Jud Süss’ film in 1966.\(^{82}\)

Her studies of Josel of Rosheim and Joseph Süß Oppenheimer presented exemplary figures as ‘models’, in a similar way to the actions and characteristics of the protagonists she elevated in her novel. In Josel’s life story she had found personal encouragement which she wished to convey to a Jewish readership in America through her publications with the Jewish Publication Society and furthermore to a non-Jewish readership in Germany.\(^{83}\) It was through her novel that she began a dialogue with readers.\(^{84}\) Responses she received to the English publication of her novel from a number of German intellectuals, such as Maas, pointed to the strong effect on the non-Jewish reader of the martyrdom of the medieval Jewish community she depicted, which provoked reflection on historical parallels under National Socialism.\(^{85}\)

Müller’s marketing of the German edition of the novel in German-speaking Europe in 1972 targeted both a popular and academic Jewish and non-Jewish readership.\(^{86}\) The book jacket text was commissioned from Albrecht Goes, a literary writer and Protestant minister in the region of Württemburg and the book was promoted widely amongst a Christian readership, for example within the Gesellschaften für christlich-jüdische Zusammenarbeit [Societies for Christian and Jewish Cooperation].\(^{87}\)


\(^{83}\) Selma Stern-Taeubler, letter to Gotthold Müller, 26 December 1963, pp. 1-2, here p. 2, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBIA, NY.

\(^{84}\) The novel Selma Stern, The Spirit Returneth...A Novel (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1946) was published in German as ihr seid meine Zeugen. Ein Novellenkranz aus der Zeit des Schwarzen Todes 1348/49 (1972). Selma Stern-Taeubler, letter to Gotthold Müller, 2 January 1972, pp. 1-2, here p. 1, see also Selma Stern-Taeubler, letter to Gotthold Müller, 6 March 1980 p. 1, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBIA, NY. Regarding Stern’s hopes for the impact of her literary and historical work in Germany see Eva G. Reichmann, letter to Selma Stern-Taeubler, 7 May 1972, pp. 1-2, here p. 1, Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, D 17, 8, UBB. See reviews of Stern’s monographs published in West Germany beginning with the 1959 edition of Josef von Rosheim are collected in Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, C 6, 1-90 (Josef von Rosheim); C 7, 1-48, C 8, 1-28 (Der preussische Staat und die Juden); C 9, 1-10 (Ihr seid meine Zeugen); C 10, 1-4 (Jud Süß), UBB.

\(^{85}\) Hermann Maas, letter to Selma Stern-Taeubler, 18 March 1955, pp. 1-2, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBIA, NY. At the time Maas was superintendent of the Evangelical Churches of North Baden. Alongside Otto Hirsch, Stern dedicated the German edition of the novel to the memory of Hermann Maas, a ‘true friend of the Jewish people’.


\(^{87}\) Gotthold Müller, letter to Max Plaut, 5 May 1972, p. 1, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBIA, NY; see also reviews such as Gotthold Berron, ‘Das grosse Geheimnis’,
The reception the novel gained from these readership sectors constitutes a challenge to Hiltrud Hantzschel’s view that this novel did not receive an ‘appreciable echo’ which other literature of the ‘Holocaust genre’ had managed.  

Stern followed its reception in West Germany expecting an emotive and almost metaphysical response from Jewish readers, hoping that both ‘German and Jewish victims’ could be consoled by her work. She gave readings to survivors or ‘witnesses’ of the Nazi period at the residential home where she lived, helping, she considered, the community to ‘forget their pain, in the knowledge that by it they sanctify God’s honour’. She also reflected on responses from non-Jewish readers in the town of Weil, the ancestral home of the main protagonists, who were prompted to consider the fate of Weil’s Jewish community during the Third Reich.

Alongside her institutional contribution, personal mentoring and encouragement of the subsequent generation of scholars, she set historical individuals as examples before her readers. The figures of Josel of Rosheim and Leo Baeck were intended to give personal encouragement to Jew and non-Jew through their model of humanity. Stern wrote in response to the chaos she saw resulting from the Yom Kippur war of 1973, increasing anti-Jewish sentiments around the world: ‘What did one fight one’s whole life for, when there is no humanity, no humanism, no humanness any more.’ On the occasion of Stern’s seventieth birthday Robert Weltsch wrote:


Hantzschel characterises the novel as belonging to a genre which has been overlooked: described as ‘writing during Auschwitz’ rather than ‘in’ or ‘after Auschwitz’. Hantzschel does not assess the reception of this novel however, only the means by which Stern achieves the implicit sub-narration of the twentieth-century destruction of European Jewry. She contextualises this work in relation to Stern’s historiographical approaches, personal and religious beliefs, Hiltrud Hantzschel. ‘Vom Emanzipationsprojekt zum Schwarzen Tod. Selma Sterns erzwungener Paradigmenwechsel angesichts der Schoah: Ihr seid meine Zeugen. Ein Novellenkranz aus der Zeit des Schwarzen Todes 1348/49’, in Ariane Huml and Monika Rappenecker (eds.), Jüdische Intellektuelle im 20. Jahrhundert. Literatur- und kulturgeschichtliche Studien (Würzburg: Verlag Königshausen & Neumann, 2003), pp. 119-32, here p. 119.


See communication between Gotthold Müller and Gotthold Berron, a reader at the Verlag Evangelische Gemeindepresse, Stuttgart, who lived in Weil and wished to promote the novel through this publishing house. He also directed Müller to approach several church leaders and educational institutions. See among other correspondence Selma Stern-Taeubler, letter to Gotthold Müller, 9 March 1981, p. 1, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBIA, NY.

Selma Stern-Taeubler, letter to Gotthold Müller, 4 January 1974, p. 1, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LBIA, NY.
You are not just a scientist, but a woman of great culture and above all, humanity, and that is the element which our world so desperately needs.\(^{92}\)

Stern’s return to the German language and a German readership encouraged others in German-Jewish historical studies to pursue the challenging reconsideration of the German-Jewish symbiosis.\(^ {93}\) Although she did not choose to reside in Germany, her scholarship contributed to the continuous presence of former German Jews in German cultural fields. She personally provided a link to the ideological and methodological traditions of the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums.\(^ {94}\) Although she worked within historiographical limitations circumscribed by her personal academic goals, she ‘did not hide behind dusty documents’.\(^ {95}\) She participated in the post-war reconstruction of German Jewry in the diaspora, reforming a relationship with Germany and engaging with the work of the younger generation of scholars through active support and critical reading.\(^ {96}\) By the 1960s and 1970s her role in the establishment of an institutionalised and integrated discipline of German-Jewish historiography in Germany was fulfilling the aims she and her husband had shared during the Weimar period. Herbert A. Strauss, a fellow German-Jewish scholar, even suggested that she had succeeded in striking ‘the balance between internal and external history’ which had finally eluded her husband.\(^ {97}\) Her validated hope for the future of German Jewry and German-Jewish historiography presents an alternative picture to that which Hoffmann describes as Stern’s destroyed perception of any teleological ‘meaningful unity’ within history.\(^ {98}\)

---

\(^{92}\) Robert Weltsch, letter to Selma Stern, 22 July 1960, pp. 1-2, Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, A 03, 31, UBB.


\(^{94}\) Christhard Hoffmann, *ibid.*, p. 212. Stern’s work gave the impression that her post-war historiography was closer to her Akademie approach than to new developments within German historiography after the Second World War. In a postscript to the republished *Jad Siß* she pointed to her decision to leave out the integration of recent secondary research: Selma Stern, *Jad Siß. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen und zur jüdischen Geschichte* (Munich: G. Müller, 1973), pp. XI. See also Selma Stern-Taeubler, letter to Gotthold Müller, 13 February 1973, p. 1, Selma Stern-Taeubler Collection, AR 7160, box 3/12 Addenda, LIBA, NY.


\(^{96}\) Stern integrated more recent scholarship emerging from the 1940s within her study of the ‘court Jew’, augmenting the research she had carried out during the 1930s towards this study.


Arendt and the German-Jewish establishment

Arendt’s major academic interests continued to address philosophical and political aspects of human actions and reflections that were rooted in her experiences of statelessness and human catastrophe. From the 1950s she wrote a number of articles in English and German for periodicals on German and Jewish historical and political themes and short studies on the life and work of key Jewish intellectual figures, republished in the 1960s and 1970s. By the time Arendt’s report on the Eichmann trial was published in West Germany, her international publishing career was well established and her major studies were accessible to a German readership. For example her work on totalitarianism was transmitted to audiences around the world with new editions in America, Britain and Germany. Arendt’s public persona in West Germany grew from the late 1950s due to her award of the Lessing Prize by the city of Hamburg and her laudatory address marking Karl Jaspers’ receipt of the peace prize from the German book trade. The circumstances of this address prompted self-reflection and juxtaposed an awareness of her vulnerability as an outsider, a woman and German-Jew, with feelings of honour regarding this auspicious role in a very public proceeding. This placed her intellectually in the male hegemonic field of philosophy in West Germany.

Her philosophical analysis of the problematic relationship between public and private spheres was tested by her own experience of publicity following her report of the Eichmann trial and responses to her analysis of the role of the Jewish leadership under National Socialism. In particular her comments on the ‘cooperation’ of the Jewish


100 Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem. Ein Bericht der Banalität der Bösen* (Munich: Piper, 1964). For example the German editions of *Elemente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft* were published in 1955, 1958 and 1962 by the Europäische Verlagsanstalt, Frankfurt am Main. Following its launch Arendt received many invitations to speak in West Germany; see Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 13 December 1955, in Lotte Kohler (ed.), *Within Four Walls*, pp. 299-30. See also Hannah Arendt, *Ich will verstehen*, pp. 249-54 who tracks these publications.


102 Arendt’s reticence about Jaspers’ request that she give the address at his prize giving in the Paulskirche, Frankfurt am Main on 28 September 1958, is expressed in Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 25 May 1958, in Lotte Kohler (ed.), *Within Four Walls*, pp. 320-22.
councils [Judenräte] with Nazi officials and the role of the Jewish leadership under Leo Baeck provoked debate and rebuke when her reports were published in book form.  

Arendt reflected privately on the vilification of her Eichmann work as a ‘political campaign, led and guided in all particulars by interest groups and governmental agencies’ that were creating an ‘image’ which would eventually ‘smother the real book’.  

Opponents charged her with many things, the most extreme: ‘defending the Gestapo and slandering Jewish victims’. She rarely responded publicly to these accusations and only published ‘an implicit answer’ as a form of response in ‘Truth and Politics’ in 1967. The recriminations she received from surviving members of the German-Jewish leadership of the 1930s created greater distance between her and key German-Jewish historiographical and intellectual circles with which they were linked. Reichmann’s participation in the German-Jewish community’s collective and public rebuttal of Arendt’s comments was not driven from within German-Jewish historiography. Although she formed a link to the WL and the LBI, formally she represented neither at the event organised by the British Section of the World Jewish Congress and reported to the wider Jewish community through the AJR Information and World Jewry. This open meeting in London presented four speakers including Reichmann for a factual refutation of Arendt’s ‘hostile’ accusations of ‘submissive meekness’ and ‘cooperation’, giving a detailed report from ‘first hand experience’ of the Jewish community’s active self-defence in the occupied territories. Scholarship has

107 Arendt noted that in the campaign to gather opponents and publicly vilify her work, certain groups were reticent to join in: ‘it seems the Rabbis would not comply with the circular letter addressed to them’, Hannah Arendt, letter to Mary McCarthy, 3 October 1963, in op. cit., pp. 151-53, here p. 153. The most widely publicised exchange within the historiographical field was that with Gershom Scholem. see Hannah Arendt and Gershom Scholem, “Eichmann in Jerusalem”: An Exchange of Letters Between Gershom Scholem and Hannah Arendt”, republished in Hannah Arendt, The Jew as Pariah, pp. 240-51.
108 A synopsis of the presentations on 29 October 1963 was published in A. L. Easterman et al., ‘They did not aid Eichmann’, World Jewry, vol. VI no. 6 (November/December 1963), pp. 9-11. This includes Eva G. Reichmann, “‘We Never Ceased to Fight the Nazis’”, p. 10, which was reprinted as Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Answering Hannah Arendt’, AJR Information, vol. XIX, no. 1 (January 1964),
noted the more vehement response to Arendt’s work upon comparison with reviews of Raul Hilberg’s *The Destruction of the European Jews* which raised problematic issues of Jewish co-operation prior to Arendt’s publication.\(^{109}\) This disparity has been considered from the perspective of the gender dynamics evident in the mainly male response to Arendt’s work, with Reichmann’s participation as a female critic in the overwhelming minority.\(^{110}\)

Opinion was divided regarding the efficacy of such public rebuttal. In Britain, Reichmann participated in this disputation, whereas Robert Weltsch refused to be drafted to the opposition of the ‘press-polemic’.\(^{111}\) From the outset of controversy, there were Jewish intellectuals and community leaders Arendt corresponded with privately, who objectively examined her work without acrimony, fully acknowledging the problematics involved in the task.\(^{112}\) Weltsch’s correspondence with Arendt on this matter was reticent and belated, acknowledging his respect for her scholarship and showing sensitivity to the complicated historical elements her analysis had opened up for consideration, as well as illuminating the misrepresenting tendency of the recriminations being levied against her from Jewish quarters.\(^{113}\)

Correspondence with Weltsch and Siegfried Moses shows the tensions between personalised and collective reactions.\(^{114}\) Although Arendt had begun to take issue with

---


\(^{110}\) The disproportionate balance of male personnel within these institutions may largely account for this fact. An exception, but one that serves to substantiate this point is Eva G. Reichmann’s participation in the response made by the German-Jewish refugee community in Great Britain.

\(^{111}\) See Robert Weltsch, letter to Hannah Arendt, 16 August 1963, pp. 1-6, here p. 1, MF 491, Robert Weltsch Collection, reel 4, box 2, folder 1, LBIA, NY.

\(^{112}\) Albert H. Friedlander was another establishment figure, at the time counselor to Jewish students at Columbia University, New York, who was prepared to address her comments in a serious and scholarly way despite his former closeness to Leo Baeck, inviting her to address and discuss with students, see Albert H. Friedlander, letter to Hannah Arendt, 20 June 1963, Adolf Eichmann File, 1938-1968, Correspondence, Organizations, Jewish, B-F, 1963-1965, Hannah Arendt Papers (HAP), Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. See also personal correspondence amongst these papers which bears testimony to her continued contact with individuals among the Jewish intellectual establishment such as Louis Finkelstein, see Hannah Arendt, letter to Louis Finkelstein, 25 February 1975, Correspondence, General, Fa-Fram miscellaneous, HAP, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.


\(^{114}\) Moses had not only been a leading Zionist and founding member of the Reichsvertretung der deutschen Juden in 1933, he was also State Comptroller [sic] of the newly founded state of Israel from 1949-61 and director of the Leo Baeck Institute at the time of its establishment. The friendships Arendt and Moses mutually shared with Kurt Blumenfeld sustained a closer relationship than Arendt
the German-Jewish historiographical elite in the late 1950s following the limited
success of the LBI publication of *Rahel Varnhagen. The Life of a Jewess*, her
relationship with Siegfried Moses the Jerusalem based director of the LBI had remained
mutually cordial.\(^{115}\) She respected the intellectual integrity of both men’s comments and
considered such a declaration from Jerusalem or London would enable serious
intellectual discussion of the matter, whereas she wrote that she could not take seriously
an ‘attack’ from the New York branch of the LBI.\(^{116}\) One senses the personal sadness of
Moses who wrote to inform Arendt of an imminent ‘declaration of war’ he would be
making on behalf of the Council of Jews from Germany instead of a ‘friendly
discussion’ had he been able to see her personally during his trip to New York.\(^{117}\)
Arendt’s reply to this warning was hardly defensive. She recommended that the
declaration be made against her alone, so that the Council’s argument might contain
greater weight, without addressing what she considered was the intellectually
incomparable work of Raul Hilberg and Bruno Bettelheim.\(^{118}\)

Within the discipline of German-Jewish historical studies the analyses made by
Arendt and Hilberg regarding Jewish passivity and complicity prompted a decisive
reassessment of German-Jewish agency during the Weimar Period and under the Third
Reich.\(^{119}\) The scholar who paved the way for this research was Arnold Paucker, director

---

example Arendt considered the LBI leadership ‘unable to understand the German-Jewish tradition or
to convey the problems of assimilation’. Hannah Arendt, letter to Kurt Blumenfeld, 10 August 1959,
quoted in Liliane Weissberg, ‘Introduction: Hannah Arendt, Rahel Varnhagen, and the Writing of
Weissberg, pp. 3-69, here p. 44.

\(^{116}\) Hannah Arendt, letter to Siegfried Moses, 12 March 1963, Adolf Eichmann File, 1938-1968,
Correspondence, Organizations, Jewish, B-F, 1963-1965, HAP, Manuscript Division, Library of
Congress, Washington, D.C.

\(^{117}\) Siegfried Moses, letter to Hannah Arendt, 7 March 1963, Adolf Eichmann File, 1938-1968,
Correspondence, Organizations, Jewish, B-F, 1963-1965, HAP, Manuscript Division, Library of
Congress, Washington, D.C.

\(^{118}\) Hannah Arendt, letter to Siegfried Moses, 12 March 1963, Adolf Eichmann File, 1938-1968,
Correspondence, Organizations, Jewish, B-F, 1963-1965, HAP, Manuscript Division, Library of
Congress, Washington, D.C. Compare also Arnold Paucker’s association of the work of Bruno Bettelheim, which emphasised Jewish
passivity and Raul Hilberg, who disregarded what he considered the negligible existence of Jewish
resistance: see Arnold Paucker, *Deutsche Juden im Widerstand 1933-1945. Tatsachen und Probleme*

\(^{119}\) Compare Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* and Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in
of the London LBI from 1959, whose writings on Jewish defence and resistance
developed over the subsequent decades. Paucker’s work sought to step beyond the
commemorative histories of the Weimar period, to provide a more complex picture of
the political and social activism in interactions between Jewish and non-Jewish
resistance to National Socialism. The impact of Paucker’s ‘Der jüdische Abwehrkampf’
[the Jewish defence] on the younger generation of scholars was significant. Sterling
identified it as the most interesting study in the volume, pointing to those who ‘fought
journalistically against nazism and antisemitism […] quite contrary to the claims of
Hannah Arendt’. Within the context of this progressive focus on Jewish self-defence
Paucker and Reichmann planned to jointly write an ‘ideological and organisational
history’ of the CV. This did not evolve however and remained unaddressed until recent
years through the rediscovery of the archives of the CV in Moscow and the research of
Avraham Barkai.

3.2.3 Reichmann’s autonomy and interactions with the Leo Baeck Institute
The strong element of personal biography, as a former member of the German-Jewish
intellectual elite and a survivor of the Weimar generation, had been emerging in
Reichmann’s writings as her public voice developed from the mid 1950s. The

Jerusalem. Arendt insisted however that the claim she had accused the Jews of ‘not-resisting’ was
not made by her but the chief prosecutor Gideon Hausner and was a product of the ‘political
campaign’ against her. See ‘Was bleibt? Es bleibt die Muttersprache (1964). Ein Gespräch mit
Günther Gaus’, in Adelbert Reif (ed.), Gespräche mit Hannah Arendt (Munich: Piper, 1976), pp. 9-

120 Arnold Paucker, ‘Der jüdische Abwehrkampf’, in Werner E. Mosse and Arnold Paucker (eds.),
Entscheidungsjahr 1932 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966), pp. 405-99. See bibliographical list and
reproductions of key studies Paucker wrote on the two topics in Arnold Paucker, Deutsche Juden im
Kampf um Recht und Freiheit (Teetz: Henrich & Henrich, 2003). Much of Paucker’s work on
Jewish defence and resistance has been published outside the LBI closer to the research interests of
the WL which did not have its own publication series and the field of scholarship carried out by the
Research Centre for German and Austrian Exile Studies, London, which addressed the study of
German left-wing resistance and political exile in Britain.

121 Eleonore Sterling, ‘Deutung des Antisemitismus (II). review of publications including Werner E.
Mosse und Arnold Paucker (eds.), Entscheidungsjahr 1932, in Politische Vierteljahresschrift,
Zeitschrift der Deutschen Vereinigung für Politische Wissenschaft, vol. 6, no. 4 (1965), pp. 544-48,
here p. 548; Eleonore Sterling, letter to Max Horkheimer, 11 July 1965, MHA V. 159.55-57, p. 1-3,
here p. 1, Horkheimer-Pollock-Archiv, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Archivzentrum, Frankfurt
am Main. Sterling herself had studied the Jewish defence of slander and persecution in the
nineteenth-century press, see Eleonore Sterling, ‘Verfolgung und Abwehr. Deutsche Rundschau
(December 1963), pp. 25-34.

122 These plans were voiced in Arnold Paucker, ‘Statement on Current Activities and Research
Programme of the London Leo Baeck Institute’ (December 1966), pp. 1-3, here p. 3, MS 237/7/44
(Leo Baeck Institute), Papers of the Institute of Jewish Affairs, Hartley Library Special Collections,
University of Southampton. On the disappearance of the CV archives, see Avraham Barkai, ‘The
173-75; and his institutional history: Avraham Barkai, “Wehr dich!”: der Centralverein deutscher
Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens (C.V.) 1893-1938.
The commemoration of German Jewry and its leaders who had perished under National Socialism gave way to the commemoration of the surviving generation as they passed away post-war. Reichmann contributed to the celebration of the life and work of leading German-Jewish intellectual figures, most notably Leo Baeck. Together with Stern she promoted the study of the internal history of the twentieth-century German-Jewish cultural and historiographical elite.\(^{123}\)

The prominence of their tributes to leading male figures highlights their own exemplary standing as female spokespeople and commentators on their own generation. Their careers point to the hierarchical gender structure of their intellectual circles and restricted number of female scholars in German-Jewish, German and international scholarship in the early post-war decades. On the whole during this decade their scholarship did not present the experiences of the woman or women, instead much of their research presented relationships between collective groups, defined by cultural, religious and national identities rather than gender.\(^{124}\) The subordination of gender history in the wake of the Holocaust can be contextualised by the failure of humanity that engulfed both sexes. A broad forum was needed for the analysis of collective experience which had first to bridge an abyss between divided people.

Following the death of Hans Reichmann, Eva Reichmann was formally accepted onto the London board of the LBI in 1964.\(^{125}\) Her editorial advice and input in the publications of the London branch are somewhat obscured by the lack of recognition awarded her at the time.\(^{126}\) Retrospectively however Arnold Paucker has acknowledged...

---


126 Similarly the depth of her editorial input at the WL is, like the contribution of many other co-workers there, without a full-scale study of the WL’s archives, untraceable. Reichmann’s competence as an editor and scholar was enlisted for a publication to commemorate the seventieth birthday of Leonard Montefiore, to which she contributed the article ‘The Study of Contemporary History as a Political and Moral Duty’, in Max Beloff (ed.), On the Track of Tyranny (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co., 1960), pp. 189-200. Her editorial role in the publication of this collection of studies was considerable; see MS 225 6/7, Archives of the Jewish Chronicle 1841-1990, Hartley Library Special Collections, University of Southampton.
the significance of Reichmann’s role as mentor and the value of her experience as an editor, scholar and journalist.¹²⁷ Her contribution to two major edited volumes on German Jewry during the first decades of the twentieth century, part of a projected five-volume series published in the Schriftenreihe, consolidated her authority as an historian of Weimar German Jewry in German academia.¹²⁸ Her insight into inner-Jewish debates of the Weimar period opened up new vistas on the period for the younger generation of scholars who were taking over the baton of German-Jewish historiography in the 1960s and 1970s.¹²⁹

The study of historical events within the living memory of the decreasing number of scholars who had begun their careers during the first decades of the twentieth century was prompted externally and internally as a renewed defence against forgetting. For example Reichmann’s contribution to the commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of the Reichskristallnacht in 1958 analysed the social and political background to those events and addressed the particular difficulties affecting public discussion of Weimar Jewish life led by protagonists such as herself. The concern was that her appearance as a German Jew before a non-Jewish audience in West Germany could be misunderstood as a form of apologetics and an attempt to defend German Jewry against old and new antisemitism.¹³⁰

Reichmann promoted the work of the LBI and the WL in West Germany, giving a radio broadcast in 1969 describing the LBI’s work to turn the memory of painful personal experience into ‘living achievement’ through the planned series on nineteenth and twentieth-century German-Jewish life.¹³¹ This series would begin with the ‘immediate past’ so that ‘many contemporaries and shapers of events’ would be able to contribute. It was written as a stand against the critically considered but ultimately

¹²⁹ Both Arnold Paucker and Steven E. Aschheim have spoken of the importance of Reichmann’s scholarship for their own writings: in conversation with the author, 2002 and 2004 respectively.
rejected objections from younger scholars regarding the ‘character of self-experienced written history’. In lectures and essays Reichmann frequently analysed both German society and the Jewish community in her assessment of the Weimar period. Tackling point by point the stereotypes and distortions used by National Socialist ideologues in anti-Jewish propaganda, she highlighted the legacy of this propaganda still evident in misconceptions regarding the political and economic significance of Jewish protagonists during those decades, such as the occupational distribution of Jewry.\textsuperscript{132}

On the occasion of her seventy-fifth birthday the LBI proposed the publication of a collection of writings spanning her career.\textsuperscript{133} She oversaw the selection of texts from four representative areas of her scholarship. Articles from the Weimar period were reproduced under the collective heading ‘Paths of Jewish Self-Assertion’; her post-war work was grouped into three areas: ‘Contributions to the History and Sociology of German Jewry’, ‘Jews and Christians / Jews and Germans, New Encounter after the Catastrophe’ and her commemorative work on Leo Baeck. These brought into focus the momentous changes in German society and German – Jewish relations during the twentieth century. In the postscript her own assessment of the collective impact of her writings on a potential readership emphasised the fundamental questions her writings had addressed despite the specific historical contexts they had originally responded to. She asserted their relevance to progressive contemporary discussion, since the ‘Jewish problem’ continued ‘busying minds’ both positively and negatively.\textsuperscript{134}

3.2.4 The political and moral imperative of \textit{Zeitgeschichte}

Throughout the post-war period Reichmann remained a marginal figure in the academic guild of West German historiographers. The support she expressed for the radical shift to address \textit{Zeitgeschichte} [contemporary history], which she observed being championed by the IfZ in Munich, highlighted the pioneering work outside Germany by

\begin{itemize}
\item pp. 1-7, here p. 5.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Eva G. Reichmann, \textit{Größe und Verhängnis deusch-jüdischer Existenz. Zeugnisse einer tragischen Begegnung} (Heidelberg: Verlag Lambert Schneider, 1974).
\end{itemize}
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the WL in London to study both German and Jewish recent history.\textsuperscript{135} The task of Reichmann and Wiener at the WL was distinct from the temporal remit of the LBI, not just to promote the study of German-Jewish history but also to lead and support the integration of German-Jewish contemporary history within West German historiography.\textsuperscript{136}

She argued that such an extreme event as genocide demanded ‘unconventional treatment’ not least within the academic world. Her own contribution to this task: the many lectures she gave on ‘The Study of Contemporary History as a Political and Moral Duty’ underlined her belief that intellectuals and academic scholarship could directly impact the process of \textit{Vergangenheitsbewältigung}, formulated as a sociological, political and civil imperative to address recent history.\textsuperscript{137} This study was given as a lecture in Great Britain and West Germany several times before it was published.\textsuperscript{138} The audiences she addressed included the Society for Christian and Jewish Cooperation and the Neue Gesellschaft [New Society] in Hamburg during a three-day programme culminating in her lecture and ensuing discussion with young people through the ‘Forum des Monats [Forum of the Month]’ at the university of Hamburg.\textsuperscript{139}

The title is directly linked to the opening address ‘\textit{Zeitgeschichte als Aufgabe}’ [contemporary history as mission] by Hans Rothfels, the editor of the first volume of the periodical – the \textit{Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte} produced by the IfZ in 1953.\textsuperscript{140}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{135} Eva G. Reichmann, ‘\textit{Zeitgeschichte als politische und moralische Aufgabe}’, in Eva G. Reichmann. \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 90-104, here pp. 98-103.
  \item \textsuperscript{136} The LBI, in particular through the work of the London board progressively forged contacts firstly with Jewish scholars in Germany and later German scholars, promoting the reinsertion of German-Jewish history within the study of German history. For example in 1968 a group of LBI scholars including Reichmann held an important meeting with German historians to discuss consolidating contacts and future collaborative projects, see ‘Besprechung von Vertretern des LBI mit deutschen Historikern, Berlin 10 March 1968’, London Leo Baeck Institute Collection, box 62. LBI A, NY.
  \item \textsuperscript{137} Eva G. Reichmann, ‘\textit{Zeitgeschichte als politische und moralische Aufgabe}’. in Eva G. Reichmann, \textit{Größe und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz}, pp. 90-104.
  \item \textsuperscript{139} The Neue Gesellschaft in Hamburg was established in 1954 by social democrats who had been involved in resistance work during the Third Reich, as an institution for political education. Reports of Reichmann’s lecture include: Mg, ‘Ein lichter Punkt auf der Landkarte’, \textit{Mitteilungsblatt der Gesellschaft für christlich-jüdische Zusammenarbeit in Hamburg}, no. 42 (August 1960), p. 2, and Ralph Giordano, ‘Zeitgeschichte eine Sonderdisziplin. Vortrag von Dr. Eva Reichmann in Hamburg’, \textit{Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland}, vol. XV, no. 11, 10 June 1960, p. 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{140} Hans Rothfels, ‘\textit{Zeitgeschichte als Aufgabe}’, \textit{Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte}, vol. 1 (1953), pp. 1-8.
\end{itemize}
Mathias Beer has identified continuities between the study of Zeitgeschichte by Hans Rothfels in the 1920s who had worked at the Berlin Zentralstelle zur Erforschung der Kriegesursachen [Central Office for Research into the Causes of War] and this post-war initiative by a core of scholars including Rothfels and Paul Kluge at the IZ.\textsuperscript{141} It is perhaps coincidental that in the year that Reichmann’s lecture addressed a Bonn audience, the WL was undergoing changes that would consolidate its position regarding the study of contemporary history, distinct from modern history, political current affairs or purely National Socialism, under the guidance of the new director Walter Laqueur.\textsuperscript{142}

Much of Reichmann’s work had supported this aspect of the WL’s engagement since the mid 1950s, in the early 1960s she gradually wound down her role as research director and following the restructuring of the WL, additionally named the Institute for Contemporary History, her associations became much looser.\textsuperscript{143}

Reichmann, Wiener and other former German-Jewish publicists provide an example of the continuity of contemporary historical research from the analyses of the CV during the Weimar period to the 1960s. Reichmann theorised on the methodological and ideological basis for the study of contemporary history in the post-war period, building on her earlier career as a commentator on current affairs outside the academic field of German and Jewish historiography since the 1920s.\textsuperscript{144} She considered it the particular ‘obligation’ of contemporaries of these events to interpret and shed light on the circumstances which contributed to their existence, since she perceived the understanding of the present as vital for the comprehension of the past.\textsuperscript{145}


\textsuperscript{143} The correspondence of Reichmann held at the WL only stretches as far as 1963, WLA 357 Reichmann, WL, London. In Barkow’s institutional history she also fades from view around this time. Regarding the restructuring changes around this time, see op. cit., pp. 149-60.

\textsuperscript{144} Reichmann’s first doctoral thesis in national economics focused on a very contemporary issue which was to become even more topical after this work was completed in the aftermath of the economic crisis of 1923 and with the advent of National Socialism, see Eva Jungmann, ‘Auszug aus der Dissertation: Spontaneität und Ideologie als Faktoren der modernen sozialen Bewegung’, Heidelberg (summer semester 1921), pp. 1-7. Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, Box 2, Folder 17, LBIA, NY. Reichmann’s German edition of her monograph reviewed in the Historisches Jahrbuch was presented as a contribution to contemporary historiography, see Max Straubach, ‘Beiträge und Berichte / Zeitgeschichte – Veröffentlichungen des Jahres 1956’, Historisches Jahrbuch, vol. 77 (1958), pp. 554-55.

\textsuperscript{145} Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Zeitgeschichte als politische und moralische Aufgabe’, in Eva G. Reichmann,
juxtaposes historiographical objections to this ‘specialism’ predating 1945 citing theoretical critics Leopold von Ranke, Jacob Burckhardt, Friedrich Meinecke and George M. Trevelyan with contemporary theoretical support from the discipline of sociology. 146 This showed the contribution of interdisciplinary exchange to the reshaping of German historiography.

She encouraged her audiences to consider recent history, modelling openness to assess her own ideological positions and personal experiences. She was keen to address the aspects of human nature that allowed the crimes of the Nazi period to go unchallenged which ultimately equated with condonation. 147 Her critique of moral indifference bore an element of self-reproach that she as a journalist and scholar with a public voice had not done enough to warn during the 1930s. 148 The study of recent German history would have a direct bearing on society she considered through the younger generations, initially through the younger corpus of teachers and their students. Her lecturing to these two groups addressed her belief that German youth needed a new relationship to the history of their nation in order to fully develop a sound historical consciousness. 149 Ralph Giordano a journalist and writer, who survived the Holocaust in hiding in Hamburg devoted his career to the critical reappraisal of the Third Reich; a concerned observer of the resurgence of extreme right-wing politics and a promoter of civil courage. He reviewed Reichmann’s lecture synthesising what he considered its key elements, reiterating her view that Germany had no freedom from its history. 150 Like Reichmann he pointed out that there had been no revolution in 1945 to overthrow Hitler. Consequently the policies of Bonn were to be viewed as serving contemporary exigencies rather than the pursuit of freedom.

3.2.5 Reichmann versus Scholem: historical agency

Reichmann and colleagues at the LBI critically re-evaluated the attitudes and actions of their generation of German-Jewish leadership and their historical interpretation of the Weimar and National Socialist periods. The reactions provoked by the analyses of Jewish passivity and complicity, published by Arendt and Hilberg, reverberated within the historiographical community and beyond. For Reichmann the debate over this alleged complicity forced her to consider again any causal relationships between antisemitism and Jewish life during the Weimar period. She felt compelled to take up her pen when Gershom Scholem, Professor of Jewish Mysticism at Hebrew University, Jerusalem, who had emigrated from Germany in 1922 and was a founding member of the LBI in Jerusalem, implicated her writings when he opened up debate regarding the existence of a so-called German-Jewish 'dialogue'.

German-Jewish assimilation was newly criticised, in particular the union of German and Jewish personal and collective identity which non-Zionist German Jewry experienced as part of the invigorated self-assertion during the inter-war years. Over the following decade the debate became polarised between Zionist and non-Zionist historiography regarding the existence of any 'symbiosis', 'dialogue' or 'synthesis' between Jew and non-Jew as a result of Jewish emancipation in Germany.

Reichmann kept to the sidelines of the wider debate over the former existence of a German-Jewish dialogue, however she did not let Scholem's explicit implication of her own writings go without challenge. He had stated that her analysis contributed to the 'tendency' to present the National Socialist seizure of power as a kind of historical accident without which everything between Germans and Jews would really have been making tolerably good progress.

---


152 This debate became more open in the 1970s, taken up within wider scholarship: see Meir Gilon, *Perspectives of German-Jewish History in the 19th and 20th Century* (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1971) and David Bronsen (ed.), *Jews and Germans from 1860-1933: The Problematic Symbiosis* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1979).

153 Gershom Scholem, ‘Noch einmal: das deutsch-jüdische Gespräch’, *Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts*, vol. 8, no. 30 (1965), referring to Reichmann directly on p. 169; Reichmann’s response was published as Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Klarung in eigener Sache’, *Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts*, vol. 9, no. 36 (1965), pp. 342-44. See also Eva G. Reichmann, letter to Robert Raphael Geis, 20 October
She limited her considerations to an examination of her own reading of German and Jewish actions during the Weimar period presented in *Hostages of Civilisation* to see whether she ‘herself was guilty of the sin’, in response to Scholem’s views that the existence of a ‘German-Jewish symbiosis’ particularly during the inter-war years had been a ‘myth’. She rejected Scholem’s criticism of analyses of National Socialism which only focused on the German causes of the Holocaust without addressing German-Jewish responsibility, this he levelled at her work.154 Laying out her interpretation of Scholem’s ‘erroneous view’ of the standpoint she had presented, she pointed to their diverging starting points; criticising his study of the ‘Jewish problem’ from such a ‘strongly judeo-centric’ standpoint.155

Previously Reichmann had openly expressed her concern that the analysis of the political advent of National Socialism and the development of antisemitism was often carried out in parallel with the study of German-Jewish life and relations with non-Jews prior to the accession of the Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei (NSDAP). This reaffirmed the standpoint she expressed in her monograph, that ‘for all their [the Jews] problematics, they cannot offer a key to that which annihilated them’; their function as ‘scapegoat’ or ‘anti-symbol’ could not account for the real causes rooted in the human soul.156 Her own explication of the multiple factors affecting relations between Jews and Germans which had contributed to a ‘subjective or “unreal” Jewish question’ had tried to encompass ‘all factors tangential to the German – Jewish relationship’. In contrast she considered Scholem’s interpretation took the ‘Jewish complex’ out of the context in which she had placed it: that of the ‘whole National Socialist phenomenon’.157 She stated in conclusion to the ‘clarification’ she offered

---


157 Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Klarung in eigener Sache’, *Bulletin des Leo Baeck Instituts*, vol. 9, no. 36 (1965), p. 343. Reichmann did not address the symbiosis debate in any subsequent work. The LBI in London chose to describe their research projects as ‘Studies on German-Jewish Co-existence’, adding a short note stating their preference for this term rather than ‘the often used term “Symbiosis”’, taking this explanation no further. See Arnold Paucker, ‘Statement on Current Activities and Research Programme of the London Leo Baeck Institute’ (December 1966), p. 2, MS 237/7/44 (Leo Baeck Institute), Papers of the Institute of Jewish Affairs, Hartley Library Special Collections, University of Southampton.
Scholem, that she had always opposed those who argued that National Socialism was an 'accident of history', therefore she considered her own position close to his, despite the fact they portrayed differently the 'character and strength of effect of individual causal factors'. Her analysis regarded events as 'determined by surrounding factors' in contrast to Scholem's tendency to see 'the personal guilt of individuals and collectives – both on the Jewish and non-Jewish side'.

Reflection on the gradual reconnection between the two forcefully separated elements of Reichmann's former German-Jewish identity; described as a 'united dual nature [geeinte Zwienatur]' underpinned her personal interaction in German society. She had thought that the German and the Jewish elements of her identity would never grow together again after such violent separation but her refuge in Great Britain had enabled renewed connections between these elements. Her description of the depth of this interconnection sheds light on the personal exploration of identity in her post-war scholarship:

the Jewish is most strongly aware of itself in association with German-Jewish history, the former German part, in its coming to terms with the guilt burdened relationship with its Jewish co-citizens.

Reichmann did not contribute further to this debate, nor did Stern join the intellectual exchange on German-Jewish symbiosis prompted by Scholem. Stern's veiled reflections wavered between positive and negative judgement of the German-Jewish symbiosis which had underpinned her beziehungsgeschichtliche historiographical approach. Saddened at times by the feeling that the struggle for emancipation had been in vain and that the 'dream of a symbiosis of Jewishness and Germanness, had been dreamed out', she was keen to support and watch how contemporary scholarship, particularly the work of the younger generation of Jewish scholars in the LBI Year Book, judged the 'fruitful symbiosis of Germanness and

---

160 Ibid.
Jewishness' differently from the older historians such as herself who had directly experienced it.161

3.2.6 Sterling: between political science and German-Jewish historiography

Two factors shaped the profile of Sterling’s work outside a specifically German-Jewish institution such as the LBI or the WL.162 Firstly her assistantship at the Institut für Politikwissenschaft [Institute for Political Science] in Frankfurt am Main from 1956 changed the emphasis of her academic research to mainly non-Jewish political history. As a research assistant to Carlo Schmid, at the time vice-president of the Bundestag [lower house of the West German parliament] and chair of the Institut für Politikwissenschaft, she worked on a major comparative analysis of democracy and dictatorship, which she gradually took authorship of and published in 1965 during her lectureship.163

Furthermore the external research which she conducted on her own account and for a variety of projects inside West Germany, increasingly provided an interface between the history of German and Jewish relations and their catastrophic breakdown under National Socialism, from this she could contemporaneously study the historical legacies in post-war society. Whereas in the late 1950s Sterling had proactively pursued involvement in German-Jewish research projects, some of which only came to publication several years later, in the following decade she experienced the reverse, approached for her contribution to projects initiated by non-Jewish and Jewish academics.164 From the beginning of the 1960s she took up activities in response to the

163 Eleonore Sterling, Der unvollkommene Staat: Studien über Diktatur und Demokratie (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1965).
need for the critical engagement of Jewish intellectuals. Like Reichmann she consolidated a Jewish intellectual presence at the forefront of Jewish/non-Jewish dialogue.  

Her public role as a spokesperson for German and Jewish relations evolved from her historical publications, educational work and interfaith public speaking. Her collaboration with the German Evangelical Church and new outlets for publication on Jewish historical subjects arose from the academic standing and personal integrity she had displayed within these contexts in the late 1950s. Predominantly the subjects she addressed extended from the work on German and Jewish relations pioneered in her doctoral dissertation on the religious and political factors in German antisemitism since the nineteenth century; analysing recent German history and increasing post-war understanding of the ideological influences on German and Jewish relations affecting contemporary democratic West Germany.

Within university academia Sterling appears to have pursued a career in parallel, concerned about being pigeon-holed and restricted in the German university system due to her work on Jewish topics. The two post-doctoral Habilitation projects she proposed did not feature Jewish subjects and the professorship which she pursued lay in the field of political science rather than history, despite her increasing involvement with


historical re-education.\footnote{Eleonore Sterling, letter to Max Horkheimer, 10 April 1965, MHA V, 159, 68-9, pp. 1-2, here p. 2, Horkheimer-Pollock-Archiv, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Archivzentrum, Frankfurt am Main.} She proposed that the comparative study she had begun under Schmid be considered or failing that a new study of Jonathan Swift’s writings. The former – her inaugural monograph within the discipline of political science, was accepted as her \textit{Habilitationsschrift} [post-doctoral thesis] in 1966.\footnote{Eleonore Sterling, \textit{Der unvollkommene Staat} (1965). See 1955-56 correspondence between Sterling and Max Horkheimer, MHA V, 159, Horkheimer-Pollock-Archiv, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Archivzentrum, Frankfurt am Main, and Eleonore Sterling, letter to Alfred Wiener, 30 August 1956, WLA 408 Sterling.}


On paper however scholarly interaction between Sterling and Arendt appears restricted to Sterling’s review of Arendt’s study of revolution and reference to her work on dictatorship.\footnote{See E. B. [Eleonore Sterling], ‘Bloße Thesen – Hannah Arendt, \textit{Ueber die Revolution},’ vol. XXI, no. 24, 1 September 1967 (authorship and published source unclear, probably \textit{Allgemeine unabhängigé jüdische Wochenzeitung}), Nachlass Eleonore Sterling, EB 89/137, folder D 1d, Die Deutsche Bibliothek (DDB), Deutsches Exilarchiv 1933-1945, Frankfurt am Main. This is a review of Hannah} In the opening paragraph of the introduction to Sterling’s
comparative study of dictatorship and democracy – Der unvollkommene Staat [the imperfect state] she cursorily acknowledged Arendt’s publication on totalitarianism, judging that little secondary literature adequately and comparatively addressed the two systems or differentiated between different forms of totalitarianism. 174 Whereas the didactic impetus behind Sterling’s comprehensive study is established in the introduction, in the closing paragraph she implicitly shifts the reader’s focus to consider the task of democracy within West German society. 175 She also expressed her own hope that society would pursue ‘freedom’: that legal and human right which all four women championed in their writings and public speaking. Sterling formulated this as a ‘risk’, echoing Reichmann’s assessment of this challenge. 176

Sterling presented her central concern for the democratic path of post-war West Germany in both her popular and academic writings. Her teaching characteristically aimed to develop students’ non-authoritarian ways of thinking for the advancement of democracy. 177 Her close academic and personal mentors inhabited divergent political and disciplinary spheres: Horkheimer and the neo-Marxist critical theorists of the Institut für Sozialforschung, Friedrich Pollock and Theodor W. Adorno; Karl Thieme, a Roman Catholic theologian and Carlo Schmid, at the time a representative of the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands [German Social Democratic Party] in the Bundestag; whose standpoint she often referred to in her journalism. 178 She was attentive to the responsibility of the SPD as the major opposition party during the first decade of West German government, especially in her articles for the American Jewish press where she presented a broad picture of West German politics. 179 Without

Arendt, Über die Revolution (Munich: Piper, 1965), one of over 70 reviews Sterling contributed to the Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland/Allgemeine unabhängige jüdische Wochenzeitung, American Historical Review, Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie, Neue Politische Literatur, Revue Internationale d’Histoire Politique et Constitutionelle.

174 Eleonore Sterling, Der unvollkommene Staat, pp. 9-14, here p. 9.
175 Ibid., p. 14.
178 Sterling followed the political career of Carlo Schmid and privately exchanged with him regarding current affairs, see correspondence between Eleonore Sterling and Carlo Schmid in Nachlass Carlo Schmid, AdsD, FES, Bonn. She was not uncritical of SPD policy, see comments in Eleonore Sterling, letter to Max Horkheimer, 3 August 1965, MHA V, 159, 52, p. 1, Horkheimer-Pollock-Archiv, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Archivzentrum, Frankfurt am Main.
179 For example see Sterling’s observation of the critique of Adenauer’s foreign policy among ‘West German non-conformist intellectuals’ and the need for the SPD to present an alternative: Eleonore Sterling, ‘Prerequisite of Democracy’, World Jewry, vol. V, no. 2 (1962), pp. 11-12, here p. 11, and Eleonore Sterling, ‘Bonn Spectre of Germany’s “Unresolved Past”’, World Jewry, vol. IV, no. 11
associating herself with any particular camp politically or ideologically, she critically approached all standpoints, ranging from ‘American Jewish imperialism’ to German nationalist politics. She personally intervened in the fight against the latter, observing and reporting on the status of the far-right and resurgent nationalist parties. She even attended and tried to disrupt a local meeting of the Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands [National Democratic Party of Germany]. In her writings she provided an ongoing commentary on the denazification of government officials, such as the case of the federal refugee minister Theodor Oberländer and tracked the government’s response to plans for extended war crime trials, their effect and echo in popular opinion.

Although Sterling pursued an academic career in social history and political science away from specifically Jewish subject areas, a large part of her research and public speaking from the beginning of this decade dealt with historical and contemporary aspects of Jewish and non-Jewish relations and cannot be considered subsidiary interests or activities given that Der unvollkommene Staat remained her only sizeable academic publication within that academic field. She reviewed a documentary series of recordings about the Third Reich created in order to help ‘grasp the incomprehensible’ and work against what Theodor Heuss called ‘wanting to forget’.

Sterling wrote that the first stage in countering this tendency was ‘the bringing to mind

---

183 Sterling cites Heuss in the foreword accompanying these recordings, in Eleonore Sterling, ‘Das Dritte Reich in Dokumenten’ (1962), pp. 1-5, here p. 1; Nachlass Eleonore Sterling, EB 89/137, folder C Id, DDB, Deutsches Exilarchiv (1953-1945), Frankfurt am Main – a review of two series of records: Heinz Garber and Guenther Zmarzlik, Das Dritte Reich in Dokumenten and Hans Ulrich Katzenmayer, Rudolf Morsey and Bernhard Stasiewski, Widerstand im Dritten Reich (Freiburg:
of the past’, to illuminate and explore it so that it could be understood in order to prevent future repetition. The trajectory which her study of antisemitism and Jewish/non-Jewish relations followed, subsequent to her doctoral dissertation, showed her commitment to this research area, which she described as

a necessary price of survival, […] a duty not just to ourselves, […] it is about inhumanity itself, for which antisemitism is representative.184

3.2.7 Rewriting Ismar Elbogen’s Die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland

Immediately following her study of democracy and dictatorship Sterling published a history of German Jewry.185 Rather than writing a history from scratch which one reviewer and colleague Robert Raphael Geis considered might have been easier, she chose to rework the Jewish historian Ismar Elbogen’s 1935 Die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland [the history of the Jews in Germany], extending the time frame past the First World War up to 1945 to address Weimar Jewry and persecution under National Socialism.186 Sterling was making a distinct statement by republishing a study originally imbued with elements of the so-called ‘lachrymose’ approach to Jewish history, originally written against the backdrop of persecution and defence of 1930s German Jewry.187 She wrote that she intended leaving the ‘presentation of inner-Jewish

--


186 Ismar Elbogen had taught alongside Eagen Taeubler and Leo Baecck at the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in the Weimar period, see Esther Seidel, Women Pioneers of Jewish Learning. Ruth Liebrecht and her Companions at the “Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums” in Berlin 1930-1934 (Berlin: Jüdische Verlagsanstalt, 2002), pp. 63-64.

187 One reviewer judged however that Sterling’s extended time frame could have been contemporised further: Hermann Levin Goldschmidt, ‘Die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland’, Neue Zürcher
circumstances and developments untouched’, but aimed to turn the ‘apologetic parts’ into a ‘critique of the general social conditions’.¹⁸⁸ Adding an ideological treatment of the social and economic context of Jew-hatred in the Weimar period, she tried to avoid presenting Jewish persecution as ‘an absolute component of German history’.¹⁸⁹ Whereas Elbogen’s sparse historical contextualisation of Jewish history had detached Jewish history from the ‘great background of German history’, as one critic wrote in 1935, Sterling redressed this shortcoming by re-contextualising the study. Her profound reworking of each chapter and incorporation of recent secondary research was seen as an objectivisation of the text, removing all assimilatory apologetics, without detracting from the testimony to ‘inner resistance’ which Elbogen’s original was seen to embody.¹⁹⁰

As the second of three republications of Elbogen’s work in the 1960s this book reasserted his place within the historiographical elite of the twentieth century, providing a bridge to the scholarship of his generation.¹⁹¹ Sterling suggested contextualising the study within Elbogen’s other writings by providing a list of his publications, but she did not aim to integrate an analysis of the historiography of the period into her text. Her critique of Elbogen’s apologia and the over-stated place he gave to the intellectual history of the ‘enemies of the Jews and opponents’ motivated her reworking of the text.¹⁹² Produced outside the main contemporary institutions promoting German-Jewish historiography, Sterling chose to contribute to the growing body of scholarship by independent scholars and publishing houses connected with the field.

The impetus for her benevolent reworking came from Sterling’s personal connection with the book, which ‘belonged to one of the most valuable treasures of my

childhood during the time of Nazi rule’, alongside her historiographical interest in the commemoration and republication of Elbogen’s scholarship. She recalled how the book had helped her learn about her forefathers, strengthening Jewish consciousness and aiding the refutation of ‘the oppressor’s slander’ in the 1930s. Personal reflection was constantly intertwined with her scholarship throughout her career. Just as her critical study of contemporary Jewish life and recent history had forced her to address her Jewish identity, her reworking of Elbogen’s history gave her cause to consider ‘the constancy of Jewish history’ and the ‘principles of hope and justice’ as key elements, made stronger by the coincidence of her first trip to Israel.

Within the context of her role as an educational consultant for the Department of Educational Science (Abteilung für Erziehungswissenschaft) at the university in Frankfurt am Main the idea of publishing an introduction to the history of the Jews in Germany had a strongly pedagogical motivation. She saw a niche for this book as she considered there was no ‘handy summarised presentation of the history of the Jews in Germany’ and secondly because Elbogen’s own pursuit of a ‘pedagogical effect’ related closely to ‘present requirements’ for educating a younger readership. Sterling supported ‘teaching from history’ and frequently applied her understanding of the ideologies and factors which had driven the persecution of the Jews to her teaching of...
tolerance towards other minority groups. Hans Jochen Gamm highlighted the contemporary relevance of Sterling’s work for the deconstruction of prejudice [Vorurteil] and civil re-education; a subject Reichmann and Sterling regularly addressed in their writings and public discussions, tackled by intellectuals and public audiences at the Nürnberger Gespräche [Nuremberg discussions] in 1965.

A collection of reviews of Sterling’s reworked publication traces its reception among popular and cultured readers, rather than academic circles. National and regional German-speaking coverage was provided by reviews in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Der Tagesspiegel, Die Zeit and Stuttgarter Nachrichten for example. Within Jewish circles it was received abroad in the Neue Zürcher Zeitung, Aufbau and Jewish Chronicle. Reviews in Das Parlament, Das Historische-Politische Buch and Die andere Zeitung placed the book within the political sphere, whilst Tribune, the Freiburger Rundbrief and the ‘Kirchenfunk [church radio]’ programme of the radio station Sender Freies Berlin situated the book within the ecumenical sphere; the ‘Kulturelles Wort’ series of the radio station Südwestfunk presented the publication within a cultural context. Within educational circles the book also received much coverage, for example in Kultus und Unterricht: Amtsblatt des Kultusministeriums and Amtliches Schulblatt für das Saarland and Schulverwaltungsblatt für Niedersachsen. Significantly, only reviewers in the field of Jewish culture addressed Sterling’s treatment of Elbogen’s work from a historiographical standpoint.

Like Stern’s novel, this book was deliberately publicised for specific audiences: the politically active and those involved in the fields of education and Christian – Jewish reconciliation, which Sterling and Reichmann increasingly promoted throughout this decade.

198 Collected in Ismar Elbogen Collection, MF 515, reel 4, 2/9, LBIA, NY.
199 Ernst Weymar, ‘Zur Geschichte der deutschen Juden’, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, no. 17, 20 January 1967; one of few reviewers to critically assess on an academic level the new secondary literature and sources Sterling had incorporated, such as her lack of consideration for the influence of Roman Catholic anti-Jewish ideologues on National Socialist antisemitic ideology. Wanda Kampmann, ‘Jüdisches Geschichtsbewusstsein heute. Die Verzahnung von Assimilation und Antisemitismus’, Die Zeit, 24 March 1967, addressed the omission of Zionist history from this presentation of German-Jewish history.
3.3 Educators and experts

The contemporary application of their scholarship during this decade found expression as it developed through educational forums and beyond. The most striking aspect of this work was the dialogue and discussion which accompanied it. Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling asserted in the 1950s that the re-education of the German youth was a cornerstone for the stable development of the West German society. They strongly supported events which provided opportunities for the young to objectively discuss recent history, giving lectures and facilitating discussion for university students.

Arendt’s own post-war reconnection with Germany had been shaped by encounters and dialogue with individuals as mediators of German society and culture. Her participation in the moral reconstruction of Germany had been on-going since the early 1950s, through lectures to university audiences, publications in the *Deutsche Universitätszeitung* and periodicals such as *Die Merkur*, *Die Wandlung* and *Die neue Rundschau* reinforced by presentations to radio listeners. She judged that the young who ‘were in good shape’ constituted a singular group within society, able to respond to re-education, since it seemed that ‘everyone over 20 is lost’. In response to her concern over developments in West German politics, such as new support for ‘old nazis’ during local elections in 1961, she attended a conference of the Student Grant Committee of the German People [Studien Stiftung des deutschen Volkes] organised in Eifel by ‘a most exceptional group from both a human and an academic standpoint’. Under discussion were issues such as difficulties communicating with the older generation and current affairs: the Eichmann trial, Adenauer’s politics and Nazi complicity among West Germany’s bureaucrats. Arendt observed the limited responses these topics provoked from their academic teachers. Describing what the professors had prepared as ‘terrible’, she called for a new impetus within political education.

---

200 Dialogue with old friends such as Jaspers, Heidegger and new acquaintances, Johannes Zilkens, Dolf Sternberger, but also strangers such as a Berlin chauffeur, see ‘Was bleibt? Es bleibt die Muttersprache (1964). Ein Gespräch mit Günther Gaus’, in Adelbert Reif (ed.), *Gespräche mit Hannah Arendt*, pp. 9-34, here pp. 33-34; also Lotte Köhler (ed.), *Within Four Walls*, in particular, Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 14 February 1950, pp. 133-35.
201 For example Arendt spoke at a seminar given by Sternberger in Heidelberg, see Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 4 June 1961, in Lotte Köhler (ed.), *Within Four Walls*, in particular, p. 380. Arendt also gave a lecture at the university of Cologne; see Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 26 October 1959, in *op. cit.*, pp. 348-50, here p. 349. She also broadcast on the radio, for example her lecture ‘Freiheit und Politik’, Hannah Arendt, letter to Heinrich Blücher, 6 August 1958, in *op. cit.*, pp. 325-26.
Reichmann's work with young people was based on the fact that she considered them the critical sector of society who would bear out the 'intellectual and moral renewal of the German people'.

Observing the difficulties of intergenerational communication, she emphasised the responsibility of the 'average father or average teacher' to discuss their own actions under National Socialism in order to break the hold of guilt which impeded intergenerational relations, preventing an 'intellectual revolution' within Vergangenheitsbewältigung. During the late 1950s she participated in events providing historical and political education, promoted by a small number of politically and religiously oriented organisations: the regional Societies for Christian and Jewish Cooperation, the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung [Friedrich Ebert Foundation], the Evangelical Academies in Arnoldshain, Tutzing and Loccum.

Two examples show Reichmann's prominent role and skill as a speaker and discussion facilitator. In 1957 she spoke at a conference in Loccum addressing Jewish life during the Weimar period, a topic she presented to a number of different audiences thereafter. The conference was covered in both the German and Jewish press, echoes which contributed to wider public discussion on guilt, democracy, antisemitism and future German society. One reporter drew attention to the concerns of the audience, made up of professionals, educators, lawyers, men and women involved in Christian


206 Eva G. Reichmann, 'Im Banne von Schuld und Gleichgültigkeit', in Eva G. Reichmann, op. cit., p. 180. Compare Eleonore Sterling, 'What Germans Knew about Nazi Crimes', Jewish Chronicle (13 November 1964), pp. 9 and 46, in which she addressed the 'burden' of the German past, which she considered the West German youth carried, pointing to the 'educational effect' of youth groups attending the Auschwitz trial, which depended on the degree of assistance provided by teachers and parents for their understanding the trials.

207 'Conferences on Contemporary History: Wiener Library Contribution', WLB, vol. XII, nos. 5-6 (1956), p. 46, this article highlights Reichmann's participation in a conference at Bad Nenndorf organised by the Lower Saxon State Office for Civic Education, a conference for 50 teachers organised by the Bonn Society for Christian-Jewish Cooperation on 'Overcoming Antisemitism – Task of Political Education'. At the Arnoldshain Evangelical Academy Reichmann spoke on 'Antisemitism – Culture and Menace'.


and Jewish reconciliation, regarding contemporary right-wing extremism. He highlighted the positive effect of Reichmann's address, ensuing discussion, encouragement and support for teachers and parents who 'fear the questions of the young'.

In turn Reichmann saw the lead taken by Protestant intellectuals to provide opportunities for teaching and discussion, through the establishment of the evangelical academies, as evidence of West Germany's 'gradual progress toward political maturity' and publicised this conference to Anglo-Jewry.

At a second conference organised by the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung in 1958 Reichmann spoke again on Jewish life in the Weimar Republic. She illuminated the discrepancy between the image of the Jew, which National Socialist antisemitism had propagated and the concrete realities of Jewish life during the period, analysing the circumstances which led to its destruction, commemorating that loss. Reichmann's talk presented her core research and personal reflections on German-Jewish history and the National Socialist dictatorship. Rather than showcase new material she wanted to facilitate open discussion of all questions, to confront patterns of hate and deconstruct prejudice by discussing whether antisemitism could be overcome in post-war West Germany.

Within the mixed audience of over a hundred participants, she observed a clear attitude amongst the young, who wished 'to be talked to differently not as participants in the collective blame'.

The SPD report of the conference opined that atonement was gravely needed. Reflecting on the model of discussion promulgated by Reichmann, it considered that 'dialogue between the Germans and the Jews has not yet happened. When this takes place the turning point will be near'. Observing that the young could play a vital role in

---

210 Josef Schmidt, 'Antisemitismus und die deutsche Geschichte. Offene Diskussion in der evangelischen Akademie zu Loeccum', Deutsche Wirtschaftszeitung (1957), Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 4, folder 2, LBIA, NY.
211 Eva G. Reichmann, 'Germans Discuss Antisemitism'. Jewish Chronicle, 27 December 1957, pp. 22-23. In the study by Rulf Jürgen Treidel, Evangelische Akademien im Nachkriegsdeutschland. Gesellschaftspolitisches Engagement in Kirchlicher Öffentlichkeitsverantwortung (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2001) there is no reference to the interfaith and reconciliatory dimension of the conferences run by these academies.
212 The lecture was given at the Landeszentrale für Heimatdienst, Hanover, Bad Nenndorf (October 1958). She also gave this paper to a study group organised by the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung at the Heimvolkschule in Bergneustadt. Cologne, 8-9 November 1958 to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the Reichskristallnacht. One review of this occasion wrote of the 'conspicuous opportunity of enlightening youth on a characteristic example of Nazi barbarism', see 'Work and Aims of the Wiener Library', WLB, vol. XII, no. 3-4 (1958), p. 25.
214 Reinhard Appel, ibid.
this dialogue, it warned of the damage caused by the failure to bring the guilty to justice.\(^{215}\) Most poignantly the report noted that the ‘strongest effect came from the Nazi persecuted Reichmann’ rather than the German speakers.\(^{216}\) Erich Lüth, Reichmann’s co-speaker, press officer for the city state of Hamburg and a leading figure in the Hamburg Society for Christian and Jewish Cooperation, saw her as a key spokesperson for the work of German-Jewish dialogue to counter indifference and ignorance, on which she spoke most strongly at the beginning of the 1960s.\(^{217}\)

The issue of intergenerational tension stemming from the older generations’ unwillingness to openly discuss the past was frequently present in the writings of Sterling and Reichmann. Sterling wrote a front-page article in 1962 discussing the American NBC broadcast of the film ‘Germany, Fathers and Sons’ to be screened in West Germany. Viewed as a challenge to the ‘barrier of silence’ between the generations, she repeated Reichmann’s call for ‘civil courage’ amongst parents and teachers.\(^{218}\) Five years later Reichmann’s discussion of the possibilities of a ‘hope for peace’ between Jews and Germans continued to point to the potential amongst the young, since on the whole they bore no personal responsibility or guilt, for a new relationship of coexistence between Jews and Germans.\(^{219}\)

Before social and political discontent among the student generation came to a head during the unrest of 1968 Reichmann warned that a ‘new outbreak of political mania’ or a ‘climate of resentment-laden radicalism’ amongst the young would not only be an attack on West Germany but also on the whole of the Western world.\(^{220}\) Subsequently however she assessed the ‘intellectual dialogue’ which the rebelling youth had created, as fulfilling a positive function perpetuating a German rationalist tradition. She suggested that, however tenuous and alarming these incremental steps seemed, they

---


gave reassurance that West Germany was pursuing a path of ‘national maturity’ for example through its commitment to ‘a pluralist society’.  

Sterling’s career as an educator and university lecturer gained a firmer footing around the time of her deeper involvement in public discourse carried out via intergenerational and intergroup dialogue. When offered a lectureship in social history by the Hochschule für Erziehung [College for Education] in Frankfurt am Main in 1962 she was ‘attracted’ to the post as she believed through it she could ‘contribute to something pedagogically and humanistically’ which would ‘give a meaning’ to her return, not yet provided by her ‘mainly analytical-critical activities’. After many unsuccessful applications blocked by what she considered was gender discrimination, Sterling took her career further, successfully gaining a professorship in political science in 1968 at the Pädagogische Hochschule, Osnabück. Her involvement with post-war education was not restricted to university spheres however. She also worked as a senior educational consultant for political science advising teachers and pupils in the schools of Hessen and participated in many educational conferences. She frequently addressed the progress of initiatives to revise educational textbooks and tracked attitudes within politics and the media regarding teaching about the Third Reich in her work for the American Jewish press.
In her journalism she monitored the growing interest in German-Jewish culture and the opening up of public discussion of Germany's National Socialist past. She assessed steps taken by the government to address the past, such as the war crimes trials and the role of the media in public re-education, through books and newspapers, radio and ultimately television, to counter suppression of the discussion of National Socialism. One example was the fourteen-part television series 'Das Dritte Reich' [the Third Reich] screened from October 1961 receiving over 8 million viewers on its first night.226

She warned of the 'over-optimism' for the 'educational results' expected from the publicity campaign carried out in parallel by the 'West German Radio and South German Radio' stations, which had produced a glossy folder sent to all educational establishments prior to the screening.227 Sterling criticised both the selection and portrayal of events within the series, as well as expressing concern that such a problematic project was presented in the form of ‘entertainment’. She was supported in her views by the recent findings of a conference run by the Ministry of the Interior for the improvement of political education, which considered the actual effect of directly presenting 'Third Reich material' to the German public. Rather than being an "educational process" in itself, the "factual and documentary" nature of primary sources appeared to prevent independent thought and reasoning, by ‘detaching fundamental problems from actual “live” experience’.228 Sterling had raised similar objections in a review of the publication of a hitherto unpublished manuscript by Adolf Hitler, sponsored by the Munich IfZ.229 Like other books she reviewed she was concerned that it did not place events within the ‘political-historical perspective’ but


227 Ibid., p. 6.

228 Ibid., p. 7.

presented without commentary ""history as it happened, without drawing the vital conclusions"". Sterling was highly critical of the editors leaving the reader to ""draw his own conclusions"".

Reichmann's personal involvement in the public discussion of Germany's recent past was informed by her identity as a Jewess and former German citizen. She considered that 'Jewish testimony' had fallen silent in Germany, the 'risk of freedom must now be dared without it'. She increasingly took up the spirit of what she recalled Leo Baeck describing as one of the 'callings of Judaism' in her academic writings and personal meditation:

to be the expression in world history of the idea of standing alone and the moral principle of the minority [...] testifying to the power of the one who is different in respect to the pressure of the one who conquers and makes everything uniform. 231

Reichmann considered that although Baeck had no longer believed in a symbiosis of Germanness and Jewishness or that former connections could ever be fully regained, he strove for proximity between Germans and Jews. 232 Having revised his stand that he would never return to Germany, she saw him as one of the first to work for reconciliation. Reichmann whole-heartedly modelled and facilitated encounter [Begegnung] between Jews and non-Jews in contemporary West Germany despite feelings of powerlessness as one of the 'few' who were trying to influence 'global events of this magnitude'. 233 She resolved 'not to let suffering crush all hope and human encounter'.

Despite Arendt's growing academic presence in West Germany through radio, television, the press and publications, she took a very different theoretical stand to Sterling and Reichmann concerning the degree of influence and authority of

---

230 Ibid. Sterling cited the introduction to Gerhard L. Weinberg (ed.), Hitler's Zweites Buch.
233 Eva G. Reichmann, 'Das Wagnis der Freiheit', in Eva G. Reichmann, Grösse und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz, p. 119. C. C. Aronsfeld, 'Eva Reichmann at 90. The Hazards of
intellectuals over wider society. Regarding intellectuals within the university system, she claimed that it would be ‘arrogance’ to ‘create values’ and play ‘the conscience of society’. She insisted that in the pursuit of ‘truth’, the universities could only ‘examine’ values and conscience. In 1975 upon receipt of the Sonning Prize in recognition for her contribution to European civilisation she spoke of her tendency to ‘shy away from the public realm’ despite her own ‘praise’ of it as the ‘proper space of appearances for political speech and action’. She added that ‘outsiders and mere spectators’ were better able than ‘actual actors and participants’ to ‘gain a sharper and deeper insight into the actual meaning of what happens to go before or around them’.

3.4 Intergroup and interfaith discussions
It was clear to them that the young were not the only sector of the population who would benefit from opportunities to discuss recent history. Reichmann and Sterling attended radical political meetings in their capacity as observers of West German politics, but from the outset they recognised the futility of trying to reach die-hard antisemites, as Reichmann’s Aufklärungsarbeit [work to enlighten] at the CV had taught her. The publication of their monographs in West Germany proved the catalysts for their public speaking, particularly within selected Christian academic circles, among those working for Christian and Jewish dialogue. The significance of Sterling’s doctoral study, promoting a greater understanding of the historical interaction between Christian and secular attitudes towards the Jews, was well recognised. To her surprise she was offered a subsidy by the Evangelical Church of Westfalen and the Church of the Rheinland to assist funding its publication.

Reichmann and Sterling were keen to address confessional audiences besides the secular and purely academic. This followed from the analyses which they had both put

---


forward in their major post-war monographs. Reichmann had emphasised the pagan, unchristian ideological influences on German culture and society and the demise of Christian morality; Sterling had analysed the impact of Christian anti-Judaism and the prevalent ‘imago’ of the Jew and Judaism.\textsuperscript{237} Frequent invitations to address inter-faith groups as subject specialists, gave them opportunities to present their research and reflections on the historical and contemporary interactions between Jews and Christians.\textsuperscript{238} In the sphere of Christian and Jewish dialogue, both women took part in events organised by the national Woche der Brüderlichkeit [Week of Brotherhood] and regional initiatives of the Societies for Christian and Jewish Cooperation, which led the movement for Christian and Jewish encounter and exchange that gathered pace throughout the 1950s.\textsuperscript{239}

Initially Reichmann shared Alfred Wiener’s contacts with individual Christian theologians and non-Jewish historians and intellectuals in Germany as he continued Baeck’s work of reconciliation in connection with representatives of the British branch of the Council for Christians and Jews, such as James W. Parkes.\textsuperscript{240} She increasingly followed up Wiener’s work and contacts in Germany due to his advancing ill health, resulting in invitations to speak at several evangelical academies and Societies for Christian and Jewish Cooperation. The invitation to participate in the 1961 Deutscher

\textsuperscript{237} Eva G. Reichmann,\textit{ Hostages of Civilisation} and Eleonore Sterling, \textit{Er ist wie du}, pp. 55-81.


\textsuperscript{240} Baeck promoted this sphere of interaction early in the post-war period: see the report of Baeck’s address to a study conference on the ‘Church and Judaism’ organised by the Deutscher Evangelischer Ausschuss für Dienst an Israel in Darmstadt: Special Correspondent, ‘Leo Baeck in Germany’, \textit{AJR Information}, vol. III, no. 11 November 1948, p. 2, see also 1954-55 correspondence between Baeck and Wiener in WLA 446 Leo Baeck, WL, London; Wiener and Parkes were closely linked through their shared specialist interest in the history of Jewish and non-Jewish relations and the Parkes Library was formally associated with the WL in 1960, see ‘Memorandum on the Foundation of an Association between the Wiener Library and the Parkes Library’, February 1960, MS 60 Parkes, 23/1, Hartley Library Special Collections, University of Southampton; Ben Barkow, \textit{Alfred Wiener and the Making of the Holoccaust Library}, p. 145. See Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Nachwort’ (February 1973), in Eva G. Größe und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz, p. 285.
Evangelischer Kirchentag [German Evangelical Church Congress] marked a new autonomy in this area of her work. By this time, her monograph was already widely referred to, influencing discussions on German and Jewish relations, contributing to the strong academic reputation essential for her subsequent participation.

In addition to government support for restitution, during the late 1940s and 1950s, localised initiatives bringing non-Jews and Jews together stemmed from welfare concerns for displaced persons and began to foster reconciliation giving further impetus to the creation of sustainable relationships between representative Christian organisations and Jewish citizens. Sterling participated in meetings organised by the Societies for Christian and Jewish Cooperation unified under the umbrella of the Deutscher Koordinierungsrat der Gesellschaften für Christlich-Jüdische Zusammenarbeit [German Coordinating Council] whose work was played out in regional centres, addressing secular cultural and social issues rather than theology.

Her regular involvement in the annual programme of the national Week of Brotherhood, which publicly endorsed and nurtured education and reconciliation from the end of the 1950s, came almost a decade after its inception. At the 1960 Week of Brotherhood, Reichmann’s Bonn lecture on guilt and indifference found national resonance, published in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung.

She continually kept an overview of the long-term impact of these annual events on public opinion. In 1965 she encouraged a renewed commitment to the Week of Brotherhood, acknowledging realistically the difficulties of ‘brotherhood’ given individual differences, yet unreservedly challenging all indifference and apathy towards this event, even amongst the Jews. She called for the same sincere reverence towards it with which the Jews annually mark their own day of atonement.

241 See correspondence between Leo Baeck and Alfred Wiener from the end of the 1940s regarding Martin Niemöller and Wiener’s lectures in West Germany, WLA 446 Leo Baeck, WL, London. See also correspondence from 1951 between Eva G. Reichmann and Alfred Wiener, WLA 359 and 360 Reichmann, WL, London.


The shift in gear which Reichmann and Sterling experienced in the 1960s, as participants in a national Christian programme of Christian-Jewish dialogue supported by government officials, non-Jewish and Jewish figures such as Theodor Heuss (President of West Germany 1949-59), Helmut Gollwitzer, Karl Thieme, Dietrich Goldschmidt and Robert Raphael Geis, was seen as important evidence of the willingness of the state to address the *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, by promoting and modelling atonement and reconciliation.

National and regional initiatives for dialogue and education were frequently supported by higher officials, even the work of the WL outside Germany was closely followed by Heuss and Eugen Gerstenmaier (President of the Bundestag 1954-69). 245 By its tenth year the Coordinating Council was supported by ‘government officials and many educators and molders of public opinion’, spearheaded by Heuss as patron. 246 Sterling acknowledged that these activities did not constitute a ‘mass movement’, but one that exerted a ‘continuous influence’ and growing presence within the media and certain sections of society. In her annual report on West Germany for the *American Jewish Year Book* she flagged up the collective significance of the confessional ‘intergroup’ initiatives promoting dialogue such as the Week of Brotherhood and the work of the Coordinating Council. 247

She had become interested in Jewish-Christian *rapprochement* during her initial research trip to Germany on 1952. On her return to New York she published her reflections and spoke on the topic to a Jewish audience. 248 From the 1950s her critical

---

245 See for example Gerstenmaier’s opening speech for the Germania Judaica library in Cologne and correspondence between the staff of WL and Heuss. The influence and audience which the work of Reichmann and the WL found among successive generations of government officials was affirmed by Gustav Heinemann (President of West Germany 1969-74) in response to the gift of Reichmann’s collected writings *Größe und Verhängnis deutsch-jüdischer Existenz*, see Gustav Heinemann, letter to Eva G. Reichmann, 5 June 1974, Kurt Schwerin Papers (1902-95), series 17/33, box 11, folder 16 Reichmann, Eva, Northwestern University Archives, Evanston, Illinois.


248 Eleonore Sterling, ‘Christian-Jewish Discussion in Germany’, *Congress Weekly*, vol. 20, no. 19 (1953), pp. 7-8. Sterling asked Horkheimer if he had read her article on Christian-Jewish discussion
participation in Christian and Jewish dialogue organised by the Societies for Christian and Jewish Cooperation helped to refine her understanding of the influence of historical, political and religious Jew-hatred in Germany from the late eighteenth century on the antisemitism of National Socialism, defining also her understanding of the parameters of post-war re-education. Interacting with Jewish and non-Jewish historians, theologians, her participation in local and regional discussion of historical, political and sociological questions prepared her for the highly public and national role which she undertook with Reichmann from 1961 through the Study Group for Christians and Jews of the German Evangelical Church.

Despite her commitment to dialogue, her private reflections testify to the highly emotive nature of certain attitudes and issues being worked through, particularly in interfaith discussion and theological reformulation of the relationship between Christianity and Judaism. Her dual role as a critical observer and participant caused tensions expressed at times as antagonism. Sterling’s reflections when considering her chances for the Leo Baeck Prize in 1959 pointed to this: confident of her academic abilities, she questioned the ideological criteria of the award: ‘All fits me except the love of peace’. Reichmann too grappled with Baeck’s exhortation that a Jew should

---

in Germany in the *Jewish Congress Weekly* and related the incredulous Jewish responses her reflections had prompted. Eleonore Sterling, letter to Max Horkheimer, 13 August 1953, p. 2, MHA V, 159, 131, Horkheimer-Pollock-Archiv, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Archivzentrum, Frankfurt am Main.


be a ‘seed of peace’ in accordance with the words of the prophet Zechariah.\textsuperscript{253} Reichmann readily admitted that for dialogue to exist in all its fullness, this included that which one did not wish to hear. Indeed her own discussion with the past certainly did not preclude judgement or moral positioning which she openly addressed through her demand for objectivity.\textsuperscript{254}

In the 1960s for Reichmann and Sterling the observation of German society and politics was foremost on their agendas.\textsuperscript{255} Sterling’s participation in Jewish-Christian dialogue was directed at an assessment of the state of German reconciliation and democratisation. Conscious of the relatively small number of Jews who supported the work of the Week of Brotherhood and the Societies for Christian and Jewish Cooperation, she personally modelled a critical German-Jewish interaction which altruistically supported this work. Without willing Jewish dialogue partners she argued, new relationships could not be established. She specifically saw her participation for the sake of the young, who she considered had

hardly anything to hold onto, […] and we, since through suffering we have been spared the hardening, appear human and real to them.\textsuperscript{256}

Both her and Reichmann’s intellectual and educational profiles as subject specialists were inextricably bound up with their German-Jewish identity and personal experience.

Commentary on Jewish life in post-war West Germany remained secondary in their writings. Sterling wrote one article on the results of a survey of prevalent attitudes held by Jewish youth in West Germany: attitudes to parents, future employment, feelings of homelessness and belonging.\textsuperscript{257} In 1971 Reichmann published a review outside Germany, addressing the Jewish presence in post-war Germany, responding to the publication of what she considered was a misrepresentatively titled book ‘Germany

\textsuperscript{255} Reichmann was a member of the Institute of Jewish Affairs in London after it transferred there from New York in 1965, continuing its programme to investigate contemporary issues affecting Jewish communities and report on antisemitism.
without Jews’. Considering a spectrum of attitudes to renewed Jewish life in Germany ranging from world Jewry to West German extremist groups, she presented her own view that one could read the progress of West German ‘inner democratisation’ through the attitudes of the non-Jewish majority; stating ‘Jews in Germany are a memorial – a far more effective reminder than all others made of bronze and stone’.

3.5 The Study Group for Jews and Christians

Although Reichmann and Sterling saw the public discussions and academic conferences to which they contributed during the 1950s and 1960s as momentous events revealing ‘enthusiasm for learning, thirst for knowledge and yearning for regeneration’; the most poignant of all experiences for Reichmann was the new Christian-Jewish dialogue pursued by the German Evangelical Church from 1961. The Arbeitsgemeinschaft Juden und Christen [Study Group for Jews and Christians] came into being for the 1961 Deutscher Evangelischer Kirchentag [German Evangelical Church Congress], a decade after the instigation of the biennial congress, which from 1949 had provided a programme of study groups dedicated to social and religious issues, almost a decade since the commitment to encounter and dialogue displayed by the coordinated regional Societies for Christian and Jewish Cooperation.

Whereas the published lectures and discussions held by the Study Group contextualise the history of this group, it is the personal papers and correspondence of key individuals that shed light on the interaction of these two female secular scholars as Jewish participants, especially when viewed as part of their wider study of Jewish and non-Jewish relations. The Study Group marked the elevation of the relationship between Jew and Christian to the national programme of the Evangelical Church on a


political, social and theological level and showed a decisive progression from the more problematic ‘narrative of the past’ during its early years.\textsuperscript{262} Its historical significance was that for perhaps the first time in German church history Jews were invited as equal partners in religious dialogue.\textsuperscript{263} This radical move came from leadership desires to tackle issues of guilt, human failure, reconciliation and education; as well as increased interest amongst church members in response to the processes of restitution and war crime trials.\textsuperscript{264}

An engaged Christian sector of the population could potentially be an influential force for the turnaround of public opinion, encouraged by the commitment of many West German theologians and Christian church leaders to self-reflection and atonement, who could help spearhead re-education, tolerance and understanding. Reichmann pointed to this at the outset of her presentation to the 1961 Evangelical Church congress, stating that it ‘was not a holy island’, not detached from society or beyond reproach for past actions or inaction and especially not exempt from responsibility for the future of German society.\textsuperscript{265} She perceived the National Socialist ‘flood of hatred’ had been ‘directed at Jews, but also Christian conscience and mankind itself’.

Thirty people were invited to the first preparatory meeting in Berlin January 1961, individuals known to have worked on the behalf of Jews during the persecution or who had publicly broached the issues of Christian responsibility, atonement and reconciliation in the immediate post-war period: theologians, clerics, sociologists and historians who were good public speakers. Notably the only Jewish participant invited to the meeting was Eva G. Reichmann, but by May Rabbi Robert Raphael Geis and Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich had joined the group.\textsuperscript{266} It is probable that this invitation was based on her earlier collaborative work and public speaking in West Germany. Evidence

suggests that Reichmann assisted the selection of the two Jewish theologians and subsequently Sterling who were known to her through their academic collaboration with the WL.\textsuperscript{267} Sterling was closely involved with this group until her untimely death and following 1967 there was a cooling off in relations between Reichmann and Robert Raphael Geis who had assumed a leading role amongst the Jewish group members. Subsequently Reichmann actively contributed through correspondence with group members but she did not attend later congresses.\textsuperscript{268} Additional Jewish members gradually joined during this period representing different religious and secular positions in and outside Germany, however they had a much less significant public voice at a national level within the church congress. An unequal weighting of Jewish and Christian members remained a constant feature of the group throughout its first decade.\textsuperscript{269}

The group’s inaugural programme at the three-day Berlin congress in July 1961 went to the heart of the matter admitting the failure of the Christian church during the Nazi period, admonishing anti-Judaism within church teachings, emphasising rather what binds Christians and Jews, promoting theological and sociological education. Reichmann was the only secular Jewish scholar present and spoke on nineteenth-century bourgeois anti-semitism, German nationalism, National Socialist ideology and the stereotyped image of the Jew.\textsuperscript{270} At the end of the third day the Christian members issued a statement showing their commitment to atonement, dialogue and re-education.\textsuperscript{271} By the end of the first year however the group faced polemical reactions to

\textsuperscript{267}Although evidence is not conclusive I suggest Reichmann may have influenced which Jewish members were approached, see WLA 446 Leo Baeck and 449 LBI London, WL, London.


\textsuperscript{269}See a list of study group members in Dietrich Goldschmidt and Hans-Joachim Kraus (eds.), \textit{Der ungekündigte Bund}, pp. 312-13; and Helmut Gollwitzer and Eleonore Sterling (eds.), \textit{Das gespaltene Gottesvolk}, pp. 353-55.

\textsuperscript{270}Reichmann’s contributions were published in the official documentation: Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Der “bürgerliche” Antisemitismus’, pp. 93-101 and ‘Deutscher Nationalismus zwischen Angst und Überhebung’, pp. 118-19, both in Dietrich Goldschmidt and Hans-Joachim Kraus (eds.), \textit{Der ungekündigte Bund}.

the theological issues raised in their work, branded in the Christian press as a ‘sell out’ of church tenets.272

Throughout 1962 the programme continued with open lectures and preparations for future national events. Despite the fact that theological debate took centre stage the group was spurred on to address historical and sociological issues in the light of growing indifference and the tendency within West German society to move on from discussion of its recent past in relation to the treatment of the Jews. Documentation, correspondence and Reichmann’s own reports show her contribution to the choice of topics to be addressed and specialist advice. Reichmann remained ‘an incorrigible Jewish optimist’, convinced of the serious commitment displayed in 1961 when over ten thousand participants had followed the group’s programme.273 Like Sterling she really saw dialogue as a personal rather than collective process but she had ‘hoped for a start’ if not a 2000 year reversal.274 Precisely because polemic was so close to the surface, Reichmann believed the ‘growing pains’ signalled something was being grappled with at a deeper level, which justified the persistence of thinking differently.275

Since they could not function as a public pressure group without the authority to issue declarations, political discussion was sidelined within the main framework of their congressional programme. In private the group took opportunities to underline and support pressing issues such as diplomatic recognition of Israel and the urgency of denazification within the West German justice system.276 The mid 1960s were dominated by unsettled relations between the Jewish and Christian partners in the wake of the so-called ‘Purim conflict’ due to ambiguous reactions amongst the Christian


245
participants to a Lutheran move to increase missionary activities directed at Jews. By 1967 the programme regained a more dynamic orientation given the timely pre-planned theme ‘peace is among us’ and the ending of the Six-Day War in Israel shortly before. Invited to speak on peace between Jews and Germans, Reichmann’s last paper at this congress was perhaps her most challenging given the political circumstances and public reactions within West Germany. Reichmann responded to the invitation:

I haven’t said no yet. Because this matter lies close to my heart, the context, the subject, the atmosphere, the colleagues – everything.

The topic ‘Israel’ returned discussion to a consciously politicised and socio-historical agenda. Geis and Reichmann were both aware of their responsibility not to shy away from dealing with this subject, although this could potentially offend factions particularly within the Jewish camp. Like Sterling, Reichmann accepted the inevitability of discomfort when addressing subjects about which many remained silent and both women were fully aware of the responsibility and problematic nature of their representative roles.

In the theological debates within this group, Reichmann and Sterling assumed a significant yet private role, acknowledging their non-specialist positions. The participation of Reichmann and Sterling was prescribed by their specific function as historical and sociological specialists. Reichmann described her role amongst theologians in secular terms as ‘a worldly child [das Weltkind]’. They expressed their honest and independent counsel to Ehrlich and Geis in personal correspondence, such as Sterling’s criticism of the hierarchical and patriarchal attitudes displayed by members of

280 Ibid.
At times the female members of the group lobbied male members to get their strident views heard, at other times they simply made their opinions heard directly as in the case of Lili Simon who worked as an education consultant for the Evangelical Church in the Rhineland. It is significant that gender inequality clearly still had sway within a group which set as its goal religious and social equality and tolerance.

Despite the frustrations and theological politicking, in 1969 when awarded the Order of the German Federal Republic for her reconciliation work Reichmann described it as the fulfilment of ‘a very personal wish’, placing great personal value on her ‘encounter’ with those who had ‘looked into the abyss from the other side with the same feelings of horror’. Reichmann was encouraged by Martin Buber’s concept of the ‘mutuality of discussion’ in the face of the ‘hurdles to overcoming the ignoble past’, wholeheartedly embracing his maxim ‘all real living is encounter’. Reichmann considered the challenge facing the Study Group for Christians and Jews and their congressional audience: the kind of hard talking which would be necessary in the spirit of ‘uninhibited openness’ between two friends to produce a dialogue which would challenge the tendency Buber had observed, of the individual putting up protective barriers, hiding within the social mass.

Sterling’s personal vision of dialogue acknowledged doctrinal differences between Christians and Jews. She remained committed to a ‘right’ response to the ‘tension in this division’ she saw between the two religions, referring also to the separation between German and Jew caused by the recent past. This was expressed in the foreword to the study group publication Das gespaltene Gottesvolk [the divided people of God] co-written by Sterling. The vision emerged in a 1953 article based on observations of West German Jewish-Christian discussion made during her first return. Describing two evident trends she witnessed: ‘resurging Nazism and anti-Semitism’ but

---

283 See correspondence between Reichmann, Sterling and Geis, in Robert Raphael Geis Collection, AR 7263, LBIA, NY.
288 Helmut Gollwitzer and Eleonore Sterling (eds.), Das gespaltene Gottesvolk, pp. 15-17, here p. 15.
also ‘serious theological discussions between Christians and Jews’, she noted the ‘refreshingly different’ tone of conciliatory dialogue, not envisaged as an ‘amalgam’ or ‘dissolution of faith’ but as a ‘discovery and expression of the spirit and truth from which both religions have been born’. 289 Privately however, she admitted to Horkheimer that these observations ‘describe not what I actually found in Germany, rather what I was looking for’. 290

Against the backdrop of Reichmann’s public moral and political commitment to studying recent history as a guard against ‘the enemy […] indifference’, she praised Geis’ ‘call to take up politics out of a religious duty’, remarking:

The political abstinence of the church has always been a stumbling block for me. The brave turn of the Evangelical Church to the hot iron of current affairs was one of the reasons for my inner ties. 291

Sterling was also concerned about the isolation of the few groups willing to address issues of Vergangenheitsbewältigung. In 1964 she pointedly observed that there was little public discussion of National Socialist crimes besides ‘occasional public condemnation or declarations issued by church groups and Christian-Jewish societies’. 292 The effectiveness of the group’s work was an issue raised by an audience member in 1965 during a discussion session with Eleonore Sterling. The concern was the evidence of latent antisemitism in society and the ability of the study group to have any real impact on Jewish – German relations and wider German and Israeli public opinion. 293

In 1974 Reichmann reviewed the course of Jewish and German reconciliation, addressing the view that they were merely ‘preaching to the converted’. She considered instead that they had given ‘encouragement to think’ not only to those who supported their work but also those who were unsettled or doubtful, since if they had wished to

---

293 Eleonore Sterling was questioned on this matter by an audience member, but responded only to the latter part of his question regarding latent antisemitism: ‘Antisemitismus in der Bundesrepublik. Ökonomische und psychologische Ursachen der Aggression’, in Helmut Gollwitzer and Eleonore Sterling (eds.), Das gespaltene Gottesvolk, pp. 173-74.
address only 'the individually blameless' their efforts would have stagnated. They had acted as 'forerunners who pulled behind them a much greater number who desired reconciliation.' To this end the study group was as much about the ground-breaking dialogue between the participating Jewish and Christian academics as it was about its lay audience and encounters between Christian sections of the population and the proportionately smaller Jewish community.

Reichmann purposefully directed echoes from the study group’s activities into West German society, Christian circles, the Jewish community in Germany and abroad. Absolutely central to her promoting publicity for Jewish and Christian dialogue was her awareness of the positive effect that reports of reconciliation had on the way West Germany was regarded by the wider world; as an assessment of the progress of democracy and atonement. A comparative reflection on lectures she gave in West Germany in 1962 shows her analysis of audience and media reactions as a sounding out of public thinking which she considered more representative than any abstract demographic polls. Sterling frequently cited and repeatedly challenged such surveys as accurate measures of West German opinion due to the discrepancy between the public and private expression of views on Jews, Nazism and war crime prosecutions.

Echoes of Reichmann’s educational work and lectures in West Germany were transmitted to an interested public in London. She spoke about the significance and outworkings of Jewish-Christian dialogue at the 1961 congress to the London branch of the German YMCA; furthermore four hundred guests were formally invited to the New Liberal Jewish Congregation to hear her report, including among others, German Embassy officials, members of the press and German church leaders in Britain.

There was a three-fold aspect to her addressing German speakers in Britain. Firstly her audience comprised members of the German-Jewish refugee community

---

298 For example she gave the lecture ‘Zeitgeschichte als politische und moralische Aufgabe’ in German at the German Cultural Institute in London, 27 January 1961 and the German YMCA in London on 6 December 1961, WLA 360 Reichmann, WL, London.
concerned for post-war reconstruction in their former Heimat. Secondly the non-Jewish German émigré audience was represented by a number of political dissidents who monitored political developments and thirdly it included representatives of the West German state to whom the concern of these external, interested parties was conveyed, as a signal to the West German establishment of the pressure of foreign opinion in support of denazification and democracy. Reichmann followed the reporting of study group activities in the Jewish and non-Jewish press in West Germany, particularly Christian responses which she sent to London with instructions for the circulation of this information.\(^{300}\) She also addressed the 1962 conference of the Jüdischer Frauenbund [Jewish Women’s Association] in Cologne on her participation and the response of this Jewish audience was relayed in due course to the WL.\(^{301}\)

In Albert Friedlander’s obituary to Reichmann he touched on her mediation between post-war West Germany and the German-Jewish refugee community in Great Britain. Her ‘work of reconciliation’ between Germans and Jews challenged the ‘total rejection of Germany’ by the refugee community.\(^{302}\) Although she was regarded as a ‘scholar and community leader’ within the wider community and at the Belsize Square Synagogue where she was a member, he pointed to the tardiness of recognition from the London Jewish community for her ‘persistent challenge to pre-conceived notions in the field of history and refugee psychology’. It is fair to say that the majority of her own reports of her work in post-war West Germany were written in German, accessible therefore only to a German-reading public in West Germany, Great Britain, Israel and elsewhere. Besides articles published in the *Wiener Library Bulletin* and the AJR Information which mainly reached a German-Jewish readership through English and German articles, she published very few articles in the general Jewish press in Great Britain.\(^{303}\)


\(^{303}\) She wrote isolated articles in 1951 and 1961: Unnamed correspondent [Eva G. Reichmann], ‘Dangers of Revival of Nazism’, *Jewish Chronicle*, 17 August 1951, and Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Germany’, *Jewish Chronicle Supplement*, 1 December 1961, pp. 2, 4. It is significant that Reichmann might have contributed more frequently if she had remained as closely involved with the work of the WL during the 1960s when David Kessler, who was chairman of the *Jewish Chronicle*, took the role of chairman of the executive committee of the WL following the death of Leonard Montefiore: Ben
I consider the prime contribution made by Reichmann and Sterling in the early years of the Study Group for Jews and Christians to be their persistence in putting a contemporary German-Jewish agenda into dialogue with theology. Their work pushed beyond the universities and educational institutions, influencing a confessional and secular public through the medium of German and Jewish newspapers and publications, public speaking and radio.\(^{304}\) In this way they influenced the younger generation who participated in the social and political upheavals in the late 1960s. As Jewish partners in dialogue they had the opportunity to represent the disparate Jewish community in West Germany, but in the first instance, Reichmann in particular highlights the participation of the diasporic German-Jewish intellectual community’s participation in German Wiedergutmachung [repairs] and Vergangenheitsbewältigung. Their work also illuminates the distinct gendering of German and Jewish reconciliation. Thus supporting a more nuanced appreciation of the gender dynamics in the academic and public debates that furthered German – Jewish understanding from the immediate post-war period up to the more widespread and critical engagement of 1968 and beyond.

### 3.6 Antisemitism and philosemitism

Scholarship has tried to argue the prevalence of the two phenomena: antisemitism and philosemitism in post-war West Germany. A recent contribution to this debate is Anthony Kauders’ critical reconsideration of ‘philo-Semitism’ and ‘repression’ as two central interpretations of post-war German Vergangenheitsbewältigung, rejecting the claim that ‘philo-Semitism characterized postwar reactions to Jews and the Holocaust’, seeing the function of this claim as replacing ‘the task of accounting for historical developments […] with the desire for censure’.\(^{305}\) Sterling and Reichmann frequently deconstructed philosemitism alongside their work on antisemitism during the 1960s without pinpointing one or the other as more prevalent.\(^{306}\) Evidence of moral judgement and censure in their writings however was certainly complex. They tackled post-war

---

304 Both Reichmann and Sterling attended political meetings in Germany as observers of right-wing activities and on occasion personally challenged the viewpoints of individuals, see Eva G. Reichmann, Germany’s New Nazis, pp. 1-8; and Eleonore Sterling, letter to Zachariah Schuster (American Jewish Committee, Paris), 9 September 1965, MHA V, 159, pp. 45-47, Horkheimer-Pollock-Archiv, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Archivzentrum, Frankfurt am Main.

305 Anthony D. Kauders, ‘History as Censure. “Repression” and “Philo-Semitism” in Postwar Germany’, History and Memory, vol. 15, no. 1 (Spring/Summer 2003), pp. 98-111. Again here Kauders, like Frank Stern, cites the work of scholars who mainly address the early years of the West German state, referring to primary sources from those years only, failing to address changes which were evident in the 1950s, 1960s and subsequent decades.

attitudes toward Jews as an academic subject for objective analysis, reflecting on their own participation in the re-education and moral regeneration of West German society, for which current affairs served as a teaching point and spur for personal reflection. 307

Attention is drawn by Kauders in his overview of secondary literature on the phenomenon of philosemitism to the restricted focus of existing studies, addressing agents of philosemitism in the sphere of ‘high-politics’ or in the example of Frank Stern’s study: in Allied policy making, denazification and educational reform. 308 However, like Stern, he fails to highlight or assess the role and reactions of the objects and recipients of philosemitic statements and gestures: the Jewish community in West Germany and beyond, as important agents contributing to this ‘complex situation’. 309 For philosemitism to be adequately addressed, the post-war decades need to be broken down into shorter periods to consider carefully the changing social and political scene. The expression of antisemitism and philosemitism in private, public and political life from the 1940s onwards needs assessment in a full range of settings, both German and Jewish; in the context of West Germany and on the world stage.

Not only observers of the processes of West German Vergangenheitsbewältigung, Reichmann and Sterling were attentive to shifting attitudes towards the Jews expressed in the public domain and the press. Reichmann took a long view of the process of German recovery in 1960, reviewing the former hopes she had shared with others for ‘purification and new birth’. 310 On the one hand she noted, not without an edge of cynicism, that ‘knowledgeable politicians and psychologists’ had taught her that such a change of heart was not possible for the German people faced with destroyed cities and displacement. However, she acknowledged the ‘generous manifestations of turnaround by individuals and appointed representatives of the people’ during the period of reconstruction.

This questioning of the progress of German rehabilitation had been prompted anew at the end of the 1950s by the increasing occurrence of antisemitic activities:

309 Kauders discusses the elements which he would see addressed in order to begin an adequate analysis of the role of repression and philosemitism within Vergangenheitsbewältigung: op. cit., p. 112.
swastika daubing, cemetery and synagogue desecrations. Opinions regarding the agents and motives for these incidents varied from the actions of former Nazis to Neo-Nazi groups and delinquent youth; motivated by either latent or resurgent antisemitism or antidemocratic tendencies. As an outsider representing the watchful eye of diasporic German Jewry, Reichmann commented that, although it was not assumed abroad that antisemitic attitudes had completely vanished, there was a hope that their expression would have been ostracised by a 'taking of positions'. Reichmann emphasised, here as elsewhere, that the victims of past and present discrimination were not only Jews but also Christians and innocent citizens. Her call for a response across the political and social spectrum to these events was underlined by her assertion that the 'matter concerns no less than humanity itself. It is no longer about the Jews'.

Sterling shared the view that the historical 'Jewish question' and how post-war West Germany dealt with its contemporary appearances would be the 'touchstone' of democracy. She was critical of official Jewish responses to the antisemitic outbursts of 1959 made for example by the Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland [Central Council of the Jews from Germany] the representative body for Jews living in West Germany, critical also of what she saw as their politicking regarding Wiedergutmachung and the wisdom of the decisions they made affecting Jewish life in West Germany. Returnees to Germany had provided a vital link for external Jewish observation and intervention since the early post-war years. Sterling’s work on behalf of Jewish agencies outside

314 This view draws on a statement by the U.S. High Commissioner in Germany John McCloy (Heidelberg, 1949), see Frank Sturm, The Whitewashing of the Yellow Badge, pp. 297-98.
316 See Eva G. Reichmann, Germany’s New Nazis. Impressions from a Recent Journey through Germany’s Danger Zones (London: The Wiener Library, August 1951) and other regular reports given in the AJR Information from 1946 onwards. Arendt spoke on Germany in 1950 at the annual meeting of the Conference on Jewish Relations, 26 April 1960, see publicity leaflet. R. G. 1-F-82-17, Hannah Arendt, Records of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Joseph and Miriam Ratner Center, Jewish Theological Seminary of America (JTSA), New York. Shlomo Shafir, ‘Constantly
Germany had tried to counter the effect of what she saw as the ‘resistance’ of people like the general secretary of the Central Council, Henrik van Dam towards ‘foreign organisations’.\(^\text{317}\) She was however aware of Jewish and non-Jewish attitudes in Germany which saw American Jewish institutions such as Jewish Restitution Successor Organisation and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee as agents of ‘American Jewish imperialism’ rather than ‘social welfare’.\(^\text{318}\) As one of a few prominent observers she sent extensive reports, which became more frequent in 1960, to Zachariah Shuster at the American Jewish Committee’s European office in Paris. These monitored antisemitism, the post-war situation for Jews living in West Germany, political developments and Neo-Nazi activities.\(^\text{319}\)

She was troubled by certain problematically uncritical representations of Jews and Judaism in the media, academic and educational publications in the 1950s.\(^\text{320}\) Sterling uneasily counted among contemporary enemies of the Jews ‘so-called “liberals” and “good Christians”’ who she considered simply suppressed their hatred and consequently posed a potential threat to everything that was ‘decent’.\(^\text{321}\) In correspondence with the German-Jewish scholar Guido Kisch she expressed her apprehension regarding the representation of Jewry and Judaism particularly in educational materials.\(^\text{322}\) This had an impact on two entries she wrote on ‘Juden [Jews]’ and ‘Judentum [Judaism]’ for the 1955 edition of the West German encyclopaedia Der Grosse Brockhaus.\(^\text{323}\)

She voiced her concern for both the positive and negative effect that the texts and accompanying images might have on readers if presented with stereotypical or misrepresentative information. Conscious of her own tendency to give the entries a German-Jewish bias, both in their historical content and bibliographic references, she questioned the editors’ intention to present images of ‘the richest, most glittering Thora
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\(^\text{319}\) See Shlomo Shafir, Ambiguous Relations, p. 206.
\(^\text{322}\) Eleonore Sterling, letter to Guido Kisch, 5 July 1954, p. 2. Guido Kisch Collection, AR 787, folder 7/13, LBIA, NY.
decorations', preferring 'the Worms Synagogue' and the 'new modern one in Saarbrücken' to those abroad. If the editors chose the Rashi synagogue in Worms as an illustration, she considered they ought to 'mention in the caption that it was destroyed'. Her judgement of the editors' choice of images representing Jewish religious practices was uncompromising and brought them up short, since she considered their choices gave the impression that 'Germany was again covered with beautiful new synagogues - as if nothing had happened'. Questioning the re-use of pictures from the 1931 edition she ventured that the 'photograph of the Jew with the Tefillin looks too utterly close to a Streicher figure' and the picture of Jews wearing 'old-fashioned clothes' were 'the type of thing which always adds to the sense of the ridiculous that the German feels about Jewish customs'.

In 1965 Sterling chose to present her most critical and exposed treatment of post-war German Vergangenheitsbewältigung in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung - a newspaper of the mainstream German press. She explored the dubious motives behind the expression of philosemitism, focusing on 'similarities between the mechanics of Philosemitism and Antisemitism'. She warned against the phenomenon's impact on the 'normalisation' of Jewish and German relations, as well as present and future acceptance of other minority groups. Sterling had developed her challenge to the underlying political and social psychology that pursued the normalisation of the treatment of Jews in West Germany, through her participation in religious and secular discussions of Jewish and German history and correspondence with colleagues Geis and Horkheimer.

She flagged up both German and Jewish attitudes to normalisation, such as the response of the Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland to the ‘consequences of exaggerated “philosemitism’” and their support for the ‘human goal’ – ‘the “normalization” of relations between Germans and Jews’. Her own view saw the call to normalise relations between Germans and Jews as giving licence to the suggestion that nothing had happened, so that from generation to generation antisemitic prejudices would not be talked about.

She commented on the ‘impartiality’ she saw in intellectual circles as practically amounting to ‘intellectual swastika daubing’ which allowed the expression of ‘everything bad that one can say about the Jews’. An example of which she saw as Hannah Arendt’s ‘insult’ to the Jews in Eichmann in Jerusalem. Sterling considered:

“normalisation” would only truly exist, if the anomalous characteristics of the persecution of Jews [...] were endured and explained in a humane way: and only then, if the face of humanity, violated by the persecution, led to a critique of the social order, which was and still is responsible

Critical of the speed in which Germany had established an even keel, she commented on the ‘distancing’ rather than the ‘indifference’ of the population, which she considered too strong a description. In an interview in 1964 when questioned about her view of the developments in Germany since the end of the Second World War, she replied that she viewed these developments ‘from the outside’, ‘less involved’ than she once had been, aware of the effect and distance of time.

Being permanently based in West Germany Sterling could closely observe what she saw as the creation of a ‘philosemitic stereotype’, which constituted a ‘new antisemitism’ functioning also as a whitewash. In particular she pointed to the

---

problematic two-fold idolisation of the Jew: as the stereotyped ‘bearer of culture’ and
the suffering ‘Auschwitz Jew’. Sterling considered the philosemitic trend signalled
West Germany had not yet proved itself ‘democratic’ or ‘human’; instead the ‘symbolic
image and substitute actions’ of philosemitism revealed more about foreign policy
concerns than the actual state of Jewish and non-Jewish relations. She even went as
far as to compare the Jews in West Germany to the ‘state-protected Jews [Schutz- und
Staatsjuden]’ of the pre-emancipation era, warning of the time when the government
would no longer need to prove to the outside world that it is ‘Jew-friendly’.

Another problematic expression of philosemitism in intellectual circles, which
Sterling observed, was the increasing interest in the role and place of the Jew in German
history and culture. It was ‘almost becoming a fashion to talk about the “lost and
irretrievable” German-Jewish symbiosis’, whereby both publicly and privately the
‘affinity’ between the German and Jewish spirit was stressed. Sterling did not regard
the reasons for this new interest in benevolent terms, as an act of altruism or a reaction
to the destruction of Jewish life and culture, but rather, stemming from
general anxiety over losses inflicted on German artistic, literary and
intellectual life by the Nazi terror and the dominant post-war trend of
materialism.

Furthermore she considered this ‘new German “romanticism”’ dangerous; creating an
idealisation of the actual role played by the Jews in German culture and society. She
raised concerns about this tendency citing two examples from new radio series: one by
the South German Radio station on ‘Christians, Germans and Jews’ introduced by her
doctoral supervisor Carlo Schmid and another by the Bavarian Radio on ‘The
Contribution of the Jews to European Culture’. Other examples, such as the
republication of German-Jewish war letters and a study of German-Jewish veterans of
the First World War by the Ministry for Defence contributed to what she called the
‘posthumous rehabilitation of German Jewry’. One positive aspect Sterling saw of the
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Arendt also questioned the philosemitism she witnessed among Germans she met in Israel during the
Four Walls, pp. 354-56.
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341 Ibid., pp. 3-4.
interest in the Jewish 'contribution', relates to the balance provided in educational spheres, since

children cannot be taught tolerance towards and understanding of the Jews merely by telling them about Jewish suffering and death.\(^{343}\)

She pointed to the significance of 'teaching Jewish history as an integral part of German life, past and present' which the well-established Germania Judaica library pursued as its goal.\(^{344}\)

Frank Stern is one of few scholars to raise the profile of Sterling's work on German and Jewish relations through his reference to her 1965 article 'Judenfreunde – Judenfeinde' [Philosemites – Antisemites] published in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* article.\(^{345}\) His central argumentation; regarding the political instrumentalisation of philosemitism and stereotyping, as evidence of latent antisemitic prejudice, was present in Sterling’s article. Her arguments seem to form the backbone of his critical assessment of philosemitism during the foundation of the German state from the late 1940s to the early 1950s.\(^{346}\) She judged that philosemitism was predominantly a constructed phenomenon used to substitute real acceptance and normal relations, giving the semblance of democracy and tolerance in West German society and politics to the on-looking international community. This undermined the real discussion of deep rooted attitudes towards the Jews and self-examination in the process of coming to terms with the recent past.

Stern short-sightedly concludes his study stating that ‘the decline in philosemitism began in the 1960s’; the period when Sterling and Reichmann publicly began to address this sensitive subject from the Jewish perspective.\(^{347}\) He fails to contextualise Sterling’s piece within the 1960s discourse in which it was inserted, despite the fact he used her analysis to underpin his own reading of philosemitism. By deconstructing the interplay between private, everyday and working relationships in the face of the negatively overtoned discourse on philosemitism on the one hand and constructed expressions of philosemitism on the other this would shift perceptions of

\(^{343}\) *Ibid.*  
\(^{344}\) Sterling herself was writing an introduction to the cultural, intellectual and religious history of German Jewry at the time of her death: Eleonore Sterling, *Kulturelle Entwicklung im Judentum von der Aufklärung bis zur Gegenwart.*  
\(^{347}\) Frank Stern, *op. cit.*, p. 434.
philosemitism: exploring any normative influence these relationships had, modelling co-existence, mutual respect and natural relations. It is important to place the phenomenon within the context of Jewish/non-Jewish encounter and collaboration which spearheaded the discussion of inter-group conflict and minority group integration, negotiating the plurality of democratic West German society. So focusing on the discussion of the role philosemitism played in the process of ‘normalisation’ in West Germany in the 1960s, by studying the agency and responses to the surrounding public debate made by leading Jewish spokespeople and writers such as Sterling and Reichmann. Stern avoided setting the analysis Sterling made against the setting of her post-war scholarship or participation in furthering Christian-Jewish relations. The effect this has is to ignore the Jewish contribution to the debate, by taking the Jewish voices in this discourse out of their inherent context; overlooking the significance of their willingness to participate as representative Jews in debates able to shape public attitudes.

This article came at a highpoint in Sterling’s career and public involvement with Christian and Jewish relations through her role as spokesperson and editor for the Study Group for Christians and Jews. Her sharp criticism of philosemitism was not without a counter balance. Sterling worked closely with many non-Jewish scholars and friends: relationships that were formed very often in the crucible of post-war Jewish and German re-encounter. Thus an assessment of her critique should also be qualified, viewed against the backdrop of genuine interpersonal relations. Sterling was in a strong position to assess the course of post-war relations, herself, a participant in formative discussions and debates in cultural and confessional spheres. Although her analysis presents a cautious and somewhat negative assessment of the state of these relations at times, she continued to support and promote education and discussion to combat prejudice through personal encounter and academic study.

Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling were highly aware of the reception of their writings and the response to their personal appearance as Jews, German Jews and female public speakers in West Germany. Selma Stern mused on the academic and personally directed praise she received from prominent Germans, writing:

348 Sterling comments in this article on these early sources which attempted to analyse German attitudes towards the Jews during the late 1940s and 1950s, such as Frederick Pollock, *Gruppenexperiment: Ein Studienbericht* (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1955) and public opinion polls. 349 See Helmut Gollwitzer and Eleonore Sterling (eds.), *Das gespaltene Gottesvolk*. 259
I don't know how I have earned so much friendliness. I believe that all this does not apply to me personally, rather through this they want to honour German Jewry.\textsuperscript{350}

Particularly Sterling and Reichmann spoke on philosemitism from a semi-autobiographical perspective, as willing dialogue partners and self-presented Jewish spokespeople. They observed and interacted with a range of responses to their personal testimony and representative roles. Along with other visible Jewish intellectuals they became the objects of philosemitism, both genuine and instrumentalised. Reichmann had kept an ever-watchful eye on antisemitism in post-war Germany from her earliest return trip in 1951. She noted in 1971 the changing form of antisemitism, having become ‘more narrow, more private, more strongly directed to the personal-familiar’: no longer playing a large role in Jewish life in Germany.\textsuperscript{351} Throughout those twenty years she had continued to reflectively address the ‘Jewish question’ as she had during the Weimar period, critical like Sterling of the political function this continued to exert in post-war West Germany. In their analyses of antisemitism, both Sterling and Reichmann had upheld the theory of the Jew as a scapegoat, a device which imposed an identity that had little to do with the real ‘Jew’. At the 1961 German Evangelical Church congress Reichmann had noted a similar tendency in the over-compensatory emphasis made on the Jewish contribution to German life and the idolisation of an abstract philosemitic stereotype.\textsuperscript{352}

Reichmann was unsettled by the subtle ‘larger than life’ representation of Jews in the public sphere, which placed them on a pedestal, disassociating them from the ‘crowd of normal people’.\textsuperscript{353} This she saw as a natural counter-swing resulting from the extreme events of the past and therefore judged that the time would come for the Jews to be returned to the ranks of the average person in German minds. She was also aware of the difficulties of presenting a balanced and carefully thought through representation of the National Socialist period and Jewish persecution. In her review of the stage production of the 1958 \textit{Das Tagebuch der Anne Frank} [\textit{The Diary of Anne Frank}] in

\textsuperscript{350} Selma Stern, letter to Max Kreutzberger (LBI), 24 January 1959, pp. 1-2, here p. 2. Nachlass Selma Stern-Taeubler, NL 0120, F 51, UBB.


\textsuperscript{353} See Reichmann’s contribution during a discussion session towards the end of the 1961 Evangelical Church Congress, \textit{ibid.}, p. 119.
Essen she wrote of the need for three steps necessary for the renewal of German society which this performance contributed to: ‘shock, insight, resolution’.354

Wary of the isolation and sentimentalisation of Anne Frank’s experiences in the play, Reichmann hoped that sympathy would lead the viewer to build up a resistance to ‘future temptation’. Her presentation of Weimar Jewry addressed those exaggerative and stereotypical depictions which Nazi propaganda had embedded in the German psyche. She was aware of the challenge not to exonerate or idealise German Jewry, since they were ‘good or un-good, […] lovely or unlovely, […] important and unimportant’, in short ‘ordinary people’.355 Whilst critical of the idolisation of the Jew, in her writings, she joined those who emphasised the ‘contribution’ of the Jew to Weimar German society as well as that to post-war Britain.356

One particular cultural event triggered the discussion of philosemitism by prominent Jewish and Christian intellectuals in Germany, prompted by Robert Neumann’s review of the Berlin performance of George Tabori’s play Die Kannibalen [the cannibals].357 Neumann had stated that both the ‘false and neurotic philosemitism’ of the Germans towards the Jews and the ‘false and neurotic demand of the Jews for “special treatment”’ would have to cease before the ‘real and highly un-neurotic antisemitism among the Germans’ would end.358 In Reichmann’s response she described what Neumann called the ‘philosemitic post-war psychosis’ as no longer something healthy, but questioned whether it was actually something ‘bad’.359 What she considered would be ‘bad’ was if the knowledge of the actions perpetrated in the name of National Socialism had not produced any psychosis in German society. Although she considered there had not been a deep enough reaction given the magnitude of those events, they had nevertheless registered as shock. She questioned however whether the shock methods employed in the play were appropriate, given the public’s susceptibility

358 Ibid.
to the anti-stance, evidenced by contemporary examples such as the underlying attitudes of rebelliousness in the youth.\textsuperscript{360}

She viewed the reactions it had produced on the whole as positive, citing the much quoted phrase from Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s 1772 play \textit{Emilia Galotti} ‘who does not lose his mind over certain things, has none to lose’.\textsuperscript{361} Since the German people were still ‘in the healing process’ rather than having reached the ‘healthy’ stage; care and patience were needed during this process of convalescence in order to acknowledge the ‘political-psychological reality between Jews and non-Jews’. She agreed with Neumann that a normalisation was necessary in the way Jews were treated and related to; she recognised the ‘collective-therapeutic healing-process’ amongst the Jews, but not to the degree Neumann observed. For the Jews she saw the need for a ‘new inner equilibrium that not only legitimates, but which demands engagement’.\textsuperscript{362}

Reichmann critically promoted the deconstruction of prejudices through her own writings, participation in public discussion and analysis of academic work in this area.\textsuperscript{363} Fuelling her own work for the education of West German youth, she considered that prejudice and the influence of the parental generation had the biggest part to play in the attitudes of the young. Warily she judged that groups and individuals working to break down prejudices were a minority, yet their work was exceptional in its formation of interpersonal human relations.\textsuperscript{364} During the 1970 Week of Brotherhood Reichmann addressed \textit{Abitur} students in Dusseldorf speaking from a personal and psychological perspective about the problems of prejudice, negative generalisations and the difficulties of human coexistence.\textsuperscript{365} A benchmark of the intellectual and academic support behind this process was provided by the 1965 ‘Nürnberg Gespräche’ addressing the theme of ‘Attitudes and Inappropriate Attitudes in Germany’, at which Reichmann and Sterling both spoke.\textsuperscript{366} These conferences were organised by Hermann Glaser a leading cultural

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{360} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 3654-55.
\item\textsuperscript{362} Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Das eben ist der Fluch der basen Tat, DaB sie fortzeugend Böses muß gebären’, in ‘Diskussion über die deutsch-jüdische Situation’, \textit{Tribüne}, no. 34 (September 1970), p. 3654, in Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 2, folder 6, LBI\textsuperscript{a}. NY.
\item\textsuperscript{363} For example Eva G. Reichmann, ‘Prejudices. Their Examination and Conquest’, review of K. D. Hartmann (ed.), \textit{Vorurteile, ihre Erforschung und ihre Bekämpfung}, vol. 3, \textit{Politische Psychologie} (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1964), pp. 1-3, manuscript in Eva Reichmann Collection, AR 904, box 1, folder 11, LBI\textsuperscript{a}. NY. It is not clear if this review was published.
\item\textsuperscript{366} \textit{Tribüne} devoted an entire edition to the publication of a selection of the public lectures given as part
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
figure in Nuremberg, predominantly dedicated to the working through of the National Socialist past, attended by scholars and the general public. Following these exchanges Sterling published her analysis of philosemitism and addressed wider audiences through the German media and radio.

In 1971 Reichmann still observed this process, seeing the ‘complete lack of open-mindedness’ between Germans and Jews as a ‘more serious problem’ than antisemitism. She continued however to see overemphasised philosemitism as an unavoidable, and an even natural and desirable intermediary station on the way to sought after objectivity.

She considered psychological normalisation necessary since the relationship between Germans and Jews was still in a process of ‘convalescence’.

3.7 Culminations

As the 1960s drew to a close, it marked the end of a particular era for this group of women. During this decade Arendt’s personal involvements in West Germany had become more distanced. Academically she had achieved recognition and tenure in the America university system. Stern completed her life’s work with the last volume of Der preussische Staat und die Juden. Following this she worked on two republications and edited her husband’s manuscripts and writings. Reichmann like Stern, produced her definitive publication in this decade, aged over seventy. This pulled together the diverse strands of her journalism and academic writings since the early days of her career in the


1930s. It embodied the culmination and fulfilment of her service to German-Jewish scholarship, community and twentieth-century German intellectual discourse. Although her visits and involvements in West Germany became restricted on health grounds, her identity as one of the founding generation of the Leo Baeck Institute and the former German-Jewish elite of the Weimar period, who had settled in Great Britain following the Second World War, took on new significance as many of its leading male figures passed away. Reichmann spoke from a position of personal proximity, leading the commemoration of figures such as Alfred Wiener and Ignaz Maybaum.

Public recognition for the work of these women in post-war West Germany in academic, cultural, intellectual and religious spheres from the Jewish community and the German state was mixed. In 1959 Sterling’s intellectual work to reframe understanding of Christian and Jewish relations in the nineteenth century was lauded when she and Schalom Ben-Chorin were jointly awarded the Leo Baeck Prize.

Following Sterling’s untimely death in 1968, her memory was preserved in the local topography of Frankfurt am Main, when the Eleonore-Sterling-Straße was named in a quarter not far from her former lodgings. The posthumous editions of her writings highlight her special relationship with German-Jewish themes, projecting this aspect of her career above her work in the discipline of political science. The final work published shortly after the death of Sterling, became the second volume in a new interfaith series. So demonstrating the shift, supported in the popular field by Christian academics, she herself had made, from addressing Jewish history and German-Jewish relations to teaching about Judaism itself. In the introduction Dietrich Goldschmidt
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375 Eleonore-Sterling-Straße: the street named in her honour in July 1969, neighboured the Anne-Frank-Straße and the later added Victor-Gollancz-Weg commemorating two other notable former Jewish residents. Reference to correspondence between the Stadtvermessungsamt, Frankfurt am Main and the author, 16 August 2004.
376 All her major monographs were reprinted: Eleonore Sterling, *Der unvollkommene Staat: Studien über Diktatur und Demokratie* (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1968); following her death Eleonore Sterling, *Judenhaft. Die Anfänge des politischen Antisemitismus in Deutschland (1815-1850)* (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1969) and Ismar Elbogen and Eleonore Sterling, *Die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland. Eine Einführung* (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum Verlag, 1988).
emphasised her role as a ‘messenger’ and ‘interpreter’ of Judaism in its broadest sense for many Christians’. Despite this Sterling’s memory has now almost faded in West Germany.

In 1970 Reichmann and Robert Raphael Geis jointly received the Buber-Rosenzweig Medal from the German Council for Christian-Jewish Co-operation for their lead in dialogue and education, particularly regarding the status of minority groups. She also received the Moses Mendelssohn Prize for the promotion of tolerance towards those who think differently and between peoples, races and religions. Reichmann was awarded the Federal Cross of Merit [das Verdienstkreuz – Orden der Deutschen Bundesrepublik] in 1969. A year before she was awarded the Great Cross of Merit [Großes Verdienstkreuz] by the German state she became the subject of an interview with Hans Lamm televised in West Germany. At her death, the German ambassador in London, Gebhardt von Moltke drew attention to the even wider impact of her mediatory role, writing that her death was ‘a great loss […] to the cause of British-German relations’.

Arendt, Reichmann and Stern had their German academic status revalidated long after they had resumed academic involvements in West Germany. Arendt had Rahel Varnhagen formally recognised as her Habilitation in 1971 and Reichmann received her renewed doctorate from the university of Heidelberg in 1973. Stern was presented with an honorary doctorate from the HUC for her contribution to religion and culture in 1956 and in 1963 the university of Munich renewed Stern’s annulled doctorate.

Academically Stern’s ‘doyenne’ status and ‘monumental’ scholarship was duly recognised in the field of German-Jewish historiography, yet she received no national honours. 385

Rooted in the historical juxtaposition of their academic study of German-Jewish history and personal experience of the preceding decades, they had acted as mentors of the path West Germany took to democracy, as well as the popular and academic re-conception of a national historical consciousness, in the wake of the ultra-nationalism of National Socialism. Arendt continued to keep a close eye on the state of West German politics during the 1960s, although she had scaled down her direct engagement with West German political and academic topics. In the American edition of Jaspers’ assessment of the future of West Germany, she affirmed the poignancy of his analysis and reflected on its impact for the reading public and political circles. She reiterated his alarming analysis of the troubled state of parliamentary democracy, which appeared to be sliding towards a ‘two-party dictatorship’ and the concerns he expressed regarding the absence of a new political start following 1945. 386

For Reichmann and Sterling, their work during the 1960s had taken new directions, proving a decisive moment for the place of German-Jewish studies in their wider scholarship as their relationship to the newly institutionalised discipline which they had helped to establish, began to shift. In the case of Stern this evolved into a full identification with the programme of the Leo Baeck Institute, whereas for Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling its capacity to provide a forum for them to fulfil individual academic, philosophical and pedagogic goals became more conflicted. It was outside the LBI that they satisfactorily developed a personalised rapport in the 1960s with a West German audience on paper and in person, particularly as the subject of their writings breached the temporal and disciplinary confines of historical studies.

In the case of Reichmann and Sterling, this decade was witness to their most forthright treatment of German-Jewish traditions, heritage and the historical breakdown

of German – Jewish relations, addressed to West German public and academic domains. The contribution their writings made to post-war West German historiography, *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* and the construction of a national historical identity brings into focus the role of the outsider: international networks of scholars, particularly those in the diasporic field of German-Jewish studies, who informally and formally participated in the development of West German post-war historiography. The past was seen to have a direct relevance to the present and future, particularly through the way it was mediated to the younger generations. Reichmann and Sterling continually challenged stereotyping and prejudice, spearheading the social, political and psychological development of democratic, humanitarian values with the support of the German government, academic and community representatives. Dialogue between the past and the present, between the generations and between Jews and Christians was promoted through their public presentations and the discussions they led. Highly aware of the complex issues of personal authority versus objectivity as survivors, witnesses and representatives of the Weimar generation of German Jewry, their activities during this decade highlight their dynamic intervention. As hybrid representatives: of the German-Jewish diaspora, the international Jewish communities in America and Great Britain and the Jewish community resident in West Germany, in both secular and confessional spheres they shaped discourses which aided the process of addressing the National Socialist past.
Conclusion

It has been my intention not simply to view the lives and intellectual careers of these four prominent German-Jewish scholars at the points their lives and work intersected but to consider the specific junctures which illuminate their interaction with German-Jewish traditions, scholarship and community life during the twentieth century. Viewed across this time span Arendt, Reichmann, Sterling and Stern stand out as prominent publicists, scholars and dialogue partners within the German-Jewish diaspora and West Germany. Their biographies, intellectual character and careers were unique and they feature centrally among the small number of German-Jewish women who were able to resume high-profile careers in the post-war diasporic community. In addition, the presence they commanded in post-war West German academic and public spheres, addressing recent and past German and Jewish history also distinguishes them, since German women historians and intellectuals did not occupy comparable positions during this period.

Arendt, Reichmann and Stern moved from the margins of German scholarship to the centre of German-Jewish intellectual circles across the course of their careers. During the 1920s and 1930s, alongside a large cohort of aspiring women writers and intellectuals, Reichmann and Stern successfully gained employment and publication opportunities at two key German-Jewish institutions. Arendt also successfully published her work in newspapers and academic periodicals serving the community. During this period, gender ambivalently impacted their careers, shaping responses to their work and the academic relationships they forged with male colleagues. The close private and institutional connections they had with key male figures among the German-Jewish intellectual elite enabled their talent to be recognised, developing their reputations and increasing their responsibilities.

Gendered historical subjects and contemporary issues featured in their thinking and writing as they strove to assert their position as female spokeswomen and intellectuals. The contribution Arendt, Reichmann and Stern made to the field of Jewish women’s studies during the Weimar period has received much interest from wider scholarship as an assertion of female intellectuality. This approach has failed to consider their writings in the context of a body of publications asserting German-Jewish historical studies as a subdiscipline of Jewish historiography. In the case of Stern, her work on historical female figures ceased following her employment as a professional historian of German-Jewish history, in the otherwise all-male domain of the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums [Academy for the Science of Judaism]. Reichmann focused
primarily on contemporary issues facing the whole German-Jewish community as circumstances deteriorated, rather than those affecting only women. This was due to her role as an editor and prominent cultural journalist for publications that addressed very broad male and female audiences.

Their study of German-Jewish historical subjects during these challenging years fulfilled a number of functions. It contributed to the discourses which ran in German-Jewish periodicals and newspapers, examining the course of Jewish emancipation and assimilation, analysing the state of German – Jewish relations over the last centuries, contextualising and defending against the antisemitism of the present day and contributing to German-Jewish self-assertion and cultural renewal. Stern could only implicitly address contemporary issues in her historical studies which asserted the dual nature of German-Jewish identity during the modern period. Until her emigration in 1933 Arendt had majored on philosophical retrospectives and a discreet number of historical articles that addressed Jewish emancipation and assimilation. Her journalism had not yet begun to fully address contemporary politics and current affairs. Reichmann held the most frontline position in relation to mediating the realities of everyday life to the German-Jewish community as National Socialism tightened its grip. For her, German and Jewish history provided contexts that illuminated the present, identified positive role models and gave strength and comfort to a community under threat.

Despite the prominent positions and scholarly reputations they had achieved by the 1930s, experiences of marginality continued to be present in various forms throughout their lives: from Imperial Germany through the Weimar period, under National Socialism and in new countries of refuge, not least in post-war West Germany. Discriminated against in German society and academia during the 1920s and 1930s as women and Jews, their marginality encompassed a more complex set of identities following emigration: as German-Jewish refugees in new host countries and former German citizens in post-war Germany. Their post-war identities were not articulated in strongly gendered terms, being shaped more decisively by geographical boundaries. The German-Jewish diaspora was located internationally in the margins of numerous new host countries, yet West Germany played a pivotal role as a key point of reference and anchorage.

Their post-war efforts to rebuild lives and careers strove to break from the marginal position of displaced émigrés. The employment they gained was directly predicated on their intellectual skills and specialist knowledge. Unlike many of their former male and female colleagues, they succeeded in re-establishing themselves and
creating a place for their expertise and knowledge. These efforts took place within the context of the dispersed intellectual community and the positions they achieved placed them again at the centre of the elite and predominantly male German-Jewish intellectual leadership. The niches they began to develop in the first post-war decades drew heavily on the personal mediation of their experiences of the German-Jewish twentieth century that featured in their writings. They participated privately and institutionally to the reconstruction of German-Jewish community life in the diaspora, salvaging its cultural heritage, developing their involvement with the nascent discipline of German-Jewish historiography. They constantly strove to increase their exposure in mainstream West German academic life, as their historical and contemporary studies emerged from the margins of the diaspora and diversified within the disciplines of sociology, philosophy, political science and theory. At the same time they worked as observers and mentors of West German reconstruction.

Although their institutional roles gave them common aims and responsibilities at the centre of the German-Jewish intellectual community, their careers showed very individual commitments and their writing and thinking cannot be brought together to form a homogenous discourse. Despite this their disparate disciplinary and analytical approaches show common concerns present in their work. In the post-war period Sterling emerged within this group through her commitment to pursue multiple roles at important institutions and networking to promote German-Jewish historical studies. These activities affirmed her close affiliation and collaboration with Reichmann and Stern. Her contribution to the fields of historical and contemporary Jewish/non-Jewish relations and West German academia were testament to the reputation she quickly established following her doctorate and her commitment to the study of German–Jewish historical relations. She determinedly sought a place among the established ranks of senior German-Jewish scholars, boldly addressing contemporary issues alongside Arendt and Reichmann. Although a generation younger than her academic mentors and colleagues Reichmann and Stern, Sterling’s academic career, following her permanent return to Germany in 1953 until her early death, lasted only sixteen years. This stands in marked contrast to the longevity of life and careers they enjoyed. Yet what Sterling achieved in that short span of time was remarkable and places her on the same level as the other three, as an outstanding female German-Jewish scholar of the twentieth century.

Post-war the experience of gendered isolation within the German-Jewish intellectual elite was more stark and poignant for these women than it had been in the
1920s and 1930s. The employment they achieved in the years following emigration at Jewish and German-Jewish cultural institutions in new surroundings: the American Jewish Archives, Jewish Cultural Reconstruction and the Wiener Library, placed them in important positions in the German-Jewish diaspora bearing responsibility for academic research and contact with post-war Germany. Privately and institutionally, alongside very few other women, they created local and international infrastructures and networks on which the foundations of the new discipline of German-Jewish historical studies were constructed, later formalised under the Leo Baeck Institute (LBI). Throughout the wider German and international academic community they featured among the few scholars who published on antisemitism and historical German – Jewish relations in the early 1950s. Further still, their intellectual concerns pushed at disciplinary confines and aspired to transcend national boundaries, to address and publish for a West German audience.

The work they undertook to present German-Jewish history, heritage and traditions to West German audiences, re-asserting their place in German history, was underpinned by concerns for post-war Jewish/non-Jewish relations in West Germany. This began to redress, on a contemporary and historiographical level, the exclusion of German Jewry from the history and body of the West German nation. Alongside their work to assert a diasporic German-Jewish historiography, they supported its reinsertion in the West German historical field through independent publications and growing academic reputation as subject specialists. This developed on a sociological level as educators and dialogue partners in West German society.

Their careers and writings show that the genre of German-Jewish historiography, which evolved through the twentieth century, took shape either side of the most catastrophic occurrence in German-Jewish history, when the future of German Jewry hung in the balance. Their participation in the institutionalisation of the discipline post-war, prior to and through the LBI, was significant and should not be overlooked, despite the fact they undertook higher-profiled activities in parallel to this work, seeking alternative public forums for their engagement with German-Jewish history, pursuing personal agendas and disciplinary breadth. Reichmann and Sterling in particular transmitted historical knowledge, promoting German and Jewish history education, through discussion of Jewish/non-Jewish relations, personally taking German recent history to a non-academic, non-Jewish readership and audience in West Germany; lifting discourses off the printed page.
Twenty-first-century German-Jewish scholarship and community life is frequently deconstructed in terms of continuity and discontinuity. Continuity points to the continuation of former elements of émigrés’ personal lives and intellectual engagements in the post-war period, whereas discontinuity identifies those aspects of their lives and interactions which came to an end between 1933 and 1945. Focusing on these two dimensions is however too simplistic and reductive an approach to fully acknowledge the new elements in their post-war lives which drew upon and diverged from the familiar and former, particularly in relation to the institutionalisation of German-Jewish historiography.

Two elements of their contribution to this discipline stand out. Firstly they fostered continuity between the nascent discipline during the 1920s and 1930s and the newly instituted discipline from the late 1950s, by intertextually connecting with their own writings of the earlier period and the scholarship of their colleagues. They republished earlier work and began to write the history of early twentieth-century German Jewry from the inside out. It is also significant that their contribution to the institutionalisation of German-Jewish historiography post-war initially took place outside a national framework, in an international context. Augmenting the original aim of the displaced scholars who formulated the LBI’s central mission to provide a history of German Jewry for the surviving community’s heirs, they went further to re-insert the study of German-Jewish history and traditions into the German historical context. They wrote for a German readership, supporting and promoting new awareness of Germany’s Jewish heritage beyond commemoration as an integral part of West German historical heritage.

Scholarship on the reconstruction of post-war West German historiography has tended to be circumscribed by strong national and disciplinary boundaries. The limited inroads scholarship has made to analyse the international networks of scholars in the diasporic field of German-Jewish historical studies obscures the significant contribution of ‘outsiders’ to the development of West German historiography, in particular their work to insert the German-Jewish past into the study of German history beyond, accentuating state politics, persecution and antisemitism.

The positive value of these women’s autobiographical experiences during the 1930s and 1940s had a great influence on the positions of authority they gained as respected scholars and spokespeople for the Weimar generation. The inherent tensions between subjective and objective scholarship were deeply felt elements of their grappling with recent history. This tension has been identified in the work of key male German historians who addressed recent German history and National Socialism writing
in the first post-war decades. Steven E. Aschheim has compared the impact of the personal experience of that era on these academics’ work with the influence evident in the work of male Jewish scholars. This group of female intellectuals should however not be left out of the whole comparative picture. They also explicitly dealt with the problematic aspects of their dual identities: as witnesses of an era and scholars of the same. Their willingness to personally discuss subjective beliefs, opinions and difficult questions with dialogue partners, as Reichmann formulated; as two individuals looking into the abyss together, throws light on the role of historical education outside the mainstream institutions of West German historiography.

In the case of Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling their personal intellectual aims and humanitarian vision went far beyond their key contributions to the institutionalisation of German-Jewish historiography. Arendt pursued an academic career as a political theorist in parallel with her Jewish-centred activities. This aspect of her career became more dominant as her standing in Jewish circles was compromised by the outcry over her publication *Eichmann in Jerusalem.* Stern on the other hand consolidated her dedication to historical research and the study of German-Jewish history post-war.

They spearheaded reconnection with Germany: physically and intellectually, through public speaking and personal contacts with German scholars, as representative spokespeople and independent individuals. This was pioneering work for German-Jewish émigrés, not least as women. Through personal dialogue the four women established ongoing discussion and avenues to insert German-Jewish history and cultural heritage within the post-war German public sphere, asserting a German-Jewish voice in West Germany. The dialogue they promoted encompassed exchanges between Jew and non-Jew, facilitating the continued interaction and mutual influence between German-Jewish and German culture and history. The existence of such a dialogue throughout the modern period was an important and much discussed element of the history of German and Jewish relations written post-war. Perhaps because of the immediate and urgent vision Reichmann and Sterling had for the task of reconciliation and re-education
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1 Unpublished paper given by Steven E. Aschheim as guest speaker at the Post-Doctoral Colloquium for German-Jewish History [Doktoranden-Colloquium zur deutsch-jüdischen Geschichte] convened by the Wissenschaftliche Arbeitsgemeinschaft des Leo-Baeck-Instituts, Schloss Elmau, Upper Bavaria, 16 February 2004.


through dialogue, they remained on the periphery of the deconstruction of the historical existence of a German-Jewish symbiosis.

Reichmann and Sterling took their commitment to popular historical, sociological and political re-education to new levels in the 1960s through German-Jewish reconciliation. They forged prominent roles in the emerging national programme of interfaith dialogue between Christians and Jews in West Germany under the auspices of the Gesellschaften für Christlich-Jüdische Zusammenarbeit [Societies for Christian-Jewish Collaboration] and later the German Evangelical Church. Their participation in Christian–Jewish dialogue went beyond the theological discussion of shared biblical heritage. They promoted an agenda, which addressed the process of Vergangenheitsbewältigung, morally supporting democracy in West Germany in their self-appointed roles as mentors and observers. These roles were closely bound up with their external affiliations, as representatives of the German-Jewish diaspora and the international Jewish community. They were instrumental in transmitting echoes of West German democratic progress and moral re-education, reporting abroad to Jewish interest groups, government officials and popular audiences in America, Great Britain and beyond.

Both their post-war involvements with West German reconstruction and standing in the German-Jewish intellectual diaspora were shaped by their multiple identities, as much as by any gendered imperative. Gender inherently influenced private and public responses to their work, yet it is striking that it does not appear to have been a more decisive factor, given their singular appearance in the mainly male-inhabited spheres they worked in. Amongst their generation of refugees, the older three were familiar names as they had proved their competence and scholarly reputation before they had fled Germany. Yet their agency went beyond the German-Jewish diaspora and familiar circles. They exposed themselves and asserted their intellectual integrity in the West German public domain, facing new audiences and spheres of action. Their public appearance was particularly poignant due to their identity as members of the Weimar generation National Socialism had sought to destroy.

Their transmission of knowledge was directed for the education and common good of all. Arendt, Reichmann and Sterling encouraged criticality, self-reflection and analytical questioning among listeners and readers. Their work to broaden public knowledge of the German-Jewish heritage of Germany and encourage personal reflection on past actions and events was not intended as a reversal of the former power relationship between German and Jew. They strove to empower their audiences and
readers to determine the course of society by considering responsible action, through an understanding of the roots of prejudice in ignorance, misunderstanding and human isolation. Reichmann’s work in the post-war period continued to transcend gender specificity as it had at the end of the 1930s. She addressed West German academic audiences with male predominance but also spoke to young audiences and interfaith groups, which meant that mixed audiences of men, women, young, old, Jews and Christians heard her speak and were brought into dialogue with one another.

There is a strong correlation between the success they experienced in their careers, which placed them at the leading edge of academic and intellectual German-Jewish institutions and a shift away from gendered subjects or discourse. This shift had begun for Reichmann and Stern during the Weimar period. Moving from the margins to the centre was also a process of competing to write outside a feminist agenda. For Arendt and Sterling who both aspired to academic careers in the university systems of America and West Germany respectively, their experiences of discrimination against female academics perhaps sharpened their efforts to equal their predominantly male contemporaries, forcing gender issues out of their writings. Amongst the German-Jewish elite, gendered restrictions were of less consequence. It is notable however that they did not attain ultimate leadership roles which were occupied by male colleagues.

Arendt addressed the lives and thinking of few female figures following the post-war publication of her study Rahel Varnhagen and interest in female historical experience and gendered issues did not re-emerge in later work. Gender and feminism were largely absent in these women’s writings as either analytical tools or ideological frameworks. In part this is accounted for by their belonging to a generation which fell between the pioneers of the German women’s movement at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth and the generations championing feminism in the 1960s and 1970s. Since their concerns for interpersonal and intergroup relations had been shaped by their experiences of a racial prejudice that did not differentiate between the sexes, their approach to addressing and redressing prejudice in society, promoting understanding and tolerance, encompassed as broad an audience as possible.

The experiences of Arendt, Reichmann, Sterling and Stern as German-Jewish scholars, observers of German cultural, social, political affairs and participants in
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academic and public dialogue post-war between former Jews from Germany and West Germans, allow the present-day scholar to look at a number of key historiographical issues and historical events of the German-Jewish twentieth century in a more nuanced way. They illuminate the experiences of prominent intellectual women within central institutions of Weimar Jewry, who subordinated their assertion of female intellectual identity to the central discourses which underpinned the defence of the community. Following emigration their stories show that as female scholars and writers they personally carved niches for their expertise in the German-Jewish community and beyond, building on their former reputations and individual commitment to personal and collective goals.

In particular they shed light on the very intense and engaged relationships between former Jews from Germany and the new West German state from the late 1940s. The intervention of Jewish groups outside Germany, shaping German and Jewish reconstruction in West Germany was a two-way commitment, negotiating the complex individual, collective and institutional relationships between the German-Jewish diaspora and the former Heimat. Their concern for the post-war phenomena of antisemitism and philosemitism in West German society demands that the responses of Jewish figureheads and community members be taken into consideration when deconstructing the scope and effect of these phenomena on the wider populace and government policy.

Their stories adjust certain readings of post-war West German Vergangenheitsbewältigung since the study of these processes has tended to be localised on secular West German settings. Most significantly the work of Reichmann and Sterling in the religious spheres of interfaith dialogue adds a new facet to this picture, linking academic, popular and political domains. This highlights alternative national initiatives, promoting engagement with the process of coming to terms with the recent past, shaped and observed closely by Jewish dialogue partners. Similarly their contribution to the reconstruction of a West German historical consciousness, redefined a place for German-Jewish historiography within this canon. Although they played a central role in the early work of the Leo Baeck Institute to firmly establish the discipline of German-Jewish historical studies in the diaspora, independently they brought German-Jewish history to bear on the writing of twentieth-century German history post-war and the reconstruction of popular and academic approaches to the Jewish heritage of Germany.
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