

Anna Koch, Stephan Stach

Introduction

Holocaust Memory and the Cold War: Remembering across the Iron Curtain

Even before the end of the Second World War, Europeans across the continent, among them some of the few surviving Jews, began to chronicle events, write memoirs and histories, and create narratives about the war and genocide. They did not do so in isolation. When individuals turn their recollections into a story, they rely on and draw from existing narratives, knowledge, and belief systems.¹ One of the most crucial frameworks into which memories were inserted, one that shaped peoples' recollections of World War II perhaps more than any other, was the Cold War. In the aftermath of the Second World War and following Germany's failed attempt to establish a new world order through extreme violence, the Cold War emerged as a dominant structure politicizing everyday life and shaping relationships between ideologies, states, and societies.

A few years after the end of the war, the former allies of the anti-Hitler coalition had become bitter enemies, dividing the world into two antagonistic blocs, led by the United States and the Soviet Union, respectively. Both these "super-powers" sought to secure and expand their spheres of influence. At its core, the Cold War was an ideological conflict between two different economic, political, and social systems: the liberal-democratic capitalism of the US versus the communism of the USSR; two worldviews that entailed different visions of the future and contrasting understandings of the past. The resulting arms race, the mutual spying and threats as well as proxy wars fought in non-European areas created an atmosphere of insecurity and fear of another major war in Europe, on both sides of the so-called Iron Curtain.

On either side, individuals faced pressure to commit themselves to the ideological foundations of the dominant camp. In the mid-1950s, when Stalinism and the most severe manifestations of anti-Communism faded, this pressure eased noticeably, though it never disappeared. The Cold War proved a persistent framework. It influenced how people, societies, and states dealt with and understood the war, the Holocaust, and its aftereffects. Foregrounding its essential role, this

1 Aleida Assmann, "Transformations between History and Memory," *Social Research* 75, no. 1 (2008): 49–72; Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Mary Fulbrook, "History-Writing and Collective Memory," in *Writing the History of Memory*, ed. Stefan Berger and William John Niven (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014), 65–88.

book highlights how the Cold War affected research, legal proceedings, and collective as well as individual memories of the murder of European Jews, and how the geographical and political location of historians and other actors of remembrance influenced the reception and categorization of their work. While the memory and historiography of the Holocaust changed significantly after 1990, in many ways perceptions shaped by the Cold War survived its end.

The understanding of the West as the democratic Free World and the East as totalitarian and repressive has continued to impact how scholars have evaluated efforts to commemorate the Holocaust in East and West after the collapse of the Soviet bloc. Yet historians tend to neglect the role the block confrontation played in shaping narratives in Western Europe, the US, and Israel.² At the same time, treatments of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union oscillate between suggesting a complete suppression of Holocaust memory³ and pointing to ideological control and manipulations, depicting Eastern memory as inauthentic.⁴ The Cold War paradigm led to a dismissal of narratives that see the murder of European Jews through an anti-fascist lens presenting anti-fascism as a mere tool for suppressing Holocaust memory, without considering the possibility that it could also serve as a vehicle for expressing recollections of anti-Jewish violence.⁵ This book joins re-

2 At a conference dedicated to Raul Hilberg's contribution to Holocaust historiography organized by the *Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschungen* in October 2017, no paper addressed the Cold War context of his pivotal book *The Destruction of the European Jews* (1961) and its reception, while virtually every other aspect of his personality and oeuvre was illuminated. For the program, see: <https://zzf-potsdam.de/en/veranstaltungen/raul-hilberg-die-holocaust-historiographie-eine-tagung-aus-anlass-seines-10>, accessed May 27, 2024. This is also the case in the volume that emerged from the conference, see: René Schott, ed., *Raul Hilberg und die Holocaust-Historiographie* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag 2019).

3 For example, see Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945* (New York: Penguin Books, 2005), 821–822; William Korey, "In History's 'Memory Hole': The Soviet Treatment of the Holocaust," in *Contemporary Views on the Holocaust*, ed. Randolph L. Braham (Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff, 1983), 143–156; Randolph L. Braham, "Hungary: The Assault on the Historical Memory of the Holocaust," in *The Holocaust in Hungary: Seventy Years Later*, ed. Randolph L. Braham and András Kovács (Budapest: CEU Press, 2016), 261–310.

4 Thomas C. Fox, "The Holocaust under Communism," in *The Historiography of the Holocaust*, ed. Dan Stone (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 421; Jeffrey Herf, *Divided Memory: Nazi Past in the Two Germanys* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997); Lucy S. Dawidowicz, *The Holocaust and the Historians* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981).

5 See, for instance, Dan Diner, "On the Ideology of Antifascism," *New German Critique* 67 (Winter 1996): 130; Anson Rabinbach, "Antifascism," in *Staging the Third Reich: Essays in Cultural and Intellectual History*, ed. Anson Rabinbach, Stefanos Geroulanos, and Dagmar Herzog (London: Routledge, 2020), 189–197; Antonia Grunenberg, *Antifaschismus: Ein deutscher Mythos* (Reinbeck: Rowohlt Verlag, 1993); Peter Monteath, "Holocaust Remembrance in the German Democratic Republic – and Beyond," in *Bringing the Dark Past to Light: The Reception of the Holocaust in Post-*

cent research that has challenged the notion that remembrance of the Holocaust was not possible or only possible in a contrived, inauthentic form in the states of the Eastern bloc and provides a more complex picture of how the Nazi genocide was remembered in East and West.⁶ The contributions to this volume examine how political interests influenced commemoration in *both* East and West and at the same time show how individual actors carved out a space to remember the Holocaust in ways that modified dominant Cold War narratives and at times even stood at odds with them. This book also reveals networks across the Iron Curtain on which these actors relied to share knowledge about the Holocaust, engage in debates over its interpretation, and clash over its meaning.

The “Free World” and the “Totalitarian East”

In March 1946, Winston Churchill, Britain’s wartime prime minister, declared that “from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic an iron curtain has de-

communist Europe, ed. John-Paul Himka and Joanna B. Michlic (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2013), 223–260.

6 A number of recent works reconsider Holocaust memory in socialist Eastern Europe: See Kata Bohus, Peter Hallama, and Stephan Stach, ed., *Growing in the Shadow of Antifascism: Remembering the Holocaust in State-Socialist Eastern Europe* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2022); Peter Hallama, *Nationale Helden und jüdische Opfer. Tschechische Repräsentationen des Holocaust* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015); David Shneer, “An Alternative World: Jews in the German Democratic Republic, Their Transnational Networks, and a Global Jewish Communist Community,” in *Jewish Lives under Communism: New Perspectives*, ed. Kateřina Čapková and Kamil Kijek (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2022); Philipp Graf, “Taking Up the Cause of the Jewish Collective in Berlin’s Soviet Sector during the “Interregnum” from 1945 To 1950,” in *Our Courage – Jews in Europe 1945–48*, ed. Kata Bohus, Atina Grossmann, Werner Hanak, and Mirjam Wenzel (Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2020); Bill Niven, “Remembering Nazi Anti-Semitism in the GDR,” in *Memorialization in Germany since 1945*, ed. Bill Niven and Chloe Paver (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Manuela Gerlof, *Tonspuren. Erinnerungen an den Holocaust im Hörspiel der DDR (1945–1989)* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010); Alexander Walther, “Keine Erinnerung, nirgends? Die Shoah und die DDR,” in *Deutschland Archiv*, August 6, 2019, <https://www.bpb.de/293937>, accessed May 27, 2024; Anna Koch, *Home after Fascism: Italian and German Jews after the Holocaust* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2023); Hannah Maischein, *Augenzeugenschaft, Visualität Politik. Polnische Erinnerung an die deutsche Judenvernichtung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015); Imke Hansen, “Nie wieder Auschwitz!” *Die Entstehung eines Symbols und der Alltag einer Gedenkstätte* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2015); Regina Fritz, *Nach Krieg und Judenmord. Ungarns Geschichtspolitik seit 1944* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012).

scended across the [European] continent.”⁷ Churchill’s speech resonated far beyond the small American college town where he delivered it. His call for Western Europe and the United States to stand together to defy the Soviet threat would soon become Cold War orthodoxy. The Cold War had divided Europe (as well as much of the world) into two hostile camps. These two camps told different stories about the war. Narrating the past soon became a signifier to assert belonging to one or the other camp, often relying on the same sources for opposite narrations. The effort to align narratives about the past along the ideological divide may be clearest in the case of Germany. While the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) looked back at a shared past, the two states created distinct official narratives about the war, carefully placing themselves either within the “democratic free world” or the “anti-fascist and socialist collective.”

With the end of the war, the anti-Hitler coalition’s shared commitment to anti-fascism fractured. The Eastern narrative celebrated the Red Army for its glorious victory over fascist barbarism, and the Soviet Union and the communist bloc used the dichotomy of fascism versus anti-fascism to divide the postwar world into friend and foe.⁸ In this view, fascism represented the most aggressive expression of the “bourgeois” political movement, whose main objective was to enshrine capitalism as the dominating system. Consequently, all states of the Western bloc could be declared as potentially fascist.⁹

In the West, anti-fascism soon gained the stigma of being little more than a smokescreen for communist ideology.¹⁰ Western academic Sovietology dominated by the totalitarian model underlined the similarities between communism and Nazism, leading to a more or less open equation of both systems – a way of thinking that became prevalent also, and perhaps even more so, outside these aca-

7 Winston Churchill at Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, March 5, 1946, <https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/cold-war-on-file/iron-curtain-speech/>, accessed April 9, 2024.

8 Hugo García, Mercedes Yusta, Xavier Tabet, and Cristina Clímaco, “Introduction: Beyond Revisionism: Rethinking Antifascism in the Twenty-First Century,” in *Rethinking Antifascism: History, Memory and Politics, 1922 to the Present*, ed. Hugo García, Mercedes Yusta, Xavier Tabet, and Cristina Clímaco (New York: Berghahn Books, 2016), 1–18, here 2.

9 Michael Seidman, *Transatlantic Antifascisms: From the Spanish Civil War to the End of World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); Bohus, Hallama, and Stach, “Introduction,” in *Growing in the Shadow of Antifascism*, 1–18, here 3.

10 García, Yusta, Tabet, and Clímaco, “Introduction,” 2–4; with a view on Holocaust memory: Bohus, Hallama, and Stach, “Introduction.”

demic circles.¹¹ Although some early proponents of totalitarianism, above all Hannah Arendt, did not perceive post-Stalinist communism as totalitarian, a totalitarian lens remained crucial for many Western observers.¹² With fluctuating intensity and depending on political opportunism, both sides declared the other to be the ideological successor to Nazi Germany.

Pressure on individuals, including Jews in East and West, to conform to the dominant ideology increased in the early years of the Cold War, albeit to different degrees and with different consequences depending on the location. Distrust and mutual insinuations characterized the initial phase of the Cold War and spectacular trials based on alleged or actual espionage charges in which Jews played a central role, dominated the postwar years. After the break between the former Allied powers, a phase of isolation began in the Soviet-dominated bloc and in the Soviet Union itself. Contacts with the West were generally regarded with suspicion. Cooperation between Soviet and American Jews established by the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee (JAC) broke down.¹³ The JAC had served the Soviet Union well during the war in acquiring support and financial resources in the fight against Nazi Germany. After the war, the committee's self-confident appearance vis-à-vis Soviet institutions and its numerous contacts in non-socialist countries caused problems, as did its attempt to present documentation of the Holocaust in the form of a Black Book.¹⁴ In her chapter in this volume, Elisabeth Gallas examines the joint American and Soviet effort to produce such a Black Book detailing Nazi atrocities, highlighting the challenges of this unlikely cooperation. In 1948, Soviet authorities arrested 15 leading figures of the JAC, five of them Yiddish writers, who had played a crucial role in building trust and gaining the support of American Jews. In a secret trial held in 1952, all but two were sentenced to death for espionage and subsequently executed.¹⁵

11 Frederic J. Fleron, Jr. and Erik P. Hoffmann, "Communist Studies and Political Science: Cold War and Peaceful Coexistence," in *Post-Communist Studies and Political Science: Methodology and Empirical Theory in Sovietology*, ed. Frederic J. Fleron, Jr. and Erik P. Hoffmann (Boulder: Westview Press, 1993), 3–26.

12 See: "Stalinism in Retrospect: Hannah Arendt," edited with notes by Peter Baehr, *History and Theory* 54, no. 3 (October 2015): 353–366; Hannah Arendt, *Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966).

13 The Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee (JAC) was founded in the USSR in 1941.

14 Diana Dimitru, "From Friends to Enemies? The Soviet State and Its Jews after the Holocaust," in *Jewish Lives under Communism*, 71–90.

15 Joshua Rubenstein and Vladimir P. Naumov, "Introduction," in *Stalin's Secret Pogrom. The Postwar Inquisition of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee*, ed. Joshua Rubenstein, and Vladimir P. Naumov (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 1–63; Arno Lustiger, *Stalin and the Jews: The*

The Slánský Trial in Prague held in November of the same year, by contrast, was publicly staged. Rudolf Slánský, a former leading figure of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and several other, mostly Jewish, defendants faced allegations of espionage and “Trotskyite-Titoist-Zionist” conspiracy in the service of American imperialism.¹⁶ The trial was broadcast over the radio and excerpts were shown on newsreels.¹⁷ Similar cases were held or prepared in other states of the Soviet-dominated bloc and in Moscow the Ministry of State exposed the alleged conspiracy of nine prominent, mainly Jewish, doctors who supposedly planned to murder Soviet leaders.¹⁸ Soviet press reports on the “Doctors’ Plot” accused the physicians of being terrorists and agents of the Zionist American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (Joint), which was depicted as a branch office of American intelligence.¹⁹ The Joint had indeed close ties to American intelligence circles; Moses Beckelman, a high-ranking Joint official in Europe and from 1951 its general director, had worked for the Office of Strategic Services, the predecessor of the CIA, during the war. In the paranoid atmosphere of late Stalinism, however, accusations needed no factual basis.

The Joint, as well as Zionist organizations, were part of a list of foreign entities in whose service the alleged traitors and spies supposedly stood. Most Jews in post-war Europe had received support from the Joint in one way or another and its aid packages at times even reached the Soviet Union. Attacks on prominent Jews and high-ranking Jewish officials as alleged Zionists and agents of the Joint made the Jewish population in the states of the Soviet-dominated bloc realize that they could all potentially be faced with such accusations. This was bound to cause fear even among convinced Jewish communists. In the course of “uncovering” the doctors’

Red Book: The Tragedy of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee and the Soviet Jews (New York: Enigma, 2003), 221–247.

¹⁶ Karel Kaplan, *Report on the Murder of the General Secretary* (London: I. B. Tauris & Co., 1990); Jan Gerber, *Ein Prozess in Prag. Das Volk gegen Rudolf Slánský und Genossen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016).

¹⁷ The recordings of the trial, which were thought to have been lost, were found again in 2018. There are more than sixty hours of audio and several hours of film material. See: Stephan Stach, “Prager Giftfund. Ein Schauprozess im Bild,” *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, no. 3, January 8, 2019.

¹⁸ Jeffrey Herf, “East German Communists and the Jewish Question: The Case of P. M.,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 29, no. 4 (October 1994): 627–661; Wolfgang Kießling, *Partner im “Narrenparadies.” Der Freundeskreis um Noel Field und Paul Merker* (Berlin: Dietz, 1994).

¹⁹ *Pravda*, January 13, 1953. On the Doctors’ Plot, see: Jonathan Brent and Vladimir Naumov, *Stalin’s Last Crime: The Plot against Jewish Doctors, 1948–1953*; on its long-term impact on Soviet Jews, see: Anna Shternshis, “I Was Not Like Everybody Else”: Soviet Jewish Doctors Remember the Doctors’ Plot,” in *Jewish Lives under Communism*, 91–110.

conspiracy, the press also reported on the doctors' links to the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee. The JAC members, previously useful to the Soviet rulers, were now labeled Zionist-nationalist agents and the Black Book could not be published.²⁰ The repressive nature of late Stalinism restricted open discussions, publications, and commemoration of the Nazi mass murder of Jews in Eastern Europe.

Democracies in Western Europe and North America, if to a lesser degree and by different means, also tried to influence or silence recollections that did not fit within a narrative shaped by anti-communism. In the United States, narratives of anti-fascist unity that had been popular during the war were no longer welcome. Communist Jews as well as "fellow travelers" faced increasing political repression with the spread of McCarthyism and its inquisitorial atmosphere. Communist immigrants of Jewish origin felt they could not remain in the United States, and some, prominently among them Gerhart Eisler, were arrested.²¹ In the letters to her husband, Hilde Eisler, who had recently learned about the murder of her mother and sister in Nazi-occupied Europe, linked her current experience of anti-communist persecution in the United States to memories of persecution under Nazism in Germany.²² Her letters speak to the concern among Jewish communists, who perceived the crack-down on communism in light of a continuous threat of fascism. The oppressive atmosphere of the McCarthy era reminded communist and left-wing German-Jewish immigrants in the USA of their experience of anti-communist and antisemitic persecution in Nazi Germany in the early 1930s and made a return to the Soviet occupation zone and later the GDR seem the best or even the only option.²³ After all, the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party (SED) had not only shown greater interest in the return of emigrants than the West German political elite, the "better" Germany

²⁰ Frank Grüner, *Patrioten und Kosmopoliten. Juden im Sowjetstaat 1941–1953* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008), 111–113, 121–128; Gennady Estraiikh, "The Life, Death, and Afterlife of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee," *East European Jewish Affairs* 48, no. 2 (2018): 144.

²¹ See, for instance, Phillip Deery, "A Blot upon Liberty": McCarthyism, Dr. Barsky and the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee," *American Communist History* 8, no. 2 (2009): 167–196; Elizabeth Wenger, "Speak, Memory? War Narratives and Censorship in the GDR," *The Slavonic and East European Review* 96, no. 4 (October 2018): 642–671; Ellen Schrecker, *Many Are the Crimes: McCarthyism in America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 124–128. On the witch hunt atmosphere, see also Alfred Kantorowicz, *Deutsches Tagebuch* (Munich: Kindler, 1964), 98; Ingeborg Rapoport, *Meine ersten drei Leben: Erinnerungen* (Berlin: NORA, 2002). Gerhart Eisler was sentenced to jail for misrepresenting his party affiliation on his immigration application. When released on bail, he managed to flee the United States on a Polish ship.

²² Letters from Brunhilde Eisler to Gerhart Eisler, February 26, 1947, and March 19, 1947, Federal Archives in Berlin (Bundesarchiv Berlin), NY 4117/61.

²³ See, for example, Rapoport, *Meine ersten drei Leben*, 211–212, 270–280; Kantorowicz, *Deutsches Tagebuch*, 96–98; John Borneman and Jeffrey M. Peck, *Sojourners: The Return of German Jews and the Question of Identity* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), 81–101.

was also more consistent in removing former Nazis from the state apparatus than West Germany. Several prominent Jewish emigrants, among them the writers Anna Seghers and Arnold Zweig, the composer Hanns Eisler, and the literary scholars Hans Mayer and Alfred Kantorowicz, returned to the GDR and became part of the state's cultural and political elite. Some of these remigrants including Kantorowicz later left the GDR disillusioned, but remaining in the US had seemed impossible to most communists.²⁴

Fear of political persecution spread among American Jews who were disproportionately targeted under McCarthyism. During the 1930s and 1940s, the American Communist Party, as well as other leftwing parties like the Bund and left-wing Zionists, had gained support among American Jews, especially among immigrants from Eastern Europe. In the 1950s, this made them suspect of being involved in “un-American activities.” A commitment to the United States was no longer possible without pledging anti-communism, causing heated debates within the Jewish community.²⁵ The arrest, trial, and subsequent execution of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg exacerbated existing concerns. The accusations of spying for the Soviet Union against the communist Jewish couple pressured leftist and liberal Jews and Jewish organizations to distance themselves from communism. The couple's death sentence in 1951 and their execution in 1953, which took place despite the numerous and sometimes prominent appeals for clemency, brought back memories of the war years.²⁶ Communist Jews in France, for instance, looked at Jews condemned by McCarthyism, in particular Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, as victims of antisemitism, connecting American anti-communism and the Nazi persecution of Jews.²⁷

24 See Hendrik Niether, *Leipziger Juden und die DDR. Eine Existenzerfahrung im Kalten Krieg* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 41–43; Schrecker, *Many Are the Crimes*, 124–128; Mary Fulbrook, *Reckonings: Legacies of Nazi Persecution and the Quest for Justice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), 357; Koch, *Home after Fascism*, 105, 106, 135; Karin Hartewig, *Zurückgekehrt. Die Geschichte der jüdischen Kommunisten in der DDR* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2000), 195.

25 Schrecker, *Many Are the Crimes*, 15, 39–41; Susan A. Glenn, *The Jewish Cold War: Anxiety and Identity in the Aftermath of the Holocaust*, David W. Belin Lecture in American Jewish Affairs. Belin Lecture Series, Vol. 24 (Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Publishing, University of Michigan Library, 2014), <https://www.fulcrum.org/concern/monographs/5999n585k>, accessed May 28, 2024; Leonard I. Beerman, *The Eternal Dissident: Rabbi Leonard I. Beerman and the Radical Imperative to Think and Act*, ed. David N. Myers (Oakland: University of California Press, 2018); Aviva Weingarten, *Jewish Organizations' Response to Communism and to Senator McCarthy* (London: Vallentine Mitchell; in association with the European Jewish Publication Society, 2008).

26 Deborah Dash Moore, “Reconsidering the Rosenbergs: A Symbol and Substance in Second Generation American Jewish Consciousness,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 8, no. 1 (Fall 1988): 21–37, here 28–29.

27 See Simon Perego's chapter in this volume.

Communists and leftists in the West frequently challenged the dominant anti-communist narrative. They highlighted the role of the Soviet army in the liberation of the camps and the role of the communist resistance across Europe during the war, which did not comfortably fit the totalitarian framework. Such an emphasis on the Soviet role in rescuing Jews during the Holocaust was often accompanied by the propagation of a narrative depicting the Soviet Union as a force for peace that opposed Western imperialism.²⁸ Boaz Cohen's chapter in this volume sheds light on the role memories of Soviet liberators played in Israeli discourse.

Stalin's death in 1953 and the decline of McCarthyism in the mid-1950s noticeably eased the ideological pressure on both sides of the Iron Curtain, broadening the scope to reconsider the war and the Holocaust. In the East, this meant turning away from the teleological utopianism of the Stalin era, which saw the achievement of communism as the inevitable goal of history. The relationship between the party and society changed, enabling criticisms from below, albeit within narrow limits.²⁹

Nazi perpetrator trials, held on both sides of the Iron Curtain, and the debates that accompanied them played an important role in generating discussions of and interest in the Holocaust. Some of these trials, like the GDR's trials of the West German federal minister Theodor Oberländer (1960) and Hans Globke, the closest associate of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer (1963), were staged and took place in the absence of the defendants.³⁰ These trials formed part of the GDR's propaganda campaign pointing to the presence of former Nazis in the West German government.³¹

Other trials, of which the 1961 Eichmann trial in Jerusalem and the Auschwitz trial in Frankfurt (1963–1965) are the best-known examples, also became a venue

²⁸ On the Soviet-dominated peace initiatives of the late 1940s and early 1950s, see: Melissa Feinberg, *Curtain of Lies: The Battle over Truth in Stalinist Eastern Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 31–59; Petra Goedde, *The Politics of Peace. A Global Cold War History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 39–66.

²⁹ Pavel Kolař, *Der Poststalinismus. Ideologie und Utopie einer Epoche* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2016).

³⁰ Kai Struve, "Theodor Oberländer and the Nachtigall Battalion in 1959/60 – an Entangled History of Propaganda, Politics, and Memory in East and West," *Slavic Review* 81, no. 3 (Fall 2022): 677–700; Jasmin Söhner and Máté Zombory, "Accusing Hans Globke, 1960–1963: Agency and the Iron Curtain," in *Seeking Accountability*, 351–386; Lawrence Douglas, *The Memory of Judgment: Making Law and History in the Trials of the Holocaust* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005).

³¹ Such accusations were not unfounded. The West German government integrated former Nazis, though the East German leadership, if to a lesser extent, also accepted compromised individuals as long as they proved useful and willing to serve the new regime. Mary Fulbrook, "Complicity and the Holocaust in Eastern Europe," *Jewish Historical Studies* 53 (2021): 115–35.

of confrontation between both blocs – whether in the form of media coverage, or adaptations in literature, movies, radio plays, and art.³² In this volume, Vanessa Voisin analyzes the understudied effect of the Eichmann trial on Soviet narratives of the war and the Holocaust.

The legal, scholarly, and cultural examination of the Holocaust in the late 1950s and 1960s also led to an intensification of its appropriation in the East-West confrontation. From the mid-1950s, Holocaust memory became a subject of political fights within the bipolar confrontation. Such political confrontations took on different proportions. The conflict manifested itself in the open exploitation of Holocaust memory, for example, when West German politicians and commentators compared the Berlin Wall to the wall around the Warsaw Ghetto³³ or when GDR functionaries

32 On such trials in Central and Eastern Europe and their effect on the public visibility of the Holocaust and social mobilization, see: Eric Le Bourhis, Irina Tcherneva, and Vanessa Voisin, ed., *Seeking Accountability for Nazi and War Crimes in East and Central Europe: A People's Justice?* (Rochester, NY: Rochester University Press, 2022). The radio, which had a wide range that easily crossed the Iron Curtain, played an important role, see: Gerlof, *Tonspuren*; René Wolf, *The Undivided Sky: The Holocaust on East and West German Radio in the 1960* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), esp. 46–145. Numerous contemporaries discussed the Eichmann trial. Among them Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (New York: Viking, 1963); Friedrich Karl Kaul, *Der Fall Eichmann* (Berlin: Verlag Das Neue Berlin, 1964). There are also, numerous academic studies on the trial, for instance: Deborah E. Lipstadt, *The Eichmann Trial* (New York: Schocken, 2011); Peter Krause, *Der Eichmann-Prozess in der deutschen Presse* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2002); Kata Bohus, “Not a Jewish Question? The Holocaust in Hungary in the Press and Propaganda of the Kádár Regime during the Trial of Adolf Eichmann,” *Hungarian Historical Review* 4, no. 3 (2015): 737–72. In the Auschwitz trial, Friedrich Karl Kaul represented several victims living in the GDR as joint plaintiffs and used this and other trials against Nazi criminals as a stage for to prove the superiority of the GDR. On Kaul, see: Annette Roszkopf, “Strafverteidigung als ideologische Offensive. Das Leben des Rechtsanwalts Friedrich Karl Kaul (1906–1981),” *forum historiae iuris* (August 8, 1998), accessed April 28, 2023; Ralph Dobrawa, *Der Auschwitzprozess. Ein Lehrstück deutscher Geschichte* (Berlin: Das Neue Berlin, 2013); Irmtrud Wojak, “Gerichtstag halten über uns selbst . . .”: *Geschichte und Wirkung des ersten Frankfurter Auschwitz-Prozess* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2001); Devin O. Pendas, *The Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial, 1963–1965: Genocide, History, and the Limits of the Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

33 So did, for instance, the German weekly *Die Zeit* on the occasion of the first anniversary of the building of the Berlin Wall under the title: “Die Mauer: Rote Nazis” (August 31, 1962). The writer Wolfdietch Schnurre also used this comparison in his book: *Berlin: Eine Stadt wird geteilt* (Olten: Walther, 1962), 10. See also: Stephan Stach, “Holocaust und Kalter Krieg im deutsch-polnisch-jüdischen Kontext – Das Jüdische Historische Institut in Warschau und die beiden deutschen Staaten,” *Historie. Jahrbuch des Zentrums für Historische Forschung Berlin der Polnischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 2 (2008/2009): 57–81.

used Holocaust memory to denounce connections between Nazi Germany, the FRG, and NATO.³⁴

While both sides eagerly accused the other of continuities with the Nazi regime, the Cold War from its onset hindered the prosecution of Nazi criminals. Once communism replaced Nazism as the main threat in the eyes of the Western Allies, pressure for denazification decreased and former Nazis were rehabilitated.³⁵ The Cold War also allowed for the exculpation of the Germans by shifting the blame, as Magdalena Saryusz-Wolska shows in her chapter on Hans Scholz's novel *Through the Night* (originally *Am grünen Strand der Spree*) and its radio and film adaptations. This early West German attempt to depict the Holocaust in the occupied Soviet Union obfuscated German responsibility by suggesting Eastern European complicity and making subtle references to Soviet culpability. Decades later, in the mid-1980s, conservative West German historians pointed to Soviet violence as a way of relativizing Nazi war crimes and the Holocaust in the *Historikerstreit*. In what has been termed "the last grand debate of the Cold War," both conservative historians as well as their liberal interlocutors paid little attention to the East European victims of Nazi atrocities and ultimately flattened Soviet history.³⁶ Jürgen Habermas famously pointed to the singularity of the Holocaust and rejected attempts to exculpate the Germans, refuting the notion that Bolshevism was the main culprit of unleashing unprecedented violence in Europe. He also emphasized the crucial importance of "the unreserved opening of the Federal Republic to the political culture of the West" and thus remained within a Cold War framework.³⁷

Narratives about the Holocaust and interest in its commemoration changed and shifted in the decades following the end of the war. The extent to which the memory of the Holocaust was used as ammunition in the bloc confrontation depended on the cycles of public interest and, especially east of the Iron Curtain, on whether the topic fit the current political agenda. Whether and to what extent the

34 For instance, Grete Wittkowski, vice-director of the East German Planning Commission, used her review of Ber Mark's study on the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising to denounce West German and NATO imperialism: "Der Aufstand im Warschauer Ghetto 1943: Zum Erscheinen des ersten umfassenden Berichts von Bernard Mark," *Neues Deutschland*, April 19, 1957. See also Stach: "The Jewish Diaries," 288–292. On the impact of the Eichmann trial on public debate of the Holocaust in Hungary, see Bohus, "Not a Jewish Question?"

35 Fulbrook, "Complicity and the Holocaust in Eastern Europe," 124.

36 "The *Historikerstreit* Twenty Years On," *German History* 24, no. 4 (October 2006): 587–607, here 594.

37 Jürgen Habermas, "A Kind of Settlement of Damages (Apologetic Tendencies)," *New German Critique* 44 (1988): 25–39.

Holocaust could be debated changed over time and varied greatly within the respective states of the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc countries.

Fractured and Entangled Memories

Historians of memory have challenged the notion of a single, stable, unified collective memory and highlighted the multiplicity of perceptions of the past. Recent research, following Michael Rothberg's concept of *multidirectional* memory, has also shown that distinct narratives and memories not only vied for power but also influenced one another.³⁸ The chapters within this book highlight the entangled, rather than monolithic, nature of memory narratives. As Simon Perego's examination of the divisions and contrasting narratives within the Paris Jewish community shows, memory of the war and the persecution of Jews was never homogenous – not even within one community. This, as well as the other chapters in this book, also refutes long-held assumptions that the world remained silent about the murder of European Jews in the aftermath of the war. While the so-called myth of silence has been challenged by ample documentation that highlights how survivors as well as Jewish communities and institutions gathered evidence, gave testimonies, established archives, recounted, and wrote about the Holocaust, it seems to hold power over the perception of Eastern European memory culture.³⁹

³⁸ Stefan Berger and Bill Niven, eds., *Writing the History of Memory* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014); Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009).

³⁹ For European Jews' efforts to witness and testify, see Margarete Myers Feinstein, *Holocaust Survivors in Postwar Germany, 1945–1957* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009); David Cesarani and Eric J. Sundquist, *After the Holocaust* (London: Routledge, 2012); Laura Jockusch, *Collect and Record! Jewish Holocaust Documentation in Early Postwar Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Renee Poznanski, "French Apprehensions, Jewish Expectations: From a Social Imaginary to a Political Practice," in *The Jews Are Coming Back: The Return of the Jews to Their Countries of Origin after WWII*, ed. David Bankier (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005), 25–57; Hasia R. Diner, *We Remember with Reverence and Love: American Jews and the Myth of Silence after the Holocaust, 1945–1962* (New York: New York University Press, 2009); Daniella Doron, *Jewish Youth and Identity in Postwar France: Rebuilding Family and Nation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015); Mark L. Smith, *The Yiddish Historians and the Struggle for a Jewish History of the Holocaust* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2019); Rebecca Clifford, *Commemorating the Holocaust: The Dilemmas of Remembrance in France and Italy*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

In the aftermath of the war, Jews in East and West told the story of their persecution in myriad different ways. Some pointed to the specificity of Jewish suffering, while others depicted the Jewish fate as merged with other victims of Nazism. Outside the Jewish community, the tendency to see the murder of European Jews as one of many Nazi war crimes was commonplace in the first postwar decade, and there was limited interest in the stories of survivors and early historians of the Holocaust. Holocaust narratives did not easily fit into the postwar spirit of reconstruction, emphasizing the need to look forward and leave the past behind.⁴⁰

New threats likewise overshadowed memories of the past. Fears of a nuclear apocalypse, which rose after Hiroshima and Nagasaki and remained present due to the arms race between the USA and the Soviet Union, may have contributed to the declining interest of a broader non-Jewish public in the German mass murder of Jews during the late 1940s and early 1950s.⁴¹ At the same time, such fears of future atrocities also led to multidirectionality, in which discourses around present threats and past catastrophes merged. The philosopher Günter Anders saw a structural connection between the industrialized mass murder of the German extermination camps and the atomic bombs dropped by the Americans on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which Anna Pollmann examines in her chapter. As Máté Zombory shows in his contribution, the Hungarian director Zoltán Fábri also picked up on this thread in his film *Late Season* (1967), in which he narrated the memory of the Holocaust and questions about the individual guilt of non-Jewish actors in connection with the nuclear threat. In the debates on the arms race, Holocaust survivors such as Elie Wiesel also linked the nuclear threat to the Holocaust.⁴²

Despite this lack of interest in their stories and facing numerous challenges, not least the difficulty of finding publishers, survivors in East and West wrote memoirs and historians and literati published preserved diaries of Holocaust victims and

40 Frank Biess, "Introduction: Histories of the Aftermath," in *Histories of the Aftermath: The Legacies of the Second World War in Europe*, ed. Frank Biess and Robert G. Moeller (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 1–4.

41 Jan Gerber, Philipp Graf, and Anna Pollmann, "Introduction," in *Geschichtsoptimismus und Katastrophenbewusstsein. Europa nach dem Holocaust*, ed. Jan Gerber, Philipp Graf, and Anna Pollmann (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2022), 23–35.

42 "The Day After," Discussion Panel, ABC News Viewpoint, November 20, 1983, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UzXcQ2Lr-40>, min. 24:26–26:16, accessed April 29, 2024. The connection between the nuclear threat and the Holocaust has also been the subject of study in the field of psychology, see Robert Jay Lifton and Eric Markusen, *The Genocidal Mentality: Nazi Holocaust and Nuclear Threat* (New York: Basic Books, 1990). On the nuclear disarmament movements, see: Stephanie L. Freeman, *Dreams for a Decade: International Nuclear Abolitionism and the End of the Cold War* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2023).

other documents to keep memory alive. Such testimonies frequently inspired further literary and artistic engagement. Jewish writers, whether professional authors or “ordinary” survivor-memoirists, produced narratives which were at odds with and even challenged official narratives propagated by political elites.⁴³

In the communist bloc, it was often appropriations of official narratives that opened up a discursive space – albeit a limited one – for questions on how to remember the war and the genocide of Europe’s Jews. Under the umbrella of the anti-fascist struggle, Holocaust memory could find its place. Arkadi Zeltser’s chapter in this volume shows, how the use of Holocaust memory as a weapon of Cold War propaganda allowed individuals in the Soviet Union to publicly discuss and commemorate the murder of European Jews. Irina Tcherneva’s chapter provides another example, examining the representation of the genocide in Yosef Kuzkovski’s painting *The Last Way* (1944–1948). While the possibilities for the publication of academic works were restricted, testimonies, diaries, and memoirs, as well as literary and artistic adaptations, enjoyed greater leeway, and numerous publications appeared from the 1950s onwards.⁴⁴ In Poland, the Jewish Historical Institute published books on the German mass murder of Jews and the Jewish uprisings in the Ghettos of Warsaw and Białystok, which had to adhere to the Stalinist narratives of World War II, but still described the Holocaust as an anti-Jewish crime.⁴⁵ Even a Yiddish publishing house existed which published memoirs from the ghettos and camps, albeit with critical passages shortened. The best-known example

⁴³ See, for instance, Helen Finch, *German-Jewish Life Writing in the Aftermath of the Holocaust: Beyond Testimony* (Rochester, UK: Boydell & Brewer, 2023); Koch, *Home after Fascism*.

⁴⁴ Editions of Anne Frank’s diary appeared in the late 1950s in Poland (1957), Hungary (1958), the GDR (1957), and the Soviet Union (1960). Other diaries of Holocaust survivors appeared in East European countries: in Poland the diaries of Dawid Rubinowicz and Dawid Sierakowiak (1960) were published and later translated into German and other languages. The collection of Polish Holocaust diaries, *Im Feuer vergangen*, appeared in 1958 in several editions in the GDR. Masha Rolnikaitė’s memoirs appeared in the Soviet Union in 1965. Regarding diaries, see Stephan Stach, “‘The Jewish Diaries . . . Undergo One Edition after the Other’: Early Polish Holocaust Documentation, East German Antifascism, and the Emergence of Holocaust Memory in Socialism,” in *Growing in the Shadow of Antifascism*, 275–277. On fictional works, see: Elisa-Maria Hiemer, Jiří Holý, Agata Firlej, and Hana Nichtburgerová, ed., *The Handbook of Polish, Czech, and Slovak Holocaust Fiction: Works and Contexts* (Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2021); Marek Haltof, *Polish Film and the Holocaust: Politics and Memory* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012); Judith E. Doneson, *The Holocaust in American Film* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2001).

⁴⁵ Stephan Stach, “The Prospects and Perils of Holocaust Research in Communist Poland: The First Twenty Years of the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw,” *East European Jewish Affairs* 52, no. 2–3 (2022): 137–164.

was Emanuel Ringelblum's "Notes from the Warsaw Ghetto."⁴⁶ In the 1980s, East European dissident movements exposed blank spaces in the official Holocaust memory and used counternarratives to question the historical and moral legitimacy of the Communist governments.⁴⁷

Beyond the Nation-State and across the "Iron Curtain"

The chapters in this book examine narratives spun below national narratives of the past, highlighting individual and communal perceptions, but also move above the national level by examining cultural transfers and transnational networks that crossed the Iron Curtain. Efforts to depict and make sense of the past, to track down perpetrators, and to commemorate, mourn, and remember those murdered often transcended politically bounded territories. This volume thus contributes to recent efforts to reveal transnational networks and exchanges bridging the Iron Curtain.⁴⁸

With few exceptions, attempts to re-evaluate Holocaust memory rarely transcend national borders and the former bloc division.⁴⁹ Yet the Iron Curtain never

⁴⁶ Katarzyna Person and Agnieszka Żółkiewska, "Edition of Documents from the Ringelblum Archive (the Underground Archive of the Warsaw Ghetto) in Stalinist Poland," in *Growing in the Shadow of Antifascism*, 21–37.

⁴⁷ See: Bohus, Hallama, and Stach, "Introduction," 17–19; Peter Hallama and Stephan Stach, *Gegengeschichte. Zweiter Weltkrieg und Holocaust im ostmitteleuropäischen Dissens* (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2015); Kata Bohus, "The Opposition of the Opposition: New Jewish Identities in Illegal Underground Public Sphere in Late Communist Hungary," in *Jewish Lives under Communism*, 236–252.

⁴⁸ See, for instance, Ivan Boldyrev and Olessia Kirtchik, "On (Im)permeabilities: Social and Human Sciences on Both Sides of the 'Iron Curtain,'" *History of the Human Sciences* 29, no. 4–5 (2016): 3–12; Shneer, "An Alternative World," 153–173; Philippe Vonnard, Nicola Sbeti, and Grégory Quin, *Beyond Boycotts: Sport during the Cold War in Europe* (Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2018). Research on the cultural history of the Cold War has shown that cooperation across the Iron Curtain took place even in such sensitive sectors as science and technology, see for instance: Manfred Sapper, Volker Weichsel, Klaus Gestwa, and Stefan Rohdewald, eds., *Kooperation trotz Konfrontation. Wissenschaft und Technik im Kalten Krieg* (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2009), special edition of *Osteuropa* 59, no. 10. For a German-Polish case study on the knowledge transfer between conflict and cooperation, see Stach, "Holocaust und Kalter Krieg."

⁴⁹ A rare example for a comparative work across the Iron Curtain is Michael Meng, *Shattered Spaces: Encountering Jewish Ruins in Postwar Germany and Poland* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011).

sealed off a part of the world: art, stories, books, histories, people, and their memories traveled back and forth, and we can understand neither Western nor Eastern memory culture without taking into account both confrontation and collaboration between the two sides. Books provide an excellent example not merely of knowledge transfers but also of efforts to insert stories within the respective ideological frameworks. Perhaps the best-known Holocaust testimony, the diary of Anne Frank, moved across the Iron Curtain, adapted to suit different audiences and memorial discourses. The diary underwent several changes, starting with Otto Frank's editing of his daughter's text. Subsequent stage and Hollywood film adaptations further changed Anne's writings, omitting references to her Jewishness and turning her into a universally accessible symbol of the innocent victim. Hollywood depicted the Jewish victim, whose life was tragically and brutally cut short, as an American teenager who spread a message of hope, despite all difficulties. In Eastern Europe, the book could be published only after the thaw. The author Ilya Ehrenburg wrote the preface to the 1960 Russian edition of *Anne Frank's Diary*. Ehrenburg highlighted the immensity of Jewish suffering during the war but also used the text to launch anti-Western denunciations and point to continuities between postwar West Germany and the Nazi state. Elsewhere in Eastern Europe, the text was also incorporated into an anti-fascist narrative, which did not stop readers from interpreting it individually.⁵⁰

However, the travel of books and documents across the Iron Curtain was not one-directional, as Jacob Sloan's 1958 translation of Emanuel Ringelblum's *Notes from the Warsaw Ghetto* exemplifies. Based on its Yiddish version published by the Jewish Historical Institute in 1952, Sloan's translation was published in numerous editions and served as a template for subsequent translations into all other languages, except for Polish.⁵¹ The Warsaw Ghetto and in particular the uprising in spring 1943 held and still holds a central place in Jewish memory of the Holocaust. In the aftermath of the war, in both East and West, narratives of heroic resistance trumped stories of suffering, and the uprising provided a counternar-

⁵⁰ On the reception of Anne Frank's diary and its numerous adaptations in different contexts, see: Sylke Kirschnick, *Anne Frank und die DDR. Politische Deutungen und persönliche Lesarten des berühmten Tagebuchs* (Berlin: Ch. Links, 2009); Katja Heimsath, "Trotz allem glaube ich an das Gute im Menschen". *Das Tagebuch der Anne Frank und seine Rezeption in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Hamburg: Hamburg University Press, 2013); Ralph Melnick, *The Stolen Legacy of Anne Frank: Meyer Levin, Lillian Hellman, and the Staging of the Diary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); Kata Bohus, "Anne and Eva: Two Diaries, Two Holocaust Memories in Communist Hungary," *Remembrance and Solidarity Studies* 5 (2016): 97–114; Griselda Pollock, "Stilled Life: Traumatic Knowing, Political Violence, and the Dying of Anna Frank," *Mortality* 12, no. 2 (2007): 124–141. For the Soviet reception, see Arkadi Zeltser's chapter in this book.

⁵¹ Stach, "The Prospects and Perils," 146.

rative to accusations of Jewish passivity.⁵² The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising became *the* symbol of Jewish resistance, but chroniclers disagreed on who they perceived as its main heroes. In Poland in particular, memories of the uprising were highly contested.⁵³ Sloan's reading differed from the version put forward by Alberto Nirenstein, an early historian of the Holocaust who moved back and forth between East and West. Nirenstein researched at the Warsaw Jewish Historical Institute between 1951 and 1954, before returning to his family in Italy. Upon his return he published his annotated source edition *Ricorda cosa ti ha fatto Amalek* which Anna Koch and Stephan Stach examine in their contribution to this volume.

Recent research also points to cultural diplomacy and the resulting artistic and personal contacts, which created exchange, entanglement and interconnection between actors on both sides.⁵⁴ Communist and leftist Jewish artists and intellectuals on both sides of the Iron Curtain, retained old and built new networks after the war. The GDR, and in particular East Berlin, provided a space for exchanges, inviting Communist Jewish performers from East and West. Some of these performances commemorated anti-Jewish persecution and racial violence, albeit within an anti-fascist framework.⁵⁵

Cooperation across the Iron Curtain played an important role in the tracing and prosecution of Nazi criminal. During the 1960s, East German officials, as part of their effort to highlight continuities between the Nazi state and the FRG, contacted Jewish public figures and organizations in the West hoping that they would assist in uncovering Nazi criminals in West Germany, as Jonathan Kaplan shows in his contribution. Efforts to gather evidence also relied on transnational cooperation. West German trials since at least the 1960s included documentary evidence and expert witnesses from Communist states in their assessment, as for instance in the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial or the Bielefeld Bialystok Trial.⁵⁶ Nadège Rargaru's

52 See Avinoam Patt, *The Jewish Heroes of Warsaw* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2021).

53 In the 45 years of communist Poland's existence, numerous clashes arose over the interpretation and significance of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising between various Jewish groups, between Jewish and non-Jewish actors, between the liberal and nationalist wings of the communist Polish United Workers' Party, and between the party and government apparatus and the Solidarność movement, see: Renata Kobylarz, *Walka o pamięć. Polityczne aspekty obchodów rocznicy powstania w getcie warszawskim 1944–1989* (Warsaw: IPN, 2009).

54 Simo Mikkonen, Giles Scott-Smith, and Jari Parkkinen, eds., *Entangled East and West: Cultural Diplomacy and Artistic Interaction during the Cold War* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019).

55 Shneer, "An Alternative World."

56 Katrin Stoll, *Die Herstellung der Wahrheit: Strafverfahren gegen ehemalige Angehörige der Sicherheitspolizei für den Bezirk Bialystok* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), esp. 309–330.

contribution in this volume takes the Frankfurt trial against Adolf Beckerle as a starting point to demonstrate the importance of connections between Eastern, Western, and non-aligned states for the prosecution of Nazi criminals. The transnational web of publications, actors, and networks playing a role in the documentation, remembrance and legal assessment of the Holocaust underscores that the history of the Cold War needs to be understood as more than a confrontation of two superpowers causing the isolation of Eastern Europe; what emerges is also a history of exchanges and communication, albeit amidst challenging circumstances.

Contributions to this Book

The authors of this volume shed light on three areas in which the Cold War and Holocaust memory became entangled: firstly, contributions highlight the impact of the bloc confrontation on the interpretation and remembrance of the Holocaust in the East *and* West. Secondly, the authors emphasize that neither in the East nor in the West these official narrations determined people's understanding of the Holocaust, highlighting the multiplicity of memories. Finally, they reveal how Jewish and non-Jewish actors from different countries cooperated to promote research and memory of the genocide of Europe's Jewish population.

In her chapter, Elisabeth Gallas sheds light on the collaborative endeavor to document Nazi crimes in the 1946 Black Book, highlighting both the ideological tensions between the two Allies and the grassroots efforts to sidestep Cold War antagonism. From the outset, the book was a transnational project relying on the collaboration between four organizations spanning continents – the World Jewish Congress (WJC), the Jewish National Council in Palestine Va'ad Leumi (Va'ad Leumi), the Soviet Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee (JAC), and the American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists and Scientists, Inc. (Writers Committee). Gallas's research reveals the challenges these various organizations and representatives faced due to ideological and political divisions, as well as logistical and practical difficulties. It also highlights their determination to work together and create Jewish unity in the face of persecution, across political factions and national borders.

Ideological factions did not merely divide Jews from East and West, but also ran through national communities, as the two following contributions to the volume show. Boaz Cohen examines how the East-West divide and the emerging Cold War informed Israeli discussions of how to commemorate the Holocaust. In the formative years of the Israeli state Holocaust memory shaped issues of legislation, government formation, and foreign policy, and was tightly linked to the

question of the newly founded state's present and future, including its relationship with the two Germanies and its alignment within the Cold War division.

As Simon Perego's chapter shows, the Cold War also shaped the discussion of how to commemorate the Holocaust in the Parisian community. Commemorations played a key role in staging conflicts linked to ideological division within this highly politicized community, divided by what the French Jewish writer Arnold Mandel labeled in 1956 "the Communist Schism." Perego illuminates the political function of commemorative practices by examining how the gatherings organized by Jewish-Communist, Bundist, and Zionist associations served as a transnational ideological battlefield, notwithstanding the willingness of some actors to organize united Holocaust commemorations. While in postwar Paris Holocaust commemorations were supposed to appease political conflicts out of respect for the dead, they nevertheless contributed to expressing and even exacerbating ideological tensions among Parisian Jews.

Moving from the West to the East, Arkadi Zeltser examines how the Cold War framework made the public discussion of the Holocaust in the USSR possible, even though the Soviet narrative of "the Great Patriotic War" marginalized particular memories of Jewish suffering. Discussing the Holocaust became a means of criticizing the West, and in particular West Germany for its role in hiding Nazi war criminals, making publications such as the Russian translation of *The Diary of Anne Frank* and *I Must Tell You* by Masha Rolnikaitė possible.

In the following chapter, Anna Koch and Stephan Stach discuss the life and work of the Polish-Jewish historian Alberto Nirenstein, who published one of the first source collections on the Holocaust in Italian, *Ricorda cosa ti ha fatto Amalek*. The book was translated into English and published in the US, thus both the book and its author moved across several national boundaries. While Nirenstein's work does not fit neatly within the Cold War frontlines, American reviewers primarily perceived it as a biased ideological work, condemning it as communist, thus highlighting the impact of the Cold War on its reception.

Nadège Ragaru's contribution also considers transnational dimensions and transfers, focusing on the trial of Adolf Heinz Beckerle at the District Court of Hesse in Frankfurt (FRG) in 1967–1968. She reveals how knowledge about the Holocaust emerged via a complex entanglement between national, regional, and international scales. The chapter highlights how global connections between West Germany, the United States, Israel, Bulgaria, the USSR, Poland, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Austria were instrumental in the prosecution of Beckerle's war crimes and shows how knowledge about the Holocaust spread through these connections.

War crimes also play a dominant role in Vanessa Voisin's chapter, which focuses on a Soviet documentary produced in 1963–1964, titled *In the Name of the Living*. The documentary, directed by Leon Mazrukho, covers a war crimes trial

held in Krasnodar in October 1963. The nine defendants were former auxiliaries of *Sonderkommando* 10A, responsible for the Holocaust and other crimes against humanity perpetrated in southern Russia. Her analysis of the film highlights how Cold War propaganda intermingles with the author's artistic project.

Film also plays a dominant role in Máté Zombory's contribution, which examines Zoltán Fábri's 1967 film, *Late Season*. Challenging the notion of the exclusively Western origins of Holocaust memory, the article discusses how anti-fascist humanism, exemplified by the oeuvre of the director and particularly his 1967 film, universalized the moral significance of Auschwitz. Situating the film both within the context of de-Stalinized Hungary and developments in European cinematography while highlighting cross-cultural influences, Zombory's work adds another dimension to understanding transnational aspects of Holocaust memory.

Irina Tcherneva's chapter brings us from film to painting. Her contribution examines *The Last Way* (1944–1948) by the Jewish Ukrainian artist, Yosef Kuzkovski which depicts the extermination of Jews in Babi Yar in Nazi-occupied Ukraine. In the 1970s the Israeli Knesset purchased the painting. The history of the painting sheds light on the representation of the genocide that unfolded between the public and private spheres. An analysis of individual and collective uses of this artwork illuminates a widening gap between the Soviet political and judicial powers and local groups, acting as alternative purveyors of a narrative around the Holocaust.

Likewise, Magdalena Saryusz-Wolska focuses on a detailed study of a work of art and thus allows us to see how the changing Cold War contexts shaped cultural productions. She examines the 1955 novel *Through the Night* by the West German writer Hans Scholz, which depicts the execution of Jews near the Belarussian city of Orsha in 1941. Radio and television adaptations that included the massacre scene in full length soon followed. Saryusz-Wolska traces the changes in each version, especially those related to the representations of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Her layered reading of *Through the Night* sheds light on the construction of West German cultural memory in the Cold War framework.

The specific case of West Germany, as a close ally of the US and a Nazi successor state, also functions as the backdrop of Anna Pollmann's discussion of two visits of the German-Jewish writer and philosopher Günther Anders to Berlin in the 1950s. Anders, who was one of the first philosophers to provide a comprehensive analysis of the atomic bomb, became an icon of the West German anti-nuclear protest movement. Pollmann shows how both in Anders' work and within the wider protest movement links were made between the threat of nuclear destruction and the traumas of the war.

Jonathan Kaplan's chapter brings us from West to East Germany. He examines international efforts and diplomatic strategies of the East German Ministry

of Foreign Affairs (MfAA) directed against the Federal Republic and in particular against National Socialists and war criminals in West Germany. As part of the ministry's campaign titled *Aktion Nazidiplomaten*, its officials aimed to propagate and expand the circulation of incriminating material on West German Nazi diplomats. Apart from official diplomacy, the GDR foreign ministry relied on contacts with western Jewish and Jewish-oriented organizations that dedicated themselves to uncovering and hunting down former Nazis and war criminals; one of them was Rabbi Samuel Burr Yampol of Chicago, head of the "National Committee to Combat Nazism in the USA." Investigating the complex and complicated relationship between GDR officials and their American Jewish collaborator, Kaplan highlights transnational efforts to bring Nazi war criminals to justice.

An edited volume such as this can only provide a starting point for thinking through the various commonalities, differences, and entanglements between Eastern and Western memory of the Holocaust. Still, the contributions to this volume offer insight into how Cold War thinking shaped Holocaust memory in East and West. Examining Holocaust memory from various disciplinary perspectives and focusing on different parts of the world, from the Soviet Union to the US, from Hungary to France, the authors highlight the various ways in which scholars, writers, artists, and survivors both countered and contributed to dominant narratives shaped by oppositional ideological stances. While such distinct ideological positions often mattered greatly, at other times a shared interest in bringing perpetrators to justice, commemorating victims, or providing testimony to the atrocities committed against Europe's Jews, led to cooperation and transfers across the Iron Curtain.

