

Alfred Eckert

Deportation Train ‘Da 32’ from Nuremberg and its 1,012 Occupants

Abstract: The article concerns deportation train ‘Da 32’ and the fate of its 1,012 Jewish occupants. The first mass transport from Franconia (Northern Bavaria) left Nuremberg for the Riga-Jungfernhof concentration camp (Latvia) with the Deutsche Reichsbahn on November 29, 1941. Only 52 people survived. The gradual destruction of the Nuremberg group is placed in the context of the Nazi ‘Final Solution’. After presenting the available sources, the article focuses on researching the biographical personal details of the victims and reconstructing the further paths of persecution following deportation. Within this, the events at the place of departure, Nuremberg, and at the destination, Riga-Jungfernhof, are examined along with the time spent by them in the Riga ghetto and their further deportation to the concentration camps. The chances of survival for those who were deported are additionally discussed and statistically analyzed by assessing social ties.

Introduction

November 2021 marked the 80th anniversary of the first deportation of the Jewish population from Franconia. 1,012 men, women, and children were deported with ‘*Judentransport*’ (‘Jew transport’) number ‘Da 32’¹ from Nuremberg to Riga in German-occupied Latvia with the Deutsche Reichsbahn on November 29, 1941.² On

1 On the meaning of the code ‘Da’ cf. Alfred Gottwaldt and Diana Schulle: *Die “Judendeportationen” aus dem Deutschen Reich 1941–1945*, Wiesbaden: Marix, 2005, 63.

2 The number of people deported via Nuremberg transport ‘Da 32’ is stated in the literature as being between 1,008 and 1,027. My investigations discovered that four people – Berthold Bernheimer, Elsa Mannheimer, Flora Kronacher (née Heumann), and Ignatz Julius Selling – were not, as previously thought, among those deported from Nuremberg. However, the following seven people, who have not been stated in the literature to date, should be taken into account: Rosa Himmelreich, Jakob Koschland, Frieda Lärmer, Lina Walfisch, Karl Stein, Regine Stein (née Hecht), and Maria Stein. I would like to thank Michaela Fröhlich, Nuremberg, for the reference to Flora Kronacher (née Heumann) and other relevant information. Furthermore, I would like to thank Dr Ekkehard Hübschmann, Gefrees, for the reference to Ignatz Julius Selling and other relevant information. According to the current state of research, the Nuremberg ‘Jew transport’ comprised 1,012 people.

the same day, the chief of the Reich Security Main Office (RSHA) Reinhard Heydrich sent out invitations to the planned Wannsee Conference, which was originally intended to take place on December 9, 1941, but was then postponed until January 1942.

The people who were deported came from eight Franconian places of departure: Bamberg, Bayreuth, Coburg, Erlangen, Forchheim, Fürth, Nuremberg, and Würzburg. 52 of them survived the Shoah. According to my current knowledge, six people are still alive today.

This contribution is intended to show, in the form of a case study, what happened to the 1,012 deported people between November 29, 1941, and the German surrender on May 8, 1945, and what the paths of persecution were following deportation. The transports in the first few months after deportations began in October 1941 were not yet oriented towards the systematic murder of the victims of persecution. Many of those deported were initially imprisoned in various ghettos and camps, where they were conscripted for forced labor. Their chances of survival were thus sometimes greater than those of people on subsequent transports from Germany, which ended directly in Auschwitz or other extermination sites.

For the people concerned, deportation represented a transition from the previous deprivation of rights and marginalization within German society into the SS system of terror and the concentration camp system with the constant threat of being murdered. In this article, all aspects of an individual deportation train from Germany are examined by evaluating the social ties of those who were deported, the chances of survival and survival strategies of the people concerned are investigated in detail. The article is intended as a preliminary appraisal; research into the transport is not yet complete. In the following discussion, I will outline the various departure points for those deported with the transport on November 29, 1941, (hereinafter: Nuremberg transport) in the period from December 2, 1941, to the end of the war, and the events associated with this. Alongside reconstructing the individual paths of persecution, the number of survivors from the transport will also be ascertained and statistically evaluated according to their place of origin.

Sources and State of Research

In his comprehensive standard reference on deportations from Germany, *Der verwaltete Mensch*, published in 1974, H.G. Adler primarily refers to the files of the Würzburg Gestapo preserved in the Würzburg State Archive and thus to part of

the transport on November 29, 1941.³ Adler's analyses comprise, among other things, the organization of the Gestapo, the transfer of the victims to the assembly camps (*Sammellager*) and the forced cooperation of the Jewish Community. He also outlines the fate of individual deportees. Both the surviving Gestapo files and Adler's early analysis – both prerequisites that do not exist in the same way for other locations within the '*Altreich*' – form an important basis for this research into the transport on November 29, 1941. They are supplemented by the transport lists preserved in the Nuremberg City Archives and the Würzburg State Archive.⁴ The Arolsen Archives also hold documents containing the names of deportees, including a postwar compilation from the residents' registration office of Nuremberg.⁵

A further key source is the photo album containing photographs from the three deportations from Franconia in the years 1941 and 1942, which has been preserved by the Würzburg State Archive.⁶ The 119 photographs contained in this, a further 19 pictures that originally belonged to the album but found their way to the USA after the war, and an additional photo handed over during a trial in Würzburg in 1949 represent the largest known collection of deportation photographs from the Deutsche Reich. The 139 photographs were taken by an official from the Würzburg Gestapo and also show Jews from Würzburg being searched as part of preparations for the transport on November 29, 1941. Photographs also show people being brought to Würzburg train station, climbing onto the connecting train to Nuremberg, and the loading of luggage.⁷

3 H.G. Adler: *Der verwaltete Mensch. Studien zur Deportation der Juden aus Deutschland*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1974.

4 An official list entitled 'Deported Jews, 1st wave' lists the Jews from Nuremberg who were deported on November 29, 1941. The list can be found in the Nuremberg City Archives, holding C 31/I, No. 26, 2–15. No original transport lists of deportees from Nuremberg have been retained. A 'List of Jews to be evacuated from Würzburg' can be found in the Würzburg State Archive (holding Gestapo 18874, 9–18). See also Thomas Freier: "Nürnberg – Würzburg nach Riga". Available at: https://www.statistik-des-holocaust.de/list_ger_bay_41129.html. Last accessed: 10.01.2022. Freier assumes that 1,010 people were deported. My research has resulted in 1,012 deportees, see footnote 2.

5 Deportation from Nuremberg to Riga/Jungfernhof, 29.11.1941, 1.2.1.1/11195000–11195006/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives; deportation from Würzburg via Nuremberg to Riga, 27.11.1941, 1.2.1.1/11195523–11195532/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.

6 Photo album, Gestapo 18880a, Würzburg State Archive. The album, which had been considered lost, was rediscovered by historian Edith Raim in 2001 in the ancillary papers for post-war proceedings at the Nuremberg-Fürth public prosecutor's office. See also the article by Christoph Kreutzmüller in this volume.

7 Further photographs document the 2nd and 3rd deportation from Franconia on March 24, 1942, and April 25, 1942. For a critical analysis of the album and a detailed presentation of the orga-

Images that document the departure of the first eight Forchheim Jews represent a further photographic source.⁸ Finally, some portraits of the deportees exist,⁹ mostly passport photographs from the identity cards of the Jewish residents of communities and towns, photographs from the family albums of surviving relatives,¹⁰ or from other forms of identification in administrative files.¹¹ Further information about the transport can be found dispersed in relevant research publications about the Shoah and in publications on local and regional history.¹²

nization of the transports and the structure of the Gestapo in Würzburg and Nuremberg see Albrecht Liess (ed.): *Wege in die Vernichtung. Die Deportation der Juden aus Mainfranken 1941–1943*, Munich: Directorate General of the Bavaria State Archive, 2003. All 139 photographs are shown in this exhibition catalogue. The photo album with 119 photographs is held in the Würzburg State Archive under the signature Gestapo 18880a. 19 original photographs found their way to the USA, see RG 238, NG 2421, National Archives, Washington.

8 Rolf Kilian Kiessling: *Juden in Forchheim. 300 Jahre jüdisches Leben in einer kleinen fränkischen Stadt*, Forchheim: Verlag Kulturamt des Landkreises Forchheim, 2004. Eight out of a total of fourteen photographs are published on pages 205–209.

9 The portraits are pictured in various regional memorial books for the Jewish victims of National Socialism. See for Bamberg: Verein zur Förderung der jüdischen Geschichte und Kultur Bambergs e.V. (ed.): *Gedenkbuch der jüdischen Bürger Bambergs*, Bamberg: Erich Weiß, 2008, 449; see for Bayreuth: Historical Museum Bayreuth: “Gedenkbuch der Stadt Bayreuth für die Opfer des Nationalsozialismus”. Available at: <https://gedenkbuch.bayreuth.de>. Last accessed: 12.01.2022; see for Erlangen: Ilse Sponsel: *Gedenkbuch für die Erlanger Opfer der Schoa*, Erlangen: Bürgermeister- und Presseamt der Stadt Erlangen, 2001; see for Fürth: Gisela Naomi Blume: “Memorbuch für die Fürther Opfer der Shoah”. Available at: <https://www.juedische-fuerther.de/index.php/memorbuch-opfer-der-shoah>. Last accessed: 20.02.2022; see for Forchheim: Kiessling, *Juden in Forchheim*, 205–209; see for Nuremberg: Gerhard Jochem and Ulrike Kettner: *Gedenkbuch für die Nürnberger Opfer der Schoa*, Nuremberg: City Archive, 1998; idem: *Gedenkbuch für die Nürnberger Opfer der Schoa*, Nuremberg: City Archive, 2002; see for Würzburg: Jüdisches Leben in Unterfranken – Biographische Datenbank e.V.: “Jüdisches Leben in Unterfranken”. Available at: <https://juedisches-unterfranken.de/>. Last accessed: 10.02.2022.

10 Numerous photographs can be found in the holdings of the Fürth and Nuremberg City Archives and in the Nuremberg State Archive.

11 Photographs from passports of Jewish citizens (up to 1938) and registration cards from the residents’ registration office have been preserved in the holdings of the community and city archives in the places of departure, such as Würzburg, Nuremberg, and Fürth. Photographs of Jewish club members from the 1929 to 1955 membership records of the soccer club 1. FC Nürnberg, rediscovered at the end of 2020, are held in the club’s archive. These included two Jewish members, who were deported to Riga-Jungfernhof and Stutthof.

12 Cf. in particular Ekkehard Hübschmann: “Die Deportation von Juden aus Franken nach Riga”, in *Frankenland. Zeitschrift für fränkische Landeskunde und Kulturpflege*, 5, 2004, 344–369. Available at: <http://www.agfjg.de/deportationen/huebschmann2004a.pdf>. Last accessed: 15.01.2022.

Despite the relatively good sources, systematic research into the paths of persecution for those deported from Nuremberg on November 29, 1941, and an investigation into the prisoner community have so far been a research desideratum.

Origin of Deportees, Transport to the Assembly Camp, and the Nuremberg Gestapo

The selection of the deportees in the eight Franconian places of departure Bamberg, Bayreuth, Coburg, Erlangen, Forchheim, Fürth, Nuremberg, and Würzburg, and the drafting of deportation lists were handled in different ways. According to Christopher Browning, the Jews in Nuremberg were chosen for transport by the police using a register of the Jewish Community, probably a members' register, while the police in Würzburg only specified the number of people to be deported. The local Jewish Community then had to select the names themselves by order of the Gestapo and produce a corresponding list.¹³

The place of birth and place of departure were identical for a good quarter of the Jews in the Nuremberg transport (27.05 percent). The influx of Jews to larger cities, particularly Würzburg, Fürth, Nuremberg, and Bamberg, mainly took place for economic reasons, for example, setting up companies, or in connection with marriages, before 1933. There were also Jews who had immigrated to Franconian towns from Poland. After 1933, people primarily moved due to persecution; many Jews sought protection from antisemitic hostility in the anonymity of larger towns. For example, Fritz and Lina Kimmelstiel from Forth (Middle Franconia) moved to Nuremberg in October 1938 with their children Albert and Max. They had been forced to sell their property, their house with a shop in Forth, to neighbors just a few months before.¹⁴ The majority of those who moved to the cities came from smaller Franconian towns and villages in the surrounding area following the November pogroms in 1938. Their new accommoda-

¹³ Christopher Browning: *Die Entfesselung der "Endlösung". Nationalsozialistische Judenpolitik 1939–1942*, Munich: Propyläen, 2003, 551. However, according to Beate Meyer, the addresses of the Jews deported from Nuremberg were taken from the residents' register by the Gestapo. Cf. Beate Meyer: "Handlungsspielräume regionaler jüdischer Repräsentanten (1941–1945)", in Birthe Kundrus and Beate Meyer (eds.): *Die Deportation der Juden aus Deutschland. Pläne – Praxis – Reaktionen 1938–1945*, Göttingen: Wallstein, 2005², 63–85, here 76.

¹⁴ Martina Switalski: *Shalom Forth. Jüdisches Dorfleben in Franken*, Münster: Waxmann, 2012, 188–192.

tion was usually compulsory apartments in what were known as ‘*Judenhäuser*’ (‘Jews houses’) or ‘*Judenwohnungen*’ (‘Jews apartments’).¹⁵

The deportees with the Nuremberg transport came from various social classes. Alongside tradespeople, doctors, and other independent workers, there were also teachers, domestic workers, and pensioners. The people from Würzburg mainly came from agricultural professions, such as cattle and horse traders, farmers, and wine merchants.

The proportion of family or kinship relationships within the groups from the eight places of departure was as follows: Bamberg 75.4 percent, Bayreuth 93.5 percent, Coburg 76.9 percent, Erlangen 100 percent, Forchheim 75.0 percent, Fürth 68.1 percent, Nuremberg 76.7 percent, and Würzburg 86.1 percent.¹⁶

Once the Jewish people selected for deportation on November 29, 1941, were handed their ‘evacuation orders’ on November 23, 1941,¹⁷ the possibility of escaping this threatening situation was extremely low: Emigration had no longer been possible since October 1941 and going underground was essentially futile.¹⁸

One example shows how fatal a sense of responsibility could be. Master baker Hugo Schuster and his family were Orthodox Jews. As the ‘matzot baker of Fürth’,¹⁹ he supplied matzot to the Jewish communities of Fürth and the whole of Middle Franconia.²⁰ Schuster, his wife Recha Rachel, and his daughter Nelly had already held an immigration certificate to Palestine since 1933 thanks to the help of his brother-in-law Hugo Oppenheimer. However, the master baker

15 Cf. Hübschmann, *Die Deportation von Juden aus Franken nach Riga*, 345–346; Verein zur Förderung der jüdischen Geschichte und Kultur Bambergs e. V., *Gedenkbuch der jüdischen Bürger Bambergs*, 449; Norbert Aas (ed.): *Juden in Bayreuth 1933–2003. Verfolgung, Vertreibung – und das Danach*, Bayreuth: Bumerang, 2008, 59–63; Hubert Fromm: *Die Coburger Juden. Geduldet – Geächtet – Vernichtet*, Coburg: Evangelisches Bildungswerk Coburg e. V. and Initiative Stadtmuseum Coburg, 2012, 126–127; Kiessling, *Juden in Forchheim*, 204; Gisela Naomi Blume and Raphael Halmôn: *Zum Gedenken an die von den Nazis ermordeten Fürther Juden 1933–1945*, Fürth: City Archive Fürth, 1997, 13–14; Jochem/Kettner, *Gedenkbuch für die Nürnberger Opfer der Schoa*, volume 1, 463–464.

16 The family and kinship links between all of the transport participants were investigated (families, spouses, siblings, relatives). The sources come from research into the biographies of the deportees.

17 Hübschmann, *Die Deportation von Juden aus Franken nach Riga*, 355.

18 Only 23 Jews, who lived in ‘mixed marriages’ or were hidden, survived the Shoah in Fürth. See Barbara Ohm: *Geschichte der Juden in Fürth*, volume 2, Fürth: Geschichtsverein Fürth, 2014, 268.

19 Hugo Schuster only produced kosher baked goods, e.g. normal matzot, Shmurah matzot or the traditional Shabbat bread berches, at his bakery in Fürth. I would like to thank the nephew of Hugo Schuster, Uri B. Oppenheimer, for this information.

20 Blume/Halmôn, *Fürther Juden*, 389. Matzot is the unleavened bread for Passover.

decided to stay out of a sense of duty because “he was the last baker in Franconia who could supply his community with matzot”.²¹ The whole family was deported with the transport on November 29, 1941.²²

Between November 25 and 28, 1941, the persons selected for deportation were collected from their homes by the Gestapo, SS or criminal police; with the exception of those from Würzburg, who had to go to the assembly point at Würzburg city hall on November 26, 1941. A short time later, they were transferred from the assembly points in the eight places of departure to the assembly center in Nuremberg-Langwasser by the SS or criminal police by bus, truck, car, or train.²³

The Reich Security Main Office (RSHA) based in Berlin was responsible for coordinating the deportations throughout Germany. The main responsibility for organizing the transports from the three Franconian administrative regions (Lower, Middle, and Upper Franconia) lay with the Staatspolizeistelle in Nuremberg-Fürth. This organized the deportation of Franconian Jews in collaboration with its subordinate field office in Würzburg. The formal overall management of the transport was conducted by the Polizeipräsident in Nuremberg-Fürth and the Höherer SS- und Polizeiführer Main, Benno Martin. Within the Staatspolizeistelle, SS-Sturmbannführer and Kriminalrat Theodor Grafenberger was entrusted with organizing the transport as the head of Department II (Executive) and head of the Nuremberg ‘*Judenreferat*’, a department responsible for matters relating to Jews. Grafenberger’s colleague in the ‘*Judenreferat*’, Kriminalkommissar Christian Woesch, was responsible for the practical work involved in all ‘transport matters’. His main task was to select the people to be deported from Fürth and Nuremberg and create lists. He also conducted all of the negotiations with the Reichsbahn with regard to ordering trains and requesting means of transport, such as trucks and cars to collect the deportees and their luggage.²⁴

The Würzburg field office of the Staatspolizeistelle Nuremberg-Fürth, led by Kriminalkommissar Ernst Gramowski, played a major role in carrying out the deportation. The head of Department II/2 (churches, Jews, emigration, and the

21 Uri B. Oppenheimer in a telephone conversation with the author, 13.10.2021. He obtained the information from conversations with his father, Hugo Oppenheimer.

22 Cf. Blume/Halmôn, *Fürther Juden*, 389–390.

23 Cf. Hübschmann, *Die Deportation von Juden aus Franken nach Riga*, 355–361.

24 Hübschmann, *Die Deportation von Juden aus Franken nach Riga*, 346.

press) and deputy head of the Würzburg field office, Kriminalinspektor Michael Völkl, was responsible for the specific implementation on site.²⁵

Police Commissioner Benno Martin selected five large wooden barracks at *Waldlager 2* (forest camp 2) outside Nuremberg, on the site of the Nuremberg Rally in Langwasser, to serve as short-term accommodation and assembly camp for the people scheduled for deportation. Around one kilometer from the camp was Märzfeld train station, from which the deportation train departed for Riga.²⁶

Before the victims reached their barracks accommodation at the actual assembly camp, each person was once again ‘channeled’ through four rooms.²⁷ As part of this *Schleusung*, their luggage was thoroughly searched and all valuables, identification papers, and securities were seized. The victims also underwent a degrading body search and were forced to strip naked. In the last room a bailiff issued each victim a *Vermögenseinziehungsverfügung* (seizure of assets order). This meant that their entire assets were seized to the benefit of the German Reich.²⁸ While preparations were being made for the transport, the 11th Decree to the Reich Citizenship Law²⁹ was issued on November 25, 1941, which provided pseudo-legal justification for the expropriation of the deported Jews.³⁰

At 3.00 pm on Saturday, November 29, 1941, transport train number ‘Da 32’ carrying 1,012 people left Nuremberg-Märzfeld train station heading for the city of Riga in Latvia, 1,600 kilometers from Nuremberg. The special train (*Sonderzug*) comprised 22 to 27 cars.³¹ There is no specific evidence to date regarding the exact route taken by the train from Nuremberg to Riga. It can be assumed

25 Herbert Schott: “Die ersten drei Deportationen mainfränkischer Juden 1941/42”, in Albrecht Liess (ed.): *Wege in die Vernichtung. Die Deportation der Juden aus Mainfranken 1941–1943*, Munich: Directorate General of the Bavaria State Archive, 2003, 73–166, here 76.

26 Alexander Schmidt: *Das Reichsparteitagsgelände in Nürnberg*, Nuremberg: Sandberg, 2014, 157.

27 The procedure of searching the people selected for deportation and issuing official papers in the places of departure, such as in Würzburg, was repeated in the same way for a second time in Nuremberg.

28 Hübschmann, *Die Deportation von Juden aus Franken nach Riga*, 362–363.

29 Reichsgesetzblatt (RGBl.), I, 722–724.

30 Martin Friedenberger: *Fiskalische Ausplünderung. Die Berliner Steuer- und Finanzverwaltung und die jüdische Bevölkerung 1933–1945*, Berlin: Metropol, 2008, 274. Cf. also Adler, *Der verwaltete Mensch*, 500–503.

31 The train consisted of 15 3rd-class cars (each wagon accommodating a maximum of 66 people plus young children, where applicable) for the Jewish victims, two 2nd-class passenger cars for the escorts, and five to ten goods cars for the luggage. The author’s own research based on an estimated extrapolation: Official occupancy of a car at 66 people per car x 15 cars = 990 people + young children.

with some certainty that the route, as was the case for most mass transports heading to Riga, led via Berlin in a northeast direction via Landsberg (Warthe) – Kreuz – Schneidemühl – Firchau to Riga.³²

Arrival in Riga and the Jungfernhof Camp

The Nuremberg transport was one of twenty transports with German, Austrian, and Czech Jews, who were deported to Riga between November 27, 1941, and February 6, 1942.³³ There were plans to temporarily house them in the Riga ghetto.³⁴ This had been sealed on October 25, 1941, when there were more than 29,600 Latvian Jews living there. More than 27,500 of them were murdered on November 30, 1941, 'Riga Bloody Sunday', and one week later on December 8/9, 1941, to make room for the Jews deported from the German Reich to Riga.³⁵ Those murdered also included all 1,053 occupants of the 7th deportation transport to the East from Berlin, which had reached Riga on November 30, 1941. This mass murder in the forest of Rumbula took place on the orders of the Höherer SS- und Polizeiführer for Ostland and Rußland-Nord, SS Obergruppenführer Friedrich Jeckeln, who acted on his own authority.³⁶

The train from Nuremberg arrived at its destination Riga just a few days after 'Bloody Sunday'. On December 2, 1941, after three days and two nights, it reached the Riga-Skirotava freight yard, which is located in a suburb in the south-east of the city and served as the destination station for transports to Riga.³⁷

As the clearing of the Riga ghetto and the murder of the ghetto inhabitants had not yet been completed, those deported from Nuremberg were taken from

32 There is evidence of the route of the transport train from Düsseldorf with train number Da 38, which took the same route via Berlin to the destination Riga-Skirotava (Jungfernhof). See transport report by Polizeihauptmann Paul Salitter, 26.12.1941, printed in Raul Hilberg: *Sonderzüge nach Auschwitz*, Mainz: Dumjahn, 1981, 130 – 138. Yad Vashem assumes the same transport route via Berlin, see Yad Vashem: "Transport, Zug 'Da 32' von Nürnberg nach Jungfernhof". Available at: <https://deportation.yadvashem.org/index.html?language=de&itemId=9437978&ind=1>. Last accessed: 15.01.2022.

33 Gottwaldt/Schulle, *Judendeportationen*, 110.

34 The Riga ghetto only represented an interim solution. Cf. Andrej Angrick and Peter Klein: *Die "Endlösung" in Riga. Ausbeutung und Vernichtung 1941–1944*, Darmstadt: WBG, 2006, 199.

35 Gottwaldt/Schulle, *Judendeportationen*, 111; Angrick/Klein, *Endlösung in Riga*, 180.

36 Richard Rhodes: *Die deutschen Mörder. Die SS-Einsatzgruppen und der Holocaust*, Bergisch Gladbach: Lübbe, 2004, 318 – 320.

37 Gottwaldt/Schulle, *Judendeportationen*, 122.

Skirotava to the Jungfernhof estate, six kilometers from the center of Riga.³⁸ The journey there involved the occupants of the transport traveling 1.5 kilometers on foot.

Jungfernhof, a former farming estate for the city of Riga, which had been taken over by the Security Police (SiPo) following the German occupation of Latvia, served as a detention camp, labor camp, and temporary assembly point. It was not originally intended as a prisoner camp and thus, compared to other camps and ghettos, it represents a special case within the Nazi camp system. There were plans to create a large model agricultural business to ensure supplies to SS units stationed in and around Riga. The camp commander and estate manager was farmer and SS-Unterscharführer Rudolf Seck, who came from Süderdithmarschen.³⁹

Jungfernhof was in a dilapidated state when the Nuremberg deportees arrived. The 200-hectare estate extended between the Dünaburg (Daugavpils) highway and the bank of the Daugava River. The farm complex consisted of a walled farmhouse, three large wooden barns, five small houses, and various cattle sheds. The barns were in a dire condition, the building completely unsuitable for housing several thousand people. In November 1941, multi-story wooden bunk beds had been set up in a hurry in the unheated barns and sheds by Soviet prisoners of war and civilian workers.⁴⁰ Survivor Albert Kimmelstiel wrote in 1945: "The accommodation of the people was a catastrophe. 500 [men] in one open barn, without doors and without window frames, the roof completely rotten, snow, rain, and wind [...] at 32 degrees below zero".⁴¹ Alongside the structural inadequacies came the complete overcrowding of the site. The Nuremberg transport was followed a few days later by a transport from Stuttgart, one from Vienna, and one from Hamburg, each with around 1,000 people. Just under 4,000 Jews thus lived crammed together in a very small space in the worst living and weather conditions. Around 850 people from the four transports died within their first four months at the Jungfernhof camp due to the cold, hunger, illness, and mass shootings.

The 'prisoner community' at Jungfernhof consisted of Germans and Austrians. Life together involved less conflict than the imposed communities in

³⁸ Ibid., 134.

³⁹ Wolfgang Scheffler: "Ein historischer Überblick", in idem./Diana Schulle: *Buch der Erinnerung. Das Schicksal der in die baltischen Staaten deportierten deutschen, österreichischen und tschechoslowakischen Juden 1941–1945*, volume 1, Munich: Saur, 2003, 1–43, here 9–13. There has so far been insufficient research into the history of the Jungfernhof labor camp.

⁴⁰ Gottwaldt/Schulle, *Judendeportationen*, 114.

⁴¹ Albert Kimmelstiel quoted in Switalski, Shalom Forth, 169. Translation by the author.

other transit ghettos, in which 'Western Jews' had to share living space with the local Jewish population.

The arrivals spent the first few weeks after arriving at Jungfernhof organizing their own food. A separate emergency kitchen was gradually set up for each transport, which took care of the meagre food supplies for the prisoners.⁴² Working on the farm was currently unthinkable as it was the middle of a cold winter. Labor details (*Arbeitskommandos*) were later formed, who cleared for example the streets of Riga and the surrounding areas from snow or who tried to obtain firewood. A labor detail at the train station, consisting of younger men, had to unload and clean the transport trains arriving at Skirotava train station. There was also a quarry labor detail, which left the camp for work each morning.⁴³ As the weather became warmer, the establishment of a farm began. The prisoners had to sow vegetables and grow potatoes⁴⁴ on the former runway, which originated from the construction of an airport that was begun on the estate site during Soviet occupation.⁴⁵ Male prisoners had previously been conscripted to perform heavy physical labor to remove large granite slabs from the runway. The women removed mounds in large, heavy tubs to form level areas of farmland.⁴⁶ Prisoners, such as Käthe Frieß, also had to work in the shoe and clothing storage rooms, or as blacksmiths and carpenters.⁴⁷

Despite the hopeless situation and the busy and exhausting everyday life, the prisoner community at Jungfernhof nevertheless found opportunities to establish a cultural and religious life that gave them back a little 'normality' and 'privacy'.

The Jews who were deported into the Riga area in December 1941 were not scheduled for organized systematic murder at that time. On March 15, 1942, SS-Sturmbannführer Rudolf Lange, Commander of the SS Security Police and the SD in Latvia, issued the order to convert the Jungfernhof labor camp into an estate. This order was based, among other things, on the insistence of camp commander Seck to decimate the camp population by removing old and incapacitated people.⁴⁸ Following this conversion, the SS organized the '*Aktion Dünamünde*' at

42 Christin Sandow (ed.): "*Schießen Sie mich nieder!*" Käte Frieß' Aufzeichnungen über KZ und Zwangsarbeit von 1941 bis 1945, Berlin: Lukas, 2017, 32.

43 Angrick/Klein, "Endlösung" in Riga, 225.

44 Hanneliese Reinauer (survivor from the Bayreuth group) in an interview with the author on November 21, 2011.

45 Scheffler, Historischer Überblick, 9.

46 Sandow, Käte Frieß' Aufzeichnungen, 48.

47 Ibid., 34–37.

48 Hans-Hermann Seiffert: *Eine Sehnder Jüdin kehrt zurück*, Konstanz: Hartung-Gorre, 2016, 59.

Jungfernhof on March 26, 1942. All camp inmates over 50 years of age, the sick, and children under 14 years of age with their mothers were to be moved to a new, allegedly better camp.⁴⁹ Lange falsely claimed that the prisoners were being taken to Dünamünde, where they would allegedly find much easier working conditions and better accommodation at a fish cannery.⁵⁰ A district of Riga named Dünamünde did actually exist approx. 30 kilometers to the north-west of Jungfernhof. However, there were no fish canneries there. Instead, the SS took between 1,700 and 1,800 elderly and sick people to the Bikernieki forest to be shot by the Latvian SS. Those killed included the majority of older men and women, as well as mothers with their children, from the Nuremberg transport.⁵¹ However, it is no longer possible to determine the exact number.

The '*Aktion Dünamünde*' represented a crucial turning point in the lives of the prisoners who remained at Jungfernhof.⁵² It meant that each of the survivors from the Nuremberg group lost at least one close family member, relative, or friend. Whole families were wiped out overnight, mothers killed with their children, old, sick, and weak individuals murdered. Men were separated from their families and lost their wives and children.

The mass shooting on March 26, 1942, meant that the 450 prisoners who were still alive now had more space and food at Jungfernhof. On the very next day after the massacre, the SS ordered the building of new heated accommodation barracks with toilets, washrooms, and recreation rooms. Seck released potatoes and vegetables from the fields; the rations also included meat. Seck believed that he could best achieve his goal of creating a model farming estate at Jungfernhof with strong, healthy prisoners.⁵³ The improved conditions were intended to keep sickness away from the camp while retaining and boosting forced labor.

Although the Jungfernhof camp was isolated and did not have an enclosing fence, any camp lighting, or watchtowers, and was only controlled by a mobile patrol of 15 to 20 Latvian auxiliary police officers (Hilfspolizisten), there is no

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Scheffler, Historischer Überblick, 11.

⁵¹ It is certain that, with the exception of two children from Nuremberg (Peter and Samuel Stern), all of the children under six years of age from the Nuremberg transport were killed during this operation. Cf. Gerhard Jochem: "Zum 80. Jahrestag der Deportation von Nürnberg nach Riga-Jungfernhof am 29. November 1941. Das Beispiel der Familie Stern". Available at: <https://stadtarchive-metropolregion-nuernberg.de/zum-80-jahrestag-der-deportation-von-nuernberg-nach-riga-jungfernhof-am-29-november-1941-das-beispiel-der-familie-stern/>. Last accessed: 16.02.2022.

⁵² Sandow, Käte Frieß' Aufzeichnungen, 170.

⁵³ Ibid., 45.

evidence of a single escape or escape attempt by any of the around 4,000 prisoners. This may have been due to the rough terrain, the foreign country, the language barriers, and the unfavorable weather conditions. Without (Latvian) assistance, no one could survive on the run outside the camp for a prolonged period of time. However, a large proportion of the Latvian population held antisemitic views, which meant that there was not much prospect of assistance and there was a risk of being betrayed.⁵⁴

Salaspils, Auschwitz, Riga Ghetto, Riga-Kaiserwald, and Stutthof

The surviving prisoners were taken from Jungfernhof to various camps and ghettos. These included the Salaspils police detention camp (*Polizeihaftlager*), which had been set up around 12 kilometers to the south-east of Jungfernhof at the beginning of December 1941 under the leadership of SS-Obersturmführer Gerhard Maywald. Male prisoners from Jungfernhof and the Riga ghetto were brought there to perform the toughest forced labor in order to build barracks and watch-towers.⁵⁵ These also included around 56 members of the Nuremberg group, strong, healthy men between 16 and 50 years of age, who were transferred to Salaspils shortly after the transport arrived on December 4/5, 1941.⁵⁶ Due to the catastrophic conditions there – it was cold and the accommodation and food supplies were completely inadequate – many of them died in Salaspils. Mass executions also took place there.⁵⁷

The SS had already used the Riga ghetto at the beginning of 1942 to house parts of the Nuremberg group. Following the mass murder of Latvian Jews in the ghetto on November 30 and December 7/8, 1941, the ghetto was divided into two parts: The largest section was named the '*Reichsjudenghetto*' ('German Jew ghetto'), in which the deportees from the German Reich had to live. The smaller section, the '*Kleine Ghetto*' ('Small ghetto'), was inhabited by Latvian Jews. In early 1942, around 200 women from Jungfernhof, including some from the Nuremberg

54 Scheffler, *Historischer Überblick*, 11. Only two men from the Nuremberg group managed to escape during their persecution after their forced stay in Jungfernhof: Ludwig Gutmann from the Maly Trostinez camp in 1944 and Henry Behrens during the Allied bombing of his transport in Germany in 1945.

55 Cf. *ibid.*, 14.

56 *Ibid.*, 14, footnote 61.

57 *Ibid.*, 9–16; Josef Katz: *Erinnerungen eines Überlebenden*, Kiel: Neuer Malik Verlag, 1988, 39–40.

group, came to the larger section of the ghetto. More followed in the subsequent months. Between April 1942 and August 1943, all of the prisoners who remained at Jungfernhof – apart from around 80 forced laborers, who had to stay until Jungfernhof was closed in 1944 – were gradually transferred to the Riga ghetto. Some of the women who came to the ghetto in January 1942 had voluntarily registered for work there. They were divided into work crews (*Arbeitskolonnen*) to clear snow in the city and to perform tidying and sorting work in the ghetto. Some of them were forced to work on the moor near the city in summer 1943.⁵⁸

In an order dated June 21, 1943, Heinrich Himmler instructed Friedrich Jeckeln that “all Jews still present in ghettos in the Ostland region are to be brought together in concentration camps”.⁵⁹ The Latvian SS closed the ‘*Reichsjudenghetto*’ in Riga on November 2, 1943. Following a selection process, some of the inhabitants, particularly the elderly, sick, and those unfit for work, were taken to Auschwitz by train.⁶⁰ The majority of the former ghetto occupants, Jews who were fit for work, were taken to the Riga-Kaiserwald concentration camp, which had been set up in March 1943.⁶¹ Franziska Jahn ascertained that around 5,550 to 5,900 German, Czech, and Austrian Jews from the Riga ghetto were transferred to Kaiserwald between July and November 1943.⁶² From August 1943, the Riga-Kaiserwald concentration camp was the only main camp in occupied Latvia to which all sub-camps were connected.

At Riga-Kaiserwald, the prisoners were re-registered, had their heads shaved, and were given striped uniforms. 15-year-old Hanneliese Reinauer from Bayreuth found the cutting of the hair to be the most degrading aspect.⁶³ From the reception procedure onwards, the identity of the prisoners now only consisted of a prisoner number. The former inmates of the Riga ghetto, including at least 192 survivors from the Nuremberg group,⁶⁴ were distributed between the sub-

⁵⁸ Scheffler, *Historischer Überblick*, 11–13; Lilly Menczel: *Vom Rhein nach Riga. Deportiert von Köln: Bericht einer Überlebenden des Holocaust*, Hamburg: VSA, 2012, 36.

⁵⁹ Heiner Lichtenstein: *Im Namen des Volkes? Eine persönliche Bilanz der NS-Prozesse*, Cologne: Bund-Verlag, 1984, 156. Translation by the author.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Wolfgang Benz and Barbara Distel (eds.): *Der Ort des Terrors. Geschichte der nationalsozialistischen Konzentrationslager*, volume 8, Munich: Beck, 2008, 15–87; Franziska Jahn: *Das KZ Riga-Kaiserwald und seine Außenlager 1943–1944. Strukturen und Entwicklungen*, Berlin: Metropol, 2018.

⁶² Jahn, *Riga-Kaiserwald*, 437.

⁶³ Norbert Aas: *... und trotzdem wieder Bayreuth. Hanneliese Reinauer-Wandersmann*, Bayreuth: Bumerang, 2011, 80.

⁶⁴ The number results from the number of survivors of the massacre on March 26, 1942, from the Nuremberg group (183 people) plus nine surviving men from Salaspils.

camps Spilve, Strasdenhof, Dondangen, and Eleja-Meitene near Mitau (Jelgava), which were subordinate to the Riga-Kaiserwald main camp. They were also brought to other sub-camps within Riga to perform forced labor: Heereskraftfahrpark (army motor vehicle repair), Mühlgraben (army clothing supply), Lenta (repair shop for the SS), SS-Truppenwirtschaftslager, Riga (Reichsbahn) and Allgemeine Elektrizitätsgesellschaft (AEG, general electric corporation).⁶⁵ Families with older children and married couples, who were initially able to stay together in the ghetto, were torn apart and separated by gender. However, they were able to contact each other, see each other, and talk to each other through the barbed wire.⁶⁶

Franziska Jahn calculated the actual number of surviving former prisoners of the Kaiserwald complex to be at least 2,170. It is, however, possible, that up to around 3,500 people could have survived the Kaiserwald concentration camp.⁶⁷ The others, the old, weak, and children, died in the sub-camps and in the main camp, where the SS organized two murder campaigns: The brutal '*Kinderaktion*' ('children's raid') and the '*Krebsbachaktion*' ('Krebsbach action'), named after site doctor Eduard Krebsbach, from spring 1944.⁶⁸

Due to the advancing Soviet front, all Jewish prisoners from the Baltic region were relocated to camps further towards the German Reich from summer 1944 and the Kaiserwald complex was closed.⁶⁹ The destination for the prisoners in the Riga area was the nearest Stutthof concentration camp near Danzig (Gdańsk). This had serious consequences for the camp inmates at Kaiserwald concentration camp and the prisoners housed in the barracks, who once again had to undergo a selection process and withstand the exhausting 'evacuation' by land and sea over the Baltic Sea to Stutthof concentration camp 600 kilometers away. The journey by land initially led to the port city of Libau (Liepāja) 200 kilometers to the west of Riga. The first transports left there on August 6, 1944, on ships that reached Stutthof via Danzig (Gdańsk) on August 9, 1944.⁷⁰

The Stutthof camp, which was set up in 1939 as a 'civilian prison camp' (*Zivilgefangenenlager*) and received the status of 'Grade I concentration camp' on

⁶⁵ Lichtenstein, *Im Namen des Volkes*, 157; Jahn, *Riga-Kaiserwald*, 344–347.

⁶⁶ Menczel, *Vom Rhein nach Riga*, 11 and 41.

⁶⁷ Jahn, *Riga-Kaiserwald*, 438.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 415–420. According to my current knowledge, not a single prisoner from the Nuremberg group is known to have died during internment at the Kaiserwald concentration camp or the sub-camp.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 407–431.

⁷⁰ Benz/Distel, *Der Ort des Terrors*, volume 8, 52–53.

January 19, 1942,⁷¹ was already overcrowded when the prisoners from Riga arrived. The hygiene conditions there and the supplies of food and medications to the prisoners were catastrophic. The health of the prisoners brought here from Riga deteriorated noticeably. The women were mainly conscripted to perform forced labor in the Stutthof sub-camps. From there, individual prisoners went to Neuengamme and later to the Fuhlsbüttel Gestapo prison in Hamburg. However, most of the men were taken by Reichsbahn to other camps in the German Reich shortly after arriving at Stutthof concentration camp, the majority of them to Buchenwald concentration camp, others to the concentration camps in Bergen-Belsen, Natzweiler, Dachau, Neuengamme, Auschwitz-Monowitz, Sachsenhausen, Dachau-Kaufering, Mauthausen, and Libau (Liepāja)/Latvia.⁷² Individual prisoners from Riga, including members of the Nuremberg transport, were part of the inhumane death marches, which left Stutthof concentration camp from January 26, 1945, and the sub-camps heading towards the West.⁷³ In the subsequent months until surrender, the prisoners who survived the death marches, predominantly women, were, in some cases, liberated by members of the Soviet Army or were left behind by fleeing SS guards.⁷⁴

Prisoner Community and Chances of Survival

The people from the Nuremberg group were increasingly decimated by illness, selection processes, and shooting over time in the various places of detention following deportation to Riga. At least 193 out of the 1,012 deportees were still alive following the ‘*Aktion Dünamünde*’ on March 26, 1942. And at least 135 peo-

71 Karin Orth: *Das System der nationalsozialistischen Konzentrationslager. Eine politische Organisationsgeschichte*, Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 1999, 155.

72 Scheffler/Schulle, *Buch der Erinnerung*, volume 1, 42 and volume 2, 533–567.

73 Danuta Drywa: “Stutthof-Stammlager”, in Wolfgang Benz and Barbara Distel (eds.): *Der Ort des Terrors. Geschichte der nationalsozialistischen Konzentrationslager*, volume 6, Munich: Beck, 2007, 477–530, here 514. Concerning the ‘evacuation routes’ see overview map in Jahn, *Riga-Kaiserwald*, 427.

74 The two prisoners from Bayreuth, Friedel and her daughter Hanneliese Reinauer, had been sent from a sub-camp in Thorn to Bromberg with a group of 40 to 50 people in January 1945. On January 26, 1945, the SS guards left them at night and thus they were liberated. Cf. Aas, *Juden in Bayreuth*, 85–87.

ple were still living upon registration at Stutthof concentration camp on August 9 and October 1, 1944.⁷⁵

If we consider the mortality rates of the prisoners from the Jungfernhof in the first five months (December 1941 to April 1942), we can see that the majority of the people already died during this short period due to the tough weather conditions, due to freezing, and mass murder (89 percent). A total of around 850 people at Jungfernhof fell victim to the hard winter of 1941/1942 with hunger and temperatures down to minus 32 degrees centigrade. After March 26, 1942, only 450 mostly younger workers remained at Jungfernhof, at least 183 of whom were members of the Nuremberg group.⁷⁶

Of the 3,991 people deported in the transports from Nuremberg, Stuttgart, Vienna, and Hamburg, only 150 of the 'Jungfernhofers' survived, 52 of whom belonged to the Nuremberg group.⁷⁷ The survivors from the Nuremberg transport were aged between 6 and 60 years, their average age 30.5 years.⁷⁸ Some people survived because their manual skills as a farmer, gardener, carpenter, chef, metalworker, etc., were needed, others because they were in a good physical condition, others because they had attachment figures, such as mothers, fathers, daughters, or sons, who supported them during their detention in the camp. In the following, I will take a closer look at the extent to which these social ties increased the chances of survival.

75 When ascertaining the change in the number of survivors, three key dates were compared: 26.03.1942 ('*Aktion Dünamünde*'), 09.08.1944/01.10.1944 (registration in Stutthof concentration camp), and 08.05.1945 (end of the war).

76 Cf. fig. 1. There were also at least 10 men conscripted to perform forced labor at the Salaspils camp at this time.

77 Gottwaldt/Schulle, *Judendeportationen*, 115. The 148 survivors mentioned by Gottwaldt and Schulle must be corrected to 150 due to Irene Gerstl and Justin Zeilberger, who have not been recorded as survivors in the literature to date. For Irene Gerstl, see Reiner Strätz: *Biographisches Handbuch*, volume 1, Würzburg: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1989, 191; for Justin Zeilberger, see Hübschmann, *Die Deportation von Juden aus Franken nach Riga*, 365. – The number of survivors from the Nuremberg transport should be reduced by two people, Ignatz Julius Selling, who was from Stuttgart, and Ludwig Ramsfelder, who was not deported. However, Irene Gerstl and Justin Zeilberger, who had not been recorded as survivors in the literature to date, need to be taken into account. The number of survivors thus remains unchanged.

78 Age on 08.05.1945.

Tab. 1: Chronological presentation of the decimation of the Nuremberg group⁷⁹

Chronology/places of departure	BA	BY	CO	ER	FO	FÜ	NU	WÜ	Transport
Occupants of transport 'Da 32' on November 29, 1941	118	46	25	4	8	94	515	202	1,012
Survivors 'Aktion Dünamünde' on March 26, 1942	21	8	1	4	0	26	86	37	183
Living men on March 26, 1942 at the Salaspils camp	1	3	-	-	-	-	4	2	10
Survivors on March 26, 1942 total	22	11	1	4	0	26	90	39	193
Alive on January 1, 1945	5	4	1	3	0	7	27	24	71
Died between January 1, 1945 and May 8, 1945	2	-	-	-	-	3	7	7	19
Survivors on May 8, 1945	3	4	1	3	0	4	20	17	52

Legend: BA = Bamberg; BY = Bayreuth; CO = Coburg; ER = Erlangen; FO = Forchheim; FÜ = Fürth; NU = Nuremberg; WÜ = Würzburg

Alongside the provision of food and maintaining health, belonging to a social group within the prisoner community was an important factor when it came to the chances of survival. Living under the care of a group could guaranteed support from familiar people. It provided safety and offered a better supply of food and an emotional bond. However, the larger and closer the kinship relationship with other transport participants, the more frequently families and individuals were confronted with the death of their relatives and friends.

Those deported included various family groups, married couples, kinship and friendship groups, and relationships that arose during the detention at Jungfernhof. An investigation into the family and kinship relationships and ties among the transport participants found that at least over three quarters of the deportees (78 percent) were related either directly or by marriage to other people in the transport. The majority were nuclear families (mother, father, children) with 38.8 percent. This was followed by married couples without children with a share of 29 percent. Only around one in five people in the deported group was an individual without any kinship relationship to another transport participant (see fig. 2).⁸⁰

⁷⁹ Cf. Scheffler/Schulle, *Buch der Erinnerung*, volume 2, 545–566. The table was created by the author and supplemented with data from his own research. The death data for deportees on 26.03.1942, 01.01.1945, and 08.05.1945 was compared.

⁸⁰ My research comprised ascertaining the family and kinship links between all the transport participants. The investigation concerned family groups (father, mother, with children, spouses

These links became fewer and fewer over time and largely existed until at least March 26, 1942 ('*Aktion Dünamünde*'). Following this, very few families still existed among the prisoners. Alongside the family group, partnerships and marriages formed the second most common social tie. Social groups were generally retained, even when changing camps or ghettos.⁸¹ For many people, social ties were helpful and crucial for survival. Of the 135 prisoners from the Nuremberg group who were registered on arrival at Stutthof concentration camp, it can be shown that over half of them (72 people) had a kinship relationship or social tie, i.e. were accompanied by at least one family member. In turn, one in every three of these (25 out of a total of 52 survivors) had survived the Shoah.⁸² One reason for the high proportion of survivors with family connections is that this early transport originated directly in the home region of the deportees. In later transports from the home region and between the concentration camps, in contrast, the age structure and the composition of the social groups changed significantly.

At least 265,000 people were deported from the 'Greater Germanic Reich' for extermination, 24,685 of these were transported to Riga. From the 25 transports to Riga in 1941/1942, only 1,082 people survived the Shoah, 609 of these were women and 473 men.

Of the 52 survivors from the Nuremberg group, 38 people emigrated to the USA after liberation, two each to Palestine/Israel and the United Kingdom, and one person to Chile. Justin Zeilberger died a week after his liberation. Only eight people returned to their former home Franconia.

The history of an individual transport and the reconstruction of the paths of persecution for the people who were deported on it represents an often little-noticed chapter in the written history of the Shoah.

The existence of biographical sources for the individual victims is essential in order to allow their many individual fates to be traced and to reconstruct the history of a transport. In the case of the researched transport from Nuremberg, documents have been retained for some of the deportees, while only names

with children), siblings, brother-in-law or sister-in-law, and individuals, for whom no kinship relationship with another transport participation could so far be demonstrated.

81 Jahn, *Riga-Kaiserwald*, 338–339.

82 The development of the number of survivors from the Nuremberg transport at the time of the registrations at Stutthof concentration camp on August 9, 1944, and October 1, 1944, (135 people) was compared with the number of survivors on May 8, 1945. The number of registered prisoners from the Nuremberg group at Stutthof concentration camp was taken from Scheffler/Schulle, *Buch der Erinnerung*, volume 2, 567.

and places and dates of birth are known for others. An evaluation of the sources makes it possible to identify kinship relationships within the group of deportees.

Tab. 2: Social links of Jews from the transport 'Da 32' on November 29, 1941

Place of departure	Number of deportees	Total kinship relationships with regard to the departure transport		of which family members		of which married couples (number of people)		of which individuals without kinship/family relations	
		Pers.	%	Pers.	%	Pers.	%	Pers.	%
Bamberg	118	89	75.4	36	30.5	42	35.6	28	23.7
Bayreuth	46	43	93.5	19	41.3	18	39.1	3	6.5
Coburg	25	20	80.0	6	24.0	14	56.0	6	24.0
Erlangen	4	4	100	4	100	-	-	-	-
Forchheim	8	5	62.5	3	37.5	2	25.0	3	37.5
Fürth	94	64	68.1	36	38.3	26	27.7	21	22.3
Nuremberg	515	395	76.7	196	38.1	150	29.1	116	22.5
Würzburg	202	174	86.1	96	47.5	42	20.8	38	18.8
Total	1,012	789	78.0	393	38.8	294	29.1	216	21.4

The figures may deviate slightly. The percentages relate to the respective departure transport/total transport.⁸³

Most people from this specific Nuremberg transport were not alone on the way to their deaths. They were accompanied by spouses, family members, relatives, acquaintances, and friends. The suffering was made all the more intolerable when whole families were wiped out, grandmother or grandfather, mother or father, mothers with young children, brother or sister, brother-in-law or sister-in-law were killed, such as in the mass graves in Bikernieki forest or other murder sites, and the family members were forced to witness this within close proximity.

It is to be assumed that most camp prisoners would still have died from hunger, freezing, illness, old age, group executions, selection procedures, and due to 'extermination through labor' even if the large-scale '*Aktion Dünamünde*' had not

⁸³ Cf. *ibid.*, 545–567.

existed. There was no escape to freedom for the prisoners.⁸⁴ Their only salvation lay in the collapse of National Socialism and the end of the war.

84 Comment in the meeting protocol about the “Final Solution of the Jewish Question” on January 20, 1942 (Wannsee Conference): “Any final remnant that survives will doubtless consist of the most resistant elements. They will have to be dealt with appropriately because otherwise, by natural selection, they would form the germ cell of a new Jewish revival.” Quoted in Mark Roseman: *The Wannsee Conference and the Final Solution: A Reconsideration*, New York: Metropolitan Books, 2002, 157–172, here 164–165.

