

Ingo Loose

Deportations of Jews to the Ghetto of Litzmannstadt (Łódź)

Some Thoughts on the State of Research, on Older Discussions and Open Questions

Abstract: Using a memorial book from 2009 for more than 4,200 Berlin Jews deported to the ghetto of Litzmannstadt as a starting point, the article outlines the state of research on the ghetto and especially on the deportations from a number of cities in the Reich in autumn 1941. Second, it discusses the significance and position of Litzmannstadt in Shoah research, the desiderata and – in some cases even significant – gaps in our knowledge, but also the uneven reception and evaluation of the preserved sources, i.e. archival findings as well as survivors' testimonies. This includes also the question to what extent the choice of sources influences the nature of the questions we ask about the history of a given ghetto or the Shoah in general.

Introduction: What We Do Know

The ghetto in Łódź (or Litzmannstadt in German, when the town was renamed between 1940 and 1945) in occupied Poland (i.e., in the annexed western territories, the so-called Reichsgau Wartheland or Warthegau) was in terms of size and population after the Warsaw ghetto the second biggest ghetto the Nazis imposed in Eastern Middle Europe and lasted until summer 1944. At this time, the overwhelming majority of European Jews was already murdered in the Shoah. Although Łódź had a numerous Jewish population before September 1, 1939, tens of thousands of Jews were brought to the ghetto also from other regions and from many smaller ghettos in the 'Warthegau' between autumn 1941 and the end of 1942. In the following, I would like to pursue the question of whether the current state of research indicates significant scholarly gaps and what this could mean for further research into the ghetto of Litzmannstadt and for the history of deportations in general.

In 2009, a memorial book was published for the more than 4,200 Jews deported in four transports from Berlin to Litzmannstadt between mid-October and the beginning of November 1941. These were four out of 25 transports (i.e. including five transports with Roma from the Austrian Burgenland region) to

Litzmannstadt, which, apart from a few previous deportations between October 1938 and early 1941, marked the beginning of countless other transports ‘to the East’. This marked also the beginning of the industrial dimension of the Shoah through stationary killing camps in autumn 1941, when the erection of the Kulmhof death camp 70 km in the north of Litzmannstadt was already under way.¹ Following the opening of the Radegast commemoration site in Łódź in 2004, this memorial book emerged from a research project for students in cooperation with the State Archives of Łódź and the Foundation Topography of Terror in Berlin. On the basis of preserved transport lists and numerous other archival findings especially in Łódź not only almost all deportees from Berlin (and from Emden, from where Jews were included in the second Berlin transport) were identified, but their individual fate, too, could be precisely described in the context of the ghetto. The documentation includes information on the death of more than 40,000 people within the ghetto, the murder of tens of thousands in the Kulmhof extermination camp and finally on the mass deportations of almost 70,000 Jews to the Auschwitz-Birkenau death camp in August 1944 which marked the liquidation of the Litzmannstadt ghetto as one of the very last ghettos in German occupied Europe.

Since then, several other memorial books have been published – partly concerning other transports from Berlin (e.g. to Minsk),² partly for other deportees being sent from the Reich to Litzmannstadt, for example, from Prague, Vienna, Düsseldorf, Luxemburg/Trier,³ in the fall of 1941.⁴ These memorial books have

1 Ingo Loose (ed.): *Berliner Juden im Getto Litzmannstadt 1941–1944. Ein Gedenkbuch*, Berlin/Łódź: Foundation Topography of Terror, 2009; Polish edition: Ingo Loose (ed.): *Żydzi Berlińscy w Litzmannstadt Getto 1941–1944. Księga pamięci*, Berlin/Łódź: Fundacja Topografia Terroru, 2009; Ingo Loose (ed.): *Die Verfolgung und Ermordung der europäischen Juden durch das nationalsozialistische Deutschland 1933–1945. Volume 10: Polen. Die eingegliederten Gebiete August 1941–1945*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2020.

2 Anja Reuss and Kristin Schneider (eds.): *Berlin – Minsk. Unvergessene Lebensgeschichten. Ein Gedenkbuch für die nach Minsk deportierten Berliner Jüdinnen und Juden*, Berlin: Metropol, 2013; Clara Hecker: “Deutsche Juden im Minsker Ghetto”, in *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 58, 2006, 823–843; Julia Berlit-Jackstien and Karljosef Kreter (eds.): *Abgeschoben in den Tod: Die Deportation von 1001 jüdischen Hannoveranerinnen und Hannoveranern am 15. Dezember 1941 nach Riga*, Hannover: Hahn, 2011.

3 Angelika Brechelmacher, Bertrand Perz and Regina Wonisch (eds.): *Post 41. Berichte aus dem Getto Litzmannstadt. Ein Gedenkbuch*, Vienna: Mandelbaum, 2015; Pascale Eberhard (ed.): *Der Überlebenskampf jüdischer Deportierter aus Luxemburg und der Trierer Region im Getto Litzmannstadt. Briefe Mai 1942*, Saarbrücken: Blattlausverlag, 2012; Angela Genger and Hildegard Jakobs (eds.): *Düsseldorf/ Getto Litzmannstadt. 1941*, Essen: Klartext, 2010; Rolf Uphoff: *Reise ohne Wiederkehr, Wege in das Grauen. Die Deportation der letzten jüdischen Bürger Emdens, Nordens und*

chosen sometimes comparable, sometimes different approaches to the topic of deportations and the Jewish deportees. However, what these publications have in common with their claim not only to historical reconstruction, but also with the intention of commemoration, is the individualization of the victims, not only the listing of their names, but also the exploration of their private life before the deportation. The intention is to portray them as individual human beings, as personalities and not alone as victims, all the less as nameless victims being deported somewhere 'in the East'. What some of these memorial books also strive for, albeit to a different extent, is the connection with the places to which the deportees were involuntarily brought to, that is: in a completely alien and catastrophic world, in which they remained alive for more or less long, or died from the severe living conditions shortly after their arrival or in the long run were murdered in the death camps.

However, the biggest surprise, when working on the memorial book mentioned above, were the numerous reactions from all over the world, emails and letters from relatives and even from a few survivors from Australia to South America, Europe, the USA and Israel. It turned out that there was a large (albeit hardly coherent) community of descendants who followed every new publication on the topic. And what was perhaps even more surprising and satisfying at the same time was that the research also acquired a religious dimension in that many relatives finally, since the exact date of death of the deportees became known for the first time, could say 'yorzeit' or *kaddish* on the day of death of their beloved ones.

Deportations were a central pillar of the Nazi mass crimes in Europe before (namely in October 1938) and especially during the Second World War and served different motives. First, the expulsion of the Jews was the one and first political goal and central mobilizing ideology of Hitler and the NSDAP since its first days in the early 1920s. Second, the Nazi regime deported Jewish, as well as non-Jewish laborers to work.⁵ Third, prisoners were deported to all kinds of camps, Jews to hundreds of ghettos, in order to allegedly fight diseases,

Aurichs, Emden: Stadt Emden, 2011; Richard Seemann: *Ghetto Litzmannstadt. Dokumente a výpovědi o životě českých židů v ložském ghettu*, Praha: self-published, 2000.

4 For a concise overview of all deportations of Jews from the Reich during the Shoah, see Alfred Gottwaldt and Diana Schulle (eds.): *Die "Judendeportationen" aus dem Deutschen Reich 1941–1945. Eine kommentierte Chronologie*, Wiesbaden: Marix, 2005.

5 Wolf Gruner: *Jewish Forced Labor Under the Nazis. Economic Needs and Racial Aims, 1938–1944*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006; Dieter Maier: *Arbeitseinsatz und Deportation. Die Mitwirkung der Arbeitsverwaltung bei der nationalsozialistischen Judenverfolgung in den Jahren 1938–1945*, Berlin: Hentrich, 1994.

for the enrichment of the perpetrators and to make room for Germanization. Finally, above all, deportations were a crucial aspect of the Shoah: Three million Jewish victims out of six million altogether were deported in some way, as well as tens of thousands of Roma and Sinti, whose deportations and their fate in general are still insufficiently scrutinized, if not grossly neglected.⁶

If we look at the state of research, Litzmannstadt can probably be considered one of the best-researched ghettos of all, alongside Warsaw. And it should be added that it is also the one with by far the most preserved original sources – from the perpetrators as well as from the victims. Editions, for example the famous chronicle of the ghetto,⁷ books, research papers, memorial texts, huge photo collections from Jewish and non-Jewish perspectives,⁸ source editions, some of which appeared immediately after the end of the war, are available to researchers today. The same applies to the most diverse forms of commemoration on site and at the places where the deportation trains to Litzmannstadt departed. Finally, the many stumbling stones (*Stolpersteine*) in the places of last residence for deportees should be mentioned as well.

A considerable number of monographs, for example from the pen of Isaiah Trunk or Henryk Rubin,⁹ in recent years from Michal Unger, Andrea Löw, and others,¹⁰ prove the good but in some respect still insufficient state of knowledge of the overall history of the Litzmannstadt ghetto. In addition, there are also se-

6 Cf. Birthe Kundrus and Beate Meyer (eds.): *Die Deportation der Juden aus Deutschland. Pläne – Praxis – Reaktionen 1938–1945*, Göttingen: Wallstein, 2005².

7 Julian Baranowski et al. (eds.): *Kronika getta łódzkiego/Litzmannstadt Getto 1941–1944*, Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2009; German edition: Sascha Feuchert, Erwin Leibfried and Jörg Riecke (eds.): *Die Chronik des Gettos Lodz/Litzmannstadt*, Göttingen: Wallstein, 2007.

8 Ingo Loose (ed.): *Das Gesicht des Gettos. Bilder jüdischer Photographen aus dem Getto Litzmannstadt 1940–1944 / The Face of the Ghetto. Pictures taken by Jewish Photographers in the Litzmannstadt Ghetto 1940–1944*, Berlin: Foundation Topography of Terror, 2010; Tanja Kinzel: *Im Fokus der Kamera. Fotografien aus dem Getto Lodz im Spannungsfeld von Kontexten und Perspektiven*, Berlin: Metropol, 2021.

9 Isaiah Trunk: *Lodzsher geto. A historishe un sotsiologishe shidue mit dokumentn, tabelle un mape*, New York: Marstin Press, 1962; English edition: idem.: *Łódź Ghetto. A History*, Bloomington/Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006; Icchak (Henryk) Rubin: *Żydzi w Łodzi pod niemiecką okupacją 1939–1945*, London: Kontra, 1988.

10 Hanno Loewy and Gerhard Schoenberger: “Unser einziger Weg ist Arbeit.” *Das Getto in Łódź 1940–1944*, Vienna: Löcker, 1990; Michal Unger (ed.): *The Last Ghetto. Life in the Lodz Ghetto 1940–1944. Ha-geto ha-akharon. Ha-khaym ba-geto lodzh 1940–1944*, Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1997³; Andrea Löw: *Juden im Getto Litzmannstadt. Lebensbedingungen, Selbstwahrnehmung, Verhalten*, Göttingen: Wallstein, 2006; Carlos Alberto Haas: *Das Private im Ghetto. Jüdisches Leben im deutsch besetzten Polen 1939 bis 1944*, Göttingen: Wallstein, 2020.

veral detailed studies, for example on the judiciary of the ghetto¹¹ or on the German administration authorities¹² or even on stamps and money in the ghetto.¹³ The role that the deportations played in the decision-making process in Berlin and on the periphery for the murder of European Jews in the fall of 1941 is also described, although it is not exhaustingly studied, especially not in a comparing way.¹⁴ At the same time, in recent years, research results and the commemoration of the victims in the city of Łódź, especially since the 60th anniversary of the liquidation of the ghetto in 2004, have met with intense interest, as reflected in the genesis of the Radegast memorial at the former railway station where the deportations from the Reich arrived and the transports towards the Kulmhof death camp departed,¹⁵ the Park of the Rescued (Park Ocalałych w Łodzi) and the Marek Edelman Dialogue Center.

All in all, it is not entirely presumptuous to say that we know a lot about the Litzmannstadt ghetto, the German plans and goals for it, the involuntarily inhabitants and victims, the deportations from the Reich, Vienna, Prague and Luxembourg, but also from the Reichsgau Wartheland to Litzmannstadt. Furthermore, quite few is known about the responsible perpetrators on site, in the Warthegau's 'capital' Posen (Poznań) and finally also in Berlin.

With this short and incomplete backdrop in mind, one may ask which questions or topics have not yet met sufficient – if any – historical research and which questions are still to be discussed in order to broaden our overall knowledge and maybe to establish new areas of research especially when it comes to

11 Svenja Bethke: "Regeln und Sanktionen im Getto Litzmannstadt. Die Bekanntmachungen des Judenratsvorsitzenden Rumkowski", in *Zeitschrift für Genozidforschung*, 1/2, 2013, 30–52; idem: *Tanz auf Messers Schneide. Kriminalität und Recht in den Ghettos Warschau, Litzmannstadt und Wilna*, Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2015.

12 Peter Klein: *Die "Gettoverwaltung Litzmannstadt" 1940–1944. Eine Dienststelle im Spannungsfeld von Kommunalbürokratie und staatlicher Verfolgungspolitik*, Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2009; Adam Sitarek: "Otoczone drutem państwa". *Struktura i funkcjonowanie administracji żydowskiej getta łódzkiego*, Łódź: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, 2015.

13 Manfred Schulze and Stefan Petriuk: *Unsere Arbeit – unsere Hoffnung. Getto Lodz 1940–1945. Eine zeitgeschichtliche Dokumentation des Post- und Geldwesens im Lager Litzmannstadt*, Schwalmtal: Phil-Creativ, 1995. See also the article by Anna Veronica Pobbe in this volume.

14 See above all Michael Alberti: *Die Verfolgung und Vernichtung der Juden im Reichsgau Wartheland 1939–1945*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006; Gottwaldt and Schulle, "Judendeportationen" aus dem Deutschen Reich; Wolf Gruner: "Von der Kollektivausweisung zur Deportation der Juden aus Deutschland (1938–1945). Neue Perspektiven und Dokumente", in Kundrus and Meyer, *Pläne – Praxis – Reaktionen*, 21–62.

15 Cf. Ingo Loose: "Das Vernichtungslager Kulmhof am Ner (Chełmno nad Nerem) 1941 bis 1945", in Beate Meyer (ed.): *Deutsche Jüdinnen und Juden in Ghettos und Lagern (1941–1945)*. Łódź. Chełmno. Minsk. Riga. Auschwitz. Theresienstadt, Berlin: Metropol, 2017, 54–75.

the deportations of Jews to the Litzmannstadt ghetto or from the ghetto to the death camps.

Precisely where things seem familiar and well researched to us, historical research can and should focus on three central tasks in addition to knowledge production as such: reflecting on our explanatory models, criticizing methods, and reassessing the preserved sources. In the following, I would like to reduce this to three questions, namely: What do we not yet know? How does the existing knowledge influence and affect research and the public understanding of historiography of the Shoah,¹⁶ of the ghettos, and the deportations in particular? And finally, already in the form of a conclusion: What can the future hold for our perception of the deportations to Litzmannstadt and of deportations during the Shoah in general?

What We Still Do Not Know

Since the researchers' but also the general public's interest in knowledge is constantly changing, depending on our current historical, social and political circumstances, the idea is misleading from the start, that historical research is more or less like a puzzle, in which all is about finding missing parts and inserting them correctly until the finished picture finally lies in front of us. At first sight it seems to be easy, in a certain way additively, which is just as legitimate as it is important, to expand the level of knowledge about the deportations to Litzmannstadt, for example by pressing ahead with research on the still unexplored cities in the Reich from which transports with Jews were directed to the Litzmannstadt ghetto. Primarily this is being done on the micro level with a considerable number of publications in recent years, mostly in Poland and Germany. However, the many different presentations at the conference *Deportations in the Nazi Era – Sources and Research* in November 2020, on which this volume is based, showed how complex the amount of detail quickly becomes.

It has long been known that the deportations from the Reich to the Reichsgau Wartheland had a central function for the radicalization of the Nazi persecution of Jews and their subsequent systematic extermination.¹⁷ Since October

¹⁶ On the term Shoah itself, see Dan Michman: "Why Is the Shoah Called 'the Shoah' or 'the Holocaust'? On the History of the Terminology for the Nazi Anti-Jewish Campaign", in *The Journal of Holocaust Research*, 35/4, 2021, 233–256.

¹⁷ Ian Kershaw: "Improvised Genocide? The Emergence of the 'Final Solution' in the Warthegau", in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 2/6, 1992, 51–78; Peter Klein: "Die Erlaubnis zum grenzenlosen Massenmord – Das Schicksal der Berliner Juden und die Rolle der Einsatz-

1938 at the latest, when 17,000 Jews of Polish nationality were forcibly deported from the Reich to the Polish border, the Nazi leadership had been thinking about how Jews could be deported 'to the East'. Soon after the occupation of Poland in September 1939, large areas, i.e. annexed Western Poland, were designated as territory to be Germanized. With regard to the Reich, it was Reinhard Heydrich, who stated at the Wannsee Conference of January 20, 1942, that "housing issues and other socio-political necessities"¹⁸ added to the urgency of deportations. Apart from deportations from Vienna and Prague, it was the big cities in the 'Altreich' or rather the cities with the biggest Jewish population, most of them already hit by Allied air raids, from which the Jews started to be deported in autumn 1941. In October 1941 alone more than 8,000 Jews from the 'Altreich' were brought to Litzmannstadt, altogether approximately 20,000.¹⁹

However, the first deportations of Polish Jews (and Polish Gentiles) from the Warthegau region to the 'General Government' took place in late autumn and winter 1939/40 to make space for 60,000 Baltic German 'resettlers' who mostly settled in the 'Warthegau' and demanded housing and jobs preferably in towns like Posen.²⁰ What followed were countless internal deportations within the 'Warthegau' – especially in the context of several 'near plans' for the fast and total 'Germanization' and the operation 'Home to the Reich' ('*Heim-ins-Reich-Aktion*'). Already these transports were accompanied by excessive brutality, mass shootings on site and in the near forests, as research literature has convincingly shown. The next step were transports to the ghettos, labor camps, later to the Kulmhof extermination camp on which research has made significant

gruppen bei dem Versuch, Juden als Partisanen 'auszurotten'", in Rolf-Dieter Müller and Hans-Erich Volkmann (eds.): *Die Wehrmacht. Mythos und Realität*, Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999, 923–947; Peter Klein: "Die Rolle der Vernichtungslager Kulmhof (Chełmno), Belzec (Bełżec) und Auschwitz-Birkenau in den frühen Deportationsvorbereitungen", in Dittmar Dahlmann and Gerhard Hirschfeld (eds.): *Lager, Zwangsarbeit, Vertreibung und Deportation. Dimensionen der Massenverbrechen in der Sowjetunion und in Deutschland 1933–1945*, Essen: Klartext, 1999, 459–481; Ingo Loose: "Wartheland", in Wolf Gruner and Jörg Osterloh (eds.): *The Greater German Reich and the Jews. Nazi Persecution Policies in the Annexed Territories 1935–1945*, New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2015, 189–218.

18 Cited from the Protocol of the Wannsee Conference, January 20, 1942, in Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (PAAA), R 100857, fol. 166–188, here fol. 173, p. 8 of the protocol. Translation by the author.

19 Götz Aly: *Hitlers Volksstaat. Raub, Rassenkrieg und nationaler Sozialismus*, Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 2005³, 140.

20 Michael Alberti assumes that the majority of the deportees were Jews. See Alberti, *Vernichtung der Juden im Reichsgau Wartheland*, 136–137, especially footnote 415. Cf. in contrast Maria Rutowska: *Wysiedlenia ludności polskiej z Kraju Warty do Generalnego Gubernatorstwa 1939–1941*, Poznań: Instytut Zachodni, 2003, 49.

progress in recent years.²¹ However, the successive liquidation of the smaller ghettos in the first half of 1942, etc. have scarcely been investigated, not to mention the situation for Jews in the province.²² A better understanding of the dynamics or systematics and the immense potential for increasing violence of these deportations would be decisive for a better understanding of when deportations in the 'Warthegau' changed from a policy of 'making space' to systematic mass murder. This would also make the whole range of actors and their fields for maneuver, institutions, district self-administration etc. better visible.

Most research deals specifically with individual transports and/or ghettos and treats them more or less separately from the larger historical context of the deportations. An additional and demanding task therefore would be a comparative approach to a broader set of deportations either from various cities to Litzmannstadt or within the 'Warthegau', because research projects on individual transports often fail in combining their findings and interpretations with other transports, deportations etc. While comparing different ghettos or a certain number of deportations, the problem of scaling, for example, scaling ghettos of different sizes and their respective social structures, etc., can be better detected or even avoided, because what historiography knows about the ghettos in Litzmannstadt or Warsaw is not necessarily correct with regard to smaller ghettos. How do we deal with the knowledge of the approximately 20,000 Reich German, Prague and Luxembourg Jews in Litzmannstadt in relation to smaller ghettos, of which our knowledge often tends towards zero?

Looking from a German perspective alone at the antisemitic persecution in the years after the 'seizure of power' in 1933 on the one hand and at the deportations of Jews from the Reich 'to the East' in autumn 1941 on the other hand, we run the risk of ignoring and disregarding the fate of hundreds of thousands of Jews, especially in East Central and Eastern Europe for several years in which the ghettos continued to exist and Jews continuously got murdered. In the Litzmannstadt ghetto alone, well over 40,000 people died of malnutrition and epidemics as late as 1944. The corresponding number of victims in Warsaw was

21 Alberti, *Vernichtung der Juden im Reichsgau Wartheland*; Bartłomiej and Małgorzata Grzanka: *The Shadow of the Holocaust. The Beginning of the Operation of the German Kulmhof Death Camp in Chełmno-on-Ner*, Luboń: Martyr's Museum in Żabikowo, 2016; Ingo Loose: "Chełmno nad Nerem/Kulmhof am Ner heute begegnen", in Martin Langebach and Hanna Liever: *Im Schatten von Auschwitz. Spurensuche in Polen, Belarus und der Ukraine. Begegnen, erinnern, lernen*, Bonn: Federal Agency for Civic Education, 2017, 206–225.

22 Ingo Loose: "Odkrycie prowincji w historiografii Holocaustu po 1945 roku", in Adam Sitarek, Michał Trębacz and Ewa Wiatr (eds.): *Zagłada Żydów na polskiej prowincji*, Łódź: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, 2012, 467–479.

still far higher, not to mention the countless other compulsory housing areas, camps, and ghettos in occupied Poland and other occupied countries during the Shoah. At least 600,000 people, perhaps more, are estimated to have perished in the ghettos alone; even more victims were deported from the ghettos to their death.²³

While many people believe that they have a comparatively precise idea of concentration and extermination camps, this is much less the case for the approximately 1,200 ghettos that the Nazis established in East Central and Eastern Europe during the Second World War.²⁴ In historiography, the history of the ghettos is not in principle unknown, but there are still considerable gaps in knowledge about the ghettos and even more with regard to the countless translocations of their Jewish inmates.

There are many reasons to take a closer look at the active and self-determined behavior of the persecuted Jews, from mutual social aid to armed resistance, even during the Shoah. Probably based on Ernst Simon's succinct book title *Aufbau im Untergang* (Construction in Decline),²⁵ in the mid-1960s the phrase 'probation in decline' was coined by Ernst Gottfried Löwenthal, who himself had been able to escape into British exile in 1939.²⁶ The numerous biographical appraisals from Löwenthal's pen still read today like a pantheon of German-Jewish culture of the twentieth century. However, Löwenthal's collection of hundreds of biographies was not all about prominent Jewish personalities (although not one of them was deported to the 'Warthegau' or Litzmannstadt). He understood the concept of 'probation' as an expression of the fact that the Jews were by no means just passive victims, he rather spoke of the 'fighting German Jewry', especially the women and men who tried their best in the service of the Jewish community to alleviate the growing need, all too often themselves being sooner or later victims of the Shoah. This admittedly broad concept of resistance therefore seems to be well suited when we talk about the possibilities and the obligation to self-organization in the ghettos. The Jewish resistance, especially the armed one, above all the uprising in the Warsaw ghetto in January and

23 Dieter Pohl: "Ghettos im Holocaust. Zum Stand der historischen Forschung", in Jürgen Zarusky (ed.): *Ghettorenten. Entschädigungspolitik, Rechtsprechung und historische Forschung*, Munich: Oldenbourg, 2010, 39–50.

24 Christopher Browning: "Mehr als Warschau und Lodz. Der Holocaust in Polen", in idem. (ed.): *Der Weg zur "Endlösung". Entscheidungen und Täter*, Bonn: Dietz, 1998, 127–148.

25 Ernst Simon: *Aufbau im Untergang. Jüdische Erwachsenenbildung im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland als geistiger Widerstand*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1959, 68–69, 72.

26 E.G. Löwenthal (ed.): *Bewährung im Untergang. Ein Gedenkbuch. Im Auftrag des Council of Jews from Germany*, London, Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1965.

April 1943, but also the uprisings in the Treblinka and Sobibor extermination camps in autumn 1943, not least the uprising of the Jewish ‘*Sonderkommando*’ in Auschwitz-Birkenau in October 1944 were undoubtedly outstanding events of lasting historical importance.²⁷ Despite the defeat and the following complete destruction of the Warsaw ghetto, the uprising has become a powerful counter narrative to the aforementioned alleged passivity of the Jews during the Shoah for which the ‘Jewish Elder’ in Litzmannstadt, Mordechai Chaim Rumkowski, who was allegedly compliant with the Germans, became the central symbol. Nevertheless, were there any other options, i.e. during the deportations, for the Jews to resist on their own initiative? This, of course, depended on many factors, not to the least on the age of the deportees who in the case of the Berlin transports to Litzmannstadt were very much older than the average in the ghetto. In the immediate postwar period, however, the image of ‘Jewish resistance’ was even broader and referred to other aspects of Jewish action and suffering during the Shoah, too. There were probably very few Jewish survivors who, especially in East Central and Eastern Europe, had no personal experience with being deported to one of the countless ghettos. This was often only the starting point, for example, for deportations to a labor or death camp or for fleeing and hiding. However, the first postwar years were a time of systematic gathering of information, above all by the Jewish Historical Commissions that had formed in the liberated cities with formerly important Jewish communities in Poland and elsewhere. Here the foundation stone was laid for a collection today comprising several thousand testimonies in the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw, which was accompanied by a rich literature of memoirs, however, predominantly written by Jews for Jews, namely in Yiddish. In this way, around the mid-1950s, hundreds of survival reports and contemporary testimonies of the murdered were already published. Suffice to mention the famous Argentine book series *Dos poylishe yidntum* (The Polish Jewry), in which dozens of important reports appeared about individual ghettos (with Warsaw and Litzmannstadt having the most accounts by Jewish survivors). All of them still impressively demonstrate the diverse efforts to maintain human dignity and solidarity within the Jewish community, even under the unspeakable living conditions in the ghettos.

However, one very important aspect rarely received the attention it deserves, for what the uninformed observer could have understood as the passivity of the Jewish masses and what Aba Kovner in the Vilna ghetto had already addressed in his famous appeal that the Jewish masses should not allow themselves to be

27 Arno Lustiger: *Zum Kampf auf Leben und Tod! Vom Widerstand der Juden in Europa 1933–1945*, Erfstadt: Area, 2005, 15–26, 44–56.

led to the slaughter like sheep. This is exactly what reveals a dimension of humanity of its own. The Warsaw based sociologist and historian Barbara Engelking pointed this out using the example of so-called Jewish columns moving from a ghetto – and this could have been equally Warsaw, Litzmannstadt, or any other ghetto – to the train station or the next murder site, supposedly without resistance: “It seems much more understandable to me,” Engelking writes,

that people in the face of death, when the last chance of rescue could presumably be found only in connection with other people, wanted to stay together with their neighbors and relatives and beloved ones. In doing so, they showed love, solidarity, loyalty, and courage. In this common death march I see many positive feelings, many signs of greatness, loyalty and sacrifice. Only the very superficial gaze of an indifferent observer interprets this as a migration of the “sheep to the slaughter”.²⁸

Shmuel Ron, a survivor from the Upper Silesian forced labor camp system for Jews, describes it very similarly:

I’ve always asked myself who can be considered a hero – just the ghetto fighters, or maybe others too? A story that my cousin Sam told me gave an answer to this in a certain sense: Before the selection in Birkenau, Sam stood in the same row as his father. His father was a godly man, he stood there muttering passages of the Talmud that he knew by heart. Sam turned to him and said, “Is this the time to think about the Talmud?” His father replied, “I do mine, and He – pointing to heaven – does his.” A few minutes later Sam’s father picked up a crying child who was standing beside him, all alone without an adult in his company. “I am your horse now and you ride me,” he said to the child in Polish. And so they both went to their deaths.²⁹

Similar accounts from the Kulmhof death camp – at least for the first phase between December 1941 and 1943 – do not exist because there were no survivors who could later tell about them. However, this perspective in particular and social history of the Jewish victims in general can be portrayed only through the eyes of the victims themselves. In his path breaking study *Admitting the Holocaust*, Lawrence Langer has stressed that Jewish diaries from the ghettos often describe perpetrators (and bystanders) in a way postwar and post-Shoah re-

²⁸ Barbara Engelking: *Jest taki piękny słoneczny dzień ... Losy Żydów szukających ratunku na wsi polskiej 1942–1945*, Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Centrum Badań nad Zagładą Żydów, 2011, 32. Translation by the author.

²⁹ Shmuel Ron: *Die Erinnerungen haben mich nie losgelassen. Vom jüdischen Widerstand im besetzten Polen*, Frankfurt am Main: Neue Kritik, 1998, 154. Translation by the author.

searchers simply could not and cannot.³⁰ Through a re-reading of the victims' diaries, the focus lies on a perspective from the inside, on the gradual acquisition of knowledge by the victims and on the adaption of their behavior towards the ever-growing pressure from the outside. This includes not only everyday life and suffering as well as the perception of other Jews sharing a common fate in the ghetto, but also how they thought about the perpetrators. Among other diarists this can be impressively studied in the diary of Jakub Poznański written in the Litzmannstadt ghetto, who constantly watched the interactions between German oppressors and Jewish victims during the war.³¹ What is also entirely based on Jewish accounts is the study of culture. Authors like, for example, David Roskies have emphasized the importance of Shoah diaries for a better understanding of Jewish or Yiddish culture and Jewish religion among the ghetto inhabitants.³² This picture is not automatically the same as we most often have in mind or think we are familiar with when reading postwar histories of this period. However, diaries written in Litzmannstadt and other ghettos have their limitations as well, for example, many diarists were well educated, meaning that they were perhaps not at all representative of the entire Jewish population in a given ghetto. This strongly influenced the content of diaries and the way that their authors – and subsequently historians – reflected on living conditions in the ghettos. The task at hand, however, is to fill the gaps in our understanding of underrepresented groups such as women, children, the elderly, religious Jews, the young generation, or the lower socioeconomic strata of the ghetto population.

How limited our knowledge can prove becomes clear when new questions are brought to science from 'outside'. This became evident, for example, a few years ago, in connection with the compensation of former Jewish forced laborers in the ghettos – the so-called ghetto pensions. Historians were confronted with questions, namely about the remuneration of work in the broadest sense (money,

30 Lawrence L. Langer: "Ghetto Chronicles: Life at the Brink", in idem: *Admitting the Holocaust. Collected Essays*, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, 41–50; Mark Roseman: "Holocaust Perpetrators in Victims' Eyes", in Christian Wiese and Paul Betts (eds.): *Years of Persecution, Years of Extermination: Saul Friedländer and the Future of Holocaust Studies*, London: Continuum, 2010, 81–100.

31 Jakub Poznański: *Tagebuch aus dem Ghetto Litzmannstadt*, Berlin: Metropol, 2011; Polish edition: Jakub Poznański: *Dziennik z łódzkiego getta*, Warszawa: ŻIH, 2002. On the topic of private life in the ghettos – including Litzmannstadt – see Haas, *Das Private im Ghetto*.

32 David Roskies: *The Literature of Destruction: Jewish Responses to Catastrophe*, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1988; Robert Moses Shapiro (ed.): *Holocaust Chronicles. Individualizing the Holocaust through Diaries and other Contemporaneous Personal Accounts*, New York: Ktav Publishing, 1999.

food, protection etc.), which were important especially with regard to ghettos such as Litzmannstadt with a numerous set of craft and other workshops and which simply could not be answered on the basis of the existing state of research.³³ In other words: What the German Federal and Regional social courts dealing with ghetto pension cases wanted to know at the time, nobody among the scholars working in the field had asked before.

Such gaps are sometimes embarrassing or even scandalous – for example in the case of groups of victims that have been until now scarcely researched, such as the aforementioned more than 5,000 Roma from the Austrian Burgenland who were deported to Litzmannstadt at the beginning of November 1941 and entirely murdered only a couple of weeks later.³⁴ The same is true for the persecution and deportations of Roma and Sinti to Auschwitz-Birkenau and elsewhere. In addition, we only slowly begin to understand the crucial connection between the murder of patients and disabled persons and the genesis of the murder of Jews especially in the Reichsgau Wartheland.³⁵ Most of the time our questions about history are formulated and constructed in the present. As the present changes, so does our attitude towards history and the interest in it as well as, last but not least, the needs of a retrospective creation of meaning – especially in relation to the Shoah. And, of course, we have different questions today than, for example, in the 1960s.

33 “Gesetz zur Zahlbarmachung von Renten aus Beschäftigungen in einem Ghetto vom 20. Juni 2002 (mit Wirkung vom 1. Juli 1997)”, in BGBl. I, 2074; Jürgen Zarusky, *Ghettorenten*; Kristin Platt: *Bezweifelte Erinnerung, verweigerter Glaubhaftigkeit. Überlebende des Holocaust in den Ghettorenten-Verfahren*, Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2012; ra-online (pt): “Bundessozialgericht erleichtert Zugang zu ‘Ghetto-Renten’”. Available at: http://www.kostenlose-urteile.de/BSG_B-13-R-8108-RB-13-R-8508-RB-13-R-13908-R_Bundessozialgericht-erleichtert-Zugang-zu-Ghetto-Renten.news7940.htm. Last accessed: 30.12.2021.

34 Karola Fings: “Sinti und Roma – eine Reise am Abgrund”, in Langebach and Liever, *Im Schatten von Auschwitz*, 386–399; Frank Sparing: “Das ‘Zigeunerwohngebiet’ im Ghetto Lodz 1941/42”, in Christoph Dieckmann and Babette Quinkert (eds.): *Im Ghetto 1939–1945. Neue Forschungen zu Alltag und Umfeld*, Göttingen: Wallstein, 2009, 136–170.

35 This point was made particularly strong already by Henry Friedlander, a survivor from the Litzmannstadt Ghetto, see Henry Friedlander: *Der Weg zum NS-Genozid. Von der Euthanasie zur Endlösung*, Berlin: Berlin Verlag, 1997.

How the Existing Knowledge Influences and Affects Research and the Public Understanding of Historiography

What are the structures of knowledge and memory that influence our way of doing research today, in five years or 15 years? Does a perception of loss of the deported neighbors in Berlin, Hamburg, Frankfurt am Main, Vienna, or Düsseldorf,³⁶ imagined by different means of commemoration, lead to stable or an 'improved' awareness of Shoah history, or does it distort or perhaps even obscure the view of the transnational, European dimension of the annihilation of European Jews? In addition to detailed studies, biographies and to the growing but often poorly or at least insufficiently informational commemoration of the past we also need new integrating analyses that put the insights of numerous micro-level investigations into a broader narrative context, revealing, so to speak, the entire picture.

In general, the perspective on the Shoah has changed significantly in the last almost twenty to thirty years, not only in Germany, but also internationally. Shoah research had been part of national historiography for a long time, specifically in those countries that had been occupied or dominated by National Socialism in Europe and whose Jewish population mostly fell victim to Shoah. On the one hand, Jewish memories and national historiographies have often shown a fragile balance even in Western Europe, whereas in Eastern and East Central Europe recent narratives again tend to marginalize the specifics of the Shoah within their national framework.³⁷ 'National historiography' means that in France, for example, the Shoah was understood as an integral part of the history of France between 1940 and 1945 and that, of course, historians of the Shoah were primarily interested in the fate of French Jews. Regardless of whether in Poland, France or the Netherlands: it was increasingly the perspective of the victims that historians took, even if they usually perceived them as a collective of

36 In the sense of what Bernt Engelmann describes as an inconceivable loss that is still felt today in 'Germany without Jews'. See Bernt Engelmann: *Deutschland ohne Juden. Eine Bilanz*, Munich: Schneekluth, 1970.

37 Cf. Jan Grabowski and Ingo Loose: "Die Holocaustgeschichtsschreibung – ein Fall für die Gerichte? Zur Gefährdung der Wissenschaftsfreiheit in Polen", in *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 69, 7/8, 2021, 647–668; Havi Dreifuss: "The Polish Government's Holocaust 'Truth Campaign' Is a Weird Mix of Authoritarianism, Ignorance, and Injured Pride", in *Tablet*, 26.02.2021. Available at: <https://www.tabletmag.com/sections/news/articles/poland-holocaust-controversy-yad-vashem-response>. Last accessed: 30.12.2021.

victims. On the other hand, for a long time this interest was limited to the Jews who remained in a given country. Those who were deported most often were described as ‘perished in the East’, and until 1989 the Iron Curtain led to very limited research what the precise fate of the Jewish deportees ‘in the East’ really had been. Even now, more than 30 years after the fall of the Berlin wall, this filter of perception is still alive, although to a somehow weaker extend. An additional problem is that the historians’ knowledge of foreign languages has apparently decreased in recent years, which represents a considerable obstacle to researching the multilingual sources.

As is well known, Shoah research in Germany for a long time focused predominantly on the history of the perpetrators, and this mainly because the most essential impulses for historical studies came from the prosecutors and the courts, where the focus on the perpetrators and their crimes naturally stood in the foreground. Especially the last few years, however, when the awareness increased that only a few years will be left before the last witnesses, the last survivors, will no longer be able to provide any information about their personal experiences, have brought about a change from the perception of victims as ‘gray masses’ to an individualization of the victims. This can also be observed in the aforementioned large number of memorial books and survivors’ accounts that are published. The beginning of this development was marked by the bestseller by Auschwitz survivor Ruth Klüger *weiter leben*, followed by a now almost unmanageable number of publications.

Later on, the complex coexistence of hundreds of thousands of Jews in the ghettos also aroused increased interest. The ghettos were no longer only the ‘courtyard to hell’, but an object of interest in itself. The opening of many archives after 1989 brought a large number of new files to light, which posed new questions and shaped numerous new topics, especially on the internal perspective of the ghettos and on the Jewish inmates, of which the documents of the perpetrators had not given any information in the years before.

If we understand the deportations to Litzmannstadt as an integral part of the history of the ghetto, one can have the impression that German research in recent years has tended to support commemoration in the places of the departing transports. Whereas in Poland, the transports from the Reich to the ghettos were rather used for introspection in the ghettos, especially about the relationship between ‘Eastern and Western Jews’ in which the perpetrators and also the individuality of the deportees largely disappeared behind a supposed Jewish ‘clash of cultures’.³⁸

38 With regard to Litzmannstadt see as an example Krystyna Radziszewska: “Żydzi zachod-

If one follows Raul Hilberg's well-known categorization of perpetrators, victims and spectators, whereby the term bystanders probably better describes the ambivalence with reference to the latter, then in the case of Litzmannstadt we know a lot about the victims and the perpetrators. But only comparatively little is known about the third category, the bystanders, with the possible exception of individual complaints about how inconvenient it was to use the fenced-off German tram through the ghetto. Seeking for new evidence concerning the bystanders as well as the perpetrators, it is impossible not to reach for witness accounts. The perspective of Jews and their writings have most often very few in common with postwar historiography written on the basis of German official sources alone. Nor have many historians even attempted to look at the German perpetrators through the eyes of the Jews.³⁹ Seemingly, Jewish victims had little or no need to understand Nazi motivations, but they interpreted the behavior of the perpetrators trying to foresee the next steps in the ghettoization and – shortly later – extermination policy.

Reflections on the historian's own attitude towards the subject of his or her topic of interest is a standard procedure in professional historiography. However, this should be even more essential when we reflect on why and how Shoah research is carried out by those who do it. Was and still is ghetto historiography perhaps attractive because this topic offers comparatively little target for historical-political struggles of interpretation, as they have visibly increased in the last few years? The focus on Jews alone completes the perspective on perpetrators, but also on – certainly more controversial – the co-perpetrators, the collaborators and the bystanders. With regard to the Warsaw ghetto and the 'General Government' as a whole, a vivid discussion about Jewish–Gentile relations and the role of non-German collaborators started vehemently at the beginning of the 1990s and especially since the Jedwabne debate in 2000.⁴⁰ The fact that the ghetto in Litzmannstadt does not appear in these debates is only due to the fact that

nioeuropejscy w getcie łódzkim w świetle dzienników i wspomnień z getta", in Paweł Samuś and Wiesław Puś (eds.): *Fenomen getta łódzkiego 1940–1944*, Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2006, 309–325.

³⁹ In the field of literary studies cf. Chunguang Fang: *Das Täterbild in der Überlebenden-Literatur. Ein Vergleich der Täterbilder in der frühen und späten Lagerliteratur von Buchenwald und Dachau*, Frankfurt am Main et al.: Peter Lang, 2017.

⁴⁰ The literary scholar Jan Błoński, who had seen the evacuation of the Warsaw ghetto as a child in 1943, played a prominent role. In 1987, he published an article that was immediately controversially discussed and in which he addressed the passivity of non-Jewish Poles in the face of the Holocaust. See Jan Błoński: *Biedni Polacy patrzą na getto*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1994; German edition in Marek Klecel (ed.): *Polen zwischen Ost und West. Polnische Essays des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine Anthologie*, Berlin: Suhrkamp, 1995, 76–93.

the annexed Polish territories during German occupation in recent years have found little research (and public) interest in Poland.

Since 2015 this debate has become – especially in high-circulation newspapers and social media – an increasingly uncompromising one, not seldom intermingled with far right-wing or even antisemitic tendencies. However, these are by no means just historical discourses of right-wing conservative regimes or historical discourses in East Central Europe. In Germany, too, it seems, there are invisible borders beyond which the understanding for the Jewish victims rapidly diminishes, for example in the area of restitution or the slowly begun provenance research on stolen or ‘Aryanized’ property of those who were later deported and murdered. Incidentally, this also affects deportations and the related question of who under what circumstances and with what help could have been rescued. During the work on the above-mentioned memorial book for the first four transports from Berlin to Litzmannstadt, I recall the failed attempts to find somehow reliable and informative witness reports or notes from Berliners that thousands of Jews for hours long crossed the city mainly by foot to the Berlin deportation station Grunewald in October 1941.

Conclusion: How Future Research on the Ghettos and Deportations May Look Like

The Jewish compulsory communities in the ghettos have found great academic interest in the past decades until today, with all the evaluations, judgments, but also with recognition and the sincere attempt to approach the suffering and horrors in the ghettos. But there is still, as outlined above, even in the case of Litzmannstadt an extensive gap, especially with regard to the social and emotional history of the Jews, the context and the circumstances surrounding their deportations (including their persecution and suffering prior to being deported), and living conditions in the ghetto as a compulsory, yet complex social community. Given the advances in social historiography since the 1960s, this may come as a surprise or even as a scandal.

To improve this unsatisfactory state of affairs there should be at least one aspect kept in mind, namely the constant reconsidering and re-evaluation of the sources. Social history writing long before was methodically declared the royal road of historical writing in the Federal Republic of Germany since the 1960s. Since then it has been only applied scarcely to Eastern European social history of the interwar period, to the time of the Second World War or the Shoah. It is worth mentioning that Jewish social scientists and historians, espe-

cially in the context of the famous Ringelblum Archive Oneg Shabat in the Warsaw ghetto, long before adapted similar methods while scrutinizing the living conditions in the ghetto. The contributors were professional historians such as Emanuel Ringelblum himself, Stanisław Różycki, Peretz Opoczyński, who partly had already made careers in the YIVO or elsewhere; others wrote texts for the archive for the first time in their life: Many of these texts have something peculiar to what could be described as methodical modernity. After the death of the last Jewish and non-Jewish witnesses, it will therefore be a necessity to look again at the hundreds of publications especially from the first postwar years (mainly in Yiddish), as well as at extensive archival holdings that are still more or less completely unknown to this day and can easily be found across entire Europe with the help of finding aids like EHRI.⁴¹

In addition, a lot has happened in the field of digitization, i.e. the online availability of many sources, in the last ten years. In particular, it should be emphasized that the State Archives in Łódź have pushed ahead with the digitization and online placing of archival documents relating to the ghetto like hardly any other archive in Poland. The records of the so-called Elder of the Jews in the Litzmannstadt ghetto are now completely available online.⁴² Accompanying holdings such as the several thousand files with documents by the German ghetto administration are also being successively digitized.

Nevertheless, the search for sources and their evaluation or re-evaluation are not finished, they have only just begun. New questions can come up anytime. Many sources on Litzmannstadt and publications, especially from the immediate postwar period, have been forgotten or have hardly ever been perceived by scholars.⁴³ Although it is important to record the last voices in order to document their experiences, it is also crucial that historians re-evaluate the very first voices as well. Already in the 1960s, Yad Vashem in Jerusalem and the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research in New York started to register bibliographical details of all testimonies published in Yiddish. There are several thousands of these narra-

⁴¹ European Holocaust Research Infrastructure: “EHRI Portal”. Available at: <https://portal.ehri-project.eu/>. Last accessed: 01.02.2022.

⁴² See National Digital Archive: “Przełożony Starszeństwa Żydów w Getcie Łódzkim”. Available at: <https://www.szukajwarchiwach.gov.pl/zespol/-/zespol/28211>. Last accessed: 15.02.2022.

⁴³ To mention just a few titles on Litzmannstadt, see Fareynikter retungs komitet far der shtot lodzsh (ed.): *Lodzsher Yizker-Bukh*, New York: Fareyniktes retungs-komitet fun der shtot lodzsh, 1943; Israel Tabaksblat: *Khurbn-lodzsh. 6 yor natsi-gehenom*, Buenos Aires: Tsentral-farband fun poylishe yidn in argentine, 1946; Moshe Pulaver: *Geven iz a geto*, Tel Aviv: Farlag I.L. Perets, 1963; Wolf Yasny: *Di geshikhte fun yidn in lodzh in di yorn fun der daytsher yidn-oysrotung*, 2 volumes, Tel Aviv: Farlag I.L. Perets, 1960–1966.

tives, plus several more thousand authentic reports held in the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw, including the Oneg Shabbat archive of Emanuel Ringelblum from the Warsaw ghetto but also numerous accounts from ghetto inmates from Litzmannstadt and the Warthegau in general.⁴⁴ In the late 1940s and 1950s, there were literally hundreds and thousands of survival reports and also specialist literature in Yiddish, which even in Israel and the USA is hardly used at all for research.

While at the beginning of the 1990s there was still a kind of optimistic mood to learn the languages relevant for research (mainly Polish and Yiddish), for some years there has been more of a 'retreat', focusing more on the fate of the German Jews during the 1930s. The Iron Curtain has undoubtedly made the decades-long repression of German crimes 'in the East' much easier. This – let us call it – filter effect has by no means dissolved into favor after 1989, but rather modified at best: since there were no longer any restrictions in the archives, maybe ignorance or at least convenience took over. A few hours train journey lie between the Berlin Nazi Memorial sites and literally tens of thousands of archival material on the Shoah in Polish archives, which remain mostly (or at least often) unrecognized and unused by German researchers.

Therefore occasionally there are publications that unfortunately show in detail that an important perspective is missing because either German, Polish or Yiddish sources simply could not be studied. Of course, this is a general problem of the entire, especially comparative, Shoah research, but in my impression one that is clearly neglected in theoretical debates as well as in works of individual researchers. Closely related to this is – almost inevitably – the ongoing nationalization of individual topics in Shoah research.

The comparatively good state of research on Litzmannstadt could finally be the starting point for some considerations as to what this actually means from a comparative perspective, whether Litzmannstadt can be compared, for example, with ghettos in the Wartheland region because of its size, the chronology of deportations, and/or because of the specifics in the 'Warthegau', or with similarly extensive ghettos such as those in Warsaw, Białystok or Lemberg.

⁴⁴ Philip Friedman and Joseph Gar (eds.): *Bibliography of Yiddish Books on the Catastrophe and Heroism*, New York: Marstin Press, 1962; Joseph Gar (ed.): *Bibliography of Articles on the Catastrophe and Heroism in Yiddish Periodicals*, 2 volumes, New York: Marstin Press, 1966/1969; Bolesław Woszczyński and Violetta Urbaniak (eds.): *Źródła archiwalne do dziejów Żydów w Polsce*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo DIG, 2001.

