

# The effect of the Wannsee Conference on Mischlinge experiences

*Understanding the impact of the Wannsee Conference through Mischlinge testimonies*

**BY ANNE TABB, THOMAS PEGELOW-KAPLAN,  
PHD, AND SCOTT DENHAM, PHD  
DAVIDSON COLLEGE**

Infamous for the coordination of the Final Solution of the Jewish Question, the Wannsee Conference of January 20, 1942 spent significant time probing the issue of Mischlinge. The latter third of the Wannsee Conference discussed the "...solution of the problem of mixed marriages [Mischehen] and mixed parentage [Mischlinge]." The Reich Citizenship Law of September 15, 1935, one of the Nuremberg Laws, officially defined a Mischlinge as "one who is descended from one or two grandparents who were racially full Jews."<sup>2</sup> Despite this legal classification, the status of Mischlinge remained a significant debate throughout the Third Reich. At the Wannsee Conference, Reinhard Heydrich, Head of the Reich Security Main Office (RSHA), cited a letter from Hans Heinrich Lammers, the Chief of the Reich Chancellery, as the foundation of this discussion. Heydrich proposed that first-degree Mischlinge, with exceptions, now be treated as "full Jews" and included in the measures of the "Final Solution."<sup>3</sup> Dr. Wilhelm Stuckart of the Reich Ministry of the Interior led the opposition to this proposal, pointing out that inclusion with full-Jews would "constitute endless administrative work."<sup>4</sup> Stuckart instead proposed forced sterilization of Mischlinge of the first degree and the immediate dissolution of mixed marriages. In the end, the Wannsee Conference postponed the decision about what to do to several follow-up meetings. The officials in attendance at these follow-up conferences, however, ultimately further deferred the solution of the Mischlinge debate to after the war.<sup>5</sup>

What did this indecision mean for policy towards Mischlinge? Most historians have argued that little change occurred as a direct result of the Wannsee Conference. Mark Roseman argues policy changes were a result of "signs that Wannsee had indeed changed the climate."<sup>6</sup> He points to the decision of the "Ministry for the Occupied Eastern Territories ... to treat Soviet Mischlinge as Jews" as the first indication of a "changed climate."<sup>7</sup> However, he recognizes that the arguments of the Wannsee Conference hardly applied to Russian citizens as they did to half-Germans. James Tent's argument is con-

sequently stronger, identifying actions taken in 1942 against Mischlinge as "evidence ... that Hitler was starting to make common cause more frequently with the Party's fanatical elements from 1942 onward."<sup>8</sup> Tent identifies this evidence as harsher measures taken against Mischlinge after the Wannsee Conference: "Already in July 1942, Martin Bormann ordered Party officials to take a much tougher line with their political assessments of Mischlinge when the latter applied for exemptions such as marriage, military service, or public employment. Other Party officials such as Hans Heinrich Lammers at the Reich Chancellery and Wilhelm Frick, who headed the Interior Ministry, immediately followed suit, issuing orders to government officials to enforce all regulations against Mischlinge strictly."<sup>9</sup> These changes, parallel to many of the restrictions imposed upon full-Jews earlier in the Third Reich, were reflective of the shift in policy of 1942 after the debates of the Wannsee Conference. This paper seeks to contribute to the understanding of a changed climate by tying the experience of Mischlinge to the "harsher climate" and the debates at the Wannsee Conference.

Another significant question remains: what did indecision at the Wannsee Conference and follow-up conferences mean for the experience of Mischlinge? Scholars such as Peter Monteath, James Tent, Beate Meyer, and Cornelia Essner have extensively examined the remaining records on Mischlinge to contribute the voices of these victims to the history of policies against half-Jews in the Third Reich. Meyer first looked to oral history as a way to understand the reality of the Mischlinge experience. Scholars after her followed this trend; for example Monteath notes that oral history is crucial to understand what cannot be "recounted adequately by following the paper trail of official documentation alone."<sup>10</sup> Tent agrees on the importance of oral history in his study of the Mischlinge experience, seeking to use testimonies to "expose the sufferings of a category of victims that has largely gone unnoticed in investigations of the Holocaust."<sup>11</sup> However, while these studies help explain the Mischlinge experiences follow-

ing the Wannsee Conference, further use of oral testimonies helps specifically explain these experiences in conjunction with the "changed climate" of 1942. The experiences of Mischlinge survivors, recounted in oral history, help us understand the experiences of half-Jews in the wake of the Wannsee Conference. It most often directly affected Mischlinge in cases where they attained special knowledge about high-level discussions, or were, in a very rare case for 1942, affected by a deportation order in the aftermath of these discussions. For others, changes they felt were determined by the Nazi state's fanatical wave of measures instituted after the Wannsee Conference. Finally, many continued to live "unaware that the Wannsee Conference had taken place," and were unaffected by its indecisive discussions.<sup>12</sup>

It is important to consider first the discussions at the Wannsee Conference and follow-up conferences in order to understand the conversations, attitudes, and proposed policies that influenced their tangible experiences. Stuckart's suggestion of sterilization indicated a radicalization of his position. He represented the comparatively cautious Interior Ministry, which had been fighting for a relatively moderate approach to the Mischlinge problem since the Nuremberg Laws and the creation of the Mischling as a legal category. Stuckart's expert on Jewish affairs, Bernhard Lösener, provided him with a document to this effect for the Wannsee Conference "outlining the reasons why the Mischlinge should be protected."<sup>13</sup> Thus when Stuckart proposed sterilization, Heydrich, in light of the position of the Reich Main Security Office (RSHA), considered this a great victory over the Interior Ministry. Although the Interior Ministry had not conceded that Mischlinge should be classified as so-called full-Jews, the proposal of sterilization appeared to indicate a diminishing of their economic, administrative, and legal qualms with restricting the rights of Mischlinge.<sup>14</sup> Heydrich's organization of the Conference, from the location to the invitation to the opening remarks and follow-up letter, had been created with the goal of once and for all asserting the authority of the RSHA.<sup>15</sup> After Stuckart's

proposal of sterilization, Heydrich felt that he had succeeded.<sup>16</sup>

Although Heydrich left the Wannsee Conference proud of a victory over government officials, the issue of so-called Mischlinge was still considered a “theoretical” discussion according to the protocol of the meeting.<sup>17</sup> The participants reached no formal decision and there were many obstacles in the way of official policy, which officials returned to at two follow-up conferences later in 1942. On March 6, members of the RSHA, Party Chancellery, and Reich Chancellery met at the Reich Security Main Office to continue the controversial debate. On the agenda were the administrative obstacles of sterilization, including the “700,000 hospital days” this would allegedly entail for Mischlinge, when these beds were needed for wounded soldiers.<sup>18</sup> Sterilization was deemed unrealistic by the participants unless it was ordered by the Führer, in which case they proposed Mischlinge be concentrated in a special part of a city as had been done with elderly Jews.<sup>19</sup> The issue remained unsettled and thus another conference was called on 27 October in Eichmann’s office (Amt IV B4) of the Reich Security Main Office.<sup>20</sup> Here, “voluntary” sterilization was reintroduced as a realistic solution while compulsory sterilization was debated as an issue.<sup>21</sup> The members of the RSHA, Party Chancellery, and Reich Chancellery decided that in order to create the appearance of voluntary sterilization, Mischlinge would have the “choice” of sterilization or deportation. Making sterilization a requirement for remaining in the Reich and avoiding deportation, they decided, achieved the goal of sterilization without the appearance of force.<sup>22</sup> At the conclusion of this meeting, however, the participants had still not settled on any measures and once again deferred to later discussions.

For one group of Mischlinge, the Wannsee Conference and follow-up discussions meant the difference between life and death. After the Conference, on June 8, 1942 Heinrich Himmler, with Hitler’s approval, assumed the role of head of the RSHA.<sup>23</sup> German historian Michael Wildt describes Himmler as “an active director who was able to use the RSHA to realize one of the institution’s genuine objectives: the final solution the Jewish question in Europe.”<sup>24</sup> Informed of the discussions at the Wannsee Conference and the recipient of a personal plea for the further delay of Mischlinge sterilization from Lösener on September 10, 1942, Himmler was aware of the harsher climate that had developed.<sup>25</sup> Thus, Himmler’s order that German concentration camps achieve the status of “judenfrei” in November 1942 included first-degree Mischlinge.<sup>26</sup> Driven by this principle of making Germany free from

Jews, Heinrich Müller, Reich Security Main Office Head of Department (Amt) IV and head of the Secret State Police (Gestapo), sent this decree on to the Gestapo offices in each camp whose officials would organize deportations, making sure to include first-degree Mischlinge in his deportation order. This group constituted the first and “only” Mischlinge killed in the destruction process.<sup>27</sup> The inclusion of Mischlinge in the deportations aimed at making concentration camps “free of Jews” indicated that Himmler agreed with Heydrich’s conflation at the Wannsee Conference of Mischlinge with “full-Jews” and sought to take steps towards ridding Germany of any Jewish blood.<sup>28</sup>

For others living in Germany at the time, official indecision did not mean death, yet they did face increased difficulties. Born in Frankfurt am Main to a so-called Aryan father and Jewish mother, Gerda Leuchtenberg experienced new struggles throughout the Third Reich with her status as a Mischling.<sup>29</sup> The Wannsee Conference resulted in Gerda Leuchtenberg’s father, well informed by connections through financial advising for government and industry leaders, sending her to work in a small town in hopes of anonymity.<sup>30</sup> In return for his much-needed services, these officials provided Leuchtenberg’s father with relevant and updated information on the Nazi Party’s anti-Jewish policies. This allowed her father to “forewarn his Jewish wife and Mischling daughter of trends that might affect them.”<sup>31</sup> Thus, in 1942 Gerda Leuchtenberg’s father was informed that the “persecution of Jews and Mischlinge would only worsen.”<sup>32</sup> Gerda Leuchtenberg was consequently sent by her father to work as a chemist’s assistant in a small city near the Swiss border, where her status as a Mischling was not known. The Wannsee Conference, thus, ironically changed Leuchtenberg’s life for the better, at least for the time being, by giving Leuchtenberg’s father the foresight to send her to a place out of grips of the authorities.

Awareness of the discussions at the Wannsee Conference and follow-up conferences was rare and required privileged connections, as in the case of Gerda Leuchtenberg. Most German citizens at the time, however, witnessed the fate of “full-Jews.” On July 2, 1942 Victor Klemperer, a convert to Christianity whom the regime had deemed a “full Jew,” recalled in his diary, “the removal of the old people’s home to Theresienstadt brutal. Truck with benches, crowded together, only the tiniest bundle could be taken, cuffs and blow.”<sup>33</sup> The awareness of the fate of Jews was even more prevalent among their Mischlinge relatives. One Mischling, Jutta Rose, recalled in an interview “I hid behind my mother” as they beat her

father and dragged him away from their family living room for deportation to Buchenwald.”<sup>34</sup> Marian Kaplan examines the recollection of a Mischling who discussed, as did many Mischlinge throughout the war, how he coped with awareness of the deportation of relatives with denial: “... later we said, ‘Well, they don’t write, but let’s hope they are well.’ But everybody knew they weren’t being sent to a work camp. Everybody was lying to each other and nobody admitted the truth. But everybody knew.”<sup>35</sup>

This awareness meant that throughout 1942 so-called Mischlinge were frightened by the harsher measures implemented against them. Scholars thus far confirm what Tent describes as “a series of ominous government directives circulated periodically after Wannsee about Mischlinge that, despite objections from the Interior Ministry, set them on the same downward spiral that had led to the isolation, incarceration, and murder of full Jews.”<sup>36</sup> Raul Hilberg agrees with Tent, stating that although “Mischlinge were neither deported nor sterilized,” the months after the Wannsee Conference showed that “the anti-Mischling restrictions were somewhat intensified. For example, in the fall of 1942, the Education Ministry issued some elaborate regulations for the admission of Mischlinge to schools.”<sup>37</sup> Jeremy Noakes affirms the statements of the other two scholars, “the increasingly hard line toward the Mischlinge, which Hitler adopted in the spring and summer of 1942, was quickly reflected in a stream of official measures which added to the restrictions under which they suffered.”<sup>38</sup>

This wave of measures made exemptions, education, and some forms of employment more difficult for Mischlinge to obtain in the months immediately following the Wannsee Conference. Although neither Heydrich nor Stuckart succeeded in implementing their proposed measures, Nazi officials, based on the discussions at Wannsee, instituted more restrictive measures against Mischlinge. The first of these appeared in June 1942. On June 22, a decree from the Ministry for Science, Education, and Public Instruction required Mischlinge to submit a special application for admittance to universities.<sup>39</sup> This was the first update by the Ministry for Research and Education to standing guidelines on “admission of Jewish-Mischlinge to University studies” from October 25, 1940.<sup>40</sup> State Secretary Werner Zschintzsch opened the memo with the statement that these new post-Wannsee guidelines are “in agreement with the leader of the Party Chancellery.”<sup>41</sup> The leader of the Party Chancellery, Martin Bormann, was represented by his deputy for the Party Chancellery, Nazi Party Chancellery Permanent Secretary Dr. Gerhard Klop-

fer, at the Wannsee Conference.<sup>42</sup> The next day, June 23, another notice from Martin Bormann made exemptions for those remaining in the Wehrmacht increasingly difficult to obtain, now requiring recommendations from the Party.<sup>43</sup>

In the following month, this wave of measures continued. On July 1, in a notice from Hitler, Mischlinge in the municipal police (Schutzpolizei) were required to retire.<sup>44</sup> The following day, a decree from Reich Education Minister Bernhard Rust stated, "Mischlinge of the first degree are no longer to be enrolled in basic schools, training schools, and other advanced secondary schools."<sup>45</sup> Trade schools now required special permission for acceptance.<sup>46</sup> The measure also noted that it remained "in agreement with the leader of Party Chancellery and the Reich Minister of the Interior."<sup>47</sup> The Party Chancellery and the Reich Ministry of the Interior were represented at the Wannsee Conference by Klopfer and Stuckart, respectively.<sup>48</sup> This decree was distributed widely, to the education administration officials in the former Reich and into the new territories in the East including Austria, Bohemia and Moravia.<sup>49</sup> On July 3, a memo from Party Chancellery head Bormann explicitly stated, "viewing Mischlinge as having equal rights as German-blooded people must be avoided. In the future each case will be decided by the Führer."<sup>50</sup> Two men with Mischlinge status, Horst Hartwich and Ludwig Joseph, discussed in oral testimonies the influence of the July 2, 1942 measure from the Minister of Education, Bernhard Rust, on their lives.

Hartwich was born in Berlin to a Jewish pharmacist father and an "Aryan" mother.<sup>51</sup> In the summer of 1942, 15-year old Hartwich was giving a presentation for Dr. Ratloff's class on Goethe and after fumbling his words, his teacher told him to not speak "with Jewish hastiness."<sup>52</sup> Although Hartwich offers few details on this incident, he alleges that his teacher did not intend to offend. In fact, according to Hartwich's recollection, this teacher apologized after class for forgetting the student's partially Jewish background. This recognition of his then-non-Jewish status in 1942 was one of his last interactions with a teacher in his secondary school. A few weeks after the incident, the director of his school informed Hartwich of his expulsion from Lessing Gymnasium. The July 2 measure abruptly ended Hartwich's education at the age of 17.

Ludwig Joseph's education was also abruptly halted after the July 2, 1942 measure. Ludwig Joseph was born February 24, 1927 to a Jewish orthopedic surgeon father, Ernst Joseph and Protestant Mother, Herta Joseph.<sup>53</sup> Joseph recalled that "I went to school until July 1942; at the end of that school

year there was a new directive from the Nazi Education Department that anybody who is half Jewish can no longer attend a secondary or high school, in fact, any school—not even grade school." It is unclear from his 1996 interview if Ludwig Joseph was aware of this directive from Bernhard Rust at the time of his expulsion. Notwithstanding, at the time of his interview, Joseph identified the measure of July 1942 as the cause of his removal from school. Upon leaving school Joseph wondered—"what do I do for the rest of my life when I need an education?" Then he realized he had no options, that the Ministry of Education had closed the doors of his dreams. Like Horst Hartwich, Ludwig Joseph's fate had been decided in the directives in 1942.

Two half-Jewish women who saw no immediate change after the Wannsee Conference were Cecile Hensel and Jutta Rose. Both these women completed their formal secondary education by 1942, escaping the July 2, 1942 measure which resulted in Hartwich and Joseph's expulsion. Without access to privileged knowledge, like Leuchtenberg's father, they remained unaware of the discussions at the Conference. These two women, outside of the categories affected by the follow-up measures of 1942, and without privileged knowledge, continued living unaware and unaffected.

Cecile Hensen was born to a Jewish mother and Protestant father, a local bureaucrat in the town of Laden.<sup>54</sup> Hensen, an auditing student, managed to escape the influence of the measures. According to the Zschintzsch memo of June 22, 1942, which overturned earlier guidelines allowing auditors who were Mischlinge of the first and second degree, Hensen should have been removed from school.<sup>55</sup> However, her experience shows that not all Mischlinge were immediately affected by the measures implemented against them. That year, Hensen wrote a paper for Professor Baron Polnitz on the resistance fighter Wallenstein in the play by the German classicist Friedrich Schiller. Her professor asked if it was wise for her to write a paper on this topic considering her Mischling status. Aware of the Third Reich's anti-Mischling policies, Hensen stated "if the Nazis win the war it will not matter because they will kill me, and if they lose it will not matter, because I will no longer be a second-class citizen."<sup>56</sup> As a result of this awareness, Hensen continuously attempted to conceal her identity and make friends who could use connections in the local Gestapo to aid her in a compromised situation.

Jutta Rose was born in Hanover, Germany on January 17, 1918 to a mixed marriage between a Protestant mother, Franziska Rose and Jewish father, Fritz Rose. Despite their

religious affiliation, she received little formal religious exposure.<sup>57</sup> In 1942, Rose was 24 and successfully finished with her secondary education. Rose continued her life in a Berlin apartment she shared with friend, Hilde. Rose's aunt was able to help support her economically, allowing Rose freedom from the necessity of employment while living in Berlin. Rose met a young art student, Henri Nannen while he was visiting Berlin in the summer of 1939 and carried on a romantic relationship throughout the war. They corresponded continuously between Berlin and his home in Munich despite Rose's statement, "I gave witness to him that he was an ardent Nazi."<sup>58</sup> Henri Nannen famously founded Stern in 1948, becoming an important figure in the media of the Federal Republic after the war. Moishe Postone discussed an editorial after the war in which Henri Nannen condemned "himself for knowing and not acting, and even continuing to wear a Luftwaffe uniform with pride."<sup>59</sup> Although this does not confirm Rose's statement that he was in fact a member of the Nazi Party, he reflected after the war his own role as involved with the Nazi government from the Luftwaffe and furthermore an aware bystander. Rose recalled that throughout their relationship she felt comfortable talking to him about politics, even telling him that she would not visit him in Munich where she might encounter that "bastard Hitler."<sup>60</sup> In addition to this risky relationship with an alleged Nazi, Jutta took private lessons with a music teacher, Professor Elke, at his home in Wannsee twice a week in 1942. Despite this ironically disturbing proximity to the location of the Wannsee Conference, Jutta Rose's experience from 1942 remained unaffected by the Conference's debate.

Scholars on the whole conclude that most Mischlinge owe their survival to Hitler's indecision, although the Mischlinge experience shows that this survival often constituted considerable hardships. Tent points out that in a letter to Himmler on the final solution of the Mischlinge issue, Stuckart discussed the effect of public morale of "Aryan" relatives and option of sterilization, and "concluded by proposing that Hitler alone should decide the issue."<sup>61</sup> This mention of Hitler was meant to deliberately delay the issue, based on knowledge that "Propaganda Minister Goebbels continued to worry about public morale."<sup>62</sup> These concerns fueled Hitler's unwillingness to decide upon the fate of Mischlinge in regards to the Final Solution. Roseman agrees that the Mischlinge matter remained in abeyance partially because of the indecision between officials at the Wannsee Conference, but above all, "Hitler's unwillingness to tackle the matter in wartime that decided the matter."<sup>63</sup> Meyer confirms



this hypothesis, arguing that in regard to Mischlinge “Hitler was asked to find a solution, but he postponed making a decision until after the war. The majority of people in mixed marriages owe their lives to the fact that this decision was deferred.”<sup>64</sup> Despite this agreement by scholars, the Mischlinge experiences expose that although Hitler did not decide to include Mischlinge in the Final Solution in 1942, many were directly, or indirectly, affected by the measures that followed the Conference, with an overall continuum of varied degrees of change.

Survival after the Wannsee Conference, as the integration of oral testimonies expose, was manifest in a wide variety of tangible experiences of Mischlinge. For Mischlinge imprisoned in concentration camps in 1942, the “changed climate” led to their inclusion in deportation to extermination camps. For Gerda Leuchtenberg, it meant fleeing to a small town where her Mischlinge status was unknown. For Horst Hartwich and Ludwig Joseph, the wave of fanatical measures after the Wannsee meeting meant expulsion from not only secondary schools, but options for future employment, which rested on the foundation of education. Fortunately for Cecile Hensen and Jutta Rose, survival after Wannsee meant a cautious continuation of their lives. For all Mischlinge, however, survival was constantly plagued by fear. Witnessing the fate of their Jewish relatives, like Jutta Rose, or observing the fate of Jews and Mischlinge, like Victor Klemperer, created a suffocating atmosphere of fear for those aware their Jewish ancestry. As Cecile Hensen wrote in a poem during the years of the Third Reich: “They did not arrest me. They did not beat me. I made it through. I know, I was lucky. It was the naked fear that I could hardly bear. It ate me up. Bit by bit.”<sup>65</sup> After the Wannsee Conference, “lucky” Mischlinge survived due to the indecision of the Nazi leaders. However, the reality of this constantly fearful survival ranged a wide spectrum of experiences. Understanding this spectrum of experiences exposes the ominous Mischlinge debate at the Wannsee Conference and the tangible changes it meant for those living with follow-up measures, awareness of debates, or for others, ignorance.

## Acknowledgments

I am grateful to the German Academic Exchange Service, the Davidson Research Initiative, and the Dean Rusk International Studies Program of Davidson College, NC, for financing the archival research in Germany on which my paper is based. I owe much appreciation to my two Professors, Dr. Pegelow-Kaplan and Dr. Denham for assisting me through this research project. Additional thanks to Dr. Denham for his translation

work. My classmates in History 433 were a great help in their extensive commentary on various drafts of this piece. I am also grateful for the assistance of Robert Dalton, Assistant Head, Research and Instructional Services, Davis Library, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and Martina Böhm of the Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart.

## References

- <sup>1</sup>“Protocol of the Wannsee Conference.” Haus der Wannsee Konferenz. <<http://www.gwhk.de>>. (02/06/2012).
- <sup>2</sup>Noakes, J. and Pridham, G. (1998). *Nazism, 1919-1945*. University of Exeter Press. Pg 344.
- <sup>3</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>4</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>5</sup>“Translation of Document No. NG-2586 from the Foreign Office (21 March 1942) DIII 294 g Rs.” Printed in Mendelsohn, J. (1982). *Legalizing the Holocaust: The Early Phase, 1933-1939*, Vol. 11. Garland Publishing. Pg 223.
- <sup>6</sup>Roseman, M. (2003). *The Wannsee Conference and the Final Solution: A Reconsideration*. Picador/Metropolitan Books. Pg 146.
- <sup>7</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>8</sup>Tent, J. (2003). In the shadow of the Holocaust: Nazi persecution of Jewish-Christian Germans. University Press of Kansas. Pg 146.
- <sup>9</sup>Tent offers these examples: “Any applications by Mischlinge seeking exemptions from the Reich Citizenship Law were to be terminated immediately. It was at this time that the Party banned Mischlinge from attending Gymnasiums and other elite secondary schools.” Ibid. Pg 146-47. Tent’s claim that these changes began in July is not exactly accurate, however. In the Education Ministry memo of 22 June 1942, state secretary Werner Zschintzsch remarked on an “agreement with the leader of the Party Chancellery” Bormann. Clearly the climate was changing already in mid-June. The distribution notes on the copy received by the Ministry of Culture and Education in Karlsruhe demonstrate that the new guidelines were distributed already by July 3. Werner Zschintzsch (Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung. (22 June 1942) „Memo to State Ministries of Education and Research Administration Offices (Betrifft Zulassung von jüdischen Mischlingen zum Hochschulbesuch).“ Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart. EA 99/ 001 Bu 250.
- <sup>10</sup>Monteath, P. (2008). The „Mischling“ Experience in Oral History. *The Oral History Review* 35.2. Pg 140.
- <sup>11</sup>Tent. Pg 1.
- <sup>12</sup>Tent. Pg 145.
- <sup>13</sup>Roseman. Pg 142. Additionally, Thomas Pegelow-Kaplan cites a statement by the Lösener-Knost 1942 commentary on the Nuremberg Laws that racial legislation up to that point had “once and for all” drawn the line between Jew and Mischlinge. Yet Pegelow-Kaplan comments that this was an unsuccessful attempt by the racial experts of the Interior Ministry to establish finality in the debate when in reality they could not “encompass the myriad different cases of people’s imagined racial descent.” Pegelow, T. (2009). *The Language of Nazi Genocide: Linguistic Violence and the Struggle of Germans of Jewish Ancestry*. Cambridge University Press. Pg 172.
- <sup>14</sup>Noakes, J. (1989). The development of Nazi policy towards the German-Jewish “Mischlinge” 1933-1945. *The Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 34.1. Pg 313.
- <sup>15</sup>Tent. Pg 121.
- <sup>16</sup>Sterilization was a familiar tactic to those present at the Wannsee Conference. Hitler introduced compulsory sterilization of those with hereditary diseases just months after taking the position of chancellor. Friedländer, S. (2007). *The Years of Extermination: Nazi Germany and the Jews, 1939-1945*. Harper Collins Publishers. Pg Leading up to the Conference, steriliza-

tion had been discussed in conjunction with the Mischlinge issue in 1941 between the Reich Chancellery and the Ministry of Justice. Dr. Heinrich Gross stressed to Reichsminister Lammers the “necessity for sterilizing persons of mixed blood of the 1<sup>st</sup> degree” to prevent a new generation of second degree Mischlinge. Dr. Walter Gross reported that Lammers was “positively in favour” of this sterilization proposal. Office of Chief Counsel for War Crimes. U.S. Army APO 696-A, Document NG-978. (2 October 1941) Minutes of the Consultation with Reichsminister Lammers. Printed in Mendelsohn. Pg 284-5.

<sup>17</sup>“Protocol of the Wannsee Conference.”

<sup>18</sup>Summary of measures to be taken against partly Jewish people. (March 6, 1942; June 11, 1942) Conference at the Reich Main Security Office. Printed in Mendelsohn 11. Pg 193.

<sup>19</sup>Theresienstadt was an example of ghettos for the elderly.

<sup>20</sup>This second follow-up conference was not the next time the Mischlinge issue was discussed in 1942. For example, on March 16, the Reich Minister of the Interior discussed how the Führer could in some cases reclassify “valuable” Jews as Mischlinge and valuable “half-Jews” as “persons of German blood.” The letter goes on to say in cases where the Führer did not reclassify half-Jews as “persons of German blood,” they should be given the option of sterilization in order to remain in the Reich. (March 16, 1942) Letter from the Reich Minister of the Interior dated 16 March, 1942. Printed in Mendelsohn 11. Pg 197-200.

<sup>21</sup>Noakes attributes this reintroduction as a result of the “experiments with X-rays which were being carried out in concentration camps.” Noakes. Pg 347.

<sup>22</sup>(October 27, 1942) Minutes of a meeting of Amt IV B4 (Eichmann’s office) in the Reich Security Main Office on the treatment of partly Jewish people. Printed in Mendelsohn, 11. Pg 129-133.

<sup>23</sup>Wildt, M. and Lampert, T. (2009). *An Uncompromising Generation: The Nazi Leadership of the Reich Security Main Office*. University of Wisconsin Press. Pg 341.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid. Pg 347.

<sup>25</sup>Raul Hilberg discusses this plea: “Lösener wrote his letter around September 10, 1942, and addressed it to Himmler. He repeated all the arguments that Stuckart had enumerated... Lösener admitted that sterilization was not feasible during the war. After all, he consoled Himmler “one cannot rectify errors and sins committed during the last 200 years in one day.” But after the war the sterilizations could be carried out easily.” Hilberg, R. (1985). *The Destruction of the European Jews*. Holmes & Meier Publishers. Pg 242.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid. Pg 454.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

<sup>28</sup>Heydrich was shot by Czech resistance fighters on May 27, 1942 outside of Prague and died of injuries on June 4, 1942. Himmler and Heydrich worked closely together in 1942. For example, they communicated about Operation Zeppelin, “Heydrich approved Gräfe’s plan and forwarded it to Himmler, who in turn decided to present it to Hitler on January, 1942.” Wildt. Pg 335-340.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>(28 June 1994) Interview with Gerda Leuchtenberg by James Tent. Printed in Tent. Pg 93-94.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

<sup>33</sup>Klemperer, Victor. (2001). *I Will Bear Witness: A Diary of the Nazi Years 1942-1945*. Random House Press. Pg 90.

<sup>34</sup>Pozzi-Tha, Elisabeth. (March 26, 1998) “Interview with Jutta Rose.” *Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation*.

<sup>35</sup>Kaplan, M. (1998). *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany*. Oxford University Press. Pg 196.

<sup>36</sup>Tent. Pg 146.

<sup>37</sup>Hilberg. Pg 425.

<sup>38</sup>Noakes. 349.

<sup>39</sup>Werner Zschintzsch (Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung). „Memo to State Ministries of Education and Research Administration Offices, 22 June 1942, Betrifft Zulassung von jüdischen Mischlingen zum Hochschulbesuch.“ Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, EA 99/ 001 Bü 250. Translated by Scott Denham.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid.

<sup>42</sup>“The Participants of the Conference.” Haus der Wannsee Konferenz. <<http://www.ghwk.de>> (February 6, 2012).

<sup>43</sup>Walk, Joseph (1981). Das Sonderrecht für die Juden im NS-Staat: Eine Sammlung der gesetzlichen Massnahmen und Richtlinien, Inhalt und Bedeutung. Müller Juristischer Verlag. Pg 378-79. These exceptions parallel exceptions for university students from Zschintzsch’s memo on June 22, 1942, which stated that those Mischlinge who were granted exceptions to be in the Wehrmacht were allowed to study. This indicates coordination between the Party Chancellery and the Ministry of Education on exceptions for Mischlinge. Translated by Scott Denham.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid.

<sup>45</sup>Bernard Rust (Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung). (2 July 1942). “Memo to State Ministries of Education, Education Administrators of the Reichsgaue and the new territories of Danzig-West Prussia, the Wartheland, and Sudetenland, including Prussian Education Offices, as well as for information to the Reichsprotektor in Bohemia and Moravia. Betrifft Zulassung jüdischer Mischlinge zum Schulbesuch.” Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart. EA 99/001 Bü 250. Translated by Scott Denham.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>“The Participants of the Conference.”

<sup>49</sup>Bernard Rust. (2 July 1942) Memo to State Ministries.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid.

<sup>51</sup>Horst Hartwich. “Unpublished memoir of his youth.” Cited with permission of the author in Tent. Pg 35.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

<sup>53</sup>Averick, Leah. (December 17, 1996). Interview with Ludwig Joseph by Leah Averick. Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation.

<sup>54</sup>Gelbi, Cathy. (1990) “Interview with Cecile Hensen” Recording held in the Yale Fortunoff Archive, accessed at The Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe. Translated by Scott Denham.

<sup>55</sup>Werner Zschintzsch. (June 22, 1942) Memo.

<sup>56</sup>Interview with Cecile Hensen.

<sup>57</sup>Interview with Jutta Rose.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid.

<sup>59</sup>Postone, M. (1980) “Anti-Semitism and National Socialism: Notes on the German Reaction to ‘Holocaust.’” *New German Critique* 19. Pg 99.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid.

<sup>61</sup>Tent. Pg 146.

<sup>62</sup>Tent. Pg 146.

<sup>63</sup>Roseman. Pg 147.

<sup>64</sup>Beate Meyer. (2000) “The Mixed Marriage: A Guarantee of Survival or a Reflection of German Society during the Nazi Regime?” from David Bankier. *Probing the Depths of German Antisemitism: German Society and the Persecution of the Jews, 1933-1941*. Berghahn Books, 2000. Pg 62-63.

<sup>65</sup>Interview with Cecile Hensen.