S: I. M. O. N.
SHOAH: INTERVENTION. METHODS. DOCUMENTATION.
Vol. 8 | 2021 | No.3
WIENER WIESENTHAL INSTITUT FÜR HOLOCAUST-STUDIEN (VWI)

Nikolaus Hagen

Survivor Testimonies on German-Jewish 'Mixed Marriages'

Historiography, Potentials and Challenges

Abstract

The history of 'mixed marriages' was for the longest time a rather neglected topic in Holocaust studies, but it has gained considerable attention since the early 1990s. This attention thus coincided with the heyday of large oral history projects. This article looks back at the role and place of oral history and survivor testimonies in the historiography of 'mixed marriages' and explores the potential for future research, by examining the body of such testimonies (both by the parent and the children generation) in the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies.

Introduction

In early 2020, while searching in the vast digital collection of the Fortunoff Archive for the testimonies of Jewish survivors who had survived the Holocaust in 'mixed marriages' with their non-Jewish spouses, I discovered a recording of Martha S., filmed in 1984 in New York City.[1] As I learnt from watching the first minutes of the testimony, her full name was Martha Saraffian née Kummermann, and she was born in 1907 to German-speaking Jewish parents in Prague. She was raised in Trutnov/Trautenau, a small town in the German-majority Bohemian borderlands near the Silesian border. In the 1930s, she met and eventually married her non-Jewish husband – a Christian German or Czech, I presumed, as the testimony had been tagged with the topical keywords "interfaith marriage". It came as a surprise when Martha Saraffian revealed about eight minutes into the recording that her late husband had been a stateless Armenian Christian. As I listened on, I learnt that Hrand Saraffian was a survivor of the 1890s Hamidian massacres in Ottoman Turkey, and that he had come to Austria-Hungary as a child refugee and eventually settled in Bohemia/Czechoslovakia. Their marriage caused Martha Saraffian to lose her Czechoslovakian citizenship. When Nazi Germany annexed their hometown of Trutnov in the fall of 1938, Hrand and Martha Saraffian and their two young daughters were all stateless.

The unexpected revelation about Hrand Saraffian's ethnic background made me immediately question whether the German authorities had regarded the Saraffians not only as an 'interfaith marriage' but as a 'mixed marriage' – a marriage between a

1 Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, HVT-0237, Martha S., 26 February 1984. For an in-depth introduction to Martha Saraffian's testimony, see: Nikolaus Hagen, Introduction to the Testimony of Martha Saraffian (HVT-237), in: The Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies Critical Edition Series, New Haven 2021, http://editions.fortunoff.library.yale.edu/essay/hvt-0237 (5 November 2021).

ARTICLE
https://doi.org/10.23777/SN.0121 | www.vwi.ac.at

'Jew' and an 'Aryan' – in the sense of Germany's 1935 racial laws.[2] And, if so, did they consider Hrand Saraffian, who was a fluent German speaker, as 'German' or 'Czech'? After he was initially suspected of being Jewish, Hrand Saraffian was indeed classified as "of German blood". The family's 'racial' status was further complicated by the fact that their elder daughter was, like Martha Saraffian, a member of the Jewish community and thus considered a *Geltungsjüdin*. The younger daughter was registered as a Christian and thus categorised as a *Mischling*. Hence, the family was not considered 'privileged', but it nevertheless received a precarious degree of protection, while many of its close relatives, including Martha's mother, were deported and murdered. Although it is not explicitly discussed in the testimony, the Saraffians' apparent status as a German-Jewish 'mixed marriage' (rather than a Czech-Jewish mixed marriage – a difference that only existed in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia[3]) eventually delayed their being called up for slave labour. In 1944, both Martha and Hrand Saraffian were forced into arduous slave labour in multiple camps, some of them specifically maintained for persons in 'mixed marriages'. Eventually, in early 1945, Martha was deported from Prague's Hagibor camp[4] to the Theresienstadt Ghetto. Her experiences in both camps form an important part of the testimony. Both she and her husband survived and were eventually reunited with their two daughters, who had been sheltered by non-Jewish family friends.

The testimony also touches upon the aftermath of the Holocaust and Martha Saraffian's lifelong search for justice and compensation. Despite surviving the Holocaust in their homeland, the Saraffian family were essentially refugees who had lost their livelihood and family members, and they were left without any assistance or compensation from the Czechoslovakian state, which considered them stateless foreigners. Eventually, with international assistance, they were able to emigrate overseas.

The Saraffian family story, as told by Martha Saraffian in her testimony, is a striking example of a history that "for lack of [other] evidence, would not exist", as Christopher Browning has put it in his reflections on Holocaust testimonies.[5] While we can find her name in certain survivors' databases – for example the digitised Theresienstadt Ghetto's prisoner card file[6] – and a number of her personal documents still exist in local Czech archives,[7] these files and documents do not immediately reveal the many layered dimensions of her story, such as her 'mixed marriage', the Armenian refugee background of Hrand Saraffian, the complicated status of her two daughters, and the family's statelessness. Beyond the individual fate and unique

2 The so-called 'Nuremberg Race Laws' consisted of two complimentary laws and several subsequent regulations. The first was the Reich Citizenship Law (Reichsbürgergesetz) and the second was the Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour (Gesetz zum Schutze des deutschen Blutes und der deutschen Ehre). The latter banned marriages between persons deemed Jewish and those "of German blood". The initial laws were both published on 15 September 1935. The status of a 'mixed marriage' was effectively established at the end of 1938 in a secret directive by Adolf Hitler given to Hermann Göring.

3 Cf. Benjamin Frommer, Privileged Victims. Intermarriage between Jews, Czechs, and Germans in the Nazi Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, in: Adrienne Edgar/Benjamin Frommer (ed.), Intermarriage from Central Europe to Central Asia, Lincoln 2020, 47-82.

4 Cf. Ivana Dejmková, Hagibor aneb Jak jedno místo v Praze získalo smutnou pověst [Hagibor or How One Place in Prague Gained a Sad Reputation], in: Olga Fejtová (ed.), Evropská velkoměsta za druhé světové války: každodennost okupovaného velkoměsta. Praha 1939–1945 v evropském srovnání [European Cities during World War II: The Everyday Life of an Occupied City. Prague 1939–1945 in European Comparison], Prague 2007, 254-262.

5 Christopher Browning, Collected Memories. Holocaust History and Postwar Testimony, Madison/London 2003, 39.

6 Arolsen Archives, 1.1.42.2/5078444, Marta Saraffianová.

7 For example, the Státní okresní archiv Trutnov (District State Archive of Trutnov) maintains the census sheets and citizen registration files of the Kummermann and Saraffian families.

story that a testimony reveals and which make each one worth exploring, Martha Saraffian's interview also exemplifies how a testimony may raise entirely new research questions and lead us to explore new avenues. In this specific case, it is not only the rather rare first-generation testimony of a Jewish woman surviving in a 'mixed marriage' in the peripheries of Nazi Germany, but also the story of the intersection of the two paradigmatic European genocides in the history of one family. It may inspire us to rethink the relationship between the Armenian genocide and the genocide of European Jewry.[8] It is also an extraordinary glimpse into the grey borderlines of the complex racialised social space of marriage established by the Nuremberg Laws and Nazi racial policies. It may lead us, for example, to further explore the question of who the 'non-Jews' in these German-Jewish 'mixed marriages' were. Who was really considered to be 'of German blood'? Were there other cases similar to that of the Saraffians? And, if so, how were they treated by the Nazis? On a more fundamental level, when it comes to the specific implementation of the persecution of 'mixed marriages' in Bohemia and Moravia, the testimony provides ample evidence and clues on aspects that have only partially been explored thus far.[9]

Being able to find and work with this testimony and many others[10] obviously depended entirely on the fact that it had been recorded in the first place,[11] and that it was made available and accessible for research through indexing, cataloguing, and ultimately through digitisation. For example, at the time when I discovered this specific testimony, a full transcript was not available, but the archivists had added the descriptor "interfaith marriage". The descriptor was thus my only way of ever finding this specific story, a seemingly banal but non-negligible fact. Most Holocaust testimonies were recorded or written down before or right at the onset of what digital historian Ian Milligan has recently named the "age of abundance" – roughly the time since the mid-1990s, when personal computers and the internet became mass phenomena.[12] These testimonies were thus not 'born-digital'. However, digitisation and, increasingly so, aggregation and the linkage between databases and repositories has profoundly changed how we can access and work with such testimonies. While the ability to record new Holocaust testimonies will sooner rather than later come to an end, the availability for research of those that already exist is dramatically increasing.[13] One fundamental problem when working with such survivor accounts is, as the Fortunoff Archive acknowledges on its website, "the sheer number of available testimonies, as well as the lack of transcripts and appropriate search tools, [which] have remained a significant barrier to understanding the Holocaust from the perspective of the survivor".[14] One could perhaps add the 'sheer length' of these testimo-

8 Cf. Wolf Gruner, "Armenier-Greuel". Was wussten jüdische und nichtjüdische Deutsche im NS-Staat über den Völkermord von 1915/16, in: Sybille Steinbacher (ed.), Holocaust und Völkermorde. Die Reichweite des Vergleichs, Frankfurt am Main/New York 2012, 31-54.

9 On the Holocaust in Czechia in general, see: Wolf Gruner, The Holocaust in Bohemia and Moravia. Czech Initiatives, German Policies, Jewish Responses, New York 2019. On the persecution of 'mixed marriages' in the Czech lands, see: Frommer. Privileged Victims.

10 I use the term 'testimony' here in the broadest sense, including oral history interviews, memoir literature, and other forms of autobiographical narrations and reflections.

11 On the act of producing and collecting Holocaust testimonies, see: Noah Shenker, Reframing Holocaust Testimony, Bloomington 2015.

12 Ian Milligan, History in the Age of Abundance? How the Web is Transforming Historical Research, Montreal 2019.

13 For example, the Wiener Holocaust Library recently made over 1,000 written accounts of Holocaust eyewitnesses available online through its platform Testifying to the Truth, https://www.testifyingtothetruth.co.uk (5 November 2021).

14 Yale Digital Humanities Lab, Let Them Speak. An Anthology of Holocaust Testimonies, https://dhlab.yale.edu/projects/let-them-speak (5 November 2021).

nies to this list of obstacles. Paradoxically, digitisation has both reduced and increased this challenge. While it certainly eases access to these testimonies, especially through full-text search in transcripts, it exponentially multiplies the availability of sources, the 'sheer number' of results we are confronted with. A single search query can now easily yield hundreds and even thousands of results, yet only very few of these results may eventually prove to be relevant for our specific research questions and interests.

When working with the Fortunoff Archive's collection, I was constantly confronted with this synchrony of abundance and scarcity. In this article, I reflect on some of these experiences and challenges, while exploring the body of testimonies on 'mixed marriages' in its repository. At the time when I conducted this research, I was primarily interested in testimonies from Germany, Austria, and Czechia – as these are the areas that fall within the scope of my research on the gendered aspects regarding the persecution of German-Jewish 'mixed marriages'. My conclusions thus primarily pertain to this subset of testimonies and specifically to those that can be found in the Fortunoff Archive.[15] There is a second dimension to the synchrony of abundance and scarcity. While watching, listening, and reading through these testimonies, I began to recognise the names and stories of survivors which I had previously read in books and articles. In some cases, testimonies (indirectly) referenced other testimonies. Likewise, even the literature on testimonies itself, as well as conferences and (fictional) films on the topic, were mentioned in some of the testimonies. This led me to rethink the interdependency of the historiography of this specific aspect of Holocaust history and the practice of giving and recording testimonies. In this article, I want to combine these two thoughts. In the first part, I will look back at the role and place of oral history and survivor testimonies in the historiography of German-Jewish 'mixed marriages'. In the second part, I will draw on my own experiences to examine the challenges and limitations, and also the strategies, for finding such testimonies in the Fortunoff Archive and similar repositories, such as the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum's (USHMM) digital collection and the USC Shoah Foundation's Visual History Archive (VHA).

Oral History and the Historiography of German-Jewish 'Mixed Marriages'

The history of the persecution of 'mixed marriages' was for a long time a rather neglected and minor topic in Holocaust studies, but it has gained considerable attention since the early 1990s.[16] This surge in interest, especially in English- and German-language research, coincided with the heyday of large oral history projects, and survivor testimonies (both by the parent and the children generations) have been an important source for exploring this history.

It was perhaps one such testimony, the diaries of linguist Victor Klemperer, who survived the Holocaust together with his non-Jewish wife in Dresden, which increased public awareness and scholarly interest for the fate and harsh reality of Ger-

15 For comparative reasons, I also searched other collections, such as the USC Shoah Foundation's Visual History Archive. However, this search did not amount to the systematic and 'complete' analysis of the relevant testimonies in these other collections.

16 The most recent and in-depth study is Maximilian Strnad, Privileg Mischehe? Handlungsräume "jüdisch versippter" Familien 1933–1949, Göttingen 2021.

man Jews in 'mixed marriages'.[17] An edition of Klemperer's diaries from the years 1933 to 1945 was published in Germany in 1995 and marked the beginning of several publications on the topic in the following years. Coincidentally, also in 1995, a memorial commemorating the roundup (and later release) of about 2,000 intermarried Jews and *Geltungsjuden* in Berlin's Rosenstraße in February and March 1943, and the subsequent protests of their non-Jewish relatives, was unveiled.[18] It was the first public monument commemorating the persecution of 'mixed marriages' and, as it emphasised the agency of non-Jewish women, it invited the German public to identify with their resistance against the Nazi authorities. Just a year later, in 1996, Nathan Stoltzfus's book *Resistance of the Heart*, which for the first time explored these very events in detail, was published in the United States.[19] For his research, Stoltzfus heavily relied on interviews with survivors and witnesses whom he met from the mid-1980s in Berlin. His account of their histories empowered them in two ways: first, by putting their stories and memories centre-stage; and second, by emphasising their agency rather than their victimhood.[20]

Also in 1996, the Fortunoff Archive's German affiliate project at the Moses Mendelssohn Zentrum in Potsdam began recording survivor testimonies. Of the 78 interviews that were conducted in this project in 1996, the only year in which the project operated, over a third were with children growing up and surviving in intermarried families, most of them in Berlin. Many of the interviewees recalled or referred to the Rosenstraße events in their testimonies. This reflected both the significance of these events in their own lives and the then contemporary interest in the subject. Many interviewees also stressed that it had been the protests of their family members (or their own protests, in the cases of children) which had eventually led to the release of the Jews interned in Rosenstraße. Some of those giving testimony in Potsdam for the Fortunoff Archive had previously also been interviewed by Stoltzfus, and several gave testimony for the Shoah Foundation, which also began filming in Germany the same year. In 1998, journalist Nina Schröder published a collection of seven written testimonies, based on interviews with survivors and witnesses of the Rosenstraße protests.[21] The topic received renewed public and scholarly attention in 2003, when German filmmaker Margarethe von Trotta released her fictional movie *Rosenstraße*, based on the same events and again stressing the centrality of the non-Jewish relatives' protests.[22] The film was accompanied by a book, which included

17 Victor Klemperer, Ich will Zeugnis ablegen bis zum letzten. Tagebücher 1933–1945, 2 Vol., Berlin 1995. English translations followed three and four years later: Victor Klemperer, I Shall Bear Witness. The Diaries of Victor Klemperer, 1933–1941, London 1998, and Victor Klemperer, To the Bitter End. The Diaries of Victor Klemperer, 1942–1945, London 1999.

18 The memorial, called the "Block of Women", by East German sculptor Ingeborg Hunzinger (1915–2009), had already been commissioned in the German Democratic Republic. Hunzinger herself came from a 'mixed' family and was persecuted as a *Mischling* in Nazi Germany.

19 Nathan Stoltzfus, Resistance of the Heart. Intermarriage and the Rosenstrasse Protest in Nazi Germany, New York/London 1996. The German edition followed three years later: Nathan Stoltzfus, Widerstand des Herzens. Der Aufstand der Berliner Frauen in der Rosenstraße – 1943, Munich/Vienna 1999.

20 The 'heroes' of his book are the non-Jewish women protesting for the release of their husbands. The degree and success of this protest were at the centre of a historians' debate and controversy in the early 2000s.

21 Nina Schröder, Hitlers unbeugsame Gegnerinnen. Der Frauenaufstand in der Rosenstraße, Munich 1997. The second edition was released under a new title: Nina Schröder, Die Frauen der Rosenstraße. Hitlers unbeugsame Gegnerinnen, Munich 2003.

22 While the film was critically acclaimed, there was also some backlash for its claim to 'authenticity' and for its narration of the events. For example, Anna M. Parkinson concluded that von Trotta's "attempt to do justice to a visual representation of German women's countermemory is overshadowed by the complexities of the memories she wishes to explore […]". Anna M. Parkinson, Neo-Feminist Mütterfilm? The Emotional Politics of Margarethe von Trotta's *Rosenstrasse*, in: Jaimey Fisher/Brad Prager (ed.), The Collapse of the Conventional. German Film and Its Politics at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century, Detroit 2010, 109-135.

excerpts from the interviews of several survivors who had served both as inspiration for the plot and as models for the characters.[23] Again, some of them had earlier spoken to Stolzfus and had recorded testimonies for the Fortunoff Archive and the Shoah Foundation. While not a work of scholarship, the film exacerbated an already smouldering small-scale *Historikerstreit* on the correct interpretation of the Rosenstraße events. On the surface, this dispute revolved around two questions: why had the Nazis interned Berlin's intermarried Jews in 1943, and did their relatives' protest outside the imprisonment site led to their eventual release? The latter was increasingly questioned by some Holocaust historians, among them Wolf Gruner.[24] As the subtitle of a conference on the matter "Zeitzeugen und Historiker zwischen Akten und Erinnerung" (Witnesses and Historians between Records and Memories), organised by the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung in Berlin in April 2004, revealed, beneath the surface this dispute pivoted around the place of personal memories and sentiments in writing Holocaust history.[25] Consequently, the conference also included a panel of survivors and witnesses, who retold their memories of the events.

As many oral history projects, such as the Fortunoff Archive's affiliate, were based around Berlin, and due to the increasingly narrow focus of research in the 1990s and the early 2000s on the Rosenstraße events, several survivors were interviewed time and time again. They thus achieved the status of 'expert witnesses' on the history of 'mixed marriages'. For example, Hans-Oskar Löwenstein de Witt (1926–2004), the only child from one 'mixed marriage' who survived in Berlin, was interviewed twice by Stoltzfus in 1984 and 1989, and then by Bryan Mark Rigg in 1994. In 1996, Löwenstein de Witt was filmed by the Moses Mendelsohn Zentrum for the Fortunoff Archive[26] and by the Shoah Foundation, and he gave another testimony for Schröder around the same time. His family history was also the key inspiration for von Trotta's film of 2003, with the film's main character modelled on Löwenstein de Witt's mother. Furthermore, Löwenstein de Witt was a speaker at the 2004 Berlin conference. His testimony for the Fortunoff Archive is thus an important source for the historiography of this topic.

In the 1990s and the early 2000s there was, of course, research on 'mixed marriages' unrelated to Berlin or Rosenstraße. Between 1990 and 1995, German historian Beate Meyer conducted dozens of oral history interviews with children from 'mixed families' from Hamburg. These formed one part of the source base for her seminal study on *Mischlinge*, which was published in 1999.[27] In 1992, the Documentation Centre of Austrian Resistance published a volume with Jewish survivor testimonies, the results of an oral history project that had started already in 1982, and which included the testimonies of survivors who were children from 'mixed mar-

23 Thilo Wydra, Rosenstraße. Die Geschichte, Die Hintergründe, Die Regisseurin, Berlin 2003.

24 Wolf Gruner, Widerstand in der Rosenstraße. Die Fabrik-Aktion und die Verfolgung der "Mischehen" 1943, Frankfurt am Main 2005. Others, such as Joachim Neander, maintain that the "question of who brought about the release of those held in the Rosenstraße 2-4 facility […] and for what reason, remains open". Joachim Neander, Auschwitz und die Berliner Fabrikaktion Februar/März 1943, in: theologie.geschichte 1 (2006), https://theologie-geschichte.de/ojs2/index.php/tg/article/view/76/84 (5 November 2021).

25 Conference Report: "Der Protest in der Rosenstraße 1943 – Zeitzeugen und Historiker zwischen Akten und Erinnerung", Berlin 29–30 April 2004, in: H-Soz-Kult, 14 June 2004, https://www.hsozkult.de/conferencereport/id/tagungsberichte-501 (5 November 2021).

26 HVT-3424, Hans L., 23 March 1996.

27 Beate Meyer, "Jüdische Mischlinge". Rassenpolitik und Verfolgungsjahre 1933–1945, Munich/Berlin 1999, 19. The interviews are preserved by the Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte in Hamburg, http://www.werkstatt-der-erinnerung.de/data/Bestaende_Halbjuden.php (5 November 2021).

riages'.[28] However, this research on Austria was not picked up for a long time.[29] Another book worth mentioning in this context – because of its heavy reliance on interviews and testimonies – is Bryan Mark Rigg's Hitler's Jewish Soldiers, published in 2002.[30] Rigg conducted 430 interviews between 1994 and 1998. While his focus was on the military service of *Mischlinge* in the German Wehrmacht, in passing he also explored some aspects of the persecution of 'mixed marriages'. There were even a few earlier works that also relied, to varying degrees, on testimonies and interviews, such as Alan Abrams' *Special Treatment. The Untold Story of the Survival of Thousands of Jews in Hitler's Third Reich* from 1985[31] and Ursula Büttner's *Die Not der Juden teilen* from 1988.[32]

As previously mentioned, more recent research since the 2010s has largely moved beyond the narrow debates at the turn of the decade before. The Rosenstraße events are no longer the focus of research; nevertheless, they remain a significant *lieu de mémoire*. The important role of testimonies as sources, and of oral and visual history as fundamental methods, makes this very small sub-field of Holocaust research quite different from the overall field and the latter's long reliance on what are usually called 'perpetrator sources'. As previously suggested, interest in the topic may have been sparked in the first place by testimonies. Another more practical reason for the reliance on testimonies was perhaps the perceived lack of traditional historical sources and archival material, a result of the specific history of this group of victims. As Nazi Germany neither passed a consolidated law or policy on such marriages, nor tasked a specific central agency or branch of the civil service with their persecution, they were quite literally the exceptions, governed by numerous (often regional) exemption clauses, special provisions, ad hoc decisions, and even case-by-case evaluations (such as the infamous ancestral and 'race' evaluations carried out by the *Reichssippenamt*[33]). In turn, this means that the historical traces cannot be found in one or even several archival collections but are instead scattered throughout dozens of archives and collections, often hidden among the many other cases of Nazi victims.[34] Thus, very early attempts to tackle this persecution as legal or political history have, despite their importance as ground-breaking literature, remained unsatisfactory.[35] Contrary to a widely cited claim by Aleida Assmann that "survivors as witnesses do not, as a rule, add to our knowledge of factual history",[36] it was most likely the testimonies that provided the key facts. At the end of his book, Stoltzfus remarks that, when he came to East Berlin in the 1980s looking for sources for his dissertation, he initially could find hardly any. After several media reports about his research ap-

28 Dokumentationsarchiv des österreichischen Widerstands (ed.), Erzählte Geschichte. Band 3: Jüdische Schicksale, Vienna 1992.

29 Evan Burr Bukey, Jews and Intermarriage in Nazi Austria, New York 2011; Michaela Raggam-Blesch, Privileged under Nazi-Rule: The Fate of Three Intermarried Families in Vienna, in: Journal of Genocide Research 21 (2019) 3, 378-397.

30 Bryan Mark Rigg, Hitler's Jewish Soldiers. The Untold Story of Nazi Racial Laws and Men of Jewish Decent in the German Military, Lawrence 2002.

31 Alan Abrams, Special Treatment. The Untold Story of the Survival of Thousands of Jews in Hitler's Third Reich, Secaucus 1985.

32 Ursula Büttner, Die Not der Juden teilen. Christlich-jüdische Familien im Dritten Reich. Beispiel und Zeugnis des Schriftstellers Robert Brendel, Hamburg 1988.

33 Cf. Evan Burr Bukey, Jews and Intermarriage in Nazi Austria, New York 2011, 23-81.

34 Cf. Meyer, "Jüdische Mischlinge", 15.

35 In 1948, Bruno Blau published a first essay on *Mischehen*, focussing on legal acts, a work he further expanded in a study on anti-semitic laws and legal acts: Bruno Blau, Das Ausnahmerecht für die Juden in den europäischen Ländern 1933–1945 I. Teil: Deutschland, New York 1952; Hermann Graml, Mischlinge und Mischehen, in: Gutachten des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte, Vol. I, München 1958, 66-72.

36 Aleida Assmann, History, Memory, and the Genre of Testimony, in: Poetics Today 27 (2006) 2, 261-273.

peared, "dozens of eyewitnesses began to call", as he remembered, and these persons provided "another bridge across the decades", one that the written material alone would not have done.[37]

This reliance on survivor testimonies has sometimes been called into question or even been criticised. In his own book on the Rosenstraße protests, Wolf Gruner emphasised that previous accounts of the events (which he was highly critical of) had primarily (and, perhaps, too much) relied on ex-post testimonies rather than critical archival studies. Nevertheless, he acknowledged the importance, for his own study, of testimonies for the "depiction and analysis" of the events.[38] The archival situation is much better today than it was thirty years ago, with better indexing, partial digitisation, full-text-search available, and – most importantly – more liberal access policies in place. This is most certainly the case in Berlin, where archives and collections, scattered and divided at the end of and after the war, have been painstakingly reunified in the past three decades. Huge collections, such as the Arolsen Archives, have only very recently become easily accessible to researchers and the public. Nevertheless, 'natural' limitations remain regarding 'traditional' historical sources that we will never be able to access. This is most certainly the case when moving beyond the metropoles of the Third Reich and exploring the fate of intermarried Jews in small towns and rural areas.

Many stories, such as Martha Saraffian's family history, would have or will remain uncovered, without testimony. As her history demonstrates, such testimonies do not just add 'another' story to a history that is seemingly already explored, but they often raise entirely new questions and open new avenues for research.

Finding Testimonies on 'Mixed Marriages' in Online Repositories

Among the thousands of recorded Holocaust survivor testimonies collected and preserved by major institutions, such as Yale University's Fortunoff Archive, the USC Shoah Foundation's VHA, the USHMM, Yad Vashem, and many other projects, only a tiny fraction of them were given by persons who survived in a 'mixed marriage'.[39]

Considering the relatively small share of this subgroup among the pre-Holocaust European Jewish population, or among Nazi victims more broadly, this is perhaps not a great surprise. On the other hand, the majority of Central European Jews living in 'mixed marriages' survived the Holocaust, and their percentage among the surviving Jewry was thus considerably higher than it had been before. In post-war Germany, this was most certainly the case. In 1945, of the approximately 15,000 Jews who had survived the Holocaust in Nazi Germany, close to 90 per cent lived in a

37 Stoltzfus, Resistance, 289-291.

38 Wolf Gruner, Widerstand in der Rosenstraße. Die Fabrik-Aktion und die Verfolgung der "Mischehen" 1943, Frankfurt am Main 2005, 10.

39 My conclusion is based on intensively working with these databases rather than a systematic evaluation, which is for various reasons hardly feasible. For example, most existing databases use systems of cataloguing, descriptions, and keywords to make testimonies accessible and searchable for the user, but these differ from repository to repository and do not follow common rules. In some cases, the full-text search of transcripts is available. There is, however, not one or two specific keywords which will yield 'all' testimonies by intermarried Jews. Written testimonies and memoires, not published as books, are perhaps more numerous than audio or video testimonies, but in many cases even harder to find and access, as they are scattered over hundreds of specialised and non-specialised libraries, museums, archives, and other institutions, and their respective catalogues.

'mixed marriage'.[40] Observing this phenomenon, Bruno Blau, a German-Jewish demographic statistician of Jewry and survivor of the Holocaust, remarked in 1948: "[t]he multitude of mixed marriages, which rightfully so were regarded as one of the biggest threats for Central Europe's Jewry, saved it from its almost complete destruction".[41] The late arrival of large-scale oral history projects to Central Europe is perhaps one of the reasons why the number of available testimonies does not seem to reflect this. Another challenge is finding and accessing those testimonies that do exist.

To date, none of the major online databases and repositories categorise or index testimonies of either the first or the second generation specifically as 'mixed marriages' in the sense of the terminology of the Nazi perpetrators. We must thus rely on relatively broad search terms, topical descriptions, and index keywords such as 'interfaith marriage', 'Jewish-non Jewish marriages', and others. Some of these terms have obviously a slightly or even decidedly different meaning or are much broader in sense than the Nazi terminology. For example, a marriage between two Catholics would commonly not have been considered an interfaith marriage, even if the Nuremberg Laws deemed one of the spouses as Jewish or one of them had converted prior to the marriage. On the other hand, a civil marriage between a member of a Reform Jewish congregation and a Protestant could be considered an interfaith marriage, despite its secular nature, in the sense that both belonged to different faiths. For the Nazi authorities, however, these could have both equally been 'mixed marriages'. The archivists who assigned the index keywords to such testimonies may have also chosen to label both as 'interfaith marriage', alluding to the persecution during the Holocaust, rather than making a factual statement. The categorisations and catalogues used by the large survivor testimony collections thus do not allow us to distinguish easily between the two meanings – and we certainly do not know the reasoning of the respective archivist. For the most part, these nuances in meaning seem to make little difference when initially searching these databases, as labels, keywords, and categories primarily serve to make these testimonies more accessible rather than act as scholarly categorisations. Nevertheless, awareness of the difference in meaning – and their impact on the search results – is important.

In some cases, such a categorisation or index entry may also refer to a marriage that was concluded after the Holocaust. Unless decidedly remarked upon in the description, there is currently no possibility for automatically filtering and excluding such results. The ability to systematically explore these large collections still depends on a relatively reduced system of topical subject headings (keywords) and descriptions. While full-text search and other ways of exploring these collections are increasing, they also pose the problem of even larger numbers of results that must be carefully combed through in order to find the relevant testimonies.

The collection of the Fortunoff Archive can be accessed and searched in multiple ways.[42] Until recently, Orbis, Yale University Library's catalogue, was the primary search tool. Aviary, the archive's new integrated platform, has become the preferred and easiest entry point. The Visual Search Tool is a third way to find testimonies and refine search results. These different tools and search options may yield slightly different results, even when using the same search terms. A search for 'interfaith marriage' results in 131 testimonies (60 in English, 29 in German, the rest in other lan-

40 Strnad, The Fortune, 174.

41 Bruno Blau, Die Mischehe im Nazireich, in: Judaica 4 (1948), 46-57, here 57.

42 The searches for this article were conducted in May 2020; results may differ today.

guages), both in Orbis[43] and Aviary. Of these, 73 are also labelled "children of interfaith marriage"; of the 29 testimonies in German (most of which were recorded in 1996 in Potsdam), 28 are tagged "children of interfaith marriage". These two keywords yield the most relevant results for this topic. Aviary allows for full-text search in partial and full transcripts that are constantly being added to the collection, and thus enables more refined searches, such as for 'Christian mother', 'father Catholic', 'intermarriage', or 'Mischehe', terms which may appear in the transcripts but are usually not mentioned in the descriptions. For some specific queries, results thus differ between the two main catalogues. The term 'mixed marriage' yields 25 results in Aviary and only seven via the catalogue, which is limited to a small set of descriptive fields. Since 'interfaith marriage' yields the same results in Orbis and Aviary, we can conclude that the term only appears in the descriptive fields but not in the available transcripts (which so far do not exist for all the testimonies). In Aviary, we can also search for the term 'interfaith marriage' in the descriptions and add a search for 'Berlin' limited to the transcript or the index. This helps to exclude testimonies mentioning 'Berlin' that are without any relevance for this subject.

Ultimately, no search technique or tool replaces watching and examining the testimonies closely. As previously stated, not all of these 131 results pertain to 'mixed marriages' as according to Nazi definitions. Furthermore, the results are not limited to testimonies from the area of Nazi Germany 'proper'. While the Nuremberg Laws were introduced in Germany and its annexed territories only, in territories under Nazi occupation, puppet-states, and allied states, different laws and measures applied.[44] Nevertheless, similar statuses of 'protected mixed marriages' also existed in some of these territories, although there were often legal and practical differences. In the Occupied Eastern Territories, in Poland and the Soviet Union, the status of 'protected mixed marriages' did not exist and *Mischlinge* were treated as Jews.[45] However, in some cases, a 'mixed marriage' facilitated the hiding of a Jewish identity or provided a degree of protection due to closer integration with the non-Jewish population. Of course, actual interfaith marriages and conversions were not unique to Germany or Austria.[46] This is why we also find testimonies from these territories that mention intermarriage in detail.[47] While English-language testimonies (which tell about experiences in many different areas) and German-language ones (mostly referring to experiences in Germany, Austria and Czechia) are the most numerous, the results also include ones in Serbian, Croatian, Hungarian, French, Dutch, and other languages. For example, 13 of the 131 testimonies with the subject label 'interfaith marriage' were conducted in Serbian and mostly tell of the experience of persecution in Ustaša-ruled or German-occupied territories. Language alone is of course only a vague indicator. For example, one of the testimonies in French was in fact the story of an intermarried family from Germany which had fled to France.[48] In another French-language testimony, the interviewee, who was born in Austria-Hungary, had

43 The search was performed using Yale University Library's Orbis Advanced search: Title(HVT) AND Subject("interfaith marriage").

44 Cf. Wolf Gruner/Jörg Osterloh (eds.), The Greater German Reich and the Jews. Nazi Persecution Policies in the Annexed Territories 1935–1945, New York/Oxford 2015.

45 "Jews, living in the Occupied Eastern Territories in a mixed marriage with non-Jews, are falling without regard under the definition of 'Jew' in the Occupied Eastern Territories." Bundesarchiv Berlin, Reich Minister for the Occupied Eastern Territories, Decree on the Definition of the Term "Jew" in the Occupied Eastern Territories, May 1942, R 18/3746 a, fol. 013068.

46 For conversions to Christianity and related testimonies in the Fortunoff Archive, see: Ion Popa, Experiences of Jews Who Converted to Christianity before and during the Holocaust, in: S:I.M.O.N. 7 (2020) 1, 75-86.

47 See, for example, HVT-3623, Aleksandra U., 12. August 1995.

48 HVT-3446, Lea A., 27 January 1996.

spent the interwar period in Berlin and only later went to France.[49] The 'classification' of this testimony, tagged as "interfaith marriage", is particularly challenging, as the interviewee had not been married during the Holocaust. After his liberation from Auschwitz, he returned to France and married the non-Jewish widow of his intermarried cousin who had been murdered. Although he himself did not live in a 'mixed marriage' during the Holocaust, his testimony also covers in part the experience of his later wife and her late Jewish husband and their 'mixed marriage' in France. While this complicates finding specific cases of 'mixed marriages' from specific regions, the positive side is that there is a lot of potential for future comparative research. It also shows how disparate such experiences could have been, how flight and migration shaped these experiences and, as a result, how complicated it is to also reconstruct the historical and factual background for interpreting these cases. It is noteworthy that, among the 131 testimonies, only one was conducted in Hebrew. This is perhaps surprising given the fact that Hebrew is the second most prevalent language in the collection.[50]

In addition, there are testimonies not categorised as 'interfaith marriage' or 'children of interfaith marriage' that nevertheless mention these phenomena. For example, one interviewee, a woman who was born in 1930 in Berlin and raised by two Jewish parents, mentions that three of her aunts and uncles had been married to non-Jews. Her testimony is particularly interesting because, within her own family, an array of very different experiences of 'mixed married' families can be observed. In one case, a non-Jewish husband divorced her aunt, forcing her into the underground.[51]

The Visual Search Tool allows us to explore subsets with additional criteria, such as by the gender or the location of birth of the interviewees.[52] For example, 63 per cent of testimonies with the subject "interfaith marriage" were given by women, as well as 64 per cent of those with the subject "children of interfaith marriage" (overall, only 46 per cent of testimonies were given by women).[53] Of the 131 testimonies, information about the birthplace (or the country of birth) of the interviewee is currently available for 117. Of these, 47 were born in Germany (21 in Berlin, two each in Bremen, Hamburg, and Munich, and the others in various cities, towns, and unspecified locations in Germany), five in Austria (of which four were born in Vienna), five in Czechia, and two, without further specification, in Czechoslovakia. Other countries include Poland (10), Serbia (10), Hungary (5), the Netherlands (5), Ukraine (5), and France (4). Certainly, the birthplace only loosely correlates with the place of residence during the Holocaust and after liberation, especially considering how political borders in Europe changed several times during the twentieth century. For example, when watching the testimonies carefully, one can find several other persons who were living in the interwar period and in the Nazi-era in Vienna but were born elsewhere, predominantly in former parts of Austria-Hungary. Sometimes multiple migrations and flight routes further complicate such stories. One interviewee, Lisa F., was born in 1909 in today's Ukraine, then Austria-Hungary, and

49 HVT-3226, Jacob R., 13 February 1995.

50 About 433 testimonies out of over 4,500 were given in Hebrew.

51 HVT-0489, Roni B., 6 September 1984.

52 However, the results again differ between Orbis/Aviary and the Visual Search Tool, even when searching for the same topical descriptor.

53 The higher female proportion among the interviewees can only in part be explained by the larger percentage of women among all first-degree *Mischlinge*, which was 54 per cent according to the 1939 census. Author's calculation based on Meyer, "Jüdische Mischlinge", 465.

grew up in Vienna and later in Berlin in a German-speaking secular Jewish family.[54] In 1933, she fled to Czechoslovakia still holding Austrian citizenship. In Prague, she met and married a non-Jewish German political refugee. Eventually, in 1935, the couple emigrated to France via Switzerland. After unsuccessfully trying to flee to Spain, when Germany invaded France, the couple was able to emigrate to Cuba with the help of an American committee.

The prevalence of certain birthplaces also reflects the presence and activity – or lack thereof – of Fortunoff Archive affiliate projects in certain cities. As of now, there is no possibility to specifically search for a location of residence prior to or during the Holocaust. Stories from rural and peripheral areas are most likely also underrepresented since most interviews were conducted in major cities.

The archive also includes testimonies by persons who did not experience the Holocaust themselves. Hence, among the 131 testimonies, there was also one by a person born in Nairobi, Kenya, in 1946. It turned out the interviewee's mother was German-Jewish – although, perhaps, not living in a 'mixed marriage'.[55] This testimony was also an outlier in terms of the age of the interviewee. For 126 of the 131 testimonies, we know the interviewee's birth year or date. In this case, the interviewees were born between 1902 and 1946, although in fact only this one interviewee was born after 1939, and only 16 were born after 1932. This age distribution roughly correlates with Beate Meyer's interviews with persons persecuted as *Mischlinge* and *Geltungsjuden* who were born between 1908 and 1940,[56] and it likely reflects the predominance of second-generation interviewees in the subset.

Since the question of 'mixed marriages' was in many or most cases not the focus of the interviews, which were also conducted by many different interviewers and by various affiliate projects, the relevance of some testimonies for this topic is sometimes not easy to determine. In any case, it also depends on specific interests and research questions. Furthermore, the testimonies vary considerably in length – between 45 minutes and over six hours. While most follow a relatively similar pattern, usually starting with early childhood memories and family background, they vary considerably in aspects like interview style and depth.

These issues are not specific to the Fortunoff Archive and its repository. The USHMM uses a very similar topical keyword system for its online collections. A subject search for 'interfaith marriage' video testimonies yields 95 results, of which eleven also carry the suffix "Germany" and four the suffix "Austria". 60 testimonies are labelled "children of interfaith marriages" – nine with the suffix "Germany", three with "Austria".[57] Due to the museum's vast collection, additional video testimonies are 'hidden' inside other specialised subcollections (for example, film material used for documentations), which are harder to find and may require different search strategies. The USC Shoah Foundation's VHA uses an entirely different keyword system, called the "index". The index term yielding the most results for this specific case is "Jewish-non Jewish marriages" (1,657 results). An index term usually only refers to a specific segment; it is thus not necessarily the main theme of a testimony. As previously stated, the Shoah Foundation began filming at a much later date than the

54 HVT-1669, Lisa F., 18 November 1990.

55 HVT-0161, Rev. Michael V., 27 March 1980. This interview is perhaps unique, because only a fraction of it is about the family's experience in the Holocaust and most of it is a theological discussion between the interviewer, Dori Laub, and the interviewee, Michael Vasey. Through the interview alone, I could not determine whether the interviewees' parents married prior to or after 1945.

56 Meyer, "Jüdische Mischlinge", 19.

57 USHMM collections search: Subjects and Keywords > "interfaith marriage"; Film, Audio, and Video > Video Recording; Record Type > Oral History.

Fortunoff Archive did – although the beginning of the former's operations in Germany in 1996 coincided with that of the Fortunoff Archive's German affiliate project and there are overlaps. While the overall number of testimonies in the VHA is larger, for this specific topic it is surprisingly similar to that of the Fortunoff Archive.[58] In some cases, we can find testimonies by the same person in two or more repositories. For example, Hans-Oskar Löwenstein de Witt gave two testimonies in the same month: one was recorded on 5 March 1996 for the VHA[59] and the other three weeks later, on 23 March, for the Fortunoff Archive's affiliate.[60]

No matter the keyword or the repository, the interviewees were in most cases children of 'mixed marriages', thus the second generation rather than the first, or they were other relatives of such intermarried couples. Less than a quarter of the relevant testimonies were given by the first generation. How can we explain this relatively small number of such video and audio testimonies? One rather obvious part of the explanation for this scarcity is certainly demographics. The Nazis had banned marriages between Jews and non-Jews in 1935 with their infamous "Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honour", and German marriage law required those wanting to get married to be twenty-one (or eighteen in exceptional cases) years of age or older.[61] Hence, the youngest cohort that was still able to marry regularly in Germany before this law came into effect in 1935 was born around the year 1913. The average person living in a 'mixed marriage' was of course much older.[62] Age distribution also differed quite significantly from region to region. In a sample of 50 Jewish women and men living in 'mixed marriages' in western Austria in the year 1939, I found the median birth year to be 1893, the most prevalent 1883, the earliest 1869, and the most recent 1913.[63] In the 1990s, everyone in this group of 50 would have already been well advanced in age. Among the testimonies in the Fortunoff Archive, the oldest first-generation interviewee was born in 1906 and the youngest in 1920.

Age also interplays with another factor: migration and/or the location of survival. Among the hundreds of thousands of Jews who were forced (and able) to leave Germany, Austria, and Czechia, there were also many who were married to non-Jewish partners. Since no exceptions for intermarried Jews existed prior to the end of 1938 (or, in other words, the concept of 'mixed marriage' only existed *ex negativo* through its banning in 1935), they were subject to the same discrimination and persecution as were all other Jews, and they were thus in many cases forced to flee and emigrate. For example, Hildegard W., who was born in 1912 in Berlin in a Protestant family, emigrated with her Jewish husband Georg, a furrier, to Switzerland in 1937 and eventually to the United States. She gave her testimony to the Fortunoff Archive in 1987.[64]

58 For example, the Fortunoff Archive has 29 German testimonies labelled "interfaith marriage" and the VHA has 28 with the index keyword "Jewish-non Jewish marriage". There are also overlaps.

59 VHA, Interview 11178.

60 HVT-3424, Hans L., 23 March 1996.

61 Gesetz zur Vereinheitlichung des Rechts der Eheschließung und der Ehescheidung im Lande Österreich und im übrigen Reichsgebiet, 6 July 1938, in: Reichsgesetzblatt I 1938, 807.

62 The most prevalent marriage age for men in 1939 was 25 (twelve per cent of total marriages), followed by 26, 24, and 27. Only 16 per cent of men married before the age of 25, and less than half of all men married before the age of 28. Author's calculation based on Statistisches Reichsamt (ed.), Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich 59 (1941/42), Berlin 1942, 72. According to Steven Lowenstein's findings, in the 1930s German Jews married even later than non-Jews. Steven M. Lowenstein, Jewish Intermarriage and Conversion in Germany and Austria, in: Modern Judaism 25 (2005) 1, 23-61, here 31.

63 Author's calculation, based on Tiroler Landesarchiv, Bundespolizeidirektion Innsbruck, Unterlagen der Arisierungsstelle Innsbruck, Gestapo Staatspolizeistelle Innsbruck, Judenauswanderung aus Tirol/Vorarlberg, 9. September 1939.

64 HVT-0937, Hildegard W., 14 July 1987.

Generally speaking, however, intermarried Jews were presumably less likely to emigrate, or conversely more likely to stay in Germany, than were non-intermarried Jews, due to the formers' non-Jewish family ties.[65] When *Mischlinge* sons were drafted into the Wehrmacht in 1939, this perhaps further encouraged staying in Germany at a time of mass emigration and flight.[66] Hence, the number of such couples remained relatively stable between 1939 and 1945 – although it certainly did decrease due to persecution, deportation, and natural deaths.[67] While we lack the statistics, it is reasonable to assume that those who left prior to 1939 were – just like Georg and Hildegard W. – below the median age, since older, especially already retired, intermarried couples were for a variety of reasons more likely to stay. As some anti-Jewish laws and provisions also specifically targeted non-Jewish spouses, especially members of certain professions, such couples had a higher incentive to leave earlier than others. For example, intermarried non-Jews were banned from membership in the Reich Chamber of Culture, which effectively meant that writers, artists, musicians and other cultural workers found their livelihoods destroyed. Unless they received a very rare exemption, they were thus prone to emigration if they were not willing or able to change their profession. This partly explains the relatively high number of prominent intermarried writers and artists, such as Bertolt Brecht and Thomas Mann and their wives, who emigrated quite early. On the other hand, even in a highly politicised and regulated profession such as law, intermarried non-Jewish lawyers and attorneys were still allowed to practice law and thus could continue to make a living. As law is a highly localised profession, they were also more likely to stay in Germany as they would not have been able to practice law abroad. Certainly, the members of some specific professions had more reasons to leave than others, and younger couples were also more likely to leave than retirees. Unfortunately, the reasoning for 'staying' or 'leaving' Germany is rarely discussed in the testimonies analysed for this article.

The Fortunoff Archive contains testimonies on 'mixed' couples and families that chose to leave Europe after liberation in 1945 – such as the Saraffian family, which first emigrated to Argentina and later to the United States, or the family of Hans-Oskar Löwenstein, which emigrated to Israel before eventually returning to Germany. In the mid-1980s, when Nathan Stoltzfus was in Berlin to conduct research for his book on the Rosenstraße protests of 1943, he was still able to interview dozens of these survivors, their children and relatives. By 1989, as he remarks in his books, many of the first generation were already in their nineties and no longer willing or able to talk, even if they had spoken with him just a few years earlier.[68] This was, however, still seven years before the primarily United States-based interview projects started to expand to Central Europe. While the Fortunoff Archive's forerunner began to conduct interviews in 1979 in New England and New York, and quickly expanded to other American cities and states, its German affiliate project only began filming in 1996. There was a small Czech and Slovak affiliate program which filmed

65 This integration could also mean having Nazi Party members in the immediate family: in rare cases, even *Mischlinge* or intermarried Jews and their spouses were members of Nazi organisations. Lowenstein makes a similar argument in Jewish Intermarriage, 52.

66 Meyer, "Jüdische Mischlinge", 17.

67 Although the Nuremberg Laws had banned marriages between "persons of German and related blood" and "Jews", this law did not apply to foreigners. Hence, even in 1939 'mixed marriages' – even actual interfaith marriages – took place in Germany, although on a very small scale.

68 Stoltzfus, Resistance, 292.

between 1992 and 1996, but no Austrian one.[69] The Shoah Foundation, which also commissioned interviews in Europe, was only founded in 1994, with most of the recording in Germany beginning in 1996. The systematic collection of testimonies in Europe thus began at a much later stage than in the United States, which meant that the number of potential interviewees – for this specific survivor group as well as the overall group – had already dwindled. On the other hand, we have hundreds of testimonies of the children of such mixed marriages, and even more if we also count those who mention their intermarried uncles and aunts, siblings, other family members, or even neighbours and acquaintances. These children are certainly a 'hinge generation'.[70] In many cases, they had first-hand experiences of anti-semitic discrimination and persecution as either *Mischlinge* or *Geltungsjuden*. Sometimes, they were arrested or forced into slave labour together with their Jewish parent, such as Hans-Oskar Löwenstein, who was imprisoned in Rosenstraße together with his father. As such, they are not a 'second generation' in the strict sense, but rather an in-between generation. Interestingly, as Beate Meyer remarks, up until the 1980s, when members of this group had given testimony, the experience of their parents was usually the focal point of the interview or testimony.[71] Nevertheless, their situation differed from that of their parents and their testimonies cannot be understood as being in lieu of their parents.

Conclusion

Looking back at the historiography of the persecution of 'mixed marriages', one can clearly see the important role of survivor testimonies, both for discovering and popularising the subject in the first place and as historical evidence. Until the early 2000s, survivors even played an active role in the telling and exploration of this history, especially in the context of the Rosenstraße protests. They did not just give testimony, they actively engaged in the discourse and, through this participation, the discourse also entered some of their testimonies.

In her testimony for the Fortunoff Archive, recorded in 2007, Hannelore H., who had been imprisoned in Rosenstraße in 1943 as a child from a 'mixed marriage', showed a clear knowledge of the contemporary German historical discourse – despite already having lived in Connecticut for many years. In her testimony, she referred to both Margarethe von Trotta's 2003 Rosenstraße movie and to the symposium at the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung in 2004. She even took a stance towards both, clearly affirming her position as a witness but also as a participant in a historical discourse.[72] When searching for the term 'Rosenstraße' in the Fortunoff Archive, one also finds a 2001 interview with a German historian who was born after the Holocaust.[73] The person who referred to Rosenstraße – and mentioned Nathan Stoltzfus in this context – was not the interviewee, but the interviewer Dori Laub, one of the founders of the archive. Testimonies thus not only reveal how the discourse has shaped the memories and acts of giving testimony, but also how the topic

69 Interviews for what would eventually become the Austrian Heritage Archive were conducted from 1996 onwards in New York City and in Israel, but not in Austria itself: https://austrianheritagearchive.at/en/content/austrian-heritage-archive (5 November 2021).

70 Marianne Hirsch, The Generation of Postmemory. Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust, New York 2012, 1.

71 Meyer, "Jüdische Mischlinge", 9.

72 HVT-4406, Hannelore H., 19 October 2007.

73 HVT-4101, Anna R., 25 January 2001.

has entered public awareness and how its relevance has changed in the minds of the interviewers.

The survey of testimonies of 'mixed marriages' in the Fortunoff Archive revealed a surprisingly wide array of different experiences and trajectories, from many different areas, both in Nazi Germany and outside of it. Even testimonies given by survivors of the same generation, the same gender, and from the same region, such as from Bohemia, reveal vastly different experiences. Although the number of actual first-generation accounts is quite small, there is a surprisingly large body of testimonies that do mention the phenomenon and which also help to comparatively analyse these first-generation experiences. These testimonies also reveal how intermarriage has played a role in the lives of many survivors, even those who were not themselves intermarried or were not children of 'mixed marriages' but had intermarried relatives or tried to enter into 'mixed marriage' and were barred from doing so. The large number of testimonies from Eastern and Southeastern Europe, especially from Croatia and Serbia, was especially surprising and clearly demonstrates the potential for future comparative research.

Nikolaus Hagen is a Claims Conference Saul Kagan Postdoctoral Fellow in Advanced Shoah Studies and Lecturer in History at the University College for Teacher Education Vorarlberg. In 2019/2020 he was VWI-Fortunoff Fellow at Yale University's Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies and the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies. Hagen is the author of *Nationalsozialistische Kulturpolitik in Tirol und Vorarlberg* (Innsbruck 2022) and the co-editor of several volumes, including *Displaced Persons-Forschung in Deutschland und Österreich. Eine Bestandsaufnahme zu Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 2021). In his current research project, he explores the persecution of 'mixed marriages' in the peripheries of Nazi Germany, focusing on the gendered experiences of this persecution.
E-mail: nikolaus.hagen@uibk.ac.at

Quotation: Nikolaus Hagen, Survivor Testimonies on German-Jewish 'Mixed Marriages'. Historiography, Potentials and Challenges, in: S:I.M.O.N. – Shoah: Intervention. Methods. Documentation. 8 (2021) 3, 4-19.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.23777/SN.0321/ART_NHAG01
S:I.M.O.N.– Shoah: Intervention. Methods. DocumentatiON. is the semi-annual open access e-journal of the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI) in English and German.
ISSN 2408-9192 | 8 (2021) 3 | https://doi.org/10.23777/SN.0121
This article is licensed under the following Creative Commons License: CC-BY-NC-ND (Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives)
In appreciation to the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany (Claims Conference) for supporting this publication.