"WE ARE HERE"

New Approaches to Jewish Displaced Persons in Postwar Germany

---

Edited by Avinoam J. Patt and Michael Berkowitz

Wayne State University Press Detroit

In honor and memory of John D. Klier (1946–2007),
esteemed colleague and dear friend

In honor and memory of Officer Stephen Tyrone Johns (1969–2009),
killed on duty at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

14 13 12 11 10 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

We are here : new approaches to Jewish displaced persons in postwar Germany / edited by Avinoam J. Patt and Michael Berkowitz.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-8143-3350-1 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. Jews—Germany—History—1945–1990. 2. Holocaust survivors—Germany—History—20th century. 3. Holocaust survivors—Germany—Social conditions—20th century 4. Jewish refugees—Germany—History—20th century. 5. Germany—Ethnic relations—History—20th century.
I. Patt, Avinoam J. II. Berkowitz, Michael.
DS134.26.W4 2010
940.53'1814—dc22
2009031168

Typeset by Maya Rhodes
Composed in Scala and Meta

Living in Landsberg, Dreaming of Deganiah

Jewish Displaced Youths and Zionism after the Holocaust

AVINOAM J. PATT

Some five months after the liberation in Germany, a group of young Holocaust survivors, barely removed from years of persecution and torture at the hands of the Nazi regime, moved to the estate of the virulently anti-Semitic Nazi propagandist Julius Streicher. As Streicher awaited trial in nearby Nuremberg, this group of young Zionists set about transforming his estate into an agricultural training farm, or hakhsharah, in preparation for what they hoped would be their future lives in Palestine. In the December 21, 1945, issue of the Landsberg displaced persons (DP) camp newspaper, Baruch Cheta, leader of this group, summarized the accomplishments of Kibbutz Nili:

> Not long ago, Pleikhershof was the estate and seat of one of Hitler's highest associates, the editor of the sadly famous "*Sturmer*," Julius Streicher. In the office, where for many years the great Jew-hater sat and wrote his blood-thirsty anti-Jewish articles . . . where Streicher wrote to the German people "The Jews are our misfortune" [*Di jidn zajnen unzer umglik*], can be found today the secretariat of an agricultural pioneering school, of Jewish boys and girls, coming from all corners of Europe, learning to work the land, agriculture, cattle-herding, etc., that which is in the first line necessary in the building up of the Land of Israel. This is one of the greatest Jewish satisfactions[,] . . . to be able to see Hebrew writings and slogans, like the People of Israel live [*Am Jsroel chaj*], the strength of Israel will not lie [*Necach Jsroel loj jeszaker*, in initials, NILI], on Streicher's palace; thus we have named our new kibbutz, the first agricultural school in Bavaria.[1]

The members of the new kibbutz were thus making use of the so-called modern Jewish Haman's own personal land to prepare themselves for life in the Jewish state, beginning each day at 4:00 a.m. with the milking of cows, learning by heart the Hebrew words for cow, horse, agricultural tools, and other essential terms of farm labor.[2] The symbolic nature of the revenge exacted by the young survivors on Streicher's estate was unmistakable. However, the powerful political value of young Zionists working to build their futures in Palestine would have profound implications beyond the satisfaction experienced by the members of Kibbutz Nili.

By the middle of 1946, thousands of young kibbutz members representing all strands of the Zionist movement inhabited forty such training farms (hakhsharot) and animated political and cultural life in the DP camps of postwar Germany. Farms and kibbutzim such as Kibbutz Nili acquired widespread visibility among the DP population as a whole, to the point where military and civilian officials and workers often represented the kibbutz and hakhsharah populations as encompassing the overwhelming majority of Jewish youths.[3] Even so, most of the youths who joined such kibbutz groups had little prior experience of Zionism and next to no understanding of Zionist ideology. This chapter will address three related aspects of this phenomenon: (1) How was a situation so amenable to the Zionist project created in such a short period following the war? (2) Why did so many Jewish youths choose such a course so quickly, and why did the course they chose come to characterize the conduct of young Jewish Holocaust survivors as a whole? (3) Finally, what was the appeal of Zionism for these youths, and what did it mean to them in practice, on the everyday level, as they awaited a resolution to their stateless condition after the war?

These are not idle questions; their answers bear heavily upon the history of the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. Following World War II the seemingly overwhelming Zionist enthusiasm of the Jewish DPs, witnessed in part by the gravitation of a significant portion of Jewish DP youths to kibbutzim and hakhsharot, was vital in informing the diplomatic decisions that led to the creation of

the State of Israel as international observers representing the United States, Britain, and the United Nations weighed the desires of the large Jewish refugee population in Europe.[4] Likewise, the founders of the newly created State of Israel pointed to a clear relationship between the Holocaust and Israel, with survivors actively participating in the founding of the state. In fact, between 1948 and 1949, some twenty-two thousand DPs (seventy-eight hundred from Germany alone) were enlisted in the Haganah and sent to Palestine/Israel from the DP camps in Germany, Italy, Austria, and Cyprus to aid in the fighting there.[5] The elected bodies officially representing the Jewish DPs in Germany endorsed the conscription of young DPs enthusiastically, calling upon all able-bodied men and women between the ages of seventeen and thirty-five to fulfill their "national duty."[6] Israel's Declaration of Independence, read by David Ben-Gurion on May 14, 1948, asserted that the remnant that survived the Holocaust continued to migrate to Palestine, undaunted by difficulties and dangers, and "never ceased to assert their right to a life of dignity, freedom and honest toil in their national homeland."[7] Some framed the two seminal events in twentieth-century Jewish history as inextricably linked, as a "fateful historical reaction" that led the DPs to claim their place in a Jewish state.[8] For this reason it seems essential to understand the sources of that enthusiasm especially among young people, who bore a significant portion of the burden in the battles for Israel's independence.[9]

While there has been general historiographical consensus over the fact that the Jewish DPs presented an enthusiastic Zionist position in the years following the war, there has been considerable debate as to the source of this enthusiasm. Most scholars have accepted the dominant Zionist representation offered at the time, namely that the active steps that Jewish DP youths took to prepare themselves for migration to Palestine by joining kibbutzim and hakhsharot were a natural outgrowth of their experience under Nazi rule.[10] This thesis of an intuitive Zionism born directly from the war was affirmed in 2002 in Zeev Mankowitz's comprehensive study of Jewish DPs in postwar Germany. As Mankowitz argued, "the creation of a Jewish state in the Land of Israel was taken to be the last will and testament bequeathed by the dead to the living. . . . It signified the only real hope for the rescue and rehabilitation of the little that remained of European Jewry and, in the longer term, the promise of the Jewish future."[11] Fifty years after the end of the war, however, a group of Israeli scholars threw this chain of historical inevitability into question. In fact, some suggested that the Holocaust almost prevented the creation of the State of Israel by depriving the Yishuv (the prestate Jewish settlement in Palestine) of the European manpower reserve it so needed, making the DPs the last hope of the Yishuv to establish a state.[12] Idith Zertal and others questioned the nature of the relationship between the Yishuv and the survivors and the clandestine immigration movement at its center, concluding that the Zionists in the Yishuv had cynically manipulated the dispirited and demoralized survivors for their own political ends.[13]

A third group of scholars has similarly emphasized the importance of the postwar context but has identified features other than the activities of Zionist organizations as crucial to the development of DP Zionism. These scholars have pointed to the role of diplomatic and political developments in the mid-1940s in shaping a collective national identity among Jewish DPs. Changes in Allied policy to categorize the Jews as a distinct national group rather than as citizens of their former home countries played into Zionist hands. If Jews were indeed a nation, then they were, as Zionists had long claimed, entitled to national independence and territorial sovereignty. Thus, according to this logic, Zionism came to appear to Jewish DPs as the ideology most in tune with contemporary international political thinking.[14]

These assessments of the DP situation and the origins of DP Zionist enthusiasm have a number of shortcomings, however. They tend to describe the Jewish DPs as an undifferentiated mass with uniform wartime experiences, although it is apparent that the She'erit Hapletah (Surviving Remnant) was a population with a distinctively youthful demographic makeup that influenced its political and cultural choices.[15] From an early point following liberation it was evident that as much as half of the surviving population was under the age of twenty-five, and some 80 percent were under age forty. These young people, who were more likely to have survived years of persecution because of hardiness and selection for work, were for the most part orphaned and alone. The decisions made by young Jewish DPs have to be understood in relation to both their particular background as Jews and their universal background as young people struggling to move on with their lives in the aftermath of the Holocaust. For those youths who had survived the Holocaust in concentration and forced labor camps, in hiding, fighting with the partisans, and elsewhere, this was especially true. They were forced to confront adult decisions both during and after the war but were left without parents or family in order to make such decisions.

Most studies of the Jewish DP population have also tended to rely on sources created by either the DP camp leadership or by outside groups (such as Zionist emissaries from Palestine, the U.S. Army, and international relief agencies) to explain the choices made by youths. This is surprising considering the volume of source material creat-

ed by young DPs themselves, including articles in the DP and youth movement press as well as letters, correspondence, diaries, journals, and testimonies created by kibbutz members. While sources created by outside groups who worked with the DPs may provide contemporaneous descriptions of DP youths, only through an examination of sources created by the young survivors themselves is it possible to fully understand the challenges they faced after the war and the calculations they made in determining the course of their lives after the Holocaust. Furthermore, Zionism in the DP camps has for the most part only been examined from the Yishuv perspective, asking what role DPs played in the creation of the State of Israel. Regardless of whether the state would have been created or not, Zionism filled a crucial function for the Jewish DPs and proved appealing to a number of groups in postwar Germany, who all supported the Zionist project for different reasons. This support would lead to the creation of a flourishing Zionist network in the American zone of Germany whereby survivor youths could continue the process of Zionist immersion within the framework of kibbutzim and hakhsharot, and this did in fact ultimately aid in the creation of the State of Israel.

The Jews in Germany after Liberation

Immediately following liberation, while most of the ten million DPs, prisoners of war (POWs), and forced laborers in Germany after the war made the decision to return home with ease, the fifty thousand or so Jewish DPs did not face such a clear decision. Unsure of what awaited them at home, often fairly certain that their families had been destroyed during the war, those who decided to stay in a DP camp also had to face the fact that this meant continuing to live with collaborators who also refused to return home. In general, Polish and Baltic Jews were the least likely to return to their home countries (although many did), while Jews from countries such as Hungary, Romania, France, and Greece were far more likely to return to their countries following liberation.[16] Jewish DPs who had made the decision to remain in Germany thus faced a choice: they could remain in the DP camp (generally German military barracks, former POW and slave labor camps, tent cities, industrial housing, and the like), or they could leave the DP camp if they chose to settle in Germany permanently, a choice that some fifteen thousand German Jewish survivors made in the summer of 1945.[17]

Some of the first Jews to encounter the surviving Jewish population, apart from the occasional Jewish Brigade soldier (a division from Palestine serving with the British Army) were Jewish chaplains serving with the American military.[18] One particularly active chaplain, Abraham Klausner, who first helped survivors catalog who had actually survived and aided in the early political organization of the She'erit Hapletah, reported to his superiors in the United States on the situation of the Jews in postwar Germany. In conducting a survey of conditions faced by Jewish DPs in Germany, Klausner visited approximately fourteen thousand Jews living in seventeen DP camps one month following liberation. He found deplorable conditions, poor accommodations, no plumbing, no clothing, rampant disease, continuing malnourishment, and a lack of any plan on the part of the American military. "Liberated but not free, that is the paradox of the Jew," Klausner concluded in a report detailing the condition of the Jewish survivors.[19] And indeed, of the approximately fifty thousand to sixty thousand Jewish survivors at the time of liberation, within the first weeks following liberation many thousands perished from complications arising from disease, starvation, and the camp experience.[20]

It had also become evident that a disproportionate segment of the surviving Jewish population was composed of young people. One month after Allied forces defeated the Third Reich, M. Winogrodzki, a Jewish Holocaust survivor freshly liberated from Dachau, composed a report on conditions for Jews such as himself in the newly created U.S. zone of occupation. Concern for the large number of young people he found among the liberated Jews in Bavaria was a prominent feature of his report. "Here in the Munich region," he wrote, "there are both large and small concentration camps with a Jewish population of ca. 50,000, of which a great number are young, for the most part without parents and therefore without existing supervision."[21] His observation was borne out by a series of reports and surveys presented by various agencies representing a broad spectrum of interests from the earliest weeks following liberation and for years thereafter in which the proportion of Jewish DPs between the ages of fifteen and thirty was consistently estimated at more than half and often above 80 percent of the total Jewish population.[22]

For those at the time who were familiar with the broadest outlines of the experience of European Jewry under Nazi rule, these statistics should not have been surprising. Every Jew within the Germans' reach had been marked for death. Avoiding the death sentence demanded quickness of foot and wit, audacity, adaptability, physical stamina, and the ability to blend inconspicuously into often hostile surroundings (in addition to no small measure of luck). Those qualities generally tend to be present in greater measure among the young than among their elders. Chances for survival were also often enhanced by absence of concern for dependent children, again a situation more common

among teenagers and young adults than among those beyond the customary age of marriage. It is no wonder, then, that Jewish survivors numbered disproportionately in those age ranges. Similarly, it stands to reason that a relatively large number of Jewish DPs should have been orphans; parents whose children were teenagers during the early 1940s were already of an age where the physical and mental demands of survival were increasingly likely to prove too much to bear. Nor is it surprising that many who observed these young, largely orphaned Jews during the first weeks following liberation commented prominently on their seeming lack of direction, perhaps even their paralytic confusion, concerning how they might begin to resume normal lives. Winogrodzki summed up the situation succinctly when he wrote, "These children, who no longer have parents, do not know when and where they should go."[23]

While organizing among themselves, the DPs and chaplains such as Klausner continued to describe the poor conditions facing the DPs in letters to military authorities and world Jewish organizations (such as the World Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee). Some former members of Zionist youth movements, such as Winogrodzki in Dachau, turned to Nathan Schwalb in the He-Halutz office in Geneva.[24] They reported poor treatment of Jewish DPs at the hands of their liberators, with Jewish DPs being denied rations, housed in camps with former collaborators, and denied freedom of movement from camps. Jewish DPs pleaded for assistance from the U.S. military government and United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) to rectify their miserable situation.[25]

For those Jewish DPs who chose the temporary existence of the DP camps, liberation was far from all they had hoped for. Beyond the wish for food, clothing, shelter, and security, Jewish DPs expected some validation of their survival, a sign that the outside world had not completely forsaken them. Expecting to be welcomed by the world with open arms, Jewish DPs found liberation to be a rude awakening, as they still struggled to obtain bearable living conditions and yearned for contact from the rest of the Jewish world, which had still largely been denied access to the DP camps due to the chaotic postwar situation. As Klausner had noted, the American military seemed to lack any plan for the Jewish refugees who had chosen not to return to their home countries.

The reports of continuing deprivation in the liberated camps and poor organization of recovery issued by the survivors and the Jewish chaplains serving there did eventually succeed in prompting American officials to take a greater interest in the problem of the DPs. On June 22, 1945, President Harry S. Truman dispatched Earl Harrison (dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School) to Europe to prepare a report regarding the "needs of stateless and non-repatriable refugees among the displaced persons in Germany and to determine the extent to which those needs are being met by military, governmental and private organizations."[26] Once Harrison arrived in the camps in Germany, the Jewish DPs, along with Klausner and soldiers from the Jewish Brigade, worked to make sure that he was aware of the miserable conditions facing the Jews.[27] In his scathing report back to Truman, published in August 1945, Harrison stated that we are "treating the Jews as the Nazis treated them except that we do not exterminate them."[28] He proposed that Jews be separated in their own camps—until then they had been forced to live with other national groups and former collaborators—and to resolve their refugee status, he proposed that one hundred thousand immigration certificates to Palestine be granted immediately to the Jewish DPs. Following Harrison's report, American authorities worked to ameliorate conditions for Jewish DPs, moving Jews to separate camps and agreeing to the appointment of an adviser for Jewish affairs. Harrison's suggestions served to link the resolution of the Jewish DP situation with the situation in Palestine, thereby elevating the diplomatic implications of the Jewish DP political stance. Still, Jewish DPs had the distinct sense that their many calls for assistance continued to fall on deaf ears both in Germany and in America.

Kibbutz Buchenwald and the Hakhsharah in Postwar Germany

Feeling abandoned by lack of contact from the rest of the Jewish world after liberation, many among the Jewish DPs resolved to help themselves. Among the liberated young Jews in Buchenwald were three former He-Halutz members who had remained active during the war in organizing groups of Zionist youths in Buchenwald and Auschwitz. Arthur Posnansky and Yechezkel Tydor, who were in the death march from Auschwitz to Buchenwald in January 1945, joined Eliyahu Gruenbaum in Buchenwald and, in the tumultuous last few months before liberation, began to plan for the postwar period.[29] The three would be central in the organization of the first kibbutz hakhsharah in postwar Germany, Kibbutz Buchenwald.

The diary of the collective group that began to come together in Buchenwald following liberation reveals the early considerations that entered the minds of the young survivors already faced with the question of where to go next. Since liberation, Posnansky had sought as-

sistance from Nathan Schwalb at the He-Halutz office in Geneva in organizing "the hundreds of Jews, parentless, homeless, without any relatives," in Buchenwald who had remained alive and desired to go to hakhsharah but were frustrated at the lack of contact from Jewish organizations.[30] Once they had made the realization that the world seemed to have no plans for the Jews, however, Posnansky, Tydor, and the Buchenwald group proposed an option that could remove survivors who had begun to recover from the war from the squalor of the DP camp. As noted in an early diary entry,

> Perhaps for the thousandth time the Jewish committee in Buchenwald was holding a meeting on the question: Where to? A Polish Jew, a German, a Czech, a Hungarian—each faced the same burning problem: Where should the few surviving Jews of Buchenwald go? How could we ever have believed that at the end of the war the surviving Jews would have no more worries, that everything would be fine! The world, we had thought, would welcome our few survivors with open arms! We, the first victims of the Nazis. They would love us! Quickly enough, we saw that the world had other things on its mind than Jewish suffering. So where to? Comrade Posnansky put forth an idea: into our own kibbutz. To build a group of Buchenwald's youth, and find a farm where we could prepare for Palestine. A wonderful idea. There would be no lack of candidates for the kibbutz, for energy was reawakening in the survivors and seeking an outlet. From that idea sprang Kibbutz Buchenwald.[31]

The founders of Kibbutz Buchenwald pointed to the dual function of the kibbutz: on the one hand, it would assist in avoiding the temptations of black market activity and the desire to exact revenge on the German populace;[32] on the other hand, it could help train youths for the pioneering lifestyle of Eretz Israel through *shituf* (sharing), socialization, and vocational training.[33]

The early political leadership of the She'erit Hapletah, composed of many former members of Zionist youth groups who had chosen to remain in Germany rather than return to Eastern Europe, was overwhelmingly attuned to the needs of the youths in the DP camps.[34] From an early point in time, the Jewish DP leadership espoused a strong Zionist position. In many cases it was the surviving members of Zionist youth movements and political parties who undertook the self-help work and in turn became most active among those seeking to convince survivors to avoid a return to Eastern Europe. These were generally youth movement leaders who had experience leading and organizing Jewish youths both before and, in some cases, during the war. This experience made them well suited to lead the younger Jewish population that had survived life in German concentration camps. For the young Jewish survivors in the DP camps (primarily under the age of thirty-five), regardless of whether they had experience in a Zionist youth group before the war, such kibbutz groups emerged as attractive options, providing them with the camaraderie, support, and replacement family they so desperately craved.

The emerging popularity of the alternative living experiment near Buchenwald demonstrated the value of this option to DP youths and the Jewish DP leadership. Despite reservations over farming the accursed German soil and entering into relationships with German locals, the young farmers believed that the end goal—that is, the building of the Land of Israel—justified the temporary transgression of working in Germany. At the first meeting of the Conference of Liberated Jews on July 25, 1945, the representatives of Kibbutz Buchenwald argued that their kibbutz could serve as a model for the thousands of Jewish youths in Germany. With ninety-four delegates representing the approximately fifty thousand surviving Jews in Germany and Austria, the meeting was an opportunity for the Jewish DPs to state their concerns and come together as a cohesive political group.[35] While all were in agreement that *di jugnt* (the youth), as the future of the Jewish people, needed to be occupied productively to prepare for life in Palestine, others on the newly formed Zionist-oriented Central Committee were concerned that by encouraging Jewish youths to settle on farms in Germany, they could be induced to remain in Germany long term. Still, the popularity of the newly organized kibbutz groups within the camps and the belief that some productive use of time needed to be provided for the many Jewish youths in Germany demonstrated the need to expand the farming project. Thus, the Central Committee and the Zionist groups in the DP camps came to focus their efforts in the sphere of youths on vocational and agricultural training, which would largely be organized under the auspices of the kibbutz groups of the Zionist youth movements.

In response to the move of Jewish youths into the Zionist groups, at the second meeting of the Zionist organization in Bavaria on August 20 in Landsberg, the Zionist leadership decided that in addition to the official formation of a United Zionist Organization (UZO), they would authorize the creation of No'ar Chalutzi Meuchad (United Pioneering Youth), more commonly known as Nocham.[36] Such an official youth movement could systematize the loose clusters of youths who had already congregated in the various DP centers and guarantee

greater membership for the UZO and Nocham, also facilitating the process of aliyah to Palestine from the DP camps.[37] In this initial period, the various Zionist youth movements agreed to participate within the Nocham framework; over the course of 1946, however, divisions would emerge and each movement (aside from Gordoniah) erected an independent apparatus in the DP camps.[38]

According to leaders of the She'erit Hapletah, Jewish youths in the DP camps had a responsibility to be productive in order to guarantee the rebirth of the Jewish people. Furthermore, as Samuel Gringauz, head of the Landsberg DP camp, suggested on Yom Kippur in September 1945, "For you, our young people, are the agents of our revenge which ought to be a proud assertion to continue life. You must readily show the world and all our enemies that despite everything we are here to stay. Your revenge must be in working and toiling for your own land. You must create and build, dance and sing, open yourselves to life, to living and labor."[39] Jewish youths thus had a duty to be the revitalizing force in the rebirth of the Jewish people after the catastrophe. As Jewish youths emerged as the most vocal and desirable element of the Jewish DP population, such a focus could also serve to empower youth, who until that time had only been the victims of persecution and dehumanization. This language of productivization would prove appealing to various groups in postwar Germany who focused on the survivor youths (and those ages fifteen to thirty in particular) as the agents of Zionist productivity for the wider DP population.

The U.S. Army, UNRRA, the Jewish Agency, and the Kibbutz Project

While the youth movement leaders and the DP leadership viewed life in the kibbutz and farming as therapeutic activities for survivor youths, others in the Zionist movement (and in the American zone administration) viewed the kibbutzim from a far more functional and instrumental perspective. In a visit to Kibbutz Buchenwald at the end of July 1945, Eliyahu Dobkin, head of the Jewish Agency's aliyah department and the highest-ranking Jewish Agency official to reach Germany until then, sought to convince kibbutz members eager to make aliyah that the kibbutz could have far more value as a symbolic protest through its continued functioning in Germany. As was noted in the kibbutz journal after Dobkin's visit, "Now we asked what news he had for us. His reply disturbed us greatly. For he suggested that we should remain here as a kibbutz for the time being, since our existence made us a symbol of vital political importance to the Jewish cause. . . . [E]ven if we were given the means to proceed to Palestine, there were plenty of others who would come into the kibbutz and maintain it in Germany as the next immigrant group."[40] (Ultimately the original members of Kibbutz Buchenwald were granted the aliyah certificates they desired and immigrated to Palestine in August 1945.) Both during and after the war, however, the Yishuv continued to question whether the She'erit Hapletah could really be counted on to aid in the creation of the state. Leaders doubted both the character of the surviving population and the degree of Zionist enthusiasm among the DPs.[41] Nonetheless, in his October 1945 visit to the DP camps, David Ben-Gurion became convinced of the Zionist enthusiasm of the She'erit Hapletah, witnessing its early organization and initiative in the creation of training farms and kibbutzim in particular.

In October 1945 Ben-Gurion, in his capacity as head of the Jewish Agency, visited the DP camps in Germany, where the Jewish DPs welcomed him as "the personal embodiment of all their hopes for the future."[42] Major Irving Heymont, responsible for the administration of the Landsberg DP camp, described Ben-Gurion's visit to Landsberg on October 22, 1945, and the excitement that the visit engendered among the camp population. The camp was already abuzz, for the day before the first election of the camp committee had occurred, with the Ichud Zionist slate of Samuel Gringauz emerging victorious. As Heymont related, "To add to the excitement of election day, the camp was visited by Mr. David Ben-Gurion—the head of the Zionist organization if Palestine. *To the people of the camp, he is God. It seems that he represents all of their hopes of getting to Palestine.* . . . I don't think that a visit by President Truman could cause as much excitement."[43]

Through his meetings with General Dwight D. Eisenhower and General Walter Bedell-Smith, Ben-Gurion learned that the U.S. Army authorities did not intend to stop Jewish infiltrees from Eastern Europe from entering the American zone; sensing an opportunity, he outlined a plan that was to bring as many Jews as possible into the occupation zones that were under U.S. command.[44] In the wake of the Harrison Report, in which American authorities had been excoriated for poor treatment of Jews, American officials provided separate camps for Jews and were determined to improve conditions for Jews in the U.S. zone. Furthermore, Ben-Gurion submitted a number of suggestions to Eisenhower on how to improve the morale of the Jewish DPs, which included allowing the Jewish DPs to govern themselves, subject to the ultimate authority of the U.S. Army, and providing agricultural and vocational training on confiscated Nazi farms.[45]

Other American officials were impressed by the early success of Kibbutz Buchenwald and other farms in not only improving DP morale and spiritual rehabilitation but also in providing for many of their

Major Irving Heymont converses with David Ben-Gurion during his visit to the Landsberg DP camp. Also pictured is U.S. Army chaplain Rabbi Abraham Klausner (*left*) and Abraham Glassgold, UNRRA camp director (*far right*). (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Photograph no. 80978A, courtesy of Sara Huberfeld)

own food needs and preparing for their future in Palestine (and not in the United States) as well as serving as a possible form of punishment for former Nazis.[46] At the time of Ben-Gurion's visit to the DP camps in late October 1945, five agricultural training settlements were already in existence, with their early success demonstrating the viability of an agricultural plan on a larger scale. Kibbutz Nili, for example, was appropriated for Jewish DPs by the U.S. Army, which ordered the evacuation of Russian and Ukrainian DPs living on the farm in October and November 1945.[47] Still, American officials had to balance their Jewish policy with the increasingly more important task of German reconstruction.

For farms to be viable, however, they needed not only the approval of American officials but also the support of a number of aid agencies, which also sought to address the issue of overcrowding and DP demoralization, while providing shelter for the increasing numbers of infiltrees being allowed to enter by American authorities. John Whiting, as UNRRA zone administrator, noting his belief that many of the DPs ultimately sought to make their way to Palestine, also concluded that agricultural training could be an excellent way to make use of the Jewish DPs' time in Germany and thus justified the seizure of German estates for Jewish farmers.[48] Whiting in effect became a spokesperson for the merit of these hakhsharot, arguing to military officials that "it is, in my opinion, a fact that the use of the properties by the Jewish displaced persons would increase the productivity and actually contribute more to the local German economy than present usage does."[49] Thus, he indirectly advocated a Zionist position, but not out of an overwhelming love for the idea of a Jewish state. Rather, as he saw it, Zionism came to represent a solution to his immediate problem of overcrowding, which could lead to DP demoralization, crime, black market activity, and the spread of tuberculosis.

UNRRA's support for training farms corresponded nicely with the Jewish Agency's diplomatic goals. UNRRA would be assisted in its efforts to secure land and instructors for farming projects by representatives of the Jewish Agency operating in Germany. *Shlichim* (emissaries) from the Jewish Agency attached to Haim Hoffman's delegation worked to ensure the expansion of the project. The first delegation of twenty Jewish Agency emissaries, technically working under the auspices of UNRRA, had arrived in Germany in the middle of December 1945 and worked to organize aliyah, assist the Bricha in accommodating infiltrees from Eastern Europe, facilitate agricultural and vocational training, offer political instruction, and provide Zionist education.[50] With the arrival of more *shlichim* over the course of 1946, the Jewish Agency team expanded its efforts to assist in the opening of hakhsharot. For political reasons the Jewish Agency believed that such farms, while preparing youths for life in Palestine through agricultural training, could also prove valuable by increasing the visibility of DP Zionism and isolating the pioneering avant-garde from the rest of the DP camp. For the most part, however, Jewish Agency workers adopted the largely instrumental view of the youths based on a continuing belief in survivor youths as unsuitable for agricultural labor. Haim Hoffman corroborated this view of the survivor youth as less than ideal for the type of labor required of agricultural workers, although he believed that the farms could successfully transform their residents into suitable Zionist material: "after a short time, a different type of person was created from the residents of the camps who was even closer to the Eretz Israeli type of person."[51]

Through the support of these various groups, however, the number of farms grew steadily well before the sizable influx of Jewish refugees from Poland arriving with the Bricha. By June 1946 thirty-five farms were in existence with more than thirty-six hundred inhabitants. This suggests that while the stated rationale for the creation of farms

GROWTH OF HAKHSHAROT IN THE AMERICAN ZONE

Date of Survey	Number of Hakhsharot	Number of Inhabitants	Total population in U.S. Zone (Hakhshara Population as % of Total Population)
January 27, 1946	8	870	49,695 (1.75%)
May 31, 1946	26	2,337 (or 2,236)	67,491 (3.46%)
June 30, 1946	35	3,661	75,517 (4.84%)
September 30, 1946	36	3,515	138,551 (2.54%)
October 31, 1946	36	3,442	141,077 (2.4%)

Note. The calculations are based on the following JDC population surveys (available in the YIVO Archives): January 1946 (microfilm MK 488, Leo Schwarz Papers, reel 9, folder 57, frame 576); May 31, 1946 (microfilm MK 488, Leo Schwarz Papers, reel 2, folder 20, frames 835–41); June 30, 1946 (microfilm MK 488, Leo Schwarz Papers, reel 2, folder 21, frame 1024); September 30, 1946 (microfilm MK 483, DPG reel 3, folder 29, frame 53); October 31, 1946 (microfilm MK 483, DPG reel 3, folder 30, frame 200).

was to alleviate overcrowding, it is clear that the creation of farms preceded the large infiltration of East European Jewish refugees with the Bricha, therefore indicating that diplomatic concerns may have been as significant as demographic ones.

Just as importantly, on the diplomatic level the high visibility of the kibbutzim and hakhsharot and their manifestations of Zionist enthusiasm demonstrated to outside observers a perceived state of Palestine passion on the part of the Jewish DPs. The apparent importance of Zionism for the increasing numbers of arriving DPs confirmed the necessity of the Zionist solution for representatives of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry (AACI). After beginning their work in Washington and London in January 1946, in February members of the commission began visiting the DP camps in Germany and Austria as well as sites in Poland to assess the Jewish situation.[52] Notwithstanding some concerns over Zionist propaganda and manipulation, on April 20, 1946, the AACI recommended "(A) that 100,000 certificates be authorized immediately for the admission into Palestine of Jews who have been the victims of Nazi and Fascist persecution; (B) that these certificates be awarded as far as possible in 1946 and that actual immigration be pushed forward as rapidly as conditions will permit." This was the conclusion that the committee came to not only

A large crowd of Jewish DPs at the Neu Freimann DP camp participate in a demonstration protesting British immigration policy to Israel. (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Photograph no. 96435, courtesy of Jack Sutin)

because of a lack of any other options but also because the committee genuinely believed that this was the truest expression of the Jewish DPs' desires. "Furthermore, that is where almost all of them want to go. There they are sure that they will receive a welcome denied them elsewhere. There they hope to enjoy peace and rebuild their lives." The committee based these findings in part on surveys conducted among the DPs. However, the committee also firmly believed that based on what it had observed among the Jewish DPs, they were a group ardently preparing themselves for a Zionist future. While many among the DPs were seen as reluctant to work, "On the other hand, whenever facilities are provided for practical training for life in Palestine they eagerly take advantage of them."[53]

Despite the recommendations of the AACI, however, over the course of 1946 and into 1947 diplomatic efforts stalled, and it became clear that for the majority of the youths in the kibbutzim life would continue in Germany and not on the path to Palestine. As more and more infiltrees arrived from Poland, kibbutz groups in the DP camps moved to training farms in the American zone of Germany, where they would continue life within the youth movement awaiting selection for aliyah. The massive influx of Jews from Eastern Europe, with the ar-

rival of Jews who had survived in the far reaches of the Soviet Union and many more families, also led to a major demographic shift in the DP camps. Over the course of 1946, approximately one hundred thousand Jews from Eastern Europe were brought to the American zone of Germany by the Bricha, some one-third of them youths organized within the framework of kibbutzim of the pioneering Zionist youth movements.[54] Who were these youths in the kibbutzim, and what did they get out of this experience? What was the initial appeal of the kibbutz for those youths who chose to join the groups, and why did they choose to remain in the group rather than seek other options as time dragged on in Germany?

Jewish Youths and Zionism in the Kibbutz Groups: The Case of Kibbutz Lochamei HaGetaot al shem Tosia Altman

While Kibbutz Buchenwald and Kibbutz Nili proved appealing to young survivors eager to remove themselves from the DP camp environment in the first months after liberation, the majority of the kibbutzim by the end of 1946 were occupied by youths who had survived the war in Poland or the Soviet Union. Unlike their counterparts in Germany, many of these Polish youths had already had their first encounters with the Zionist framework of the kibbutz in Poland and were thus, to a greater extent, part of a cohesive group upon their arrival in Germany. Nonetheless, their experience of Zionism was also a work in progress that had begun to be shaped first in Poland.

Among these groups infiltrating the American zone of Germany at the end of 1945 were two Hashomer Hatzair kibbutzim organized in Sosnowiec and Bytom in Poland. Their experiences in postwar Germany would be fairly typical of those for kibbutz youths. The two groups, which united to form one kibbutz with 110 members once they reached the Landsberg DP camp, took on the name Kibbutz Lochamei HaGetaot al shem Tosia Altman in December 1945. Like many of the Hashomer Hatzair kibbutzim in the DP camps, the kibbutz was named after a fallen resistance fighter from the movement.[55] The two *madrichim* of the kibbutz, Miriam and Baruch Yechieli, who served as the guides, teachers, and spiritual leaders of the kibbutz, had returned to Poland after spending the war in the Soviet Union. The group kept a collective diary, which was commenced while the kibbutz was still in Germany, detailing the history of the kibbutz.[56] Although the youths arriving in kibbutzim such as Tosia Altman may not have known it at the time, their presence in the American zone would have significant diplomatic ramifications.

Cover page of the collective diary kept by Kibbutz Lochamei HaGetaot al shem Tosia Altman. (Kibbutz Gazit Archive, Israel)

As was the case with the members of Kibbutz Tosia Altman, while they had been filled with hope of an early arrival in Palestine following their departure from Poland, weeks in Germany soon dragged into months, and months dragged into years. After spending fourteen months in the American zone, eight of which they spent farming the soil of Germany on a hakhsharah near Eschwege, the kibbutz left for Palestine in early 1947. They arrived there only in the spring of 1948 following a year-long internment in Cyprus. The length of the period within the DP camps raised the question of whether the kibbutz could continue as a cohesive group or would remain the most appealing option for the youths who had arrived in Germany. Still, through a focus on materials created by young Jewish DPs themselves living in the kibbutzim, it becomes evident that the time spent by the youths in the kibbutz groups was put to use in deepening Zionist enthusiasm and strengthening attachment to both the Jewish past and the Zionist future.

For many, however, the initial appeal of the kibbutz in the summer of 1945 had little to do with ideology; practical concerns were far more pressing. An early diary entry in Bytom described members who were steered to the kibbutz by the League for Labor Palestine (Ha-Liga le-ma'an Erets-Yisrael ha-Ovedet) and who "arrived young, without any ideological awareness and unable to understand the nature of kibbutz life. They saw the kibbutz as a practical means of aliyah to Israel."[57] The new members in both kibbutzim in Bytom and Sosnowiec, unaware of many of the meanings behind the Zionist activities in the kibbutz, had clearly not joined out of commitment to the socialist-Zionist ethic but instead saw the kibbutz as preferable to the meager options available in Poland. As one early member, Inka Weisbort, later recalled, "the negative feelings were the primary reason for joining the kibbutz: fear of loneliness, of anti-Semitism, and the threats of the outside world. . . . Positive feelings, like the better social atmosphere . . . , desire to make aliyah and . . . achieve the Zionist ideal" came only much later.[58]

The creation of kibbutzim and the choices made by Jewish youths to join them were an important part of a mutually beneficial relationship for Jewish youths and the Zionist movements in postwar Poland. While the movements viewed the kibbutzim as a method of enlisting followers and expanding the ranks of the Zionist parties, the youths who joined the kibbutzim tended to stay because of the psychological support they derived from the communal structure, which proved highly therapeutic for many of the survivors because it placed them with a similar community of youths who had undergone wartime trauma. The activity within the kibbutz, both in daily work and in education, could help to avert the depression, anxiety, and anger that were certain by-products of the post-traumatic stress disorder that many of these survivors were perhaps facing.[59] Although veteran movement activists may have been critical of the pioneering quality of the surviving youths, they were in fact dependent on these youths to reconstitute the decimated European movements.

While the Zionist ideological aspects of the kibbutz were secondary, by joining a kibbutz these youths were making a statement of membership in a Zionist organization. And membership in the kibbutz came along with the opportunity for education in Jewish and Zionist history as well as the ideology of the movement that they joined. (While many had abandoned the religion of their youth, the Jewish aspects of the kibbutz continued to hold appeal as a meaningful part of their identity.) The Zionist opportunity, however, was not merely defined by its end goal—the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine—but also came to be understood as the community provided by the kibbutz, the education it offered, the structure, and the chance to work as well as the hope for departure from Europe.

Although the members did not necessarily join for ideological reasons, this did not preclude the growth of Zionist enthusiasm. On the contrary, as members remained within the kibbutz, they learned more about their youth movement, the history of the Zionist movement, the ideas and beliefs that their movement stood for, and their new partnership in a legacy of wartime heroism. After their arrival in Germany with the Bricha, the kibbutz used the time spent in the DP camps to further their Zionist education and training. (Kibbutz Tosia Altman spent two months in Landsberg before moving to Leipheim in January 1946.) The kibbutz also provided a cultural outlet for dramatic performances, music, dancing, and writing, all of which were part of the Zionist immersion. Both in the diary and in reports to the youth movement leadership, Kibbutz Tosia Altman detailed daily Hebrew lessons, courses in Zionist and Jewish history, the history of the youth movements, and vocational and agricultural training designed to prepare the youths for their future lives in Palestine.

The daily schedule of the kibbutzim was thus run on the time of the youth movement, as was the calendar of the kibbutz. The daily activities in the kibbutz and the new interpretation of familiar events, such as Jewish holidays, had the function of reorienting members' conceptions of the past, present, and future. Kibbutz members paid special attention to the celebrations of Jewish and Zionist movement holidays in the sources they created as well as in the weekly commemoration of the Sabbath in an *oneg shabbes* (enjoying the Sabbath). As members of Kibbutz Tosia Altman noted in their diary, the *oneg*

shabbes, held on Friday evenings, was a time to have discussions of literature and readings of books and newspapers and was a chance for members to present plays and performances; a successful *oneg shabbes* could keep the kibbutz discussing it for several days afterward.[60] These were common to the kibbutzim of all the youth movements regardless of the level of religious observance. In fact, Hashomer Hatzair, as a Marxist-leaning socialist group, was decidedly secular, yet the movement calendar continued to run according to the familiar Jewish holidays. The weekly *oneg shabbes* certainly did not imply observance; both Kibbutz Yosef Kaplan and Kibbutz Tosia Altman noted the Sabbath as a popular time to go to the movies in the DP camps.[61]

The celebration of holidays within the kibbutzim tended to blend Jewish and Zionist motifs; in many cases, Jewish traditions were appropriated by the movement in order to emphasize wartime heroism. On the last night of Chanukah 1945 Kibbutz Tosia Altman held a party to celebrate the holiday (with guests from UNRRA and representatives of the camp) and to bid farewell to the first aliyah group from the kibbutz. The kibbutz sang songs from the ghetto, which "described the many graves in which our families were buried. The songs told the stories of the Jewish child, on the Jewish home in Poland and Lithuania, on Janusz Korczak, who went to his death without abandoning the children he taught. The songs told the stories of the ghetto fighters whose deaths in bravery rivaled the deaths of the Maccabees."[62] Likewise, other holidays such as the 11th of Adar, Yom Tel Hai, and Purim were used as opportunities to educate the kibbutz members about the heroism of Zionist leaders. Yom Tel Hai, when the members learned about the heroism of Trumpeldor, was followed a few days later by a more light-hearted celebration of the Jewish holiday of Purim with a comical rendition of the kibbutz's play, "*Haganah*."[63] The Föhrenwald camp newspaper noted the celebration of a "*Purim-Ownt*" (Purim Evening) with the Hashomer Hatzair kibbutz in which the "*madrichim* of the kibbutz, Mirjam . . . gave a speech on the heroes of the present-day Purim, the fighters from the Warsaw, Vilna, Bialystok, and Częstochowa ghettos, as well as the partisans and the front-line fighters, who with there blood defended the honor of the Jewish people just as once before did Mordecai and Esther defend Jewish honor before King Ahashuerus."[64]

The youth movements also used holidays as opportunities to celebrate in nature with hikes, picnics, scouting games, Haganah exercises and bonfires. Approximately six weeks after the celebration of Chanukah, Kibbutz Yosef Kaplan (another Hashomer Hatzair kibbutz named after one of the founders of the Jewish Fighting Organization in the Warsaw Ghetto who was killed in September 1942) commemorated Tu Be-Shevat (the New Year for the trees) with a hike in the forest, capped off by a party and a celebratory bonfire. The kibbutz decided to make a contribution to the Jewish National Fund in order to plant two trees in the groves of Kibbutz Mishmar HaEmek in Palestine in their name.[65] Although they were still living in Germany, the kibbutz members were able to observe these occasions as if they were already in the Land of Israel, if not in body then at least in spirit.

The Hashomer Hatzair movement leadership also tried to maintain a sense of belonging to a larger community by publishing its own movement newspaper, which was distributed to all of the kibbutzim in the American zone. The newspaper, titled *Hashomer Hatzair*, was published in Munich in Yiddish (twenty volumes appeared between March 1946 and October 1947) and was dedicated to keeping members informed of current political debates in Eretz Israel, issues facing the movement there and in Germany, ideological concerns, the history of the movement, and the past glories of the movement during the war. In the first volume of the newspaper, Zelig Shushan, the Hashomer Hatzair emissary from the Yishuv, described his encounter with the survivors in Europe in an article titled "The Meeting with the Comrades in the Diaspora." According to Shushan, these youths carried the responsibility of those who had died to continue along the path of *halutziut* (the pioneering way). He assured the young survivors who had "seen what it is to wander on the ruins of Jewish life, on the cemeteries of your parents, sisters, and brothers," that they were "not alone in your struggle. You are comrades in a large movement, 'Hashomer Hatzair.' Your shoulder joins together with all of the shoulders of Hashomer Haztair in the entire world."[66] Such an approach pointed to the method of the movement in reframing the misery and destruction of the war as a basis for the rebirth of the Jewish people. A passage such as this, read from the newspaper to kibbutz members at an evening *asefa* (assembly), may have helped to infuse their recent trauma with an uplifting and potentially productive source of meaning.

In addition to noting the connection to Eretz Israel and making members feel a part of the community there (in time if not in space), a greater part of the newspaper continued to emphasize the heroism of Hashomer Hatzair in leading wartime resistance. As was noted in volume 2 of the newspaper (April 1946) dedicated to the three-year anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, "our movement was among the first to make the call for rebellion." The cover was graced by a drawing of the ruins of the Warsaw Ghetto, and the first page profiled Mordecai Anielewicz, including a selection from his last will and testament to the world: "How happy am I that I am one of the

first Jewish fighters in the ghetto." The volume also included part of Abba Kovner's appeal to the Jews of the Vilna Ghetto "not to go like sheep to the slaughter"[67] as well as the hymn of the United Partisans Organization (Fareinigte Partizaner Organizatsye), "Zog Nit Keyn Mol."[68] Articles by ghetto fighters Ruzhka Korzcak, Abba Kovner, and Chaya Klinger detailed their wartime activity in the resistance. Later editions of the newspaper continued this emphasis with profiles of other resistance leaders after whom Hashomer Hatzair kibbutzim were named, including Yosef Kaplan and Tosia Altman (volumes 3 and 4) as well as leaders such as Frumka Plotnicka and Abba Kovner. The Zionism of the youth movements in the kibbutzim thus replaced the traumatic individual past of the survivors with the shared experience of wartime heroism in the ghetto revolts regardless of what members' experiences had been in the war.

Zionism in this way not only reframed the past but also provided a new way for the youths to understand their present situation. Kibbutz members came into contact with Germans on the farms and in economic exchanges; the acquisition of estates for farming and the participation of German farmhands reveals that Jewish DPs did not live in a German-free vacuum in the American zone. In April 1946 the members of Kibbutz Tosia Altman moved to a farm near Eschwege, where they engaged in agricultural training designed to prepare for their future lives in Palestine. As was the case with a number of other farms, the young farmers in Kibbutz Tosia Altman took over what had shortly before been the property of the German war machine. As they described in the diary,

> Before we came here we imagined to ourselves that on a farm can be found cows, horses, fields, etc. as is normal on every agricultural farm. How much was our disappointment to find in this place a large airport with broken plane parts scattered about, different building materials, machine parts, and the like. The building was abandoned and dirty. We were asked to clean it and bring things in order and change the place around the abandoned airfield into a blooming agricultural farm.[69]

Within a matter of weeks, however—and with the assistance of German farmers—the kibbutz members managed to acquire livestock, plant crops, and begin the operation of a fully functioning farm. Although their contact with Germans may have been more limited than those who lived in cities, they were still confronted with the reality of continued existence among their former enemies. The agricultural department of the Central Committee (established in the spring of 1946) worked to instill a "love for the soil" among the youths; the "blood-soaked" German soil would have to serve as a surrogate for the soil of agricultural labor in an abstract sense.[70] Still, farming German soil ended up having meaning for Jewish DPs on a number of levels. The DP youths in Kibbutz Nili in Pleikhershof linked farming to revenge, finding satisfaction in working the land on Julius Streicher's estate while he stood trial in nearby Nuremberg. As the leader of Kibbutz Nili wrote in the *Landsberger Lager Tsaytung*, the work was difficult, but it was done with humor, energy, and the singing of Hebrew "songs of building and struggle." With the creation of Kibbutz Nili in Pleikhershof, "the white and blue flag flies over Streicher's farm."[71] There could be no mistaking the symbolic value of this gesture by a kibbutz named "Nili," based on the acronym of the initial letters of the Hebrew verse "Netzach Yisrael Lo Yeshakker" ("the Strength of Israel will not lie"; 1 Sam. 15:29). The young farmers symbolically exacted their revenge on the "great Jew-hater," affirming the eternal presence of the Jewish people on the appropriated Nazi land. The renaming of farm buildings and livestock with Hebrew names were part of a consciously symbolic revenge for youths empowered by membership in a kibbutz and the Zionist youth movement. While Zionism could allow them to transcend their current situation through a focus on the future, when they did face Germany and Nazism they were now armed with the tools to do so. At the same time, the young farmers could take pride in their collective accomplishments, as farming provided some tangible product to their time and efforts in Germany as they waited for departure on aliyah.

After more than a year in Germany, the members of Kibbutz Tosia Altman received the news for which they had been waiting for so long: they should prepare themselves for departure. "Our joy knew no bounds. We began our preparations for aliyah, but first we thought about our departure party."[72] On December 29, 1946, the members of Kibbutz Tosia Altman held their final departure party. Yosef (Tzunik) Richter, Miriam's brother, spoke and said that "in the history of the Jews there is no example of young people like us, who only yesterday . . . left concentration camps, bunkers, and forests and now . . . have taken upon ourselves the responsibility for the future of the people."[73] The Hashomer Hatzair movement *shaliach* (emissary) Yehoshua Bruk praised the kibbutz as "the last of the first kibbutzim created after the war to leave for aliyah" and congratulated them as they received the symbol of movement graduates, the Chazak ve-Ematz (literally "strong and brave," from Deuteronomy 31:7).

On January 5, 1947, the kibbutz left the farm forever, the farm "which we established, developed, and invested great energy [in]. Here

Carrying rakes and hoes, members of Kibbutz Nili hakhsharah (Zionist collective) pass through the entrance arch on their way to the fields. (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Photograph no. 30025, courtesy of Ruchana Medine White)

we were educated and trained for different forms of work and therefore this period will remain engraved in our hearts. She [the farm] sealed on us the signature of productive work."[74] Their efforts on the farm were temporary, but the members sensed that the work had left a permanent impression and in ensuring their departure from Germany had been worth any physical or emotional hardship. They took a train from Eschwege via Frankfurt to the south. It was far too cold (28 degrees F) to traverse the Alps for Italy (a common border crossing route for Bricha groups), so they joined their comrades in Kibbutz Shmuel Breslaw at Hochland and awaited their departure. For many of the kibbutz members, the ten days spent at Hochland prior to leaving constituted a long-awaited vacation where the working conditions were easy and they were allowed to sleep late. Finally, on January 16, 1947, they left Hochland traveling via Leipheim. At dawn on the morning of January 17, 1947, the kibbutz reached the Austro-German border on trucks driven by members of the Bricha. As was noted in the diary, "we left forever the cursed Germany, in which we resided for 14 months, beginning in November 1945 until January 1947. Beautiful and rich experiences were our part during this period, but everyone was united in his/her thoughts on the difficult path that lay before us." The kibbutz spent two months in Italy before leaving for Palestine. On

the way, they were intercepted by British forces and were deported to Cyprus, where much of the kibbutz spent one more year before departing for Palestine in March 1948.[75]

Conclusion: The Functions of Zionism in Postwar Germany

For the youths in the kibbutzim, the ideological pronouncements of Central Committee leaders such as Samuel Gringauz and Zalman Grinberg mattered little. Nonetheless, ideology provided a significant foundation for a distinctive form of DP Zionism that supported the postwar political contributions of the DPs on the diplomatic level by appealing to various groups interested in ameliorating the DP situation. On the ground, DP Zionism could succeed because it made sense both on the ideological level and the practical level; without pragmatic solutions to the most pressing needs of the young survivors, it could not have attracted and maintained the membership that it did.

It is clear that the DPs played an important role in the creation of the State of Israel so soon after the war. However, even without the retroactive knowledge that the State of Israel would ultimately be created, Zionism was highly successful in filling a positive function for DP youths in the aftermath of the Holocaust by providing a secure environment for vocational training, education, and rehabilitation and a surrogate family that could ultimately restore their belief in humanity. For the wider Jewish DP population, Zionism filled a symbolic need that had arisen for the Jewish people in the wake of tragedy even if not all would make the Zionist dream their personal reality. In the words of one survivor who intended to live in Montevideo but responded to a survey by indicating that he would make aliyah to Palestine, "I may be able to live in Uruguay, but the Jews . . . the Jews must live in Israel." Zionism in the DP camps was thus not merely a monolithic Zionism, geared solely to the requirements of the Yishuv; it filled the needs of many groups productively, therapeutically, and diplomatically.

In February 1947 the British referred the problem of Palestine to the United Nations, and following the drama of the *Exodus* Affair in the summer of 1947 and the work and report of United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, the United Nations voted for the partition of Palestine on November 29, 1947. The announcement was greeted with great enthusiasm in the DP camps, and the Central Committee declared that "on the ruins of the Diaspora will arise the Jewish state, which will represent the most beautiful ideals of our people and will give the possibility to return the Jewish masses of the historical past and the coming future. With the help of the Jewish state the Jewish

camps in Germany will be liquidated and the Jewish people will return to the family of free nations after 2000 years."[76]

As hostilities broke out between the Haganah and Arab forces, the DPs were called upon to stand up in defense of the homeland they had never seen. The youths, who had proudly demonstrated their Zionist enthusiasm in the kibbutz groups, were asked to do their duty to the people on behalf of the wider DP population. At the Third Congress of the She'erit Hapletah in early April 1948, the Central Committee issued its call: "The Fatherland Calls: Do Your Duty to the People." The Zionist movement, the Yishuv, and indeed the Fatherland was calling, and in the DP camps the youth were expected to answer this call.

Notes

1. *Landsberger Lager Czajtung*, vol. 11, December 21, 1945, Baruch Cheta, reel 1-1, p. 4, Jewish DP Periodicals Collection, YIVO Archives, New York (hereafter YIVO).
2. Ibid.
3. It is important to note that the term "kibbutz" came to represent a collective settlement that differed greatly from the kibbutzim that had been created as agricultural settlements by the Zionist movement in Palestine. After the war, the term "kibbutz" was used to refer to groups of youths, affiliated with Zionist youth movements, who presumably lived together in a collective framework. The "collective" aspects of group life in the kibbutzim of the survivors were highly variable. Agricultural hakhsharot were training farms where kibbutz groups worked to prepare for life in Palestine.
4. This conclusion has been noted by numerous scholars who have written on the Jewish DPs. See as discussed in volume introduction.
5. See Hanna Yablonka, *Foreign Brethren: Holocaust Survivors in the State of Israel, 1948–1952* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi Press, 1994), 82. Yablonka estimates that the twenty-two thousand enlisted DPs comprised perhaps one-third of the Israel Defense Forces' sixty thousand combat soldiers during the Israeli War of Independence. The Haganah was the underground military organization for self-defense and security established by the Zionist organization in Palestine in 1920.
6. Resolutions of the Third Congress of the She'erit Hapletah, microfilm MK 483, reel 1, folder 5, frames 639–41 (Yiddish), Displaced Persons Camps, Germany Collection, YIVO (hereafter YIVO DPG). The Third Congress of the She'erit Hapletah met from March 30 to April 2, 1948, in Bad Reichenhall.
7. The Declaration of the Establishment of Israel, in N. Greenwood, ed., *Israel Yearbook and Almanac 1991/92* (Jerusalem: International Publication Service, 1992), 298–99.
8. Elimelech Rimalt (member of the Knesset for the General Zionist Party) made such an argument in the Knesset in 1953. Quoted in Yechiam Weitz, "Shaping the Memory of the Holocaust in Israeli Society of the 1950s," in *Major Changes within the Jewish People in the Wake of the Holocaust*, edited by Israel Gutman (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1996), 500. In fact, in the middle of World War II as the Nazi annihilation of the Jewish community of Europe reached its height, Benzion Dinur concluded that "the only path of escape from the fate of destruction is the return to the Jewish homeland"; see Benzion Dinur, "Galuyot ve-Hurbanan," in Dinur, *Dorot u-reshumot: Mekhkarim ve-iyunim ba-historyografyah ha-yisraelit* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1978), 192.
9. According to Emmanuel Sivan, 21,755 soldiers arrived from Europe to join in the Israeli War of Independence in 1948. Of those soldiers who arrived in Israel in 1948, 72.5 percent were born between 1923 and 1930, while 67.4 percent of the 1940–47 arrivals and 78.5 percent of Sabras (native-born Israelis) fell into this age range. Likewise, the average age of those who died was twenty-two years old for the 1948 and 1940–47 arrivals and twenty years old for the Sabras. Emmanuel Sivan, *Dor Tashakh: Mitos, Diyukan ve-Zikaron* (Israel: Ministry of Defense, 1991), 76.
10. See Koppel S. Pinson, "Jewish Life in Liberated Germany: A Study of the Jewish DPs," *Jewish Social Science* 9, no. 2 (1947): 117. Pinson, a sociologist who had been sent to the DP camps in the American zone of Germany by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee to assist in the formation of an education policy for the Jewish DPs, offered one of the earliest articulations of this argument: "The events of 1939–1945 seemed to discredit completely those philosophies of Jewish life prevailing before the war which were not centered around Palestine. The Zionists were the only ones that had a program that seemed to make sense after this catastrophe. . . . Without Palestine there seemed to be no future for them. Anti-Zionism or even a neutral attitude toward Zionism came to mean for them a threat to the most fundamental stakes in their future."
11. Zeev Mankowitz, *Life between Memory and Hope: The Survivors of the Holocaust in Occupied Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 69. "For many, their almost intuitive Zionism stood for the warmth, unquestioning acceptance and security of home; for the more politically minded it signified the only real hope for the rescue and rehabilitation of the little that remained of European Jewry and, in the longer term, the promise of the Jewish future."
12. Evyatar Friesel "The Holocaust: Factor in the Birth of Israel?," in *Major Changes within the Jewish People in the Wake of the Holocaust*, edited by Yisrael Guttman, 519–552 (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1996).
13. Idith Zertal, *From Catastrophe to Power: Holocaust Survivors and the Emergence of the State of Israel* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998). Yosef Grodzinsky, *Homer Enoshi Tov: Yehudim mul Tsiyonim, 1945–1951 [In the Shadow of the Holocaust: The Struggle between Jews and*

Zionists in the Aftermath of the World War II] (Or Yehudah, Israel: Hed Artzi, 1998), 185, similarly suggested that after the war the "the Zionist activists turned to the weakest. They selected from the 'human dust' good human material for the state on the way—to take the survivors from the furnaces to the smelter." He focused on the conscription campaign in the DP camps as a particularly egregious example of Zionist manipulation of the surviving Jews. See also Zeev Tzahor, "Holocaust Survivors as a Political Factor," *Middle Eastern Studies* 24, no. 4 (1988): 432–44. Tom Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israëlis and the Holocaust* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), also takes this approach.

14. Dan Diner, "Elements in Becoming a Subject: Jewish DPs in Historical Context," *Jahrbuch zur Geshichte und Wirkung des Holocaust* 2 (1997): 229–48. Dan Diner, among others, has noted that at the end of the war, U.S. and British occupation officials refused to categorize Jews as a distinct people among the DPs; instead, Jews were identified as belonging to the dominant nationality of their countries of residence. The Allies only changed their approach under the impact of a series of events that occurred in 1945–46 (including most notably the publication of the Harrison Report), coming to construct Jews as a separate national group with its own particular needs and interests. See also Arieh Kochavi, *Post-Holocaust Politics: Britain, the U.S., and Jewish Refugees, 1945–1948* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).
15. Of the studies written in English about the Jewish DPs, Mankowitz's "Politics of Education," chapter 7 in *Life between Memory and Hope*, focuses on the experience of youths in kibbutz groups. He tends to explain the Zionist choice as an intuitive response to the Holocaust. Judith Tydor Baumel, *Kibbutz Buchenwald: Survivors and Pioneers* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1997), covers one kibbutz group whose experience was unique in that the members left Germany soon after liberation and were composed entirely of survivors from camps in Germany.
16. Zeev Mankowitz, "The Formation of She'erit Hapleita: November 1944–July 1945," *Yad Vashem Studies* 20 (1990): 27, asserts that for the most part the Jews of Hungary and Romania sought to return home following liberation, while the Polish Jews (some 90 percent of those liberated) were far more divided on the issue. Later surveys of the Jewish DP population in the American zone of Germany corroborated this information. A survey of the Jewish DP population of the 4,976 residents of Landsberg taken on October 1, 1945, indicated that 75.2 percent (3,740) of residents were Polish, while only 5.7 percent (283) were Hungarian and 3.3 percent (162) were Romanian. A survey of residents of Feldafing taken at the same time indicated that a population drop from 600 to 400 from the summer to October 1945 was attributable to the sizable repatriation of Hungarian and Romanian Jews. "Jewish DP Population Survey," microfilm MK 488, roll 8, frames 1032–37, Leo Schwarz Papers (hereafter LSP), YIVO.

17. See Ruth Schreiber, "The New Organization of the Jewish Community in Germany, 1945–1952" (PhD dissertation, Tel Aviv University, October 1995), 11. While some 36 percent of Jews from Eastern Europe did try to live in German cities in January 1946, the continuing housing shortage and reluctance of some newly formed German Jewish *kehillot* (religious communities) to represent Jews of non-German descent made this option a difficult one. While not the rule, this was the case in Frankfurt, for example (ibid., 33). As waves of Jews began to arrive from Poland over the course of 1945 and 1946, fewer Jews made the choice to live in German cities (ibid., 55–56). German Jews also suffered from initially being denied the status of persecuted individuals and were classified as enemy nationals along with Austrian and Hungarian Jews in some cases.
18. For more on the Brigade, see Yoav Gelber, "The Meeting between the Jewish Soldiers from Palestine Serving in the British Army and *She'erit Hapletah*," in *She'erit Hapletah, 1944–1948: Rehabilitation and Political Struggle*, edited by Yisrael Gutman and Avital Saf, 60–80 (Jerusalem: Yad Vashem, 1990).
19. June 24, 1945, report of Klausner, "A Detailed Report on the Liberated Jew as He Now Suffers His Period of Liberation under the Discipline of the Armed Forces of the United States," in Alexander Grobman, *Rekindling the Flame: American Jewish Chaplains and the Survivors of European Jewry, 1944–1948* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993), 42–43. Chaplain Abraham Klausner arrived in Dachau during the third week of May. While initially reluctant to serve in Europe at all, unsure of what he could contribute in a place where the fighting had already ended, he soon made it his mission to assist the Jewish survivors in any way possible. He was eventually integral in efforts to create the Central Committee of Liberated Jews and in publishing the first lists of survivors for relatives seeking one another.
20. See Leonard Dinnerstein, *America and the Survivors of the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 28. Slightly different statistics can be found in Irit Keynan, *Lo Nirga Ha-Ra'av: Nitzulei Ha-Shoah ve-Shlichei Eretz Yisrael: Germaniah 1945–1948* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved Publishers, 1996), 45.
21. M. Winogrodzki to Nathan Schwalb, June 18, 1945, Record group (hereafter RG) 123/Maccabi/0012, box 20, folder 4, letters to Nathan Schwalb in He-Halutz Geneva Office, pp. 88–89, Ha'apalah Project, Haganah Archives, Tel Aviv (hereafter HPHA).
22. In June 1945 two Paris-based representatives of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, Ruth Kliger and David Shaltiel, told the heads of the political and immigration departments of the Jewish Agency Executive in Jerusalem that up to 95 percent of the survivors were under thirty-five years old. Kliger and Shaltiel to Shertok and Dobkin, June 11, 1945, folder S6/3659, Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem. A survey of Jewish DPs in Bavaria taken in February 1946 found that 83.1 percent of

their number was between the ages of fifteen and forty, with more than 40 percent between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four and 61.3 percent between the ages of nineteen and thirty-four. Jewish Population in Bavaria, February 1946, microfilm MK 488, roll 9, folder 57, frame 581, LSP, YIVO. A study by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee of Jews in the U.S. occupation zone in Germany more than one year after liberation found that 83.1 percent were between the ages of six and forty-four. Jewish Population, U.S. zone Germany, November 30, 1946, microfilm MK 488, folder 57, reel LSP 9, frame 682, YIVO.

23. Winogrodzki to Nathan Schwalb, June 18, 1945, RG 123/Maccabi/0012, box 20, folder 4, letters to Nathan Schwalb in He-Halutz Geneva Office, pp. 88–89, HPHA.
24. He-Halutz was created to prepare Zionist youths in Europe for life in Palestine through agricultural and vocational training and served as an umbrella organization for a number of pioneering Zionist youth movements in interwar Europe. See Israel Oppenheim, *The Struggle of Jewish Youth for Productivization: The Zionist Youth Movement in Poland* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1989). Nathan Scwhalb served as the He-Halutz representative in Geneva during and after the war. See Raya Cohen, *Bein Sham Le-Kan: Sipuram shel 'Eidim le-Hurban, 1939–1942* [*The Story of Witnesses to Destruction: Jewish Emissaries in Switzerland, 1939–1942*] (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1999).
25. While many Ukrainians who had collaborated with the SS continued to be well fed, the Jewish prisoners, who had always received the worst nourishment, continued to be malnourished. Insufficient food and disease were not the only concerns troubling Jewish DPs. The fact that Jewish ex-prisoners continued to be clothed in the shreds of striped prisoner garb was also troubling to the Jewish survivors who had begun to organize in order to represent their needs before the military authorities. According to testimony, "We were liberated in striped prisoners' clothes, and we are sorry to state that till now the thousands of jewish [*sic*] ex-prisoners have no proper clothing, underwear or shoes." See Zalman Grinberg and Puczyc to OMGUS and UNRRA, July 10, 1945, microfilm MK 483, frame 340, YIVO DPG.
26. Kochavi, *Post-Holocaust Politics*, 89; Dinnerstein, *America and the Survivors of the Holocaust*, chap. 2. Harrison's suggestions, excluding the transfer of refugees to Palestine, were implemented almost immediately by General Eisenhower, who was assisted in his work by the newly appointed adviser on Jewish Affairs, Rabbi Judah Nadich (appointed on August 24, 1945); see Kochavi, *Post-Holocaust Politics*, 93. Nadich was replaced as special adviser after three months by Judge Simon Rifkind.
27. Protocol, July 14, 1945, meeting of Executive Committee, microfilm MK 488, roll 15, frame 141, LSP, YIVO. At a meeting of the executive committee of the newly formed Jewish DP organization, Lieutenant Simon of the Jewish Brigade reported that he had recently briefed Harrison on the situation of the Jewish survivors and made sure that he was aware of the importance of free immigration for the Jews to Palestine. Harrison, he suggested, had a favorable understanding of the situation. See also Grobman, *Rekindling the Flame*, 72. Harrison was the former U.S. commissioner of immigration and the U.S. representative on the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees.
28. Report of Earl G. Harrison to President Truman, August 24, 1945. See treatments in Kochavi, *Post-Holocaust Politics*, 89, and Dinnerstein, *America and the Survivors of the Holocaust*, chap. 2.
29. See Baumel, *Kibbutz Buchenwald*, 5.
30. Letter from Arthur Posnansky to Nathan Schwalb, May 22, 1945, folder 123/Maccabi/12, p. 83 (in German), Ha'apalah Project, Haganah Archives.
31. Kibbutz Buchenwald Diary, in Leo Schwarz, *The Root and the Bough: The Epic of an Enduring People* (New York: Rinehart, 1949), 310–11.
32. Baumel, *Kibbutz Buchenwald*, chaps. 2, 22, 27.
33. See letter from Poznansky at Huldah, September 19, 1945, in Ada Schein, "Ma'arehet ha-hinukh be-mahanot ha-'akurim ha-yehudiyim be-Germanyah ube-Austryah, 1945-1951" (PhD dissertation, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2001), 162.
34. See Mankowitz, *Life between Memory and Hope*, 36, and Mankowitz, "The Formation of She'erit Hapleita." A number of early leaders of the Jewish DPs in Germany, including Samuel Gringauz, Zalman Grinberg, and Leib Garfunkel (head of the organization of Holocaust Survivors in Italy) as well as the founders of the early DP Zionist youth group Nocham (United Pioneer Youth Movement), emerged from an early group of survivors from Kovno concentrated in Dachau. In the pages of *Nitzotz* (an underground publication in Dachau) both before and after liberation, the members of Irgun Brith Zion (and the editor, Shlomo Frankel) lobbied for the importance of Zionist unity, a characteristic that would be central to the early organization of the She'erit Hapletah in Germany. Gringauz, Grinberg, and Frankel were later among the most active in creating the official institutions that would represent the Jewish DPs in Germany, helping to organize the Central Committee of Liberated Jews and the UZO. Samuel Gringauz was born at the turn of the century in eastern Prussia. He was deported from Kovno to Dachau in August 1944, was active in the Zionist underground in Kaufering, and was liberated with the group near Schwabenhausen at the end of April 1945; Mankowitz, *Life between Memory and Hope*, 174. Grinberg was a doctor who had studied medicine in Switzerland. Shlomo Frankel went on to be active in the flourishing DP press, continuing to edit *Nitzotz* after liberation and then *Das Wort*. See Mankowitz, *Life between Memory and Hope*, 347.
35. Protocols, Conference of Liberated Jews, July 25, 1945, microfilm MK 483, reel 61, frames 721–27, YIVO DPG.

36. Three weeks later, on September 11–12, 1945, in a preparatory meeting in Landsberg for the upcoming Zionist conference at Frankfurt, the founding principles of Nocham and the UZO were laid out: the creation of a Jewish state; construction of the country on socialist principles; elevation of labor, agriculture, hakhsharah, and Hebrew language and culture; and aliyah by all means. The new group also took upon itself shekel collection (the membership dues of the World Zionist Organization) and called for activity on behalf of the Labor Federation (Histadrut) in Palestine; in keeping with its complete identification with the Zionist executive in Palestine, the UZO also excluded the revisionist youth movement Betar from the united camp. See Pratei Kol of First Zionist Conference in Frankfurt, October 23–24, 1945, MP-1, folder 3, Yad Vashem Archives. Yehoyakim Cochavi sees the strong influence of the Brigade in the resolutions of Nocham and suggests that the socialist language led to later divisions with nonsocialist Zionists from Poland. He proposes that Brigade soldiers also paid special attention to the question of the youths, as many of them were formerly active in Yishuv youth movements. Many of the members of the newly formed Nocham were survivors in their twenties from Lithuania and before the war had been members of Bnei Akiva.
37. Letter from Zionist center in Bavaria to Jewish Agency, August 10, 1945, folder S6/3657, Central Zionist Archives. The letter seems to suggest that Nocham was already in existence by early August. The DP Zionist group expressed concern that those who were "actively working to build Zionism in the DP camps in Germany will not have the opportunity to make aliyah . . . and all their lives, even in the worst days, they dreamt of making aliyah and building Erets Israel and therefore they have the full privilege to make aliyah."
38. This call for unity was in response to the division that existed between the kibbutz movements in Palestine and their youth movements there and in the Diaspora. The two main kibbutz movements in Palestine were Kibbutz Ha-Arzi (the National Kibbutz movement founded in 1927) and Ha-Kibbutz Ha-Me'uhad (the United Kibbutz Movement founded in 1927). Hashomer Hatzair was the youth movement of the National Kibbutz movement, while Dror and Gordoniah were affiliated with the United Kibbutz movement. Although the early leaders of the youth movements in postwar Europe strove for unity following liberation, the leaders of the movements in Palestine feared such unity, which could dilute and confuse the potential membership reservoir for the kibbutz movements organized among the youth movement groups in Europe. See Schein, "Ma'arehet ha-hinukh be-mahanot ha-'akurim ha-yehudiyim be-Germanyah ube-Austryah, 1945-1951" 163.
39. *Landsberger Lager Cajtung*, no. 1, October 8, 1945, p. 3, reel 1, Jewish DP Periodicals Collection, YIVO. For a thorough analysis of Gringauz's ideology, see Mankowitz, *Life between Memory and Hope*, chap. 8. The verse "Nikmat dam jeled hakatan od lobarah hasatan" (Satan has not yet created a fitting revenge for the blood of a small child) is taken from the Hayyim Nachman Bialik poem "'Al ha-Shehitah," written in 1903.
40. July 21, 1945, Kibbutz Buchenwald Diary, in Schwarz, *The Root and the Bough*, 322, and Baumel, *Kibbutz Buchenwald*, 49.
41. See for example, Dina Porat, "The Role of European Jewry in the Plans of the Zionist Movement during World War II and Its Aftermath," in *She'erit Hapletah, 1944–1948: Rehabilitation and Political Struggle*, edited by Yisrael Gutman and Avital Saf, 286–303.
42. Judah Nadich, *Eisenhower and the Jews* (New York: Twayne, 1953), 231. The episode is also described by Heymont.
43. Letter 19, October 22, 1945, in Irving Heymont, *Among the Survivors of the Holocaust, 1945: The Landsberg DP Camp Letters of Major Irving Heymont, United States Army* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1982), 65, my emphasis.
44. Kochavi, *Post-Holocaust Politics*, 134.
45. See Meir Avizohar, "Bikur Ben-Gurion be-mahanot ha-'akurim ve-tefisato ha-leumit be-tom Milhemet ha-'Olam ha-Sheniah" [Ben-Gurion's Visit to the DP Camps and His National Outlook in the Aftermath of World War II], in *Yahadut Mizrach Eiropah Bein Shoah Le-tekuma, 1944–1948* [The Jews of Eastern Europe between Holocaust and Rebirth, 1944–1948], edited by Benjamin Pinkus, 253–70 (Sde Boker, Israel: Ben-Gurion University, 1987); Kochavi, *Post-Holocaust Politics*, 94; and Nadich, *Eisenhower and the Jews*, 238. The Jewish DPs were granted the right to self-governance by the U.S. Army in September 1946.
46. Irving Heymont, in his capacity as American head of the largest DP camp at Landsberg, also discussed the overcrowding situation with Ben-Gurion, detailing his struggles to move DPs to the new camp at Föhrenwald as so-called Jewish infiltrees began to arrive from Poland. Heymont agreed with Ben-Gurion's farming suggestion; as Heymont wrote in a letter home to his wife, "I hope he is right. Many of the people, particularly those in the kibbutzim, are anxious to get out on farms. It would also help to relieve the overcrowding and enable more people to lead a normal life. There are plenty of farmers around here who were active Nazis." Heymont, *Among the Survivors of the Holocaust*, 102. Judah Nadich, adviser for Jewish affairs, saw Kibbutz Buchenwald "as an object lesson for all those who were interested in the welfare of the displaced persons. . . . Not only was their work helping to fill their present requirements, particularly with regard to fresh vegetables, fruits, and grains, but they were successfully preparing for their future, the kind of future they greatly desired, life in a cooperative colony in Palestine" (Nadich, *Eisenhower and the Jews*, 137).
47. Jim Tobias, *Der Kibbuz auf dem Streicher-Hof: Die vergessene Geschichte der judischen Kollektivfarmen, 1945–1948* (Nurnberg: Dahlinger und Fuchs, 1997).
48. See J. Whiting, Report on Jewish DPS in the U.S. zone, folder 65, frames 7–15, roll LSP 10, YIVO. As Whiting had argued in January 1946,

> A greater emphasis should be placed on the training and retraining of Jewish displaced persons both in farm schools (Hachsharoth) and in German industry. Although there has been no classification made of Jewish displaced persons by age and sex we know that there are at least several thousand youngsters who are at present occupied only in idleness and who could be placed in factories schools, or on farms. Agronomists, teachers, etc. are now available from the Jewish Agency and it would be a waste of their time as well as a waste on the displaced persons lives not to get such programs under way.

49. Memorandum from J. H. Whiting to the commanding general, U.S. Third Army, folder 65, frame 15, roll LSP 10, YIVO. On the scale of American military occupation policy, the visit of Ben-Gurion to the U.S. zone of Germany seems to have influenced the development of a unified agricultural policy for the Jewish DPs.
50. Haim Hoffman, "Ha-mishlekhet ha-eretz yisraelit le-She'erit Hapletah," *Yalkut Moreshet* 30 (1980): 19. The "political instruction" listed by Hoffman has been the subject of debate regarding the origins of DP Zionist enthusiasm before the AACI. As noted above, members of the AACI were aware of this effort by Yishuv emissaries and still concluded that the majority of DPs desired settlement in Palestine.
51. Ibid., 29.
52. "Visit of the Sub-committee to the American Zone of Austria," Vienna, February 25, 1946, RG 43, AACI, box 12, pp. 4–5, United States National Archives, Washington, D.C.
53. Report of the AACI, Lausanne, April 20, 1946, YIVO.
54. See table from Yochanan Cohen, *Ovrim kol Gvul: HaBrichah, Polin, 1945–1946* (Tel Aviv: Zemorah-Bitan, 1995), 469. Summary of "HaBricha" from Poland according to movements, July 1945–1946, Hativah Z. Netzer, box 3, folder 4, Bricha Archive, Efal, Israel. According to Cohen's calculations, 33,592 of those who departed with the Bricha were organized in kibbutzim, 6,901 were children, and 71,041 traveled in families or as individuals. This means that approximately 40,000 traveled without parents (either because they were orphaned or sent ahead) within the framework of kibbutzim and children's homes. Of those who traveled in families or as individuals (71,041), perhaps 20 percent could have fallen into the category of youths under the age of twenty-five, who were desired by the pioneering kibbutzim. Even if 50 percent (35,520) fell into this age bracket, this would suggest that roughly half of those in this age category left within the framework of kibbutzim. If we apply the more conservative (and accurate) estimate of 20 percent (approximately 14,000), then more than twice as many in this age group left within the framework of kibbutzim. On the situation in postwar Poland leading to the success of the Bricha, see David Engel, *Beyn shihrur li-verihah Beyn shihrur li-verikhah: Nitsule ha-shoah be-Polin ve-ha-ma'avak 'al hanhagatam, 1944–1946* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1996).
55. The decision to name many of the kibbutzim after the movement's resistance fighters who had died during the war was only taken at the first Hashomer Hatzair movement conference in postwar Germany at Biberach on December 10, 1945. There, several of the kibbutzim were renamed after Hashomer Hatzair resistance fighters such as Mordecai Anielewicz (the first groups from Sosnowiec and Bytom), Chaviva Reik, Yosef Kaplan (the first groups from Warsaw and Krakow), Tosia Altman, Aryeh Vilner, and Zvi Brandes.
56. Shlomo Shaltiel, ed., *HaYoman: Kibbutz Lochamei HaGetaot al Shem Tosia Altman* (Israel: Giv'at Havivah, Israel, 1997).
57. Ibid., 43. The League for Labor Palestine was the umbrella organization linking Poalei Zion (Ciyonim Sotsyalistim, or Zionist Socialists) to Dror and Hashomer Hatzair in the organization of the Bricha movement.
58. Shaltiel, *HaYoman*, 198–201.
59. For a sample of psychological studies of Holocaust survivors, see Robert Jay Lifton, "The Concept of the Survivor," in *Survivors, Victims, and Perpetrators*, edited by Joel E. Dimsdale, 113–26 (New York: Hemisphere Publishing, 1980). In the same volume, see Leo Ettinger, "The Concentration Syndrome and Its Late Sequelae," 127–62, and Dimsdale, "The Coping Behavior of Nazi Concentration Camp Survivors," 163–74. For a definition of post-traumatic stress disorder, See "Diagnosis Code 309.81," in *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 4th ed. (Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association, 1994). For a recent overview of research on the subject, see Jonathan Davidson and Edna Foa, eds., *Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: DSM-IV and Beyond* (Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press, 1993).
60. Shaltiel, *HaYoman*, 83.
61. Kibbutz Tosia Altman in Eschwege, report to Hashomer Hatzair central leadership in Germany [n.d., probably April 1946], RG 123/HaShomer Hatzair/410, Yoman Kibbutz Lochamei HeGettaot al shem Tosia Altman, in Eschwege, pp. 319–22, HPHA; report of Kibbutz Yosef Kaplan, Kibbutz Lochamei HaGetaot al shem Yosef Kaplan, in Jordenbad, May 20, 1946, p. 188, HPHA. This raises the interesting question of the relationship of the secular youth movement to the Jewish religion. Weinberg's educational manifesto noted the importance of education in Jewish history with a focus on the historical character of religious events. In the interwar period, the approach of the movement to religion was as inclusive one; while religion was certainly not understood as the basis of group identification, members were instructed to "always identify with [their] brothers in the long black dress and never publicly insult religious ritual . . . [and] to bring the ideal of national rebirth to the synagogues and Jewish streets and plant national consciousness in the masses of our people, in these people the *shomer* should see his most holy task." From M. Zilbertal, *Ha-Hinukh Ha-Shomri: Kovetz Hinukhi shel Hashomer Hatzair, 1913–1938* (Shomer Education: An Educational

Volume of Hashomer Hatzair), cited in Zvi Lamm, *Shitat Ha-Hinukh shel Hashomer Hatzair* (The Educational Method of Hashomer Hatzair) (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1998), 70.

62. Shaltiel, *HaYoman*, 67–68.
63. Ibid., 92.
64. *BaMidbar* 4, no. 6 (March 20, 1946): 7, reel 15-11, Jewish DP Periodicals Collection, YIVO.
65. "Report of Kibbutz Yosef Kaplan to Movement Central Leadership," RG 123/HaShomer Hatzair/410, KLGYK, report of Kibbutz Yosef Kaplan, p. 176, HPHA.
66. Zelig Shushan, "The Meeting with the Comrades in the Diaspora," *Hashomer Hatzair*, March 1946, p. 8; Zelig, last name Shushan, based on Shaltiel, *HaYoman*, Yoman, 83.
67. *Hashomer Hatzair*, April 1946, p. 3, YIVO. Kovner first made his appeal to the members of the He-Halutz youth organization in the Vilna Ghetto on New Year's Eve, December 31, 1941. He declared that all the Jews who were taken from Vilna were murdered at Ponary and called upon the Jewish youths to organize for armed struggle against the Germans. Three weeks later, on January 21, 1942, the Zionist youth movements in the ghetto decided to form the Fareynigte Partisaner Organisatsye (United Partisans' Organization). Anielewicz's letter to Zuckerman was his last letter prior to dying in the uprising and seems to have been penned on April 23, 1943, to his comrade Yitzhak (Antek) Zuckerman. See [M. Kann], "Na oczach swiata" [In the Eyes of the World], Zamosc, 1932 [i.e., Warsaw, 1943], pp. 33–34, Yad Vashem Archives.
68. "Zog nit Keyn Mol" (Never Say), first verse of the song of the Partisans by Hirsh Glik.
69. Shaltiel, *HaYoman*, 96.
70. See *Landwirtschaftlecher Wegwajzer*, vol. 1, May 1946, reel 11-3, Jewish DP Periodicals Collection, YIVO.
71. Ibid.
72. Shaltiel, *HaYoman*, 123.
73. Ibid.
74. Ibid., 123–24.
75. Chronology of Kibbutz Tosia Altman from January 1947 until March 1948, in Shaltiel, *HaYoman*, 129–70:

    January 18, 1947: St. Valentina
    January 22, 1947: Milan to Rome
    January 24, 1947: UNRRA camp Cine-Citte
    February 7, 1947: Monta Maria (Rome)
    March 17, 1947: Leave Rome
    March 22, 1947–March 30, 1947: Board Ma'apilim ship *Moledet;* stopped by the British and not allowed to enter Palestine
    April 1, 1947: Arrive in Cyprus
    May 1, 1947: Arrive in camp no. 67
    July 1947: Protest of the whole camp in Cypress on behalf of the *Exodus*
    July 19, 1947: Wedding of Yaffa and Zvi
    July 23, 1947: Hunger strike on behalf of boat *Knesset Israel*, returned to Cyprus by the British
    August 5, 1947: Avramele is born to Dvorah and Moshe from the Belgian group
    August 22, 1947: Second anniversary of kibbutz
    September 2, 1947: Miriam and Baruch leave Cyprus on September 2, 1947
    September 12, 1947: Party for the babies (Mordechai born August 22)
    September 15, 1947: Rosh Hashanah
    November 25, 1947: Tzippora and Azriel make aliyah with their baby (Mordechai)
    December 20, 1947: Youth aliyah, including the nine members from kibbutz
    March 1948: Last group from Kibbutz Tosia Altman leaves Cyprus

76. *Jidisce Cajtung*, December 2, 1947, reel 1, Jewish DP Periodicals Collection, YIVO.