Nazi-Deutsch: An Ideological Language of Exclusion, Domination, and Annihilation

Karin Doerr

> Positive words, negative words, ambivalent words, words with warped meanings, words with narrowed meanings—together with catch-all expressions and the many compounds created out of words like *Rasse*, *Blut*, and *Volk*, they comprised a *weltanschaulich* vocabulary that set forth in emotionally charged idiom the Nazi outlook on life.[1]

German, as it changed during the Third Reich period, represents a deviation from human and humanistic language development and a violation of civil interaction and even the meaning of speech. It was so pervasive that it helped influence the thinking of a nation and had a devastating, irreparable effect on the victims. This important, if shameful, chapter in the history of the German language and culture demonstrates the opposite of what language could or should be, namely, in George Steiner's words, "the vessel of human grace and the prime carrier of civilization."[2]

Instead, Nazi Germany employed language as an instrument of coercion and indoctrination toward specific racial and spatial goals. The Third Reich language reveals to us these intentions even when they were meant to be concealed. Ironically, it was in democratic Weimar Germany, after World War I, that the right wing National-Socialist German Workers Party (*Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*)

began its ascent under Hitler. From his accession to power in 1933, the regime embarked on an elaborate program of bringing all levels of government, all institutions and all businesses into line with Nazi ideology. They used a term from electro-technology for this endeavor: *Gleichschaltung* (coordination). Denying personal freedom of choice, everyone had to conform to the political framework of the state. The Nazi leadership employed efficient propaganda techniques in radio, in the press, and at official functions to promote their ideas and win public support for their long-ranging plans. What was heard, seen in print, and eventually used in all walks of German life was a language that was influenced by and infused with Nazi *Weltanschauung*. It has become known as Nazi-Deutsch (Nazi German) and is a true mirror of its time, as it lays bare all the nuances of German National Socialist thought and action and the impact on all levels of speech. This included the language in dictionaries, grammar books, and common literature.

In addition, the regime introduced specific language changes and controlled language usage by means of numerous binding regulations (*Sprachregelung*). In the beginning, they reflected the policy of political coordination and, later, helped to disguise aggressive military and murderous actions. From 1940, the propaganda ministry issued a twice-daily briefing at which the "daily word" (*Tagesparole*) of the Reich publishing chief was released. Another part of language interference by the state was ''Germanization," which advocated reintroduction of archaic Germanic words and/or replacement of foreign words (*Fremdwörter*) with specially coined German ones.[3] Some of these new word creations bordered on the ridiculous in their forced attempt to circumvent the term of foreign origin. This included the well established words *Mikroskop* and *Maschine*, which were to be replaced with *Feinsehrohr* (fine-seeing tube) and *Gangwerk* (motion work), respectively. At the same time, Nazi officials retained the practice and privilege of using terms of non-German origin, such as *exekutieren* (to execute), *liquidieren* (to liquidate), or *To talevakuierung* (complete evacuation), either as linguistic distancing devices, or for effect, as was the case with *gigantisch* (gigantic) and *total*.[4] The Nazis even Germanized script by requiring the employment of the angular German handwriting (*Deutsche Schrift*) in official communication until 1941. All government-controlled printed matter, textbooks, and newspapers were reset in gothic or "black" letters, which were considered to be a specifically "German" type, in contrast to the so-called "foreign" roman type.[5]

Familiarizing oneself with this language means recognizing how pervasive it was and how totalitarian German National Socialist ideology was. It shows without a doubt the passive or active acceptance of the regime's ways and goals in the areas of culture, economy, and education, as well as its political and military agencies. The many euphemisms, neologisms, names, codes, and Third Reich jargon in general open the door to a world of concepts, intricate institutions, and unique positions within German military and civilian life. Their names and functions reveal the state's influence on education, work, and leisure activities of German children and adults. There was the Hitler Youth (*Hitlerjugend* or *HJ*) with its hierarchy of youth leaders (*Jugendführer*), youth camps (*Jugendlager*), and organized activities, such as club night (*Heimabend*), which consisted of mandatory Wednesday evening

courses for boys and girls.[6] The names of other organizations show further how the regime impacted the lives of German women by reinforcing traditional gender roles. Mother schooling (*Mütterschulung*), an ideological and practical training, prepared them for family and motherhood—all in the name of the state and its people (*Volksganze*). Not without the willingness of some women, the powerful National Socialist Women's Organization (*Nationalsozialistische Frauenschaft*) was, from 1936, exclusively responsible for training the female leaders and assigning official tasks and projects that involved all German women. It started with the association for young girls (*Jungmädelbund*). During the war, the women of the League of German Girls (*Bund Deutscher Mädchen*) had to give their services to the state (*Kriegshilfsdienst*). The notion of family had lost its traditional sense and had become instead an ideological interpretation of German blood ties defined with the archaic term *Sippe* (clan). Even the choice of a marriage partner was determined by the state as Germans had to provide the *Ariernachweis* (proof of Aryan descent), which was required after the racist 1935 Nuremberg Laws were enacted. Members of the SS elite needed the government's approval to get married and needed a proof of ancestry pass (*Ahnenpaß*).

Almost all Germans had to pledge their fealty to Hitler as leader in one form or another. This was verbalized in the different loyalty oaths (*Treueide*) that ranged from those of the young boys and girls of the Hitler Youth to the highest ranks of the SS. The personal bonding, like that expressed in the SS motto, "My honor is [synonymous with] loyalty" (*Meine Ehre heißt Treue*), relied on the notion of a common destiny.[7] Slogans, such as *Deutschland erwache!* (Wake up, Germany!) and *Führer befiehl, wir folgen!* (You, Führer, command and we will follow and obey!), were directed at the German public to attain an obedient national collective. An archaic Germanic mythology was revived and suffused the Third Reich discourse with a glorified heroism (*Heldentum*) and a willingness for self-sacrifice (*Opferwilligkeit*) and sacrificial death (*Opfertod*) of the individual. The verbalization of such concepts was intended to evoke sentiments of mystical blood ties and emotions to make Germans believe in the transcendental German nation (*Volk*). The exclusion of others from this racially perceived community (*Volksgemeinschaft*) was underscored in a heightened sense of belonging, by way of birth, to this privileged group. These few linguistic examples of life in Nazi Germany also attest to a tight government control and the connection and constant interaction of the leader, the party, and society, as well as the firm grip the state had on every aspect of an individual's life.

With their public Aryan grandiloquence, the National Socialists intended to affect collective thinking. The basic nationalistic concepts of *Volk* (people), *Blut* (blood), and *Rasse* (race) defined a system designed to exclude anything non-German as foreign (*artfremd*), as a "counter race" (*Gegenrasse*), and damaging (*Volksschädlinge*) to the entire German people.[8] The ideological discourse reflected Social Darwinist theory and contained the conviction of the superiority of the German race (*Herrenrasse*). This racial nationalism was concatenated with a particularly virulent form of antisemitism that filtered through to the language in the public and private spheres. Parallel to this pro-German agenda, the Nazis cultivated

anti-Jewish beliefs already embedded into the cultures and languages of European Christendom.[9] Centuries-old hostile myths and powerful negative icons about Jews had long predisposed many Christians against the Jews and often resulted in alienation, exclusion, and death.[10] This stereotyping and prejudice resisted the humanitarianism that stemmed from the European Enlightenment and the French Revolution, so that the Nazis intertwined these old threads of religious Jew hatred (*Judenhaß*) with new, racial forms of antisemitism. They also continued the myth of a political and economic Jewish world conspiracy (*Weltjudentum*), a fiction that lay at the core of the nineteenth-century forgery *Protocols of the Elders of Zion.* There seemed to be no problem in describing Jews both as Judeo-Bolsheviks (i.e., Communists) and as the string pullers of world capitalism. Max Weinreich summed it up succinctly in 1946:

> The Jew could be represented as the embodiment of everything to be resented, feared, and despised. He was a carrier of bolshevism but, curiously enough, he simultaneously stood for the liberal spirit of rotten Western democracy. Economically, he was both capitalist and socialist. He was blamed as the indolent pacifist but, by strange coincidence, he was also the Western instigator to wars.[11]

The most noticeable reality expressed in Nazi German is the exclusionary nationalism that contained, even when not specifically stated, the will to gain more territory (*Lebensraum*) for Germans. The plan for this expansion process included military aggression and the use of or elimination of others. Had the Nazis won World War II, their barbarous utopia would have also targeted and murdered millions of Europe's Slavic peoples. Elimination was first an open-ended concept expressed in a variety of different words, such as *abwandern* (to make go), *Zwangsentjudungsverfahren* (forced removal of Jews), and *Abschub* (expulsion). It was also concealed with euphemisms and codes: *Abrechnung mit den Juden* (the settling of accounts with the Jews), expressed as a threat, and *Umsiedlung* (resettlement), the concrete plan of removal. Sometimes elimination meant incarceration or murder of political enemies, euthanasia of the institutionalized ill, and finally the expulsion and murder of peoples. Jews were singled out and, to a lesser degree, also the Sinti-Roma (*Zigeuner*). History and language both reveal that the Jews were not only a target but their global annihilation represented an important Nazi ideal. Numbering only about half of one percent of the German population, it was the Jews whom the German National Socialists perceived as the ultimate enemy of their country and people (*Volksfeinde*), and all Jews (*Gesamtjudentum*) as the enemy of the world (*Weltfeind*) or world plague (*Weltpest*).

According to the German racist principle of *Blut und Boden* (blood and soil), German Jews were described also as *volksfremd* (alien to the German *Volk*) and therefore understood to be outside the *Volksgemeinschaft* (the community of the German people). In a short period of time, the Nazi government paved the way for legalized persecution, then expulsion, and finally genocide. This process was accompanied by an antisemitic rhetoric that Germans heard on a regular basis as part of the constant public discourse. Its language contained old and familiar epi-

thets as well as numerous neologisms directed against the Jews both as individuals and as a collective. Based on *Jude*, the already derogatory word throughout the centuries, the Nazis used many opprobrious propaganda concepts such as *Verjudung* (judaization and jewification), *Entjudung* (dejudaization), and *Alljuda* (all Judah). There were also the dehumanizing and blunt imperative slurs, some of them visible on public signs, directed against Jews: *Juda verrecke!* (Jews, drop dead!) and *Juden raus!* (Jews out!). Repetition of such venomous words and phrases certainly amounted to linguistic manipulation during the Third Reich. It is not surprising that this degrading vocabulary, replete with expletives, has remained prominent in survivors' memories.[12]

By using the German propensity to form compound words, the Nazi ideologues further produced etymological agglutination expressed or emphasized with terms such as *Blutschutz* (protection of [German] blood), *Istjude* (being Jewish according to the law), and *Rassenschande* ([sexual] violation of the [German] race). They, including many others, provided the terminology for the numerous anti-Jewish laws (*Judengesetze*). The latter were issued throughout the Third Reich period, each time becoming more restrictive for Jews. From the so-called *Judenboykott* (boycott of Jews) in 1933 to the infamous Nuremberg Race Laws for the ''Protection of German Blood and Honour" (*Gesetz zum Schutze des deutschen Blutes und der deutschen Ehre*) in 1935, and those after 1938, they all manifest the vicious fight against the Jews from within the country. The various stages of this new legal and social reality, in turn, constructed word combinations such as *Judenhaus* (buildings designated for Jews), *Judenstern* (Jewish star), and *Sternträger* (bearer of the [Jewish] star), which were accepted and employed as a matter of course in daily speech. The result, clearly expressed in the language, is well-known: isolation of the Jews from the German community, exclusion from civil rights, deprivation of their livelihood, and expulsion and/or murder.

Nazi-Deutsch reveals also a "new [German] form" of *Judenhaß* that Saul Friedländer described: "this representation of evil was not merely religious, not merely racial, not merely political. It was a stage-by-stage aggregation of these successive waves of anti-Jewish hatred, of the successive layers of a tale of Jewish conspiracy against Aryan humanity."[13] Therefore, an admixture of medical and religious terms, in addition to the Darwinian phraseology, was present in the Nazi language. Based on a pseudo medical science, the Jews were perceived as scourge (*Seuche*) or bacteria (*Volksbazillen*) that needed to be excised from the body of the German nation (*Volkskörper*). These convenient analogies facilitated the acceptance by the general German public of the need for a healthy and pure German race, *judenrein* (literally, "clean" or "cleansed" of Jews), and, ultimately, a new super nation. The government's means to this end was the program of *Rassenhygiene* (race hygiene), a vague term that promoted the protection and cleansing (*Säuberung*) of German blood and society. Ideas of purification were already concretized when Nazi doctors started to kill thousands of German patients in institutions under the euthanasia program, coded "T-4," in the later 1930s. They made murder legitimate by calling the lives of the incurably sick "life unworthy of life" (*lebensunwertes Leben*). The subsequent planning of the murder of the Jews

was the next step and expressed with existing words that underwent a shift of meaning or were given different metaphoric and ambiguous connotations. One poignant example is the term *Endziel* (final goal), a precursor to the infamous euphemism *Endlösung* (final solution) *der Judenfrage* (Jewish problem). The solution was the eradication or extinction (*Ausrottung* or *Ausmerze*) of this "Jewish world parasite" (*Weltparasit*).

In official communication, the Nazis favored noun phrases and the imperative and passive modes. Bureaucrats, in particular, employed German in this style and manner in order to render their statements and actions imprecise and impersonal. For instance, the passive voice "He was taken into protective custody (*Schutzhaft*)" served as a double veil in that it avoided mentioning the agent of this action and, at the same time, concealed the assigned or newly established meaning. The euphemism "protective custody'' stood for forced incarceration and often torture and death in prisons and concentration camps situated mainly in Germany. *Schutzhaft* allowed those who issued the orders to act with impunity and often with unparalleled brutality and sadism.

Further, Hitler and his followers, in their aggressive propaganda speeches, misused and distorted well-known phrases and proverbs to appeal to the public. Wolfgang Mieder's extensive study on this "proverbial manipulation" shows how a nation's heritage of collective and common wisdom was tampered with during the Third Reich.[14] Proverbs and variations of them, such as *Arbeit macht frei* (Work will set you free), were displayed in the barracks and on gates of Nazi concentration camps. Today, few postwar Germans realize how colloquial German is still permeated with Nazi-popularized sayings, of which *Jedem das Seine* (To each his own) and *Leben und leben lassen* (Live and let live) are but two further examples.[15] For former inmates, they are a cruel reminder of their suffering, and many German-speaking survivors are reluctant or unable to use them.[16] Some old sayings had lost their symbolic meaning and returned to a literalness that often exceeded their graphic origin. "He who digs a hole for others will fall into it himself" (*We r andern eine Grube gräbt, fällt selbst hinein*) became perversely real in a sadistic killing method called *Brunnenlaufen* (literally, running around the water well) in Dachau. Prisoners were forced to run around a deep water hole without moving their heads. Dizziness made them fall into it and drown. This and other realities created an immense, sustained fear for one's life, inside and outside concentration camps, for which German Jews coined the word *Judenangst*.[17] Gratuitous violence used in these constantly invented tortures also gave brutality to verbal expression. As George Steiner later concluded, if one uses a language "to conceive, organize, and justify" concentration camps (and genocide), "something perverse will happen to the language"[18] and of course to the users and recipients of this language.

Nazi bureaucrats often used abbreviations. They ranged from the common *RS* (meaning *Rundschreiben* [circulating memo]) to the macabre *S.B.* The latter was later a code, instead of *Sonderbehandlung* (special treatment), in official prisoners' files to conceal the fact of execution.[19] *RU* stood for *Rückkehr unerwünscht* (return not wanted) and signified a death sentence for inmates. Other single letters or combinations were used to simplify communication and perhaps to avoid spelling out

the word in full and thus articulating its true meaning even to the perpetrators. For example, *A* stood for *Arbeitsjude* (a Jew deemed fit for forced labor and subsequent death) and *MKL* for *Männerkonzentrationslager* (concentration camp for men). Acronyms were popular as well as terrifying, of which *Gestapo* for *Geheime Staatspolizei* (secret state police) is one of the best known. Letters sometimes became intimidating symbols, such as SS written as two lightning bolts and situated prominently on officers' uniform collars and all correspondence. The government typewriters during the Nazi era were equipped with a special key bearing this symbol, which dates back to the origins of the Germanic *Sig-Rune* (sigrún, victory rune).

Linguistically, the steps toward war and genocide also meant the rapid devolution of German from a vocabulary of exclusionary nationalism to a language of persecution and murder. After the *Reichskristallnacht*, itself a Nazi euphemism for the vicious November 1938 pogrom that signaled the beginning of the intensified war against the Jews, the regime's official language became more opaque, distorted, and euphemistic. It culminated in what has been termed *Exekutionsvokabular* (execution vocabulary) and *Nazi-Tarnjargon* (Nazi camouflage language) as it hid military activities that went hand in hand with the plans for murder and annihilation.[20] One well-known euphemism for this plan was *Umsiedlung* (resettlement), which stood for expulsion of the Jews from Germany. The most infamous phrase of all was *Endlösung der Judenfrage* (Final Solution of the Jewish Problem), the unprecedented scheme for industrialized mass murder and genocide.[21] Berel Lang proposes, "quite simply, to call this new figure by an old name, one which more usually would not be associated with *figures* of speech at all—that is, the lie."[22]

These terms have been of special concern to many scholars who have dealt with the Nazi period and its language. Most of them were camouflage or code words (*Tarnwörter*) whose function was to conceal actions or facts. They differed from standard neologisms, for these terms generally consisted of old and familiar words that had been given new meanings, while the old meaning remained in use as well. Its new purpose and newly assigned context were camouflaged to render the word at best enigmatic or ambiguous. The Nazis employed these terms widely in official and unofficial documents, such as letters, memos, and (secret) reports. When the murderous connotation of a euphemism had become too well-known, sometimes an official would request another word be used instead. The old word became "a dysphemism, which meant that new euphemisms must be minted; and these in their turn…came to acquire all the horrific connotations of the word they re-place[d]."[23] One example is the substitute *Evakuierung* (evacuation) for *Auswanderung* (emigration), both meaning, in addition to their original and still-valid usage, forced transportation of Jews to ghettos and concentration camps, as was recorded in the minutes of the Wannsee Conference in 1942.[24] Another term was *Sonderbehandlung*, to be replaced, on Himmler's order from 1943, by the innocuous participle *durchgeschleust*, meaning "funneled'' or "flushed through," but used as a euphemism for "killed in a death camp."[25]

In examining such terms, non-German and German scholars have pondered the likelihood of the regime's apparent success in disguising completely Nazi crimes and mass murder. Historian Raul Hilberg, among others, has highlighted the major

words and exposed their camouflage.[26] Other experts have studied their application. Several English-language publications, dating back to the 1950s and 1960s, look at Nazi use and misuse of language mainly from the Jewish, that is to say, the victims', viewpoint. Nachman Blumenthal and Saul Esh, in various issues of *Yad Vashem Studies*, between 1957 and 1967, are among the earliest recorders of the German vocabulary of genocide. Similarly, the annotated German compilations of Nazi terminology, notably, *Aus dem Wörterbuch des Unmenschen* (From the Dictionary of the Beasts) and *Aus dem Lexikon der Mörder* (From the Encyclopedia of Murderers),[27] reveal in their descriptive and accusatory titles a victim-oriented perspective. Both volumes explain with bitterness and emotion the use of the Nazi language as a weapon of destruction against the Jews. These were pioneering works by those who suffered, in addition to their ordeals, from Nazi speech acts.

For people who lived outside the Third Reich environment and were not familiar with Nazi-Deutsch and its context, it needed to be defined, explained, and translated. To this purpose, the U.S. War Department published its *Handbook on German Military Forces* in 1945. It provided English definitions of German military terms and those belonging to the Nazi war effort and its machinery.[28] One year earlier, the Office of European Economic Research had issued the German-English *Nazi-Deutsch: A Glossary of Contemporary German Usage*. Much smaller in scope, it contains mainly government and military terminology that was gleaned from, at that time, "current German newspapers and magazines, a list of Germanizations of foreign technical terms issued by the Reich Patent Office, the *Brockhaus* [a widely used German dictionary], and a number of German military dictionaries," among others.[29] During the Nuremberg war crimes trials in 1946, the Allied officials in charge of the proceedings had to rely on such glossaries, both to understand the Nazi abbreviations and codes and also to identify the Nazi government and military ranking systems. Although very useful tools, such compilations had and have their limitations, in part because they exclude the vocabulary of persecution and genocide. For example, the reader of the 1944 glossary does not find entries for the infamous Nazi euphemisms, such as *Aktion*, *Selektion*, *Sonderbehandlung*, and *Umsiedlung*. No references point to the large body of then-current antisemitic words, and the word *Jude* is defined only according to the Nazi Race Laws. Pejorative words referring to Jews, especially newly formed compounds, were also translated to express the Nazi perspective, so that *Judengenosse* became "philo-semite" or "Republican," and *judenrein*, matter of factly, "free from Jewish elements." Finally, these handbooks are not comprehensive.

German scholars, such as Cornelia Berning,[30] have researched the connection between language and ideology. They were followed, in 1964, by her important glossary of selected Nazi terms.[31] Her dictionary includes the numerous word combinations with *Volk*, *Blut*, and *Rasse* that provided the linguistic basis for the Nazi ideology of race. Konrad Ehlich wrote critical analyses on Nazi-Deutsch in the 1980s; Utz Maas published articles in 1983 and 1984 and wrote a book on the subject in 1984.[32]

A huge undertaking was the historic reference work, *Das Große Lexikon des Dritten Reiches* (The Great Encyclopedia of the Third Reich).[33] It documents the Hitler epoch and contains Nazi terminology. In 1988, Renate Birkenauer and Karl-Heinz

Brackmann contributed their extensive compilation *NS-DEUTSCH*. It has been a valuable German research tool for decades and the most detailed work on the major Nazi German terms to date. Cornelia Berning's 1998 *Vokabular des Nationalismus* is an extended version of her earlier publication; it is intended also for German researchers in this field. However, both volumes deal predominantly with Nazi ideology as expressed in the political theory of race and less with individual policies and actions against and impacts on the Jews and the Eastern European peoples.

This scholarly preoccupation over the decades with the phenomenon of Nazi German demonstrates both interest and the importance of this charged language. Basically the research can be divided into the two categories: glossaries of terms and sociolinguistic analyses. What is often neglected in these studies of the latter category is how the Nazi language affected society in general and how people used it and/or were victimized by its use. One such person, who was both observer and target during the Third Reich, was Victor Klemperer. His work on the German of the Nazi era differs from all other publications on the subject because he presents it as a living and evolving language. His is a revealing, professional eyewitness account and a testament to Nazi Germany's language use in political, public, and private discourse.

Klemperer's (only now) widely known and lauded *LTI: Notizbuch eines Philologen* (*Lingua Tertii Imperii:* Notebook of a Philologist) is based on his secretly written diaries throughout the Hitler period. He was a philologist and university professor of literature when the Nazis came to power. Although he had converted to Protestantism in his youth and belonged to Germany's highly educated intellectuals, he lost his post because the regime defined him as Jewish. He survived persecution and the Nazi extermination program because he was married to a German gentile. He called the German language he watched being transformed and deformed before his very eyes and ears *Lingua Tertii Imperii,* Latin for ''language of the Third Reich."[34] One of Klemperer's notable observations was that it influenced the country's written and oral language, not just at the government level. For this reason, his firsthand analysis and his experiences as a persecuted Jew are vivid reminders of how exclusionary and targeting speech functioned in Nazi Germany's daily life.[35] For example, some surviving German Jews associate distinctly the Nazi adjective *judengelb* (Jew yellow) with an assault on their being.[36] Among other things, it refers to the yellow star that Jews (*Sternträger*) were ordered to wear publicly from September 19, 1941. Klemperer found this moment of degradation and stigmatization the heaviest day in "those twelve years of hell" and referred with rage to the "yellow rag with the black imprint: *Jude.*"[37] Other survivors recall the yellow park benches restricted to Jews as visual signs of segregation. They bore the painted phrase *Nur für Juden* (For Jews only). It is this open antisemitic vocabulary, attesting to a grim reality, that is generally missing from Nazi-Deutsch glossaries and Nazi language discussions.

Another recently published memoir, *Mein Leben* (My Life), by Germany's foremost literary critic Marcel Reich-Ranicki, deals with yet another aspect of language use and experience during the Third Reich.[38] The author and his parents belonged to those Jews who carried Polish passports and were expelled from Germany,

precipitously, shortly before the *Reichskristallnacht* pogrom of 1938. He later became secretary of the translation and correspondence section (*Übersetzungs- und Korrespondenzbüro*) of the *Judenrat* (a Jewish council instituted by the Nazis) in the Warsaw Ghetto. In this capacity he encountered and had to employ the euphemistic language of the Nazi regime. He witnessed the deadly consequences as three terms spelled, in disguise, the destruction of the ghetto and the death of its inhabitants: *Erste Aktion* (first action), *Große Aktion* (great action), and *Umsiedlungsaktion* (resettlement action). They stood for the German order from Berlin to start transporting the majority of the ghetto's Jews (on July 22, 1942) to be murdered in the death camp of Treblinka. At the same time, Reich-Ranicki encountered the degrading behavior of German and Austrian officials, including common soldiers. Their language illustrated how the pervasive antisemitism in their countries had borne fruit when some of them forced the already terrified people to sing in a chorus: "We are Jewish pigs. We are dirty Jews. We are subhuman" (*Wir sind jüdische Schweine. Wir sind dreckige Juden. Wir sind Untermenschen*.[39] His frightening experience outside Germany was different from Klemperer's within the country. Unlike the latter, Reich-Ranicki came into too-close contact with what has been termed "the Nazi beast" whose speech was defined as "barking" rather than speaking. Therefore, many survivors are particularly sensitive to commands in German because they can activate memories and a chain of reactions.[40]

Such significant moral devolution also caused the German language to sink to its nadir. When the criminal regime was finally unmasked, some German journalists and writers declared the need for a new language. May 7, 1945, often called *Stunde Null* (Zero Hour) or *Nullpunkt* (Point Zero), referred to this distinct temporal reference point as a new linguistic beginning as well as a political and moral one.[41] This allowed ordinary Germans to focus on their lives, to rebuild their bombed-out country, and perhaps to forget. Their silence may reflect discomfort with the perpetrator's perspective because their recalling Nazi-Deutsch and what it signified may cut too close to personal knowledge. At the same time, those few thousand Jews who survived Nazi persecution and murder tried to recover their shattered lives. The aftermath of World War II and the war against them yielded the unfathomable reality of the virtual annihilation of their people in Central and Eastern Europe. As displaced persons and often stateless, they carried the *Churban* (Hebrew for destruction; later, Holocaust) with them internally, and a part of their indelible memories of Nazi terror related to things German, including the language. These individuals had suffered the impact of the crimes connected with that "dangerous'' language, and they have had to deal with the psychological consequences ever since. These contrasting fields of recollecting and forgetting mirror the two parallel histories of the Nazi period—one for the self-declared Aryans and one for those defined by Nazi German law as Jews.[42] According to Dan Diner there will be no bridge to connect these contrasting memories of the German perpetrators and of their victims in the foreseeable future.[43]

This historical reality parallels the fact that Nazi-Deutsch was a living language that either influenced or impacted people. The examination of one particular word as a representative example of how it affected Germans and Jews differently will

demonstrate how some euphemisms functioned at that crucial time and how they have persisted up to the present. The word *Umsiedlung* received, in addition to its denotative, original meaning of "resettlement," a euphemistic meaning that stood first and foremost for "the forceful removal of German Jews and left to die or to be murdered in the East of Europe." As we know, the Nazi regime's public explanation was "resettlement to an Eastern European country to work,'' implying of course, to live. Assuming that many German Jews at first did not know the Nazi government's true intentions behind that plan—simply because the plan was plausible—"resettlement" still represented for them being uprooted from their familiar geographical, professional, cultural, and linguistic environment and being transported to restart life in an unknown place with nothing certain. Further, it meant that they were stripped of their citizenship, were expelled from their country, and had to leave everything behind. But they could not imagine the degrading treatment and inhuman means of transportation that they actually faced—from coaches to freight cars once across the German border. Thus, in this context, *Umsiedlung* lost its original dictionary meaning and became expulsion. This word signified a nightmarish experience that was a prelude to an even more unimaginable reality: death to the Jews for the crime of existence.

But many Germans, even if they did not know of what was also called more precisely but still ambiguously after 1942 the "Jewish transports" (*Judentransporte*) to concentration camps, generally found *Umsiedlung* to be a proper solution to their problem of a Jewish presence in Germany. Despite the fact that they had to be aware of this legally and morally questionable procedure, the word "resettlement" was a perfect umbrella term for the entire project and process to eliminate the Jews from what they considered their own space. Marion Kaplan sums up the different German attitudes.

> Some [Germans] wanted them [German Jews] to "disappear"; others were afraid to ask; still others hoped to exonerate themselves later by not "knowing" now…. Moreover,those Germans who chose ignorance had an easy time of it, since Jews had been so thoroughly ostracised and segregated before their deportation.[44]

If Germans did know more, it was still preferable for them to believe in or hide behind the government-provided meaning of resettlement, for they actually saw their Jewish citizens being deported. As Kaplan suggests correctly, to know only what the Nazi regime actually told them about resettlement, did not incriminate them morally in their minds and was, further, a respectable and civilized solution to Germany's "Jewish problem" (*die Judenfrage*). David Bankier argues similarly: "Knowledge generated guilt since it entailed responsibility, and many believed that they could preserve their dignity by avoiding the horrible truth."[45] Thus, until now, could so many Germans claim ignorance. When they do recollect the Nazi era they usually exclude the suffering of others during the war and all aspects of the Holocaust. Instead, they focus on their own war experiences.

Indeed, the language of that time attests to their hardship, their losses, and their sacrifices. Alone the many words refer euphemistically to emergency situations,

such as the rationing of all goods (*Bewirtschaftung*), forced donations for the soldiers on the front (*Winterhilfe*), and compulsory labor for the war effort (*Arbeitsdienst*) by young and old, including women. The Nazi government expected these services and sacrifices from them for the sake of their country (*Vaterland*). The language also reveals mounting resentment with the regime as the war persisted and bombs fell on German civilians. The abbreviation *Bolona* (for "*Bombenlose Nacht!* "), "Have a bombless night," instead of "Good night," expressed their black humor. German army slang lays bare the soldiers' sarcastic attitude toward the losing war battles and their military superiors. "Frozen-meat medal'' (*Gefrierfleischorden*) and "frost medal" (*Frostmedaille*) are but two of their many versions for decorations earned while fighting on the Eastern Front in the brutal Russian winter.

There is no doubt that war hardship for Germans was real and that many perceived the disastrous situation the country had reached under the Hitler regime. Yet, they may not realize how the Third Reich language reveals their lack of compassion for others, albeit very often dictated by the Nazi state. For example, during Allied air raids, Jews and foreign (slave) workers were not allowed to join Germans in the bomb shelters. The workers had to use a "splinter ditch" (*Splittergraben*) outside, which they had usually dug themselves. For this reason, all German suffering and expressions of discontent pale in comparison with the suffering inflicted upon those whom they had exposed to death by excluding them from their human community: first the German Jews and then all other Jews and non-Germans. The difference between historical experience and recollections is a known fact. Dan Diner distinguishes between the "banality on the side of the perpetrators" and the "monstrosity of the victims" who suffered the force of their deeds.[46] Heartlessness, indifference, open hostility and hatred expressed in word and deed against their fellow Jewish citizens may have facilitated the actions of Germans that finally led to the Holocaust. The revelations of the horrific crimes against civilians by the special task groups (*Einsatzgruppen*) in the Eastern territories, the mass murders by the Nazi death-head officers (*Totenkopf SS*) in concentration camps, and the questionable deeds by the German military (*Wehrmacht*) often relativize German suffering during the war. Unfortunately, this may make it even more difficult for some to feel empathy for a German woman who lost a son or husband in the war. In the back of our minds we wonder about a soldier's actions as the German troops advanced into foreign territory. Usually, Germans suppress these harsh realities of the past, some of which George Steiner highlights with these graphic words:

> Most Germans probably did not know the actual details of liquidation. They may not have known about the mechanics of the gas/ovens…. But when the house next door was emptied overnight of its tenants, or when Jews, with their yellow star sewn on their coats, were barred from the air-raid shelters and made to cower in the open, burning streets, only a blind cretin could not have known.[47]

As the Third Reich reality vanished with the collapse of the Nazi regime and its elaborate ideologically influenced apparatus, a large part of its nomenclature disappeared as well. Germans remained in their cultural and linguistic environment and

contributed to a renewal and change of their language. Some of the euphemistically used words took on either a different meaning or reverted back to their original form. Other important aspects of the Third Reich's language and life were simply silenced and, perhaps unwittingly, retained the mentality behind them.[48] As a nation's dictionaries reveal historical and other influences on its language, so do German reference works. Unless one consults a specialized dictionary or glossary, such as those mentioned previously, it is generally difficult to find Nazi-Deutsch terms.[49]

The standard contemporary German dictionaries are selective as to their inclusion and definitions of Nazi vocabulary, some of them signaling it with the abbreviation *ns* (National Socialist) and thus relegating it to the past. The most infamous code words for the policy of genocide reveal an unsettling tendency in their definitions or omissions. Entries often do not explain sufficiently their true Nazi meaning, or they use inappropriate terminology in their definitions as some words are replaced by other words (e.g., the equation of *Endlösung* with *Liquidierung* [liquidation]).[50] In fact, the continued use of Nazi German is also noticeable in scholarly publications and in German school textbooks.[51] Most of their authors have not yet found an acceptable contemporary language in their writings about Nazi atrocities. Walter F. Renn and Elisabeth Maxwell call this practice siding with the perpetrator.[52] They warn about the perpetuation of Nazi terminology in this way, particularly their crass terms, such as *Ausrottung der Juden* (extermination or eradication of Jews) or the coded *Endlösung* instead of "destruction, mass murder, or genocide of the European Jews." Renn explains:

> The designation [of the Final Solution of the Jewish Problem] is so firmly entrenched in texts and scholarly literature that it will probably never entirely be replaced; but its use is no less objectionable since it renders harmless the unspeakable reality of the Holocaust and continues to use the terminology of the murderers. Perhaps, most important, it subtly perpetuates the idea that there was a *Jewish* problem—instead of an antisemitic problem—and conveys the obscene notion that genocide may be referred to legitimately as a "solution." Nothing could be less edifying than, in effect, making the killers the final judges for designating the terms of description for what they did to the Jews of Europe. The term was Hitler's, and its use is a posthumous victory.[53]

The title of Raul Hilberg's book *The Destruction* [rather than extermination] *of the European Jews* demonstrated early in Holocaust scholarship that Nazi German is not a valid language to be used today. Years later, Dominick LaCarpa still argues similarly and suggests:

> Other terms such as "final solution" or "annihilation" repeat Nazi terminology, often of course with the use of square quotes as a distancing frame or alienation effect…. Still,the best option may be to use various terms with an awareness of their problematic nature and not to become riveted on one or another of them.[54]

Particularly in Germany, inappropriate usage may be symptomatic of a continued ambivalence about how the country deals with the fate of the Jews. Others may want to underscore Nazi cruelty by using their words.

Holocaust survivors also use Nazi German terms to express the circumstances of their people's genocide. This includes the heavily burdened term *Jude* that is forever linked to the fundamental denial of their existence by Nazi Germany. For survivors who do not speak German on a regular basis, Nazi-Deutsch has stayed frozen in time. They need not search dictionaries for the correct terms because they are etched into their memory, and they use them with a chilling familiarity. The potent meaning and force of German words, for example, *Judenrat* (Jewish council) and *Umschlagplatz* (official gathering point for Jews before deportation), would be diminished or lost in translation.

As Nazi-Deutsch shows without a doubt, sixty years ago the German language was distorted and misused to deceive or dehumanize those who were targeted, to conceal gross human rights violations, to shield citizens from the grim facts behind criminal state actions, and most likely to deceive the perpetrators themselves. The high-ranking Nazi officials who were present at the 1942 Wannsee Conference in Berlin discussed openly the unprecedented scheme for the systematic killing of Jews by means of hard labor under inhuman conditions and by industrialized mass murder. But the conference minutes that recorded the agenda for this large-scale, murderous operation provide a chilling example of concealing the criminal intentions of a government with veiled language. This document was skillfully honed to make it sound almost innocuous if one did not know the implicit meaning behind the terminology and the carefully chosen words. It has become a historic paradigm for the official *Nazi-Tarnjargon* (camouflage jargon) that Nazi leaders and military personnel used in discussions and written records to disguise, even from future readers, the scheme for and the execution of the physical destruction of Jewish life and culture. Camouflaging the genocide with language—even in the planning stages—was the first denial of it. Contemporary Holocaust deniers use these very documents as proof for their viewpoint, arguing that ''any Nazi 'coded' document—that is, using euphemisms for practices associated with the extermination of Jews—is to be interpreted in its strictly literal meaning, whereas any document speaking plainly of the genocide is to be ignored or 'underinterpreted.' ''[55] There was to be no record of the fate of the Jews, as the often-cited remark by Heinrich Himmler suggested: "In our history this is an unwritten, never-to-be-written page of glory."[56] The relevance of Nazi (euphemistic) language practices and, consequently, the accuracy in defining this usage has come to the fore again today during the libel trial of *David Irving v. Deborah Lipstadt*, in Britain.[57]

The opaque Third Reich terminology has provided a linguistic and psychological veil that has, over the years, protected many Germans from confronting the reality of the past. The old euphemisms have actually aided both onlookers and perpetrators, then and now, by neutralizing any guilt, and they have also prevented expressions of compassion and sorrow. Despite the fact that more than half of Germans alive today were born after World War II, what is still "needed is a genuine analysis of antisemitism, of prejudice based on cultural difference that expresses itself as the negation of the other [Jewish] identity."[58] Perhaps then we would come to a different conclusion than Eric A. Johnson did in his recent findings that also confirm those of other scholars.

> [A]fter reading more than 1,000 Gestapo and Special Court case files and speaking with scores of people who spent their younger years in Nazi Germany, it is not clear to me whether in that older generation people feel compassion even now for the victims of the crimes perpetrated by their former country. Most older Germans do regret that these crimes were committed, if only because they placed a heavy and lasting burden on Germans. Many aging Germans, as they now face their own death, look back at their past not remembering that they were once perpetrators or bystanders but with the sense that they have been the real victims of Nazi terror.[59]

After a lengthy involvement with the language of the Nazi period and recognizing how it, together with the exclusionary policies and the murderous intentions of this regime, touched on every aspect of German society, one can only conclude that virtually all citizens had to be aware of some of the regime's human rights violations. Under the cloak of war, events were happening that were contrary to long-established ethical values. The numerous words of the Nazi-Deutsch vocabulary are the individual pieces to the large puzzle that, in the end, gives the complete picture of government control, aggression, persecution, and annihilation. Shortly after the Holocaust, Nachman Blumenthal wrote:

> Comprehension of the Nazi terminology is largely dependent upon understanding of the period in which it was created. Thus research into Nazi terminology must constitute an introduction to historical research. This is necessary in order to avoid wholesale deception and confusion of the terms coined and used by the Nazis [and to endure that they] are taken at their face value.[60]

Nazi-Deutsch remains an indelible map of the intricate system under German National Socialism. This language has become an essential part of the academic discourse of Holocaust scholarship and it may even shed some light on the decades-old debate as to whether the Holocaust was an intentional Nazi objective or an evolving plan. As the twentieth century has passed into history, and its greatest catastrophe recedes further into the past, we need to assure that the next generation of scholars and students, especially in English-speaking milieux, has access to the specialized language of the Third Reich that reflects its horrific ideological *Weltanschauung*.

Historians may revise history and even distort meanings of events, but this language, embedded in its Nazi context, concretizes a world like few other elements can. It is impossible to deny that *Sturm* (storm), as an officer's rank, reflects the notion of conquest and attack. The language even lays bare the thread of antisemitism that was woven, at times seemingly invisible, into the entire fabric of National Socialist Germany and exposes the disguise of codes. Otherwise, who would guess that behind beautiful words like *Frühlingswind* (literally, spring breeze) and *Meerschaum* (literally, sea foam) lay hidden the crass reality of planned roundups and attacks against Jews in France. Who could have imagined that *Sternträger* (bearer of a star) and *Rosengarten* (rose garden) camouflaged discrimination, torture and murder, and that *Kristallnacht* (crystal night) was one of the key events in Germany's war against the Jews that culminated in the worst genocide of the twentieth century? The true meaning of these terms makes us recognize illegal

and inhuman acts hidden beneath benign words and urges us to be vigilant in our own language use. Victor Klemperer expressed his observations of Third Reich language with his anti-proverb, "*In lingua veritas*" and, with this motto, underscored the irony that Nazi-Deutsch reveals the incontrovertible fact of a criminal regime that was thriving in the heart of a once-civilized Europe.

Notes

1. John Wesley Young, *Totalitarian Language: Orwell's Newspeak and Its Nazi and Communist Predecessors* (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Bell and Howell, 1994), 262.
2. George Steiner, *Language and Silence: Essays on Language, Literature, and the Inhuman* (New York: Athenaeum, 1982), 109.
3. For example, *Lichtbild* instead of *Photo; Fernsprecher* instead of *Telephon*; *Fernsehrohr* instead of *Teleskop*. However, not all of the official suggestions were accepted by the public and some of them never established themselves in the German vernacular. Others entered common usage and remained beyond the Nazi period. For instance, *Fernsprecher* has only recently been changed to the more international term Telefon on public phone booths in Germany.
4. Foreign words were preferred when using military terminology, such as *Front* and *mobilisieren*, and fashionable words, such as *dynamisch* and *garantieren*. See Eugen Seidel and Ingeborg Seidel-Slotty, *Sprachwandel im Dritten Reich: Eine kritische Untersuchung faschistischer Einflüsse* (Halle, Germany: VEB Verlag Sprache und Literatur, 1961), 123, 124.
5. Renate Birkenauer and Karl-Heinz Brackmann, *NS-DEUTSCH: "Selbstverständliche" Begriffe und Schlagwörter aus der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus* (Straelen/Niederrhein, Germany: Straelener Manuskripte Verlage, 1988), 50.
6. The latter were Nazi training camps for the obligatory German youth work service (*Jugenddienstpflicht*), decreed in 1939, for all Hitler Youth members from ages ten to eighteen. Their service was for the war effort and included harvesting crops, helping in air-raid shelters, and aiding war-injured combatants at train stations and sick barracks.
7. This may be one clue as to why Germans remained true to their people and leader for two more years, after it was clear the war was lost in 1943.
8. See, for example, the compilation of Nazi terms demonstrating the predominance of these words in compounds, in Cornelia Schmitz-Berning, *Vokabular des Nationalsozialismus* (New York: de Gruyter, 1998). Critical opposition to such nationalistic language came, in the beginning of the Hitler period, from well-known figures, such as Karl Kraus and Bertolt Brecht. For instance, Brecht would deliberately write *Bevölkerung* (population) instead of *Volk*.
9. Arthur Cohen, *The Myth of the Judeo-Christian Tradition* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 52; Jacob Katz, "Was the Holocaust Predictable?" in *The Holocaust in Historical Experience*, ed. Yehuda Bauer and Nathan Rotenstreich (New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1981), 34, 36.
10. Ruth Mellinkoff, *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages*, vols. 1 and 2. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).
11. Max Weinreich, *Hitler's Professors: The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People* (New York: Yiddish Scientific Institute—YIVO, 1946), 28.
12. For many of them, just hearing commands or a particular tone of voice from Germans today can trigger fear and reactions that mentally thrust them back into the Nazi era.

13. Saul Friedländer, "Extermination of Jews in Historiography," in *The Holocaust: Origins, Implementation, Aftermath*, ed. Omer Bartov (New York: Routledge, 2000), 83.
14. Wolfgang Mieder, " 'As if I were the master of the situation': Proverbial Manipulation in Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf*," in *The Politics of Proverbs: From Traditional Wisdom to Proverbial Stereotypes* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977), 9; and in *De Proverbio* 1, no. 1 (1995): 1; "Sprichwörter unter dem Hakenkreuz,'' in *Deutsche Sprichwörter in Literatur, Politik, Presse, und Werbung* (Hamburg, Germany: Buske, 1983), 181–201; "Proverbs in Nazi Germany," in *Proverbs Are Never Out of Season* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 252–255; and "Language and Folklore of the Holocaust," in *The Holocaust: Introductory Essays*, ed. David Scrase and Wolfgang Mieder (Burlington: Center for Holocaust Studies, University of Vermont, 1996), 93–106.
15. Karin Doerr, "'To Each His Own' (*Jedem das Seine*): The (Mis-)Use of German Proverbs in Concentration Camps and Beyond," in *Proverbium* 17 (2000): 71–90; and Wolfgang Brückner, *"Arbeit macht frei": Herkunft und Hintergrund der KZ-Devise* (Opladen, Germany: Leske and Budrich, 1998).
16. Ruth Klüger (Auschwitz survivor) recalls with cynicism the German proverbs "Reden ist Silber, Schweigen ist Gold" ("Speech is silver, silence is gold") and "Leben und leben lassen" ("Live and let live"). See her *weiter leben: Eine Jugend* (Göttingen, Germany: Wallstein, 1992), 21.
17. Victor Klemperer, *Ich will Zeugnis ablegen bis zum letzten: Tagebücher 1933–1945*, vol. 2, ed. Walter Nowojski (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1995), 551.
18. Steiner, *Language and Silence*, 101.
19. Joseph Wulf, *Aus dem Lexikon der Mörder: "Sonderbehandlung" und Sinn verwandte Worte in nationalsozialistischen Dokumenten* (Gütersloh, Germany: Sigbert Mohn, 1963).
20. Siegfried Bork, *Mißbrauch der Sprache: Tendenzen nationalsozialistischer Sprachregelung* (Bern: Francke, 1970), 88.
21. The term and concept *Endlösung* represents the entirety of the Nazi genocide of the Jews as understood by the perpetrator. For the general population during the Hitler period, *Endlösung* stood for the elimination of Jews from German society. Due to the intended vagueness of the language and the lack of more written documents, the historical debate continues today as to whether this originally meant the intention for deportation or mass murder. The eventual meaning of *Endlösung* was made fully known to the public only in 1946 with the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials. See Birkenauer and Brackmann, *NSDEUTSCH*, 62.
22. Berel Lang, "Language and Genocide," in *Act and Idea in Nazi Genocide* (Chicago: 1990), 91. Many of these terms and certainly their real meanings were concealed from the public.
23. Young, *Totalitarian Language*, 459.
24. John Mendelsohn, ed., *The Holocaust: Selected Documents in Eighteen Volumes*. Vol. 11: *The Wannsee Protocol and a 1944 Report on Auschwitz by the Office of Strategic Services* (New York: Garland, 1982), 3–17.
25. Birkenauer and Brackmann, *NS-DEUTSCH*, 55.
26. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985), 1:328–334, 3:1007–1029; Henry Friedlander, "The Manipulation of Language," in *The Holocaust: Ideology, Bureaucracy, and Genocide*, ed. Henry Friedlander and Sybil Milton, (Millwood, NY: Kraus International, 1980), 103–113. If not otherwise noted, all translations into English are my own.
27. Dolf Sternberger, Gerhard Storz, and W. E. Süskind, *Aus dem Wörterbuch des Unmenschen* (Hamburg, Germany: 1957). Wulf, *Aus dem Lexikon der Mörder*.

28. U.S. War Department, *Handbook on German Military Forces* (1945; reprint, with an introduction by Stephen E. Ambrose, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1990).
29. Heinz Paechter *Nazi-Deutsch: A Glossary of Contemporary German Usage* (New York: Frederick Ungar, Spring 1944), n.p.
30. Cornelia Berning, "Die Sprache der Nationalsozialisten," *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung* 16–19 (1960–1963).
31. Cornelia Berning, *Vom Abstammungsnachweis zum Zuchwort: Vokabular des Nationalsozialismus* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1964).
32. Konrad Ehlich, ed., *Sprache im Faschismus* (Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Suhrkamp, 1987); Utz Maas, "Sprache im Nationalsozialismus," *Diskussion Deutsch* 14 (1983): 499–517; Utz Maas, *Als der Geist der Gemeinschaft eine Sprache fand: Sprache im Nationalsozialismus: Versuch einer historischen Argumentationsanalyse* (Opladen, Germany: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1984). Maas limits his research to the linguistic analysis of fascism in Nazi youth texts (*Hitlerjugend*) between 1933 and 1938. For a Marxist perspective, see Seidel and Seidel-Slotty, *Sprachwandel im Dritten Reich*.
33. Christian Zentner and Friedemann Bedürftig, *Das Große Lexikon des Dritten Reichs* (Munich: Südwest Verlag, 1985). English translation: Amy Hackett, ed. and trans., *The Great Encyclopedia of the Third Reich* (New York: Macmillan, 1991).
34. Victor Klemperer, *LTI: Notizbuch eines Philologen* (Leipzig, Germany: Reclam, 1996). His diaries from that period were first printed in 1947 and reissued in Germany in 1996. In 1998, the first volume also became available to English-speaking readers under the title *I Will Bear Witness*, trans. Martin Chalmers (New York: Random House, 1998).
35. Wolfgang Mieder crystallizes the reality of the Jews in Germany by showing examples of proverbial speech in Klemperer's work. See Wolfgang Mieder, *"In lingua veritas:" Sprichwörtliche Rhetorik in Victor Klemperers Tägebüchern 1933–1945* (Vienna: 2000).
36. Karin Doerr, interview with Charlotte Lintzell, Montreal, July 10 and October 22, 1997.
37. "Von da an war der Judenstern zu tragen, der sechszackige Davidsstern, der Lappen in der gelben Farbe, die heute noch Pest und Quarantäne bedeutet und die im Mittelalter die Kennfarbe der Juden war, die Farbe des Neides und der ins Blut getretenen Galle, die Farbe des zu meidenden Bösen; der gelbe Lappen mit dem schwarzen Aufdruck: 'Jude.'" See Mieder, *"In lingua veritas,"* 213.
38. Marcel Reich-Ranicki, *Mein Leben* (Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1999).
39. Ibid., 184, 185.
40. For instance, "Los, los! Vorwärts!" ("Hurry up, move on!") signifies nothing threatening to "normal people," as one survivor writes, but it can trigger a panic attack in someone who remembers the past context of persecution. See Yaacov Ben-Chanan, "Weiterleben—weiter leben" oder "Vom rauhen Glück, heute Jude zu sein" (Open Letter, 1995), 10. Olga Sher confirms such occurrences with her experience when, on a tour bus, she heard a German guide shouting, "Alles raus!" ("Everybody out!") (Karin Doerr, interviews with Olga Sher, Montreal, June 5 and July 5, 1997).
41. Stephen Brockmann, "German Culture at the 'Zero Hour,'" in *Revisiting Zero Hour 1945: The Emergence of Postwar German Culture*, ed. Stephen Brockmann and Frank Trommler (Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins University, 1996), 23, 25.
42. Saul Friedländer calls this *Alltagsgeschichte* (history of everyday life). See Saul Friedländer, *Memory, History, and the Extermination of the Jews of Europe* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), 93.
43. Dan Diner, "Der Holocaust als Geschichtsnarrativ—Über Variationen historischen Gedächtnisses," in *In der Sprache der Täter: Neue Lektüren deutschsprachiger Nachkriegs-*

und Gegenwartsliteratur, ed. Stephan Braese (Opladen, Germany: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1998), 23.

44. Marion Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 199.
45. David Bankier, *The Germans and the Final Solution: Public Opinion Under Nazism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 130.
46. "Im großen und ganzen zerfällt die Tat der Massenvernichtung gleichsam notwendig in zwei unterschiedliche, ja gegensätzliche Erfahrungswelten: Banalität auf der Täterseite—hervorgerufen durch die verwaltungstechnischen Maßnahmen in der Durchführung; Monstrosität auf Seiten der die volle Wucht der Tathandlung erleidenden Opfer." See Diner, "Der Holocaust als Geschichtsnarrativ," 23.
47. Steiner, *Language and Silence*, 107, 108.
48. Horst Mahler, a 1960's German student activist and representative of the postwar generation, stated, "Only the political power of German fascism was broken in 1945; its ideological power [was broken] only in parts." Quote from Sabine von Dirke, " 'Where were you 1933–1945?' The Legacy of the Nazi Past Beyond the Zero Hour," in *Revisiting Zero Hour 1945: The Emergence of Postwar German Culture*, ed. Stephen Brockman and Frank Trommler (Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 77.
49. At the Technische Universität of Braunschweig a team of language experts is presently working on the tenth edition of Hermann Paul's *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Special consideration is being given to the vocabulary of National Socialism.
50. Karin Doerr and Kurt Jonassohn, ''The Persistence of Nazi German," paper presented at the Genocide Scholars Conference, June 12–15, 1999, Madison, Wisconsin; and "In Search of the Vocabulary of Genocide in German Dictionaries," paper presented at the 30th Annual Scholars' Conference on the Holocaust and the Churches: The Century of Genocide, March 4–7, 2000, Saint Joseph's University, Philadelphia, Pennsyvlania.
51. Randolph L. Braham, ed. *The Treatment of the Holocaust in Textbooks: The Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, The United States of America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987).
52. Walter F. Renn, "Textbooks: Treatment of the Holocaust and Related Themes," in *The Treatment of the Holocaust in Textbooks*, ed. Randolph L. Braham (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987). Elisabeth Maxwell argues similarly: "If we allow memory to tamper with the past, we are not only becoming partners in crime, helping to kill the dead a second time, but we are also allowing the ideologies of the repressors of memory to go unchallenged." See Elisabeth Maxwell, "The Crystal of Memory or the Smoke of Remembrance?" in *Confronting the Holocaust: A Mandate for the 21st Century. Studies in the Shoah*,ed.G.Jan Colin and Marcia Sachs Littell (New York: University Press of America, 1997), 19:152.
53. Renn, "Textbooks," 92.
54. Dominick LaCarpa, *History and Memory after Auschwitz* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 53–54.
55. Richard J. Golsan, "Introduction," in *The Future of a Negation: Reflections on the Question of Genocide*, ed. Alain Finkielkraut, trans. Mary Byrd Kelly (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), xxvi.
56. English translation taken from Lucy Dawidowicz, ed., *A Holocaust Reader* (West Orange, NJ: Behrman House, 1976), 132–133.
57. The German word in question was *abschaffen*, which translates into "to do away with" or "to get rid of." The denial argument claimed that the meaning was not genocidal.
58. Friedmann J. Weidauer, "'Fighting for Defeat': Jewish Identity in Postwar Germany and Austria," *Seminar: A Journal of Germanic Studies* 34(3) (September 1998), 297.

59. Eric A. Johnson, *Nazi Terror: The Gestapo, Jews, and Ordinary Germans* (New York: Basic Books, 1999), 486.
60. Nachman Blumenthal, "On the Nazi Vocabulary," *Yad Vashem Studies: On the European Jewish Catastrophe and Resistance* 1 (1957), 65.