



Immigrants & Minorities

Historical Studies in Ethnicity, Migration and Diaspora

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/fimm20>

“Doubtful Cases”: Intermarried Families in the Post-Holocaust Jewish World

Ori Yehudai

To cite this article: Ori Yehudai (2020): “Doubtful Cases”: Intermarried Families in the Post-Holocaust Jewish World, *Immigrants & Minorities*, DOI: [10.1080/02619288.2020.1794839](https://doi.org/10.1080/02619288.2020.1794839)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619288.2020.1794839>



© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 13 Aug 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 194



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

“Doubtful Cases”: Intermarried Families in the Post-Holocaust Jewish World

Ori Yehudai

Department of History, The Ohio State University, Columbus, USA

ABSTRACT

After World War II, thousands of non-Jews – most of them married to Jewish Holocaust survivors – sought relief and emigration assistance from Jewish aid organisations working in Europe. Yet Jewish organisations and Jewish communities in potential countries of resettlement were often reluctant to assist non-Jews or accept intermarried families into their midst. This article explores these tensions. It argues that appeals from non-Jews compelled Jewish institutions to consider broader questions about the boundaries of the Jewish collective and the tension between the ‘Jewish’ and ‘humanitarian’ aspects of Jewish relief work. Ironically, non-Jews played an important role in processes shaping the post-war Jewish world.

KEYWORDS Holocaust survivors; Jews; intermarriage; Germany; United States; Australia; Jewish/non-Jewish relations

Introduction

In October 1949, Artur Beokers asked the International Refugee Organisation (IRO), a UN agency working to find resettlement options for post-war refugees in Europe, to facilitate his emigration from Hamburg to the United States. Beokers was born to a German Christian family in 1897, and in the early 1920s he married a Polish Jewish woman and converted to Judaism. The couple emigrated to Brazil, where their son was born in 1933. But two years later they returned to Germany and settled in the Altona district of Hamburg, as they were ‘not aware at the time of the kind of discrimination already in force under the Nazi regime.’ After settling in Germany, they tried to escape Nazi persecution through various means, including relinquishing Judaism and deleting their names from lists of the Jewish community of Altona. Despite their attempts, Artur’s wife was sent to segregated forced labour in Germany, and Artur himself was forced to leave his job and engage in ‘earth work.’ Even worse, their son was sent to the Gross-Rosen

CONTACT Ori Yehudai  yehudai.3@osu.edu

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

concentration camp and did not return. The IRO initially rejected Beokers' appeal, arguing that his experience under Nazism did not qualify as persecution. Beokers petitioned against the decision. In March 1950 IRO's Review Board agreed to consider Beokers as eligible for emigration assistance, explaining that he should be given 'the benefit of the doubt as to the severity of his actual persecution,' and bearing in mind also that 'the whole family suffered.'¹

The confusion surrounding Beokers' status was part of a larger phenomenon. In the aftermath of World War II, thousands of non-Jews – most of them intermarried with Jewish survivors – sought relief and emigration support from Jewish and non-Jewish aid organisations, especially in displaced persons (DP) camps in occupied Germany. Their appeals posed moral and logistical challenges to Jewish organisations operating in Europe and to Jewish communities in potential countries of destination, who were hesitant and even reluctant to assist non-Jews or to accept intermarried families into their fold. This article explores these challenges and the frequent debates and complications they provoked. I argue that the need to respond to appeals from non-Jews and intermarried families compelled Jewish communities and relief societies to consider broader questions about the boundaries of the Jewish collective, gender relations, and especially the tension between the 'Jewish' and 'humanitarian' aspects of Jewish relief work. Ironically, then, non-Jews played an important role in some of the processes helping to shape the post-war Jewish world.

Thanks to the work of several historians, we are now aware of the pressures and dilemmas faced by intermarried Jewish families during the Third Reich. Evan Burr Bukey, for example, noted the distress of Jewish mothers whose sons joined the Wehrmacht, the decrees preventing Jewish spouses and those married to Jews from pursuing medical, legal and other careers, and the harassment of children of intermarriages in schools.²

Scholars researching the aftermath of the war have paid less attention to the question of intermarriage. Despite the large body of literature on Jewish DPs in Europe, we have little knowledge of the experiences of displaced Jews married to non-Jews.³ Notable exceptions are the works of Atina Grossmann and Michael Brenner, which explore the attitude of the post-war German Jewish community towards intermarriage and the reactions of the Jewish relief system in the country to requests for material assistance from non-Jewish spouses of Jewish DPs.⁴ These pioneering

studies, however, focus only on Germany. This article broadens the perspective by including debates surrounding emigration from Europe and resettlement in new destinations. It thus provides a more comprehensive, transnational dimension to the issue, highlighting the connection between events, experience and policies in Europe and those in countries of resettlement.

I first set the stage with a short discussion of the encounter between non-Jews and Jewish institutions, especially in Germany, where there was the largest concentration of Jewish survivors after World War II. At its height, the Jewish DP population in post-war Germany numbered around a quarter of a million individuals, mostly Polish Jews who could not rebuild their lives in Poland after the war and found temporary shelter in Central Europe. Germany therefore became the main centre for Jewish relief work in the post-war period.

I then proceed to explore attitudes towards the emigration from Europe of intermarried families, focusing primarily on the policies of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC or the Joint), the most important Jewish aid organisation working in post-war Europe.

The next section examines how the American Jewish community reacted to the idea of accepting intermarried families from Europe. The response of American Jews is of special interest, as not only did they become the largest and strongest Jewish community in the world after the war, but intermarriage has been a major concern for the organised American Jewish community also in recent decades, generating fears about Jewish continuity and survival. My discussion here thus adds an historical perspective to an important contemporary issue.

The article then concludes with a discussion of the response of the Australian Jewish community. In Australia, like in the United States, the Jewish community could provide communal (in addition to individual) assurances sponsoring refugee immigration from Europe.⁵ This meant that the Jewish communities in both countries had a strong influence on the selection of newcomers. The special arrangement of community assurances in the United States and Australia made the resettlement of intermarried families into a public community issue in both countries, while also engendering debates between agencies facilitating the resettlement of Jewish refugees in the United States and Australia on the one hand and organisations handling Jewish emigration from Europe on the other. Those debates, in turn, emphasised the tension between what could be seen as pure humanitarian concerns and Jewish communal considerations.

Another major destination for post-war Jewish refugee resettlement was of course Israel. Yet, because Israel was established as a Jewish state, non-Jewish immigration to that country merits a separate discussion involving questions of the definition of Israel as a Jewish and democratic state, relations between religion and state, the status of non-Jews, state policies of conversion to Judaism and others.⁶

Although the Jewish communities and organisations discussed in the following pages did not have to deal with those issues, they still faced complicated decisions about the definition of Jewish identity arising from the post-war reality. This is evident in the various types of 'non-Jews' who requested assistance from Jewish bodies in that period. They included, among others, non-Jews who had stayed faithful to their Jewish partners during the war, or even suffered Nazi persecution because they were married to a Jewish person; non-Jews who had married Jews only after the war; former Jews who had adopted another religion but converted to Judaism after the war; non-Jews who had converted to Judaism in the past, renounced their Judaism during the Nazi period, but wished to join the Jewish community again after the war; and non-Jews whose only connection to the Jewish community was that they had helped to save Jews during the war. By investigating the policies designed to deal with these and other cases, this article aims to provide a better understanding of the practices of inclusion and exclusion that Jewish communities and organisations outside Israel adopted as part of the process of post-war reconstruction.

Intermarried Families in Post-War Europe

Since Germany became the central arena for the activity of Jewish relief bodies after the war, it was there that the question of how Jewish aid organisations should treat non-Jews came into sharpest focus. Out of the approximately 525,000 Jews living in Germany in 1933, about 35,000, or six percent, were married to non-Jews, and this rate remained largely unchanged until 1939. In October 1941, German authorities began systematic deportations of Jews from Germany to ghettos and camps in Eastern Europe, but, until 1944, Jews married to a non-Jewish spouse were spared deportation. Because intermarried Jews were by-and-large allowed to stay in Germany until 1944, while most other Jews had been deported earlier, in 1944 the rate of intermarried Jews increased to 85% of the total Jewish population in the country. In the autumn of 1944, however, as the allies came closer to the Reich, the Germans radicalised their

anti-Jewish policies and began deporting intermarried Jews from certain areas of the Reich. In late January 1945, Reinhard Heydrich's Reich Security Main Office ordered the deportation of all remaining Jews from the entire Reich, including those living in mixed marriages. Even non-Jewish spouses were not spared persecution. Most intermarried non-Jews had been removed from civil service and government positions already since 1937, German men married to Jews had been expelled from the army in April 1940, and in October 1944 many were forced into hard labour, as we saw in the case of Artur Beokers. Non-Jewish women married to Jews were also often placed into forced labour with varying degrees of oppression.⁷

Yet, due to the relatively late Nazi decision to deport intermarried Jews, inconsistencies in the policies of local authorities carrying out deportations, and successful interventions of non-Jewish relatives and employers, Jews married to 'Aryans' had better chances of survival than other Jews. And so more than 65% of the approximately 15,000 German Jews who had survived the war on German soil were partners of mixed marriages.⁸ Of the roughly 8,000 persons registered with the Berlin Gemeinde (Jewish community) in mid-1946, 5,500, or about 68% were married to non-Jews.⁹ A similar trend existed in the post-war years also in smaller communities in Germany. Almost all 400 members of the Jewish community in Frankfurt, for example, were married to non-Jews, and in the Jewish community of Wuppertal, 60 out of the 90 married members were partners of mixed marriages.¹⁰

The prevalence of intermarriage aroused concern among German Jews, especially as to the future development of their communities. According to Michael Brenner, intermarried couples were expected to educate their children as Jews. Some German Jewish communities even decided that Jewish parents who did not comply with the demand should not be allowed to hold community positions. Another related question was how to deal with people who sought admission into the community through conversion to Judaism. The Berlin Gemeinde created a special committee to deal with applications for conversion, which by June 1946 had amounted to 2,500. Some of the applicants were Jews who had left the community upon marrying a non-Jew, either before or after 1933, and others were non-Jews like Artur Beokers who had converted to Judaism after marrying a Jewish spouse but had retracted their conversion during the Nazi period. Applications even came from non-Jewish Germans who had no family relations with Jews, but 'would

rather identify with the victims than with the murderers.' The Berlin rabbinate looked askance at requests for conversion and approved only five percent of the applications submitted between 1948 and 1953. The central rabbinate of the Jewish DPs in the British zone of occupied Germany published a document in 1947 refusing all conversions to Judaism.¹¹

As Atina Grossmann has shown, the conspicuous presence of non-Jews in the community, and especially the large number of requests to enter or re-enter the community, were a source of confusion and dilemmas also from the perspective of relief policies. While membership in the Jewish community could provide moral support, sense of belonging and continuity of Jewish identity, it was no secret that it also granted access to material benefits granted to Gemeinde members as part of the early efforts of post-war reconstruction.¹²

Due to their limited resources, however, both international aid organisations and the Gemeinde had to make difficult decisions about eligibility for assistance. The Joint insisted that it would only support those who had identified as 'confessionally' Jewish and were officially associated with the Gemeinde. This meant that all non-Jewish spouses were excluded from relief assistance, even if they had suffered as a result of their marriage to Jews or had helped to save their Jewish spouses during the war.¹³ The archival records of the Joint shed light on the complexities arising from that policy. In one case, a non-Jewish wife married to a Jew wished to be recognised as Jewish but her grown children had been brought up as Catholic and did not wish to be considered Jewish. The children were officially ineligible for assistance, but Joint officials were hesitant to give the mother food and clothing without taking her children into consideration.¹⁴ The Gemeinde adopted a policy similar to that of the Joint. It consulted local police records to find out whether applicants for relief or Gemeinde membership had been registered as Jews before May 1945, and excluded non-Jews, whose Jewish spouses had died, from Gemeinde privileges such as extra food rations or the right to be buried beside their partners in the Jewish cemetery at Weissensee. While both the Gemeinde and the Joint left room for flexibility, their policies provoked bitterness and anger from rejected applicants.¹⁵

One reflection of the confusion of the immediate post-war period was that policies were not uniform everywhere. Unlike in Berlin, the Joint office in Vienna, where the vast majority of Austrian Jews were living, included in its relief packages non-Jews who had not deserted their

Jewish spouses during the war. But this policy also aroused opposition. In early 1947, a former director of the Austrian Jewish community (Kultusgemeinde) complained to the Joint headquarters in New York 'that the gentile, non-Jewish wife of a Jew receives the same as a poor ex-inmate of a concentration camp . . . I am suffering terribly to see that those who had the right to cry "Heil Hitler" now receive the same allotment of food as we do.'¹⁶ The Joint's chief of operations in Austria defended the policy as free from discrimination and prejudice, but his response also revealed the extent of the phenomenon: of the 9,400 people receiving welfare assistance from the Joint in Austria, 7,700, or more than 80%, were non-Jewish wives, widows or orphans of Jews.¹⁷

Another type of intermarriage was that between Jewish DPs, mostly of Eastern European origin, and German women. Atina Grossmann reports that by 1950, more than 1,000 such marriages had been registered in Germany, and that there were many more short-lived and permanent relationships. They were part of the larger phenomenon of close interactions between Jewish DPs and Germans in occupied Germany, and resulted, at least to some extent, from the 'surplus of Jewish men' caused by the 'approximately 60/40 skewed sex ratio' among Jewish DPs. Marriages between Jewish DPs and German women aroused anger and bitter debates in DP communities, as some saw such unions as a disgrace to the memory of Jewish women murdered by the Nazis. In some extreme cases, Jewish DPs married to German women were banished from their communities.¹⁸ Whereas marriages between German Jews and 'Aryan' spouses had their roots in the historical experience of German Jewry, those between Jewish DPs and local Germans were the product of the post-war reality. And while intermarried German Jews became the majority of German Jews living in Germany after the war because they were less affected than other members of their community by Nazi deportations, Jewish DPs with German spouses were more likely to stay in Germany when the general Jewish DP population started leaving Europe to settle in new destinations.

Intermarried Families and the Emigration Question

But intermarried families who preferred to settle outside of Europe posed a challenge to the agencies facilitating DP emigration. Since Jewish survivors first started gathering in post-war DP camps in Germany, Austria and Italy, their most preferred destinations for permanent resettlement were Palestine and the United States. Large-scale emigration to both those

countries, however, was impossible due to limitations on Jewish immigration to Palestine imposed by the British mandate authorities, and to restrictive American immigration policies that had been in place since the early 1920s. American policy started softening in December 1945, when President Harry Truman issued a directive authorising preferential treatment for the admission of DPs within existing immigration laws. As a result of this new policy, some 28,000 Jewish DPs had entered the United States by June 1948. More massive emigration from the DP camps began after 1948, as the end of the British mandate and the establishment of Israel allowed some 100,000 DPs to settle in the Jewish state by mid-1950. Following the American DP acts of 1948 and 1950 an additional wave of approximately 70,000 Jewish DPs had immigrated to the United States by 1952. Smaller numbers went to Canada (20,000), Australia (17,000), Belgium (8,000) and several other countries.¹⁹

The exact number of intermarried families who took part in those migration movements is unknown. In the summer of 1951, the Joint's European Headquarters reported that it had dealt with at least 3,500 non-Jewish cases.²⁰ In late 1952, the Joint's Munich office estimated that intermarried families comprised between 25 and 30% of its emigration load.²¹ Already in 1949, the same office spoke of a 'tremendous number' of cases of that kind.²² Indeed, while the exact numbers are unclear, the phenomenon was significant enough to bewilder relief officers handling Jewish refugee emigration from Europe. Field officers of the Joint – especially those stationed in Germany – wrote to their supervisors asking for guidance and clarification on how to deal with the 'complicated problem presented by non-Jews who apply at our emigration offices for assistance.'²³ Not only Jewish bodies were troubled with the problem of arranging emigration for intermarried families. In January 1951, a report of the IRO listed mixed marriages as part of the 'difficult to resettle group,' which also included 'amputees,' 'over-age,' and 'physically handicapped' people.²⁴ While the IRO did not refer specifically to intermarried Jews, its concerns resonated with those of Jewish relief agencies.

The Emigration Headquarters of the Joint tried to devise a strategy to deal with those concerns. In April 1947, Irwin Rosen, the headquarters director, distributed to field officers some preliminary guidelines. Rosen did not think it practicable to establish a hard and fast rule covering all possible requests for emigration assistance from non-Jews. He recognised that there might be people whom the Joint would not define as Jews, but who had nevertheless suffered under the Nazis because of their relationship

with Jews. He was also worried about the 'public relations angles' of the problem – suggesting, perhaps, that automatic refusal of all appeals from non-Jews might tarnish the image of the Joint as a humanitarian assistance organisation. Even though Rosen wished to avoid a fixed and definite policy, he insisted that the general approach should be to keep the number of assisted non-Jews down to a minimum. The Joint, he advised, should only help non-Jewish applicants who could demonstrate 'some Jewish relationship' and could not receive help from non-Jewish organisations. Rosen's final remark was that, even in those cases deemed eligible, assistance should be restricted to technical services that did not involve financial expenditure. 'Payment of expenses for non-Jewish cases,' he wrote, 'should be limited to only very exceptional situations for the apparent reason that JDC funds are limited and it is the organisation's obligation to give priority in the financing of emigration to those cases which clearly come within the scope of its activities' – namely Jewish refugees.²⁵

Despite those guidelines, the question of the Joint's attitude towards intermarried families kept coming up in internal discussions and reports from the field. One example of the perplexity around those cases can be found in a letter from an emigration officer of the Joint working in Frankfurt. She divided the non-Jewish cases under her care into no less than 10 different categories, some of which included 'non-Jewish women married to Jews before 1939;' 'non-Jewish women married to Jews after 1945;' 'non-Jewish men married to Jews before or during the war;' 'half-Jewish, did not profess Jewish faith during the war, still protestant;' and even 'non-Jewish family – Polish Catholics, helped Jews during the war ...' The officer recommended the appropriate policy for each one of these and other categories based on existing guidelines and her own interpretations. But she complained that mixed marriages 'constitute a continual source of anxiety and difficulty.'²⁶

In response to the ongoing confusion, in 1949, Charles Jordan, who had in the meantime replaced Rosen as Director of Emigration Headquarters, developed a more elaborate policy document. It appears from the document that the flood of requests from non-Jews had prompted Joint officials to reflect on the mission of their organisation as a humanitarian body that was also specifically Jewish. Jordan indicated that his headquarters had agreed in previous discussions of the issue that the Joint was primarily a Jewish organisation whose purpose was to assist Jews. But 'in view of the circumstances of Jewish life in Europe in the past' – that is, the high rate of intermarriage – the agency would not

exclude intermarried families from emigration and resettlement assistance. Jordan confirmed that the Joint's existing practice of verifying that members of intermarried families seeking support considered themselves Jewish and identified with the Jewish community was 'in the spirit of the liberal humanitarian tradition of the Joint.' He added that the Joint would consider for emigration support any family that included even one Jewish person, whether or not that person was the 'head of the family.'

But there were also qualifications. In line with the aforementioned report from Frankfurt, Jordan instructed field officers to distinguish between marriages contracted before and after the end of the war. Jordan regarded the former as more authentic, while post-war marriages were 'doubtful cases' as they raised the suspicion that the non-Jewish spouse had entered into the marriage in the hope of becoming eligible for emigration and relief assistance from Jewish societies.²⁷ At the same time, Joint officials also suspected that Jewish DPs had married German spouses in order to become eligible for immigration to the United States under the quota system, while also enjoying support from Jewish organisations. Established by the Immigration Act of 1924, the quota system set limits on immigration from any given country based on the percentage of US residents originating from that country. Most Jewish DPs had come from Eastern European countries that were allotted relatively small quotas. The quota for Poland, where the majority of Jewish DPs had originated, was only 6,524 immigrants per year, compared with 25,957 for Germany. Marrying a German spouse after the war could therefore clearly improve the chances of immigration to the United States.²⁸

Even though the Joint viewed marriages contracted before the end of the war as generally more authentic, it did not consider non-Jewish partners in such marriages as automatically eligible for emigration assistance. An important concern regarding such cases was the conduct of the non-Jewish spouse during the war. Jordan instructed that non-Jews who had collaborated with anti-Jewish persecution be excluded from emigration assistance. He insisted, by contrast, that those who had stood by the Jewish members of their family should receive assistance – especially if they had been persecuted as a result of remaining loyal to their Jewish spouse. With this principle, the Joint departed from its earlier policy of denying relief assistance to non-Jews – even those who had suffered during the war as a result of being married to a Jewish person.²⁹

While the new policy was more flexible and humane, it was also more intrusive. The process of verifying eligibility for emigration support now required relief officers to scrutinise the biographies of applicants, the

motivations behind their marriage and the nature of their relationships. This scrutiny was part of a larger picture. As Gerard Daniel Cohen has demonstrated, officials of the IRO, the body responsible for the largest resettlement operations of refugees from Europe after the war, were conducting intensive screening activities in the DP camps in order to determine who was eligible for international relief assistance and who was not. Officials aimed to distinguish between 'true' refugees – those believed to be escaping political persecution – and 'false' refugees, who were seen as merely economic migrants. Screening of applicants also meant to exclude from assistance former Nazi collaborators and veterans of the German army, and with the onset of the Cold War, also those suspected as Communists.³⁰

In the case of intermarried families, however, the scrutiny of applicants for emigration support focused not so much on applicants' political background or orientation, but on intimate issues related to their marital life. As Jordan wrote, decisions on eligibility depended 'essentially upon what we think of the people as human beings; how sincere we think they are in their relations to each other; whether there is any appearance of opportunism which enters into the situation.'³¹

The policy indeed relied to a large extent on the personal judgement of relief officials. Joint workers had 'a great deal of feeling' especially when dealing with cases of non-Jewish German women recently married to Jewish men, since there was 'a strong assumption' that immigration to the United States was the 'decisive factor' in those marriages.³² Jordan, for example, ordered a field officer to reject the application of a Jewish DP named Abraham Tellner, who was destined to emigrate from Frankfurt to Utica, New York, in the summer 1949. After Tellner's emigration had already been approved, he informed the Joint that he was contemplating marrying a German woman and emigrating with her to the United States. Jordan was "reluctant to comply with such a request. This would look to me like too much of a last minute affair," he concluded.³³

But in other cases Jordan showed greater leniency. Hildegard Spier was a non-Jewish German women who had married a Jewish husband before the war. She converted to Judaism in 1928 and raised her son as Jewish. Her husband was murdered in a concentration camp during the war. In 1949, she was trying to emigrate from Frankfurt to the United States (it is unclear from the sources whether her son was still with her). Although she had already received emigration support from a Christian agency, the Joint took over her case following Jordan's 'special request,' explaining that 'Since applicant adopted Jewish faith, we can see no reason to question handling of this

situation by JDC.³⁴ It seems that the difference between Tellner's and Spier's stories was that the marital relationship in the latter case appeared authentic, rendering the application more credible.

Henry Levy, Jordan's successor in the Emigration Headquarters, likewise recommended the rejection of those engaged in 'a marriage of convenience.' To illustrate the dubious nature of some of the applications submitted by intermarried families, Levy cited a case where a Jewish DP named Janek Schlit, who had already been approved for emigration support from the Joint in 1952 as a single man, suddenly informed the agency that he had recently married a non-Jewish German woman, and that they had a son born to them in 1948. 'I believe I am not going too far astray in suggesting that it behooves our office to find out if in effect this child which was born in 1948 is really the son of the applicant,' Levy stated. 'If the child was born in 1948 and this particular man was living with this woman, why then does he only now come to us to tell us that he has a child and is married to a non-Jewish German girl?' Levy suspected that Schlit was assuming that registering under the German quota as a father to a German child would expedite his emigration to the United States.³⁵ Regardless of whether Schlit was telling the truth or not, Levy's response demonstrates the misgivings and doubts of relief officials dealing with emigration requests from intermarried families – and the disadvantaged situation in which those families found themselves.

In addition to such practical and technical difficulties arising from the experience of field officers, the idea of helping non-Jewish spouses also encountered more essential opposition. In early 1948, even before Jordan had published his guidelines, the newspaper of the Jewish community of Düsseldorf reported that it was receiving letters 'from all parts of Germany' expressing regret that Jewish organisations "did as much as nothing for those [non-Jewish] people who stood during the hard times of persecution faithful to their husbands or wives and thus to [world] Jewry." According to the newspaper, the letters furnished many proofs that 'it was only due to this faithfulness [that] many of our fellow believers were saved from being victims of the Nazis too.'³⁶ The report from Düsseldorf was sent to Herbert Katzki, the Joint's Assistant Director-General for Overseas Operations, but Katzki rejected the complaint. It was unclear to the staff at his office ...

Why American Jewry must assist as a reward the non-Jewish spouse of a mixed marriage in Germany because the non-Jewish husband or wife stuck to his or her partner during the difficult days. Do these people really think that American Jewry owes something to the non-Jewish spouse or is the Jewish spouse trying to be a good fellow to the non-Jewish member at the expense of American Jewry?³⁷

Katzki's response demonstrates the lack of consensus among the leadership of the Joint as to the moral obligation of the organisation, and by extension, of the larger Jewish world towards non-Jews who had 'stuck to' their Jewish spouses during the war. For Katzki, the religious or ethnic background of applicants was more important than their behaviour during the war. Katzki's approach towards the mission of the Joint as a Jewish humanitarian body differed from that of Jordan in that Katzki placed a stronger emphasis on the 'Jewish' rather than the 'humanitarian' component of the Joint's work. Katzki also stressed the commitment of the Joint to American Jews, who were funding the Joint's operations in Europe. He justified his disapproval of assistance to non-Jews on the assumption that American Jews would adopt the same negative stand.

Intermarried Families and the American Jewish Community

Katzki's assumption was not baseless. Reports from the United States indicated that American Jewish organisations and communities were reluctant to provide services to non-Jewish newcomers or to receive intermarried families into their midst.³⁸ One Joint official raised the concern that by helping intermarried families to settle in the United States the Joint took the risk of investing precious resources in people who could not be trusted to maintain connection with the Jewish community.³⁹ Another official warned against sending to the United States Jews married to non-Jews 'since this would certainly create antipathy toward the whole concept of the DP program in the United States.'⁴⁰

A blatant expression of such sentiments among American Jews is found in a letter to the Joint from Eugene Schoenberger of St. Louis. Schoenberger had been active in a fundraising campaign for the United Jewish Appeal (UJA), a major contributor to the Joint. He had also volunteered to give English lessons to newcomers from Europe in his St. Louis community but was disappointed that 'except for one woman who is purely Jewish ... all the others are mixed marriages, tending to the Christian side.' Schoenberger understood the desire of prospective immigrants to get away from the unfavourable conditions in post-war Germany, but accused intermarried families of taking advantage of Jewish relief means. He thought that a 'purely Jewish relief organization' like the Joint should help 'pure,' 'real' Jews who had gone through 'concentration camps and tortures for years and years and did not live normal civil life' like intermarried families. While Schoenberger admitted that a policy of refusing help to

non-Jews might provoke anti-Jewish hatred, he was convinced that such a policy was necessary for securing 'the survival of Judaism.' 'Mixed marriages,' he continued, 'are lost to Judaism ... they don't mean anything to the future of Judaism, their children will be Gentile – and with six million Jews murdered we can't afford to spend our limited Jewish means on saving people who won't help carrying on Judaism for future generations!'

Schoenberger also referred to the tension between the Jewish and humanitarian components of the Joint's mission, maintaining that his work for the UJA campaign had not been intended to promote 'some humanitarian cause,' but to 'ascertain that Judaism would be strengthened in its struggle for survival.' The Joint's efforts, he charged, should likewise not be directed at people who 'also' suffered during the Nazi period, but at keeping 'the last remnant of the real Jews alive, who will be the fathers and mothers of future generations of Jews.'⁴¹

Schoenberger's pronounced anger and repeated insistence on the notion of 'pure' Jews may seem extreme, but his general aversion towards the reception of non-Jews in American Jewish communities was far from being marginal. This approach also found expression in the official policy of the body in charge of resettling Jewish refugees in post-war United States – the United Services for New Americans (USNA).

The American Jewish community had created USNA in 1946 as a new refugee agency in anticipation of the arrival of Jewish DPs from Europe. USNA handled the resettlement of refugees through collaboration both with agencies facilitating Jewish DP emigration from Europe and with Jewish communities absorbing the newcomers throughout the United States. USNA was also one of a number of voluntary agencies authorised by American immigration authorities to supply DPs with corporate affidavits. As opposed to individual affidavits, which were provided by American citizens willing to sponsor a DP – usually a family member – and take responsibility for his or her resettlement and integration in the United States, corporate affidavits were meant to serve DPs who did not have relatives in the United States, or those whose relatives could not act as sponsors. The provision of corporate affidavits depended on cooperation between USNA and local American Jewish communities agreeing to assume responsibility for the resettlement of specific newcomers.⁴² This meant that communities had an influence on the selection of refugees who could not obtain individual sponsorship.

Shortly after Jordan had distributed his guidelines for assistance to intermarried families, he received a cable from Ann Petluck, USNA's

Director for Migration Services. Petluck wrote that the Joint's policy was in conflict with that of USNA since the Joint was considering for emigration assistance any family that included even one Jewish person – while USNA was only willing to provide services to families where the head of the family was Jewish. Petluck urged Jordan to immediately suspend implementation of his policy until further communication from USNA. A few weeks later she wrote a longer letter detailing USNA's position on intermarried families, which she described as 'a complex question involving humane, emotional and communal considerations.' Petluck recounted that upon its establishment, USNA had decided that, since private social services in the United States were largely organised on a sectarian basis, and since there were migration agencies servicing non-Jews, USNA would avoid dealing with applications from non-Jews. This did not mean that USNA refused to assist intermarried families. USNA's definition of the term 'Jews' included 'members of mixed marriages, orthodox Jews, reformed Jews, baptized Jews, etc.' Petluck assured Jordan that 'if persons feel they are Jews and affiliate with the Jewish community and are not now professing non-Jews, USNA will include them in the Corporate Affidavit.'

But in cases of mixed marriages, USNA's corporate affidavit was to be used only where the head of the family was Jewish. Moreover, the agency insisted that the head of the family must be the husband: 'where the wife was Jewish and husband non-Jewish, we stated that the case would not be eligible for our Corporate Affidavit.' Petluck agreed with Jordan that relief policies should be 'developed in a liberal humanitarian spirit,'⁴³ and admitted that USNA's policy 'may appear to be restrictive or negative in application.' But, like Katzki, she justified the policy by relying on the attitudes of American Jews, explaining that USNA's stance 'is as liberal as the mores of the Jewish community in the United States permit':

Where the head of the family is not Jewish, our cooperating agencies find it difficult to accept a concept that the family is Jewish. Our cooperating agencies ... have offered considerable resistance to offering services to mixed marriage families where the head of the family is non-Jewish.⁴⁴

In an almost reproachful tone, Petluck informed Jordan about instances in which Joint relief officers in Europe, who had been aware of USNA's policy, had 'attempted to skirt' it: in cases where the wife was Jewish and the husband non-Jewish, Joint officers had registered the wife as the principal applicant, namely the head of the family, so that a non-Jew would not be nominated for USNA's corporate affidavit. But those cases were ineligible for USNA's corporate affidavit as USNA only considered the

husband as the head of the family.⁴⁵ According to Petluck, attempts to deviate from USNA's procedures had led to difficulties vis-à-vis absorbing communities. 'These facts are inescapable,' she concluded, 'and our day to day experiences verify the validity of our policy.'⁴⁶

These initial clarifications were followed by extensive correspondence between the Joint and USNA on the treatment of intermarried families and especially the status of the 'head' of such families. USNA pointed out many different cases where the Joint had gone against USNA's policy, and the Joint had to 'correct certain actions that had been taken.' Eventually, Jordan instructed all field offices of the Joint to deny community assurances to intermarried families when the head of the family was non-Jewish – but he did so 'reluctantly and against [his] own convictions.'⁴⁷

USNA's policy, which eventually also became the policy of the Joint, reflected a broader disinclination to accept non-Jews into the Jewish community. As we have seen, various officials and individuals shared that sentiment. But in USNA's case, the attitude towards non-Jews was also intertwined with a conservative outlook on gender and family relations. By demanding that only intermarried families with a Jewish husband be considered eligible for a corporate affidavit, USNA adhered to a traditional view regarding the husband as the head of the family. As is well-known, in Jewish as well as other traditions, the designation of the husband as the 'head of the family' reflected a patriarchal system, established in antiquity, whereby the adult man was regarded as the 'ruler and owner' of all the persons in the household, who were supposed to completely submit to the authority of the head.⁴⁸ The developments of gender relations in Jewish culture from antiquity to the mid-twentieth century are of course beyond the scope of this article. However, it is worth mentioning that, as several scholars have pointed out, patriarchal conceptions have been preserved to a certain extent through the 1950s, as women still occupied a relatively marginal position in the American Jewish community at the time. In the religious sphere, for example, according to Sylvia Barack Fishman and Daniel Parmer, 'women sat in worship services primarily as passive recipients, rather than active leaders, whatever the denomination.' They took leadership roles primarily in various women's movements and organisations. Feminism and egalitarianism began to take shape in American Jewish life only in the 1960s.⁴⁹

USNA's claim that the insistence on the husband as the head of the family was 'as liberal as the mores of the Jewish community in the United States permit' should therefore be seen in the historical context of gender relations in American Jewish communities in the 1950s, and in the even

broader cultural context of the status of women in Jewish tradition. At the same time, though, USNA's policy deviated from a long-standing Jewish practice determining that Jewishness is transmitted by the mother. USNA thus embraced a traditional approach to gender relations and a non-traditional approach to Jewish identity. In any event, USNA's refusal to accommodate intermarried families with a Jewish wife effectively reduced the number of non-Jews admitted to the Jewish community. There is no evidence that the requirement regarding the Jewishness of the head of the family was used as a pretext for the rejection of intermarried families, but it certainly limited the ability of such families to immigrate to the United States. USNA's policy demonstrates the interrelations between conceptions of gender and family on the one hand, and the definition of the boundaries of the Jewish community on the other.

Intermarriage is regarded as one of the most acute problems facing contemporary American Jewry, and has been the subject of a plethora of studies.⁵⁰ An historical perspective suggests that intermarriage has been part of Jewish life already in colonial America, but it came to be viewed with special alarm much later. Keren McGinity notes that Reform rabbis became increasingly concerned with the issue in the 1930s and 1940s. In a convention in Montreal in 1947, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the rabbinic association of American Reform Judaism, reaffirmed its resolution of 1909 declaring that 'mixed marriages are contrary to the tradition of Jewish religion and should therefore be discouraged by the American rabbinate.' A more extreme resolution calling for the prohibition under any circumstances of marriages between Jews and unconverted Gentiles was barely defeated in the convention by a vote of 74 to 72.⁵¹ In later decades Reform rabbis took a more flexible stand on intermarriage, but other sections of American Jewry began devoting greater attention to the issue in the middle of the 1960s. As Hasia Diner notes, the *American Jewish Yearbook* published its first article on intermarriage in 1963, and since the early 1970s intermarriage has been at the centre of numerous public and scholarly discussions. The basic worry was that, as a result of the growing rate of intermarriage, 'the glue binding together Jewish life would lose its hold.'⁵²

This concern is usually discussed in the context of the increasing interaction between Jews and non-Jews living in the United States. The reactions to the arrival of intermarried families from post-war Europe, however, show that the notion of threat to the integrity of the American Jewish community emerged also in the context of immigration, and was closely related to the historical experience of European Jews. Furthermore, as Beth

Cohen demonstrates, the encounter between Holocaust survivor immigrants and the American Jewish community was fraught with tensions, as American Jews and American Jewish agencies charged with helping survivors did not understand survivors' needs. The encounter was thus marked by 'limited help to outright indifference to active rejection.'⁵³ The story of intermarried families adds a new dimension to this history, showing that the challenges of the period involved not only the appropriate treatment of newcomers absorbed by the community, but also questions of Jewish identity, belonging, and practices of inclusion and exclusion.

Intermarried Refugee Families and the Australian Jewish Community

American Jewish organisations were not the only ones grappling with those problems. Another case in point was the response of the Australian Jewish community. As Suzanne Rutland has pointed out, an atmosphere of xenophobia and 'anti-Jewish refugee hysteria' in post-war Australia had led the Australian government to insist that the Jewish community take full responsibility for the resettlement of Jewish refugees. This meant that, like in the United States, the Jewish community had a considerable influence on the selection of refugees – especially those who were sponsored by community institutions. In confronting the challenge of refugee resettlement, the community relied on significant support from American Jewish relief bodies such as the Joint, which ensured the resettlement in Australia of 25,000 Jews between 1945 and 1961. While American Jewish organisations 'became partners in the "Australian Immigration Project",'⁵⁴ the issue of non-Jewish immigrants and intermarried families was a source of discord between the Joint and the Australian Jewish relief system.

In September 1947, a conference of Australian Jewish relief agencies convened in Melbourne to discuss a range of issues relating to the absorption of new Jewish immigrants. Delegates were not unanimous on the question of intermarried families. Dr. Benfey of Victoria told other representatives that a special Permit Committee of the Melbourne Jewish community was asking immigration candidates to sign a declaration confirming that all persons included in the application were Jewish. However, he still sought the advice of other participants as to which cases should be refused. Mr. Symonds of North South Wales, who served as treasurer of the Australian Jewish Welfare Society, said that he had asked communities to 'put all doubtful cases on the side' until he discussed the issue further with international Jewish migration organisations. But Symonds' personal view was that the Australian Jewish

community was not 'entitled to say to a person you cannot come in because you have married out.' Mr. Moses, representative of Queensland, however, said that his community was refusing to work with non-Jews: 'On the lists coming from HIAS (Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society) and Joint, we only want Jewish names.' Symonds stuck to his opinion that Jewish relief work should not be limited to Jews only: 'You must not leave Christian people behind; it would create a terrible position if a welfare officer went on board [a ship] to welcome Jewish migrants and there are some non-Jews who he leaves completely aside.'⁵⁵ Mr. Brand of New South Wales likewise opined that 'as a welfare officer – you cannot leave [non-Jews] to look after themselves. The department [of Immigration] appreciates, that, although we are a Jewish welfare society, we do assist Catholics and Protestants.'⁵⁶

The meeting did not reach a decision, but the more restrictive stance eventually prevailed. In various correspondence regarding Jewish refugee emigration from Europe, Joint officials mentioned the need to take into consideration the refusal of the organised Australian Jewish community to admit non-Jews. Jordan, who was advocating a more liberal attitude, seems to have been upset by that state of affairs. In June 1949, he wrote to the European director of the Joint that the 'Australian Societies are absolutely refusing to allow us to assist in the emigration of [non-Jewish] persons to Australia, even though they may have landing permits secured by members of the Jewish community in Australia. The welfare societies say that in such cases the sponsors must take the entire responsibility and that they will not involve themselves.' It appears, then, that some individual Australian Jews were willing to sponsor the resettlement of intermarried families, but the official welfare committees were unwilling to take part in such initiatives. Jordan suggested that in order to 'bring the Committees in line with our thinking,' the Joint should reassert its position on assisting non-Jews in connection with 'the granting of any further funds to Australia.' The policy on intermarried families thus threatened to undermine the cooperation between the Australian Jewish community and the Joint in the broader resettlement project.⁵⁷ Jordan also communicated his concerns directly to the Australian Jewish Welfare Society:

You can rest assured that we tried to enforce the policy laid down by you that only fully observing Jews are to be introduced into Australia and that you would not accept any persons of mixed marriages religiously. This does not mean of course that we can give you a written guarantee that there may not be some slip up occasionally. I think you have to allow for a margin of error. Also, we do not have an intelligence service attached to the JDC which can operate on the basis that every statement made by every applicant must be looked upon with

suspicion and thoroughly investigated before we can make a determination of the case. On the whole we believe what people tell us. We sometimes find out that we were misinformed ... Of course, if you wish, we could have that applicants for Australian emigration under your sponsorship make out a sworn statement that, upon arrival in Australia, they will become a member of the Jewish community and attend synagogue regularly. I doubt however that that would make a substantial difference.⁵⁸

Beyond Jordan's displeasure with the attitude of the Australian Jewish organisation, the letter sheds light on some of the larger problems of post-war resettlement of intermarried families which this article has discussed. Jordan's letter testifies to the staunch resistance among the Australian Jewish community – or at least its representative welfare body – to receiving non-Jews. It shows that, like in the case of the American Jewish community, the resistance was explained through the fear that non-Jews would use Jewish relief funds to leave Europe but would then not become part of the Jewish community in their country of settlement. The letter also points to the practical difficulties that relief officers in Europe were facing in dealing with members of intermarriages applying for resettlement assistance. Particularly burdensome was the need to determine applicants' identity, background and relation to Judaism and the Jewish community, as well as the chances that they would remain committed to the community even after reaching their target country. At the same time, the letter also points to the suspicion with which such immigration candidates were viewed.

The system of community sponsorship enabled the Jewish communities of the United States and Australia to enhance their contribution to the efforts to find new homes for post-war Jewish refugees. But, as the interactions between the Joint and Jewish welfare bodies in both countries reveal, that system also gave rise to disputes surrounding the treatment of non-Jews. These disputes were rooted in a deeper tension between the general tendency of relief officials to assist people in need and officials' more immediate commitment to their own community; between the universal nature of humanitarian work and the particular concerns of the Jewish community.

Conclusion

Today, major Jewish aid organisations openly state their willingness, even commitment, to extend help to non-Jews. The mission statement on the website of the Joint includes a special reference to 'non-sectarian aid,'

declaring that 'In times of crisis ... JDC offers aid to non-Jews to fulfill the Jewish tenet of *tikkun olam*, the moral responsibility to repair the world and alleviate suffering wherever it exists.'⁵⁹ The fundraising campaign slogan of HIAS reads: 'Once, we helped refugees because they were Jewish. Today we help refugees because we are Jewish.'⁶⁰ Those statements reflect a synergy between Jewish and universal humanitarian values. They convey the idea that the willingness and desire of the Joint and HIAS to assist non-Jews stem naturally from the Jewish identity of these two organisations.

But, as this article has demonstrated, in the aftermath of World War II Jewish aid to non-Jewish refugees and migrants was a controversial issue that provoked objection from various circles within the Jewish world. We should view this objection within an historical context. In the years following World War II, Jewish aid societies were constrained by dwindling financial resources. The budget of the Joint, for instance, has dropped from 72,000,000 USD in 1948 to 21,000,000 USD in 1952.⁶¹ This meant that relief officials had to make difficult decisions about relief priorities and the allocation of limited resources. In addition to material problems, the Jewish world in the aftermath of the Holocaust was anxious about the question of Jewish continuity and survival, which seemed to be threatened by intermarriage. Those concerns have continued to guide Jewish approaches to intermarriage even in later decades.⁶²

In the unique historical context of post-war displacement, the combination of 'Jewish' and 'humanitarian' values seemed less natural or unquestionable than it appears in the current self-perceptions of American Jewish aid societies. As we have seen, some officials and observers thought that Jewish relief funds and efforts should be invested exclusively in helping Jews. They wished to give clear precedence to particular Jewish concerns over universal ones. In the immediate aftermath of the war, the Joint did not provide relief packages to non-Jewish partners of Jewish survivors, even if the non-Jewish members of the family had remained loyal to their Jewish spouses during the war or even suffered persecution as a result of being married to Jews. Later the Joint developed a more liberal policy which took into consideration the conduct of Jewish spouses during the war among other factors. The more flexible stance of the European emigration offices of the Joint, especially under the leadership of Charles Jordan, however, put the organisation in conflict with Jewish agencies operating in countries of destination, mainly

USNA in the United States and the Australian Jewish Welfare Society. USNA insisted that only intermarried families with a Jewish husband would be eligible for community assistance, thereby reducing the number of intermarried families who could start new lives in the United States. The Australian agency refused to assist intermarried families altogether, albeit following an internal debate. The tensions between the Joint and those bodies reflected a wider tension between particularistic and universalistic tendencies within the Jewish community. On a more practical level, this was a tension between the desire to dedicate resources and energies to assist Jews on the one hand, and on the other, the propensity of relief officers to place a stronger emphasis on the humanitarian dimension of their mission.

Intermarried families and non-Jews seeking help from Jewish institutions were a relatively small group within the massive relief and resettlement operations carried out by Jewish and non-Jewish organisations in the aftermath of World War II and the Holocaust. But their presence still posed moral and logistical challenges to the relief system and raised fundamental questions regarding the relationship between Jews and non-Jews in the post-war era.

Notes

1. Decision of the Review Board, IRO, 17 March 1950, and statement of Artur Beokers, 21 October 1949, in IRO collections, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Archives, AJ/43/477/25.
2. Evan Burr Bukey, *Jews and Inter-marriage in Nazi Austria* (Cambridge, 2011), 1–3. See also Marion Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish life in Nazi Germany* (New York, 1998); Maximilian Strnad, "The Fortune of Survival – Inter-married German Jews in the Dying Breath of the 'Thousand-Year Reich'," *Dapim: Studies on the Holocaust*, 29/3 (2015), 173–96; Jeremy Noaks, "The Development of Nazi Policy towards the German-Jewish 'Mischlinge' 1933–1945," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook*, 34 (1989), 291–354; Nathan Stoltzfus, *Resistance of the Heart: Inter-marriage and the Rosenstrasse Protest in Nazi Germany* (New York, 1996).
3. Some of the important studies on Jewish DPs in post-war Europe include Gerard Daniel Cohen, *In War's Wake: Europe's Displaced Persons in the Post-War Order* (New York, 2011); Ze'ev Mankowitz, *Life between Memory and Hope: The Survivors of the Holocaust in Occupied Germany* (Cambridge, 2002); Avinoam Patt, *Finding Home and Homeland: Jewish Youth and Zionism in the Aftermath of the Holocaust* (Detroit, 2009); Angelika Königseder and Juliane Wetzel, *Waiting for Hope: Jewish Displaced Persons in Post-World War II Germany* (Evanston, 2001).
4. Atina Grossmann, *Jews, Germans and Allies: Close Encounters in Occupied Germany* (Princeton, 2007); Michel Brenner, 'East European and German Jews

- in Postwar Germany,' in Y. Michel Bodeman ed., *Jews, Germans, Memory: Reconstructions of Jewish Life in Germany* (Ann Arbor, 1996), 49–64.
5. In Canada, by contrast, immigration sponsorships were provided either by family relatives or potential employers. See Adara Goldberg, *Holocaust Survivors in Canada: Exclusion, Inclusion, Transformation, 1947–1955* (Winnipeg, Manitoba, 2015).
 6. For existing studies on this topic, see Dvora Hacothen, "The Law of Return as an Embodiment of the Link between Israel and the Jews of the Diaspora," *The Journal of Israeli History*, 19/1 (1998), 61–89; Netanel Fisher and Avi Shilon, "Integrating Non-Jewish Immigrants and the Formation of Israel's Ethnic-Civic Nationhood: from Ben-Gurion to the Present," *Middle Eastern Studies*, 53/2 (2016), 166–82; Netanel Fisher, "Joining the Jewish State: Israel's Conversion Policies," in Tudor Parfitt and Netanel Fisher, eds., *Becoming Jewish: New Jews and Emerging Jewish Communities in a Globalised World* (Cambridge, 2016), 224–242.
 7. Strnad, "The Fortune of Survival;" Stoltzfus, *Resistance of the Heart*, 9. The numbers cited in this section refer to people who identified as Jews by faith, not to people identified as Jews by the Nazis.
 8. Strnad, "The Fortune of Survival," 195.
 9. Grossmann, *Jews, Germans, and Allies*, 95.
 10. American Jewish Yearbook, vol. 49 (1947–1948), 366. The sources do not indicate which partner of those intermarriages was Jewish.
 11. Brenner, "East European and German Jews," 58.
 12. Grossmann, *Jews, Germans, and Allies*, 88–100.
 13. *Ibid*, 97.
 14. Report on supply and transportation in Germany, JDC Archives, 5 August 1946, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00037/00741.
 15. *Ibid* and Grossmann, *Jews, Germans, and Allies*, 97–8.
 16. Letter from the former director of the Kultusgemeinde in Austria, 22 January 1947, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00013/00879.
 17. J. S. Silber to JDC New York, 3 April 1947, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00013/00846.
 18. Grossmann, *Jews, Germans, and Allies*, 227–30.
 19. The numbers are from Beth Cohen, *Case Closed: Holocaust Survivors in Post-War America* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2006), 12; Grossmann, *Jews, Germans, and Allies*, 251, 353; Arie Kochavi, "Liberation and Dispersal," in Peter Hayes and John K. Roth, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Holocaust Studies* (New York, 2010), 520–21.
 20. James Rice, JDC Geneva to Theodore Feder, JDC Munich, 23 July 1951, JDC Archives, G45/54/GR/009/0412.
 21. Henry Levy, JDC's European Emigration Headquarters to Samuel Haber, JDC Munich, 11 December 1952, RG 246.1, folder 2540, USNA collection, Centre for Jewish History, New York.
 22. 'Report on Emigration Activities for October 1949,' Emigration Services, Munich, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00112/00538.

23. Memorandum by Irwin Rosen, Director JDC Emigration Headquarters, 25 April 1947, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00176/00591. See also Personal Service Department to Main Office, 8 July 1947, JDC Archives, G/45/54/ADM/009/0845; Charles Jordan to Joseph Schwartz, 9 August 1949, JDC Archives, G/45/54/GR/041/0236; Renee Weinberg, JDC Frankfurt to HIAS-JDC Coordinating Committee, 17 August 1949, JDC Archives, G/45/54/008/0482.
24. 'Voluntary Agencies' Special Programs for Potentially Residual Groups,' IRO, 1 January 1951, JDC Archives, G45/54/ORG/048/0829.
25. Rosen, 25 April 1947, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00176/00591.
26. Weinberg to HIAS-JDC Coordinating Committee, 17 August 1949, JDC Archives, G/45/54/008/0482.
27. Charles Jordan to Dr. J. Schwartz, European Executive Council, 29 August 1949, JDC Archives, G/45/54/ORG/008/0476.
28. On that suspicion, see, for example, Levy to Haber, 11 December 1952, RG 246.1, folder 2540, USNA collection, Centre for Jewish History, New York; for quota numbers, see Cohen, *Case Closed*, 12.
29. Jordan to Schwartz, 29 August 1949, JDC Archives, G/45/54/ORG/008/0476.
30. Cohen, *In War's Wake*, 35–57.
31. Jordan to Rene Weinberg, 26 August 1949, JDC Archives, G45/54/ORG/008/0480.
32. Minutes of meeting between Charles Jordan and officials of the United Services for New Americans (USNA), held 6 and 16 January 1950, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00117/00698. See also 'Report on Emigration Activities for October 1949,' Emigration Services, Munich, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00112/00538.
33. Jordan to Rene Weinberg, 26 August 1949, JDC Archives, G45/54/ORG/008/0480.
34. 'USNA Migration Department Analysis on 24 Cases of Mixed Marriages,' 17 August 1949, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00117/00914.
35. Levy to Haber, 11 December 1952, RG 246.1, folder 2540, USNA collection, Centre for Jewish History, New York.
36. An English translation of the letter is in Joseph Fink, JDC Berlin to Herbert Katzki, JDC Paris, 28 January 1948, JDC Archives, G/45/54/GR/041/0238.
37. Katzki to JDC Berlin, 9 February 1948, JDC Archives, G/45/54/GR/041/0238.
38. Ann Petluck, United Services for New Americans to Charles Jordan, 24 October 1949, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00190/0423; Levy to Haber, 11 December 1952, RG 246.1, folder 2540, USNA collection, Centre for Jewish History, New York.
39. *Ibid.* Levy cited one case in which the connection was indeed not maintained.
40. 'Report on Emigration Activities for October 1949,' Emigration Services, Munich, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00112/00538.
41. Eugene Schoenberger to the Joint's Head Office, New York, 9 August 1946, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00035/01186.
42. Cohen, *Case Closed*, 9, 32–5.
43. Ann Petluck to Charles Jordan, 20 September 1949, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00117/00911.
44. Petluck to Jordan, 24 October 1949, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00190/0423.

45. Petluck to Jordan, 20 September 1949, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00117/00911.
46. Ibid and Petluck to Jordan, 24 October 1949, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00190/0423.
47. Jordan to Rita Stein, JDC New York, 24 April 1950, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00117/00639.
48. John L. Berquist, "Family Structures: Hebrew Bible," in Julia M. O'Brien, ed., *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of the Bible and Gender Studies, Vol. 1* (New York, 2014), 201. See also Tikva Frymer-Kensk, 'Patriarchal Family Relationships and Near Eastern Law,' *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 44(4), 1981, 209–214; William Loader, *Making Sense of Sex: Attitudes Towards Sexuality in Early Jewish and Christian Literature* (Cambridge, 2013), 15.
49. The quotation is from Sylvia Barack Fishman and Daniel Parmer, *Matrilineal Ascent/Patrilineal Descent: The Gender Imbalance in American Jewish Life* (Waltham, MA, 2008), 20; see also Deborah Lipstadt, "The Impact of the Women's Movement on American Jewish Life: An Overview after Twenty Years," *Studies in Contemporary Jewry no.11* (New York, 1995), 87; Joyce Antler, *Jewish Radical Feminism: Voices from the Women's Liberation Movement* (New York, 2018). On the pre-1960s period, see Melissa R. Klapper, *Ballots, Babies, and Banners of Peace American Jewish Women's Activism, 1890–1940* (New York, 2013).
50. To cite just a few examples: Keren McGinity, *Still Jewish: A History of Women and Inter-marriage in America* (New York, 2009); idem, *Marrying Out: Jewish Men, Inter-marriage and Fatherhood* (Bloomington, Ind., 2014); Sylvia Barack Fishman, *Double or nothing?: Jewish Families and Mixed Marriage* (Waltham, Mass., 2004); Jennifer Thompson, *Jewish on Their Own Terms: How Inter-married Couples are Changing American Judaism* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2014).
51. McGinity, *Still Jewish*, 74; *The American Jewish World*, 4 July 1947. For a discussion of the colonial era, see Jonathan Sarna, *American Judaism: A history* (New Haven, 2004), 27–28.
52. Hasia Diner, *The Jews of the United States, 1654 to 2000* (Berkeley, 2004), especially 306–311. The quotation is from p. 306.
53. Cohen, *Case Closed*, 49.
54. Suzanne Rutland, "Resettling the Survivors of the Holocaust in Australia," *Holocaust Studies: A Journal of Culture and History* 16/3 (2010), 33–56. The quotation is from p. 34.
55. Minutes of Conference of Australian Jewish Welfare Societies, Melbourne, 7 and 8 September 1947, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00009/01131.
56. .ibid.
57. Jordan to Joseph Schwartz, 9 June 1949, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00009/00530. See also Jordan to Schwartz, 29 August 1949, JDC Archives, G/45/54/ORG/008/0476; 'Meeting at Adelaide Airport with Mark Mains, 14 September 1949, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00008/0049; Katzki to Moses Leavitt, 31 December 1957, JDC Archives, NY/55-64/CR/013/0736.
58. Jordan to Brand, 11 August 1950, JDC Archives, NY/AR/45-54/00009/00193.
59. <https://www.iataskforce.org/entities/view/197>.

60. <https://www.hias.org/welcome-campaign-congregations>.
61. Ronald Zweig, *German Reparations and the Jewish World: A History of the Claims Conference* (London, 2001), 74–75.
62. See, for examples, McGinity, *Still Jewish*, 123, 129, 145–46; Diner, *The Jews of the United States*, 307; Edward Shapiro, *A Time for Healing: American Jewry Since World War II* (Baltimore, 1992), 24.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Bibliography

- Antler, J. *Jewish Radical Feminism: Voices from the Women's Liberation Movement*. New York: New York University Press, 2018.
- Barack Fishman, S. *Double or Nothing?: Jewish Families and Mixed Marriage*. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2004.
- Barack Fishman, S., and D. Parmer. *Matrilineal Ascent/Patrilineal Descent: The Gender Imbalance in American Jewish Life*. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, 2008.
- Berquist, J. L. "Family Structures: Hebrew Bible." In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Gender Studies*, edited by J. M. O'Brien, 200–205. Vol. 1. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Brenner, M., and N. Frei. "Institutional New Beginning." In *A History of Jews in Germany since 1945: Politics, Culture, and Society*, edited by M. Brenner, 147–175. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2018.
- Brenner, M. "East European and German Jews in Postwar Germany." In *Jews, Germans, Memory: Reconstructions of Jewish Life in Germany*, edited by Y. Michel Bodeman, 49–64. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Bukey, E. B. *Jews and Intermarriage in Nazi Austria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Cohen, B. *Case Closed: Holocaust Survivors in Postwar America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2006.
- Cohen, G. *Daniel, in War's Wake: Europe's Displaced Persons in the Postwar Order*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Diner, H. *The Jews of the United States, 1654 to 2000*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Fisher, N. "Joining the Jewish State: Israel's Conversion Policies." In *Becoming Jewish: New Jews and Emerging Jewish Communities in a Globalized World*, edited by T. Parfitt and N. Fisher, 224–242. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Fisher, N., and A. Shilon. "Integrating Non-Jewish Immigrants and the Formation of Israel's Ethnic-Civic Nationhood: From Ben Gurion to the Present." *Middle Eastern Studies* 53/2 (2016): 166–182.
- Frymer-Kensk, T. "Patriarchal Family Relationships and Near Eastern Law." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 44, no. 4 (1981): 209–214.

- Goldberg, A. *Holocaust Survivors in Canada: Exclusion, Inclusion, Transformation, 1947-1955*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: University of Manitoba Press, 2015.
- Grossmann, A. *Jews, Germans and Allies: Close Encounters in Occupied Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Grossmann, A., and T. Lewinsky. "An Autonomous Society." In *A History of Jews in Germany since 1945: Politics, Culture, and Society*, edited by M. Brenner, 85–111. Bloomington, Ind: Indiana University Press, 2018.
- Hacohen, D. "The Law of Return as an Embodiment of the Link between Israel and the Jews of the Diaspora." *The Journal of Israeli History* 19/1 (1998): 61–89.
- Kaplan, M. *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Klapper, M. *Ballots, Babies, and Banners of Peace: American Jewish Women's Activism, 1890-1940*. New York: New York University Press, 2013.
- Kochavi, A. "Liberation and Dispersal." In *The Oxford Handbook of Holocaust Studies*, edited by P. Hayes and J. K. Roth, 509–523. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Königseder, A., and J. Wetzel. *Waiting for Hope: Jewish Displaced Persons in Post-World War II Germany*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2001.
- Lipstadt, D., "The Impact of the Women's Movement on American Jewish Life: An Overview after Twenty Years," In *Studies in Contemporary Jewry, Vol 11*, 86–98. New York, Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Loader, W. *Making Sense of Sex: Attitudes Towards Sexuality in Early Jewish and Christian Literature*. Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013.
- Mankowitz, Z. *Life between Memory and Hope: The Survivors of the Holocaust in Occupied Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- McGinity, K. *Still Jewish: A History of Women and Intermarriage in America*. New York: New York University Press, 2009.
- McGinity, K. *Marrying Out: Jewish Men, Intermarriage and Fatherhood*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 2014.
- Noaks, J. "The Development of Nazi Policy Towards the German-Jewish "Mischlinge" 1933-1945." *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 34 (1989): 291–354.
- Patt, A. *Finding Home and Homeland: Jewish Youth and Zionism in the Aftermath of the Holocaust*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2009.
- Rutland, S. "Resettling the Survivors of the Holocaust in Australia." *Holocaust Studies: A Journal of Culture and History* 16/3 (2010): 33–56.
- Sarna, J. *American Judaism: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.
- Shapiro, E. *A Time for Healing: American Jewry since World War II*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Stoltzfus, N. *Resistance of the Heart: Intermarriage and the Rosenstrasse Protest in Nazi Germany*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1996.
- Strnad, M. "The Fortune of Survival – Intermarried German Jews in the Dying Breath of the 'Thousand-Year Reich'." *Dapim: Studies on the Holocaust* 29/3 (2015): 173–196.
- Thompson, J. *Jewish on Their Own Terms: How Intermarried Couples are Changing American Judaism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2014.
- Zweig, R. *German Reparations and the Jewish World: A History of the Claims Conference*. London: Frank Cass, 2001.