Section three of the collection, “Pogroms,” includes three essays that address the outbreak of violence against Jews in the first weeks following the 1941 German invasion. The most rigorous and thoroughly documented of these is Andrzej Żbikowski’s “Pogroms in Northeastern Poland: Spontaneous Reactions and German Instigations.” Thorough, balanced, and relying on accounts of surviving Jews and court records from the postwar era, this chapter describes the “spectrum of violence” against Jews during the transition from Soviet to German rule. Analyzing events in more than sixty locations in June and July 1941, Żbikowski confronts several issues crucial to our understanding of the motives for and course of anti-Jewish violence: the credibility of sources such as eyewitness accounts and postwar trial documents of communist Poland’s Security Service; Polish responses to the German invasion; the relative importance of German police or military presence in initiating, perpetuating, or even limiting violence; and the diverse motives for the attacks, whether economic, ideological, or rooted in the desire to exact revenge against the Jews for their alleged collaboration with the Soviets.

Viewed as a whole, Shared History—Divided Memory is a signal contribution to the ongoing discussions of interethnic relations in wartime Polish territory. In challenging historiographical paradigms and engaging new sources, many of its essays break new ground in the field, and some—in particular Rozenblat’s and Żbikowski’s contributions—chart new paths for future research. The volume may not achieve its goal of helping to create a “shared narrative” (p. 17), but it does succeed in bridging narratives that traditionally conflict. In terms of methodology, what connects the essays in this collection is above all their ambitious reliance on previously untapped sources: archived testimonies, memoirs, trial documents, and NKVD records. Thematically, however, all of them are linked by their confrontation with the disputed place of the Jew in Soviet-occupied Poland, for not only are the authors forced to confront the pernicious stereotypes of the Żydokomuna, the Jew as traitor, and the Jew as economic beneficiary of Soviet rule; they are also compelled to examine these stereotypes as motives for hatred, violence, and participation in Nazi Germany’s program of destruction.
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Eichmann’s Men, Hans Safrian (New York: Cambridge University Press in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2010), x + 315 pp., cloth, $80.00, pbk., $23.99.

Seventeen years after its original publication, Eichmanns Männer finally has been translated, thanks to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Since this
Regarding how they did it, Safrian focused primarily on the evolution of the Holocaust from its expulsionist origins and on the processes developed for its achievement. His highly detailed account of the process has been thoroughly developed and expanded by more recent literature. Written at a time when the intentionalist-functionalist debate was fizzling out, Safrian’s work offered a synthesis that differs only in detail from the current consensus among scholars.

Among Safrian’s enduring contributions to the narrative and analysis of the escalation process were his revisions of previously-held beliefs about Eichmann’s creative genius as the presumed author of several central developments. Specifically, Safrian criticized existing scholarship for crediting to Eichmann the “Vienna Model” for the forceful encouragement of Jewish emigration, and for assigning too much credit to Eichmann’s alleged organizational skills in putting it into effect. “Such explanations totally ignore the fundamental sociopolitical dimensions of the indigenous antisemitism of the Ostmark (Austria),” Safrian writes, “even though it is precisely the greed for loot and the Herrenmenschen-Allüren, the pretensions of the members of the ‘Master Race,’ on the part of Austrian anti-semites, and their participation in racist policies that accelerated the criminal logic of exclusion” (p. 2). This one sentence contains Safrian’s primary explanation for the involvement of the Eichmann men and the virulence with which they performed their missions. Well before the Browning-Goldhagen debate over whether the perpetrators were “ordinary men” or “ordinary Germans,” Safrian had portrayed Eichmann’s men as “ordinary Austrians.”

Safrian rejected both the simplistic demonization of the perpetrators that prevailed during the 1940s and 1950s, and, of course, Hannah Arendt’s replacement of that imagery with the imagery of mediocre bureaucrats diligently performing their jobs without any special antisemitic motivations—a model favored by many scholars from the 1960s into the 1990s. In Safrian’s model—which allows for many individual exceptions—antisemitism combined with the unhealthy ego needs of the perpetrators to motivate their behavior.

Safrian developed this theme after tracing Eichmann’s career from its origin in the SS-Sicherheitsdienst (SD) Section on Jewry, II-112. Unfortunately there is no analysis of his superiors and colleagues at this early stage, many of whom played key roles in the development and execution of the Holocaust without sharing Eichmann’s particular characteristics. Thereafter the focus is on Eichmann’s men, that is, those whom he recruited mostly from in and around Vienna to staff his Zentralstelle für jüdische Auswanderung (Central Office for Jewish Emigration). This constitutes Safrian’s major contribution to Täterforschung.
and our understanding of the evolution of perpetrator mentality. With Safrian’s fine biographical sketches of these men and descriptions of their behavior during and after their Nazi careers, a convincing picture of their character and motivation emerges.

They turn out to have exemplified the SD’s propensity to develop “young boy’s clubs”—not the traditional “old boys’ clubs”—as recruitment circles drawing on particular socioeconomic and personality types. This cohort often defied that organization’s elitist intellectual self-image. Instead, it tapped young ne’er-do-wells whose origins in Austria’s antisemitic culture combined with their damaged egos to produce men who avidly acted out an ego-gratifying *Herrenmenschen* identity by brutalizing the helpless Jews over whose fate they reigned. In essence, they were “little Eichmanns,” mostly somewhat younger than their model, without administrative experience, without previous membership in the police or SD (only a few from the SS), and not previously distinguished as rabid antisemites. As the Zentralstellen system expanded across the Reich and became essentially Section IV-D4 of the Gestapo, the men, like Eichmann, would build careers that affirmed their self-importance and enabled their self-aggrandizement while they lorded it over millions of defenseless victims. They became models for numerous colleagues and subordinates who would staff the Zentralstellen and Sonderkommandos that deported Jews and other victims to the ghettos and death camps in the East. Of course, both broader analyses of the *Judenberater* (“Jewish consultants”) and more specific case studies of *Judenreferenten* (“Jewish experts”) subsequently have enriched our picture of the Gestapo-SD perpetrators. Even within Safrian’s relatively small set of heterogeneous perpetrators, however, one needs a broader net in the search for comprehensive explanations of perpetrator motivation.

After establishing the peculiar identity of Eichmann’s sub-set of Jewish specialists, Safrian focused on their role in the transition from forced expulsion to mass murder during the years 1941–1942. The view broadens well beyond the Eichmann men to their collaborators in the Wehrmacht, occupation administrations, Nazi-allied governments, and indigenous populations. Thus Safrian considered the contributions of “ordinary Frenchmen and eastern Europeans,” who also frequently combined indigenous antisemitism with greed for Jewish property as a driving force behind their actions.

Of special interest is the author’s concluding chapter on the postwar adventures of these men. A few met what might be called a just fate in postwar trials. Others came to justice, as did Eichmann, after years of anonymity in Europe or elsewhere. Most, however, escaped with minimal punishment, some—especially in Austria—even finding an honorable rehabilitation. A few, such as Alois Brunner, built profitable careers on their acquired “expertise,” surviving in comfort in places such as Syria.
Thoroughly documented and well translated, Safrian’s study offers valuable insights into a particular subset of perpetrators. Although its treatment of the evolution of the Holocaust may be considered dated, students of historiography will appreciate *Eichmann’s Men* for its significant contributions. One wishes for more prompt English-language translations of such seminal German-language works.

**Note**
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Since Victor Klemperer published his famous 1947 work on the language of the Third Reich, *LTI: Lingua Tertii Imperii*, many scholars, mostly philologists and literary critics, have inquired into the vocabulary of the Nazis. Whereas these studies have tended to favor a static picture of the manipulative power of the Nazi language, Thomas Pegelow Kaplan aims to historicize the topic and embed it in the political and social history of the murder of the Jews. Relying on a revised Foucauldian notion of discourse analysis that focuses on how historical actors’ negotiations of what can be said shapes “truth,” Pegelow Kaplan explores how various actors defined Germanness and Jewishness by engaging in linguistic inclusions and exclusions.

Because he is interested in continuities and discontinuities beyond the major political caesuras, Pegelow Kaplan begins his period of research in April 1928, a time of political stability and inclusionary tendencies. He analyzes five crucial moments in the Nazi politics of exclusion, ending after the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg in October 1946. In order to avoid a top-down perspective, he identifies three discursive levels: the official guidelines issued by the state agencies (such as Goebbels’s ministry and the Reichssippenamt or RSA) that defined the language of belonging and gave meaning to legal provisions such as the Nuremberg Laws; mass media, in particular newspapers that disseminated, confirmed, or contested this language; and personal accounts such as diaries, which