

Panel 1

Who is a Perpetrator? The Changing Construction and Interpretation over Time

Harald Welzer, Center for Interdisciplinary Memory Research, Essen

“Reference Frames of Group Violence”

Human beings reach a decision after having interpreted and defined the situations they are situated in. Their definition is crucial for what they do, irrespective of how irrational, wrong or crazy their decision seems to be from the outside. These definitions are carried out against the background of reference frames which constitute the organised structure for perceptions and in this way for interpretations, decisions and actions.

However, the concept of reference frames has barely been elaborated; the frame analytical approaches of Maurice Halbwachs and also Erving Goffman have been developed decades ago, but have hardly been carried on by cultural science. This is unfortunate, since frame analysis allows for a much higher level of alienation towards social phenomena than other approaches within cultural science that, as a general rule, deal with incomprehensible behaviour in a normative way, characterising it as “absurd”, “irrational”, “delusional” or “pathological”. However, those terms are no analytical terms, but rather moral ones – thus linked to the reference frames of those persons using them.

An approach that tries to reconstruct reference frames of actions has up to date only been elaborated heuristically (Goffman 1980) respectively exemplary (Browning 1993; Waller 2002; Welzer 2005). According to Goffman, reference frames are organised structures of actions and experience (1980: 18 et sqq.) It is assumed here that human beings make their decisions against the background of complex presumptions of which only the lesser part actually reaches the level of conscious reflection (Klein 2003), a presumption that is shared by psychology and social psychology, but also by cognitive neuroscience (Roth 2001; 2003; Markowitsch & Welzer 2005; Welzer 2002). Other elements of reference frames to which actors orient their perceptions, interpretations and decisions, are natural background assumptions of everyday life (“That’s just the way it is.”, “This is the way it’s done!”), more abstract background conceptions (racial vs. concepts of equality; concepts of justice), socialised attitudes and forms of habitus, demands created in a certain situation, the actions of the others, decided instructions und much more. Those factors constitute in a gradual concretion the reference frame along which the individual actor constitutes his perception of the situation and therewith his conclusions and decisions.

Besides the reference frame, the socio-structural situation in which the agent is located and also the change of situation (for example through external effects such as war or violence) by interactions and group processes is relevant for the actions of persons. These factors constitute the figurative dimension of action. A certain act always takes place within several contexts. Against the background of such an approach it is not only possible to describe what actors have actually done, but also how they perceived the respective situation as a person, which situational conditions have determined their behaviour and under which supra-individual, beyond the borders of subjective attribution, social and normative basic conditions their particular behaviour took place (cf. in summary Waller 2002; Welzer 2005).

In the following, I would like to display a central aspect of the reference frames of perpetrators of the Holocaust, namely those that did not act non-morally, but within the perceived context of a national socialist morale.

National socialist morale

“If in later years a researcher, who only knows Jews from hearsay, rakes up the documents in the *Stadtarchiv* (town archive) Dortmund, he or she will discover that German pawn offices have marginally participated in the solution of the Jewish Question in Germany.” This is written with visible satisfaction by the head of the municipal pawn office in Dortmund in August 1941.¹ This proud sentence discloses a lot of what may be described as „national socialist morale“, as this officeholder assumes several certainties:

1. that it was sound and reasonable to contribute to the solution of the Jewish Question,
2. that it was sound and reasonable to solve it in this way so that descendants, the historians of an imagined future, only knew Jews from hearsay. This means that the imagined future is a component of the current decisions for actions,
3. that it is a painful, yet profitable job to contribute to the desired state, and
4. that this future is characterised by a newly defined „universe of common obligation“ to which Jews do not belong.

1. In his broad analysis about the „destruction of the European Jews“, Raul Hilberg introduces the chapter on perpetrators with the following sentences: “The Germans killed more than five million Jews. This outbreak of violence did not come out of the blue; it took place, because the perpetrators ascribed a meaning to it.”² By “meaning“ Hilberg refers to the certainty which was at that time commonly shared within the German society, that there was a „Jewish Question“ which needed an urgent solution – just the way the head of the pawn office expresses it. Such a common certainty never becomes accepted when it merely exists as pure ideology, but rather when it becomes part of a societal practice in which the social, juridical and material exclusion becomes the day-to-day exercised form of dealing with a group of persons – for example in the sense Hannah Arendt has phrased it: “The Nazis actually acted as though the whole world would be controlled by Jews and conspiracy was needed to be rescued. The racial doctrine was no longer a theory with a highly doubtful scientific value, but was realised every day within an efficient world in whose frame it would have been highly ‘unrealistic’ to doubt the account of reality.”³ This estimation can be almost inversely be proved by a sentence by Joseph Goebbels who notes in his diary on 20 August, 1941: “You only have to imagine what the Jews would do to us if they had the power to know what to do, since we are in power.”⁴

The cascade of decrees and laws introduced by 1933 which, for example, prohibited Jewish professors or judges the exercise of their professions, supported by initiatives of officials from sports and clubs that excluded Jewish boxers from boxing clubs or

¹ Kwiet, Konrad, according to (Anm.). See the original quote: „Wenn in späteren Jahren einmal ein Forscher, der die Juden nur vom Hörensagen kennt, die Akten im Stadtarchiv Dortmund durchwühlt, wird er die Erkenntnis gewinnen, dass auch die deutschen Pfandleihanstalten zu ihrem geringen Teil an der Lösung der Judenfrage in Deutschland mitgearbeitet haben.“

² See the original quote: „Die Deutschen töteten mehr als fünf Millionen Juden. Dieser Gewaltausbruch kam nicht aus heiterem Himmel; er fand statt, weil ihm die Täter einen Sinn beimaßen.“

³ (Anm.). See the original quote: „Die Nazis handelten wirklich so, als ob die Welt von Juden beherrscht sei und einer Gegenverschwörung bedürfe, um gerettet zu werden. Die Rassedoktrin war nicht mehr eine Theorie höchst zweifelhaften wissenschaftlichen Wertes, sondern wurde jeden Tag innerhalb einer funktionierenden Welt realisiert, in deren Rahmen es höchst ‚unrealistisch‘ gewesen wäre, ihren Realitätswert zu bezweifeln.“

⁴ According to . See the original quote: „Man braucht sich nur vorzustellen, was die Juden mit uns machen würden, wenn sie die Macht besäßen, um zu wissen, was man tun muß, da wir die Macht besitzen.“

allotment holders from their garden, gradually, yet appallingly quickly, generated a societal reality in which two categories of human beings were created: those which belonged as „Aryan“ or „German“ human beings to the universe of common certainty, thus those to social values such as mercy, solidarity and altruism were still applied to. And those which did not belong this universe and who the more constituted a problem that seemed to need a solution, the more the process of exclusion radicalised. If „the Jew“ from the perspective of racial-biological and folkish theories on the one side and from the perspective of everyday consciousness on the other appeared as enemy of the Germans par excellence, then this may seem to be absurd or even completely irrational from today’s view – but does not change the fact that this perception formed the basis at that time to preach and implement certain actions which resulted in the well and truly real death of millions of human beings. And not only this: this interpretation realised in actions also caused the sustainable establishment of a reality in which groups which were turned into victims, were henceforth regarded within the frame of this definition: „They primarily remembered in terms of what has happened to them.“⁵

At this point it might make sense to refer to the fact that perpetrators and victims psychologically do *not* differ from each other, before one of the groups is involved in a process that is composed of exclusion, deprivation, deportation and finally extermination of the victims by the other. Nevertheless, perpetrators and victims constitute a part of a common social figuration; their perceptions, interpretations and actions are related to each other, even though within a frame of an extreme power imbalance. The head of the pawn office has experienced and shaped this figuration on the part of those who belonged to the majority of society and who were certainly able to approve the last consequence of this process, not from the beginning, but certainly at the end. At the same point in time, in August 1941, the others who constituted the suffering part of the same process were already dead or were situated in a condition of acute threat or, if they had not been able to emigrate, were at the others mercy and thus nearly dead. In this way, the increasing impoverishment and marginalisation of the victims during the years after 1933 and the simultaneously growing ignorance and hostility of the perpetrators are two sides of the same procedure during which the normative standards, the things that were considered „normal“, changed. The protocol of the Wannsee conference in January 1942 entails a formulation about „**verproletarisierten Juden**“ (proletarianized jews)⁶. Before they could finally be annihilated, the victims were brought into a condition that not only excluded them on an administrative basis, but from the social majority of society.

2. The imagination that one fine day one would only know about the Jews „from hearsay“ is no private idea of our head of the pawnshop; elsewhere the exhibits for the Jewish Museum of the SS ⁷in Prague were collected at the same time and the

⁵ (Anm.). See the original quote: „Man erinnert sich ihrer hauptsächlich im Sinne dessen, was ihnen allen widerfuhr.“

⁶ Protocol of a meeting of Reinhard Heydrichs with representatives of the higher administration (Oberste Reichsbehörde) and officers of the *Sicherheitspolizei* and the *SD* on 20 January 1941, concerns the „final solution of the Jewish Question“, in,

⁷ Predominantly Jewish scientists tried to collect, conserve and analyse the legacy from Bohemia and Moravia. „Their situation was strange, presumably unique in the history of the museums of the world: Nearly every night, a museum, which had only possessed a relatively small, provincial collection, disposed of a gigantic refuge of most valuable credentials Jewish culture; [...] This could have been the great dream of every single person working in a museum, if the circumstances had not been that dreadfully. Since every single object, that came to them, was as silent witness of the violence that was directed towards the Jews, a document of the destruction of ancient, developed culture. And with the progression of the war it became obvious that these objects were the only things that were supposed to remain under German rule. For everybody, the persons working in the museums, too, were by and by removed and did not return, despite some exceptions.“ See the original quote: „Ihre Situation war kurios, vermutlich einzigartig in der Geschichte der Museen dieser Welt: Beinahe über Nacht verfügte ein Museum, das vorher nur eine relativ kleine, provinzielle Sammlung besessen hatte, über einen gigantischen Hort wertvollster Zeugnisse der jüdischen Kultur; [...] Das hätte der Wunschtraum eines jeden Museologen gewesen sein können, wenn nicht die Umstände so furchtbar gewesen wären. Denn schließlich

racial anthropologists meticulously collected data to maintain the former existence of the extinct race for ensuing ages. What does this rather bizarre idea of firstly excluding, than depredating, deporting and finally killing human beings and then making them an element of their own history in form of a museum actually mean? On the one hand, it means that the extermination of a group has only then been completed when also the memories about this group have been exterminated or predominantly defined. Totalitarian states, as for example Stalinism has shown very clearly, carry out practical politics of memory in a very intensive way,⁸ because, as for example demonstrated in the literary utopia “1984” or “Fahrenheit 451”, the control over the memory is necessary for the complete possession of human beings. In this respect, a national socialist composure of the history of the Jews belongs to the overall project of the strategies of extermination to which the head of the pawnshop makes a contribution, too, since they seem to make sense to him. In this world of thought, Jews, and this is above all remarkable, are conceptualised as already extinct, and those preliminary drafts of the state that is reached later are a central element of a national socialist morale.

In every moment, actions refer to previous and future elements, to previous elements since they resort to experience, to future elements since an achieved aim is part of the concept and its implementation. When conducting an action, the anticipation of a later consequence forms a basis. Every experience, as Alfred Schütz argues, “carries protentions of events whose direct succession is expected [...], and it carries anticipations to whom the current experience is connected.”⁹ Thereby, there are anticipations of temporarily far away results, for instance about other societal conditions, that are perceived in the mode of the future II simple: It will have happened. This time is a highly complex mental operation, since it assumes that one can look back at something that has emerged in the future, as for example W.G. Sebald ascribes to the *Volksgenossen*, “in August 1942 as the spikes of the sixth army had reached the Volga and when not few dreamed about how they would settle after the war in a manor with a cherry garden near the Don.”¹⁰ Schütz calls this dreaming ahead an “anticipated retrospection”, and exactly those retrospections are the driving force for the thinking and action of the head of the pawnshop as well as for curators or racial anthropologists and for all the countless other persons who participated in the extermination of the Jews.

The protagonists of the “Third Reich” drew a great deal of their energy from anticipated retrospections; a prototypical figure is Albert Speer, who even developed a theory of the value of ruins (“Ruinenwerttheorie”), which created monumental structures of the “Thousand Year Reich” for a future in which only the ruins would announce the former size of the Reich.¹¹ The occupation, which was absolutely self-evident, of towns and countries, their definition as pure raw material for the own utopia of creation, can also be exemplified by a diary entry of the above cited Erich

war jedes einzelne Objekt, das zu ihnen kam, ein stummer Zeuge der Gewalt, die den Juden angetan wurde, ein Dokument der Zerstörung einer uralten, gewachsenen Kultur. Und mit fortschreiten des Krieges wurde klar, dass diese Gegenstände das Einzige waren, was von den Juden unter deutscher Herrschaft beliebt sollte. Denn alle, auch die Museumsarbeiter selber, wurden nach und nach abtransportiert und kehrten mit ganz wenigen Ausnahmen nicht mehr zurück.“ (Ibid., p. 234)

⁸ Practical policy of memory is analogue to the policy of exclusion, which never precedes purely ideologically or theoretically, effective, because it changes reality. “The allegation that Moscow has only one underground is only a lie as long as the Bolsheviks do not have the power to destroy the others.“ (Anm.)

⁹ . See the original quote: „trägt Protentionen von Ereignissen mit sich, deren unmittelbare Nachfolge erwartet wird [...], und sie trägt Antizipationen von temporal entfernten Ereignissen mit sich, mit denen die gegenwärtige Erfahrung erwartungsgemäß verbunden ist.“

¹⁰ . See the original quote: „im August 1942, als die Spitzen der sechsten Armee die Wolga erreicht hatten und als nicht wenige davon träumten, wie sie nach dem Krieg in den Kirschgärten am stillen Don auf einem Landgut sich niederlassen wollten.“

¹¹ .

von dem Bach-Zelewski, who visits the captured Minsk and thereby argues: "The opera is built in the Bolshevik style and would have to disappear later."¹² (14.8.1941) Hitler originally pursued the idea to destroy the French capital after the conquest which was abandoned after a tourist trip of the "Führer" to Paris in favour of a more constructive alternative: "Prepare a decree," he told Albert Speer, "in which I command the complete reopening of the buildings in Berlin...Wasn't Paris nice? Yet, Berlin has to be nicer! I often considered destroying Paris [...], but when Berlin is ready, Paris will only be a shadow. Why should we destroy it then?"¹³

Other prototypical projects, which are driven by anticipated retrospectives, are in National Socialism the "racial" pure "*Volksgemeinschaft*" or the settlement of the Eastern area; accompanied by the persecution of the Jews and their extermination, the euthanasia, experiments on human beings in the concentration camps, the murder and deportations in the conquered countries. In this regard, one should not forget that National Socialism focuses on the youngest functional elite of all modern societies – "Goebbels was 35 years old, Heydrich 28, Speer 27, Eichmann 26, Mengele 21, Himmler and Frank 32 at the point of the takeover [...]. They established, in a destructive sense, the most successful generational project of the latest history."¹⁴ Also, the less prominent men of the functional elite were about thirty, well educated and highly committed, and they addressed themselves to their tasks with a lot of energy, since the „Third Reich“ seemed to have promised them a soon „Realisation of the Utopian“ (Hans Mommsen).¹⁵ If one considers the destructive energy that was invested in the production of weapons (and was to a considerable part based on forced labour), the plans for the Eastern settlement, the project of extermination, if one sees the gigantic dimensions of buildings such as the Strength through Joy- building Prora on Ruegen or the subterranean production facilities such as Mittelbau-Dora in the Harz Mountains with one's own eyes, then one understands the potential that unfolds when human beings possess a scope for implementation and creation for their own wishes, hopes and energies, however morally negative and destructive they may be.

3. The realisation of the Utopian affords a lot of work. As we can see with our head of the pawn office, work can also be a pleasure, when it follows a certain goal that is appreciated by the working person and of whose achievement he or she can be proud of, thus when his or her administration "has partly contributed to the solution of the Jewish Question in Germany". The proudness results from the active participation in a common project – and this being a rather abstract form of participation in the historical mission of the "*Führer*", and in the concrete form of conducting the own tasks which are indirectly or (in the case of the head of the pawn office) directly linked to this mission or are only subjectively being perceived as such.

The work of the SS group leader von dem Bach-Zelewski was directly linked to the military and exterminatory aspects of this mission; his diary is full of complaints about obstacles constraining his work caused by disabled officers of the *Wehrmacht* and the SS, about incorrect decisions made by higher instances, about scepticism towards the strategies and tactics of the military. The downside of these complaints is

¹² See the original quote: „Die Oper ist im jetzigen bolschewistischen Stil gebaut und müsste später verschwinden.“

¹³ . See the original quote: „Bereiten Sie einen Erlaß worin dem ich die volle Wiederaufnahme der Bauten in Berlin anordne... War Paris nicht schön? Aber Berlin muß viel schöner werden! Ich habe mir früher oft überlegt, ob man Paris nicht zerstören müsse, [...] aber wenn wir in Berlin fertig sind, wird Paris nur noch ein Schatten sein. Warum sollen wir es zerstören?"

¹⁴ (Anm.). See the original quote: „zum Zeitpunkt der Machtübernahme 1933 war Goebbels 35 Jahre alt, Heydrich 28, Speer 27, Eichmann 26, Mengele 21, Himmler und Frank waren 32. [...] Sie errichteten das im zerstörerischen Sinn erfolgreichste Generationsprojekt der Neuere Geschichte.“

¹⁵ An analysis of SS-leaders at the *Rasse- und Siedlungshauptamt* of the SS concludes that 76 percent of this group were younger than 40 at the time of the outbreak of the war. Similarly, the level of education is astonishing: 40 of them had an academic degree, thereof 21 a doctor's degree, another five were professors and two already habilitated. See (Anm.).

the self-perception of a committed protagonist of an historical mission who tries to accomplish the things in terms of the *Führer*, in terms of the *Reichsführer* SS and on behalf of himself.

Von dem Bach-Zelewski's diary reports on the resolute intervention against the sexual intemperance of his people ("My house has to stay clean", 5/9/1941)¹⁶, does not tolerate incorrectness of subordinates (19/1/1942)¹⁷, and constantly complains about the "adversaries", "cowards" and "hedgers" amongst his own people, whereby he develops his greatest incomprehension towards those persons who seemingly act towards their own end, thus harming the common mission. His own attitude is made up of restlessness and selflessness: "I got to know every single man of my flag. I care for the families of my SS men as if their where my own." (27/6/1941)¹⁸ After Himmler hat visited the occupied Mogilev on 27 September 1941, von dem Bach noted: " I have not often seen the *Reichsführer* that outgoing. He was content with everything I had done. My clean accommodations appealed to him very much, since the completely destroyed Mogilev appeared as contrast [...]. During the joint meal, white tablecloth and flowers, clean orderly and female servants, a little musical entertainment of a Russian piano virtuoso and a balalaika player." (27/10/1941).¹⁹ Clearly, the proudness to have pleased the *Reichsführer* is conceivable here, yet, directly after this description von dem Bach makes an reflection that articulates his own motivation, his deep belief to be part of a cultural mission: "We Germans should not abandon our cultural needs exactly here, if we do not want to decline to the level of this Eastern race."

The fact that these reports are riddled with a form of realisation of cultural needs, such as „I ordered my company to execute the male population of the village“ (7/8/1941)²⁰, does not foil this work ethic, but rather underscores it: von dem Bach and with him countless others accomplished their mission in a deep belief about the necessity of the associated tasks. And coming close to the border of his capacities, this only documents his definition of the situation and this work ethic; as Himmler signals via radio message the early permission for his holiday, he disgustedly answers: "The comment of the *Reichsführer* is incomprehensible to me, since I was supposed to leave in October, but have always refused to take holiday during movements at the front. [...] I am disgusted that I am supposed to take holidays before the final pacification at the front (19/12/1941).²¹

Even when Himmlers answers two days later: „Dear Bach, I have read your Ft. which pleasure and delight“ (21.12.41)²², Bach's attitude cannot be interpreted as authoritarian and oriented towards his career alone: It is about something for him, and his definition of the task which he himself and the German cultural nation are confronted with, requires prioritisation of the necessary completion of his work to personal trouble.

In his autobiographical records, the commandant Rudolf Höß states not to have been "happy since the beginning of the mass execution in Auschwitz". "I was dissatisfied with myself. And also the main task, the never ending work and the unreliability of the personnel. Not to be understood and heard by my superiors. Truly, no enjoyable and desirable condition."²³ The connection of "Auschwitz" and "happiness" was no

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 (Anm.). See the original quote: „Ich wurde unzufrieden mit mir selbst. Dann noch die Hauptaufgabe, die nie abreißende Arbeit und die Unzuverlässigkeit der Mitarbeiter. Das Nichtverstanden- und Nichtgehörtwerden von meinen

antagonism at least for the commandant himself – if there had not been frustration about missing achievements, the ignorance of the personnel, the exhausting aspects of his employment. The mass execution requires a lot of work so that the fortune of the commandant is clouded.

His complaint not to have been happy since the beginning of the mass execution refers by no means to the moral implication of his official tasks, but rather to the connected technical problems and inability of his personnel that complicate his completion of his tasks. If one uses force towards oneself and reads the autobiographic credentials of perpetrators such as Höß and von dem Bach-Zelewski and then suspends to the knowledge about the projects they have worked to the point of exhaustion, then first and foremost one aspect becomes clear: the actors of this type have not only acted within the frame of a perceived acquittal, but their definition of an acquittal consisted of exceeding the requested degree, *to do more*, than they were expected to do. Here, within the mobilisation of such a motivation that certainly corresponds with transmitted deontology and with proudness of work and production, one of the fatale strengths of the national socialist system can be found, and this mobilisation was only possible because the actors were deeply committed to the sense of this exhausting duty and were willing to do their best.

4. However, the project they were committed to was based on the definition that there was a „Jewish Question“ that desperately needed a solution. The generalisation of this definition is, as stated above, a question for the practice; Peter Longerich has impressively demonstrated that the “Jewish policy“ was the central constituent of the national socialist structural change of the public sphere. “The central regime repeatedly reduced the complex problem it was confronted with to the unsolved “Jewish Question“ and centred it in its policy. Thereby, the regime codified anti-Semitic patterns of interpretation as binding interpretation of the reality that did not allow for contradiction. Within this process, the regime enforced certain behaviour patterns of the majority of the population for the Jewish minority that, carried on and enhanced by propaganda, was supposed to express the population’s compliance with the “Jewish policy“.²⁴

The meaning for the social micro level of everyday life from January 1933 onwards can be impressively read by Viktor Klemperer, Lilly Jahn oder Sebastian Haffner. Lilly Jahn, a Jewish physician, married to an “Aryan“ doctor in a small village near Kassel was completely isolated as early as in 1933; friends and acquaintances break the ties; Lilly herself, up to then an accepted and liked physician, has to give up her work so that at least the surgery of her husband may remain. When she went shopping, “she always looked at the ground to avoid embarrassing people having to greet her”.²⁵ The enormous dynamic of the process of denying solidarity in national socialist Germany has up to date not become a subject matter of social psychological analysis, although it offers alarming evidence for the apparently given possibilities to re-format the normative and social structure in only a few minutes and to establish a specific morale, in this case the national socialist morale. Michael Wildt has recently pointed to the fact how openly brutal the everyday prosecution of Jewish citizens took

Vorgesetzten. Wahrlich kein erfreulicher und wünschenswerter Zustand.“

²⁴ (annotation 4). See the original quote: “Das Regime reduzierte wiederholt die komplexen Problemlagen, denen es sich gegenüber sah, auf die ungelöste ‚Judenfrage‘ und stellte diese in den Mittelpunkt seiner Politik. Damit schrieb das Regime antisemitische Deutungsmuster als verbindliche, Widerspruch ausschließende Interpretation der Wirklichkeit fest. Es ordnete innen- und außenpolitische, militärische, soziale, wirtschaftliche und kulturelle Phänomene einem alles beherrschenden antijüdischen Diskurs unter. Im Zuge dieses Prozesses setzte das Regime gleichzeitig bestimmte Verhaltensmuster der Bevölkerungsmehrheit gegenüber der jüdischen Minderheit durch, die – durch die Propaganda aufgegriffen und verstärkt – die Zustimmung der Bevölkerung zur ‚Judenpolitik‘ zum Ausdruck bringen sollten.“

²⁵ . See the original quote: „blickte sie stets nur zu Boden, um niemanden in die Verlegenheit zu bringen, sie grüßen zu müssen.“

place from March 1933 onwards and which role especially young people played in this form of public exercise of violence. One cannot speak of a “silent” prosecution of the Jews during the first years of National Socialism as it has been stated on various other occasions.²⁶

Sebastian Haffner has described the enormously quick process of societal reorganisation during the year 1933 from his point of view; his demonstration until today constitutes the only systematic documentation of a rapid structural change of the public sphere during the year of Hitler’s so-called takeover. Here, a pitiless self-analysis of a contemporary takes place, who exceedingly critically and disgustedly registers the establishment of the new conditions after January 1933, but is anyhow involved in this process of reorganisation and changes himself. Yet, what distinguishes him from his contemporaries is mainly the fact that he is conscious about the reorganisation of his own psycho-social condition.

Haffner characterises a process which also comprises the behavioural norms of the individual members of society. In March 1933, two months after Hitler’s takeover, Haffner, being a young court assessor, sits in the library of the superior Court of Justice, when SA-members search the room for Jewish personnel. This operation proceeds, as Haffner records, astonishingly unspectacular: “Everything went fine. The (Jewish) judges took off their toga and were modest and went home in plain clothes, and were flanked by SS-personnel down the stairs. There only was trouble in the study. A Jewish lawyer put up a fuss and was beaten.”²⁷

Haffner himself observes this event in the library from far away and hopes that it may end soon. Yet finally, the SA also appears in the reading room: “The door was pulled open, brown uniforms welled into the room, and one, apparently the leader, called with a sounding and bouncing voice: ‘Non-Aryans are supposed to immediately leave the pub.’ I noticed that he used the formal expression ‘Non-Aryans’ and the informal expression ‘pub’. Again, somebody answered [...]: ‘They have already left!’ Our constable stood in such a posture as though he wanted to touch his cap with his hands. My heart was batting. What could be done? How could one retain the composure? Ignore, avoid being seen! I lowered down to my document.

Mechanically, I read some sentences: ‘Incorrect, but also insignificant is the allegation of the defendant...’ ‘Do not notice!

A brown uniform approached me and stood in front of me: ‘Are you Aryan?’ Before I could even bethink, I answered: ‘Yes.’ A scrutiny on my nose – and he retreated.

Blood surged into my face. I felt, a moment too late, the disgrace, the defeat. I had said ‘yes’. Well, I was an ‘Aryan’, for God’s sake. I did not lie. But I had allowed to let worse things to happen.”²⁸

‘Worse things’ from Haffner’s point of view was to ignore how the Jewish colleagues and superiors were led away, and furthermore there was a decision to be made: not

²⁶ . Also compare . On the thesis of silent persecution see .

²⁷ . See the original quote: „Es war alles überaus glatt gegangen. Die [jüdischen] Richter hatten ihre Togen ausgezogen und waren bescheiden und zivil aus dem Hause gegangen, die Treppe hinunter flankiert von aufgestellten SA-Leuten. Nur im Anwaltszimmer war es etwas wild zugegangen. Ein jüdischer Anwalt hatte ‚Menkenke gemacht‘ und war verprügelt worden.“

²⁸ See the original quote: „Die Tür wurde aufgerissen, braune Uniformen quollen herein, und einer, offenbar der Anführer, rief mit schallender, strammer Ausrufestimme: ‚Nichtarier haben sofort das Lokal zu verlassen!‘ Es fiel mir auf, daß er den gewählten Ausdruck ‚Nichtarier‘ und den höchst ungewählten ‚Lokal‘ verwendete. Wieder antwortete einer [...]: ‚Sind schon raus!‘ Unsere Wachtmeister standen in einer Haltung da, als wollten sie die Hand an die Mütze legen. Mir schlug das Herz. Was konnte man tun? Wie wahrte man seine Haltung? Ignorieren, sich gar nicht sehen lassen! Ich senkte mich auf mein Aktenstück. Ich las mechanisch irgendwelche Sätze: ‚Unrichtig, aber auch unerheblich ist die Behauptung des Beklagten...‘ Keine Notiz nehmen! Indem kam eine braune Uniform auf mich zu und machte Front vor mir: ‚Sind Sie arisch?‘ Ehe ich mich besinnen konnte, hatte ich geantwortet: ‚Ja.‘ Ein prüfender Blick auf meine Nase – und er retriierte. Mir aber schoß das Blut ins Gesicht. Ich empfand, einen Augenblick zu spät, die Blamage, die Niederlage. Ich hatte ‚ja‘ gesagt! Nun ja, ich war ein ‚Arier‘, in Gottes Namen. Ich hatte nicht gelogen. Ich hatte nur viel Schlimmeres geschehen lassen.“

to notice the events, despite of internal contraction, despite of precise observation. For political reasons, Haffner immigrated to England a few years later, and one will be able to say that he too was only a follower. This is the reason why we are able to read from his sensitive description of the changing individual and collective behaviour how the dynamic modification of behavioural norms takes place. Three psychological mechanisms play an important role here. Firstly, the fear of repression which requires no further explanation becomes effective here, especially in a situation that is new, without precedent and cannot be really judged. If one does not know the rules, one tends not to act. In Haffner's case, the indirect threat by the SA-personnel turns into considerable uncertainty and leads to the decision to delve into the documents, thus to construct a form of virtual shelter or, as Erving Goffman would say, to create a 'territory of self' to protect oneself.²⁹

At this point, another mechanism becomes effective that generally has fatal consequences: that we tend to legitimate things we have conducted with an ambivalent feeling, to harmonise those things with our self-perception. This is the reason why it often subjectively seems to be more reasonable to repeat an action than questioning it by correcting it. If one decides to cover the first time, the chance will increase that one will behave in the same way in an analogous situation a second, third or fourth time. And vice versa it will be more unlikely that one will depart from a chosen path. And this in turn forms the basis for the third constitutional mechanism: that one, as part of a concurrent social reorganisation, would rebel against the events at the beginning, but tolerates them later on. With regards to the described assault, if the Jewish colleagues would have not been "modest", but had been beaten, injured or tortured by the SA in Haffner's presence, his tolerance limit might have been exceeded – which was not the case in an earlier situation where nothing really 'bad' occurred.

With the further progress of the reorganisation process, far more profound injuries of moral self-expectations are accepted than one would have tolerated at the beginning. This mechanism explains the irritating acceptance of the exclusion of Jews from the German societal majority even on behalf of those persons who at first did not seem to be anti-Semitic. Looking away, accepting, participating and becoming active are no completely different behaviour patterns, but phases of a continuum of changing behavioural norms.

In any case, a few months later, the sensitive and critical Sebastian Haffner finds himself later in a "community camp for articulated clerks" in Jüterborg and sees himself how he sings national socialist songs, completes athletics, is trained in the world-view and how he keeps cave whilst another articulated clerk is being subdued to a *vehmgericht*, thus collectively beaten.

In the evenings, one listens to Hitler's speech in the radio. 'When he finished, the worst thing happened. The music signalled: Germany above all, and everybody lifted their arms. Some, such as me, hesitated. It was horribly degrading. Yet, weren't we supposed to pass our exam? I had, for the first time, a feeling strong like flavour in the mouth, a feeling, the feeling: 'It doesn't count. It's not me, it's not true.' And with this feeling I also lifted my arm and held him in the air, about three minutes long, as long as the Germany and the Horst-Wessels-song lasted. Most of them joint in singing, ragged and booming. I moved my mouth and fake the singing, just as you do it in church.

²⁹ Goffman defines a territory of self as symbolic or social spheres that individuals use to protect themselves from endangerments of their own bodily or psychological integrity. With their help one tries to avoid being touched by other bodies or inhaling the vapour of other people and the like. The possibilities to maintain the territories of self are manifold, yet limited. One can entrench oneself behind books or newspapers and thus establish a symbolic, intimate and private sphere. See

Yet, everybody had their arms up in the air and we stood in front of the eyeless radio that pulled our arms just like the puppet player moves the arms of his marionettes, and we sang or we pretended to sing; everybody being the Gestapo of everybody else.”³⁰

Haffner impressively demonstrates not only the successive reorganisation process of the behaviour which he originally had accepted and considered acceptable, but also the fine adjustment of the common social practice. The reorganisation of the behavioural norm is neither an external nor an individual procedure, but one that constitutes itself in a mutual affirmation that is social action itself. In this way, and namely with regards to every “internal“ resistance and despite his criticism, also Sebastian Haffner turns into a comrade amongst others, and this only means to preserve his personally perceived integrity is made of recourse to an inner alienation: ”I was wearing a uniform with a swastika. I stood upright and cleaned my gun. But none of this really counted. I wasn’t asked before I did it. It wasn’t me who did it. It was a game, and I played a role.“³¹

As we can see, it is this distance that allows the participation in a behavioural model which the person itself would not have permitted a little earlier. If one interpreted these changing behavioural norms as “moral corruption“ or “loss of inhibitions“ to explain the perceptions, actions and behavioural patterns of human beings during National Socialism, one miss out on an important aspect: Here, the “normal“, interpersonal behaviour is being changed *as a whole*, and the orientations of the individual contribute to this change in a very subtle, unnoticed way. And the most astonishing fact is how quickly this can proceed.

This change is noticed by outsiders rather by insiders, thus from observers that are not part of the same process. Teddy, one of Haffner’s friends who moved to Paris, comes to Berlin in summer 1933 to find a completely foreign world: “I could see from Teddy’s face how she gasped for breath. Very innocent she asked for pubs and cabarets that were long ago closed down, for actors who did not live anymore. She had read a lot in the newspapers, yet now, in reality, everything was completely different – less sensational perhaps, however much more difficult to understand and to tolerate. The flags with the swastika everywhere, the brown uniforms you could not oversee: on the bus, in the café, on the street, in the zoo - everywhere they spread out like an occupation army. The constant drumming, the military marches day and night – strange, Teddy listened and asked what was going on. She didn’t know that it would rather be a reason to aks what was going on if the there was no military marches. The red posters with the symbols of the announcements of executions on the pillars, nearly every morning, next to the posters of the cinemas and the summer restaurants; I hardly noticed them anymore, but Teddy shivered when she innocently studies the pillars. During a walk I suddenly pushed her into a doorway. She didn’t understand and was frighedened and asked: ‘What’s going on?’

‘There is an SA flag’, I said, as though I had said the most natural thing on earth.

‘Oh well! So?’

³⁰ (annotation 27). See the original quote: „Als er ausgeredet hatte, kam das Schlimmste. Die Musik signalisierte: Deutschland über alles, und alles hob die Arme. Ein paar mochten, gleich mir, zögern. Es hatte so etwas scheuüchlich Entwürdigendes. Aber wollten wir unser Examen machen oder nicht? Ich hatte, zum ersten Mal, ein Gefühl so stark wie ein Geschmack im Munde – das Gefühl: ‚Es zählt ja nicht. Ich bin es ja gar nicht, es gilt nicht.‘ Und mit diesem Gefühl hob auch ich den Arm und hielt ihn ausgestreckt in die Luft, ungefähr drei Minuten lang. So lange dauern das Deutschland- und Horst-Wessel-Lied. Die meisten sangen mit, zackig und dröhnend. Ich bewegte ein wenig die Lippen und markierte Gesang, wie man es in der Kirche beim Choralsingen tut. Aber die Arme hatten alle in der Luft, und so standen wir vor dem augenlosen Radioapparat, der nun die Arme hochzog wie ein Puppenspieler die Arme seiner Marionetten, und sangen oder taten so, als ob wir sangen; jeder die Gestapo des anderen

³¹ . See the original quote: „Ich trug eine Uniform mit Hakenkreuzbinde. Ich stand stramm und putzte mein Gewehr. Aber das alles galt ja gar nicht. Ich war nicht gefragt worden, ehe ich es tat. Es war ja gar nicht ich, der es tat. Es war ein Spiel, und ich spielte eine Rolle.“

‘Would you want to greet her?’

‘No, why?’

‘You have to do that, when you see one on the street.’

‘What does that mean? Have to? Just don’t do it.’

Poor Teddy, she truly came from another world! I didn’t answer, I just made a morbid face.³²

Haffner’s sensitivity in noticing those subtle, in their single steps perhaps seemingly harmless changes of perception and orientation that proceeded in himself, as National Socialism assumed the societal sovereignty of interpretation and action, makes the reading of this book a very disturbing experience. From a social-psychological perspective, this experience raises a critical question: How is it possible, that those changes in behavioural norms, which are accepted and valid for everyone, may proceed in such a speed as it is demonstrated as we can observe it with regards to the example of the early stages of the “Third Reich“?

As a result, the normative changes mean that one group of members of the society is gradually excluded from the “universe of common obligation“ which still applies to the others, for the members of the majority society, but becomes exclusive now. This procedure is, as stated above, the central assumption for the emergence of genocidal processes. This exclusion proceeds along the definition that the group which is supposed to be excluded *per se*, and this means every single member, constitutes a threat for the well-being and lastly for the existence of the majority society – which accordingly finds salvation to disarm the group which is perceived as threatening and, as a last consequence, to destroy it. This is the reason why every known process of extermination is preceded by a definition of the threatening group, and this definition is followed by an accelerating social, psychological, material and juridical deprivation which converts the firstly only asserted differentness of the excluded group into a reality that is formed and sensed by the contemporaries. In the extremely one-sided power structure after the process of extermination from 1941 onwards, the social universes of the members of the perpetrator society and of the members of the victim groups are nearly completely separated; the establishment of the Yellow Star in September 1941 now makes the possibility to cross the border between those universes impossible. Now, perpetrators and victims are opposed as members of two completely different groups of human beings – just as the noble, “Aryan Herrenmenschen“ had imagined it.

Primo Levi describes a situation in Auschwitz that embodies this contra-humane relation in a concise way. Levi, who was a chemist, was assigned to a “chemistry command“, but had to pass a chemistry test carried out by an SS physician. Levi enters the room of the physician named Pannwitz: “Pannwitz is tall, skinny and blond; he has eyes, hair and a nose, as all the Germany will have, and he is dreadfully

³² . See the original quote: “Es war Teddy geradezu anzusehen, wie sie nach Luft schnappte. Ganz harmlos fragte sie noch nach Lokalen und Kabarettts, die längst geschlossen waren, nach Schauspielern, die es längst nicht mehr gab. Sie hatte natürlich vieles in den Zeitungen gelesen, aber nun, in der Wirklichkeit, war doch alles ganz anders – weniger sensationell vielleicht, aber viel schwerer zu verstehen und viel schwerer zu ertragen. Die Hakenkreuzfahnen überall, die braunen Uniformen, denen man nirgends auskam: im Autobus, im Café, auf der Straße, im Tiergarten – überall machte es sich breit wie eine Besatzungsarmee. Das ständige Trommeln, die Marschmusik Tag und Nacht – komisch, Teddy horchte noch auf und fragte, was denn jetzt los sei. Sie wußte noch nicht, daß man eher Anlaß zum Fragen gehabt hätte, wenn es einmal keine Marschmusik gegeben hätte. Die roten Plakate mit den Hinrichtungs-Bekanntmachungen an den Säulen, fast jeden Morgen, neben den Plakaten der Kinos und der Sommerrestaurants; ich sah sie schon gar nicht mehr, aber Teddy schauderte noch plötzlich zusammen, wenn sie harmlos die Säule studierte. Auf einem Spaziergang zog ich sie plötzlich in einen Hausflur. Sie begriff es gar nicht und fragte ganz erschreckt: ‚Was ist denn los?‘ Da kommt eine SA-Fahne‘, sagte ich, wie man das Selbstverständlichste von der Welt sagt. ‚Naja, und?‘ ‚Und willst Du sie vielleicht grüßen?‘ ‚Nein, wieso?‘ ‚Das muß man, wenn man ihr auf der Straße begegnet.‘ ‚Was heißt muß? Man tuts einfach nicht.‘ Die arme Teddy, sie kam wirklich aus einer anderen Welt! Ich antwortete gar nicht, ich zog nur eine trübsinnige Grimasse.“

enthroned behind a massive desk. I, prisoner 174517, stand in his workroom, a real workroom, clear, clean and neat, and it feels as though I need to leave stains everywhere I go.

As he finishes writing, he looks up and looks at me.

From the outset onwards, I had to think about doctor Pannwitz from different angles. I questioned myself what might have went on inside this human being and what he did besides polymerisation and Germanic consciousness; since I am a free person again, I especially wish to meet him once again, not because of revengefulness, but because of curiosity towards the human soul.

Such a look has never existed between human beings. Yet, if I were able to explain this look in every single peculiarity which was interchanged between two creatures as if they were separated by a glass wall of an aquarium and who inhabited different elements, then I would have been able to explain the character of the insanity of the Third Reich.³³

Levi names the core of the operation mode of the national socialist system that lies in the solution of a perceived and sensed problem which has been considered necessary by an oversized majority and experienced by the minority. The cause for this problem is the fundamental, resistant and non-terminable difference of two groups of people, for which reason the policy of exclusion and extermination, following Raul Hilberg and Peter Longerich³⁴, is no jobbing of the national socialist dominance, but its theoretical and practical core. Then the "Jewish Question", justified by science, history and social policy, adopted from the point of view of the regime becomes part of a collective point of reference as well as the relay station to reduce reality. It is exactly here, where the enormous energy is set free which is characteristic for the short story of the "Third Reich".

Longerich argues in this regard that between 1933 and 1941 several phases of anti-Jewish policy can be identified which respectively followed the motive to compress complex domestic and external problems "into the frame of interpretation of an anti-Jewish defence: One reacted to the international criticism on the new government – in a critical phase during the process of the takeover – with the 'boycott' of German Jews; the regime reacted to the complicated situation of the year 1935 with segregation and the legal discrimination of Jews that were in the first instance held responsible for the culminating problems; and according to the same pattern the pogrom followed the external strains of the year 1938 and the complete elimination of the Jews from the German society."³⁵

The changeover to the decided extermination policy coincidences with the aggression towards the Soviet Union, its rapid broadening and finally the totalisation

³³ See the original quote: „Pannwitz ist hochgewachsen, mager und blond; er hat Augen, Haare und Nase, wie alle Deutschen sie haben müssen, und er thront fürchterlich hinter seinem wuchtigen Schreibtisch. Ich, Häftling 174517, stehe in seinem Arbeitszimmer, einem richtigen Arbeitszimmer, klar, sauber und ordentlich, und mir ist, als müsste ich überall, wo ich hinkomme, Schmutzflecken hinterlassen. Wie er mit Schreiben fertig ist, hebt er die Augen und sieht mich an. Von Stund an habe ich oft und unter verschiedenen Aspekten an diesen Doktor Pannwitz denken müssen. Ich habe mich gefragt, was wohl im Innern dieses Menschen vorgegangen sein mag und womit er neben der Polymerisation und dem germanischen Bewusstsein seine Zeit ausfüllte; seit ich wieder ein freier Mensch bin, wünsche ich mir besonders, ihm noch einmal zu begegnen, nicht aus Rachsucht, sondern aus Neugierde auf die menschliche Seele. Denn zwischen Menschen hat es einen solchen Blick nie gegeben. Könnte ich mir aber bis ins letzte die Eigenart jenes Blickes erklären, der wie durch die Glaswand eines Aquariums zwischen zwei Lebewesen getauscht wurde, die verschiedene Elemente bewohnen, so hätte ich damit auch das Wesen des Wahnsinns im Dritten Reich erklärt.“

³⁴

³⁵ (annotation 4). See the original quote: „in den Interpretationsrahmen eines antijüdischen Abwehrkampfes zu pressen: Auf die internationale Kritik an der neuen Regierung reagierte man – in einer kritischen Phase des Machtergreifungsprozesses – mit dem ‚Boycott‘ der deutschen Juden; die komplizierte Situation des Jahres 1935 beantwortete das Regime mit der Segregation und rechtlichen Diskriminierung der Juden, die man in erster Linie für die kumulierenden Probleme verantwortlich machte; und nach dem gleichen Muster folgten auf die außenpolitischen Spannungen des Jahres 1938 der Pogrom und die völlige Ausschaltung der Juden aus der deutschen Gesellschaft.“

coincidences with the deflating awareness that this part of the war would not end with a quick victory. The constant intensification of the anti-Jewish policy at the same time means a focusing of all social and political questions to the “dejudaisation“ of the society thought as being expansive. “This anti-Semitic frame of interpretation”, as Longerich states, “was not only a binding interpretation pattern within the discourse dominated by National Socialists, but also a behavioural pattern for everyday behaviour of the citizens in public: Also, the avoidance of Jewish shops, the abandoning of personal contacts with Jews, but also the role as passive eyewitnesses which can be observed in large parts of the population during the November pogrom belong to this aspect.”³⁶

In this way, correlating actions become apparent where a changed normative structure is not enforced vertically from top to bottom, but where in a practical and increasingly sharpening way the relation between human beings is being de-solidarised and a new social “normality“ is being established. In 1941, in this normality, an average *Volksgenosse* may perceive it as unthinkable that Jews are being killed, but does not notice anything remarkable about the fact that place name signs announce the fact that this village should be free of Jews, that park benches should not be used by Jews, that Jewish citizens were completely disfranchised etc. In the same fashion, a civil servant of the Department of Foreign Affairs, Albrecht von Kassel, elaborates on his understanding of the term “final solution” during a trial of war criminals:

“The term “final solution” has been used in different ways. 1936 the term only meant that Jews had to leave Germany, but they were supposed to be plundered then; it wasn’t nice, but not criminal...”

Judge Maguire: Was this the correct translation?

Dr. Becker: I would like to ask you to repeat the sentence.

Answer: I said, it unfortunately wasn’t nice, but not criminal. We didn’t want to take their lives, only their money.”³⁷

In such a statement that could be accompanied by numerous others the normative shift can be observed which took place and was established between 1933 and 1945 in the assumptive world³⁸ of the *Volksgenossen*. And this generalised change of the normative structure provides the mental basis for the implementation of the “final solution for the Jewish Question” as it was implemented or tolerated by completely normal men and women from 1941 onwards. Two statements of nurses, who were accused of having poisoned patients in the sanatorium Meseritz-Obrawalde:

Question: “You have mentioned that you were a civil servant and therefore felt obliged to implement every instruction. Have you never thought about the legitimacy of your tasks and actions? Would you have also committed a different crime, such as thievery, perjury, robbery etc, if one had requested you as civil servant to do so?”

³⁶ . See the original quote: „Der antisemitische Interpretationsrahmen war nicht nur verbindliches Deutungsmuster innerhalb des durch die Nationalsozialisten bestimmten Diskurses, sondern setzte auch Verhaltensmuster für das Alltagsverhalten der Bürger in der Öffentlichkeit: Dazu gehörte das Meiden jüdischer Geschäfte, die Aufgabe persönlicher Kontakte zu Juden, aber auch die Rolle des sich passiv verhaltenden Augenzeugen, die sich bei weiten Teilen der Bevölkerung während des Novemberpogroms beobachten lässt.“

³⁷ According to (annotation 2). See the original quote: „Dieser Ausdruck ‚Endlösung‘ ist ja in verschiedenem Sinne gebraucht worden. 1936 bedeutete Endlösung ja nur, dass die Juden alle Deutschland verlassen sollten, und dabei sollten sie allerdings ausgeplündert werden; es war nicht schön, aber auch nicht erbrecherisch... Richter Maguire: War das soeben eine richtige Übersetzung? Dr. Becker: Ich bitte Sie, noch einmal den Satz zu wiederholen. Antwort: Ich habe gesagt, es war leider nicht schön, aber nicht verbrecherisch. Man wollte ihnen nicht ans Leben, sondern man wollte ihnen nur das Geld wegnehmen.“

³⁸ Assumptive world is a term coined by Alfred Schütz to describe the subjective perception of the things that are naturally being assigned to the „being just so“ in the world.

Answer: "I would not have conducted a bank robbery or a thievery, since you don't do such things. Furthermore, thievery would not have belonged to my tasks. To interposed questions I'll respond that I would have never conducted thievery. I know that you are not allowed to do something like this. In bad times, I was a saleswoman and I would have been easy for me then. But I never did anything, since I just knew; you aren't allowed to do that. I already learned as a child: You are not allowed to steal."

Another nurse:

"If somebody objects me whether I would have conducted thievery in response to the respective order, I just say that I wouldn't have done it. The application of drugs, even though for the killing of insane persons, I indeed considered my official duty that I could not deny."³⁹

The variability of moral conceptions becomes apparent where the killing is perceived as moral duty, as clearly showed. The national socialist morale elevates the extermination of human beings to the state of a moral duty, but maintains the other transmitted norms such as the prohibition of thievery. "From now on", as Omer Bartov writes, "one can say that a non-moral character⁴⁰ has been ascribed to conventional moral – namely then, when it contradicts with the higher morale, to kill for the greater good of the *Volksgemeinschaft*, the race, the blood, the nature etc.

³⁹ . See the original quote: Frage: „Sie haben eben erwähnt, daß Sie Beamtin waren und sich deswegen verpflichtet fühlten, jeden an Sie gerichteten Auftrag zu erfüllen. Haben Sie sich nie Gedanken über die Rechtmäßigkeit der Aufträge und Ihres Handelns gemacht? Hätten Sie beispielsweise irgendein anderes Verbrechen, wie Diebstahl, Meineid, Raub usw. begangen, wenn man es von Ihnen als Beamtin gefordert hätte?“Antwort: „Einen Bankraub oder einen Diebstahl hätte ich nicht ausgeführt, weil man so etwas nicht tut. Außerdem hätte ein Diebstahl nicht zu meinen Aufgaben gehört. Auf Zwischenfragen sage ich, daß ich einen Diebstahl nie begangen hätte. Ich weiß, daß man so etwas nicht tun darf. In der schlechten Zeit war ich Verkäuferin und ich hätte damals leicht Gelegenheit gehabt. Aber so etwas habe ich nie getan, weil ich einfach wußte, das darf man nicht tun. Schon als Kind hatte ich gelernt: Du darfst nicht stehlen.“ Wenn mir vorgehalten wird, ob ich auf einen entsprechenden Befehl hin einen Diebstahl ausgeführt hätte, so sage ich hierzu, daß ich das nicht getan hätte. Die Verabreichung von Medikamenten und sei es auch zum Zwecke der Tötung von Geisteskranken gewesen, sah ich allerdings als eine mir obliegende Dienstpflicht an, die ich nicht verweigern durfte.“