

Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar and Helping the Persecuted

Scope of the Research and Some Reflections

Frank Dabba Smith

.....

Abstract

As a study of corporate and individual behaviour in the context of Nazi Germany, my research concerning Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar – the manufacturer of the Leica camera – is situated and seeks to build on the insights of scholars writing histories of businesses during this period. Leitz's highly unusual activities to help approximately eighty Jews and non-Jews, throughout the duration of the Nazi regime, involved training, employment, financial aid, and assistance both to leave Germany and when abroad. Where necessary, Leitz also intervened to help employees subjected to criminal prosecution. Ambivalence is present when discussing Leitz's increasingly conformist public face and producing sophisticated armaments, designed and built by in-house experts. Leitz also relied on forced labourers brought from Ukraine. These ambivalent activities, along with maintaining an extensive range of critical relationships with those holding authority, crucially enabled Ernst Leitz to survive and retain ownership of his firm.

Keywords: altruism, dialogue, Germany, Holocaust, Leica, manufacturing, Nazism, photography

.....

The Scope of the Research

The little-known subject of the activities of the firm Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar and its sole owner Ernst Leitz II (born 1871 in Wetzlar; died 1956 in Giessen) during the period of the Third Reich has appeared, for the most part, in non-academic sources.¹ This industrial firm, already renowned since the mid nineteenth century for its innovative microscopes, introduced the 35mm format Leica camera to the world in 1925. Leicas, as well as a system of lenses and other accessories, are still produced today in



Wetzlar an-der-Lahn (less than fifty miles north of Frankfurt am-Main), albeit by different factory owners.

Aside from the doctoral thesis by Willi Erb published in 1956, with its collected statistics, there have apparently been no academic studies devoted to the history of the origins and evolution of the firm of Ernst Leitz.² Erb's survey is derived primarily from public Leitz company circulars, brochures as well as the *Festschriften* published on the 100th anniversary of the company in 1949. One theme of this postwar study is the family-run nature of the firm and the mutual loyalty between the owners and the workers, arising out of both economic interdependent and socially altruistic motivations, giving rise to a paternalistic factory-community (*Werksgemeinschaft*) that included such benefits as health insurance, loans and housing programmes for employees.³ In addition, for the sake of fostering individual and group morale, there were inclusive company traditions of annual recreational trips to the Rhine for the entire workforce and cultural activities popular in German firms such as choral singing.⁴ Unmentioned in Erb's account is that, as social personalities, both Ernst Leitz I and II preferred the company of factory workers and that Ernst Leitz II's office door was kept fully open and displayed a sign saying 'enter without knocking' as an indication of his sheer personal accessibility.⁵

In terms of the guiding ethos of the Leitz company, there is, briefly discussed in Willi Erb's 1956 account, Ernst Leitz II's sustained and deep involvement in liberal and progressive political activity.⁶ This vital aspect, during the period after the First World War and enduring throughout the existence of the Weimar Republic, represented a public expression of Leitz's social values and underpinned the enduring mutual antagonism between him and the Nazi regime. Ernst Leitz II was an active supporter of the Weimar Republic and its parliamentary democratic form of government through his involvement in the left-liberal German Democratic Party (Deutsche Demokratische Partei, DDP) founded on 16 November 1918.⁷ Both the founders and members of the DDP included a disproportionately high number of Jews in their ranks of middle-class business people, journalists and academics.⁸ Individual Jews and communal groups were motivated to support the DDP as part of their effort to counter the rise of vitriolic forms of antisemitism.⁹ In this regard, the Nazis loathed the DDP and spread much hostile propaganda concerning its allegedly endemic Jewishness.

Early DDP stalwarts included Theodor Heuss (born 1884 in Brackenheim; died 1963 in Stuttgart), later the first president of the post-World War II Bundesrepublik. Leitz helped Heuss to survive financially during the Nazi years by giving him and his wife Elly Heuss-Knapp advertisement writing assignments.¹⁰ The minister who married Theodor and

Elly Heuss in 1908 was Dr Albert Schweitzer, a close friend of the bride and later associated with the Leitz family.¹¹ In addition to Heuss, another prominent DDP parliamentarian, Reverend Adolf Korell (born 1872 in Ober-Gleen; died 1941 in Eschbach), was supported financially by Ernst Leitz II after he was hounded from public life by the Nazis.¹²

In the locale of Wetzlar, Ernst Leitz II was elected to the office of town councillor in 1916 and was re-elected in 1919 as a member of the DDP, formed in 1918.¹³ He stood as a DDP candidate for the Reichstag in 1924 and its successor party, the Deutsche Staatspartei, in 1932. During the 1924 campaign he confronted Nazi Jakob Sprenger, future Gauleiter of Hesse-Nassau during the Third Reich, over his intransigent position concerning the Dawes Plan, an American attempt to ease the harshest economic measures of the Versailles Treaty.¹⁴ While campaigning on 27 April 1932, Leitz referred publicly to the Nazi SA members as being ‘brown apes’ (*braune Affen*).¹⁵ Remarkably, he was re-elected to the town council on 9 March 1933, serving until the end of that year.¹⁶

Ernst Leitz II also joined and financially supported the Reichsbanner Schwarz-Rot-Gold, a formal coalition consisting primarily of Social Democratic Party (SPD) adherents along with members of the DDP and the German Centre Party (Deutsche Zentrumspartei). Formed in 1924 after the failed coup attempts by the Nazis (in Munich) and the Communists (in Hamburg) against the Weimar government, the aim of the Reichsbanner organisation was to enrol First World War military veterans and youth to protect the new and vulnerable democratic state. Street demonstrations were staged – including in Wetzlar – and violent clashes fought against the Nazis and Communists. Before being forcibly disbanded by the Nazis in 1933, there were reputedly three million members nationwide.¹⁷ The 1929 membership list for the Wetzlar chapters of the Reichsbanner – at a time when national membership of that political organisation was perceived to be overly dominated by the SPD, partly due to the rightward swing and decline in membership of the DDP – includes Ernst Leitz II; senior Leitz employees Franz Bergmann, Professor Max Berek and Alfred Türk; Jewish Leitz employee Carl Brinkmann; and Wetzlar Jewish residents Georg Rabow, Jakob Rosenthal, Josef Rosenthal and Nathan Rosenthal (II).¹⁸ Berek, Türk, Brinkmann and the three Rosenthals, in the face of Nazi persecution, were later helped by Leitz.

While acknowledging Erb’s postwar dissertation, it is now vital to place the actions of Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar during the Holocaust within the historiography concerning the behaviour of other established German firms. The historiography that is most relevant to my research concerning the behaviour of a German business during the time of the Nazi regime is a much more recent empirical approach due, in many instances, to the

decisions by some German companies to engage independent academics to write unvarnished corporate histories in the wake of legal actions concerning the exploitation of forced labour during the Nazi period. Another factor was the greater interest after the reunification of Germany facilitated by the availability of archival material unexamined previously by outside academics. The key work in this approach has been conducted by scholars such as Johannes Bähr, Paul Erker, Gerald Feldman, Harold James, Peter Hayes and others.¹⁹

From the start, it must be acknowledged that such companies functioned within an unusually 'highly controlled economic environment'.²⁰ The histories of the firms considered in the monographs published by these researchers may be characterised as offering nuanced findings as regards questions of complicity versus coercion or willing versus reluctant collaboration when it came to political and economic engagement with the Nazi state and its policies. Ascertaining the motives of business leaders may be profoundly difficult, but the above historians do identify factors such as the drive for personal survival and pride in a professional's ability to adapt to any circumstances and thus ensure the maintenance and flourishing of one's company during difficult times.²¹ Some executives maintained these values and yet managed to help persecuted people, and these examples are of particular interest in this study. In terms of this historiography, ultimately, the question may be posed, how were Leitz's activities both similar and different to these examples of collegiality and compassion, and what might be gleaned to help us understand how Ernst Leitz was able to get away with surviving and maintaining ownership of his company during the period of Nazi rule?

One of the most prominent figures in this area of historical research was Gerald D. Feldman (1937–2007), who studied leading German financial enterprises during the Nazi period.²² In considering the basic question of whether such institutions were 'reluctant or willing collaborators' with the Nazi government, Feldman responds from an empirical perspective, claiming that all too much discussion has long taken place within 'a playground for ideologists, journalists, and others for whom sound historical practice and method have often been of minor importance or of no importance at all'.²³

For Feldman and his fellow empiricists, the relative reluctance or willingness of a given business concern to collaborate with the Nazis may not be considered as a static or consistent picture but, rather, as complex and variegated images depending, for example, on particular constellations of times, places and events as well as the changing interests and concerns of the individual actors within a company. The overall history of the twelve years of Nazi rule was one of constant and overwhelming

political, economic and military change. These and other aspects must be taken into account, especially as such extenuating pressures and turmoil greatly affected the behaviour of individuals, as well as networks of inter-personal interactions that served as contexts for their various activities.

A renowned example of a liberal-minded non-Jewish industrialist operating in Germany who was engaged in helping the persecuted was Robert Bosch of Stuttgart, whose vast enterprise manufactured, for example, spark plugs and starting motors. Bosch and his company helped some individuals but primarily aided communal charity organisations, such as the *Judische Gemeinde*, headed by his friend, Rabbi Dr Leo Baeck.²⁴ Bosch's deputy, Hans Walz, to whom much of this activity was delegated, was also pivotal in monetarily supporting Carl Goerdeler, a man who acted with 'individual courage ... to become a leading figure in the conspiratorial opposition to Hitler's regime'.²⁵ Robert Bosch survived, with his company intact, until his death in 1942 (due to illness), through a combination of providing vital equipment on a vast scale for Germany's rearmament and largely withdrawing from public life.

Bosch specifically delegated his involvement in helping persecuted Jews and opposing Hitler to socially adept and courageous managers such as Hans Walz who were effective in exploiting corrupt Nazi officials through bribery. It is not fully clear, however, exactly how Hans Walz survived the duration of the Nazi regime, as Carl Goerdeler did confess the names of many supporters involved in the conspiracy to assassinate Hitler on 20 July 1944. Walz's continued bribery of Gottlob Berger was indeed a factor as he rose to the highly influential position of chief of the headquarters of the SS and was deeply involved in the successful expansion of the *Waffen-SS*.²⁶ It is quite possible that Berger did successfully influence Heinrich Himmler and Roland Freisler, the notorious judge of the *Volksgerichtshof* show trials who sentenced numerous 20 July conspirators to death by hanging. All senior Bosch executives who could have been implicated in the plot survived the war.²⁷ This is an extraordinarily complex and ambivalent history culminating in the post-Nuremberg Trial imprisonment of Hans Walz as a war criminal for utilising forced labour – including Jews imprisoned in concentration camps – on a vast scale, and yet, upon his release, receiving recognition as a 'Righteous Gentile' by Yad Vashem.

In contrast to Bosch, Leitz and his much smaller company helped, on an individual basis, about eighty Jews and non-Jews who were persecuted by the Nazi regime. This assistance was rendered in three primary but non-exclusive ways: first, giving training and/or employment to Jews, half-Jews, non-Jews married to Jews and, also, persecuted non-Jews who had engaged in democratic politics prior to the Nazi assumption of

power; second, helping Jews, half-Jews and non-Jews married to Jews to leave Germany and, in many instances, enabling them to succeed when abroad; and, third, intervening to help employees subjected to legal problems, especially due to the increasingly draconian nature of the Nazi regime over time with regard to those denounced in terms of their political loyalty.

The first two categories of help became increasingly intertwined as the situation for Jews living in Nazi Germany worsened and until emigration was no longer possible. Long-term employment, including apprenticeships and subsequent promotions, at the Leitz factory in Wetzlar was given, beginning in the very early days of the Third Reich, to young people who later were assisted to leave Germany. For half-Jews and some non-Jews married to Jews remaining in Germany, long-term employment at the Leitz factory was also arranged. Most of those given employment by Leitz, whether eventually leaving Germany or remaining there, had no previous association with the photographic industry. Such long-term vocational training for Jews in non-Jewish-owned businesses was rare from 1933 in Nazi Germany.²⁸ Fully sustaining and stable employment of half-Jews and those married to Jews in non-Jewish-owned firms became increasingly unusual over the life of the Nazi regime as well.²⁹

Research has also revealed the help that Ernst Leitz II gave to those facing different legal problems brought upon them by racist Nazi policies and authorities, apart from offering either long- or short-term training and/or employment or other forms of financial assistance before emigrating from Germany. This aspect involves Leitz's ability, to a limited but important extent, to intervene on behalf of individuals. What all of these incidents have in common is Ernst Leitz II using his personal prestige and/or his extensive network of personal relationships to exercise influence on authorities at a local, regional and even national level.

The two principal sources of historical material utilised in researching Leitz's help to the persecuted have consisted of documentary material and interviews. Documents have been discovered and located in archives by me personally; some were provided by archivists at my request while others were sought on my behalf by the grandson of Ernst Leitz II, Dr Knut Kühn-Leitz. Other material was either given or sought on my behalf by Doris Ebertz, a Wetzlar author specialising in the heritage and fate of the town's Jews.³⁰ Further documents were provided by the individuals or descendants of those discussed in this project whom I had either located personally or to whom I was referred by Knut Kühn-Leitz. Other individual sources for interviews and documents contacted me as a result of the publicity arising out of my research being reported in the news media.

When it comes to the acquiring of documentary materials by researchers, there are certainly methodological concerns for those writing histories of aspects of the behaviour of businesses during the Holocaust. As Gerald Feldman notes, in many instances executives were not interested in corporate histories involving politics or anything challenging mythical legacies, and archives remained off-limits to researchers.³¹ Due to destruction by bombings during war or, for example, disposal by uninterested new owners of subsequently divided firms moving from a previous location, potentially invaluable historical material was lost. The latter was the case in the 1980s with material concerning Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar that would have been especially relevant to this project. The existence of employee records would have made it possible, for example, to corroborate further the postwar statements made by Ernst Leitz II as well as the descendants of those who were helped as refugees.

Another aspect of my research has sought to explore, in contrast, the nature of the public face displayed by Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar while operating as a business concern under the constraints of the dictatorial Nazi regime. While Dr Ernst Leitz II, the owner of the company, as well as certain family members and employees were active in different ways in giving help to many persecuted people from 1933 to 1945, maintaining a public image in conformity with the Nazis' outlook was increasingly necessary as the regime further implemented its racial, economic and military aims. For example, in Nazi Germany, advertising as well as social functions such as public displays of ritual and trips for workers were imbued with shared symbolic content serving to bind people together into a cult that promised to satisfy their deepest longings. Key questions that I have sought to answer include: to what extent did Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar participate publicly in this public discourse of unity and racial purity?; at what point and why did he finally give in to joining the NSDAP?; and, further, given the pervasiveness of this Nazi framework, was it at all possible for a firm and its owner to articulate other deeply held alternative values publicly and, if so, to what extent, when and how?

As historians Daniel H. Magilow and Lisa Silverman note, some questions that may be raised to interrogate such visual historical material critically might include: 'Who made it? Where, when, why and under what circumstances? What audiences did it initially target, and how have these audiences evolved? Has the representation itself changed over time and, if so, how? What popular and scholarly discussions have developed around these representations?'³² Within my research, there are considerable problems with respect to exact dating and determining the periodical sources for advertisements, for example, but attempting critical engagement with these visual representations occurring in Nazi Germany is,

nonetheless, at least partly possible. I have also situated the Leica camera and its advertisements within the thinking of leading scholars working in areas such as the place of photographs and the activity of photographing during the time of the Nazi regime.

In addition to being concerned with the public face of Leitz, a further key subject is that of the production of military equipment for the Nazi regime. The usage of forced labour, including 700–800 Ukrainian women working in the Leitz factory from 1942, has been a source of controversy, as with countless other German manufacturing firms contributing to the war effort. There is some evidence, however, that Leitz family members personally sought to ameliorate conditions for the *Zwangsarbeiterinnen*, and this earned the recrimination of the Gestapo, charged by the regime with overseeing the treatment of such foreigners labouring within Germany.

Despite an early denunciation of Leitz made to the war department by the head of the Hessen Chamber of Commerce Carl Lüer and the regime's awareness of Ernst Leitz's non-compliance with Nazi racial views, the firm supplied the German military with in-house designed binoculars, cameras and lenses (especially for the Luftwaffe and the propaganda units attached to the military), aiming devices for long-distance artillery guns and V2 rockets (*Richtkreis-Kollimator 12m K12*) and gun sights for Panzer tanks (*Turmzielfernrohr*). Later, Leitz worked closely with AEG to develop active infrared night vision equipment for tanks, which became especially important after Allied domination of Germany's airspace made such vehicles vulnerable targets during the daytime. The equipment that was fully developed by in-house experts certainly made the Leitz organisation strategically very important to the government and, at critical junctures, ensured the Leitz family's survival as well as the independence of their company.

In conclusion, the topic of the behaviour of the firm Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar and its sole owner Ernst Leitz II during the Third Reich, until my research, has been written about primarily in non-academic spheres, and there has been controversy about this famous entrepreneur and his eponymous firm. Unfortunately, there has been insufficient engagement with the relevant historiography to offer a genuinely helpful and illuminating contribution to understanding the complexities of human behaviour within the context of the relationships between businesses and the Nazi dictatorship. In both German and Jewish settings, viewing actions in black and white terms as either that of a 'saint' or 'sinner' makes this history less relevant to us today, as human beings, universally subject to the mercurial political and economic pressures that can tip a society into dominating and persecuting innocent individuals or groups. Such concerns, in part, have inspired me to delve into this topic in depth,

as a researcher, in order to attempt to examine the evidence critically and to consider it within a historical context. In sum, my contribution to the historiography is bringing to light the activities of a rare liberal businessman operating within Germany throughout the duration of the Nazi regime and helping the persecuted most often in appropriate ways. I have also sought to explain how this compassionate man survived and prevented the Nazis from seizing control of his world-famous company. I hope that illuminating the history of the tightrope act for this 'left-liberal' entrepreneur will make an important aspect of the academic field of corporate and individual behaviour in the context of Nazi Germany a less neglected subject.

Some Reflections

The seeds of my enduring passion for this research can be traced all the way back to my using Leica cameras constantly from a very young age. My involvement with photography has endured for nearly fifty years, beginning as a young amateur, later becoming a professional documentary photographer and, latterly, using Leicas as tools to enhance my work as a rabbi and teacher as well as for producing internationally exhibited art projects.

While an undergraduate student at the University of California at Berkeley in the mid 1970s, I read a very brief account concerning how Norman Lipton, the managing editor of *Popular Photography* magazine, first learned that Ernst Leitz II, the owner of the factory in Germany producing Leica cameras, was involved with 'the saving of Jews' during the 1930s. As a job-hunter during the American economic depression in 1937, he met an employee of the Leitz agency in New York, Gus Wolfman, 'who report[ed] that not only was Leitz not anti-Semitic [*sic*] but that the company was engaged in the most remarkable endeavour: the saving of Jews':

... a Jew named [Augustus] Gus Wolfman ... was working for E. Leitz, New York, the American branch of Leica. 'Come to work for us here', said Wolfman to the incredulous Lipton. It seems that Dr. Leitz hired Jews in Germany in the late 1930s and gave them a short training course in photography at Wetzlar; then as the Europa and Bremen left port, those same Jews with Leicas around their necks for 'stake' money were on board, having been given passage to New York. At the dock, they were met by Alfred Bach [Boch], head of Leitz in the U.S. and Lipton's boss. The refugees were housed in the Great Northern Hotel, while the Leica people found them jobs.³³

My fascination with Snyder's report of Lipton's recollection was revived twenty years later when, as a recently ordained rabbi based in London, I found an expanded version in a book compiled and self-published by George Gilbert, an amateur historian of photography who had retired from working in the advertising industry on behalf of clients including photographic equipment manufacturers:

Six months after Kristalnacht [*sic*] ... groups of 20 to 30 men and women began to arrive at the New York dock from both the SS Bremen and the SS Hamburg. They were immediately shepherded to the Great Northern Hotel near the Leitz New York office. The travellers, mostly Jews and a few Catholics, were from the E. Leitz Gmbh [*sic*] Wetzlar plant. All had been designated as 'technicians', 'sales representatives', 'camera demonstrators', and 'store display personnel' to qualify for Exit Visas [*sic*] from a German government anxious to expand export. Among them were Wetzlar citizens who had never worked for Leitz who, nonetheless, paid for their passage and support [*sic*]. The process of finding work in the photographic industry was the responsibility of the U.S. Leica office. American camera stores, repair centers and other centers opened employment for the refugees, who arrived in similar groups up to September 1939.

America was not the only destination. Ernst Leitz III [*sic*], president of the firm, arranged for Jewish Leica dealers to escape Germany to Shanghai, Johannesburg, Sidney [*sic*] – wherever the company had contacts. Ernst Leitz' [*sic*] daughter Elsie undertook a mission of her own, helping Jewish women to escape to Switzerland. There the Leitz family had relatives and friends. On one fateful trip, the Swiss border guard held a group for German guards. Elsie was imprisoned in the Frankfurt jail until her father obtained her release with a guarantee that she would not be visiting Swiss relatives again.³⁴

Having previously researched the diverse usages of photography in the Holocaust for my rabbinic thesis, I felt motivated to contact George Gilbert in hopes of being introduced to Norman Lipton and to discern for myself historical fact from error both within and between these two versions of the story.³⁵ In 1997, I travelled to New York to meet Lipton and Gilbert. Both shared many personal anecdotes about themselves but, unfortunately, neither was able or willing to offer sufficient documentary evidence to support either claim. In hopes of further encouraging them, I suggested a collaboration in order to research more fully the topic of Leitz's apparent altruism, which might eventually result in a publication. Following this meeting, I also decided to take personal initiative and to find a way to meet with members of the Leitz family in Germany.

As an active member of the Leica Historical Society (UK) – a small organisation formed primarily by Leica camera collectors – I was eventually able to make contact through a founder, Rolf Fricke, with Dr Knut Kühn-Leitz, grandson of Ernst Leitz II. It was also through reading a pamphlet published by the Leica Historical Society that I had succeeded in learning more of the failed attempt by Elsie Kühn-Leitz (1903–1985, both dates Wetzlar) – Ernst Leitz II’s daughter and the mother of Knut – to help a Jewish resident of Wetzlar, Hedwig Palm, flee from impending deportation by the Nazis in May 1943.³⁶ This publication was a translation into English of her own report that had been composed shortly after the war and subsequently published in German.³⁷

During our first conversation, Kühn-Leitz confirmed his mother’s account of the episode in which merely one Jewish woman, Hedwig Palm, had attempted to reach her sister in Switzerland. As his mother had written, it was a dairyman on the German side of the border who had informed the German authorities about Hedwig Palm. The lone person accompanying Palm, Julie Gerke, was an informant who had implicated Elsie Kühn-Leitz and her father to the Gestapo. Afterwards, Kühn-Leitz was imprisoned in a Frankfurt jail and her father obtained her release partly on the condition that she never again visited the camp for forced labourers attached to the Leitz factory, as the Gestapo considered her attempts to ameliorate the harsh conditions as trespassing. As a result of these sharp contradictions with Gilbert’s rendition, I was confused but, nonetheless, impressed that Elsie Kühn-Leitz’s own description of her actions was more modest.

Fortunately, Dr Kühn-Leitz (born 1936 and died 2020 in Wetzlar) was prepared to help me further, and so began a new stage in my research effort in 1999. During our first conversation, I also related to him the possibility that his grandfather may have helped many persecuted people in a variety of ways during the period of the Nazi regime. In response to my desire to learn much more, Kühn-Leitz told me that his elders had never discussed such matters with him and he was ignorant of any actions aside from his mother Elsie’s own account of her attempt to help Hedwig Palm flee to Switzerland in May 1943.

Since that first contact, Knut Kühn-Leitz and I met and communicated countless times over many years. He assisted me in meeting helpful individuals both currently and retired from working at Leica Camera AG and at Leica Microsystems AG. He also helped me to search for traces of those whom we learned were somehow helped by Leitz, as well as their descendants. As a result of our shared enthusiasm, he edited and published several books on members of his family and I contributed some of my research about those who were helped by Ernst

Leitz of Wetzlar as articles.³⁸ Without Knut Kühn-Leitz's kind assistance, my research would not have been possible, but I have long realised I must also endeavour to be critically aware of and guard against bias on my part, especially when coming to understand how Ernst Leitz II and his family survived Nazi rule while retaining full ownership of the factory plus having utilised the forced labour of some 700–800 Ukrainian women beginning in 1942.³⁹

Meanwhile, my first essay on the topic was translated and published in academic journals in the UK in 1999 and in Germany in 2000.⁴⁰ In these articles, I stated what I tentatively knew and understood, and concluded with my hope that further evidence-based research would reveal the full extent of the altruism of Leitz. The original English version of the essay was then updated and George Gilbert and I agreed that it would appear as a pamphlet to be published by the American Photographic Historical Society. Gilbert had come up with the phrase 'Leica Freedom Train' and was also circulating brief but, unfortunately without my authorisation, highly embellished accounts on the internet that included my name, and I began to receive many queries. In addition, many typographical errors had appeared on the pre-publication proof of my essay as a result of Gilbert's poor-quality electronic scanning of my manuscript. After considerable effort to make the necessary corrections, I gave my approval for publication in the spring of 2002.

What then followed was shocking: I received copies of the pamphlet and Gilbert had added unattributed and unauthorised embellishments and exaggerations to my text. He also added illustrations, photographs and dubious captions without my approval and without having obtained permission from the copyright owners. I then confronted Gilbert and requested that he include my objections with each copy of the pamphlet.⁴¹ When he failed to do so, I then demanded that he destroy all remaining copies of the publication, to which he reluctantly agreed. Unfortunately, he had already sent out copies to organisations such as the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. As for my share of the booklets, I immediately dumped all but two copies at the London Borough of Harrow collection point for recycling paper. I had been very naive in trusting George Gilbert and had not only chosen to ignore earlier alarming signs in his words and actions but I also failed to perform due diligence so I could gauge his professional standing.

In an effort to try somehow to limit reputational damage, I then issued the following disclaimer to further inquiries, which was also published as a letter in *Viewfinder*, the quarterly magazine of the Leica Historical Society of America in 2002:

... with reference to my comprehensive essay appearing in a 'monograph' being published by the American Photographic Historical Society ... I'm afraid I must dissociate myself from this project. Unfortunately, the editor of the publication introduced his own unattributed opinions as well as factual errors into the pages of my research article. The result for the critical reader is confusion and, ultimately, dismay.⁴²

I also refuted, in this same letter, the claims that George Gilbert had made in his own article⁴³ in the previous issue of the *Viewfinder*:

Concerning the 'passengers' who were helped by Leitz ... I have seen no evidence whatsoever during my research that gays, radicals and other anti-Nazis were saved. Here, Gilbert is echoing Norman Lipton's claims for which he never offered a shred of evidence concerning such a breadth of activity. Of course, it would be wonderful if proof of such rescues existed. But as I haven't seen any backing for such claims, I do not want to risk embellishing what is already a remarkable piece of history.

We do have, however, testimonies concerning Leitz employees and their families (such as Julius Huisgen and his half-Jewish wife) as well as camera dealers and their families (such as Henry Enfield). In addition, young Jewish people were taken on as apprentices (lengthy periods of training) in Wetzlar and subsequently by the Leitz organization sent to New York where they were placed in jobs. The case of Kurt Rosenberg is a shining example of the latter category for which we have much documentary evidence. There are other examples of Leitz helping young people in distress but we do not know how many.

In the year following this deeply disappointing episode, my children's book on the subject of Elsie Kühn-Leitz, *Elsie's War*, was published by Frances Lincoln Ltd., and it subsequently received favourable reviews in the mainstream press in the United Kingdom.⁴⁴ I carried on with researching and also arranged and witnessed private meetings between Knut Kühn-Leitz and some of the descendants of those who were helped by Ernst Leitz and his company.

In November 2006, I was contacted by Mark Honigsbaum, an established London-based journalist, who wished to write a lengthy story for the *Guardian* (UK) newspaper after he had been forwarded a version of George Gilbert's 'Freedom Train' story. Having experienced the distressing episode with George Gilbert, I insisted on grounds of historical accuracy, as well as my sense of responsibility to those who had shared their stories with me, on the full right of approving any resulting article before submission for publication. Honigsbaum agreed, and I was already impressed by the serious quality of his in-depth writing concerning other sensitive and complex subjects. I had also insisted that Honigsbaum offer

the story to one of the most credible newspapers in the United Kingdom, the *Financial Times*. This collaboration worked generally very well and the resulting 4,000-word article plus many photographs was featured as the cover story for the 3 February 2007 issue of the weekly *FT Magazine*.⁴⁵

Almost immediately following this publication, I was contacted by journalists working with other prominent newspapers. Nothing in my experience had prepared me for this deluge but, for the most part, these professionals were cooperative and seemed uninterested in sensationalising the actual history.⁴⁶ I was even less prepared, however, for what happened when suddenly thrust into the public realm and, especially, associated with a subject apparently so loaded with emotion and controversy as German rescuers during the Holocaust. This additional aspect of my naiveté was very soon shattered when I learned by email from Bastian Obermeyer, an editor at the *Süddeutsche Zeitung Magazin*, that a Wetzlar-based journalist, Alois Kösters, had protested the contents of the German version of the *FT Magazine* article published on 16 February 2007.⁴⁷

The thrust of Kösters' objection was that Ernst Leitz II could not be compared to the heroic manufacturer Oskar Schindler who had saved approximately 1,200 Jews in Poland bound for imminent extermination, as merely the headlines for the *FT Magazine* and *Süddeutsche Zeitung Magazin* articles had tantalisingly hinted. In stark contrast, Kösters asserted, there had been fewer than a handful of Jews helped by Leitz and, thus, no possible proof for Norman Lipton's claims existed. He attacked the media for creating a fuss over very little and, finally, insinuated that my involvement only served to help peddle the dubiously exaggerated 'Freedom Train' legend.⁴⁸

In his rhetoric, Alois Kösters utilised a classic 'straw man' approach and had misrepresented my position deliberately in order to destroy it. My approach was not that of adopting Lipton's account uncritically, nor had I ever compared Leitz to Schindler, as the historical contexts for their respective actions were obviously hugely different with respect to timing and location, the nature of the products manufactured, the numbers of people helped or saved, potential risks undertaken, methods utilised and the duration of any altruistic activities. Kösters had never contacted me and had apparently not considered or understood fully my publications in English or in German when he wrote his article.⁴⁹ Moreover, he had neither spoken with Bernd Lindenthal, chairman of the Wetzlarer Geschichtsverein, who was familiar with my research, or with Knut Kühn-Leitz, the grandson of Dr Ernst Leitz II. Kösters' representation of my perspective was based largely on the unsubstantiated approach of George Gilbert, and he attacked the contents and seriousness of the *FT* article on that basis.⁵⁰

During the time of this controversy, the Wetzlarer Geschichtsverein published my research article containing many examples of help given to the persecuted by Leitz and his organisation.⁵¹ A version in English was soon published as well.⁵² I was already realising that I needed a way to frame and present my research so as to make an academically rigorous contribution that would surpass my efforts thus far. I wanted to be able to respond more coherently both to detractors and, especially, to leave a worthy research contribution for posterity. In addition, I thought it essential to understand further how Ernst Leitz II and his family members were able to survive as well as maintain ownership of their company during the tumultuous period of Nazi rule. These three aims required further academic training as well as effective guidance and evaluation; hence my PhD dissertation written under the supervision of Professor Michael Berkowitz, Department of Hebrew and Jewish Studies, University College London.⁵³

These motivations were reinforced during the earlier stages of my PhD dissertation project when a Wetzlar-based amateur historian, Karsten Porezag, published his own account of Ernst Leitz's help to the persecuted in 2009, *Ernst Leitz aus Wetzlar und die Juden: Mythos und Fakten*.⁵⁴ By then, I had learned that Porezag had previously influenced the Wetzlar-based journalist Alois Kösters and this book expanded upon earlier arguments seeking to minimise Leitz's actions. In essence, Porezag's book was an enlarged repetition of Kösters' straw man approach referred to above. Furthermore, Porezag sought to reproach Leitz for not providing affidavits for Jews seeking to enter the United States and, in doing so, invoked the apparently courageous example of Ludwig Seligmann, a Jew born in Wetzlar in 1890 and having found refuge in the United States, whom he claimed had provided 150 affidavits to Jewish refugees and yet offered no actual documentation for this assertion.⁵⁵ In my research, I discovered that it had been stated by Joseph Rosenthal, a Jewish refugee from Wetzlar, that Seligmann required payment of a Leica camera for each instance of supplying an affidavit.⁵⁶ In another instance involving Seligmann, Leitz-trained refugee Kurt Rosenberg obtained a \$1,500 loan from him in the United States for the purpose of setting up a suitable bank account in order to serve as a guarantor for his parents' visa application.⁵⁷

While a guarantor's affidavit was essential for being able to obtain a visa to reside in the United States, Porezag's reductionist approach neglects a myriad of other factors such as age, gender, health, prospects for retraining and employment, possessing sufficient liquid assets, foreign language abilities, psychological flexibility, obligations to support vulnerable family members such as aged parents that also greatly influenced a potential refugee's willingness or ability to leave Germany. In

addition, Jews faced navigating their way through onerous bureaucratic procedures and punitively debilitating taxation on the part of the Nazi authorities as well as barriers, quotas and capricious bureaucrats on the part of foreign countries suffering from poorly performing economies and nativist prejudices.

Out of a total of about 500,000 Jews living in Germany in 1933, only slightly more than half were able to leave before the outbreak of war.⁵⁸ Jewish emigration may have been the official policy of the Nazi regime, but a vigorous programme of economic marginalisation followed by exploitative Aryanisation and the seizure of property by the state itself made it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for a more and more destitute Jewish population to leave. In his desire to destroy his straw man myth of Ernst Leitz as a 'Schindler', Porezag blithely ignored the extenuating circumstances and contradictions having to be navigated by Jewish victims of Nazi persecution. Ultimately, his reductionist approach leads to a conclusion that Jews were to blame for their own failures to leave Germany when, in fact, the persecution was bewildering and disempowering to many of its victims. It was the most vulnerable – especially elderly women – who were disproportionately remaining in the end.

Finally, Porezag attempted to denigrate the actions of Ernst Leitz by claiming that he did nothing illegal apart from making a few financial contributions to Jews, nor did his actions on behalf of the persecuted carry any risk of personal danger.⁵⁹ Porezag's generalisation concerning the legality or illegality of Leitz's actions ignores the huge problems of traditional German law becoming perverted by racist ideology and, moreover, the parallel exercise of arbitrary power by authorities in Nazi Germany.⁶⁰ Furthermore, such claims concerning the risk of personal danger are also highly simplistic – and made by Porezag with the benefit of hindsight – rather than considering the acute levels of fear and anxiety that Ernst Leitz II and his family surely felt at the time and, especially so, during the periods of the Ehrenfeld-Türk (1938–1939) and Hedwig Palm episodes (1943).⁶¹

Most recently, further controversy from another direction emerged after completion of the dissertation and the subsequent oral examination held in November 2015. At this point, I received strong objections from Knut Kühn-Leitz concerning certain passages in chapter five of the dissertation, 'The Changing Public Face of Leitz'. Here, I argued that compliance to normative public displays of ritual and advertising served as part of a survival strategy for Ernst Leitz II. Kühn-Leitz claimed that I had insinuated that his grandfather had deliberately supported the racial policies of the Nazi regime as indicated by company advertising; that I had 'condemned' his grandfather's public display at the annual company

outing on the Rhine River; and that I had ‘fantasised’ that his grandfather had attended a 1942 awards ceremony in Berlin as a way to express his heartfelt support for the Nazi regime.⁶² In my reply to his emotional letter, I stated in part:

To claim that such [Leica camera] adverts were ‘apolitical’ during this period is to ignore excellent recent scholarship concerning the Nazis’ use of consumerism as a tool. They did so precisely because such advertising was deemed by the public to be inherently apolitical in nature. Overtly racist motifs were seen by many Germans to be repulsive and, thus, the featuring of aryan-looking models became emphasized to inculcate racial ‘belonging’ and ‘respectability’.

Incidentally, this is also why genealogical research became an extremely popular pastime and is included in *Die Leica in Beruf und Wissenschaft* and, moreover, immediately after a chapter on the use of the Leica in racial studies written by an SS racial ‘expert’ that doesn’t once mention the word ‘Jew’.... To avoid contributing to this all-pervasive public discourse would have been very problematic for the company and, especially so, given Ernst Leitz II’s long involvement with democratic political causes and positive relationships with many Jews...⁶³

It is quite understandable that Knut Kühn-Leitz, as a loving grandson devoted to protecting the legacy of Ernst Leitz II, would wish for his grandfather to be viewed as saintly and, especially so, given the presence of individuals such as Kösters and Porezag who had been so biased in seeking to denigrate the immense good that Ernst Leitz II had done on behalf of persecuted people. In the case of Kühn-Leitz, I had underestimated his emotional need for a hagiographic viewpoint and that this would influence his not being able to ‘see the forest through the trees’ in terms of my approach to the subject. Sadly, Knut Kühn-Leitz died in May 2020 before any further dialogue was possible.

With the aim of gaining some further understanding of the current issues within the field of post-Holocaust dialogue in Germany, I gratefully accepted an invitation from my friend Alexandra Senfft to attend a meeting of the ‘Study Group on Intergenerational Consequences of the Holocaust’ (‘PAKH’) held at East-West Forum-Gut Gödelitz (near Dobeln, Central Saxony), in February 2020.⁶⁴ Consisting mainly of psychotherapists who are the descendants of both victims and perpetrators, this group is committed to dialogue in accordance with their sense of responsibility to uphold memory without transmitting hostility. As I listened to the accounts of some of those present concerning the contradictory feelings they have towards their perpetrator-parents, I recalled the pithy words that Rabbi Albert Friedlander shared with me decades

ago with regard to the ambivalence one might feel in the present concerning such dialogue relationships: ‘I cannot forget, I cannot forgive [as someone not persecuted directly] but we must find ways to live together anyway’.

Rabbi Dr Frank Dabba Smith has worked as a photographer and teacher, serving later as a liberal rabbi until retiring in 2019. He is a Lecturer at Leo Baeck College, Honorary Research Fellow at University College London and Co-Chair of the International Advisory Committee of EcoPeace-Middle East.

Notes

1. Frank Dabba Smith, *Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar: Helping the Persecuted*, PhD diss., University College London, 2017.
2. Willi Erb, *Vom Mikroskop zur Leica: Die Geschichte der Leica-Werke* (Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1956).
3. Ibid., 158.
4. Pamela M. Potter, *Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the End of Hitler's Reich* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998), 4–8.
5. Dr Knut Kühn-Leitz, discussion, 19 May 1999, Wetzlar.
6. Erb, *Vom Mikroskop*, 124–128.
7. Bruce Frye, *Liberal Democrats in the Weimar Republic: The History of the German Democratic Party and the German State Party* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1985), 46.
8. Ibid., 46–48.
9. Francis R. Nicosia and David Scrase (eds), *Jewish Life in Nazi Germany: Dilemmas and Responses* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012), 74.
10. Bernd Lindenthal, ‘Der lange Kampf mit den Nationalsozialisten’, in *Ernst Leitz II: ‘Ich entscheide hiermit: Es wird riskiert’*, ed. Knut Kühn-Leitz (Königswinter, Germany: Heel Verlag, 2014), 128–130. For the text of the warmhearted speech that Bundespräsident Theodor Heuss made on the occasion of Dr Ernst Leitz II’s eightieth birthday, see Knut Kühn-Leitz (ed.), *Ernst Leitz: Wegbereiter der Leica: Ein vorbildlicher Unternehmer und mutiger Demokrat* (Königswinter, Germany: Heel Verlag, 2006), 158–160.
11. After the Second World War, Elsie Kühn-Leitz, the daughter of Ernst Leitz II, became an active supporter and visitor to Schweitzer’s hospital in Lambaréné, Gabon. See Unknown Author, ‘Visit with Doctor Schweitzer’, *Leica Photography* 13, no. 1 (1960), 31.
12. Smith, *Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar: Helping the Persecuted*, 159.
13. Erb, *Vom Mikroskop*, 124–125.

14. Wolfgang Wiedl, 'Der liberale Demokrat', in Kühn-Leitz, *Ernst Leitz: Wegbereiter der Leica*, 125.
15. Ernst Leitz II, submission to the public prosecutor of the denazification court, 6 March 1947, Hessisches Hauptstaatsarchiv Wiesbaden HHStAW, Bestand 520/F in K.1991.
16. Wiedl, 'Der liberale Demokrat', 127.
17. Donna Harsch, *German Social Democracy and the Rise of Nazism* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 1.
18. Membership list of the Reichsbanner Schwarz-Rot-Gold, 1929, Wetzlar, Historisches Archiv Stadt Wetzlar.
19. See, as examples: Johannes Bähr and Paul Erker, *Bosch: The History of a Global Enterprise* (Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 2015); Gerald D. Feldman, *Allianz and the German Insurance Business, 1933–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Peter Hayes, *Industry and Ideology: IG Farben in the Third Reich* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Harold James, *The Deutsche Bank and the Nazi Economic War against the Jews: The Expropriation of Jewish Property* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
20. Francis R. Nicosia and Jonathan Huener (eds), *Business and Industry in Nazi Germany* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2004), 5.
21. Hayes, *Industry and Ideology*, xxvi.
22. Feldman, *Allianz and the German Insurance Press*.
23. Gerald D. Feldman, 'Financial Institutions in Nazi Germany: Reluctant or Willing Collaborators?', in Nicosia and Huener, *Business and Industry in Nazi Germany*, 15.
24. Smith, *Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar: Helping the Persecuted*, 55–62.
25. Adam Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction: The Making and Breaking of the Nazi Economy* (London: Penguin Books, 2007), 217.
26. Bähr and Erker, *Bosch*, 243 and 617; Joachim Scholtyssek, Robert Bosch und der liberale Widerstand (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1999), 526–528. Out of gratitude, Walz and the company gave employment plus considerable financial and legal support to Berger after the war and until his death in 1975, despite the grotesquely dark side of his Nazi past and later bizarre right-wing behaviour.
27. Bähr and Erker, *Bosch*, 242–244. Only Albrecht Fischer, who had earlier assisted Walz in efforts to help persecuted Jews, was tried by the Nazis but he was acquitted.
28. Avraham Barkai, *From Boycott to Annihilation: The Economic Struggle of German Jews 1933–1943* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1989), 85–92, 147.
29. Ibid., 47; Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews Volume I: The Years of Persecution 1933–1939* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1997), 149–155; Adolf Hitler et al., 'Reich Citizenship Law' and the 'Law for the Protection of German Blood and German Honor', in *The Third Reich Sourcebook*, ed. Anson Rabinbach and Sander L. Gilman (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013), 209–210.

30. Doris Ebertz was assisted in her archival research by Susanne Meinl.
31. Feldman, *Allianz*, viii–ix.
32. Daniel H. Magilow and Lisa Silverman, *Holocaust Representations in History: An Introduction* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 1.
33. Norman Snyder, *The Photography Catalog: The Best Equipment, Materials, Techniques and Resources* (New York: Harper and Row, 1976), 248.
34. George Gilbert, *The Illustrated Worldwide Who's Who of Jews in Photography* (New York: George Gilbert, 1996), 151.
35. Frank Dabba Smith, *Photography and the Holocaust*, MA diss., Leo Baeck College, 1994. In this project, I surveyed the usage of photography by all sides involved: Nazis spreading anti-Jewish propaganda and perpetrators seeking to share or report their participation in persecutions; individual German soldiers, who may have been sympathetic to Jews, recording what they witnessed in the Warsaw Ghetto; Jewish self-help organisations; individual Jewish artist-witnesses and other resisters seeking to communicate the extent of Nazi crimes as well as Jewish suffering to the outside world; and, finally, the Allied liberators and propagandists justifying the war against Nazi Germany. As a part of this research, I developed a method for categorising photographs based on who was making the photographs and for what purpose. This work also incorporated the relevant historical contexts of the evolving persecution against Jews perpetrated by the Nazis and their accomplices. I will always remain deeply grateful to Albert Friedlander for his wise supervision of this project and Evelyn Friedlander for her abiding interest.
36. Smith, *Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar: Helping the Persecuted*, 145–151; Elsie Kühn-Leitz, *The Time of My Imprisonment by the Gestapo in Frankfurt/Main from 10th September to 28th November 1943* (UK: Leica Historical Society, 1984).
37. Klaus Otto Nass (ed.), *Elsie Kühn-Leitz: Mut zur Menschlichkeit, Vom Wirken einer Frau in ihrer Zeit, Dokumente, Briefe und Berichte* (Bonn: Europa Union Verlag, 1994), 41–76.
38. Frank Dabba Smith, 'Der stille Helfer Ernst Leitz', in Kühn-Leitz, *Ernst Leitz: Wegbereiter der Leica*, 30–96; Frank Dabba Smith and Annette Woschée, 'Ernst Leitz hilft verfolgten Wetzlarer Mitbürgen', in *Ein Unternehmer mit Zivilcourage in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Knut Kühn-Leitz (Hanau, Germany: CoCon-Verlag, 2008), 132–135; Frank Dabba Smith and Heidi Trabert, 'Tue Gutes und sprich nicht darüber', in Kühn-Leitz, *Ernst Leitz II: 'Ich entscheide hiermit: Es wird riskiert'*, 156–216.
39. Smith, *Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar: Helping the Persecuted*, 239–252.
40. Frank Dabba Smith, 'Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar and the Jews', *The Journal for Progressive Judaism* (May 1998), 5–14; Frank Dabba Smith, 'Ernst Leitz aus Wetzlar und die Juden', *Fotogeschichte: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Ästhetik der Fotografie* (2000), 49–56.
41. Frank Dabba Smith, email to George Gilbert, 30 May 2002.
42. Frank Dabba Smith, 'Letter to the Editor', *Viewfinder* 35, no. 3 (2002), 7.
43. George Gilbert, 'About Leica Cameras and the Freedom Train', *Viewfinder* 35, no. 2 (2002), 26–28.

44. Frank Dabba Smith, *Elsie's War: A Story of Courage in Nazi Germany* (London: Frances Lincoln Limited, 2003).
45. Mark Honigsbaum, 'A New Life through a Lens', *FT Magazine* (3 February 2007), 16–21.
46. See, for example, Thomas Kielinger, 'Der Gute Mensch von Wetzlar', *Die Welt* (9 February 2007), 10; Jean-Pierre Langellier, 'Au bout de l'objectif, la liberté', *Le Monde* (17 February 2007), 3.
47. Mark Honigsbaum, 'Leitz' Liste: Der Chef des Unternehmens Leica war Mitglied der NSDAP. Dass er damit mindestens 41 jüdischen Angestellten das Leben rettete, hat er nie erzählt', *Süddeutsche Zeitung Magazin* (16 February 2007), 8–11; Bastian Obermeyer, email to Frank Dabba Smith, 20 February 2007; Alois Kösters, 'Medien feiern Ernst Leitz als "neuen Schindler"', *Wetzlarer Neue Zeitung* (20 February 2007), 8.
48. Bastian Obermeyer, email to Frank Dabba Smith.
49. Smith, 'Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar and the Jews'; Smith, 'Ernst Leitz aus Wetzlar und die Juden'.
50. Alois Kösters, 'Doch Kein Schindler', *Die Zeit* (22 March 2007), 15.
51. Frank Dabba Smith, 'Ernst Leitz II: Ein Unternehmer mit Mut zur Menschlichkeit in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus', *Mitteilungen des Wetzlarer Geschichtsvereins Band 43* (2007), 235–286.
52. Frank Dabba Smith, 'Dr Ernst Leitz II of Wetzlar and the People He Helped during the Shoah: Research in Progress', *European Judaism* 40, no. 1 (2007), 3–37.
53. Smith, *Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar: Helping the Persecuted*.
54. Karsten Porezag, *Ernst Leitz aus Wetzlar und die Juden: Mythos und Fakten, Zur Emigration deutscher Juden 1933–1941* (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2009).
55. Ibid., 67–75.
56. Smith, *Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar: Helping the Persecuted*, 117–118; Doris and Walter Ebertz, *Die jüdischen Familien in Wetzlar: Ein Gedenkbuch* (Wetzlar: Wetzlarer Geschichtsverein, 2010), 491.
57. Smith, *Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar: Helping the Persecuted*, 91–95; Jan Jaben-Eilon, 'Kurt Rosenberg: Leitz Sponsored Refugee' *Leica Historical Society Newsletter* (February 2003), 21. It seems that the activities of Ludwig Seligmann might have been diverse in nature and, within the context of a defined project concerning individual initiatives of overseas Jewish self-help, they deserve further research.
58. 57. Barkai, *From Boycott to Annihilation*, 142.
59. Porezag, *Ernst Leitz aus Wetzlar und die Juden*, 86.
60. Alan E. Steinweis and Robert D. Rachlin (eds), *The Law in Nazi Germany: Ideology, Opportunism, and the Perversion of Justice* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2015), 1–12.
61. Smith, *Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar: Helping the Persecuted*, 149–150.
62. Knut Kühn-Leitz, letter to Frank Dabba Smith, Wetzlar, 9 June 2016.
63. Frank Dabba Smith, letter to Knut Kühn-Leitz, Harrow, 26 December 2016; B.K. Schultz, 'Die Leica in der rassenkundlichen Methodik', in *Die Leica in*

Beruf und Wissenschaft, ed. Heinrich Stöckler (Frankfurt am Main: Breidenstein Verlagsgesellschaft, 1941), 287–300.

64. Beata Hammerich, Johannes Pfäfflin, Peter Pogany-Whendt, Erda Siebert and Bernd Sonntag, 'Handing Down the Holocaust in Germany: A Reflection on the Dialogue between Second Generation Descendants of Perpetrators and Survivors', in *Breaking Intergenerational Cycles of Repetition: A Global Dialogue on Historical Trauma and Memory*, ed. Pumla Gobodo-Madilizela (Berlin: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 2016), 247–266. The 'Ehrenfeld-Türk' affair involved a Gestapo informant in the Leitz factory stealing a copy of a letter of recommendation written to assist Hans-Heinrich Ehrenfeld, a prominent Jewish camera retailer who was fleeing as a refugee to the United States. Alfred Türk, Sales Director at Leitz, was arrested and Gestapo officials revealed that they were aware of Leitz's other activities on behalf of persecuted people. A conference was held in Berlin where an agreement was made between the Gestapo and the Ministry of Economics, enabled by Ernst Leitz II's friend Hans Humbert who argued that Leitz's exports brought much badly needed foreign currency to Germany. See Smith, *Ernst Leitz of Wetzlar: Helping the Persecuted*, 159.