

‘Out of the huts emerged a settled people’:
community-building in West German refugee camps

Details:

McLaren, Meryn, “‘Out of the huts emerged a settled people’:
community-building in West German refugee camps”, *German
History*, 28(1), 2010.

Version: Post-Print

Link(s) to article on publisher's website

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/gerhis/ghp106>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open-Research Archive's data policy on reuse of materials please consult <http://research.smuc.ac.uk/policies.html>

‘Out of the Huts emerged Settled People’: Community Building in West German Refugee Camps

Meryn McLaren

Abstract: From 1944 up to 1958, the western zones of Germany had to absorb over nine million refugees who had fled or been expelled from their homes east of the Oder-Neiße rivers or had left the Soviet Zone. Owing to these large numbers and the catastrophic housing conditions, many had to spend varying periods of time in camps. This article looks at refugee camps for German refugees in three West German *Länder* to examine the extent to which community building can be seen to have taken place between 1945 and 1960. The development of the refugee camp phenomenon is traced, from the initial policies to ensure a quick turn-around, to the transformation of many camps into *Wohnlager*, providing facilities for everyday living, social events and employment. Perceptions of outsiders are analysed and found to show that they were rarely able to recognise instances of community growth. This may be largely explained by political considerations and concern over the social effects of living in a refugee camp environment. Finally, the article turns to Camp Poxdorf/Hagenau in Mid-Franconia to demonstrate how a refugee settlement with a thriving social life was able to emerge from an unremarkable hut camp. The conclusion places the refugee camps in the wider context of the post-war history of the FRG, arguing that fears surrounding ‘asocials’ in camps reflected wider fears about society, but, like the rest of the population, refugee camp residents were working towards achieving a state of normalcy. Camp communities can be seen to have aided integration by providing an environment where the residents could get used to their situation and look to the future.

From 1944 onwards around twelve million *Reichsdeutsche* from the German eastern provinces and ethnic Germans living in Eastern Europe fled or were expelled from the territories east of the Oder-Neisse rivers to what were to become Germany's new borders under the Potsdam Agreement.¹ This population movement was on an unprecedented scale and had wide-reaching consequences for the country's social, political, and economic development. Nine million of the refugees managed to reach the Western Allied Occupation Zones (the Federal Republic from 1949), many of whom faced stays of varying lengths in one or more of the reception or refugee camps dotted around West Germany. In addition, a great many refugees also arrived from the Soviet Occupation Zone (later the German Democratic Republic). By 1961, approximately three million Germans had moved from the GDR to the Federal Republic.² Figures for the number of refugee camps and their residents in the American and British Zones in the early post war years are only available at local level and are generally unreliable, due to the chaotic nature of the refugees' arrivals and the omission in the figures of camps not run by the local government.³ However, in 1955 a census of the refugee camps was carried out, which reported that in the August of that year, there were still 3,008 camps operating in West Germany (excluding West Berlin), housing 289,374 residents.⁴ Even this figure can be said to be conservative, as the census did not include those camps with fewer than 20 residents.⁵ Thus, the sheer number of people still living in camps at that time hints at the major role that the refugee camp issue played in the post-war history of the refugees in the Federal Republic of Germany and its importance to the understanding of the social dynamics of reintegration and modernisation at play in the late 1940s and 1950s.

Naturally, the significance of the refugee camps cannot and should not be measured purely quantitatively. The subject of community as it relates to refugee camps has been

largely neglected by those scholars working on the history of the integration of the refugees and expellees –work by Mathias Beer and Bernhard Parisius providing rare exceptions⁶ - but it is that very subject, much more than the numbers of refugee camp residents, that is arguably so crucial to the understanding of the dynamics of society in the early Federal Republic. The existence of pockets of refugees living isolated from wider German society and forming their own micro-communities could be seen to have been potentially damaging to the prospect of a cohesive society. During the Nazi era, the ideal of a *Volksgemeinschaft* that included all German citizens was widely propagated and was a key element of German identity and aspirations for a German *Reich*.⁷ However, towards the end of the war, the arrival of the refugees and expellees started to blow apart the notion of a unified German community, as the *Reichsdeutsche* and *Volksdeutsche* appeared to the locals very foreign, with their own customs and dialects. Even their forms of Protestantism and Catholicism were seen to be different from that in western Germany.⁸ These differences were without doubt part of the reason for the deep suspicion levelled against the ‘new citizens’ and refugee literature contains countless examples of the difficult initial relationships between refugees and locals.⁹ However, many historians have put forward the thesis that the expellees also worked as a modernising force, disturbing local environments, challenging ingrained traditions and cultural conventions, and ‘deprovincialising’ rural villages.¹⁰

The primary questions this work seeks to explore are, to what extent did a sense of community form within refugee camps, which was distinct from that of the wider refugee and expellee community and what effect can these ‘camp communities’ be seen to have had on the wider society of the newly formed Federal Republic of Germany? Section I includes a description of the purpose, function and development of refugee camps in the

immediate post-war period and throughout the 1950s. Section II analyses letters and reports from the district and *Land* authorities, the British and American Military authorities, welfare agencies, academics, and students who carried out work experience in Youth Camp Poggenhagen, in order to establish the extent to which their views of the refugee camps matched those of the residents. It examines whether outsiders were able to acknowledge camp community, where it existed, and the importance of social facilities to their residents. It also explores the images of refugee camp residents these documents presented and what political motivations came into play in the construction of these reports. The case study in Section III shows that Camp Poxdorf in Bavaria developed a very strong community amongst its residents owing both to the developing infrastructure of the camp, which gradually allowed normal life to flourish, and the shared regional and cultural background of its residents. Finally, Section IV asks in what ways the situation in the refugee camps encapsulated and interacted with the wider process of rebuilding West German society after the Second World War. This final section will also look at how refugee camp life can be argued to have assisted integration and the realisation that there was to be no more 'going back'.

I: : The Issue of the Refugees and Refugee Camps

Immediately following the end of the war, the term *Flüchtling* was used to cover all types of refugees. It was not until 1947 that *Vertriebener* acquired common usage to denote those who had left their homes under the Potsdam Agreement. The similar term *Heimatvertriebener* ('expellee from the *Heimat*') was developed by refugee lobbyists and later achieved common usage and legal status. According to Franz J. Bauer, the term *Heimatvertriebener* was to 'on the one hand signal the demands of the expellees of West German society as well as of the expulsion countries [...] and on the other hand it created

a judicial-conceptual distance to refugees from the Soviet Zone/GDR'.¹¹ A Federal Republic-wide refugee identity card scheme was brought in through the Federal Expellee Law of 19 May 1953. Three categories were created: '*Heimatvertriebene*' – whose homes on 1.1.1937 were in the former German territories - could apply for refugee status A, and refugee status B was for '*Vertriebene*' – Germans and ethnic Germans whose homes on 1.1.1939 were in the former eastern territories.¹²

Conversely, the status of many refugees from the Soviet Zone or the GDR was a legally grey area. Some refugees with business contacts were able to obtain 'inter-zone' passes to cross into the Western Zones officially, but even those people without inter-zone passes were able to obtain residency permits. The precondition for the granting of a residency permit was the recognition of the reasons stated by the incomer for their change of address through commissions (*Notaufnahmeverfahren*) held in the transit camps. A residency permit would be approved if the applicant had suffered political persecution in the SBZ, for the reuniting of family, or if his or her workplace was in the west.¹³ Additionally, the British occupation authorities had a policy of sending no-one back to the Soviet Zone.¹⁴ However, many who had been recognised as refugees under the 1951 *Notaufnahmeverfahren* were then unable to gain recognition as an official Soviet Zone refugee under the Federal Expellee Law. Under this law *Sowjetzonenflüchtling* (Soviet Zone refugee) referred solely to "a German citizen or ethnic German, whose place of residence is or was in the Soviet Occupation Zone or the Soviet occupied sector of Berlin, and who has fled there to escape a particular plight due to the political situation".¹⁵ The definition of *Sowjetzonenflüchtlinge*, who were to receive refugee identity card C, was thus a lot less broad than status A and B, or the *Notaufnahmeverfahren*. Few GDR

refugees were able to fulfil the legal requirements to be termed *Sowjetzonenflüchtlinge*, which then left the majority of refugees from the Soviet Zone/GDR in a legal limbo and tainted with the stigma of being ‘illegals’.¹⁶ The attitude of officials towards refugees from the Soviet Zone was often one of suspicion and mistrust.¹⁷ The fact that so few of these refugees were subsequently able to gain recognition under the Federal Expellee Law did little to alleviate their concerns.

Despite being superficially in a similar position as newcomers to West Germany, there is some evidence to suggest that the expellees did not always welcome the presence of refugees from the Soviet Zone. Although outwardly sympathetic to their plight, in discussions over the shaping of Equalization of Burdens legislation, the expellee associations spoke against the inclusion of migrants from the Soviet Zone/GDR.¹⁸ Whilst the wave of refugees from the Soviet Zone served to highlight that the problems resulting from flight and expulsion had not yet been solved, they also acted as competition for *Lastenausgleich* and the other support measures.¹⁹ Some residents of transit camps such as Siegen in North Rhine Westphalia recalled the atmosphere there being tense. For example, Herr B wrote that holders of different types of refugee identity card did not mix and this added a certain strain to camp life.²⁰ However, amongst the former residents contacted for this study, there is little indication of real conflict or competition between expellees and refugees from the Soviet Zone. On the contrary, another resident of transit camp Siegen claimed, ‘the expellees and refugees kept together – they only had each other’.²¹ This experience is echoed in the marriage between Herr T – a resident of Camp Poxdorf originally from the Sudetenland – and his wife, a refugee from the GDR.²²

In May 1945, Germany was in ruins: structurally, economically and socially. Of the 1939 housing stock, 27.5% no longer existed by 1946.²³ Many of the houses that were still standing, especially in the towns and cities, were barely habitable and many families were reduced to living in cellars. In the midst of all this chaos, there were population movements everywhere as people attempted to return home, or at least to somewhere which could offer a roof over their heads. Thus, not just expellees, but evacuees, Displaced Persons,²⁴ returning soldiers and Prisoners of War streamed along the streets of Germany.²⁵ The challenge that lay ahead of the Allied forces and the German government as a result of the expulsion should thus not be understated. Even before the end of the war, 900,000 refugees had arrived in West Germany, but following Germany's capitulation the number of refugees and expellees arriving from the 'wild' and 'planned' expulsions until October 1946 was 4,800,000, and an additional 2,200,000 reached the western Zones between 1947 and 1950.²⁶

The first port of call for most refugees upon arrival in West Germany was a reception camp. Reception camps on the borders of each occupation Zone experienced a tremendous number of refugees passing through them and, especially during the organized expulsion in 1946, had to deal with an almost constant stream of transportations. For example, records show that in Bavaria the reception camps had to cope with the arrival of 12,000 expellees in twelve trains during January 1946, 85,000 in 72 trains during April, and at the peak in June, 142,000 expellees arrived in 132 trains.²⁷ Expellees' stays in the reception camps were typically very brief: they were given something to eat, medically examined and sprayed with DDT powder, before being given the refugee identification papers and confirmation of their medical examination needed to

be allowed to stay in that occupation Zone and returning to the train to travel to their final destination.²⁸ However, as will be shown below, the lengths of refugees' stays in reception camps could vary substantially and in many cases had to be much longer than was originally intended. For example, the 102,000 refugees who were housed in Bavarian camps in October 1949 made up 5.25% of the 1.9 million refugees who had arrived in Bavaria by that point. In 1953 Helmut Schelsky estimated that ten percent of refugee families were still living in camps or other emergency accommodation.²⁹

Depending on size, the early refugee camps reflected in most cases the set-up of the reception camps, and were in many cases former *Wehrmacht* barracks or training camps, forced labourer- and concentration camps. In the short term other public buildings were also used.³⁰ Accommodation was basic, usually comprising solely of straw-filled sacks for mattresses, or, if the refugees were fortunate, military camp beds. With the huge numbers of refugees who had to be cared for, even this basic arrangement became harder to supply. The authorities often had to resort to confiscation in order to equip and furnish the camps. In Siegen, local businesses were called upon to help provide needed equipment.³¹ The majority of camps started off offering communal catering, as this was cheaper and more practical than trying to provide the refugees with cooking facilities. In line with the Allied policy on the German refugee problem, the financing of the camps was 'a German matter' and, unlike DP camps, refugee camps for German refugees and expellees were neither administrated nor financed by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. State-run camps were officially financed by the *Land* government (in Bavaria) or at *Regierungsbezirk* level in North Rhine Westphalia.³²

However, documents suggest that in practice the costs relating to the camps often fell on the town, *Kreise* and *Gemeinde* authorities.³³

During the height of the refugee arrivals in 1946, the refugee camps tried to achieve as quick a turn-around of refugees as possible, but in areas hit with particularly high influxes, camps were becoming increasingly long-term. The main reason for this was, of course, lack of housing and the impossibility of building sufficient new housing directly after the war, but on an individual level, refugees who typically found themselves residing in camps for longer included those who had found employment in an area, but not accommodation, and pensioners and widows with children, who could not afford anywhere else. As with the rest of Germany at this time, the *Frauenüberschuss* was clearly evident in refugee camps. As late on as October 1952, in camps Schafhof, Hiltoltsteinerbunker, Witschelstrasse, Wasserturm and Langwasser, there were 2,412 female and only 2,072 male residents.³⁴

The *Land* authorities and camp management had to adapt to the fact that finding permanent homes for all refugees was to be a slow process and the ‘camp clearance’ programmes which started in many areas in the 1950s often took many years to complete. Even early on, reception camps such as Camps Wellersberg and Fischbacherberg in Siegen increasingly had to flaunt the two day limit placed on stays in the camp,³⁵ and the periods of time refugees spent in housing camps frequently ran into years: a report by the *Statistisches Bundesamt* on the situation in West German refugee camps in 1955 recorded that of the 131,987 refugee and expellee residents of ‘long term’ camps, 127,361 (96.5%) had been living in the camp since 1954 or earlier, with 47,946 (36.3%) having been there

since 1946 or earlier.³⁶ The historian Hermann Beckstein sees this as having been an entirely negative development, describing how many camps transformed into ‘ghetto-like residential quarters’. Emphasising the poor conditions of the buildings, inadequate sanitation facilities and cramped living conditions, he writes, ‘they encouraged the segregation of the social environment and pushed the camp residents ever further into the social margins’.³⁷ This is, however, only a partial reading of the history of the refugee camps. Following the 1948 currency reform it became possible to make more improvements to the camps, and by the early 1950s, those refugee camps that were still being used and that it was thought would not be able to be cleared in the near future began to appropriate a more ‘homely’ feel. In terms of renovations, the main priority for those who ran the camp was to clear the mass sleeping quarters, which were noisy and allowed for no privacy, either by dividing large rooms into small single family rooms, or building separate huts and using the old sleeping quarters for other purposes. For example, in June 1949, the first floor of one of the big halls in Camp DOMAG, in Hamlyn, Lower Saxony, was renovated, by erecting two and a half metre high divisions, in order to create ‘living-bunks’ of 10m². These were then furnished with basic furniture and electric lights.³⁸ Sometimes the ‘transformation’ of a ‘mass camp’ into a ‘housing camp’ simply entailed ending the state management and the catering facilities, so that the refugees could begin normal residence.³⁹ Other measures that were taken by more long term residents, where possible, included the cultivation of small garden plots – which acted both as a way to brighten up the camps and provide a supplement to the refugees’ diet – and the keeping of animals.⁴⁰ Also, as the refugee camps became longer term, an increasing number of facilities were established for residents, from ‘community’ and church rooms to schools and crèches, and occasionally small shops.⁴¹

Whilst the camp management was often appointed by the local refugee officers, most camps offered some degree of self governance to their residents, and this also could be significant to the extent that community was able to grow. In Bavaria, draft camp regulations were drawn up in 1951 for the use of transit camps, which included an order for camp committees to be established. In each camp a committee was to be elected by and from the residents. The camp committee had an advisory role, it represented the interests of the camp residents *vis-à-vis* the camp manager and was to bring up the wishes and complaints of the refugees. The camp committee was also to support the work of the camp manager in a number of ways. For example, they had the right to oversee the catering and were to be informed of the distribution of donations. More generally, together with the camp manager, they were to ensure that camp regulations were kept to.⁴² The elections for the camp committees in Bavaria were held every six months by secret ballot for all residents above the age of 21. A former resident described the work of the camp committee in Camp Langenzenn:

If residents had complaints or wishes, they would firstly approach the camp committee to discuss how one could improve such and such a thing, this way or that. Then the three members of the committee would discuss the issue.[...] Most of the problems were able to be solved. Sometimes [...] people had extreme demands and then they had to say, 'that doesn't work, we can't do that'. The camp committee also had another important function. There were occasional conflicts – in such a big community everything can't be happy all the time. [...] Then the camp committee had to act as a justice of the peace and intervene.⁴³

Many larger camps offered some sort of community room for recreation. Herr L wrote of the community room in Camp Georgensgmünd, where the young people could play table tennis and on occasion performed sketches they wrote themselves. The camp residents

also used the room for singing and dancing.⁴⁴ ‘We had [...] the community room. It was always heated in winter and there was a radio and we built a table tennis table ourselves. Then, in the evenings, the girls from the village arrived and I played the mouth organ’. He described a cabaret evening that the residents put on to celebrate a couple’s golden wedding, for which he had painted the scenery. The cabaret included music and sketches, referencing ‘things that we had experienced in the camps’.⁴⁵ It is clear to see how these kind of events could help foster community spirit, as residents worked together to create social events whose reference points were shared experiences. In Camp Schafhof in Nuremberg, a former agricultural college, dance evenings, cultural events, as well as the annual Christmas party, were held in the ‘big room’.⁴⁶ Herr J, who came Schafhof as a child, emphasised the significance of this room to him: ‘it taught me that life wasn’t only sober, but in the evenings exciting things could happen’.⁴⁷

Axel Schildt highlighted the importance of culture in postwar Germany, when he argued that ‘culture in its widest sense proved itself – just as in the war – as an importance means of boosting morale’.⁴⁸ This was particularly the case for refugees and others who had suffered in the war. For refugees and expellees it can even be said that social and cultural events fulfilled a double purpose: not only could they provide a distraction from the harshness of everyday life in a camp, but in some cases they also provided the opportunity to keep alive old traditions from the *Heimat*. There were many social and cultural events that were established in refugee camps. Some were initiated by the camp management and welfare organisations, whilst others were organised by the refugees themselves. Records concerning the ‘cultural care’ of camp residents are testament to the numerous events arranged in refugee camps. For example, in 1953 the Dortmunder

Sängerknaben put on two events in transit camp Massen.⁴⁹ For younger residents the *Falken* (the socialist youth group) organised film nights in Camp Schafhof. Herr J. recalls with relish watching cowboy films.⁵⁰ Other activities focused on the culture of the *Heimat*, for example a Silesian Youth group was also set up in Schafhof, whose members put on occasional social evenings.⁵¹ In Camp Poxdorf, a youth 'Spielgruppe' was set up by the Sudetendeutschen Landmannschaft in 1951, which, according to the Forchheim *Landrat* enjoyed great popularity and involved nearly all the young people in the camp.⁵²

In camps more isolated from towns and villages, or where the local establishments were overfilled, camp kindergarten and schools were set up. The teachers, often refugees themselves, had to contend with teaching children with a wide range of ages and abilities in one class with very few resources, but, as will be seen below, the camp school experience was a central part of the young residents' social life in the camps. These facilities were not only important in creating a village-like environment in some of the camps that helped foster social networks, but in some cases they were able to offer the residents employment opportunities. Examples of different types of employment available in refugee camps ranged from the small businesses set up by the residents themselves in Camp Poxdorf to the sewing and toy-making workshops in Camps Hof-Moschendorf and Schafhof.⁵³

II: How the Camps Were Perceived by Outside Observers

Outsider observers of the refugee camps, including local authority officers, representatives of the allied Military Government, welfare workers and academics tended to see refugee camps in a negative light and some even viewed their continued presence as a threat to West German society. One factor that coloured the German authorities'

attitude towards the refugee camps under their control and had implications for the extent to which they were able to support them and encourage the community building within them was the financial burden that they represented. The districts that found themselves financially responsible for refugee camps were unwilling – or unable – to implement all the upkeep and improvements necessary. For example, when the *Oberkreisdirektor* of *Landkreis* Lüneburg in Lower Saxony, asked the *Regierungspräsident* of Lüneburg for support in requesting funds from the Lower Saxony Office for Refugees and Finance to prepare Camp Neetze to withstand winter weather, he emphasised that *Landkreis* Lüneburg 'could not be expected to take over the maintenance of hut accommodation'.⁵⁴

Whilst many local government records make plain their desire for the camps under their control to be closed, and the lands to be sold or returned to their owners, in the cases of factory land, the officials did not often get into debates about social conditions in the camps – other than to complain that the accommodation was 'very insufficient'.⁵⁵ The town authorities in Siegen, however, were an exception and barely ceased informing others about the moral degradation visible in the Camps of Wellersberg and Fischbacherberg, which, the councillors believed, presented a great threat to the town and its residents. The *Stadt* Siegen wrote many letters in 1947 and 1948 to both the *Land* and Military Governments voicing grave concerns about the effect that Camp Wellersberg was having on the local residents. These 'anti-social' elements were, according to the *Stadt* Siegen, the chief cause of the rise in crime and sexually transmitted diseases in the town. For example, in report from the town administration to the British Military Commander Haley, in August 1947, was written:

At the current time, around 1,300 are staying in the camp. The residents always express face to face to the camp management that they give no

thought at all to work. They are much better off now than if they were in a job. They receive normal rations, as well as the half hospital supplement [...] therefore substantially more than the working population of the town of Siegen. [...] The residents of the neighbouring streets can hardly defend themselves from the many beggars. Also, in the rest of the town, begging has taken on alarming proportions. The number of thefts is constantly increasing. In a single day seven camp residents were arrested for stealing from fields.[...] Every evening a fire burns on the sports ground of the barracks to cook the stolen food. [...]

In recent weeks only twenty cases of syphilis were detected. These are only the cases that can be established by doctors during appointments. The real number will be considerably higher. In the uninhibited way in which male and female residents associate with each other, a further spread is inevitable. Residents having sexual intercourse during the day in the camp or even in the corridors, without a thought for the children, is an everyday occurrence. [...] The wider spread of venereal disease amongst the population and the occupation troops cannot be avoided.⁵⁶

Also highlighted was the high number of heavily pregnant women who, it was hinted, turned up in the camp to enjoy the medical care.⁵⁷

From the final two years of the war, Germany experienced a surge in crime, as wartime conditions meant that many people had to lay aside all normal conventions of good citizenship in order to obtain adequate food and fuel. Thus, the commonly perceived problem of crime and morals in the camps was just part of a much wider problem of adult and juvenile criminality, which would only begin to be conclusively solved with the introduction of the Deutsche Mark in 1948.⁵⁸ However, there was particular concern surrounding the contribution of refugee camps and housing poverty to this wave of crime and immorality.⁵⁹ In the eyes of contemporaries and according to social hygiene assumptions, 'bad' housing created 'bad' people and there was a direct link between cramped housing and criminality and delinquency.⁶⁰ Camps were imagined by many to be full of 'asocials', particularly as the crowded conditions necessitated living arrangements considered very suspect. Perceived moral problems included the fact that

single men and women forced to sleep in the same barrack rooms, young children in the same room as their parents or married siblings, and there were many instances of unmarried couples living as man and wife. In any case, asocial behaviour was also traditionally seen to be a common side effect of unemployment, which was rife in many camps.⁶¹ Also, with most camps being numerically dominated by women, children and the elderly, the lack of male role models became another reason for camps to be considered morally dangerous.⁶² Concerns over these situations were particularly pronounced, as following the end of the war, there was increased emphasis placed on the need for morality and the reestablishment of a stable family life, as the Protestant and Catholic Churches sought to right the societal excesses of the National Socialist years.⁶³

Frau A, Frau F and Frau H felt that their camp residence was a handicap in befriending locals and obtaining employment. However, in general there seems to be a distinction between the fears of the officials and the perceptions of ordinary town residents. Most of the thirty five former resident respondents to the question on resident-local relations do not feel that their living in a camp had much bearing on the treatment and attitudes towards them shown by locals. Although many had stories to tell relating to prejudice they had received from the local population – for example, mistrust from the parents of local girlfriends and boyfriends - very few of these were centered around the fact that they lived in camp accommodation and this prejudice was seen by the refugees more as part of the general refugee experience.⁶⁴

Whilst official Allied policy on the German refugee camps was that it was 'a German matter', it was also one 'with which the English wanted to help',⁶⁵ partly out of the

knowledge that any bad publicity concerning the camps would be reflected on them, as the military occupiers.⁶⁶ Thus, the British Military Government took an active interest in refugee camp affairs. The Regional Governmental Officer for North Rhine Westphalia emphasised, 'it is not possible for Military Government to stand by and watch people being treated in a callous and inhuman manner by irresponsible local authorities whose principle concern seems to be to avoid doing anything unpopular.'⁶⁷ In this vein, the Chief Manpower Officer of North Rhine Westphalia issued instructions in 1948 for Wipperfurth Camp to be emptied and closed for cleaning and overhaul 'as a top priority job', and saw part of his remit as being to 'stimulate the responsible Germans into taking [action]' on problems with the camps.⁶⁸

The British shared many of the German authorities' concerns about refugee camps, in particular the conditions, apathy and immorality evident in the camps. In a report following an inspection of Camp Detmold, North Rhine Westphalia's Chief Manpower Officer referred to the refugees as 'unfortunates at present herded in these dumps [camps like Detmold]'.⁶⁹ The Acting Regional Commissioner for North Rhine Westphalia described Camp Wipperfurth conditions as being 'so bad as to be almost indescribable'⁷⁰, but an officer from the British Military Government's headquarters in *Regierungsbezirk* Cologne explained these conditions as being 'due mainly to the fact that the refugees themselves are dirty and will not help themselves'.⁷¹ An officer in the Public Health Department in North Rhine Westphalia opined that although there was no question of negligence arising from the conditions of four camps examined for a report on children in refugee camps, 'a salient danger is the moral one'.⁷² A report by the British Red Cross Welfare Officer in Arnsberg also expressed the familiar worry about the 'demoralising

effect' of overcrowding in [Arnsberg] camp, which, was 'causing grave concern to some of the more self-respecting families because of their growing children'.⁷³ However, he was also scathing about the apparent skewed priorities and 'disregard for the needs of the refugees' shown by the local authorities for having taken possession of one the wooden huts, formerly used as a Kindergarten and 'various community purposes', with the intention of rehousing people living in the town, despite the overcrowding amongst the refugee residents there. It is clear therefore that although he shared some of the views about the existence of asocials in the camps, the welfare officer blamed the German authorities for exacerbating the problems which he saw in the camp.

From the US Military Government's point of view, the very existence of refugee camps for the expellees was detrimental to their chances of assimilation. The Americans were particularly eager to avoid creating a new 'minorities problem' and so viewed long-term stays in the camps – and even the preservation of pre-existing communities by housing old neighbours from the *Heimat* in the same district – as contributing towards an unwanted 'ghettoisation' of the 'new citizens'. Thus the US Zone prioritised the policy objective of providing the new arrivals with private accommodation as quickly as possible.⁷⁴ Whilst the existence of long term housing camps like Camps Poxdorf and Schafhof are testimony to the fact this policy did not run as smoothly as the US Military Government would have hoped, by 1955, despite having had one of the largest influxes of refugees, Bavaria had reduced its number of refugee camps from 1,381 (October 1946) to 215.⁷⁵

Negative stereotypes of refugee camp residents were mainly directed against 'false' refugees and those entering West Germany from the Soviet Zone. Erica Carter writes that although the concern that refugees would endanger political stability in general was widespread, it was the Soviet Zone refugees against whom accusations and stereotypes of being shoplifters and secret agents were levelled.⁷⁶ This prejudice identified by Carter is supported by the many documents relating to the problems in Camp Wellersberg. The town administrators were keen to emphasize that it was not the 'genuine' refugees and expellees who were perceived to cause a threat (i.e. those who arrived for the expulsion, fled the Soviet Zone for political reasons, or to be reunited with family), but the numerous 'illegal' and fake refugees, asocials, who were taking advantage of cheap board and lodgings.⁷⁷ However, any refugee could find themselves put in this category by outsiders, just by virtue of living in a camp, particularly if they had fled from the Soviet Zone. Pfau and Seidel note that in contrast to the expellees from the German Eastern Territories, the Soviet Occupation Zone refugees in Camp Wellersberg were no longer seen as 'real' refugees, but were referred to as 'false' or 'illegal' and had to face great mistrust from both the Siegen population and the town authorities.⁷⁸

Concerns were expressed by many different social commentators on the moral and psychological harm that a camp upbringing must be having on its residents and in particular the children. Frau M. Grosser, town councillor of Solingen-Ohligs, representing the *Katholischer Fürsorge Verein für Mädchen, Frauen und Kinder* wrote to the *Ministerpräsident* of North Rhine Westphalia, Carl Arnold, expressing that she 'foresaw great danger' in the continued habitation of refugee camps. She claimed that long term camp life was creating a 'class of asocials' and that mothers were extremely

worried about the upbringing and further development of their children.⁷⁹ The Minister for Social Affairs agreed with Grosser that accommodation in mass camps represented a danger and expressed his intention for 'homely accommodation' to be achieved 'by all means'.⁸⁰

Although the refugee camp issue was new, the terms framing the debate certainly were not. The language used to describe the refugee camp residents shows a revealing continuity with the discourse surrounding the unemployed in Germany following the Wall Street Crash. Just as the jobless became a 'shared symbol of the problems of the Weimar Republic',⁸¹ the refugee camp inmates were a stark reminder of the problems of the post-war reconstruction era. The *CVJM* report on the activities of its *Heimatlose Lagerdienst* describes residents as apathetic and passive and Grosser's view of them as asocial clearly reflects early 1930s discussions of the unemployed.⁸² For example, unemployment was seen by a member of the German Economic Council in 1930 to create 'disquieting moments of unrest' and 'endanger the physical and moral character of the people',⁸³ just as there were fears in the late 1940s about refugee camps being a breeding ground for radicalism and immorality. Similarly, the fears of Saxony president of the Chamber of Commerce of 'a material and spiritual destitution' for those affected by unemployment and that this 'hopelessness and discouragement lead[s] to a paralysis of initiative'⁸⁴ was echoed twenty years later by many of those arguing for a swift closure of the remaining refugee camps. The return of the idea voiced by Professor Wilhelm Haas in 1932 that an 'asocial spirit' borne of the desperation of those made redundant manifested itself in criminal activity, can clearly be seen in the complaints about camp residents in Siegen.⁸⁵

Another common stereotype regarding refugee camp residents was that they were work-shy. The town clerk of Siegen claimed that even those with a willingness to work soon had their enthusiasm for employment sapped on contact with the asocial elements in Camp Wellersberg,⁸⁶ whilst even the Bavarian Red Cross accused the Camp Hof residents of laziness and being responsible for the failure of their vegetable crops. The Red Cross worker complained, 'most of them did not carry out the normal quota of work, so lots [of the crop] was spoiled'.⁸⁷

The parallels in the discourses are, however, unsurprising, as even by 1955, altogether 67% of refugees resident in housing camps were either not gainfully employed (61.4%) or unemployed (5.8%). Just over half of the latter (6,812) had been unemployed since 1952 and earlier,⁸⁸ and so in the eyes of society, the camps represented the unpleasant combination of two societal problems: unemployment and the refugee issue. Thus, apathy caused by lack of honest work was reinforced by the helplessness caused by the insitutionalised atmosphere of the camp. Whilst employed refugees could - if reluctantly - be seen by observers to be contributing to reconstruction efforts and progressing towards integration, the 'work-shy' refugees, languishing in camps, were increasingly viewed as a social menace. The Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) Technical Assistance Commission's report on the Integration of the Refugees in the German Republic made explicit the problem of refugee camp residence and unemployment, stating that many camp refugees were 'temporarily confined to a life of idleness and boredom' and skilled workers in the camp were 'gradually losing [their skills] through inactivity'.⁸⁹ The report's authors suggested that the opportunities this

enforced leisure offered residents to learn new skills were not being used and put forward the well-meaning, but ultimately unrealistic recommendation that a handicraft programme should be established in each refugee camp.⁹⁰

Concerns over the continued existence of refugee camps were shared by a number of academics. For example, sociologist Karl Kurz believed that refugee children and those living in single room households were particularly endangered by their upbringing.⁹¹ He wondered, 'what kind of memories and impressions of their youth will this not insignificant section of the growing generation bring with them in life?'⁹² The authors of the Technical Assistance Commission's report cautioned,

Children growing up in such surroundings are subjected to many shocks, which endanger their normal adjustment to society. There are the moral conflicts resulting from mixing with all kinds of strangers at a formative stage in their development and the disillusionment in discovering that their own parents seem unable to keep control of their family life.⁹³

In his 1953 study of expellee youth, the sociologist Karl Valentin Müller described the 'human situation' in refugee camps in 1951 as increasingly worsening and counted himself among those who saw the main mood in the camps as apathy. His theory to explain this was that the independent, quiet, capable refugees were more likely to move out of the camp sooner, leaving the unindustrious, indecisive, resigned, less positive elements. However, he was at pains to qualify this judgement, stressing that, 'naturally, that is only the average situation of disadvantage; obviously there are very many worthy elements who stayed in the camp simply out of genuine poverty and despite their best efforts to move away',⁹⁴ and pointed out that not all commentators were united in their predictions of the consequences of this 'complete human sinking'. He also acknowledged

that there were 'oases of positivity' in the camps – if increasingly rare – where orderly, capable families and clean children were to be found.⁹⁵

Thus, contemporary outsider responses to refugee camps reveal a definite pattern. Refugee camps were predominantly seen as places that fostered apathy, depression, crime and immorality, and as such, pressure was placed on the *Länder* by the town and district authorities, Military Government and welfare organisations to close them down as a priority. Whilst there were great financial motives to move refugees out of camps, which greatly influenced the German authorities' stance on the issue, other motives also came into play, which help to explain the attitudes shown, such as the US Military Government's anxiousness to prevent 'ghettos' of expellees and suspicion of refugees arriving from the Eastern Bloc in the context of the developing Cold War. Concerns over asocial behaviour and the effects of unemployment mark the continued relevance of those issues amongst the German population: social attitudes and values retained their old strong desire for *Ordnung* in society.⁹⁶ Whilst Müller remained more optimistic about the future of expellees, academic opinion tended to back up general concerns about refugee camp life and the dangers it held, especially for children and young people. Above all, the refugee camp marked a blot on the landscape of a West Germany that was frantically trying to rebuild itself, and the 'economic miracle' of the 1950s was never going to be complete with the continued existence of the camps. All these factors are significant in explaining the very black-and-white opinions on refugee camps and their residents shown by outsiders, and the latter's widespread inability to notice the togetherness and community spirit in the camps which played an important role in helping the residents cope with their poverty and retain optimism for the future.

However, a further plausible explanation for the inability of outsiders to recognise any positive aspects of the camps lies in the fact that they simply did not spend enough time in camps to be able to become aware of the cohesion, community and enterprising spirit that developed in camps like Poxdorf, Langenzenn and Poggenhagen. Reports written by university students who carried out two-week work placements at Youth Camp Poggenhagen in 1949 reveal a much more balanced view.⁹⁷ The *Praktikanten* admitted that they could not see the camp community at Poggenhagen and positivity of its residents at first, therefore it would be naïve to expect officials and others who only had at best infrequent and short visits to refugee camps, if at all, to be able to get beyond the mostly miserable first impressions.

III: Case Study: Camp Poxdorf in Bavaria

In contrast to the negative impression refugee camps made on many outside observers, a more in-depth case study of a Bavarian camp reveals a completely different picture of camp life. Camp Poxdorf was a former Luftwaffe spare parts storage area between the villages of Poxdorf and Baiersdorf in mid-Franconia which began to take in refugees and expellees in 1946 and was finally demolished in 1963.⁹⁸ Whilst it could be argued that the community that developed in Camp Poxdorf was particularly strong, and benefited from a range of factors that were not always all together in a single camp, it demonstrates well how different factors – many of which were evident in other camps⁹⁹ - could interact and reinforce each other in the community-building process. Camp Poxdorf is also a valuable example because of the variety of material available about the camp from a range of perspectives. It is well documented by official documents and

other archive material from the Staatsarchiv Bamberg, it has been written about in a number of published books and unpublished memoirs, many photographs of the camp taken by residents in the 1940s and 1950s exist, the author has been able to carry out questionnaires and oral history interviews with five former residents, as well as two refugees who lived outside of the camp, but became part of the community.¹⁰⁰

In January 1952 it was recorded as housing 363 refugees.¹⁰¹ It was in many respects a typical refugee 'housing camp', in that it was comprised of a number of wooden barrack huts, which were gradually split into individual rooms, but from these humble beginnings the town district of Hagenau grew,¹⁰² with the building work for the first permanent houses on the site being begun in September 1950, funded by the Catholic foundation, St Josef Trust.¹⁰³

The *Landrat* of Forchheim's monthly refugee matters reports in 1950 and 1951 chart Camp Poxdorf's development through the establishment of businesses and the St Josef building project.¹⁰⁴ The Refugee Office in *Landkreis* Forchheim looked after the welfare of the families staying in Camp Poxdorf and in January 1947 the State Commissioner for Refugee Matters took over responsibility for the camp. The camp straddled the towns of Poxdorf and Langensedelbach, but at first neither town showed interest in Camp Poxdorf, as they feared high investment costs and 'no authority felt themselves responsible for the refugees in Hagenau'.¹⁰⁵ On the other hand, the writings of the councillor responsible for refugees and foreigners make clear how Camp Poxdorf benefited from innovative thinking from the *Landkreis* refugee office. In October 1949, the monthly report

describes measures taken to encourage viable businesses to set up in the camp to improve the employment situation there and stimulate economic growth.¹⁰⁶

The actions taken by local government and their attitude towards Camp Poxdorf can be seen to have been a crucial factor in its subsequent development. Whilst the neglect from the towns that were meant to be responsible for the camp possibly stimulated self-help initiatives and a greater degree of community action on the part of the residents, the Refugee Office Leader in Forchheim's efforts to encourage businesses to establish themselves in the camp was instrumental in creating the economic conditions for the community of Hagenau to grow and prosper in the longer term.

Many of the residents there lived in the camp long term and its population remained fairly stable, after some initial fluctuations. There were 504 refugees in the camp in March 1947; the numbers fell to 447 in April, and then fell to 381 by September. By September 1948 the numbers dropped to 344, but by December 1948 they had reached 388 and again fluctuated little in the following 12 months. The patchy records for 1950 and 1951 suggest the numbers resident in Poxdorf in this period varied only between 380 and 390.¹⁰⁷ Most residents thus did not move into 'proper' housing until the 1950s and a significant number of these refugees moved into the St Josef homes, thus staying within the area of the former camp for decades and some still live in Hagenau.¹⁰⁸ Camp Poxdorf is a very good example of how a close-knit community could develop within a refugee camp which is still very much in evidence in the present day. Von der Brelie-Lewien's comment that, 'some later yearned looked back fondly to the settlement and camp communities of the early postwar years, the place where, along with many others, they

had first put down roots,¹⁰⁹ was clearly reflected in the three day celebrations of Hagenau's 60th anniversary of in September 2006, which attracted around 150 visitors. The alumni group for the camp school is still active and many of the friendships formed within the camp have lasted over the years, remaining strong today. A number of factors can be identified that possibly contributed to the community building in Camp Poxdorf. First of all, a large proportion of the residents who arrived in 1946 came from the same region: Eger in the Sudetenland.¹¹⁰ Whilst a lot of the residents only met each other in the nearby transit camp Schwabach, after the expulsion, the former Poxdorf residents contacted for this research project were all of the view that their shared background played an important part in the formation of relationships and community feeling in Camp Poxdorf. For example, Herr T wrote that this underscored the togetherness brought about by the initial common rejection by the locals: 'Many people came from the same village, we spoke the same dialect. It was simply that we were best placed to understand each other's worries and troubles'¹¹¹ Other former residents of the camp also emphasise this point, suggesting that it is a common feeling.¹¹²

In addition to the common place of origin of many of the Poxdorf residents, the long term residency of lots of the refugees living there also provided a favourable condition for a real community to grow. This factor, in tandem with the camp's relatively favourable economic situation, meant that the camp gradually provided a range of amenities for its residents. According to a list of social facilities in refugee camps compiled in 1953, at that time the camp had a school, a Kindergarten, a playground, a sports ground, a licensed house and a room for youth work.¹¹³ A voluntary fire brigade was founded by the residents in 1948, and a *Chronik* of the district mentions the establishment of two

Stammtische in 1952 and 1953.¹¹⁴ Even the basic camp infrastructure contributed to the cohesion amongst the residents. Frau G remembered, 'only one hut had a water supply and it was in the middle and people always met up there. There were always conversations - and not only about the expulsion'.¹¹⁵

After having suffered discrimination at the local village school in Poxdorf, where the teacher 'couldn't stand the children from the camp', Frau G and Herr T, have many happy memories of the camp school, their classmates and first teacher there.¹¹⁶ The teacher was a 21 year old Silesian, who 'understood' the children. Frau G. remembers, 'from the first day onwards we were delighted with him.'¹¹⁷ On sunny days, the pupils would take the chairs and desks from the school room outside to be taught in the open air. Frau G summarized her schooldays as following: 'Our schooldays were perfect [...] what we experienced there. It was only a year and a half with that teacher, but it was unparalleled. It was the most wonderful time! I would not want to have missed out on it - you can ask all the old pupils and they would all say the same. All of them! It was a magnificent time there with us!'¹¹⁸

Camp Poxdorf was also the scene for many cultural events and festivals - 'all just like back home'¹¹⁹ - such as *Fasching*, May Day, a church fair, the *Sonnenwendefeier* and an annual masked ball.¹²⁰ Frau M remembered of the festivities, 'The 'camp' could sure celebrate. Our masked balls were famed far and wide. Before the currency reform there was no possibility to buy masks, but the improvisation was fantastic. So the villagers from round and about would come to see!'¹²¹ These events were not only significant as evidence for the self-initiated social and cultural life that developed amongst the

refugees, but they also played a role in bringing the locals together with the camp residents, as the balls were open to all and attended by a number of native Poxdorfer from the village. As Frau G wrote, 'with time they began to realise that we were civilised people after all'.¹²²

The community in Camp Poxdorf was also helped considerably by the geographical location of the camp. In March 1951 it was reported that all the young people in Camp Poxdorf were either in training or employment.¹²³ The *Landrat* with responsibility for refugees in Forchheim reported that the camp's co-operation with the career advice section of the employment office was good, but had hit difficulties in providing the young people with apprenticeships, because of the lack of appropriate apprenticeships in the *Landkreis*. However, these problems were overcome by going further afield and finding apprenticeships in the employment office regions of Erlangen, Nuremberg and Bamberg. The town of Forchheim also provided vocational training opportunities.¹²⁴ Camp Poxdorf's good transport links to other towns meant that not only did the residents have more opportunities for seeking and travelling to work, but was instrumental to the firm Fränkische Wäscherei und Appreturanstalt's decision to move its factory from Erlangen to the camp in 1950, which created 300 jobs. The *Landsrat* for Forchheim commented in July of that year that 'there are now hardly any able-bodied unemployed residents' in Camp Poxdorf.¹²⁵ Therefore, not only were the residents not forced out of the camp by the need to find jobs in other areas and from 1951, when the first St Josef houses were built, some were able to move into permanent housing within the camp, but the comparatively high level of employment meant that Poxdorf residents were free from the unemployment-related lethargy and depression that was to be seen in many other

camps.¹²⁶ These were undoubtedly important contributing factors to the community there. As Herr S comments, 'it all led to people simply staying here, didn't it?'¹²⁷

Herr G described the process by which, whilst their original *Heimat* remained important to their identity, Hagenau became a second *Heimat* to many of the refugees living there.

Again and again it was seen that after a certain amount of time people got used to it here and achieved things. We also have a feeling towards our *Heimat* that was there before. That is still there, but in the meantime, I believe that if someone were to ask them if they wanted to go home [...] it has somehow moved to the periphery.[...] I know from camp life that there was a huge feeling of cohesion. [...] A certain group of people found each other in Hagenau, and here they achieved something again, and they found something – and that is a kind of *Heimat*.¹²⁸

Herr S also sees the growth of community in Hagenau as inevitable and comparable to that in any village.

In a village one must conform to the community. There was a *Bürgermeister*, there was a village community, there were municipal elections. It was exactly the same in the camp and they had to do what was in the interests of the people. It was no different there. [...] Then everyone built their houses and they remained. That is how this area developed – out of the huts, out of the former refugees became settled people.¹²⁹

IV: The Significance of Camp Community in Postwar West Germany

Many refugees and expellees experienced a tough reception from the locals when they arrived in West Germany for a number of reasons, firstly because they were viewed as competition for food, jobs and assistance at a time when everybody was struggling with the basics of living, but also as a result of their being 'unwanted strangers.'¹³⁰ As Kossert has phrased it, 'Background, language and mannerisms alone offered enough ammunition for discrimination, but in addition there was poverty, and belonging to another Christian

denomination, in particular in rural areas'.¹³¹ The newcomers were also regarded with the longstanding prejudice that was directed against all people 'from the East' and they found themselves often being taunted as '*Pimoks*' or '*Pollacken*' by the locals.¹³² Some refugees felt that this rejection and stereotyping was increased due to their living in camps and the continuity with the foreign forced labourers, which reinforced the parallel with '*Pollacken*' in the eyes of the locals, or camps' connections in the eyes of many with asocials.¹³³ However, in another sense some refugee camps could be argued to have aided integration, as they gave residents the chance to get used to their situation and accept that there was no going back in a supportive and self contained environment where they could form relationships and assert their cultural identity away from the hostility of the locals.

In common with the residents of Camp Poxdorf, the importance of a shared background was highlighted by many others who had stayed in various camps across West Germany, therefore can be seen as a widespread component in the development of community feeling in refugee camps.¹³⁴ However, although many camp cultural events strove to keep the traditions of the *Heimat* alive, the camps were not impermeable to more local cultures and customs, which were introduced by events put on by local dramatic societies, puppeteers and youth groups, such as the *Falken*.¹³⁵ The masked balls held in Camp Poxdorf also illustrate how the local population could, likewise, be introduced to the expellees' traditions. So, rather than being closed cultural communities, it is argued that refugee camps actually acted as a melting pot, holding events that stemmed from a number of traditions.

So, how does the experience of refugee camp residents fit into the changing society of post-war West Germany as a whole? Axel Schildt has suggested that Germans endured the end of the war and the occupation period with a mixture of relief, apathy, self pity and a persistent feeling of fear.¹³⁶ As has been Cillustrated, contemporaries were greatly worried about the destabilising effect that the refugee camps would have and that the malign influence of the more 'asocial' elements on wider society. The presence of the refugee camps thus encapsulated this widespread fear for the future of German society that was prevalent in these years. However, other than isolated instances, such as the Dachau Revolt in 1948,¹³⁷ the prophesised radicalisation of the camp residents did not transpire and reports of the chaos the camps' asocials caused in the local community were often exaggerated for political effect, as seen in the case of Siegen. It can even be argued that many housing camps were a positive force in the rebuilding of German society, as they fostered the formation of communities that were disintegrating elsewhere: one symptom of the chaos and uncertainty at the end of the war has been identified as Germans' 'retreat' into the family sphere.¹³⁸ Whilst this was also true of many expellee families,¹³⁹ for those who lived in refugee camps, establishing connections with fellow residents also often proved to be a very important coping mechanism. Although it must be emphasised that the level of cohesion visible in Camp Poxdorf/Hagenau was exceptional, there are many other examples of camp communities that can be seen to have existed in West Germany, even if few of them were to become permanent. The important thing was that neighbourly relationships and social lives developed that helped the expellees deal with their situations in a turbulent time in their lives.

In contrast to the contemporary perceptions that refugee camp residents were apathetic, many long term residents displayed great inventiveness in trying to improve their living conditions, evident in the tidy interiors of the huts and well tended gardens. In short, just like the other citizens of the Federal Republic, the refugees craved 'normalcy' in their lives, represented not just by improvements to their huts but participation in community life and social events. Whilst in the majority of cases, the camp community was fleeting, lasting only until the residents were able to move out of the camps and begin a new chapter in their lives, in other cases, such as the Hagenau residents, this community was to last for decades. It is arguably partly the burgeoning communities that prevented the widely feared radicalisation of the expellees living in refugee camps, despite their unexpected longevity – instead of breeding discontent, many bred cohesion, which helped the residents put up with the disappointments and inconveniences of their 'temporary' accommodation. Thus, it can be seen that despite the many very negative aspects to refugee camp life, the camp community building process that was visible in a number of camps, particularly the long term housing camps, helped provide an antidote to the bad times and assisted the peaceful integration of camp residents into West German society.

(University of Sheffield)

hip05mm@sheffield.ac.uk

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Hauptstaatsarchiv Hannover (HstAH):

Hann 180 Hann Nr.397/1, S. 25
Nds. 120 Hann 40/78 Nr. 49
Nds. 120 Lüneburg, Acc. 31/67 Nr. 36
Nds. 120 Lün. Acc 31/67 Nr. 98/1
Nds. 380 Acc. 62/65 Nr. 536

Hauptstaatsarchiv Düsseldorf (HstAD):

NW67 Nr. 1258 Bd I
NW67 Nr.1300
NW67 Nr. 1505

National Archives, Kew, London (NA):

FO 1013/ 314.
FO 1013/774
FO 1052/323

Staatsarchiv Bamberg (StAB)

Regierung von Oberfranken, K3.1975 Nr. 657
Regierung von Oberfranken, K3.1975 Nr. 658
Landratsamt Forchheim, K9 Nr. 9012
Landratsamt Forchheim, K9 9014

Staatsarchiv Nürnberg (StAN)

Reg v Mfr., Abgabe 1978, Nr. 19768
Reg. v. Mfr., Abgabe 1978, Nr. 19802
Reg v Mfr., Abgabe 2000, Registratur 630, Nr. 24/5 (Karton 201)

Stadtarchiv Siegen (StaASi)

E 917
E 1021

Contemporary Published Documents, Reports and Studies

Duchesne-Cripps, Audrey, *The Mental Outlook of the Displaced Persons as Seen through Welfare Work in Displaced Person's Camps* (essay 1955)
Kurz, Karl, *Lebensverhältnisse der Nachkriegsjugend* (Bremen, 1949)
Müller, Karl Valentin, *Heimatvertriebene Jugend*, (Kitzingen/Main, 1953)
Statistisches Bundesamt, *Die Kriegsbedingten Lager und ihren Insassen im Jahre 1955*, Statistik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Band 167 (Wiesbaden, 1957)
The Integration of Refugees into German Life – A Report of the ECA Technical Assistance Commission on the Integration of the Refugees in the German Republic (1951)
Zentralamt für Arbeit in der britischen Zone, *Die Flüchtlinge in der britischen Zone*, (Lemgo, 1948), p. 11

Interviews

DG, September 2006.
GJ, April 2007
JL, April 2007
LG, April 2007
EP, April 2007
RT, September 2006
WS, April 2007

Letters

Letter to author, Frau H. 29th October 2007

Surveys

Frau A, survey response, June 2006
Herr B, survey response, June 2006
Herr G, survey response, May 2006
Frau F, survey response, October 2007
Frau H, survey response, October 2007
Herr K, survey response, August 2007
Herr L, survey response, June 2006
Herr M., survey response, May 2006
Herr M, survey response, October 2006
Herr P, survey response, May 2006
Frau Schm, survey response, October 2007
Frau T, survey response, May 2006
Herr T., survey response, September 2006

Unpublished Material

Geißler, Magdalena, *Erinnerungen*, (1996).
Mayer, Frieda, *Ortsteil Hagenau: Chronik* (year unknown)

Theses

Kleinecke, Dagmar, *Entstehung und Entwicklung des Lagers Friedlands 1945-1955*,
PhD thesis, (Dramfeld, 1994)
McLaren, Meryn, *Refugee Camps in West Germany 1945-1960: Community Building and
Integration*, PhD thesis, (Sheffield, 2008)

Secondary Literature

Ahonen, Pertti, *After the Expulsion: West Germany and Eastern Europe 1945-1990*
(London, 2003)
Bauer, Franz J, *Flüchtlinge und Flüchtlingspolitik in Bayern, 1945-1950*, (Stuttgart,
1982)
Bauer, Franz J., 'Aufnahme und Eingliederung der Flüchtlinge und Vertriebenen. Das

- Beispiel Bayern 1945-1950' in Benz, Wolfgang (ed.), *Die Vertreibung der Deutschen aus dem Osten: Ursachen, Ereignisse, Folgen*, 2nd ed., (Frankfurt am Main, 1995)
- Beckstein, Hermann, 'Barackenmenschen. Flüchtlingslager und Lagerleben in den Landkreisen Schwabach und Hilpoltstein nach 1945' in *Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene im Landkreis Roth: Flucht – Vertreibung – Aufbau* (Roth, 2004)
- Beer, Mathias 'Lager als Lebensform in der deutschen Nachkriegsgesellschaft: Zur Neubewertung der Funktion der Flüchtlingswohnlager im Eingliederungsprozeß' in Jan Motte, Rainer Ohliger, Anne von Oswald (eds.) *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik, 50 Jahre Einwanderung: Nachkriegsgeschichte als Migrationsgeschichte* (Frankfurt/Main, 1999)
- Beer, Mathias, 'Ich möchte die Zeit nicht missen: Flüchtlingslager nach 1945 als totale Institutionen?', *Sozialwissenschaftliche Informationen*, 29, (2000), H.3
- Benz, Wolfgang (ed.), *Die Vertreibung der Deutschen aus dem Osten: Ursachen, Ereignisse, Folgen*, 2nd ed., (Frankfurt am Main, 1995)
- Carter, *How German is She? Postwar West German Reconstruction and the Consuming Woman* (Michigan, 1997)
- Connor, Ian, 'The Radicalization that Never Was? Refugees in the German Federal Republic' in Frank Biess, Mark Roseman and Hanna Schissler, *Conflict, Catastrophe and Continuity: Essays on Modern German History*, (New York, 2007),
- Erker, Paul, *Vom Heimatvertriebenen zum Neubürger: Sozialgeschichte der Flüchtlinge in einer agrarischen Region Mittelfrankens, 1945-1955* (Stuttgart, 1988)
- Frank, Rainer, *Die Heimatvertriebenen im Landkreis Weissenburg-Gunzenhausen*, (Weissenburg-Gunzenhausen, 1991)
- Fritzsche, Peter, *Life and Death in the Third Reich*, (Cambridge/Mass. 2008)
- Greim, Jürgen, *In einer neuen Heimat* (Hof, 1990)
- Grossmann, Atina, 'Trauma, Memory and Motherhood: Germans and Jewish Displaced Persons in Post-war Nazi Germany, 1945-1949' in Richard Bessel and Dirk Schumann (ed.), *Life after Death: Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europe During the 1940s and 1950s* (Cambridge, 2003)
- Höhn, Maria, *GIs and Fräuleins*, (Chapel Hill, 2002),
- Kebbedies, Frank, *Außer Kontrolle – Jugendkriminalpolitik in der NS-Zeit und der frühen Nachkriegszeit* (Essen, 2000)
- Kleßmann, Christoph, *Die doppelte Staatsgründung: Deutsche Geschichte 1945-1955* (Göttingen, 1989)
- Kossert, Andreas, *Kalte Heimat: die Geschichte der deutschen Vertriebenen nach 1945* (Munich, 2008).
- Lehmann, Albrecht, *Im Fremden ungewollt zuhaus: Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene in Westdeutschland 1945-1990*, (Munich, 1991)
- Levy, Daniel, 'Integrating Ethnic Germans in West Germany: The Early Postwar Period' in David Rock & Stefan Wolff (eds.) *Coming Home to Germany? The Integration of Ethnic Germans from Central and Eastern Europe in the Federal Republic* (New York, 2002)
- Marcuse, Harold, *Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp 1933-2001* (Cambridge, 2001)
- Mazower, Mark, *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century*, (London, 1998)
- Meyer, Sibylle & Eva Schulze, *Von Liebe sprach damals keener: Familienalltag in der*

- Nachkriegszeit* (Munich, 1985)
- Nägel, Gabriele, *Ein Dorf im Wandel: Geschichte Poxdorfs seit 1945*, (Poxdorf, 2006)
- Neblich, Esther, 'Das Flüchtlingslager in Hof-Moschendorf in der Nachkriegszeit und der Integration der Heimatvertriebenen in Raum Hof', *Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung* 64 (2004)
- Neumann, Gerald *Die Medien und die Flüchtlingsfrage in Bayern von 1945 bis 1953* (Munich, 1994)
- Pfau, Dieter, & Heinrich Ulrich Seidel (ed.), *Nachkriegszeit in Siegen 1945-1949: Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene zwischen Integration und Ablehnung* (Siegen, 2004)
- Parisius, Bernhard, *Vielen suchten sich ihre neue Heimat selbst: Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene in westlichen Niedersachsen* (Aurich, 2004)
- Reichling, Gerhard, 'Flucht und Vertreibung der Deutschen: Statistische Grundlagen und terminologische Probleme' in Rainer Schulze, Doris von der Brölie-Lewien & Helga Grebing (eds.) *Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene in der westdeutschen Nachkriegsgeschichte: Bilanzierung der Forschung und Perspektiven für die künftige Forschungsarbeit* (Hildesheim, 1987)
- Rock, David, & Stefan Wolff (ed.), *Coming Home to Germany? The Integration of Ethnic Germans from Central and Eastern Europe in the Federal Republic* (New York, 2002)
- Roseman, Mark, 'Division and stability: the Federal Republic of Germany, 1949-1989' in Mary Fulbrook (ed) *Twentieth Century Germany, Politics, Culture and Society* (London, 2001)
- Schelsky, Helmut, *Wandlungen der deutschen Familien in der Gegenwart* (Dortmund, 1953)
- Schildt, Axel, *Ankunft im Westen: Ein Essay zur Erfolgsgeschichte der Bundesrepublik* (Frankfurt, 1999)
- Schildt, Axel, *Die Sozialgeschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland bis 1989/90* (Munich, 2007)
- Schmolke, Franz, *1355-2003: 650 Jahre Stadt Baiersdorf: Geschichte und Ortsentwicklung* (Baiersdorf, 2003)
- Schoenberg, Hans W., *Germans from the East: A Study of their Migration, Resettlement and Subsequent Group History since 1945* (The Hague, 1970)
- Schraut, Sylvia, 'Make the Germans do it' – Die Flüchtlingsaufnahme in der Amerikanischen Besatzungszone' in Sylvia Schraut and Thomas Grosser (ed) *Die Flüchtlingsfrage in der deutschen Nachkriegsgesellschaft*, (Mannheim, 1996)
- Schraut, Sylvia, "'Make the Germans do it': The Refugee Problem in the American Zone of Post-war Germany' in Alfred J. Rieber, *Forced Migration in Central and Eastern Europe, 1939-1950*, (London, 2000)
- Schulze, Rainer (ed.), *Zwischen Heimat und Zuhause: Deutsche Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene in (West-)Deutschland 1945-2000* (Osnabrück, 2001)
- Seiler, Klaus, *Barackenkind: Vier Jahre Flüchtlingslager 1947-1951* (Berlin, 2004)
- Smith, David F., 'Juvenile Delinquency in the British Zone of Germany, 1945 – 51', *German History*, Vol. 12. (1) 1994
- von der Brölie-Lewien, Doris, "Dann kamen die Flüchtlinge": *Der Wandel des Landkreises Fallingb. vom Rüstungszentrum im "Dritten Reich" zur Flüchtlingshochburg nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Hildesheim, 1990)
- Voßkamp, Sabine, *Katholische Kirche und Vertriebene in Westdeutschland: Integration, Identität und ostpolitischer Diskurs 1945-1972*, (Stuttgart, 2007)

Wennemann, Adolf, 'Zwischen Emanzipation und Konformitätsdruck: Zuwanderer aus SBZ und DDR in Niedersachsen' in Klaus J. Bade (ed) *Fremde im Land* (Osnabrück, 1997), p. 130.

Willenberg, Knud, & Rudolf Groh, *Schafhof: ein Stadtteil im Abseits?* (Nuremberg, 1993)

Zukas, Alex, 'Lazy, Apathetic and Dangerous: the Social Construction of Unemployed Workers in Germany during the Late Weimar Republic', *Contemporary European History*, 10, 1 (2001)

¹ Compare, amongst many other works on this issue, Wolfgang Benz (ed.), *Die Vertreibung der Deutschen aus dem Osten: Ursachen, Ereignisse, Folgen*, 2nd ed., (Frankfurt am Main, 1995); Rainer Schulze (ed.) *Zwischen Heimat und Zuhause: Deutsche Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene in (West-)Deutschland 1945-2000* (Osnabrück, 2001); David Rock & Stefan Wolff (ed.), *Coming Home to Germany? The Integration of Ethnic Germans from Central and Eastern Europe in the Federal Republic* (New York, 2002); Pertti Ahonen, *After the Expulsion: West Germany and Eastern Europe 1945-1990* (London, 2003); Andreas Kossert, *Kalte Heimat: die Geschichte der deutschen Vertriebenen nach 1945* (Munich, 2008).

² Adolf Wennemann, 'Zwischen Emanzipation und Konformitätsdruck: Zuwanderer aus SBZ und DDR in Niedersachsen' in Klaus J. Bade (ed) *Fremde im Land* (Osnabrück, 1997), p. 130.

³ Statistisches Bundesamt, *Die Kriegsbedingten Lager und ihren Insassen im Jahre 1955*, Statistik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland Band 167 (Wiesbaden, 1957), p. 5.

⁴ Statistisches Bundesamt, *Kriegsbedingte Lager*, pp. 22, 23.

⁵ Statistisches Bundesamt, *Kriegsbedingte Lager*, p. 5.

⁶ Mathias Beer, 'Lager als Lebensform in der deutschen Nachkriegsgesellschaft: Zur Neubewertung der Funktion der Flüchtlingswohnlager im Eingliederungsprozeß' in Jan Motte, Rainer Ohliger, Anne von Oswald (eds.) *50 Jahre Bundesrepublik, 50 Jahre Einwanderung: Nachkriegsgeschichte als Migrationsgeschichte* (Frankfurt/Main, 1999) pp. 56-75; Mathias Beer, 'Ich möchte die Zeit nicht missen: Flüchtlingslager nach 1945 als totale Institutionen?', *Sozialwissenschaftliche Informationen*, 29, (2000), H.3, pp. 186-196; Bernhard Parisius, *Vielen suchten sich ihre neue Heimat selbst: Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene in westlichen Niedersachsen* (Aurich, 2004).

⁷ Cf. Peter Fritzsche, *Life and Death in the Third Reich*, (Cambridge/Mass. 2008).

⁸ Sabine Voßkamp, *Katholische Kirche und Vertriebene in Westdeutschland: Integration, Identität und ostpolitischer Diskurs 1945-1972*, (Stuttgart, 2007), pp 83-92.

⁹ Doris von der Brölie-Lewien, "Dann kamen die Flüchtlinge": *Der Wandel des Landkreises Fallingb. vom Rüstungszentrum im "Dritten Reich" zur Flüchtlingshochburg nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Hildesheim, 1990), pp. 139-145; Albrecht Lehmann, *Im Fremden ungewollt zuhaus: Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene in Westdeutschland 1945-1990*, (Munich, 1991), pp. 64-65, Daniel Levy, 'Integrating Ethnic Germans in West Germany: The Early Postwar Period' in Rock & Wolff (eds.) *Coming Home?*, pp. 25-26; and Kossert, *Kalte Heimat*, pp. 71-86 contain just a few examples.

¹⁰ Cf. Christoph Kleßmann, *Die doppelte Staatsgründung: Deutsche Geschichte 1945-1955* (Göttingen, 1989), p. 42; Kossert, *Kalte Heimat*, p. 82.

¹¹ Franz J Bauer, *Flüchtlinge und Flüchtlingspolitik in Bayern, 1945-1950*, (Stuttgart, 1982), p.20.

¹² Emigrants (refugees from the Nazi period), 'Umsiedler' (Südtirol & Bessarabien Germans, and others previously resettled under the 'Heim ins Reich' programme) and *Aussiedler* (arriving after completion of the official Potsdam settlement measures) were also classed as *Vertriebene*. Wennemann, 'Zwischen Emanzipation', p. 127.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 125-126

¹⁴ This caused some conflict with the German authorities, as a number of politicians protested against immigration from the Soviet Zone and wanted the military government to end the guaranteed asylum given to the refugees. *Ibid.*, p. 164.

¹⁵ Gerhard Reichling, 'Flucht und Vertreibung der Deutschen: Statistische Grundlagen

und terminologische Probleme' in Rainer Schulze, Doris von der Brelie-Lewien & Helga Grebing (eds.) *Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene in der westdeutschen Nachkriegsgeschichte: Bilanzierung der Forschung und Perspektiven für die künftige Forschungsarbeit* (Hildesheim, 1987), p. 52.

¹⁶ Wennemann, 'Zwischen Emanzipation', p. 126.

¹⁷ Cf. Zentralamt für Arbeit in der britischen Zone, *Die Flüchtlinge in der britischen Zone*, (Lemgo, 1948), p. 11.

¹⁸ Wennemann, 'Zwischen Emanzipation', p. 155.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 165.

²⁰ Herr B, survey response, June 2006.

²¹ Frau H, survey response, October 2007.

²² As the differences between refugees, expellees and Soviet Zone refugees are only of tangential concern in this work, and appear to have had little effect on how they experienced their time in the camps, the term refugee will be used to apply to all groups of German refugees, other than where clearly indicated. 'Soviet Zone refugee' will be used to denote the refugee's geographical origin rather than his or her legal status.

²³ Sylvia Schraut, "'Make the Germans do it': The Refugee Problem in the American Zone of Post-war Germany' in Alfred J. Rieber, *Forced Migration in Central and Eastern Europe, 1939-1950*, (London, 2000), p.116.

²⁴ Defined by the United Nations as 'nationals of the United Nations who have been obliged to leave their homes by reason of the war and are found in liberated or conquered territory'. Cited in Audrey Duchesne-Cripps, *The Mental Outlook of the Displaced Persons as Seen through Welfare Work in Displaced Person's Camps* (Cambridge, 1955), p. 7.

²⁵ ¹ Atina Grossmann estimates that 7.5 million non-Germans had been mobilized into the Nazi war economy before May 1945: Atina Grossmann, 'Trauma, Memory and Motherhood: Germans and Jewish Displaced Persons in Post-war Nazi Germany, 1945-1949' in Richard Bessel and Dirk Schumann (ed.), *Life after Death: Approaches to a Cultural and Social History of Europe During the 1940s and 1950s* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 97. Of these, around one and a half million Displaced Persons remained in Germany after 1945: Mark Mazower, *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century*, (London, 1998), p. 217. In the second half of 1945, 4,471, 680 German POWs had returned to Germany. Between 1946 and 1950 a further 4,199,341 returned. Sibylle Meyer & Eva Schulze, *Von Liebe sprach damals keener: Familienalltag in der Nachkriegszeit* (Munich, 1985), pp. 253-254.

²⁶ Hans W. Schoenberg, *Germans from the East: A Study of their Migration, Resettlement and Subsequent Group History since 1945* (The Hague, 1970), p. 44.

²⁷ Franz J. Bauer, 'Aufnahme und Eingliederung der Flüchtlinge und Vertriebenen. Das Beispiel Bayern 1945-1950' in Benz, (ed.), *Die Vertreibung*, p. 207.

²⁸ Bauer, 'Aufnahme', p. 207.

²⁹ Bauer, *Flüchtlinge*, p. 185, fn 84; Helmut Schelsky *Wandlungen der deutschen Familie in der Gegenwart* (Dortmund, 1953), p. 52.

³⁰ Beer, 'Lebensform', p. 58; Rainer Frank, *Die Heimatvertriebenen im Landkreis Weissenburg-Gunzenhausen*, (Weissenburg-Gunzenhausen, 1991) p.170.

³¹ Landrat und Oberbürgermeister to Firma Eichener Walzwerk, 20 November 1945, Stadtarchiv Siegen, (StaASi), E911.

³² Franz J Bauer, *Flüchtlinge und Flüchtlingspolitik in Bayern, 1945-1950*, (Stuttgart, 1982), p. 38, fn 71; Mil. Gov. Det (Refugee Branch) to the Landrat in Siegen, 12 February 1946, StaASi, E1012.

³³ Cf. Bauer, *Flüchtlinge und Flüchtlingspolitik*, p. 69; Mil. Gov. Det (Refugee Branch) to the Landrat in Siegen, 12 February 1946, StaASi, E1012.

³⁴ Staatsarchiv Nürnberg (StAN), Reg v Mfr., Abgabe 2000, Registratur 630, Nr. 24/5 (Karton 201).

³⁵ Memo to Regierungspräsident of Arnsberg from Military Government Detachment (refugee branch), 'Aufnahme von Flüchtlingen von der russischen Zone', 21 February 1946, Stadtarchiv Siegen (StaASi) E 1021; Memo from Regierungspräsident of Arnsberg, 'Ausgewiesene aus Neupolen', 27 February 1946, StaASi E1021. Testament to this is also the fact that the former Siegen residents contacted for this project stayed in the camps for periods varying between one day and one year.

³⁶ Statistisches Bundesamt, *Kriegsbedingte Lager*, pp. 29, 30.

³⁷ Hermann Beckstein, 'Barackenmenschen. Flüchtlingslager und Lagerleben in den Landkreisen Schwabach und Hilpoltstein nach 1945' in *Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene im Landkreis Roth: Flucht – Vertreibung – Aufbau* (Roth, 2004), pp. 15,16.

³⁸ Verzeichnis für Durchgangs- und Wohnungslager, HStAH Nds. 120 Hann 40/78 Nr. 49.

³⁹ Document 58, Auszug aus der Niederschrift der Kreistagssitzung vom 19. Juli 1952, betr. Beratung über Auflösung des Flüchtlingslagers Voggendorf, in Paul Erker, *Vom Heimatvertriebenen zum Neubürger*:

This is a pre-copy-editing, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in *German History* following peer review. The definitive publisher-authenticated version is available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/gerhis/ghp106>

Sozialgeschichte der Flüchtlinge in einer agrarischen Region Mittelfrankens, 1945-1955 (Stuttgart, 1988) p. 164.

⁴⁰ See Klaus Seiler, *Barackenkind: Vier Jahre Flüchtlingslager 1947-1951* (Berlin, 2004), pp. 12, 21-22.

⁴¹ For further details see Chapter 4 of my PhD thesis, *Refugee Camps in West Germany 1945-1960: Community Building and Integration* (Sheffield, 2008).

⁴² 'Lagerordnung', StaAN, C44/316.

⁴³ EP, interview, April 2007.

⁴⁴ Herr L, survey response, June 2006. This statement is part of 47 responses to a detailed survey questionnaire sent out to former refugee camp residents. For details, see appendix 1 of my thesis, *ibid.*

⁴⁵ JL, interview, April 2007.

⁴⁶ Letter from Nuremberg councillor to the Office for Refugee Matters, Government of Mid Franconia, 16 October 1956, Staatsarchiv Nürnberg (StA N), Reg. v. Mfr., Abgabe 1978, Nr. 19802; JL, interview, April 2007.

⁴⁷ GJ, interview, April 2007.

⁴⁸ Axel Schildt, *Die Sozialgeschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland bis 1989/90* (Munich, 2007), p.11.

⁴⁹ Letter from Camp Manager Becker to the Minister of Social Affairs, North Rhine Westphalia, 3rd June 1953, Hauptstaatsarchiv Düsseldorf (HstA D), NW67 Nr 1505, p. 118.

⁵⁰ GJ, interview, April 2007.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² Landratsamt Forchheim, 'Fürsorgebericht', 2 July 1951; Landratsamt Forchheim, 'Fürsorgebericht', 17 September 1952, Staatsarchiv Bamberg (StA B), K3.1975 Nr. 657.

⁵³ Frieda Mayer, *Ortsteil Hagenau: Chronik* (unpublished manuscript), pp. 1-2; Jürgen Greim, *In einer neuen Heimat*, (Hof, 1990) p. 184; Knud Willenberg & Rudolf Groh, *Schafhof: ein Stadtteil im Abseits?* (Nuremberg, 1993), p.23.

⁵⁴ Oberkreisdirektor, Landkreis Lüneburg an den Regierungspräsidenten in Lüneburg, 5 February 1952, HstA H Nds. 120 Lüneburg, Acc. 31/67 Nr. 36.

⁵⁵ Cf. Stadtrat zu Nürnberg, Flüchtlingsamt, to Regierung von Mittelfranken, Abtlg. Flüchtlingswesen, Ansbach, 5. December 1953, Betreff: Verlegung von Lagerinsassen des Lagers Witschelstr. nach Schafhof, StAN, Reg v Mfr., Abgabe 1978, Nr. 19768.

⁵⁶ Report to British Military Commander Haley, 19 August 1947, StaASi E917.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ David F. Smith, 'Juvenile Delinquency in the British Zone of Germany, 1945 – 51', *German History*, Vol. 12. (1) 1994, pp. 39, 49.

⁵⁹ This was also reflected in some academic studies. For example, Gerhard Hartstang wrote his 1949 Law dissertation (diss. Jur.) on Housing Poverty and its Meaning for Youth Criminality and Youth Delinquency: Frank Kebedies, *Außer Kontrolle – Jugendkriminalpolitik in der NS-Zeit und der frühen Nachkriegszeit* (Essen, 2000), p.132.

⁶⁰ Kebedies, *Außer Kontrolle*, p.132.

⁶¹ For more on the link between camp residents and unemployment please see p. 19, below.

⁶² Kebedies, *Außer Kontrolle*, p.134.

⁶³ Maria Höhn, *GIs and Fräuleins*, (Chapel Hill, 2002), p.9.

⁶⁴ Frau A, survey response, June 2006; Frau F, survey response, October 2007; Frau H, survey response, October 2007; Letter to author, Frau H, 29th October 2007; Herr K, survey response, July 2007; Herr P, survey response, May 2006

⁶⁵ Military Governor of the Province of Hanover to Oberpräsident of Hannover Province, 13th September 1945, cited by Dagmar Kleinecke, *Entstehung und Entwicklung des Lagers Friedlands 1945-1955*, thesis, (Dramfeld, 1994), p.21.

⁶⁶ Major General Acting Regional Commissioner to Chief Manpower Officer, 5th October 1948, National Archives (NA): FO 1013/774.

⁶⁷ Regional Governmental Officer, Land North Rhine Westphalia, to R.B. Commanders and K.R.O.s, Land North Rhine Westphalia, 28th September 1948, NA: FO 1013/774.

⁶⁸ Chief Manpower Officer, Land North Rhine Westphalia to Office of the Regional Commissioner, Land North Rhine Westphalia, 5th October 1948, NA: FO 1013/774.

⁶⁹ Chief Manpower Officer, Land North Rhine Westphalia, to the Office of the Regional Commissioner, North Rhine Westphalia, 27th September 1948, NA: FO 1013/774.

⁷⁰ Major General Acting Regional Commissioner to Chief Manpower Officer, 5th October 1948, NA: FO 1013/774.

This is a pre-copy-editing, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in *German History* following peer review. The definitive publisher-authenticated version is available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/gerhis/ghp106>

⁷¹ E.G. Reed, HQ Regierungsbezirk Cologne to W.J. Bate, Manpower Department, HQ North Rhine Westphalia, 11th October 1948, NA FO 1013/774.

⁷² Headquarters Military Government, Land NRW, to Regional Governmental Officer, NRW, 3rd December 1946, NA: FO 1013/ 314.

⁷³ Chief Public Health Officer Dr. W.I Bell to Land Manpower Department, 22 October 1948, NA: FO 1013/774.

⁷⁴ Sylvia Schraut, 'Make the Germans do it' – Die Flüchtlingsaufnahme in der Amerikanischen Besatzungszone' in Sylvia Schraut and Thomas Grosser (ed) *Die Flüchtlingsfrage in der deutschen Nachkriegsgesellschaft*, (Mannheim, 1996), p.123.

⁷⁵ Martin Kornrumpf, *In Bayern angekommen: Die Eingliederung der Vertriebenen, Zahlen – Daten – Namen* (Munich, 1979), p. 36; Statistisches Bundesamt, *Kriegsbedingte Lager*, p. 7.

⁷⁶ Erica Carter, *How German is She? Postwar West German Reconstruction and the Consuming Woman* (Michigan, 1997), p. 151. There were also concerns voiced that refugees and particularly camp residents would be susceptible to *right-wing* as well as left wing radicalism. Cf. Ian Connor, 'The Radicalization that Never Was? Refugees in the German Federal Republic' in Frank Biess, Mark Roseman and Hanna Schissler, *Conflict, Catastrophe and Continuity: Essays on Modern German History*, (New York, 2007), pp. 224-226

⁷⁷ Niederschrift über die Besprechung im Sozialministerium am 30.12.1947, StaASi E917. A British Official described the procedure thus: 'A refugee comes into Kreis Gandersheim for instance, gets accommodation, surrenders his Registration Card for the civilian ration card. He stays a few days or a week or two, then gets on the move again. He makes for a Refugee Camp, claims to be a genuine Refugee, gets another Registration Card and repeats the procedure elsewhere', Office of the British Military Government, 6th March 1946, p.6, NA FO 1052/323.

⁷⁸ Dieter Pfau & Heinrich Ulrich Seidel (ed.) *Nachkriegszeit in Siegen 1945-1949: Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene zwischen Integration und Ablehnung* (Siegen, 2004), p.90.

⁷⁹ Letter from Frau M. Grosser to Carl Arnold, 15 June 1949, HstA D, NW67, Nr.1300, p.171.

⁸⁰ Letter from Minister for Social Affairs to M. Grosser, 23 August 1949, HstA D, NW67, Nr.1300, p.176. Letter from Minister for Social Affairs to M. Grosser, 23 August 1949, HstA D, NW67 Nr.1300, p.176.

⁸¹ Alex Zukas, 'Lazy, Apathetic and Dangerous: the Social Construction of Unemployed Workers in Germany during the Late Weimar Republic', *Contemporary European History*, 10, 1 (2001), p.26.

⁸² Heimatlosen-Lagerdienst CVJM/YMCA, Generalsekretariat Günther Feuser: Bericht über die Entwicklung des Dienstes seit dem 1.10.1951, HstA D, NW67 Nr. 1258 Bd I, 31 May 1952.

⁸³ Pietrkowski, December 1930, cited by Zukas, 'Lazy', p.27.

⁸⁴ Hans Vogel, May 1931, cited by Zukas, 'Lazy' p.29.

⁸⁵ Zukas, 'Lazy', p.30.

⁸⁶ Oberstadtdirektor Baumann an den Sozialminister, dem Regierungspräsidenten zur Kenntnis, 30. August 1947, StaASi E917.

⁸⁷ Bavarian Red Cross employee, cited by Esther Neblich, 'Das Flüchtlingslager in Hof-Moschendorf in der Nachkriegszeit und der Integration der Heimatvertriebenen in Raum Hof', *Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung* 64 (2004) p. 226.

⁸⁸ Statistisches Bundesamt, *Kriegsbedingte Lager*, pp. 8, 34, 44, 52.

⁸⁹ *The Integration of Refugees into German Life – A Report of the ECA Technical Assistance Commission on the Integration of the Refugees in the German Republic* (1951), p.13. The report, comprising the joint work of Germans and American experts, was the product of the Federal Government's request that the US Government appoint commission to suggest ways to assist the refugees' integration into West Germany.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* p.16.

⁹¹ Karl Kurz, *Lebensverhältnisse der Nachkriegsjugend* (Bremen, 1949), pp. 92-113.

⁹² Kurz, *Lebensverhältnisse*, p. 113.

⁹³ *ECA Technical Assistance Commission* report p. 3.

⁹⁴ Karl Valentin Müller, *Heimatvertriebene Jugend*, (Kitzingen/Main, 1953) p. 156.

⁹⁵ Müller, *Heimatvertriebene*, p. 156.

⁹⁶ Mark Roseman, 'Division and stability: the Federal Republic of Germany, 1949-1989' in Mary Fullbrook (ed) *Twentieth Century Germany, Politics, Culture and Society* (London, 2001), pp. 186-187.

⁹⁷ Bericht über das sozialpädagogische Praktikum im Flüchtlingsjugend-Durchgangslager Poggenhagen vom 25. August bis 24. September 1949, Heinz Gottschalk, HstA H Nds. 380 Acc. 62/65, Nr. 536; Praktikumsbericht über das sozialpädagogische Praktikum im Jugend-Flüchtlings-Durchgangslager Poggenhagen, Krs. Neustadt am Rübenberge, von stud.-päd.-Stenger. Luthe, den 22. Sept. 1949 *ibid.*;

This is a pre-copy-editing, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in *German History* following peer review. The definitive publisher-authenticated version is available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/gerhis/ghp106>

Bericht über das sozialpädagogische Praktikum in Flüchtlings-Jugend-Durchgangslager Poggenhagen vom 1. bis 14. August 1949, Ulrich Sachse, *ibid.*

⁹⁸ Gabriele Nägel, *Ein Dorf im Wandel: Geschichte Poxdorfs seit 1945*, (Poxdorf, 2006) p. 46.

⁹⁹ For example, Camp Schafhof benefited from being in Nuremberg, and so in close proximity to employment opportunities; both Camps Langenzenn and Schafhof had large numbers of long term residents, and former residents of Camps Markt Bibert and Mistelbach, and Siegen residents who had arrived in 'Operation Swallow' transportations found there to be many refugees from the same regions in the camps.

¹⁰⁰ Cf Gabriele Nägel, *Ein Dorf im Wandel: Geschichte Poxdorfs seit 1945*, (Poxdorf, 2006); Franz Schmolke, *1355-2003: 650 Jahre Stadt Baiersdorf: Geschichte und Ortsentwicklung* (Baiersdorf, 2003); Magdalena Geißler, *Erinnerungen*, unpublished manuscript (Baiersdorf/Hagenau, 1996); Frieda Mayer, *Ortsteil Hagenau*.

¹⁰¹ Landratsamt Forchheim StA B, K3/1981, 152

¹⁰² The new name was chosen in 1953. Nägel, *Dorf*, p. 63.

¹⁰³ Dr Karl Schoenbach to Regierung von Oberfranken, Tätigkeitsbericht (Berichtzeit vom 1-31 März 1950); Monatsbericht September 1950, StA B, Landratsamt Forchheim, K9 9014.

¹⁰⁴ StA B Landratsamt Forchheim, K9 9014.

¹⁰⁵ Franz Schmolke, *1355-2003: 650 Jahre Stadt Baiersdorf*, p. 88.

¹⁰⁶ Monatsbericht Oktober 1949, IX. Besondere Verhältnisse der Flüchtlinge und Evakuierte, StA B Landratsamt Forchheim, K9 Nr. 9012.

¹⁰⁷ Monthly Reports, May 1947-August 1951, Staatsarchiv Bamberg (StAB), K9 9012, K3 1981 152/8, K9 9014, K3 1981, 150.

¹⁰⁸ Resident RT estimates that around 20% of the current residents of Hagenau formerly lived in Camp Poxdorf. Interview, September 2006.

¹⁰⁹ Von der Brelie-Lewien, „Dann kamen die Flüchtlinge“, p. 224.

¹¹⁰ Nägel, *Dorf*, p. 46.

¹¹¹ Herr T, survey response, September 2006.

¹¹² LG, interview, April 2007; WS, interview, April 2007, Herr M., survey response, May 2006.

¹¹³ 'Soziale Einrichtungen in Flüchtlingslagern, Stichtag 1.3.1953', StA B, Regierung von Oberfranken, K3.1975 Nr. 658.

¹¹⁴ Frieda Mayer, *Ortsteil Hagenau*, p 4.

¹¹⁵ LG, interview, April 2006.

¹¹⁶ Frau G, survey response, 2006, interview April 2007.

¹¹⁷ Geißler, *Erinnerungen*,.

¹¹⁸ LG, interview, April 2007.

¹¹⁹ Geißler, *Erinnerungen*.

¹²⁰ WS, Interview, April 2007; Frieda Mayer, *Hagenau*, p 4.

¹²¹ Frau M, survey response, October 2006.

¹²² Geißler, *Erinnerungen*.

¹²³ Flüchtlingsamt, Landratsamt Forchheim, 'Fürsorgebericht', 29th March 1951, StA B K3.1975 Nr.657.

¹²⁴ Flüchtlingsamt, Landratsamt Forchheim, 'Fürsorgebericht', 17th October 1952, StA B, K3.1975 Nr.657.

¹²⁵ Landratsamt Forchheim, Monatsbericht Juli 1950, StAB K9 9014.

¹²⁶ Cf. Heimatlosen-Lagerdienst CVJM/YMCA.

¹²⁷ WS, interview, 24th April 2007.

¹²⁸ DG, interview, September 2006.

¹²⁹ WS, interview, April 2007.

¹³⁰ Kossert, *Kalte Heimat*, p. 12

¹³¹ *Ibid.* p. 85.

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 77; H. D. De Vries Reilingh & K. Baschwitz, "Menschen ohne Heimat" Das Flüchtlingsproblem in einem deutschen Landkreis', *Sociaal Kompas*, 3 (1), Mei/Juni 1955, p. 45.

¹³³ Herr K, survey response, August 2007; Frau H, survey response, October 2007; Kossert, *Kalte Heimat*, p. 49.

¹³⁴ 48% of those asked whether they thought community was more likely to develop in camps where there were many people from the same region believed it was. See Meryn McLaren, *Refugee Camps in West Germany 1945-1960: Community Building and Integration*, PhD thesis, (Sheffield, 2008) appendix I.

¹³⁵ Landratsamt Forchheim, 'Fürsorgebericht', 2 July 1951; Landratsamt Forchheim, 'Fürsorgebericht', 17 September 1952, StA B, K3.1975 Nr. 657; Spielleitung Otto Schulz-Hailing an Herrn

This is a pre-copy-editing, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in *German History* following peer review. The definitive publisher-authenticated version is available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/gerhis/ghp106>

Regierungspräsidenten in Lüneburg, 26 October 1952, HstA H Nds. 120 Lün. Acc 31/67 Nr. 98/1; GJ, Interview, April 2007.

¹³⁶ Axel Schildt, *Ankunft im Westen: Ein Essay zur Erfolgsgeschichte der Bundesrepublik* (Frankfurt, 1999), p. 88.

¹³⁷ The Dachau Revolt describes the protests and hunger strikes led by Egon Herrmann in autumn 1948 to try to persuade the Bavarian government to improve camp conditions and resident input in their running. See Gerald Neumann, *Die Medien und die Flüchtlingsfrage in Bayern von 1945 bis 1953* (Munich, 1994), pp. 106-110; Harold Marcuse, *Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp 1933-2001* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 162-163.

¹³⁸ Schelsky, *Wandlungen*, pp. 63, 75, 94-95; Schildt, *Sozialgeschichte*, p. 11.

¹³⁹ Herr G, survey response, May 2006; Frau T, survey response, May 2006; Frau Schm, survey response, October 2007.