repeatedly had to prove their masculinity in their interactions with prisoners. This sometimes proved to be particularly difficult with a number of working-class inmates, whose physical ideal of powerful, muscular proletarians carried significant weight in their own notions of masculinity. A militaristic drill program launched by communist prisoners as a recreational activity was banned by Eicke because the prisoners were to be robbed of all pride in their masculinity. In the final chapter, Dillon examines the relationships between the SS and the population of the small town of Dachau. He refers here primarily to analyses by German historian Sybille Steinbacher, which are not yet available in English, and complements these with a number of disciplinary incidents that he discovered in the personnel files of SS men relating to disputes between Dachau residents and individual members of the SS. The book ends with an epilogue that traces the careers of a number of SS men after the outbreak of the war. This is ultimately disappointing because it merely rehashes material that is sufficiently well known in the literature and foregoes a deeper analysis that ties together the author’s results here.

In short, it should be noted that Dillon’s comprehensive screening of the personnel files of Dachau SS men represents the book’s major contribution to the research conducted to date. Dillon demonstrates here that he is a splendid narrator who has selected from the files many captivating stories that go beyond individual cases, and has interpreted them in a skilful and thoughtful manner. Unfortunately, however, Dillon refrains from forming an overarching analysis of these individual cases. Comparisons with other camps emerge only very sporadically and are not subject to a systematic review anywhere in the book. In the end, this leaves unanswered what I view as the key research questions in this field. Issues that need addressing here include the specific nature of the “Dachau school” run by the SS and to what extent the Dachau SS units actually differed significantly from the SS units in the other early concentration camps.

In conclusion, Dillon has produced a highly readable history of the Dachau SS units during the prewar years that offers a great deal of new information and is recommended reading for everyone who is interested in the connection between violence and masculinity under National Socialism. It remains, however, in many respects a patchwork of histories and ideas that leaves future researchers with the task of conducting a conclusive analysis of these new results.

Marc Buggeln
Humboldt University of Berlin

Tuvia Friling’s gripping and disturbing book, *A Jewish Kapo in Auschwitz: History, Memory, and the Politics of Survival*, is an account of the tragic fate of one of the victims of European politics in the twentieth century. Eliezer Gruenbaum was the second son of Yitzhak Gruenbaum, the leader of one of two Zionist groups that dominated Jewish parliamentary life in Poland in the 1920s.

One of the great strengths of this extremely well-researched book is that it provides an extensive account of this investigation based on the records in the Polish Archiwum Akt Nowych. According to one of his
accusers, the French communist Jacques Furmanski, Eliezer “was convinced that no one would come out of the camp [alive], that there would be no judges, that he would never have to explain his actions” (110). Eliezer claimed in his defense that the accusations against him were the result of the thankless position that he had assumed, a position that had made him “part of the German machine.” He admitted that on occasion he might have “gone too far,” but that ultimately he had always acted to protect party members and prisoners in general. Eliezer also claimed that the accusations could be attributed to his family name: “People were more hurt by my actions than they would have been if they had been performed by a person with an unfamiliar name” (106). Nevertheless, the party commission determined that he had given a “defeatist” (30) lecture while in the camp, and that he had been guilty of administering beatings that in some cases resulted in the deaths of prisoners. It concluded that Eliezer had “placed himself outside the party framework, and can never return to it” (110).

Eliezer therefore did not return to Poland cleared of all charges, as he had originally intended, but remained in Paris instead. He was arrested there by the French authorities on the basis of accusations against him by his fellow prisoners in Auschwitz. The trial, in which Yitzhak Gruenbaum intervened in hopes of securing the exoneration of his son, ended inconclusively when the court held that it had no jurisdiction because neither the accused nor the accusers were French citizens. Eliezer’s position in France was now increasingly uncomfortable as he was both stateless and shunned by his former communist party comrades. He decided to emigrate to Israel, but there too he was subjected to vicious attacks by right-wing and religious groups eager, among other things, to discredit his father. He decided to redeem himself by fighting in the Israeli armed forces, which he was able to join by means of his father’s intervention with David Ben-Gurion, and was killed in battle near Ramat Rachel on May 22, 1948, barely a week after the establishment of the state. There were unsubstantiated rumors that he was killed by one of his fellow soldiers. His death did not end the attacks on him. In Yehiel De-Nur’s novel They Called Him Piepl (1961), which was widely praised in the Orthodox and revisionist press, Eliezer is depicted (under a fictional name) as a vicious kapo. A Jewish Kapo in Auschwitz does not resolve how much truth there is in the accusations against him and concludes with a series of questions: “Was Eliezer Gruenbaum a Shakespearean hero? Macbeth, perhaps? Both evil and tragic? A hero and a villain? . . . Was he also defeated by the horrifying pressure he was under at the camps—was he a victim?” (261) We shall never know.

ANTONY POLONSKY
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The Ambiguity of Virtue: Gertrude van Tijn and the Fate of the Dutch Jews, based on extensive international research, is the first biography of Gertrude van Tijn—a hitherto little-known board member of the Jewish Council in Amsterdam. Among the sources used are Van Tijn’s private correspondence and her unpublished autobiography. As a former board member of the Jewish Council, Van Tijn gained a negative postwar reputation in the Dutch Jewish community as a collaborator with the Nazis and profiteer during the deportation years. Bernard Wasserstein arrives at a much more benevolent conclusion: he regards Van Tijn as a courageous and admirable woman who tried to save as many Jewish lives as possible.

Van Tijn (1891–1974) was born in Braunschweig to an assimilated Jewish merchant family. After the early death of her mother, Gertrude and her two brothers were first sent to foster parents, and later to Berlin. There she completed a course in social work under Alice Salomon. An independent character, she moved to London, started working, and became involved in women’s groups and the suffragette movement. During the First World War, the English regarded Germans as enemy aliens, and in 1915 she had to leave the country. Van Tijn came to Amsterdam, where she worked in banks as well as in Zionist and Jewish social aid organizations. She also met her husband Jacques van Tijn there, and had a marriage of seventeen years full of international travel. By 1932 she had become very active in aid work for Jewish refugees. Fundraising became her expertise and she became the Netherlands representative of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee in New York. She established work and training projects for young Jewish refugees, and soon became the driving force in the Jewish Refugees Committee in Amsterdam. After the Netherlands was occupied by Nazi Germany in 1940, the work of this Committee became very difficult. The Nazis ordered the establishment of a Jewish Council in February 1941; David Cohen and Abraham Asscher became its infamous directors, while Van Tijn became director of the emigration department, and later the “Aid to the Departing” (Hulp aan Vertrekkenden) department. Working for the Jewish Council meant exemption from deportation, and thus the board members were powerful people.

Wasserstein presents convincing descriptions of Van Tijn’s persistent efforts to facilitate the emigration of German Jews; her risky decisions to remain in or return to the Netherlands during the war; and the opportunities and dangers she faced as the only woman in the inner circle of the Jewish Council. In my view, Wasserstein does not recognize the extent of Van Tijn’s exceptional and privileged position. He stresses that she was not a full member of the Jewish Council, but it is clear that she was quite powerful and that she was regarded as such even by the Nazis. Her personal documents, dated November 1941 in Amsterdam and December 1943 in Westerbork concentration camp, record her position as “bestuurslid,” board member of the Jewish Council.

Van Tijn was also the only German Jew on the Jewish Council—this, in my view, of vital significance. The tensions between Dutch and German Jews were substantial;