



Mittäterschaft in Osteuropa
im Zweiten Weltkrieg und
im Holocaust

*Collaboration in Eastern
Europe during World War II
and the Holocaust*

5.–7.12.2013

Palais Trautson
Museumstraße 7
1010 Wien

SIMON WIESENTHAL CONFERENCE

UNITED STATES
HOLOCAUST
MEMORIAL
MUSEUM
CENTER FOR ADVANCED HOLOCAUST STUDIES

WIENER WIESENTHAL INSTITUT
FÜR HOLOCAUST-STUDIEN (VWI)

Collaboration in Eastern Europe during
World War II and the Holocaust

Abstracts & CVs

Ivan Katchanovski (University of Ottawa)	
The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, and the Nazi Genocide in Ukraine	4
Viktoria Silwanowitsch (University of Heidelberg)	
Intellectual Collaboration and Antisemitic Propaganda in “Novyj Put” (= The New Way), a newspaper under Nazi Occupation, 1941–1943	5
Alexander Prusin (New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro)	
Collaboration Balkan Style: The Native Administration and the Holocaust in Serbia, 1941–1944	6
Maria Kavala (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki)	
Greek Authorities, the Local Population, and the Holocaust in Thessaloniki during the Nazi Occupation: Collaboration, Complicity, Indifference. A Comparison between Thessaloniki and Bulgaria	7
Filip Erdeljac (New York University)	
Collaborating With the Ustasha: Resistance and Compliance in World War II Croatia	10
Regina Fritz (Institute of Contemporary History Munich-Berlin)	
Local Collaboration in Hungary following German Occupation	11
Śławomir Kapralski (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies - VWI)	
Collaboration and the Roma Genocide in Occupied Poland	12
Fielder Valone (Indiana University, Bloomington)	
Destroying the Ties that Bind: Rituals of Humiliation, Collaboration, and the Holocaust in Three Lithuanian Counties, June–December, 1941	13
Yannis Skalidakis (Panteion University, Athens)	
Local Administration as an Intermediary Agent of the Violent Modernization of Traditional Cretan Society: The Cases of Forced Labour and Destruction of the Jewish Community	16
Anders Blomqvist (Södertörn University, Stockholm)	
Economic Nationalizing in Szatmárnémeti/Satu Mare – Local Motives for Deporting Jews	17
Hana Kubátová (Charles University, Prague)	
Until the Very End: Economic Forms of Collaboration in Slovakia, Fall 1944–Spring 1945	18
Oleg Valeryevich Ratushnyak (Kuban State University, Krasnodar)	
The Cossacks and the Third Reich: Relations and Participation in the Second World War	21
Mirna Zakić (Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies, FRIAS)	
Ethnic Germans and Others: Antisemitism and Anti-Slavism among the Banat Volksdeutsche in World War II	22
Danijel Vojak (Ivo Pilar Institute of Social Sciences, Zagreb)	
The Relations and Attitudes of Non–Romani People towards the Persecution and Suffering of Roma in the Independent State of Croatia, 1941–1945	23
Jan Láníček (University of New South Wales, Sydney)	
Ordinary Gendarmes? Czech Police Forces and the Holocaust in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia	26
Alfons Adam (Terezín Initiative Institute, Prague)	
Collaboration by Czech Police Forces with the Nazi Regime	27
Alexander Korb (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies - VWI)	
Intertwined Genocides? Patterns of Ustasha Mass Violence in Croatia in Comparative Perspective	28
Tomasz Frydel (University of Toronto)	
“There Was No Order to Shoot the Jews”: The Polish “Blue” Police and the Dynamics of Local Violence in Distrikt Krakau of the General Government	29
Andrea Pető (Central European University, Budapest)	
Gendering Collaboration: The Challenges of a Micro-Historical Approach	33
Vanda Rajcan (Northwestern University, Evanston)	
“Židom strach”: Alexander Mach’s Journey from Priesthood to War Crimes Trial	34
Tetiana Pastushenko (National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kyiv)	
Soviet “Justice”: The Evolution of Definitions of Collaboration with Nazi Germany in the Soviet Union, 1941–1955	35
Franziska Exeler (European University Institute, Florence)	
Determining Guilt in Post-Occupation Soviet Belorussia	36
Iryna Sklokina (V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University)	
Soviet Politics of the Memory of Collaboration under Nazi Occupation as a Tool of National Policy: Regional Aspects	39
Imke Hansen (Uppsala University)	
“And Some of Them Were Us!” Local Collaboration in Belarus and the Ukraine as Reflected in Oral History Interviews	40
Natalia Aleksion (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies - VWI)	
“We were Classmates”: Jewish Perceptions of Collaborators in Eastern Galicia	41
Mykola Borovyk (Taras Shevchenko National University, Kyiv)	
Collaboration and Collaborators in the Everyday Perceptions of the Inhabitants of Ukraine	42

Panel 1

December 5, 2013

10:30 - 12:30

**Institutionalisierte Kollaboration
Institutionalized Collaboration***Chair: Sybille Steinbacher (University of Vienna)*

sybille.steinbacher@univie.ac.at

Sybille Steinbacher is professor of contemporary history at the University of Vienna, Austria. In 2012/13, she was a Senior Fellow at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington D.C., and in 2010, she was a Visiting Professor at the Fritz Bauer Institute for the History and Impact of the Holocaust in Frankfurt am Main, Germany. Her numerous publications include *Auschwitz: A History* (2005), „Musterstadt Auschwitz“. *Germanisierungspolitik und Judenmord in Ostoberschlesien* (2000), and *Dachau. Die Stadt und das Konzentrationslager in der NS-Zeit. Die Untersuchung einer Nachbarschaft* (1994). She is the editor of *Holocaust und Völkermorde. Die Reichweite des Vergleichs* (2012), and „Volksgenossinnen“. *Frauen in der NS-Volksgemeinschaft* (2007); she co-edited *Standort- und Kommandanturbefehle des Konzentrationslagers Auschwitz 1940-1945* (2000), and *Ausbeutung, Vernichtung, Öffentlichkeit. Neue Studien zur nationalsozialistischen Lagerpolitik* (2000).

Ivan Katchanovski
(University of Ottawa)

The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, and the Nazi Genocide in Ukraine

This paper analyzes the involvement of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) in Nazi genocide during World War II in Ukraine. The issue of the political remembrance, rehabilitation, and commemoration of these radical nationalist organizations became one of the central political issues in this post-Soviet state. The research question is whether leaders and members of the Bandera faction of the OUN (OUN-B) and the UPA were involved in the Nazi-led genocide. This article devotes particular attention to Volhynia where the UPA was established by the OUN-B in 1943. The study analyzes the biographies of 329 OUN-B and UPA leaders and documents concerning the OUN-B and the UPA, local police, and Nazi mass executions of Jews, Ukrainians, and Poles from the State Archive of the Volyn Region, the State Archive of the Rivne Region, the Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine in the Volyn Region, the Branch State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine, the National Archives in the US, and other archives. This paper shows that large proportions of leaders and members of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army served in various police and militia formations, collaborated with security and intelligence agencies of Nazi Germany, and took part in the Nazi genocide, primarily in assisting roles during mass executions of Jews in the first two years of the Nazi occupation of Ukraine.

ikatchan@uottawa.ca

Dr. Ivan Katchanovski teaches at the School of Political Studies and the Conflict Studies and Human Rights Program at the University of Ottawa. His research interests include the politics of historical memory and conflicts in Ukraine and comparative politics in the post-Soviet states. He received his Ph.D. from George Mason University. His publications include *Historical Dictionary of Ukraine* (2nd edition, 2013), *Cleft Countries: Regional Political Divisions and Cultures in Post-Soviet Ukraine and Moldova* (2006), and *The Paradox of American Unionism: Why Americans Like Unions More Than Canadians Do, But Join Much Less* (2004).

Intellectual Collaboration and Antisemitic Propaganda in “Novyj Put’” (= The New Way), a newspaper under Nazi Occupation, 1941–1943

In the Soviet territories occupied during the Second World War a number of different newspapers appeared for the purpose of disseminating Nazi propaganda. The propaganda departments recruited a number of representatives of the local population to work in this press, who, as an analysis of various press organs clearly shows, did not only take up the propaganda themes of the occupiers, but also developed these further on their own. One of the major focuses of the occupation press was antisemitism. For this subject particularly, the articles of local members of the press played a role that must not be underestimated. Therefore, in the conference presentation the role of local members of the press in the dissemination and design of antisemitic propaganda will be shown using one of the central press organs of the occupied Soviet territories, the Smolensk newspaper *Novyj Put’*.

The antisemitism in *Novyj Put’*, like that in many other newspapers, was one of the indispensable components of the anti-Bolshevik propaganda. In its anti-Bolshevik criticism, the paper often emphasized that the Bolshevik rule was Jewish rule. Thus the term *Judeo-bolshevism* is at the foreground in almost every article. But antisemitism appeared not only in political editorials which were generally provided to the editors in finished form, but often could also be found in articles penned by the local members of the press. These revealed a tendency to personify the Jewish “enemy type” by listing allegedly concrete examples, primarily in the short quasi-literary stories that, among other things, offered a broad platform for the propagation of various anti-Jewish prejudices. The example of *Novyj Put’* makes clear that the members of the press enjoyed a certain amount of freedom and leeway in their work, and were not merely a tool of the occupiers, without a will of their own. Often the local members of the press were the ones who sharpened the antisemitic propaganda even more, in that they interwove it with local context and personifications, as well as choosing a variety of literary forms for their representations, which in the end influenced the readers even more.

vsilwanowitsch@yahoo.de

Viktoria Silwanowitsch is a PhD candidate in the Department of Eastern European History at the University of Heidelberg, where she is writing a dissertation entitled *The Russian-Language National Socialist Occupation Press in the ‘Mitte’ Rear-Echelon Territory, 1941-1944*. From 2003 to 2009, she studied Eastern European History and Slavic Studies at Heidelberg University. From 2009 to 2011, she served as a research assistant for the Seminar for Eastern European History in the research project *The National Socialist Occupation Press in the Occupied Areas of the Soviet Union, 1941–1944*.

Alexander Prusin

(New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro)

Collaboration Balkan Style: The Native Administration and the Holocaust in Serbia, 1941–1944

The proposed paper aims at exploring the role of the Serbian collaborationist regime in maintaining German occupation, particularly in the persecution and genocide of Jews. German rule in Serbia was guided by the expansionist vision of the New Order and by necessity of utilizing the country's human and material resources. The Nazi ideological war thus coexisted with a more rational approach, which entailed the use of the collaborationist structures to keep the country pacified. In this context, the so-called "Council of Commissars" (April–August 1941) headed by Milan Aćimović and the "Government of National Salvation" under General Milan Nedić (August 1941–October 1944) functioned as auxiliary branches of the German military administration. At the same time, however, they actively participated in the struggle against the resistance. Under German orders, they also published and enforced anti-Jewish decrees, facilitating the Final Solution in Serbia. Some collaborationist organizations and offices such as the proto-fascist *Zbor*, the Ministry of the Interior, and the Special Police exceeded German expectations and displayed considerable zeal and initiative in disseminating a virulent antisemitic propaganda and hunting down Jews, who avoided registration and ghettoization.

aprusin@nmt.edu

Dr. Alexander Prusin is Professor of History in the Humanities Department at the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, where he teaches World and European history. He is the author of two books, *Nationalizing a Borderland: War, Ethnicity, and Anti-Jewish Violence in East Galicia, 1914-1920* (2005) and *The "Lands Between": Conflict in the East European Borderlands, 1870-1992* (2010), as well as many articles.

Greek Authorities, the Local Population, and the Holocaust in Thessaloniki during the Nazi Occupation: Collaboration, Complicity, Indifference. A Comparison between Thessaloniki and Bulgaria

Before World War II, the Jewish community of Thessaloniki, despite its shrinking during the interwar period, remained the most densely populated in Greece, with a great cultural pluralism, quite powerful financially and in troubled cohabitation with the newer residents, the refugees of 1922. In the years of Metaxas' dictatorship and the war the differences seemed rather mitigated. During the Nazi occupation, the community vanished by 96%, making thus the overall national rate of victims of the Jewish genocide in Europe one of the highest of the western countries.

This paper seeks to highlight the important role of the local collaboration, complicity, and indifference of the Greek authorities and the population in the "effective" implementation of the Final Solution; municipality archives, Jewish Community archives, written and oral testimonies and a comparison between Thessaloniki and Sofia (as far as actions and reactions of authorities and citizens are concerned) will support this effort.

In Greece there was a late implementation of the Nazi plan for the Jews comparing to the rest of Western and Eastern Europe and the Balkans. The reasons for that were the late Greece entry into the war, the triple occupation and the disagreement between Nazi Germans, Italians and Bulgarians on the issue, the report of Commando Rosenberg in April 1941, mentioning that there is no antisemitism in Greece and the consideration of the Nazi authorities about the public opinion, the development of the war in general. Despite the delay above and the fact that the Final Solution was held in a few months, the operation was very successful. The well-organized plan of the Nazis, their totalitarian practices, the deceiving of the Jewish community, the cohesion of their members and the loyalty to the rabbi Korets, and their Sephardic identity are some of the reasons for the Nazi success. However, it is important to reveal about Thessaloniki the crucial contribution of the Greek authorities to the beginning of the measures against the Jews and the role of the citizens' indifference in completing the plan of the Final Solution.

On the contrary, in Bulgaria, it was the reaction of the public opinion that stopped the measures against the Bulgarian Jews (but not against the Jews of the Bulgarian occupied zone). In Thessaloniki case maybe complicity and collaboration were not so obvious especially as far as citizens are concerned but it was as essential as elsewhere and ended up to the ravaging of its Jews and to radical change of its identity.

kavalamaria@yahoo.com

Dr. Maria Kavala holds a postdoctoral teaching position in Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. She teaches courses on the Holocaust, historical memory, and antisemitism in the Department of Political Science. She is also an Educational Associate in the BA program, *Social and Economic History of Europe*, at the Hellenic Open University. In 2009, Maria Kavala earned her PhD, with Distinction, in Modern Greek Social History, in the Department of History and Archaeology at the University of Crete with a dissertation entitled *Thessaloniki under Nazi Occupation (1941-1944): Society, Economy and Persecution of the Jews*. In January 2010, she was awarded the "Alberto Nar" Grant from the Jewish Community of Thessaloniki.

Panel 2

December 5, 2013

14:00 - 16:00

Lokale und regionale Aspekte der Kollaboration **Local and Regional Aspects of Collaboration**

Chair: Krista Hegburg (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington, DC)

khegburg@ushmm.org

Dr. Krista Hegburg is a program officer in University Programs at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. She earned her Ph.D. in the Department of Anthropology at Columbia University. Her research focuses on Roma, reparations politics, and the Czech Republic. Dr. Hegburg has taught in the Department of Anthropology at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, and at the University of Lower Silesia in Wrocław, Poland, where she was a co-founder of the International Institute for the Study of Culture and Education. Dr. Hegburg was a Charles H. Revson Fellow for Archival Research at the Center in 2005–2006.

Filip Erdeljac
(New York University)

Collaborating With the Ustasha: Resistance and Compliance in World War II Croatia

By questioning the generally accepted portrayal of the Croatian Ustasha Movement as a fringe group of extremists whose violence precluded them from securing popular support and compelled the population they ruled over to join the popular anti-fascist Partisans, this paper will examine the degree to which a variety of individuals and groups complied and collaborated with the Ustasha regime and their Nazi backers. Letters and petitions that inhabitants of the Ustasha state wrote to different state departments demonstrate that many people remained willing to support the newly established Croatian state. Though tensions between more mainstream Croatian nationalism and the Ustashes' Nazi-inspired racial nationalism persisted throughout World War II, letters that ethnic Croats wrote to the regime frequently endorsed the overall nationalist agenda of the Ustasha movement while disagreeing with certain aspects of Ustasha rule.

This paper will reveal that individual members of the Jewish, Roma, and Serbian Orthodox communities – communities clearly marked for exclusion by the Ustashes – sought ways to reconfigure their identities and comply with the regime. Letters from Jewish Croats frequently asked that the state reconsider its measures banning Jews from participating in the new state. Instead of an inherent opposition to the Ustashes and the Nazis, it was the Ustashes' unwillingness to curtail violence against them that ultimately forced the country's Serbs into an armed uprising that many Serbs initially hoped they could avoid through a variety of compromises with the Ustashes and their German and Italian allies.

filip.erdeljac@gmail.com

Filip Erdeljac is a PhD candidate at New York University's Department of History, specializing in the modern history of Southeastern Europe. He holds an MA in Modern European History from Arizona State University. Currently, he is completing his dissertation, *Croatian Nation-Building and World War II: Everyday Nationalism in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, the Ustasha State, and the Postwar Republic of Croatia, 1934-1948*, with support from the American Council of Learned Societies Dissertation Fellowship in Eastern European Studies.

Local Collaboration in Hungary following German Occupation

Following the German occupation in March, 1944 over half a million Hungarian Jews from the former Hungarian territories were deported in two stages. Although at first the German occupation had made the widely applied deportations in Hungary possible, they could not have been carried out without the collaboration of Hungarian authorities, gendarmerie, and police. Since 1989/90 historiography has concerned itself with the decisive question of how the Hungarian authorities, in the last stages of the war and in light of the fact that the military defeat of their ally, the German Reich, was becoming more and more obvious, participated so energetically in the organization and execution of the deportations.

This presentation discusses aspects of the Hungarian collaboration in the persecution and murder of Hungarian Jews, inquires about local freedom of action and in so doing focuses primarily on the example of ghettoization. Finally, a closer look at the Hungarian ghettos shows that the conditions prevailing in them, with regard to housing, medical care, opportunities to make contact with the outside world, the extent of violence, etc. differed greatly from one to the other. These differences were a result of local factors and attest to the fact that the living conditions in the ghettos depended to a great extent on the respective anti-Jewish policies of the regional administrations.

Overall, not only the participation of Hungarian administrations and gendarmerie in the ghettoization measures will be examined, but attention will also be directed to the participation of part of the Hungarian population in anti-Jewish actions – a subject that has been the subject of scant attention in academic research up to now, and has been “limited,” as Tim Cole has argued, “to isolated and rather general statements in the literature and anecdotal references in reports by survivors.”

regina.fritz@univie.ac.at

Dr. Regina Fritz is a researcher for the editorial project, “The Persecution and Extermination of the European Jews by Nazi Germany 1933-1945” (Institute of Contemporary History Munich-Berlin) and a guest lecturer at the University of Vienna. Her doctoral dissertation was published as *After the War and the Murder of the Jews. The Politics of Memory in Hungary since 1944* (Wallstein-Verlag, 2012). Her research focuses on the Holocaust, 20th- and 21st-century Hungarian history, the politics and culture of memory, and Oral History.

Slawomir Kapralski

(Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies - VWI)

Collaboration and the Roma Genocide in Occupied Poland

In my paper, I examine three main points. First, I study the reasons that decided that the collaboration of Poles in the genocide of Roma was much less developed than in the murder of Jews. I am arguing that this can be explained by the lack of an elaborated and institutionalized "antigypsyism" that would be comparable with antisemitism and by the lack of clearly negative stereotype of Roma in the Polish society. Moreover, large sectors of Polish society had very limited contact with Roma who were not concentrated in towns and whose survival during World War II largely did not depend on the local non-Roma population which had, therefore, much less opportunity to denounce Roma to the authorities or harm them in other ways. Finally, the material benefits of the collaborators were in this case much smaller than those believed to be associated with denouncing Jews.

Second, the analysis of the summary executions of Roma carried out in 1943 in Southern Poland enables to distinguish three forms of collaboration. First is the complicity of the "Blue Police" and the units of Schutzmannschaft, which were part of the firing squads, guarded, and transported the victims or safeguarded the area of execution. Second is the cooperation of the representatives of local administration, in particular the heads of the village councils, who reported about the presence of Roma, and were obliged to provide wagons and horses to transport victims or to take care of burying the corpses. Third is the involvement of the regular inhabitants that witnessed the executions, served as coachmen or participated in burials. The involved locals expressed a variety of attitudes: from sorrow and compassion to indifference which can be accounted for by the different degrees of social distance between local villagers and particular categories of victims of 1943 executions: deported German Sinti and Roma, Polish Carpathian Roma, permanently settled and relatively well integrated, nomadic groups of Polish and Hungarian Roma, seized when passing through the region.

Finally, I am briefly presenting an example of collaboration of a Rom, the infamous Rudolf Kwiek, one of the self-appointed "Gypsy kings" from the Kalderash group. I am trying to interpret his motives as well as the motives of the Roma community in Poland who, after the war, did not apply in his case the most radical informal sanctions. I am interpreting this as an attempt to keep the façade of the commonality of fate, largely damaged by the disjointed, de-centered, and de-synchronized nature of the Nazi persecution of Roma.

slawomir.kapralski@vwi.ac.at

Dr. Slawomir Kapralski is a Researcher in the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw and a Senior Fellow at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies. He holds PhD in Sociology from the Jagiellonian University in Krakow. His research focuses on nationalism, ethnicity and identity, collective memory, antisemitism and the Holocaust, and the Roma communities in Europe. His most recent book, *A Nation from the Ashes. Memory of Genocide and Roma Identity* (2012, in Polish), examines the consequences of the Holocaust for Roma. He is a member of the Gypsy Lore Society, European Association for Holocaust Studies, and European Academic Network on Romani Studies. Currently he is Senior Fellow at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI).

Fielder Valone
(Indiana University, Bloomington)

Destroying the Ties that Bind: Rituals of Humiliation, Collaboration, and the Holocaust in Three Lithuanian Counties, June–December, 1941

Using a cache of rare postwar survivor testimonies collected in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War by Leib Koniuchowsky, a Jewish chronicler of the Holocaust in provincial Lithuania, this conference paper argues that acts of “ritual humiliation” represented both an autochthonous form of collaboration as well as a crucial precondition for mass murder. This paper presents a microhistorical analysis detailing acts of ritualized violence drawn from postwar testimonies about the Holocaust in Telsiai, Taurage, and Raseiniai, three provincial counties situated southeast of the borderland where the Tilsit Kommando operated in the summer of 1941, and northwest of Kaunas and Vilnius. The history of the Holocaust in this rural triad, largely unknown and as yet understudied, provides a unique opportunity not only to examine several distinctive features of ritualized humiliation in northwestern Lithuania but also to situate such acts within the broader context of collaboration in the Final Solution. First, the rituals themselves: enacted and overseen by non-Jewish Lithuanians, and designed for public consumption, such performances effectively separated Jewish civilians from the “universe of human obligation” by highlighting the Jewishness of the victims. In contrast to the highly politicized stereotype in which Jews figured as potential carriers of a “Judeo-Bolshevik” conspiracy, the public displays of degradation recalled by the Koniuchowsky Papers suggest that a residual presence of medieval Christian antisemitic motifs radicalized relationships among Jewish and non-Jewish Lithuanians during the summer and early fall of 1941. Thus, acts of ritual humiliation provide a “missing link” in the history of local complicity with German extermination policies in a region of rural Lithuania that has heretofore received scant attention. Second, the context: the postwar testimonies of Jewish survivors from Telsiai, Taurage, and Raseiniai indicate, as do the vast majority of testimonies collected by Koniuchowsky, that virtually all the killing in this region was done by members of the Lithuanian militia, albeit in the presence of and presumably under German oversight. While the chief aim of this paper is to examine the extent to which rituals of humiliation suggest native inventiveness harkening back to earlier antisemitic traditions, on a broader level this paper also calls attention to more well established historiographical conceptions of collaboration exemplified by the mass participation of locals in the physical implementation of the Nazis’ genocidal project.

tfvalone@gmail.com

Fielder Valone holds an A.B. in history with Highest Honors, with a second degree in American Studies, from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he graduated with Highest Distinction and as a member of Phi Beta Kappa in 2011. His current and future publications include half a dozen encyclopedia entries about a slave labor camp complex located in Heydekrug (to be published in the *Encyclopedia of Camps and Ghettos: Volume VI*, Indiana University Press/United States Holocaust Memorial Museum), “Destroying the Ties that Bind: Rituals of Humiliation and the Holocaust in Provincial Lithuania” (in *Traces: the UNC-Chapel Hill Journal of History*, 2012), which received the Raymond J. Cunningham Prize awarded by the American Historical Association to the best history article in the United States written by an undergraduate, and “Rescued from Oblivion: The Leib Koniuchowsky Papers and the Holocaust in Provincial Lithuania” (*Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, forthcoming). Valone is currently a second year doctoral student in the Department of History at Indiana University.

Panel 3

December 5, 2013

16:30 - 18:00

Wirtschaftliche Aspekte der Kollaboration Economic Aspects of Collaboration

Chair: Oliver Rathkolb (University of Vienna)

oliver.rathkolb@univie.ac.at

Oliver Rathkolb is Professor at the Institute for Contemporary History of the University of Vienna. He is author of several books focusing on contemporary history and the managing editor of "Zeitgeschichte" (Contemporary History). His prize-winning study *The Paradoxical Republic. Austria 1945-2005* was published by Berghahn Books (New York/Oxford) in 2010

Yannis Skalidakis
(Panteion University, Athens)

Local Administration as an Intermediary Agent of the Violent Modernization of Traditional Cretan Society: The Cases of Forced Labour and Destruction of the Jewish Community

This paper will examine the changes imposed by the Axis occupation on traditional Cretan society, through the infliction of a form of violent and reactionary modernity on a social, political and economic level. Moreover, the issue of collaboration of local authorities in the imposition of such aspects of Nazi policy on the island of Crete will be highlighted.

This policy was dependent on the course of warfare, in general and more specifically in the Mediterranean, and resulted respectively in the radicalization of the occupation methods. Local societies had to transform their mentalities and everyday ways in order to accommodate the imperatives imposed by the occupying forces and the local administration, the latter constituting an instrument for this violent adjustment.

A system of forced labor was adopted for the necessary constructions for defending an island in the modern aerial and naval warfare. This reshaped the local economy and brought about a stratum of economic collaborators. In this paper, are presented the actions and dealings of the local authorities being the intermediary between the German military command and the economic agents involved as well as their role on imposing forced labor to the local population. Also their facilitating role in the destruction of the local Jewish community and their handling of the Jewish properties is also examined. The collaboration of the local administration played an essential role for the implementation of the Nazi policies and the "mediation" of the local administration led to a multiple radicalization of its own characteristics compared to its prewar functions.

jskalidis@yahoo.com

Dr. Yannis Skalidakis is a postdoctoral researcher in the Department of Political Science and History in the Panteion University of Athens. He is a historian specializing in World War II History and the Occupation period in Greece (1941-1944). His research interests include Modern Greece, 20th century Mediterranean and European History. In 2012, he received his PhD from the School of Political Sciences at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki with a dissertation entitled, *Political Committee of National Liberation (1944): A Type of Revolutionary Government* (in Greek, under contract with Asini Publications). His current research examines the political, social, economic and cultural dimensions of the Occupation period on the island of Crete.

Anders Blomqvist
(Södertörn University, Stockholm)

Economic Nationalizing in Szatmárnémeti/Satu Mare – Local Motives for Deporting Jews

I would like to address the question of responsibility and collaboration in the ethnic borderlands of Second World War Hungary by using the concept of economic nationalizing. This concept will be applied on a local case study of Szatmárnémeti (Satu Mare, today in Romania) by using former unexplored sources. Economic nationalism has been a driving force in the region since the 19th century and several regimes aimed at creating ethno-national economies, including dualist Hungary and interwar Romania. Economic nationalizing is a dynamic process in which an ethno-national category aims at creating a national independent and pure economy. During the dualist period the Jews were included in the ethnic category to Magyarize the economy at the expense of the nationalities, while in the inter-war period the Romanianizing of the economy was undertaken using indirect methods in the 1920s, but was more radicalized during the 1930s. The Romanian strategy focused on dividing the Hungarian and Jewish networks and even if this partly succeeded the Jewish share of the economy had increased during the Romanian period, which was mainly a result of Hungarian revisionism and the claim that the land should be returned to Hungary. However, when former Hungarian territories were returned a process of re-Hungarianization of the economy immediately started. In this period the category of Hungarian excluded Jews and other nationalities. Even though Hungary imposed anti-Jewish legislation the implementation was relatively slow. The Hungarian elite aimed at creating an ethnically pure economy, but at the same time they could earn large profits from different arrangements with the Jewish managers. Officially and legally, so-called straw men arrangements were banned, but in reality leading Hungarians were profiting from this system themselves in the city. As a result of the pro-Magyar attitude among leading Jews in the dualist period and during the interwar period some of them were exempted and defined as Hungarians, such as members of the leading Jewish manufacturing families (Princz). This means that leading Jews and Hungarians were collaborating in order to re-Hungarianize the economy, which clearly adds to the complicity. Also former members of the Romanian elite could through their Christian background and contacts with the Hungarian networks become Hungarian.

The Hungarian elite constructed an image of the rich Jews who owned large shares of the 'Hungarian national property' and promised that this fortune would be to the Hungarian community. This was depicted as a major social transformation and had started already in 1942 by dividing Jewish land to poor Hungarians. When the ghetto was announced in 1944 it was motivated by the need to confiscate Jewish houses and regarded as the first and main step and returning the national property. The compulsory declaration of Jewish property, which was later confiscated, was also regarded as a way of returning the national property. This means that a large part of the Hungarian community expected to gain in material ways by removing the Jews. Therefore I argue that the relatively strong local support or lack of resistance against the Jewish deportation was driven by economic interests from the local Hungarian community, primarily its elite. We can assume that mainly the top Hungarian leaders knew or could understand what fate the Jews would meet, while many local Hungarians were unaware of the fatal consequences of the deportations, still they had economic interests in receiving the property that the Jews had to leave behind. The results of the total re-Hungarianization of the economy, in which the Jews eventually were deported and killed, were not as expected; instead even top Hungarian politicians admitted its failure and large parts of the Hungarian community never received the economic support that they hoped for. Property was robbed and destroyed and the final outcome was that the Holocaust did not only mean the final destruction of the Jewish community, but also it destroyed a vibrant economic life of the city and the country.

anders.blomqvist@sh.se

Anders Blomqvist is a doctoral student in History at Centre for Baltic and East European Studies at Södertörn University, Stockholm, Sweden. He will defend his thesis, *Economic Nationalizing at the Ethnic Borderland: Szatmár/Satu Mare 1867-1944*, in 2014. He recently edited the volume *Hungary and Romania Beyond National Narratives: Comparisons and Entanglements* (2013).

Hana Kubátová
(Charles University, Prague)

Until the Very End: Economic Forms of Collaboration in Slovakia, Fall 1944–Spring 1945

This paper investigates the process of robbing the Jews of Slovakia as a specific form of economic collaboration. The participation in the state-sponsored “elimination of Jews from the economic and social life in Slovakia” – as the official places termed the robbing of Jews – is thus understood as an important tool of tying people to the regime. By collaborating in the various economic anti-Jewish measures, the nondemocratic regime of wartime Slovakia obliged those participating in these activities.

From a microhistorical perspective, this paper considers the period between the defeat of the Slovak National Uprising in October 1944 and the collapse of the wartime state in spring 1945. It has been argued that the German occupation of Slovakia that triggered the Uprising and lasted until the collapse of the regime in spring 1945 activated public efforts – for the first time on a larger scale – to help persecuted Jews. This paper shows, however, that the last few months of the war activated not only forms of solidarity but also both passive and active forms of collaboration. Last-minute efforts to transfer Jewish property to Slovak/Christian hands – ranging from attempts (though at this point unsuccessful) to aryanize Jewish-owned businesses, to get hold of belongings left by Jews who were deported in the fall of 1944 and denunciations of Jews in hiding, are among those analyzed here.

The paper also opens the methodological question of how to study popular responses to the Jews and the official antisemitism in general and at the end of the war in Slovakia in particular. At this point, official places often ceased to report on continuing anti-Jewish measures (or ceased to report at all in order to keep the paper trail at minimum) and situation reports increasingly stated that the majority population has become too afraid to demonstrate their views in public. This paper aims to overcome the obstacle by analyzing both wartime (situational reports) and early postwar documentation (including restitution materials).

kubatova@fsv.cuni.cz

Dr. Hana Kubátová is Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Social Sciences at Charles University in Prague. She is a social historian focusing on popular attitudes towards Jews during and after the Holocaust. In 2010, she received her PhD from Charles University. Her dissertation, turned into a book (published in Czech as *You Shall Not Steal: Popular Mood and Opinion towards the Jewish Question in Slovakia, 1938-1945*), is the first systematic work analyzing prevalent majority responses towards official antisemitism in wartime Slovakia. Dr. Kubátová was a Charles H. Revson Fellow for Archival Research at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in 2006–2007. She is currently researching the continuities and the transformation of anti-Jewish sentiments in postwar Czechoslovakia.

Panel 4

December 6 2013

10:00 - 11:30

Minderheiten und Kollaboration Minorities and Collaboration

Chair: Dieter Pohl (University of Klagenfurt)

dieter.pohl@uni-klu.ac.at

Dieter Pohl, historian, studied history at the University of Munich. His doctoral thesis 1995 dealt with the persecution of Jews in German-occupied Eastern Galicia 1941-1944. At first working at the Institute for Contemporary History in Munich, he became professor for contemporary history at the University of Klagenfurt in 2010. Since 2011, he is also member of the International Academic Advisory Board of the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI). His major research fields are among others: history of the Soviet Union, National Socialist occupation in Eastern Europe, mass violence in the 20th century. He is author and editor of numerous monographs and articles.

Oleg Valeryevich Ratushnyak
(Kuban State University, Krasnodar)

The Cossacks and the Third Reich: Relations and Participation in the Second World War

The purpose of my research is studying the Cossacks' participation in the Second World War on the side of the Third Reich. This study reveals the reasons of Hitler's support from one part of the Cossacks during his war against the USSR. It analyzes the development of the relationship between the Cossacks' leaders and heads of the Third Reich and commanders of Wehrmacht. This paper examines the extent and geography of the placement of Cossacks during the Second World War and also the form of the Cossacks' participation on the side of the Third Reich. It shows the relationship of the Cossacks' leaders with the Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia and Russian Liberation Army of general A. Vlasov. Lastly it analyzes the results of participation of the Cossacks in the Second World War on the side of the Third Reich.

Panel: Minorities and Collaboration

Friday, December 6, 10:00

oleg_ratushnyak@mail.ru

Dr. Oleg Ratushnyak is Associate Professor of the Department of Modern, Contemporary History and International Relations, Kuban State University. He earned his PhD in history with a dissertation entitled *The Don and Kuban Cossacks in Emigration (1920–1939)*. He holds a MA in Political Science from Manchester University. Dr. Ratushnyak has published widely on Russian and Cossack emigration from 1917 to 1970, and the participation of Cossacks in World War II on the German side.

Mirna Zakić

(Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies, FRIAS)

Ethnic Germans and Others: Antisemitism and Anti-Slavism among the Banat Volksdeutsche in World War II

The National Socialist definition of ethnic Germans (Volksdeutsche) – people of German ethnic origin who were citizens of states other than Germany – blurred the lines between ethnicity, nationality and race. This resulted in a fundamentally ambivalent position held by Volksdeutsche in the Nazi racial hierarchy. As members of the 'Aryan race,' they merited more regard than non-Germans, especially in parts of East and Southeast Europe under German control, but their long residence in predominantly Slavic areas exposed Volksdeutsche to suspicions of racial mixing, degeneracy and insufficient Germanness. The Nazi view of Volksdeutsche vacillated between an emphasis on their perceived racial kinship with Germans from the Reich and suspicion based on a narrower, territorial, state-oriented definition of German nationhood. Volksdeutsche, in turn, navigated this ambivalence by defining themselves in opposition to supposedly inferior groups, such as Slavs and Jews.

Whereas the position of Volksdeutsche in Poland and the Soviet Union during World War II has received more scholarly attention in recent years, the position of Volksdeutsche in Southeast Europe in the same period is less well known. My paper focuses on criteria of Germanness adopted by the Volksdeutsche of the Serbian Banat (northeastern Serbia) during that area's occupation by Reich forces (1941-1944), and these criteria's impact on Volksdeutsche participation in Nazi racial policies in partitioned Yugoslavia.

The Banat Volksdeutsche were in charge of the daily running of their home region, under Reich auspices but with minimal direct involvement by Reich personnel. The Banat was an area of great economic importance for the Third Reich due to its agricultural productivity, and the Volksdeutsche peasant was seen as the exponent of European civilization as well as a guarantor of economic prosperity in the Balkans, a supposedly savage region inhabited by Slavs and Jews. Despite this, Banat Volksdeutsche leaders were aware of the Reich's ambivalent, patronizing attitude to Volksdeutsche and the Southeast in general, and strove to demonstrate their group's unequivocal Germanness in ways that led them into complicity with the Nazi regime's violent racial policies. The Volksdeutsche press emphasized hatred and fear of the majority Slavic population even more than the supposedly powerful Jews, and participated in policies detrimental to both groups. In late 1941 Banat Volksdeutsche took part in the looting and Aryanization of Jewish property, and the persecution and deportation of the Banat Jews. Starting in 1942 most Banat Volksdeutsche men were recruited into the Waffen-SS and deployed in anti-partisan operations against civilian populations in Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia.

Even though Volksdeutsche perceptions did not have a direct impact on this escalation of Nazi racial policy in Southeast Europe, the escalation corresponded exactly to the Banat Volksdeutsche's interpretation of Nazi ideology in a way that emphasized anti-Slavism even more than antisemitism. The Volksdeutsche's adoption and specific interpretation of the Nazi worldview, coupled with their ambivalent standing in the Nazi racial hierarchy, made collaboration with the Nazi regime's most violent, racist policies seem not only possible, but logical and necessary to the Banat Volksdeutsche.

zakic@ohio.edu

Dr. Mirna Zakić obtained her Ph.D. in History from the University of Maryland in 2011. Since fall 2011, she has been Assistant Professor of History at Ohio University, where she teaches courses on the political, social and cultural history of modern Germany and Europe, with a focus on the Third Reich, World War II, the Holocaust, and their postwar legacies. Her current research focuses on ethnic German communities in Southeast Europe, the transnational spread of National Socialist ideology, and the interplay of ideology and ethnicity in World War II. She is spending the academic year 2013-2014 as a Volkswagen Stiftung Fellow at the Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany. In Freiburg, Dr. Zakić is revising her book manuscript tentatively entitled *The Furthest Watch of the Reich: National Socialism and Ethnic Germans in World War II*.

The Relations and Attitudes of Non-Romani People towards the Persecution and Suffering of Roma in the Independent State of Croatia, 1941–1945

The Roma population settled in Croatia in the second half of the 14th century, which makes them one of the oldest minority communities in this area. From that time, they have mostly been subjected to state and local policies of assimilation and persecution, which they attempted to resist by protecting their way of life, customs and language. During the Second World War in the pro-fascist Independent State of Croatia, a significant number of Roma were systematically murdered and tortured in concentration camps as a result of racial laws and policies that led to genocide.

My research focuses on analyzing the relation between the non-Roma population and Roma in the context of their race annihilation in the Independent State of Croatia. The first part of the presentation will analyze the position of Roma in the period between the two World Wars (1918 – 1941) and the impact of prejudice and stereotypes towards Roma on the non-Roma population and Croatia's authorities. I analyze cases where the non-Roma population participated in the persecution of Roma. These cases describe the participation of the non-Roma population in looting Roma property, organizing and carrying out deportations to concentration camps and the killing and torture of Roma. Cases in which non-Roma inhabitants defended the Roma and tried to save them from the persecution of the Ustasha authorities will be then analyzed. Among other things, the role of Roman Catholic priest, Anton Medven in rescuing Roma in during the war as well as the role of some Muslim intellectuals in the protection of "White Gypsies" and examples of resistance from the non-Roma population towards deportations of Roma in Ustasha and Nazi concentration camps will be presented. This research is based on mostly unpublished archival material from Croatian archives, museums and other institutions, periodicals as well as an analysis of relevant literature.

Danijel.Vojak@pilar.hr

Dr. Danijel Vojak is a research associate at the Ivo Pilar Institute of Social Science in Zagreb. He finished his PhD in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Zagreb in 2011 with a dissertation entitled *On the Eve of the War: Position of the Roma Population in Banate of Croatia, 1939 – 1941*. His research analyzes the relationship between indigenous (majority) population and the Roma minority population in this area. His current work focuses on the position and extent of the suffering of Roma during the Second World War in the pro-Nazi Independent State of Croatia.

Panel 5

December 6, 2013

14:00 - 16:00

Repressionsapparate Repressive Apparatuses

Chair: Jana Starek (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies - VWI)

jana.starek@vwi.ac.at

Jana Starek, Dr., historian, translator, co-founded and worked at the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (1982-1990). Director of the Austrian Science and Research Liaison Office Brno (1991-2004). Taught at the Masaryk-Universität in Brno and at the University of Vienna. Author of studies and co-author of anthologies on the history of Austro-Czech relations. She works at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI) since September 2010.

Jan Láníček

(University of New South Wales, Sydney)

Ordinary Gendarmes? Czech Police Forces and the Holocaust in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia

Between March 1939 and May 1945, the western parts of Czechoslovakia were occupied by the German forces, which established the so-called Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia as an administrative unit to rule the territory. From October 1941 onwards, the Czech-Jewish population was subject to deportations to the ghettos and extermination camps in the East.

Contemporary historiography does not document any cases of extensive Czech collaboration in the Final Solution. Based on the German documentation and files from the post-war retribution trials, I will argue that although the Czech population at large did not partake in the murder of the Jewish people, there was a part of the Czech population that directly and indirectly contributed to what we now call the Holocaust: the Czech police forces in the Protectorate. I will focus on two issues: first, the Czech police forces were actively involved in the deportation of the Jews from the Czech towns to the Theresienstadt ghetto that was established in Northern Bohemia as a temporary holding centre for the Czech Jews prior to their deportation to the east. Second, a special unit of Czech gendarmes was formed to guard the Theresienstadt Ghetto, the only place in the Czech Lands that could be considered as a place of death and suffering for the Jews during the war. Over 30,000 Jews died in the Ghetto, with another 88,000 being deported to the east, to Auschwitz and the Operation Reinhardt Camps. For almost four years, hundreds of ordinary Czech gendarmes guarded the Ghetto, escorted the prisoners from and to the trains, and relieved significant numbers of German units from this duty. There were also cases of brutal physical violence by the gendarmes against the deportees.

Five of the Czech gendarmes were put on trial after the war, but received only minor sentences (up to fifteen years). Thus these sentences reached by Czech judges open the last issue that needs to be considered, namely the post-war construction of the notion that rejected any extensive Czech collaboration in the Holocaust and reconfirmed the Czech self-portrayed image of their people not being guilty for Jewish suffering during the war.

By reassessing the role of the Czech police forces in the deportation of the Jews and their incarceration in Theresienstadt, I will offer new avenues of understanding concerning the nature of collaboration of ordinary Czechs in the Holocaust.

j.lanicek@unsw.edu.au

Dr. Jan Láníček is a Postdoctoral Fellow in Jewish history at the School of Humanities and Languages, University of New South Wales in Sydney. He received his PhD in History from the University of Southampton in Britain in 2011. He recently published his first monograph entitled *Czechs, Slovaks and the Jews, 1938-1948: Beyond Idealisation and Condemnation* (Palgrave, 2013), and also a co-edited volume on *Governments-in-Exile and the Jews during the Second World War* (Valentine Mitchell, 2013). His research focuses on modern Jewish history, in particular Jewish/non-Jewish relations in East-Central Europe during the 1930s and 1940s.

Collaboration by Czech Police Forces with the Nazi Regime

The German occupation power, in its persecution of ever-larger groups in the population of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia instituted on March 15, 1939, depended to a great extent on Czech police forces, which were subject to the Protectorate authorities of the German Reich. The Czech security apparatus was active from the start in the persecution, apprehension, and surveillance of the Czech population. While the German authorities praised the high degree of initiative by the Czech security forces in the persecution of Czech communists who had fled the Nazi regime from Germany, Austria and the border territories annexed to the German Reich after the Munich Pact in the spring of 1939, they also criticized the passivity of the demonstrations by Czech students in Prague on October 28, 1939.

Czech security forces participated in an exposed position in the persecution of their fellow citizens by the Nazi regime. Both in the Theresienstadt Ghetto (1941–1945) and in the Roma camps at Lety and Hodonín (in each case 1942–1943) it was primarily the members of the Czech gendarmerie who were assigned as overseers. The most extensive expansion of the repression against Czech civilian population was the intensified implementation of the general work obligation of all members of the Protectorate that had been in effect since 1940 through the establishments of eleven labor education camps, which were administered and overseen by the Protectorate police.

alfons.adam@terezinstudies.cz

Dr. Alfons Adam is a research assistant at the Terezín Initiative Institute in Prague. He was awarded a doctorate in 2008 in Düsseldorf with a dissertation entitled “Invisible Walls. Germans in Prague Society between Encapsulation and Interaction (1918-1938/39)” (Essen, 2013), and over the past few years has concentrated primarily on the subject of forced labor. His recent publications include “*The labor problem is to be solved with the help of concentration camp prisoners*”: *Forced labor in the satellite camps on the territory of today’s Czech Republic* (Berlin, 2013).

Alexander Korb

(Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies - VWI)

Intertwined Genocides? Patterns of Ustasha Mass Violence in Croatia in Comparative Perspective

The popular perception of non-German perpetrators during World War II is still dominated by two narratives: Either they are viewed as German puppets, or as sadistic monsters, which were out of German control. Even though both views contradict each other—either they were remote-controlled or out of control—both views have in common that there are not primarily interested for the motives of non-German perpetrators to use violence, for their mindsets, for their scope of action and for their perceptions of both their German partners in crime as well as of their Jewish and non-Jewish victims. In short, both their agendas and their agency have to be taken more seriously. Of course, research has made great leaps in the past two decades, and painted a more complicated picture of mass-violence committed by non-Germans. The debate surrounding Jan T. Gross' book "Neighbors" has certainly been a milestone; other key-debates centered on the definition of the term collaboration; German scholars discussed the question, whether the term is actually appropriate, as it implies a compliance of interest, which often was simply not the case. Instead, they suggested the term cooperation. In a number of case studies on both East and West European wartime-societies, scholars demonstrated that: 1) the German influence in a number of cases has been over-estimated; 2) non-German nationalists often tried to use the war to achieve ethically homogenized states or territories; 3) violence committed by non-Germans was therefore directed against Jews as much against non-Jews, especially in the ethnically mixed areas of Eastern and Southeastern Europe; 4) their goals such as national independence, territorial revisionism, and ethnic homogenization often contradicted the German military goals and were a source for conflict; and 5) non-German perpetrators were committed to achieve their goals and often developed skillful strategies, which enhanced their scope of action.

Despite these insights, there are many blind spots regarding non-German perpetrators: Comparative research is underway, but has not been conducted systematically (the research workshop promises to be a great achievement in this respect); a sociography of many perpetrator groups has not been conducted, so we do not know much about who the, say, Ustaše or the Arrow Cross activists actually were; and finally, some aspects are under-researched as such; that applies for example for the so-called Trawniki-men, who have not yet been subject of an academic monograph. In my presentation, I would like to—based on examples from my research on the Croatian Ustaša—present questions regarding the historical context and the agendas of non-German perpetrators, as well as the most urgent problems research-problems (e.g., popular reactions in countries such as Serbia, where the issue of collaboration causes heated debates).

alexander.korb@vwi.ac.at

Dr. Alexander Korb is a lecturer in Modern European History and deputy director of the Stanley Burton Centre for Holocaust and Genocide Studies at the University of Leicester. He studied medieval and modern history at Technische Universität Berlin and Gender Studies at Humboldt University. He also spent semesters abroad at various universities in Europe. In 2004, he graduated with a thesis on the reactions of the German population on the November Pogrom, which he published as a book in 2007. In 2010, he earned his doctorate from Humboldt University. The book version of the dissertation, *In the Shadow of World War II: Mass Violence of the Ustasha against Serbs, Jews and Roma in Croatia, 1941-1945* (2013), was awarded the Fraenkel Prize of the Wiener Library. Dr. Korb was a Charles H. Revson Fellow for Archival Research at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in 2006-7. Currently he is Research Fellow at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI).

Tomasz Frydel
(University of Toronto)

“There Was No Order to Shoot the Jews”: The Polish “Blue” Police and the Dynamics of Local Violence in Distrikt Krakau of the General Government

After the war, members of the Polish “Blue” Police (so called because of the color of their uniforms) were tried for killing Jews in the German-administered county of Dębica, located in the middle of Distrikt Krakau of the Generalgouvernement. The policemen were tried on the basis of the so-called “August Decree,” passed by the Polish Communist government on August 31, 1944. The Decree specified punishment for war crimes, the crime of collaboration, crimes against humanity and crimes against peace. However, somewhat unusually, the policemen did not fall back on the justification of superior German orders as mitigating factors in their defense. On the contrary, they emphasized that the Germans did not give them an order to kill Jews outside of ghettos. The policemen were only to apprehend the Jews and deliver them to the German gendarme posts. Yet many voluntarily killed dozens of Jews and saw themselves as serving Poland in doing so. Why?

This paper argues that the reasons lie in the specific dynamics of violence that developed on the local level during the war and the role played by the Blue Police within these dynamics. The Polish countryside witnessed a variety of motivations for violence toward Jews, such as antisemitism, greed, and fear. Yet in this region, the main pockets of local violence and killing can be grouped around acts of collective frenzy on the part of local peasants, which immediately followed German repressions in punishment for sheltering Jews. Thus, the role of the Blue Police is seen here on a sliding scale between responding to peasant pressures from below and German pressures from above, all within the broader process of the so-called “*Judenjagd*” or “Jew-hunting,” from 1942-1945.

The story of the Blue Police raises a number of difficult issues related to the question of collaboration in Eastern Europe, especially in a country with a powerful legacy as “the land without a Quisling.” The story of the Blue Police emerges here as a story of collaboration without its usual political and ideological supports. Members of the police did not represent any sort of extreme right-wing political ideology. For the most part, they were fairly centrist and their primary loyalty was to the Polish state and the protection of its citizens. Prior to the war, many of the policemen were used to prevent the outbreak of pogroms. Yet under the conditions of the occupation, the state police was partly transformed into killing units, who were able to interpret the killing of Jews as a security measure on behalf of protecting the local Polish community. This paper traces this evolution by examining the postwar trials of a number of these policemen bound together by linked police posts in the region.

tfrydel@gmail.com

Tomasz Frydel is a PhD candidate in history at the University of Toronto. He completed his MA at Brandeis University, where he focused on the historiography of Polish rescue efforts of Jews during the Second World War. He has worked as a Research Assistant at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and a Fellow at the Institute for Contemporary History Munich-Berlin. His dissertation examines the destruction of fugitive Jews in the Polish countryside by focusing on three counties of District Krakau of the General Government: Dębica, Rzeszów and Jasło.

Keynote Address

December 6, 2013
16:30

Doris Bergen (University of Toronto)

Collaboration – With Whom? German Presence and Absence in the East

Chair: Paul Shapiro (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum)

The term “collaboration” is loaded with historical baggage and all too easily instrumentalized. Yet it remains a powerful concept to provoke analysis of the Holocaust, because it draws attention to the complex chains of power and action that linked the Germans with authorities and populations in the occupied and allied territories. Drawing on the papers pre-circulated for this conference and my own research, I suggest some ways to conceptualize collaboration that point to new questions and under-explored issues in the Holocaust.

pshapiro@ushmm.org

Paul Shapiro is Director of the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies and since 1997 has shaped the Museum's effort to provide focused leadership to the field of Holocaust Studies in the US and abroad. Mr. Shapiro led the Museum's effort to open the archives of the International Tracing Service. He has stimulated new research and teaching about the long-neglected history of the Holocaust in the USSR. Mr. Shapiro served earlier in the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs at the United States Information Agency and Department of State, and was an Editor of the journal *Problems of Communism* and Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of International Affairs*. He also was a consultant to the Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations (OSI). Mr. Shapiro holds degrees from Harvard University and Columbia University and is the recipient of the Cross of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany (2010) and the Order of Merit-Commander Class of the Republic of Romania (2009).

doris.bergen@utoronto.ca

Dr. Doris L. Bergen is Chancellor Rose and Ray Wolfe Professor of Holocaust Studies in the Department of History at the University of Toronto. Her research focuses on issues of religion, gender, and ethnicity in the Holocaust and World War II and comparatively in other cases of extreme violence. Her books include *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* (1996); *War and Genocide: A Concise History of the Holocaust* (2003); *The Sword of the Lord: Military Chaplains from the First to the Twenty-First Centuries* (edited, 2004); and *Lessons and Legacies VIII* (edited, 2008). She has held grants and fellowships from Canada's Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), the German Marshall Fund of the United States, the DAAD, and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. Dr. Bergen was a Charles H. Revson Fellow for Archival Research at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in 1997–1998. She has taught at the Universities of Warsaw, Pristina, Tuzla, Notre Dame, and Vermont. Her current projects include a book on Germany military chaplains in the Nazi era and a study of definitions of Germanness as revealed in the Volksdeutschen/ethnic Germans of Eastern Europe during World War II and the Holocaust. Bergen is a member of the Academic Advisory Committee of the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the U. S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC.

Panel 6

December 7, 2013

10:00 - 12:00

Prozesse und Versuche, zur Rechenschaft zu ziehen Trials and Calls to Account

Chair: Kinga Frojimovics (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies - VWI)

kinga.frojimovics@vwi.ac.at

Kinga Frojimovics, historian and an archivist. Since 2007, she is the director of the Hungarian Section in Yad Vashem Archives (Jerusalem, Israel). Since 2010, she is also a research associate at Hadassah-Brandeis Institute, Brandeis University (Waltham, MA, USA).

Her field of research is the history of the Jews in Hungary in the 19th and in the 20th century. She focuses on the history of the Jewish religious trends in Hungary, and on the Holocaust. She is the co-editor of the MAKOR, the Series of the Hungarian Jewish Archives (Budapest). Currently she is Research Fellow at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI).

Gendering Collaboration: The Challenges of a Micro-Historical Approach

This proposed paper is a part of my recent book project focusing on female perpetrators of World War II in Hungary. I would like to present one chapter from this book on how a story of one mass murder committed by a paramilitary Arrow Cross squad led by a woman, demanding 19 lives on October 15, 1944, was narrated by the press, the different stages of the people's tribunal court, by the survivors, the relatives of the perpetrators, and participants of the legal system: judge, lawyer, and a police officer. In addition to oral history interviews with survivors and relatives of the perpetrators, this paper is based the analyses of court trials and literary sources (such as autobiographies) about one important instance of the Holocaust in Hungary which is also commemorated by erecting the first Holocaust monument in Budapest in 1945. I would like to focus on how the different conflicting narratives of the victims, the perpetrators, the investigators, the official Holocaust narratives (before and after the communism) were formed about what happened on a fateful night in a typical three-storey house in the 6th district of Budapest on October 15, 1944? How these different narratives are contributing to the formation of a divided memory of World War II of today's Hungary? What difference does it mean if the perpetrator is a woman? How the different forms of remembrance are excluding the formation of "dialogic remembrance" (Assmann) of collaboration today? What is the role of different institutions (educational, legal, and religious) in this process of memorializing collaboration and how this process is gendered?

petoand@t-online.hu

Dr. Andrea Pető is Associate Professor in the Department of Gender Studies at the Central European University in Budapest. She has edited twelve volumes in English, six volumes in Hungarian, and two in Russian. Her works appeared in different languages. Dr. Pető has also been a guest professor at the universities of Toronto, Buenos Aires, Stockholm, and Frankfurt. Her books include *Women in Hungarian Politics 1945-1951* (Columbia University Press, 2003) and *Geschlecht, Politik und Stalinismus in Ungarn. Eine Biographie von Júlia Rajk*. Studien zur Geschichte Ungarns, Bd. 12. (Gabriele Schäfer Verlag, 2007). Presently she is working on gendered memory of World War II and political extremisms. She was awarded with the Officer's Cross Order of Merit of the Republic of Hungary by President of the Hungarian Republic in 2005 and Bolyai Prize by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 2006. She serves as the co-president for AtGender, European Association for Gender Research, Education and Documentation.

Vanda Rajcan

(Northwestern University, Evanston)

“Židom strach”: Alexander Mach’s Journey from Priesthood to War Crimes Trial

Slovak collaboration with the Nazi regime between 1938 and 1945 remains an underexplored topic. Under the legal premise of the *Židovský Kódex*, a Slovak version of the Nuremberg Laws, the Slovak Ministry of Interior established labor and concentration camps for the 58,000 Slovak Jews before their deportation. Using recently declassified trial minutes, witness depositions, USC Shoah Foundation testimonies, and Mach’s memoirs, my paper explores the role that Alexander Mach, the Interior Minister, played during the Slovak collaboration with Nazi Germany from his tenure as Propaganda Minister in 1939 until his capture in Vienna in 1945.

Alexander Mach, born in 1902, joined the Slovak People’s Party, the nationalist and pro-Nazi party, at a very early age. Under the tutelage of Vojtech Tuka, later the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mach played a leading role in orchestrating the violence that followed the collapse of Czechoslovakia in March 1939 in his role as the head of the Slovak Office of Propaganda. In addition, Mach became the head of the Hlinka Guard, the Slovak paramilitary group similar to the German SS, the Minister of Interior and the Deputy Prime Minister (to Jozef Tiso) between 1940 and 1944 and the Minister of Home Affairs of the pro-Nazi government in exile in 1945.

On May 15, 1947, along with his co-defendants Jozef Tiso, the Slovak PM and Ferdinand Durčanský, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mach was tried before the Slovak National Court. The litany of crimes included the dissolution of Czechoslovakia, treason, collaboration, and crimes against humanity. Throughout the trial, many expected Mach to receive the death penalty alongside Tiso and Durčanský. In contrast to his co-defendants, however, the court spared Mach and sentenced him to a 30-year prison term. What factors motivated the judges to render this sentence as opposed to Tiso and Durčanský? What rhetoric did his legal team employ to achieve leniency for the main collaborator and policy-maker in Slovakia? How was it possible that Mach was amnestied after 21 years in prison and collected a state pension until his death in 1980? In my paper, I show that his suddenly found modesty, health complications, and friendships within the Communist party factored in the verdict.

vandarajcan@gmail.com

Vanda Rajcan is a first-year PhD student in the History Department at Northwestern University. Her dissertation focuses on Nazi collaborator trials in Slovakia following the Second World War. Prior to enrolling at Northwestern University, she worked as a researcher at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum where she contributed many entries on the Holocaust in Slovakia to the *Encyclopedia of Camps and Ghettos*. Her areas of interest include Holocaust Studies, Jewish History, Post-War Reconstruction, and Comparative Genocide Studies.

Tetiana Pastushenko

(National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kyiv)

Soviet “Justice”: The Evolution of Definitions of Collaboration with Nazi Germany in the Soviet Union, 1941–1955

The period immediately following the war was a dramatic development phase in the totalitarian Soviet system and its society, as well as the period in which the GULAG system reached its greatest expansion. The group of citizens now subjected to violent suppression was now comprised primarily of members of the military: soldiers of the Wehrmacht, “Vlasov soldiers” and auxiliary police, and former prisoners of war and forced laborers who had returned to the Soviet Union.

The presentation will show that the feverish search for collaborators ultimately led to repression against the entire population. At this time distinctions started to be made among the individual categories of collaborators with the Nazi occupation regime, which for a long time also remained a criterion for complicity in the Second World War. The presentation will, on the one hand, analyze the changes in Soviet legislation with regard to the assessment of cooperation with the German occupying power in 1941-1955; on the other, I will focus on the methods of the NKVD-NKGB with respect to distinguishing among the various categories of “accomplices.”

At the beginning of 1942 the first laws were enacted to criminalize civilians who lived in areas in the Soviet Union occupied by the Wehrmacht: For example, the order issued by the NKVD on February 18, 1942 “On the organization of operative Chekist work in the liberated cities and districts of the Soviet Union with the goal of exposing the accomplice and his network of agents,” in which 12 categories of “accomplices” were defined, who were to be immediately arrested.

The turning point in the military-political situation in 1944 – the Red Army’s incursion into the territory of other countries, and above all a tremendous need for labor to rebuild the destroyed country – led to significant corrections in the regime’s treatment of millions of Soviet citizens who had lived in the occupied areas during the war years. The ordinance issued by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR dated July 7, 1945 “On an amnesty on the occasion of the victory over Hitler’s Germany,” the suspension of capital punishment as of May 26, 1947, but also the order issued by the Supreme Council of the USSR on September 17, 1955 (Amnesty for “Nazi accomplices”) finally initiated the process of reintegration of Soviet citizens previously charged with treason.

The source materials drawn on were documents from the NKVD-NKGB, located in the government archives of the Ukrainian Security Service (Halusevyj Deržavnyj Archiv Služby Bezpeki Ukraïny (HDA SBU).

tetianka.p@gmail.com

Dr. Tetiana Pastushenko is a historian and Research Assistant at the Institute for Ukrainian History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Her research focuses on the history of the National Socialist occupation policy in the Ukraine, Oral History, the history of former “east workers” and prisoners of war from the Ukraine. Her publications include “‘The Settlement of Repatriated Persons in Kyiv is Prohibited...’ The Reintegration of Former Forced Labourers into Soviet Society after the War” (in: Pohl and Sebta, *Forced Labor in Hitler’s Europe: Occupation, Labor, Consequences*, (2013) and *Ostarbajtery s Kyïvščyny: verbuvannja, prymusova pracja, repatriacija* (1942–1953), (2009).

Franziska Exeler

(European University Institute, Florence)

Determining Guilt in Post-Occupation Soviet Belorussia

In my paper, I analyze different understandings of retribution and justice in post-1944 Belorussia, a Soviet republic and European borderland that first doubled its territory after the Soviet annexation of Eastern Poland in 1939 and that was then occupied by the Germans from 1941 to 1944. When the Soviets returned in 1944, the choices that people had made during the war, and the choices that they had been forced to make, haunted Belorussia. I discuss how individual inhabitants of Belorussia thought of their own wartime behavior, how they explained and justified their actions – and how the Soviet authorities in turn thought of these. While the authorities certainly had no understanding of the moral gray zones of occupation, the state's postwar punishment of those considered traitors (*izmenniki*) and German accomplices (*posobniki*) was not free of ambivalences. Moreover, although the Soviet legal system as such was unjust, in that specific post-occupation moment, individual and institutional notions of what constituted morally right punishment often overlapped – as it became particularly visible in the ubiquitous postwar property conflicts. The overlap between state and individuals that was thereby produced worked to the advantage of the authorities, stabilizing and legitimizing the Soviet dictatorship.

fexeler@Princeton.EDU

Dr. Franziska Exeler is a Max Weber Postdoctoral Fellow at the European University Institute in Florence, Italy. She holds a PhD in History from Princeton University. Her dissertation, *Reckoning with Occupation. Soviet Power, Local Communities, and the Ghosts of Wartime Behavior in Post-1944 Belorussia*, examines the impact that World War II and the German occupation had on Soviet state and society in Belorussia, and in particular on the ways in which individuals and social communities sought to reconstitute their collective lives after the war.

Panel 7

December 7, 2013

14:00 - 16:00

Die Erinnerung an die Kollaboration The Memory of Collaboration

Chair: Éva Kovács (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies - VWI)

eva.kovacs@vwi.ac.at

Éva Kovács, PhD, sociologist. Born 1964, studied sociology and economics at the Universities of Economics in Pécs and Budapest, PhD. 1994, Habilitation 2009. Éva Kovács is Head of Department of Methodology and History of Sociology in the Institute of Sociology at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Her research fields are the history of the Holocaust in Eastern Europe, research on memory and remembrance, Jewish identity in Hungary and Slovakia. She authored five monographs, edited eight volumes and published numerous articles in peer-reviewed journals. She co-founded the audiovisual archive "Voices of the Twentieth Century" and was a member of the VWI International Academic Board from 2010 to September 2012.

Éva Kovács is Research Program Director at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI) since October 2012.

Soviet Politics of the Memory of Collaboration under Nazi Occupation as a Tool of National Policy: Regional Aspects

The Soviet politics of memory of Nazi occupation was an important tool of the national policy, facilitating the construction of the Soviet polity on the base of the myths about mass resistance and friendship of the peoples, as well as the rhetorical exclusion of the dissident national movements' supporters. Asserting the higher propensity towards collaboration in the western part of Ukraine, as well as equality between nationalism and collaboration, made up the stable stereotype and presented the eastern part, particularly Kharkiv region, as "exemplary" Soviet one. Generally speaking, in 1940s through the early 1960s, collaboration with Nazis was marginal component of the local narrative of the wartime past in the eastern Ukraine. However, in the 1960s-1980s the struggle against Ukrainian, Jewish, and Tartar dissident movements, as well as against external "harmful" influences (particularly "bourgeois" western cultural products and diaspora discourses) became an important task also in the east of Ukraine. It caused gradual changes in the official Soviet propaganda, and collaboration with Nazis in the east of Ukraine became the subject of special publicist and propagandistic works written by authors who had access to KGB information on anti-soviet activity in the region, as well as to non-soviet and diaspora literature. Participation of the non-Germans in Nazi atrocities, exploitation of economy, and the repression of the Resistance movement became a part of the general picture of the wartime past. Still, collaboration in the Kharkiv region was presented as determined rather by social than political or ideological factors, on the contrary to western Ukraine. Essentialist understanding of nationality in late Soviet society also determined differences in portraying of how people of different ethnic origin were involved in collaboration. Appeal to the topic of collaboration for the sake of current ideological needs also make much more visible the problems of extermination of the Jews and Volhynian massacre (that were not completely silenced as students of the theme often state it today). Soviet propaganda stereotypes related to collaboration are still influential factor of dealing with the past in contemporary Ukraine.

orysia2011@gmail.com

Iryna Sklokina received her BA and MA in history from V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University in Kharkiv, Ukraine. She is currently finishing her dissertation, *Soviet Official Politics of Memory of Nazi Occupation in Ukraine, 1943-1985 (The case of the Kharkiv Region)*. Her research interests include memory studies and museum studies, with particular interest in late Soviet society and memory of World War II. Ms. Sklokina works at D. I. Bahalij Center for Ukrainian Studies at V.N.Karazin Kharkiv National University. She is also engaged in collaborative project, *Region, Nation and Beyond. An Interdisciplinary and Transcultural Re-conceptualization of Ukraine*, with the sub-project *Political Cult of the Dead in the Kharkiv Region in the Past 20 Years*.

Imke Hansen
(Uppsala University)

“And Some of Them Were Us!” Local Collaboration in Belarus and the Ukraine as Reflected in Oral History Interviews

In the Reichskommissariat Ostland and the Reichskommissariat Ukraine, collaboration was a day-to-day phenomenon. Particularly in smaller cities and towns the German occupiers, lacking their own personnel, were forced to rely on the local population at various levels. They built local administrative and police units using local laborers who – even though under the control of Germans – for all intents and purposes enjoyed freedom of action. Furthermore, they employed drivers, mechanics, household help, and some were billeted in the houses of local residents, at least for a time. Finally, there was also a willingness to collaborate on a less formalized level when, for example, local residents denounced others as Communists or Jews, or protected Germans from partisan actions.

In personal-history interviews, survivors of war and persecution often mention local persons, often those they had previously known, who collaborated in one form or another. The assessment of these people falls into a broad range. Not infrequently, the problem of a “double role” is discussed, i.e., the collaborators implemented German occupation policies, while at the same time protecting the local community, or at least parts thereof, from them.

My presentation concerns the question of how collaboration by the local community was perceived, above all by people who, through persecution or deportation to forced labor, experienced significant intrusions in their personal lives by the German occupation regime. Using oral history interviews with people from Ukraine and Belarus from the collections of the Forced Labor Archive and the Mauthausen Survivors Documentation Projects, my paper takes a look at the perception, definition and discussion of collaboration on the local and day-to-day levels.

imke.hansen@uni-hamburg.de

Dr. Imke Hansen is a historian and a postdoctoral fellow at the Hugo Valentin Centre of Uppsala University. Her doctoral dissertation is forthcoming in 2014 as *Never Again Auschwitz! The Emergence of a Symbol and the Day-to-Day Life of a Memorial* (Wallstein-Verlag). Her research focuses on Eastern European history of the 20th and 21st century, Holocaust Studies, and Oral History.

“We were Classmates”: Jewish Perceptions of Collaborators in Eastern Galicia

In his groundbreaking book “Neighbors”, Jan T. Gross discussed complex psychological aspects of Jewish encounter with the wave of murderous violence in Jedwabne in the summer of 1941. As local Poles tormented, humiliated and eventually murdered hundreds of local Jewish inhabitants “what the Jews saw, to their horror and [...] incomprehension, were familiar faces. Not anonymous men in uniform, cogs in a war machine, agents carrying out orders, but their own neighbors, who chose to kill and were engaged in a bloody pogrom – willing executioners”. Thus Gross linked the scope and character of Polish participation in the Jedwabne murder with Daniel Goldhagen’s controversial account of the German eager participation in the Holocaust. My paper will explore the thorny question of collaboration in Eastern Galicia by focusing on Jewish encounters with Ukrainian and Polish neighbors participating in the persecution and murder of the Jews.

Jewish account of the wave of pogroms that swept across numerous towns and villages, among them Borysław, Drohobycz, Sambor, Tarnopol and most notoriously Lwow (L’viv) stressed the trauma of recognizing familiar faces in the violent crowd: former classmates, domestics, teachers, clients and patients. A Jewish teenager taken to the Courthouse in Drohobycz and tortured there reported upon her release that “The most horrific part of her story was that when she entered the yard and saw what was going on, she turned to a Ukrainian, a professor, and asked him for help. She was attending high school and was his student. The professor was calmly watching. His answer to his student’s pleas amounted to turning his head away”. Not always did these familiar men and women directly participate in the beating and killing, but often found themselves partaking in the looting of Jewish homes and businesses. Beyond the initial shock of the violence in the summer and fall of 1941, Jews continued to encounter people they had interacted with when they tried to sell their belongings and exchanged them for food, when they looked for and constructed hiding places, when they hid in the forests and when they bunkers were discovered. Numerous Jewish testimonies stressed the sense of betrayal by former neighbors and acquaintances.

While relying on local studies by Martin Dean, Wendy Lower, and Jan Grabowski my paper will focus on the Jewish experience and conceptualization of collaboration. Based on testimonies, diaries, memoirs and oral interviews, my paper will look at Jewish accounts of betrayal in the context of the social and political setting of Eastern Galicia where Jews, Poles and Ukrainians had been intimately familiar with each other for decades. In which ways Jews accounted for the experience of betrayal and collaboration with the Nazis of people they might have known and trusted before the war? How did it change their understanding of prewar interethnic relations with Poles and Ukrainians? What categories did they apply in striving to understand their former neighbors: demoralization, greed, ideological anti-Semitism, traditional animosity toward the Jews?

naleksiun@yahoo.com

Natalia Aleksium is Associate Professor of Modern Jewish History at Touro College, Graduate School of Jewish Studies, New York. She is also Assistant Professor of Modern History at the Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences. She studied Polish and Jewish history at the Warsaw University, the Graduate School of Social Studies in Warsaw and Hebrew University in Jerusalem and New York University. Her dissertation appeared in print as *Where to? The Zionist Movement in Poland, 1944-1950* (in Polish) in 2002. In 2010, she received her second PhD from New York University based on her dissertation entitled: “Ammunition in the Struggle for National Rights: Jewish Historians in Poland between the Two World Wars”. She was a co-editor of the twentieth volume of *Polin*. She published in *Yad Vashem Studies*, *Polish Review*, *Dapim*, *East European Jewish Affairs*, *Studies in Contemporary Jewry*, *Polin*, *Gal Ed*, *East European Societies and Politics* and *German History*. She is currently working on a book about the so-called cadaver affair at European Universities in the 1920s and 1930s and on a project dealing with daily lives of Jews in hiding in Galicia during the Holocaust. In 2014, she will be Senior Fellow at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI).

Mykola Borovyk

(Taras Shevchenko National University, Kyiv)

Collaboration and Collaborators in the Everyday Perceptions of the Inhabitants of Ukraine

Studying the problem of collaboration merely from the perspective of the citizen-state relationship is common in academic literature. Engaging sources of a personal origin, such as oral autobiographical recollections, adds a new perspective to the research of this problem. In my paper, I analyze materials from the oral history project “Ukraine during World War II: Everyday Experience of Survival” undertaken by Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv in 2011–2013. Primarily, I analyze discursive patterns of representation of military experience, in particular regarding the perception of power, collaboration, and collaborators. The results of the project demonstrate a rather diverse picture of reflections of the war in the memories of Ukrainian inhabitants. At the same time, we can argue that the categorical framework established in historiography, and the notions of collaboration and resistance, in particular, most likely reflect the views of the war from the USSR ruling groups’ viewpoint. The vast majority of the Ukrainian population did not think of the war in categories of occupation and liberation, patriotism and betrayal, yet were preoccupied, first of all, with their own survival, the destinies of their close ones and retaining their households. Everyday perception of collaboration and collaborators was determined by the same necessities.

mkborovyk@gmail.com

Dr. Mykola Borovyk is Associate Professor and the head of research laboratory Center for Oral History at Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, where he also earned his PhD in History. His primary research interest is the history and memory of World War II in Ukraine, the history of Soviet culture, and Oral History.

