

Power Games: the German Nationality Policy (*Volkstumspolitik*) in Czernowitz before and during the Barbarossa campaign

Andrej Angrick

Czernowitz, capital of Romania's province of Bukovina, was a diplomatic, political, and ethnic battleground during World War II. Seeking to preserve its claim to the region against encroachments by the Soviets, Romania sought to suppress the region's most powerful ethnic minority, the Ukrainians, pursuing a policy of expulsion aimed at creating a "Romanised" zone. At the same time, the German *Sonderkommande* 10b ensconced itself in the city, arresting the better part of the Jewish population and killing hundreds. The Romanian regime, which originally viewed Germany as an ally against Soviet designs, felt betrayed when the German force began to cooperate with the Ukrainian nationalist movement. In the end Romania prevailed because of Hitler's decision not to establish an independent Ukraine that would include both Czernowitz and Bukovina. The Romanians herded 50,000 Czernowitz Jews into a ghetto; many of these were subsequently deported to Transnistria, but were not sent to death camps. But, after the war, the Jews never re-established themselves in the city, which had once been a vibrant center of Jewish culture.

Czernowitz, Earthly and Sublime

When the city of Czernowitz is spoken of today, it is usually invoked as a memorial of a culture that is no more, an ideal city blessed with all the best that the Austro-Hungarian monarchy had to offer. This perception is due chiefly to the coexistence, during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, of a number of ethno-national groups in and around the city. While these groups competed with one another, they also often cooperated.

However, as many writers have correctly noted,¹ this ideal Czernowitz is a mythical metropolis. The disparity derives from the fact that the old Czernowitz, famous for

1 Cf. the author's introduction in Von Andrei Corbea-Hoisie, ed., *Jüdische Städtebild, Czernowitz* (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer verlag, 1998), p. 7; Israel Chalfen, *Paul Celan. Eine Biography seiner Jugend* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1983), pp. 10-24 and Emanuel Turczynski, "Die Bukowina," in Isabel Röskau-Rydel ed., *Galizien* (Berlin: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1999), pp. 213-28, esp. pp. 214-17.

the freedom it afforded to artists and writers, no longer exists.² The bloody upheavals of the Second World War altered its character, perhaps more than any other city in Europe, even Königsberg,³ Breslau,⁴ or Lemberg.⁵ The transformation was a radical one in part because of Nazi Germany's expansionism, the ideological aims of which ruled out any reconciliation of conflicting interests through traditional diplomacy. The Nazis brooked no compromise; such an attitude doomed an ancient cultural landscape that drew its character from its ambiguities.

Czernowitz had, in fact, begun its decline well before the German invasion. With the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire at the end of World War I and the creation of a new European political order, Bukovina was a prize sought by all its neighbors. It had long been a frontier province of a large country – first of the Ottoman Empire, and then after 1775 of the Hapsburg domains. The Turks – more precisely the Young Turks, who had assumed control of the Ottoman state before the war – were eager to regain their old possession. But, on the defensive on nearly every front and in the process of losing their empire and dissolving the khalifate, they were unable to take advantage of the new situation.⁶ Romania, on the other hand, a relatively young state,

-
- 2 A typical account is given by a former Czernowitz resident and survivor of the ethnic cleansings, Dr. Kurt Sandberg: "Czernowitz is for me no longer the city it used to be. To me Czernowitz is now a dead city. I was a recipient of the culture as a whole – the theater life, the Romanian theater, the German theater, the German House, the sports associations; [during a visit to the city, many years after the events, as Israeli citizens] we were at Macabbi, at Jan's, in the German House – but this is no longer the Czernowitz of before! It is not the same culture; it is not the same social class. Today it has only Ukrainians and Russians, someone born today in Czernowitz is not a Czernowitzer; he is Russian! Or a Ukrainian, if that is how you wish to call him!" Quoted from Gaby Coldewey et al., *Zwischen Pruth und Jordan, Lebenserinnerungen Czernowitzer Juden* (Köln: Böhlau, 2003), p. 135.
 - 3 Regarding this issue, see Bert Hoppe, *Auf den Trümmern von Königsberg. Kaliningrad 1946-1970* (München: R. Oldenbourg, 2000).
 - 4 Gregor Thum, *Die fremde Stadt. Breslau 1945* (Berlin: Siedler, 2003), esp. pp. 107-70.
 - 5 Dmytro Zlepko, "Aufbruch unter Blau-Gelb. Der Wandel vom sowjetischen zum ukrainischen Lemberg," in Peter Fässler, Thomas Held and Dirk Sawitzki eds. *Lemberg-Lwow-Lviv* (Köln, Weimar und Wien: Böhlau, 1993), pp. 167-206, esp. pp. 174-96; Gerhard Simon, *Nationalismus und Nationalitätenpolitik in der Sowjetunion. Von der totalitären Diktatur zur nachstalinischen Gesellschaft* (Baden-Baden: Nomos verlagsgesellschaft, 1986), pp. 250-51.
 - 6 The campaign waged by the "sick man on the Bosphorus" against Russian, or more precisely, Soviet territories, focused in the spring of 1918 more on Georgia and

annexed Bukovina after the war despite opposition from the province's Ukrainians.⁷ The annexation was later recognized by the postwar treaty that dismantled the Hapsburg Empire, a reward to Romania for its support of the Allies. In fact, during the talks at the Paris peace convention, nearly all of the demands made by the leader of the Romanian delegation to the Paris peace conference, Ionel L. Brătianu, were accepted. But the Allies insisted that Romania accept their new nationalities policy. U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, in particular, demanded international guarantees from the Romanian government regarding Bukovina's minorities.⁸

But Russia had also joined the game. As early as September 1914, as a direct result of its conquest of the city, Russia demanded that Czernowitz be viewed as part of its empire. In reaction, the city's national groups joined forces, despite their opposing

Armenia, rather than on assaults on Baku. Nevertheless, Germany was soon to implement its own policy in the Caucasus, which was utterly at odds with Istanbul's. Enver Pascha continued to fight the Russians until his death in 1922, while Kamal Pascha "Attaturk" was to sign a friendship pact with the Soviet Union in March 1921. At this point in its political nation-building process – when the conflict with Greece was much more germane to issues of statehood – Turkey for a time no longer attributed any importance to Bukovina. But it should not be forgotten that this small province once belonged to the Ottoman Empire, and that the memory of nations steeped in a sense of historical mission will, once crises are overcome, often later legitimize the reconquest of such areas. For the chronological structure described here see Nicolae Jorga, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches* (Frankfurt am Main: F.A. Pertnes, 1990), vol. 4, pp. 510-12 and vol. 5, pp. 1-7 and VI-VIII [supplement]. For the German assessment of Turkish interests during the period under discussion – the beginning of World War II – see the telegram sent by the German ambassador in Ankara, Franz von Papen, to the Foreign Ministry in August 24, 1939, printed in *Akten zur Deutschen Auswärtigen Politik 1918-1945* Series D, vol. 7, p. 218 (henceforth: ADAP). Turkey's interests on the eve of World War II focused rather on a closer target: Bulgaria. On this matter, see the telegrams of the diplomat Fabricius to the Foreign Ministry on August 31 and September 1, 1939, printed in ADAP Series D, vol. 7, pp. 391-92, 414.

7 Erich Prokopowitsch, *Das Ende der österreichischen Herrschaft in der Bukowina* (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1959), esp. pp. 37-60. Notably, in November 1919, the Ukrainian Popular Assembly attempted, in cooperation with the national minorities (the Jews noted explicitly as a "peculiar nationality") to achieve its goal: a Ukrainian Bukovina. See *Ende der österreichischen Herrschaft*, p. 53.

8 See Mariana Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung der Bukowina* (München: R. Oldenbourg, 2001), pp. 93-121, where the events relating to the policy of conquest during and after World War I are described in detail, as well as the discussions leading to a peace treaty.

interests, against the common enemy.⁹ The collapse of the monarchy did not, however, lead to any change in Russia's claim. The Bolsheviks merely suspended it; during the phase of "Communism at War," the Bolshevik regime's primary goal was to achieve internal stability and defeat the Whites. However, once that ambition was achieved they fully intended to carry on the monarchy's expansionist policy.

In the meantime, there seemed to be a realistic opportunity to establish an independent Ukrainian state, and it, too, would eventually claim Bukovina as its own.¹⁰ The Ukrainians in Czernowitz supported this aim vociferously at a series of mass rallies and demonstrations.¹¹

Even the reborn Polish state under Marshal Jozef Pilsudski laid claim to Bukovina, thus providing the Ukrainians, and even more so the Romanians, with further incentive to take action. Romania quickly redeployed three battalions to buttress its assertion that Czernowitz and its environs were its territory.¹² With five claimants – Soviet Russia, Romania, Poland, Ukraine (or more precisely the Ukrainians), and Turkey – Czernowitz was the most disputed real estate in Europe. On top of that, Austria's claims were not a dead letter, although they now took on a new form. When Nazi Germany annexed that country, it took over the old Austrian claim that all of southeastern Europe,¹³ as far as the Bosphorus and including Bukovina, lay within its sphere of geo-political interests.

9 Emanuel Turczynski, *Geschichte der Bukowina in der Nazizeit. Zur Social-und Kulturgeschichte einer mitteleuropäisch geprägten Landschaft* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1993), pp. 209-13; Eduard Fischer, *Krieg ohne Heer, Meine Verteidigung der Bukowina gegen die Russen* (Wien: Franz Schubert, Josef Lenobel, 1935), pp. 93-97.

10 The decisions of the Ukrainian National Council from October 19; 2010 are printed in Theophil Hornykiewicz, ed., *Ereignisse in der Ukraine 1914-1922, deren Bedeutung und historische Hintergründe*, vol. 4 (Philadelphia: Ferdinand Berger, 1969), pp. 44-45 and Caroline Milow, *Die ukrainische Frage 1917-1923 im Spannungsfeld der europäischen Diplomatie* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002), pp. 406-8.

11 Oleksandr Dobrzanski, "Czernowitz und die Ukrainer," in Harald Heppner, ed., *Czernowitz. Die Geschichte einer ungewöhnlichen Stadt* (Köln, Weimar und Wien: Berlin, 2000), pp. 45-61, esp. 52; Rudolf A. Mark, "Die gescheiterten Staatsversuche," in Frank Golczewski ed., *Geschichte der Ukraine* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1993), pp. 172-201, esp., pp. 184-85.

12 Alexander von Randa, "Die Bukowina in den Weltkriegen," in Franz Lang, ed., *Buchenland. Hundertfünfzig Jahre Deutschum in der Bukowina* (München: Verlag des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerks, 1961), pp. 131-61, esp. pp. 154-55.

13 This was the utterly reasonable assessment of the former Romanian Foreign Minister Grigore Gafencu: *Vorspiel zum Krieg im Osten* (Zürich: Amstutz, Herdeg, 1944), pp. 70-74.

B. Before Barbarossa

Under the secret protocol appended to the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact, Bukovina was not explicitly placed in the Soviet sphere of interest. But neighboring Bessarabia was.¹⁴ The Germans were certainly aware that the Soviet Union’s westward ambitions targeted not only the Baltic States and the eastern regions of Poland, but also that the Soviets would strive for border revisions in southeastern Europe.¹⁵ The Romanians became suspicious. At the end of August 1939, the country’s representatives asked the chief of the German legation in Bucharest, Wilhelm Fabricius, for clarifications regarding Ribbentrop’s talks in Moscow.¹⁶

At the outbreak of World War II, as German and Russian troops invaded and partitioned Poland, an internal political crisis shook Romania. On September 21, 1939, assassins from the fascist Iron Guard movement murdered the Romanian prime minister, Armand Calinescu, one of their most bitter rivals.¹⁷ It is still widely believed

14 The non-aggression pact between Germany and the USSR, and the secret appendix to the protocol of August 23, 1939 appear in ADAP, Series D, vol 7: pp. 205-7.

15 Gabriel Gorodetsky, *Die grosse Täuschung. Hitler, Stalin und das Unternehmen “Barbarossa”* (Berlin: Siedler, 2003), pp. 57-60. Gorodetsky, who researched the sources thoroughly, stresses that Bukovina played an important role in Stalin’s considerations, as he had set his sights on controlling the Danube as part of the Soviet expansion toward the Black Sea, and hoped eventually to control the straits themselves. Once again Bukovina was to play a role as a “transitional region,” since the most important railway from Bessarabia to Lemberg was designated to pass through it, a route that had tremendous logistical importance. Romania, for its part, was certainly aware of these designs, and it was for this reason that King Carol pointed out the strategic importance of the Black Sea to the British ambassador during the latter’s visit to Bucharest. Control of the sea would enable a British war fleet to quickly intervene in affairs of the Caucasians. On the geopolitical role of Romania in case of a Soviet attack on Egypt, see also Zehra Önder, *Die türkische Aussenpolitik im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1977), pp. 48-49.

16 Schreiben des Gesandten Fabricius ans AA, August 27, 1939. Printed in ADAP, Series D, vol. 7, pp. 303-4. In this context it is interesting to note that the Romanian Foreign Minister, Grigore Gafencu, mentioned to his interlocutor that his government was disturbed by the fact that the “German-Soviet conflicts” might one day play out in his country’s territory.

17 The political archive of the foreign ministry, Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes (henceforth: PAAA), Gesandtschaft Bukarest, file 13/2, unpag.: Deutsche Gesandtschaft, Diary. No. 52227/39, September 24, 1939, Inhalt: Ehemahliger Ministerpräsident Armand Calinescu.

that members of German military intelligence supported this crime – even if their support was not premeditated – because in advance of the operation the chief assassin, Miti Dumitrescu, left Berlin, where members of the fugitive leadership of the Iron Guard had exiled themselves.¹⁸

Romanian monarchists responded to the assassination with extreme brutality. Defense Minister Gabriel Marnescu, who was very close to King Carol of Romania, took command and ordered collective executions as a punitive response. On the night of September 22, 1939, gendarmerie forces in Bukovina were ordered to kill three commanders of the Iron Guard in “certain towns in each and every province,” and to put on public display, for at least one full day, “the corpses of the shot men, to set an example.” In Czernowitz the gendarmerie apprehended and shot the commanders of the local Iron Guard cells – Silvestru Pizarczuk, Francisc Regwald, and one Chielita (first name unknown). Their corpses were then exhibited at the southwestern exits from the city. Similar actions were carried out in Bukovina’s other four districts. The German consul (later to become the consul-general) in Czernowitz, Fritz Schellhorn, reported to his superiors that the measures implemented had produced the desired result and that the mood among the local population was dire and gloomy.¹⁹ This was no doubt a result of the fact that the Iron Guard had the support of large segments of Czernowitz’s Romanian population, including the archbishop.²⁰ According to Armin Heinen, some 250 activists were murdered throughout Romania as revenge for the murder of Calinescu.²¹ A German report reveals that the number of murdered victims totalled almost 3,000. Among them were victims killed in the context of long running feuds, or as private acts of revenge.

In the process of reorganizing the government, in which it was transformed into what was called the National Renaissance Front, King Carol, who had ruled as an absolute monarch since the revocation of the liberal constitution, developed close ties

18 Armin Heinen, “Die Legion ‘Erzengel Michael,’” in *Rumänien. Soziale Bewegung und politische Organisation. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des internationalen Faschismus* (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1986), pp. 417-18.

19 PAAA, Gesandtschaft Bukarest, file 13/2, unpag.: Deutsches Konsulat Czernowitz an die Deutsche Gesandtschaft Bukarest, September 25, 1939. A brief report by Schellhorn, and one longer one, a survey entitled “list” (*Aufzeichnung*). The quote is from the second document.

20 Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung*, pp. 261-62; Heinen, *Die Legion*, p. 309. According to this source, the bodies of legionnaires who fought on Franco’s side and fell in battle during the Spanish Civil War were sent to Czernowitz, where they were received with honor, and despite the protest of the church’s prefects, their coffins were displayed in the Czernowitz cathedral.

21 Heinen, *Die Legion*, p. 418.

with the moderate wing of the Iron Guard, and sought to reach an agreement with them. To this end he went so far as to dismiss Defense Minister Marinescu and strip him of all political power.²² On the other hand, the “interests of the state” exacted more victims from among the movement’s supporters, or more precisely, from among those Guardists who still remained in the country. In November 1939 the arrests increased, especially “in Czernowitz and in other locations in Bukovina.” In addition, suspects were sent to detention camps where “many of the detainees” would “die of disease or other causes.”²³ While no longer seeking visible displays of its power, the regime continued to pursue Iron Guard activists mercilessly, sparing not even the Romanian aristocracy.²⁴

The German consulate in Czernowitz, which until then had relied on Calinescu, the dominant political figure in Czernowitz, followed these developments with some concern. Although the elderly German diplomat Schellhorn was not an enthusiastic supporter of the Guardists, he worried that the king’s new government, headed by Gheorghe Tatarescu, might reverse its orientation and seek rapprochement with France – which he felt would be considerably worse than having the Iron Guard in power. Schellhorn’s suspicions were fed by “the visible joy among broad classes of the non-German population in Czernowitz, and chiefly among the Jews,” regarding a possible new anti-German policy. He claimed that “informed circles” were anxious that the reorganization of the government would lead to Romania’s entry into the war as an ally of France.²⁵ Other members of the legation thought that Schellhorn’s concerns about

22 PAAA, Gesandtschaft Bukarest, file 13/2, unpag.: Vertraulicher Bericht Nummer 15, Die innenpolitische Lage Rumäniens zur Jahreswende. According to this source the minister Ernest Urdareanu became a rival of Marinescu, and took advantage of the political situation to oppose the latter’s system of patronage. The German side viewed this development favorably, because Marinescu was suspected of obtaining passports for Polish Jews in exchange for bribes, and of making “tremendous” profits at the Polish-Romanian border. See Heinen, *Die Legion*, p. 419.

23 PAAA, Gesandtschaft Bukarest, file 13/2, unpag.: Deutsches Konsulat Czernowitz, G. J. No. 138 an die Deutsche Gesandtschaft Bukarest, November 6, 1939 pertains to additional measures against the Iron Guard. The text of the report from Bukovina to Berlin was virtually identical: *ibid.*, Deutsche Gesandtschaft Bukarest ans AA, November 9, 1939, Inhalt: Weitere Massnahmen gegen die Eiserne Garde (the citation appears there).

24 PAAA, Gesandtschaft Bukarest, file 13/2, unpag.: Schreiben des Gesandten Fabricius an das AA, December 12, 1939, content: Princess Cantacuzino. The youngest son of the princess, like her other family relations, was a member of the Iron Guard and was among the victims of the retaliatory liquidations in September 1939.

Tatarescu were exaggerated. They pointed to the successful economic talks between Germany and Romania as evidence that the new government remained on course with regard to Germany.²⁶

The Romanian leadership, therefore, dealt with its internal political rivals forcefully and brutally. It took a different tack with Bukovina's Ukrainian nationalists. Under diplomatic pressure from the Soviet Union, the Romanian government sent its minister for minority affairs, Prof. Silvio Dragomir, to Czernowitz in October 1939 "to establish ties with the Ukrainians in Bukovina"; the intention being to conduct practical negotiations with the Ukrainian National Party (UNP).²⁷

The Reich Main Security Office (RSHA) was in the meantime watching with interest as the Ukrainian nationalists in Bukovina changed their political orientation. Vladimir Zalozieckij had thus far been the uncontested leader of the Ukrainians in the province, but he was soon obliged to share the leadership with a highly influential journalist and former member of parliament, Yuri Scherbeniuk. Generally speaking,

-
- 25 PAAA, Gesandtschaft Bukarest, file 13/2, unpg.: Deutsches Konsulat an die Deutsche Gesandtschaft in Bukarest, November 25, 1939, in reference to the new government. Alongside a general assessment of the situation in the region, Schellhorn first presented a description and analysis of the members of the new government who originated from Bukovina. These included the minister of culture, Jon Nistor – since 1912 an outstanding professor of history at Czernowitz's university, and its rector since 1933. Schellhorn deemed the former leader of the anti-Austrian movement in Bukovina, who had already held office in several ministries, a chauvinist and Francophile. Undersecretary of State Gheorghe Vantu from the Interior Ministry was portrayed more favorably, in terms of his daring, but was also thought to be a Francophile (but "possessing an attitude of understanding toward Germany and its right to exist"), and also too liberal. The flaw, on the other hand, of Undersecretary of State Gheorghe Grigorovici, who held office in the Labor Ministry, was the fact that he was married to a Russian Jewish woman, who "very skillfully" and "passionately" supported her husband – the former chairman of the Social Democrats in Bukovina. Grigorovici had also worked for an extensive period with the Jewish lawyer from Czernowitz, Dr. Jakob Pistiner. In addition it was reported that Grigorovici had rejected National Socialism, albeit without professing hostility toward Germany.
- 26 PAAA, Gesandtschaft Bukarest, file 13/2, unpag.: Diary. No. 7257/39 – I A 5 [Report of the envoy Fabricius], An das Auswärtige Amt, November 27, 1939, Inhalt: Kabinett Tatarescu.
- 27 BA (Berlin), R 58/7710. Undatierter Bericht [erste Seite Fehlt im Dokument – etwa Mitte, Oktober 1939] eines Gewaehrmannes des RSHA, pp.18-24.

the political atmosphere among the Ukrainians was at the time extremely conflicted, as members of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) sought German support for the establishment of a Ukrainian state. The Soviet invasion of Eastern Galicia²⁸ had caused them tremendous disappointment. Since the Ukrainians had not yet agreed among themselves about what their goals were, they refused to negotiate with Dragomir. Only after entreaties from the Romanian government did the Ukrainians submit a list of twenty demands to Dragomir's delegation, which had been working closely with the mayor of Czernowitz, Nicolae Flonder. The demands enumerated in this document – chiefly, the dissemination of Ukrainian language and culture, as well as adequate political representation in the regional and local administrative institutions – established the terms of the negotiations. They were accepted by the Romanians because they conformed in part with the demands made previously by the Ukrainian National Party. In fact, the Romanian government made far-reaching concessions to the Ukrainians, offering provisions of a type Scherbeniuk and Zaloziemyj might have been expected to demand in their capacity as the Ukrainian representatives on the supreme council of the National Renaissance Front.

On the one hand, the Romanian government needed to rein in the OUN, but it also needed to gain time with the Soviet Union. Some Romanian politicians were nevertheless anxious – as the RSHA knew – about the impending prospect of deterioration in relations with their powerful neighbors, perhaps within months.²⁹ After initial discussions in Bucharest with a delegation of moderate

28 On this issue see PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 5/1, relations with the neighboring states Ukraine and Poland 1927-1942: the German consulate in Czernowitz, from November 2, 1939, G. J. No. 143, to the German embassy in Bucharest, in reference to the situation in Eastern Galicia. According to this source, the bloody repression of uprisings, as well as executions and expulsions, were reported. Despite the closer surveillance of the borders, Ukrainian nationalists as well as state officials fled to Romania, while Romanians and Jews, usually younger people, fled in the opposite direction. In the course of these events, Romanian border police captured three Jews who had stolen over the border, and shot them dead. On the situation in Galicia see also PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 5/1 from December 2, 1939, G. s. No. 154, to the German embassy in Bucharest in regard to the relations in Western Ukraine. According to the German consulate, the GPU (the Russian secret police during the years 1923-1941) was extremely successful in its actions against the OUN, which was already widespread, and whose "goal was, apparently, shaking off Russian rule." Expulsions and executions were carried out, motivated, apparently by vengeance. Attached to the report is a list of names of Ukrainians who were shot to death at the same time in Western Galicia by members of the Soviet intelligence service.

Ukrainian nationalists that had arrived from Czernowitz, the Ukrainian delegation was accorded a certain degree of recognition. But, contrary to expectations, the Ukrainian minority was not granted privileges beyond those given to the province's ethnic Germans (*Volksdeutsche*) and Jews. Zalozieckj and his supporters were not about to reconcile themselves to this state of affairs.³⁰

Romania had already made concessions to the moderate Ukrainians, and so it was important that it take energetic action against Soviet Communist propaganda and against the incursions of the regional Soviet administration into border regions. Broad segments of the Romanian police force – from the local police in Kotzmann, up to the ranks of senior officers, such as the commander of the Oraseni border police – were suspected of entertaining special sympathies toward the Soviets. They were therefore closely watched by the Romanian security police. In addition, the Jews were assumed to be collaborating with the Communists, an allegation supported by the fact that Jewish photographers had received instructions from the Soviets to clandestinely photograph certain people. As a countermeasure, the government issued a directive that Romanian refugees caught crossing the borders were to be shot on sight; those suspected of crossing over for espionage purposes were to be stripped of their citizenship and possessions, and barred from returning to Romania. The German consulate in Czernowitz was skeptical about the efficacy of these measures,³¹ regarding them as an overreaction that indicated weakness. The consulate noted that it intended to continue to follow developments from up close.

With the situation in Romania deteriorating in December 1939, the RSHA sorely

29 BA (Berlin), R 58/7710, Undatierter Bericht [the first side of the document is missing – about the middle of October, 1939] eines Gewährmannes des RSHA, pp. 18-24. A large section of the report details the demands listed in the “minimal immediate plan” of the Ukrainians, which included the appointment of a Ukrainian deputy mayor in Czernowitz and the reinstatement of Ukrainian teachers and clerks in their former positions, as well as 27 other demands from a memorandum presented by the representatives of the Ukrainian national group on October 3, 1939, to the Romanian government. See also Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung*, pp. 314, 317-18; Hans-Christian Maner, *Parlamentarismus in Rumänien (1930-1940). Demokratie im autoritären Umfeld* (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1997), p. 396.

30 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: PV Spes, October 7, 1939, a report about the statements made by Zalozieckj after his meeting with the Romanian Prime Minister Constantin Argetoianu, who held this office for only a short time.

31 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 1/3, Deutschfeindliche Tätigkeit im Amtsbereich: [German Consulate, Czernowitz], December 8, 1939, An die deutsche Gesandtschaft Bukarest, Betrifft: Kommunistische Propaganda in Nordrumänien.

needed intelligence. Yet it seems not to have wanted to obtain it via the Foreign Ministry.³² It preferred to conduct its own independent investigations. To this end the RSHA availed itself of the services of a young and ambitious historian,³³ Professor Fritz Valjavec, the director of the Southeastern Europe Institute in Munich (Südost-Instituts München).³⁴ In December 1939 Valjavec, accompanied by an officer from the Abwehr, a German military intelligence unit, set out on an expedition to Romania to

32 This may have been a result of the fact that the consulate was assisted directly by Romanian intelligence officers, and preferred to work with German military intelligence (Abwehr). Thus the chief of the Czernowitz Siguranta (the Romanian Security Service), Karl Postatny, assisted the consulate employees, Springen and Schellhorn himself, before he was transferred out of the city. See PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, Akte 6/6, Abwehr, Spionage, Sabotage Schmuggel etc.: Abwehrstelle Rumänien, No. 395/41 geh. II, January 18, 1941, Herrn Konsul Schellhorn. Ebd.: handschriftliche Beantwortung, February 3, 1941, für Karl Postatny, Umsiedlungslager Sayda im Erzgebirge.

33 Norbert Spannberger, “*Vom volksdeutschen Nachwuchswissenschaftler zum Protagonisten nationalsozialistischer Südosteuropapolitik. Fritz Valjavec im Spiegel seiner Korrespondenz 1934-1939*”, in Mathias Beer and Gerhard Seewann, eds., *Südostforschung im Schatten des Dritten Reiches. Institutionen – Inhalte – Personen* (München: R. Oldenbourg, 2004), pp. 215-35.

34 Valjavec was appointed director in 1938 and, by his own account, pursued his post-doctoral training in Munich. The institute he headed, which was located at München 13, Schellingstr 2/II, and which was officially designated the “Institut zur Erforschung des deutschen Volkstum im Süden und Südosten” (Institute for the Study of German Nationality in the South and Southeast), was established in 1930, during the Weimar Republic, and was among the more respected scientific institutions of the Third Reich. It was closely associated with the SD (see Michael Fahlbusch, *Wissenschaft im Dienst der nationalsozialistischen Politik? Die “volksdeutschen Forschungsgemeinschaften” von 1931-1945* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1999), pp. 260-63. For this reason the Ministry for State Security in the DDR (the MfS known as the Stasi), was required after the war to take an interest in this institution and its close association with the RSHA, and especially its Gruppe VI G (which was involved in researching the national groups and the German people, and had ties with various research institutes), as well as to examine the activity of historians connected with the Wansee Institute. BstU FV, 2/72, SA vol. 1, 232-47: [Resulting report and proposals of the MfS] I.P./Mie, May 21, 1969, Betrifft. Suchaufträge 169/69, April 8, 24, 1969 für die Dienststelle 11/700. In addition to the Southeastern [European] Institute, and the people recruited for the Gruppe VI G, the Stasi also investigated the following research institutions and the airborne commando, which were in contact with Referat VI G: Ostasien-

prepare a report on the public mood in the country. The report, headed by Franz Six, was intended for the RSHA's Office II, and concerned itself chiefly with studying the adversary's worldview. Six and Valjavec had been in contact at least since 1936, and from that time the ties between the scholar and the SD (the Nazi party's intelligence agency) grew progressively closer. Ultimately, a productive association evolved, which mutually benefited both parties. Valjavec gained the trust of a highly influential SD agent, Walter Schellenberg, whom he used for his own ends.³⁵

Valjavec, who reported that the Romanian police were following him, strongly objected to the National Renaissance Front, which he described as a group of home-grown Romanian "ambition-driven careerists." He predicted the party's swift demise. On the other hand, he made no effort to conceal his enthusiasm for the Iron Guard, which, in his words, was still a "factor [shaping] public opinion." At the same time he expressed concern about whether the remaining pro-German Guardists would once again turn against the monarchy, a development that "might cause us damage, due to its outbursts of despair." In his opinion, Romania's economic situation had deteriorated significantly, due in part to bad management and corruption. But another factor was the country's excessive exports to Germany. This would certainly stoke anti-German sentiment in the country, which could be exploited by enemy propaganda. As for Germany's trade interests, the historian complained that business remained too focused on Bucharest (to the disadvantage of ethnic Germans in the provinces). This stemmed, he explained, in part from the German legations' lack of interest in companies operating outside the capital. On the other hand, Jewish buyers were assumed to be doing business with companies whose enterprises focused on the provinces, and "they were interested, of course, in harming German interests, to the greatest extent possible." The relations between the Nazi Party's Foreign Organization, the body under which Nazis outside Germany were organized, and Romania's ethnic Germans were very bad, and

Institut in Berlin-Dahlem, Orient-Institut in Tübingen, Alemmanisches-Institut in Freiburg, Nordamerika-Institut Wien, Die Reinhard Heydrich-Stiftung in Prag, das Wannsee-Institut Berlin bzw. Schloss Plankenwarth/Steiermark, Alpenländische Forschungsgemeinschaft und Publikationsstelle Innsbruck sowie das Unternehmen Lieben (u.a. in Odessa eingesetzt), Unternehmen Teich (Berlin – Am Grossen Wannsee 32) und das berüchtigte Einsatzkommando Ungarn.

35 Gerhard Seewann, "Das Südost-Institut 1930-1960," in Mathias Beer und Gerhard Seewann, eds., *Südostforschung*, pp. 49-92, esp. pp. 60-61; Gerhard Grimm, "Georg Stadtmüller und Fritz Valjavec. Zwischen Anpassung und Selbstbehauptung," in *ibid.*, pp. 237-55, esp. pp. 247-48

the activity of the SS limited. Valjavec therefore concluded that the ethnic Germans (*Volksdeutsche*) were isolated in a hostile environment and could not anticipate a rosy future. They could not count on the small number of pro-German Romanians who were close to the regime, since they expected Germany to be defeated by the West and consequently conducted themselves with great caution. In general, the atmosphere in the country was marked by “indescribable agitation” because everyone assumed that in the spring of 1940 something was about to happen, such as, for example, the loss of Bessarabia to the Soviet Union. A modicum of hope was furnished by the Finnish resistance to the Soviet Union in the north, but in the final analysis neither the Romanian army nor the state were fit to wage war.³⁶

In Berlin, the Munich professor’s report was received enthusiastically, and was highly appreciated. The chief of the Southeastern Office II, Emil Steudle, studied it thoroughly and on February 12, 1940 passed it on to Six, with an accompanying explanation of how the report provided “a comprehensive survey of the current problems in that country’s foreign policy, and its implications for relations regarding internal policy.” Valjavec’s assessment that “among the few influential pro-German Romanians a great deal of reticence is apparent” was also accepted.³⁷ Six, who at the time was attempting to establish himself and his own bureau within the RSHA, seems also to have been impressed – three days later he had Valjavec’s report brought to the attention of Heydrich. Additional copies were sent to Offices III and IV (Home Intelligence and Foreign Intelligence of the RSHA).³⁸ It could therefore be argued that Valjavec’s assessments – including their patently anti-Romanian tenor – affected RSHA policy making on southeastern Europe.³⁹

However, more than RSHA policy (which in the spring of 1940 underwent a radical

36 BA (Berlin) R 58/7710, 2-16: Bericht über eine Rumänienreise (December 8-22, 1939), gez. Valjavec. Quoted therein.

37 Ibid., p. 1: II D 2, Ste./Ve. Vom 12.2.1940, An den Leiter II, Betr. Bericht über eine Rumänienreise (December 8-22, 1939) des Dozenten Dr. Valjavec, München-Berlin. Valjavec’s name was later manually erased. On Steudle see Michael Wildt, *Generation des Unbedigten. Das Führungskorps des Reichssicherheitshauptamtes* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2002), pp. 370-71.

38 BA, R 58/7710, p. 17: Der Amtschef II, February 15, 1940, Nachrichten aus Südosteuropa, Bericht. Betr.: Bericht über eine Rumänienreise von Dr. V. Vom 8. bis December 22, 1939. Six informed Steudle about Valjavec’s report.

39 It is interesting to note that, during the same month, Six was also forced to deal with the Ukrainian question because Georg Leibbrandt, from Rosenberg’s office, demanded

change that deprived Office II of a number of its operational functions, leaving it self-absorbed and without influence),⁴⁰ “grand politics” would determine the course of events in Bukovina in the months that followed. Romanian Foreign Minister Gafencu knew already in December 1939 – thus validating Valjavec’s prediction regarding the mood in Bucharest and throughout the country – that it would be nearly impossible to deter aggression against Romania, and that the country would have to make concessions, at least on the matter of Bessarabia.⁴¹

The German consulate in Czernowitz viewed this development with some concern, since, according to the official in charge, the Communist party in Czernowitz was composed “mostly of Jews” and was likely to engage in conspiratorial collaborations with the Soviet intelligence service in Galicia. At the same time, the consulate reported that the Russians would no longer give any credence to the Jews, and that consequently they would seek more Ukrainian assistance in reconstructing the Communist organization.⁴² Consequently, Ukrainian nationalism would play a greater role in the anticipated Soviet annexation.

On the other hand, since January 1940 a persistent rumor had been spreading

to find out what the position of the RSHA was on this issue. The staff of Office II, in coordination with the chief of Office VI, Heinz Jost, and in collaboration with Leibbrandt, were supposed to formulate the future position of the Office. BA (Dahlwitz-Hoppegarten), ZR 920/62, 35-37 Amt VI, AZ: 7783/40. Jo/Rh, February 29, 1940, Vermerk, Betr.: Besprechung mit SS-Standartenführer Six am February 28. In practice the issue was transferred into the hands of, SS-Sturmabführer Vietinghoff-Scheel, head of department VI C Ost. On this particular individual see Wildt, *Generation*, p. 394.

40 Wildt, *Generation*, pp. 364-73; Lutz Hachmeister, *Der Gegnerforscher. Die Karriere des SS-Führers Franz Alfred Six* (München: C.H. Beck, 1998), pp. 212-15. In this document it is intimated that it was the foreign affairs desk, in the context of establishing personal and political connections to scientific institutions, that aroused the suspicion of the chief of Office VI in February 1940, which encouraged Jost to resist the party machinery more actively. In this light, the interpretation that regards an academic authority such as Valjavec as being employed as a type of “ammunition” in Six’s strivings to be granted the authority of an office chief is reasonable; ultimately the latter was unsuccessful in fulfilling his ambition because Heydrich did not support him. Valjavec was nevertheless to continue to serve the system (see below).

41 No. 975, December 8, 1939, Poll II 2572g, Telegramm des Gesandten Fabricius an das AA über seine Besprechung mit dem rumänischen Aussenminister, December 6, 1939, printed in ADAP, Series D, vol. 8, pp. 391-92.

42 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, fol. 1/3, Deutschfeindliche Tätigkeit im Amtsbereich:

in Czernowitz – apparently Mayor Flondor himself was the source – that German troops had invaded Western Galicia. Anti-Soviet circles seized upon the hope that these German forces would provide “more secure protection against possible Russian designs on northern Romania.” In Schellhorn’s view, this was no more than an expression of profound insecurity and of wishful thinking on the part of broad segments of the population.⁴³ The months that followed would prove just how mistaken was the assessment in Czernowitz of Germany’s role in a potential defense alliance. At the end of 1940, in a speech before the Supreme Soviet, Molotov referred to Bessarabia as an unresolved issue between the Soviet Union and Romania, and in April an increasing number of border encroachments were documented, clearly signaling that the situation was deteriorating.⁴⁴

In June 1940, the Soviet government sensed an opportunity⁴⁵ to present an ultimatum and, in partial fulfillment of the secret protocol of the Moscow agreement, not only to claim Bessarabia, but northern Bukovina as well. This would confirm Romania’s deepest fears. On June 23, 1940, Molotov announced to the German ambassador in Moscow, Friedrich Werner Graf von der Schulenburg, that the question of Bessarabia could brook “no further delays.” Bucharest, he said, had for too long

Deutsches Konsulat Czernowitz, February 19, 1940, An die Deutsche Gesandtschaft Bukarest [Bezug:] G.S. No.34, Betrifft: Stimmungsumschwung unter den Juden. *ibid.*: Czernowitz, February 16, 1940, Aufzeichnung. The author is unknown. One possible identification is Chapeurouge, who also prepared the report of February 19, at Schellhorn’s request.

43 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 1/3, Deutschfeindliche Tätigkeit im Amtsbereich: Deutsches Konsulat Czernowitz, January 22, 1940, An die deutsche Gesandtschaft Bukarest [Bezug:] G.S. No. 12, Beriff: Gerüchte über Anwesenheit deutscher Truppen in der Westukraine, quoted therein.

44 Andreas Hillgruber, Hitler, König Carol und Marschall Antonescu. *Die Deutsch-Rumänischen Beziehungen 1938-1944* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1965), pp. 70-71; Gafencu, Vorspiel, pp. 344-45; Johann Böhm, *Die Deutschen in Rumänien und das Dritte Reich 1933-1940* (Frankfurt am Main; New York: Peter Lang, 1999), pp. 244-45. The speech is presented in fragments; the most important passages cited in this article are taken from ADAP, Series D, vol. X, p. 3.

45 Gorodetsky, *Täuschung*, pp. 59-60. This account accurately describes how felicitous was the date of the presentation of the Soviet ultimatum. Hitler’s attention was still focused on the West, at a time when France had sustained a defeat and Great Britain was at war, but was not willing to intervene on behalf of Romania in the southeast. For tactical reasons, Germany was interested in maintaining its treaty with the Soviet Union.

deferred a resolution of this problem. At the first opportunity, Molotov reported, the Soviet Union would present its claims in respect to Bukovina, since the Ukrainians were a significant part of the population there. Schulenburg did his duty and conveyed the message to his minister, but cautioned at the same time that, no matter what, “the needs of the many *Volksdeutsche* who inhabit Bessarabia and Bukovina should be seen to.”⁴⁶ The Soviet Union was interested in appropriating as much territory as possible, while Romania wanted to cede as little territory as it could to its Eastern neighbor. Germany, for its part, insisted on securing its own economic interests, especially the supply of oil from Ploesti. Within this tangle of interests, Hitler was willing to sacrifice Bessarabia, but he wanted to prevent the Soviets from crossing the Pruth River.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, the Soviet’s demand to receive Bukovina was a “novelty,” as Ribbentrop stressed when he remarked that the region had formerly been part of the Austrian kingdom and that it was inhabited by a great number of *Volksdeutsche*.⁴⁸ Molotov countered the Germans with his own nationalist claim. His argument that Bukovina was in fact the last lost region of Ukrainian territory had political motives, but it was wholeheartedly embraced by the OUN. They consequently looked forward to resolving the fate of Bukovina along with the question of Bessarabia.⁴⁹ But, given Germany’s interests, the Soviets had no choice but to make do with the northern part of Bukovina and its capital, Czernowitz. At least the important Lemberg-Bessarabia rail line would remain within Soviet territory. The German side raised no serious objections to this proposal.⁵⁰

On June 26, 1940, at 23:00, Molotov summoned the Romanian charges d’affaires in Moscow, Davidescu, and presented him with an ultimatum – Romania must cede the territories the Soviet Union claimed. With the Germans counseling the Romanians

46 See the telegram from German Ambassador von der Schulenberg on June 23, 1940, printed in ADAP, Series D, vol. X, pp. 3-4.

47 Telex of the Secretary of State Ernst Freiherr von Weizsäcker, June 24, 1940, printed in ADAP, Series D, X, pp. 6-8; Ribbentrop’s notes for Hitler, June 24, 1940, printed in ADAP, Series D, X, pp. 9-10.

48 Telegram from Ribbentrop to von der Schulenberg, June 25, 1940, printed in ADAP, Series D, Bd. X, pp. 11-12. The content of the telegram, which included the official political direction that von der Schulenberg was to take vis-à-vis Molotov, was also brought to the attention of Fabricius in Bucharest.

49 Telegram from von der Schulenberg to Ribbentrop, June 26, 1940, about his conversation with Molotov; printed in ADAP, Series D, vol. X, pp. 18-19.

50 An additional telegram by von der Shulenberg to Ribbentrop from June 26, 1949, about his conversation with Molotov, is printed in ADAP, Series D, vol. X, pp. 22-23.

to accept the Soviet diktat, Romania was left to choose between a futile war and capitulation. The Romanian foreign minister could say only that Romania would obey; she would “not fight, but did not forfeit the possibility of fighting later.” In Bukovina, unlike in Poland, the seeds of war were sown only in the summer of 1940, but they were immediately ready to germinate.⁵¹ These events reignited the political crisis in Romania, undermining the foundations of the state even more powerfully than had the crisis of the previous September. The dominos began to fall: Hungary and Bulgaria also demanded border rectifications, and within a few short weeks Romania had also lost Siebenbürgen and southern Dobruđa. Simultaneously, on the internal front, the Legionnaire movement headed by Horia Sima, who had returned from Germany, resumed its pressure on the monarchy. Sima’s faction was at first still party to the making of war policy, under the aegis of alliance with the Party of the Nation (the National Renaissance Front’s new name).⁵² At the end of this process Romania remained utterly isolated, and King Carol stood face to face with the ruins of his policy. In 1940, after Romania had lost a third of its territory to its neighbors, Carol abdicated the throne in favor of Crown Prince Michael.

In the struggle for the premiership, General Ion Antonescu emerged victorious over Sima. Presumptively representing the military, Antonescu was a critic of the policies of both King Carol and the Legionnaires. He swiftly entered the political fray, presenting himself as a “personal alternative.” He was granted dictatorial powers, including all the authority vested in the head of state, for the purpose of replacing the shaky edifice of government.⁵³

Bukovina was ceded. Two days after the ultimatum, Romanian soldiers and administrative officials were evacuated from Czernowitz, and the German consulate was also forced to relocate its seat to Jassy. In addition to the Romanians, anyone else who feared the Soviets fled, especially Ukrainians with nationalist leanings. On the other hand, Romanians whose families were divided by the annexation, and also Jews who had been victims of burgeoning antisemitism in Romania, attempted to move to Bukovina.⁵⁴ Nearly all the province’s ethnic Germans remained – the

51 A directive from Ribbentrop to the delegate Schmidt, to inform the delegate Fabricius in Bucharest, from June 27, 1940, printed in ADAP, Series D, vol. X, p. 24. Different documents relating to the “hot” period of the ultimatum also appear here. Gafencu, pp. 385-93, the quote is on p. 387. Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung*, pp. 349-50; Rebecca Haynes, *Romanian Policy towards Germany, 1936-1940* (London: Macmillan, 2000), pp. 135-37.

52 Haynes, *Policy*, pp. 133-35.

53 Hillgruber, *Hitler*, pp. 73-79, 89-97.

54 Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung*, pp. 352-53, 359-60, 362.

legation in Bucharest having informed them that only active anti-Communists needed to leave speedily for Siebenbürgen.⁵⁵ In fact, rumors to this effect had already been spreading since the fall of 1939, following Hitler's speech on October 6.⁵⁶ Despite these directives, the relocation of inhabitants – as one of the German officials noted⁵⁷ – was ultimately an improvisation, a response to the Soviet pressure on Romania that seemed like it might bring Romania into the Soviet orbit. Nevertheless, this required an understanding with the Soviet government as to the logistics of relocation. The Germans were also interested in reaching an agreement about other controversial issues – they wanted to ensure that all resettlement should be voluntary, and that compensation be paid for personal property, especially real estate. Only after the negotiations ended, on September 5, 1940,⁵⁸ were the Germans permitted to send to the ceded territories their own resettlement experts from the Volksdeutsche Center (*Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle* – VoMi) of the Reich's Commission for Strengthening the German Race, a staff of about 600 people under the command of SS *Standartenführer* Horst Hoffmeyer. Heading the Soviet committee was the government's regional representative, P. Weretennikow. Both groups based themselves in their offices in the Bessarabian town of Tarutino, while the part of the commission that was designated to deal with Bukovina, under the command of *Standartenführer* Müller and Professor Herbert Mayer, was stationed in Czernowitz itself.⁵⁹

Until the arrival of the VoMi commando, the treatment of the German national groups was entrusted to the political functionaries of the particular minority; Professor

55 Telegram from ambassador Fabricius to the Foreign Ministry on June 28, 1940, printed in ADAP, Series D, vil. X, pp. 43-44; Dirk Jachomowski, *Die Umsiedlung der Bessarabien, und Dobruischadeutschen. Von der Volksgruppe zur "Siedlungsbrücke" an der Reichsgrenze* (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1984), pp. 44-46, 58-59.

56 Hitler's speech to the Reichstag on October 6, 1939, with the publishers' annotations, printed in Max Domarus, *Hitler. Reden und Proklamationen 1932-1945*, vol. 3, pp. 1377-93. The relevant sections are on p. 1,383. On the impact of this speech, see also Götz Aly, *"Endlösung." Völkerverschiebung und der Mord an den europäischen Juden* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1995), pp. 36-39.

57 Rudolf Wagner, "Die Umsiedlung der Deutschen aus der Bukowina," in *Buchenland* (hg. Von Franz Lang), pp. 509-26, esp. p. 511.

58 A German-Soviet agreement regarding the resettlement of the ethnic German population from the territory of Bessarabia and Bukovina to the German Reich, from September 5, 1940, printed in Jachomowski, *Die Umsiedlung*, pp. 209-15.

59 Wagner, *Die Umsiedlung der Deutschen*, pp. 512-13; Christian Kipper, *Die Deutsche Minderheitenproblematik in Rumänien. Der Sonderweg der Bukowinadeutschen* (München: Augsburg, 1991), pp. 48-49.

Franz Lohmer was appointed regional leader (*Gauleiter*), while Dr. Otto Broneske was made district chief (*Gauobmann*). As early as April 1940, both were secretly engaged in the assiduous and “cautious preparation” of property registration – which already displayed the signs of racist classification.⁶⁰ After local Germans were registered, the EWZ (*Einwandererzentralstelle*, a department of the SD that was the Reich’s agency for the resettlement of the *Volksdeutsche*) classified them according to their political orientation (or more precisely, trustworthiness), origin, and *Volkstum*, a term that refers to national character and tradition. In the “O” category, the EWZ placed individuals whom it believed could serve as paragons of Germanness in those conquered areas into which the Reich was to expand.⁶¹ Few ethnic Germans in Bukovina fell into this category because intermarriage with members of other national groups, so characteristic of Austro-Hungarian society, was very widespread. Schellhorn summarized his point of view in a letter to SS *Obergruppenführer* Lorenz; the spirit of National Socialism was barely discernible among them, he wrote. Rather, they evinced a bygone era’s spirit of tolerance:

At the time of the Austrians, the Germans too constituted a minority alongside the Ukrainians, the Romanians, and the Jews; most lived, as they live today also, in isolated settlements, and a not insignificant

60 Announcement from the Reich (no. 73) from April 6, 1940, printed in *Meldungen aus dem Reich 1938-1945, Die geheime Lageberichte des Sicherheitsdienstes der SS*, vol. 3 (hg. und eingeleitet von Heinz Boberach, Herrsching: 1984), p. 960.

61 Ingeborg Fleischhauer, *Das Dritte Reich und die Deutschen in der Sowjetunion* (Stuttgart: 1983), pp. 66-72. “A” cases were thought of as ungrounded, and therefore their national character needed at first to be fortified in the environment of the national community, i.e. in Germany (“Altreich”) – hence the reason for registering them. “O” cases, on the other hand, were already seen as carriers of Germanness, and therefore they could be active within a hostile environment, especially as landowners – following the brutal expulsion of the existing population, and the “transfer” to Aryan hands of farms that already existed. Based on the author’s personal knowledge, after examining an extended family, the investigation committees would change its classification from “A” to “O” if the family in question had experience in farming and cattle-breeding, i.e. skills well-suited for the transfer of expropriated farms. “S” cases were people who were suspected of bearing hostility toward the national community; they required special training, i.e. reeducation. And finally, among those from Bukovina examined there were also some who were classified as “G,” “R” and “U”; this meant they were to be deported to the GG (Generalgouvernement – the Polish territories occupied by Germany), Romania or Hungary.

number of them lived in the city. But they were [members of] the state people (*Staatsvolk*); their language was the language of the army, of the authorities and of the culture-bearing classes. The national policy pursued by the Austrian government was nevertheless to avoid any kind of stringency in its relations with members of other nations; the result was that almost all of the inhabitants of Bukovina were good Austrians and belonged to the milieu of German culture ... given this state of affairs it is understandable that, especially in the cities, marriage with people of different origins was an acceptable thing; language, more than blood, was deemed to be a uniting factor. And nonetheless, in marriages of Ukrainian and Romanian men with women of German origin, certainly the wish was that the offspring would assimilate in terms of their blood with the *Staatsvolk*. The liberalism of the Austrian administration was, unfortunately, the reason that intermarriage with Jews was also indiscriminate, and yet such marriages were nevertheless rare among the Germans.⁶²

Indeed, the SS's racist policies in respect to the Germans of Bukovia were not unequivocal. According to the "experts," the number of ambiguous cases, called "A" cases, was relatively high in comparison with their numbers among other groups of the *Volksdeutsche* who were about to be relocated (e.g. in the Baltic countries).⁶³ Nevertheless, the external racial appearance of "Czernowitz" folk was so acceptable that the experts of the EWZ's mobile V committee were obliged to authorize their settlement in the east, just like "O" cases. Their compatibility in terms of character, on the other hand, by National Socialist standards, was deemed questionable. They were labeled urban decadent, materialistic, and not family-oriented – since many of them were childless. Such "O" types were not needed in the German East, for then they

62 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 5/1, Beziehungen zu den Nachbarstaaten Ukraine und Polen 1927-1942: Deutsches Konsulat G.J. No. 107 [Schellhorn's writing], August 1, 1942, the report contains appendices with statistical data. All the quotes appear therein.

63 BA (Berlin), R 69/212: Summary report of the registration of Germans from Northern Buchenwald (Buchenwald – Bukovina) by the Immigrants Center; Kurt Rein, "Czernowitz und die Deutschen," in Harald Heppner, ed., *Czernowitz*, pp. 81-101, esp. pp. 94-95. It is reported here that "A" cases were frequently resettled in German cities, esp. Saltzgitter and Wolfsburg.

would have only exported degenerate Czernowitz “types.”⁶⁴ But this evaluation was a relatively optimistic one; the EWZ’s overall assessment was much more severe, even with regard to the “race value” of the German residents of Czernowitz:

The population of the city of Czernowitz tended to conspicuously distance itself racially speaking. Many Germans wed partners of foreign blood. Apart from this, they were mostly subject to the cultural influences of members of other nationalities, for example on the issue of restricting birth rates.⁶⁵

According to the registers of the Czernowitz consulate, prior to August 1940, some 34,210 people from northern Bukovina requested resettlement. The breakdown is as follows:

Volksdeutsche

9,965 families, 30,845 individuals

Mixed marriages (*Volksdeutsche* wife)

617 families, 1,843 individuals

Members of foreign nations

Romanians: 268 families, 685 individuals

Ukrainians: 255 families, 575 individuals

64 BA (Berlin), R 69/599, pp. 108-09: Einwandererzentralstelle, Fliegende Kommission V, February 11, 1941 re: Durchschleusung der Czernowitzer – Stadtbevölkerung; Isabel Heinemann, “Rasse, Siedlung, Deutsches Blut.” *Das Rasse- und Siedlungshauptamt der SS und die rassenpolitische Neuordnung Europas* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2003), pp. 244-47.

65 BA (Berlin), R 69/212: Summary report of the registration of Germans from Northern-Buchenwald by the Immigrants’ Center. Quoted here from the summary (*Zusammenfassung*). It is possible that the overall judgment was affected by a damning report by the chief of the SS Race and Settlement Office (*Rasse und Siedlungshauptamt – RuSHA*), to the airborne Committee VII, which, regarding the ethnic Germans residing in Northern Buchenwald, referred to “Mongol, Near Eastern, Malay, and Central Asian influences,” especially among women. This placed an “onerous burden on the shoulders of the German nations.” Since sterilization, which was the preferred solution, was not feasible because of considerations of internal politics and foreign policy, the committee recommended removing the people in question to the *Generalgouvernement*. See, BA (Berlin), R 69/599, 159. Leiter der RuS-Dienststelle, EWZ-Fliegd. Komm. VII, December 21, 1940, Betr. Fremdblütige Volksdeutsche aus Nordbuchenland.

Poles: 124 families, 287 individuals
 Hungarians: 4 families, 5 individuals
 Russians: 1 family, 5 individuals
 Czechs: 3 families, 8 individuals
 Croats: 1 family, 3 individuals
 Armenians: 2 families, 4 individuals
 Total foreign: 658 families, 1,522 individuals
 Total requesting resettlement: 34,210 individuals⁶⁶

Many of the “members of foreign nations” could claim a partial German origin. Moreover, it was worthwhile for the Germans to allow Ukrainian nationalists, members of the Iron Guard, clergy, government officials, and former Austrian military officers, as well as many landowners, to enter the territory of the Reich, since they were anti-Soviet and were potential collaborators.⁶⁷ In the coming weeks their numbers were to increase tremendously. All told, 43,500 people reregistered with the EWZ after leaving their old homeland.⁶⁸

In any event, the resettlement of the German “race comrades” (*Volksgenossen*) who came from Bukovina was implemented in accordance with the German-Soviet agreement, without taking into account their “quality.” Forty-four designated trains transferred the people from northern Buchenwald (Northern Bukovina) to the *Generalgouvernement*. The final train arrived in November 1940 at the border town of Przemyśl.⁶⁹ Thus came to an end the history of the Germans in Bukovina, and in Czernowitz.

66 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 5/1, Beziehungen zu den Nachbarstaaten Ukraine und Polen 1927-1942: Deutsches Konsulat G. J. No. 107, August 1, 1940, An den Obergruppenführer Lorenz, Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle Berlin. Hier Anlage 1.

67 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 5/1, Beziehungen zu den Nachbarstaaten Ukraine und Polen 1927-1942: [German Consulate], Entwurf des Schreibens an Obergruppenführer Lorenz G.J. No. 107, August 1, 1942. The classification of the members of foreign nations is erased in the draft, not, so it seems, because the data were incorrect, but, in my opinion, because of the desire to keep the information from reaching VoMi.

68 Dirk Jachomowski, *Die Umsiedlung*, p. 80. The number given here of people who relocated from Northern Bukovina – based on the surveys of the EWV – was 43,500.

69 Dirk Jachomowski, *Die Umsiedlung*, p. 84; Valdis O. Lumans, *Himmler’s Auxiliaries: The Volksdeutsche Mittelstelle and the German National Minorities of Europe, 1933-1945* (Chapel Hill, London: 1993), pp. 172-73.

Following these events, Office VI of the RSHA ran into trouble collecting intelligence. However, despite the resettlement of the *Volksdeutsche*, Office VI still deemed the collection of intelligence in Bukovina – in comparison with other frontier regions in the Soviet Union – satisfactory. Yet, contrary to their initial expectations, “those who were fully active in the SD during resettlement” were not credited with this; the latter viewed resettlement as their chief task, and not the “expansion of the intelligence web,” although the “network of agents” created by the SD in Bukovina “worked well” and continued to expand. This was chiefly carried out by Ukrainian contacts, whose connections reached as far as Kiev; they infiltrated across the border in order to pass on intelligence to their German contacts in southern Bukovina, which remained in Romanian hands – especially in the cities of Radautz and Botosani.⁷⁰ On the other hand, Romanians who worked for the SD are not mentioned at all.

With the annexation of Bukovina to the Ukrainian SSR, a swift process of Sovietization began in Czernowitz. In practical terms this was manifested in the radical reorganization of the economic system, through the nationalization of the large enterprises – private companies and semi-governmental welfare institutions – and a complete restaffing of the government bureaucracy. A land reform program created large cooperatives and state farms. The provincial administration was reorganized. Popular courts were established. A language reform was undertaken, the primary purpose of which was to eliminate Romania’s official status. This reversed the policy of the Romanian era, during which the relevant ministries enforced the Romanization of the public school system.

Members of the established elites who had not fled to Romania or Germany risked persecution, arrest, or exile into the interior of Russia. They might even be executed on the grounds that they were “harmful to the nation” or “trespassers.” The identity of the national group with which an individual affiliated had no significance whatsoever – the deciding factors were a person’s social status, and their own and their family’s political association.⁷¹

70 BA (Dahlwitz-Hoppegarten,) ZR 920/64, pp. 1-8: Rechenschaftsbericht des Referates VI C 1 bis zum 30. November 1940, quoted therein. Other hiding places for agents existed in Jassy and Gallanz.

71 Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung*, pp. 354-65. On the issue of Romanian language policy, see Othmar Kolar, *Rumänien und seine nationalen Minderheiten 1918 bis heute* (Wien, Köln and Weimar: Böhlau, 1997), pp. 123-24. Nevertheless, even from the contemporary Romanian perspectives, Jews, conversely, remained enemies of the people and profiteers who by virtue of their massive resettlement in Moldavia

On the Soviet side it was certainly hoped that these measures would promote the rapid assimilation of Bukovina into the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, and would simultaneously root out political adversaries. The Soviets also viewed this as the implementation of the Moscow treaty. At the same time, Soviet officials were well aware that Germany would not reconcile itself to this state of affairs forever. In sending a military delegation to Romania, Hitler clearly signaled that Antonescu's state was now under the Reich's protective wing.⁷²

From March 1941 onward, the Soviet intelligence service heard again and again from its trusted sources in Bucharest that the new agreement between the Reich and Romania placed more emphasis on war against the Soviet Union than on securing the oilfields of Ploesti. German officers in the military delegation to Bucharest chatted freely about the impending offensive, in which Romania would regain Bessarabia and northern Bukovina.⁷³ What Stalin termed the "Great Game" would begin on June 22, 1941, earlier than he had hoped. Czernowitz and the whole of Bukovina would become a battlefield between the two dictators.⁷⁴

C. Operation Barbarossa and the Conflict of Worldviews

At the outset of the Barbarossa campaign, the 11 German AOK (*Armeeoberkommando*) units and Romanian AOK units 3 and 4 crossed the border into the USSR. They were followed by the special units of the RSHA and the Romanian intelligence service, whose mission was to carry out security and policing tasks, and thus to create the preconditions for the final political reorganization of the occupied territories. Contrary to the spirit of the Hitler-Stalin pact, Bukovina, Czernowitz included, was about to become a Romanian region of interest. The Reich's acquiescence to Romanian sovereignty in the region may have meant that Germany was relinquishing an Austrian crown colony, but the SD was intent, even after the resettlement of Bukovina's ethnic Germans, to preserve some sort of political influence there.

constituted a foreign body within the Romanian community, and whose support of the Soviets in Bessarabia was regarded as a betrayal of Romania. See Lucian Boia, *Geschichte und Mythos. Über die Gegenwart des Vergangenen in der rumänischen Gesellschaft* (Köln, Weimar und Wien: Böhlau, 2003), pp. 199-202.

72 Jürgen Förster, "Rumäniens Weg in die deutsche Abhängigkeit. Zur Rolle der deutschen Militärmission, 1940/1941," in *Militärgeschichtliche Mitteilungen* 1/79, pp. 47-77, esp. pp. 58-68.

73 Gorodetsky, *Täuschung*, pp. 186, 189, 255-56, 317, 322-23, 373-74.

74 Dimitri Wolkogonow, *Stalin. Triumph und Tragödie* (Düsseldorf, Wien: Econ, 1999), pp. 546-56.

On July 6, 1941 *Sonderkommando* 10b of *Einsatzgruppe* D, under the command of SS Persterer, took up residence in the Schwarzer Adler (“Black Eagle”) Hotel in Czernowitz, after which the city came almost entirely under the control of German occupation troops. Along with its RSHA ranks, *Sonderkommando* 10b included an SD officer, who was deployed as an expert on relations with Romania. Professor Valjavec was no longer on a clandestine mission – he now returned to Romania in uniform. *Einsatzgruppe* D in Pretzsch, which received its orders directly from Heydrich, began rounding up the leaders of the city’s Jews, who numbered more than 50,000 at the time.⁷⁵ The first step were the arrests of Chief Rabbi Abraham Mark and other dignitaries, who were hauled to the hotel for interrogation. Persterer also ordered the destruction of Czernowitz’s great synagogue, as a symbolic act. In the second phase, *Sonderkommando* 10b expanded its terror activity. Its troops hunted down intellectuals in the Jewish Quarter. To facilitate the task of locating and identifying them, it made use of the file left behind by the Soviet NKVD.⁷⁶ Czernowitz’s Palace of Culture served as a detention center where the commando’s interrogators worked and prepared lists of Jewish residents. Members of the Romanian *gendarmarie* also robbed and pillaged on the streets of Czernowitz, but as *Sonderkommando* 10b noted, they mainly attacked Jews at random, without any preconceived plan.⁷⁷ Nonetheless, these

75 Ioanid Radu, *The Holocaust in Romania. The Destruction of Jews and Gypsies under the Antonescu Regime, 1940-1944* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000), pp. 130, 141, 157, 172.

76 For an evaluation of the files of the NKVD, see BA-MA (Freiburg), RH 20-11/334: Fernschreiben der Abwehrstelle Bukarest an AOK 11 für Major Riesen, July 2, 1941. Later the headquarters of the NKVD was housed in a building that had previously been the headquarters of the Romanian police. The Czernowitz city bureau was on Alexandar cel Bun street [“Alexandra” (sic) in the source], on the fourth floor of a multi-story building. Another bureau was located in the municipality building. The Soviet intelligence service was housed in the military governor’s building. A meeting point for agents was arranged at the Klauf cooperative, formerly the Schwarzer Adler hotel. “As required by logic,” this location was handed over to *Sonderkommando* 10b. Finally, the Skibiniewski estate also became a target of counter-espionage. A man named Pindus, NKVD Captain Schkolny, Rudolf Finkler, and another “target” (*Zielperson*), of whom nothing was known other than his residential address, were considered especially suspect in the eyes of German military intelligence. Later lists contained many more names of possible “agents and provocateurs” in Northern Bukovina, but the lists were sloppily prepared, as is demonstrated by the case of Eugen Ungurean, a man whose name appeared in the lists, but later served in the SD.

77 Andrej Angrick, *Besatzungspolitik und Massenmord. Die Einsatzgruppe D in der südlichen Sowjetunion 1941-1943* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2003), pp. 148-49.

bloody pogroms were inspired by guidelines promulgated by Antonescu and certified by General Constantin Vasiliu on June 18, 1941. These mandated that all of Bukovina “should be purified.” General Ion Topor, as the Supreme Praetor of the army, was in charge of coordinating the activities.⁷⁸

Yet the Romanian agenda was utterly different from that of the *Sonderkommando*. The Romanian security forces were searching primarily for Jews who they believed to be opponents of the regime, or who had arrived in Czernowitz subsequent to June 1940 onwards, and were seen as Soviet occupiers. Romanian decision makers correctly viewed the Ukrainian underground as the greatest danger to the reincorporation of Bukovina into a Greater Romania – one of the main reasons Romania entered the war. The Ukrainian underground sought to unite Bukovina with Galicia as the center of a new Ukraine, which would deprive Romania of the fruit it had reaped from siding with Nazi Germany and entering the war. Consequently, Romanian troops and security forces wielded a strong hand against parts of the Ukrainian population of Czernowitz. *Einsatzgruppe D*, on the other hand, needed the Ukrainian nationalists, and in the spirit of the SD, wanted to make use of their political influence. Therefore *Sonderkommando 10b* took action, successfully at first, to put a stop to the Romanian terror against Czernowitz’s Ukrainians.⁷⁹ They wanted to channel Romanian aggression in the direction of the Jews.

It seemed to work, at first. On July 8, 1941, cooperation between Dluschanski, the Romanian officer who headed the *gendarmerie*, and *Sonderkommando 10b* produced a “grand action,” in the course of which “almost the entire stratum of the Jewish leadership was arrested and detained.” In an operation of its own, *Sonderkommando 10b* executed “some 100 Jewish Communists” from among the detainees. More than 500 other persons, including the dignitaries who had been detained in the Schwarzer Adler Hotel, who had been sentenced to death, were shot that very day and the next by the “Romanian army and police.”⁸⁰

The historian from Munich, who had been employed to collect intelligence, and more precisely to direct policy toward the Ukrainians, also took an active role in the execution of the one hundred victims, since, like other commanders, he was required to give the *coup de grâce*. His role was testified to by Division Commander Karl

78 Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung*, p. 385.

79 Angrick, *Besatzungspolitik*, pp. 148-52; Alex Mihai Stoenescu, *Armata, Maresalul si Evreii. Cazurile Dorohoi, Bucuresti, Iasi, Odessa* (Bukarest: RAO International, 1998), pp. 290-91.

80 BA-MA (Freiburg), RH 20-11/488: Der Befehlshaber RAO International, der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD bei der Heeresgruppe Süd[,] Einsatzkommando 10b, July 9, 1941, An Ic der Heeresgruppe Süd. The quote appears therein.

Finger during his interrogation in May 1962 about the individual actions of members of *Sonderkommando* 10b:

Valjavec[,] Dr. Friedrich, SS, lecturer and professor, was present at the executions in Czernowitz and fired shots to the back of the neck. I have not mentioned him until now because I thought he was still in service, and therefore did not want to place him in jeopardy.⁸¹

When the executions were over Persterer and Valjavec went back to the Schwarzer Adler hotel and briefed their colleague, Konrad Ziehe, about the action.⁸² Valjavec

81 22 Js 203/61 der Staatsanwaltschaft München, I, vol. 5 Aussage Karl Finger, May 16, 17, 1962, pp. 1150-51, 1175. I am indebted to Ingo Haar who apprised me of the importance of this passage. From the manner of his response, one can learn that Finger did not know of Valjavec's death in February 1960. Only after he learned of the death of his former colleague did Finger provide a detailed record of the latter's deed, now that he no longer had reason to fear vengeance on the part of the respected scholar. Valjavec himself testified that he had been Persterer's interpreter, and nothing more, minimizing the significance of this fact. This were not enough, in 1957, he concealed from the official who questioned him the fact that he had been engaged in intelligence work. The inescapable conclusion is that the Munich professor wished to cover up these sinister episodes from his past, and that his testimony had no other purpose than to protect himself. See BA (Ludwigsburg), 213 AR 1897/66. vol. 1, Aussage Dr. Friedrich Valjavec, June 8, 1957, pp. 318-21. At this early stage of the investigation the interrogators accepted Valjavec's statements, which were considered "credible," and therefore they did not proceed with further investigations. See *ibid.* KD 2, May 1, 1957, Schlussbericht, pp. 321-25.

82 22 Js 203/61 Der Staatsanwaltschaft München I. vol. 11, Aussage Konrad Ziehe, December 5, 1967, pp. 2,634-35. There was no possibility of proving that Ziehe himself had taken part in the operation, although in my opinion his testimony regarding his actions was riddled with claims designed to protect himself. As for the personality of Valjavec, there is good cause to believe a different assessment than that of Grimm (see Grimm, *Georg Stadtmüller*, p. 25). It should be explicitly stated, in regard to Valjavec, that his is neither the story of a conformist nor that of a sympathizer. In view of what has since come to light regarding his personality, he appears to have been an outright careerist, an intellectual of the type which (although this has scarcely been remarked upon) the Third Reich was skilled at recruiting, because their life paths and the developmental trajectory of their personalities were heterogeneous and circuitous. If this were not the case, it would not have been possible to speak of a National Socialist movement, but rather of an "idiot's machine," to use a vulgar phrase, which would

presumably had not initially been posted in the commando in order to carry out executions. But, clearly, Valjavec the intelligence agent cannot be distinguished from Valjavec the *Unterführer*, who was obliged to perform executions by virtue of his service on the Eastern Front. Indeed, one of the salient features of the SD seems to have been the merging of such roles.⁸³

In the days that followed, *Sonderkommando* 10b began to realize that, despite its bloody debut, things were not developing as planned. That being the case, in mid- July 1941, the *Einsatzgruppe* headquarters told Berlin that it wished to pressure the Romanian authorities to “act much more incisively on the Jewish question.” At the same time, it was important to safeguard the Ukrainians, especially the members of the nationalist movement. It therefore proposed to the Romanians a prisoner exchange – Romanian Communists held by the Germans for Ukrainian nationalists held by the Romanians.⁸⁴

An attempt to reestablish an independent Ukrainian state on June 30, 1941, in Lemberg (Lvov), was swiftly suppressed by the German units and the security forces.⁸⁵ The defeat was a harsh blow for the Ukrainian nationalists in Bukovina as well. If that were not enough, the OUN had split in Krakow in 1940 between supporters of Stepan Bandera and supporters of Andrij Melnik. The organization in Czernowitz

be tantamount to grossly underestimating the German dictatorship. The opposite is true: people of intellectual stature like Valjavec were neither diverted from their paths, nor were they conformists, but were rather the *essence* of National Socialism. And precisely because of these circumstances, his biography – which is representative of others like him – has a tragic dimension. Compassion for the victims does not require extinguishing any sentiment of compassion toward people like Valjavec – in his case, a person with tremendous capabilities and analytic skills. Perhaps this was because the acting subject’s “sense of the possible” (a term Robert Musil coined in *The Man Without Qualities*, as the opposite of a sense of reality) led him unnecessarily to seek the company of criminals.

83 See Michael Wildt, *Generation*, pp. 858-68.

84 BA (Berlin), R 58/214, EM 22, July 14, 1941, quoted therein.

85 John A. Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism 1939-1945* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 90; Frank Goloczewski, “Die Kollaboration in der Ukraine”, in *Kooperation und Verbrechen. Formen der “Kollaboration” im östlichen Europa* (ed. Von Christoph Dieckmann et al. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2003), pp. 151-82, esp. pp. 162-64; Dieter Pohl, *Nationalsozialistische Judenverfolgung in Ostgalizien 1941-1944, Organisation und Durchführung eines staatlichen Massenverbrechens* (München: R. Oldenbourg, 1996), pp. 47-48; Thomas Sandkühler, “Endlösung” in Galizien. *Der Judenmord in Ostpolen und Rettungsinitiativen von Berthold Beitz 1941-1944* (Bonn: Dietz, 1996), pp. 63-64.

also split after the failure at Lemberg. Some two weeks after the occupation of Bukovina, a Ukrainian major named Jaworski appeared,⁸⁶ accompanied by several other Galicians. They supported Bandera's actions, which had led to the Ukrainian declaration of independence, even without German approval, and they requested the support of influential Ukrainian leaders. He seems to have been successful, as the Czernowitz members joined him and took orders from the Lemberg headquarters, while the Ukrainian organizations in Bucharest and Berlin were considered members of Melnik's faction.⁸⁷ The term "Bucharest Ukrainians" seems almost certainly to have referred to those nationalist Ukrainians who were equipped with weapons from the German counter-intelligence station (*Abwehrstelle*) and who received training in the Romanian capital on the use of explosives and wireless communication.⁸⁸

Disregarding factional affiliation, the personnel of *Sonderkommando* 10b sought the assistance of the OUN. They approached a group of activists who met to conspire at the restaurant of the Schwarzer Adler hotel. One Ukrainian who was present at that venue later reported in broken German as follows:

One day in July or August Woinowski Petre came to me and told me that I was supposed to appear before him that same evening, in front of the Schwarzer Adler Hotel, where the German SD had set up. I came there and met Mihai Colotelow, Mieskowski, Gheorghe, Funrmann, and other people I didn't know. Afterward Woinowski came and took us to the restaurant and there we sat down at a table. Afterward Lieutenant Valjavec came and explained to us the reason for this meeting. He said that we had to help the German army seize the hostile elements. Later, on the same occasion, a high-ranking officer spoke, but from an ideological perspective...

86 In another context he is called Loanoski.

87 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: [Czernowitz Consulate – translated from the Romanian], September 2, 1942, a section from a report by the local police (*Sicherheitsbüro*) on the Ukrainian movement. Office B of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists was apparently managed by Slacko Kinsierski.

88 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: Abwehrstelle Rumänien, Tgb.-No. 434/geh. Reichssache, August 11, 1942, Betr. Frau Helene Kopatschuk. According to this report Frau Kopatschuk made the connection between German military intelligence and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists. In January 1943, the Romanian police exposed the group and arrested its members. Several of them, especially those who had served the Germans in 1941, were handed over to the SS and were shot.

Petre Woinowski was appointed as the contact person for all those present, who soon received German identity cards and were supposed to wait for orders.⁸⁹

However, the Romanian police had already figured out that the Schwarzer Adler Hotel was not only the central residence of the SD; it also served as the “center of the Ukrainian movement,” “where on a daily basis its leaders, Jukowski, Dr. Husar, Dr. Bureak, S. Bende, Sant Tarine, and others, went to and fro.” In the course of four months, the hotel, which after the relocation of the SD to Czernowitz’s Palace of Culture remained exclusively in the service of the Ukrainians, hosted political gatherings. Here, during August and September 1941, under Valjavec’s guidance, they drafted demands to submit to the Romanian government, even though the latter had no intention whatsoever of responding to them. The Romanian authorities viewed these memoranda, which were submitted “at a time when any political gathering was forbidden by law and ordinance” not only as a provocation, but as an explicit declaration of war.⁹⁰ The *Einsatzgruppe* headquarters agreed with the Romanians’ understanding of affairs, and foresaw the impending conflict:

The Ukrainian nationalist organization is adopting irredentist causes in Bukovina. Fundamentally, working things out with the Romanian state is not to their liking. On the Romanian side this is well known. They are taking into account that sooner or later Bukovina will be handed over to the Ukrainians, if they do not succeed in eradicating the Ukrainian question.⁹¹

That the commander of *Einsatzgruppe* also preferred the Ukrainians over the Romanians as partners is evident from a private letter written by Otto Ohlendorf, the chief of security services of the RSHA. According to this letter, the Ukrainians, unlike the Romanians, were not comprised of a “mix of different nations”; similarly, the former were depicted in a much more favorable light and as potential allies, despite their abject poverty.⁹² The German mission discovered the extent to which

89 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: [explanation of] Rotislaw Husar, February 2, 194. Quoted thus in the text.

90 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: [translation] Gouvernement der Bukowina, No. 22 [Calotescus writing to Schellhorn], November 22, 1941, quoted therein.

91 BA (Berlin), R 58/215, EM 40, August 1, 1941.

92 See Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, *The “Humanist” as a Mass Murderer: The Mind and the Deeds of SS General Otto Ohlendorf* (Senior Thesis, Harvard University, 1982),

Ukrainian nationalism had taken root in Czernowitz when, in September 1941, in a memorandum that fell into the legation's hands, the regional representation of the OUN openly stressed the indivisible unity of Bukovina and Bessarabia. It also stated that Galicia was the land of the rebirth of Ukrainian nationalism. The document labeled the German decisions regarding these territories as a "gross injustice" and a "severe blow." At the same time, the Ukrainians wished to sign a military pact with Germany – at Romania's expense – in order to fight the common enemy, i.e. the Russians and the Poles.⁹³ When these proposals were shelved without producing any results, the Ukrainians in Bukovina formulated a new position toward the Reich – they would distance themselves from the German state. According to the information received from the Romanians – which should be regarded with caution because of the conflict of interest between the parties – the OUN had even considered, in light of the progress of the war, to ally itself with Great Britain, in the hopes that this would facilitate the reestablishment of a Ukrainian state.⁹⁴

While the Romanian administration mercilessly persecuted ethnic Ukrainians, the German legation viewed it as pro-Jewish. Despite "initial intentions," the Romanians were prepared to make concessions toward veteran "Austrian Jews" in Bukovina; in this manner, they hoped to set the gears of the economy back into motion in "Czernowitz, which was once a prosperous city," but had declined under Soviet rule. Neither the consulate in Czernowitz nor the legation in Bucharest presented any

pp. 93-94, regarding the undated letter from Ohlendorf to his wife, which was written during the time he served as commander of the *Einsatzgruppen*. Unfortunately, these kinds of unusual and interesting sources are not yet widely accessible, although they could contribute significantly to the scholarly discussion of the perpetrators.

93 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, Czernowitz, November 11, 1941 to the Embassy of the Great German Reich in Bucharest, a memorandum. Quotes appear therein. The content suggests that the memorandum came from Office B of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists. Another memorandum of the organization, which tries to demonstrate elementary proprietary rights, was also entered into the files. See PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: The Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists, September 15, 1941, "The Ukrainians, long-time inhabitants of Bukovina." Various conjectures could be made concerning the question of whether Valjavec, as an historian, kept or encouraged the writing of such memoranda in the context of his work for the SD in Czernowitz.

94 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: Deutsche Gesandtschaft, January 28, 1942, - S – Ukraine. For the reasons mentioned above, Makchin's Anglophile fraction acquired a group of followers in Bukovina.

counter-proposals; the German writer did admit that “the means designed in light of the state of affairs had in the meantime become the only option for saving the formerly rich territories, especially the city of Czernowitz, from utter collapse.”⁹⁵

The consulate’s official view – like that of the SD – was that the Romanians were not acting with sufficient alacrity against the Jews. But the consulate had to take economic needs into consideration. Therefore, executions were carried out “in a business-like manner, based on purely legal considerations;” but “at the same time, in compliance with the urgent requests of the Romanian bureaus, several executions had to be foregone, although the elements in question were undoubtedly deserving of the death sentence.” Nevertheless, the Germans admitted that “the leading Communists and those who pulled the strings” had long since fled. Moreover, they also admitted that Jews – especially rich individuals and immigrants holding passports from the Reich – had also been victims of expulsion during the phase of Sovietization. Even *Sonderkommando* 10b was rather surprised at the “Central European character” of Czernowitz’s Jews; its “experts” had expected them to be “typical Eastern European Jews.”

The consulate, on the other hand, was not surprised. A critical examination might even suggest that it attempted to treat these people almost decently, as “veteran Austrian citizens.” Most of them were of officer rank and displayed “badges of honor from the war” issued by the erstwhile realm of Kaiser Franz Jozef. In any event, the report emphasized the apolitical nature of these Jews, of which “nothing negative was known.” The rioters should not be sought here, the report stated, but rather within the “milieu of the rootless intelligentsia.”⁹⁶

At the end of July 1941, as the army prepared to advance, *Sonderkommando* 10b left Czernowitz. The Ukrainians, who earlier had sought contact with Persterer’s unit, now brought their affairs and concerns to the military staff that remained in the city.⁹⁷ Valjavec did not join *Sonderkommando* 10b. At the beginning of September 1941 he

95 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 6/4, Allgemien. Rassenfrage, Juden 1936-1942: Deutsches Konsulat, G.J. No. 46, July 28, 1941, Betrifft: Judenfrage in Nordbessarabien und der Nordbukowina [without signature]. All the quotes appear therein.

96 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 6/4, Allgemein, Rassenfrage, Juden 1936-1942: Aufzeichnung, July 26, 1941 [without signature]. All the quotes appear therein. For the special status of the Austrian Jews in Czernowitz, who received German citizenship after the annexation of Austria, see *ibid.* Deutsches Konsulat, G.J. No. 54, August 28, 1941, An die Deutsche Gesandtschaft Betrifft: Behandlung der Juden deutscher Staatsangehörigkeit.

97 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: Deutsches Konsulat,

left the commando and moved into army headquarters. As one of the chief advocates of a pro-Ukrainian line, the former *Sonderkommando* 10b officer used diplomatic channels to agitate against the Romanian administration and police. In particular, Valjavec complained to the German consulate that “Romanian organizations in the villages” “did not honor” the protection certificates that the SD had issued to its Ukrainian loyalists. The Romanians, he charged, simply tore up the documents, which was an insult to Germany. As an extreme example, Valjavec cited the case of one of his informers, Professor Mehediniuk of Sadagura, whose family was arrested on the pretense that he was a Communist – even though he had been an SD operative in Lemberg. Valjavec succeeded. The consulate took the matter in hand, and issued a formal complaint to the commander of the Czernowitz police, Dr. Lupu. The police chief ordered the transfer of one of the offending police officers out of the city, punishment for not understanding “the meaning of German-Romanian cooperation.”⁹⁸ Several days later, Valjavec met with Schellhorn in order to emphasize to him that “the anti-German propaganda in the city was increasing.” He promised the consul that he would find out who was responsible.⁹⁹ Given the state of affairs, almost all the blame was placed on Romanians, and nearly none on Ukrainians.¹⁰⁰

Valjavec, it seemed, had gone too far, and his rivals were furious. According to the consulate, the Romanian security service, the Siguranta of Czernowitz, was the prime agitator against what it claimed was the conspiracies being hatched in the German

Pol 3 No. 5, December 6, 1941, auf den Erlass, 24.v.M, in which Schellhorn reports retroactively about the relations between Germans and Ukrainians in Czernowitz.

98 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: Aufzeichnung, September 8, 1941, quote therein. Until that time the consulate was located in Jassy, and therefore it allowed Valjavec to make use of it for his own purposes, without being intimately familiar with the territory.

99 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 1/3, Deutschfeindliche Tätigkeit: Aufzeichnung [Schellhorn], August 15, 1941.

100 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 1/3, Deutschfeindliche Tätigkeit: Deutsches Konsulat G.J. No. 2, An die Deutsche Gesandtschaft, January 25, 1942, auf anderweitige Weisung. With the exception of a few Poles and one Armenian, the appendix listed only Romanians. These included highly influential personalities: Major Marinescu, Calotescu's adjutant, Professor Pavlescu (the director of the Ministry of Romanization), Professor Badan (director of the University Library), and Commisar Sachleanu (a functionary of the Romanian Security Service of Czernowitz). The file does not reveal any information about whether Valjavec of the RSHA provided essential information for compiling the list. Politically speaking, though, the list was in conformity with the SD position.

staff's Ukrainian bureau, out of which Valjavec worked.¹⁰¹ That the Ukrainians were working under the umbrella of Valjavec's headquarters began to annoy the Romanians; even the consulate was obliged to admit later that Valjavec and the local commander of the small German garrison, Captain Reisenstein, had not acted wisely during the previous weeks. The power struggle between the supporters of Melnik and those of Bandera within the OUN gave the Romanians an opening. The two Ukrainian camps attempted to win over the German authorities in Czernowitz. Under these circumstances, the German-Ukrainian collaboration could no longer be kept secret, and both OUN factions were now seen as threats to Romanian rule. The Siguranta could thus expose the Ukrainian bureau in the local headquarters as a hotbed of anti-Romanian incitement, and protest to the Germans.

As a consequence, the Ukrainian bureau was dismantled. Two of its four directors, Bendak and Kinsiziersky, were taken to serve as interpreters at army headquarters, and Nastuniak was transferred to the German consulate to perform the same task. This in turn led to harsh confrontations between the Ukrainian leaders and the representatives of the Reich. The attention of Captain Reisenstein (the commander of the local headquarters) and Valjavec (of the SD) had apparently been diverted to the subversive activity of the Benderists. They firmly voiced their displeasure to that faction's leadership in Czernowitz as to its irredentist propaganda. And they stressed that the Ukrainians who had not complied with German orders had damaged the Reich's interests and the prospect of establishing a Ukrainian state.

In order to prevent an absolute break with the OUN, the German consulate provided the Ukrainian leadership with an office, in lieu of the room it had been allocated at army headquarters. The Ukrainians were thus able to continue to shield their "work from the public eye" of the Romanians.¹⁰²

By the middle of November 1941, Valjavec's position had become intolerable, since his name had become synonymous with the SD's Ukrainian policy. The Bucharest embassy went so far as to demand that the entire leadership of the SS refrain from intervening any further "in questions pertaining to Romania's domestic policy."¹⁰³ The German Undersecretary of State, Martin Luther, in response sent

101 Valjavec lived in Room 37 of the local headquarters in Czernowitz.

102 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: G.J. No. 48/42, August 17, 1942, Betrifft: Berichterstattung der Czernowitzer Siguranta mit einer Anlage; *ibid.*: [Report] G.J. No. 48/II/42, September 11, 1942, In Anschluss an den Bericht, 17.v.M. G.J. 48/42, all of the quotes appear in a report from September 11, 1942.

103 PAAA, Inland II g 93: Telegramm des Gesandten Killingler No. 3742, November 14, 1941 an das Auswärtige Amt.

a request to Schellenberg to clarify whether it was appropriate that Valjavec act at his own discretion in Czernowitz, and demanded an investigation. This inquiry took a long time, since apparently a great number of people were questioned in the process, including Ohlendorf.¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, it is likely that Schellenberg, who knew Valjavec well, wished to drag the matter out. While Berlin was investigating, Valjavec's activity in Czernowitz provoked other causes for complaint on the part of the Romanians. In a letter from November 22, General Cornelio Calotescu described in great detail the collaboration between *Sonderkommando* 10b and the OUN, a course of action which he viewed as an assault against the sovereignty of the Romanian state. According to Calotescu, the driving force behind the anti-Romanian action was Fritz Valjavec, whom he mistakenly thought to be the "Chief of the German SS" in Czernowitz.¹⁰⁵ Consul-General Schellhorn attempted to minimize the damage, even if in practical terms he did little to take action against Valjavec and Konrad Ziehe, against whom complaints had also been made. In his attempts to justify himself, Schellhorn claimed that it was inconceivable "that the SD would have supported movements whose goals were antithetical to the legitimate interests of the Romanian state." However, he admitted that he had been away during the time in question, and therefore he could not judge the issue based on personal observation, which was "the only safe way to establish an opinion."¹⁰⁶

Valjavec's pro-Ukrainian line seems to have aroused the deep suspicion of the governor of Bukovina, who requested an additional audience with Schellhorn about the historian. The consulate, for its part, was not up-to-date about this scholar and SS commander, and could do nothing but register in the minutes of the meeting its astonishment at the governor's claims:

At the time Valjavec was in touch with a Jew named Melzer, who presented himself to Valjavec as a Romanian, and the SD made use of him to carry out a variety of missions. Among other things, he also arrived at

104 PAAA, Inland II g 93: D II 2248g Schnellbrief Luthers, November 17, 1941. Valjavec appears erroneously as "Watzlawek." Since no answer had arrived from the SD on December 3. nor on December 18, 1941, Luther wished to present the course of events to him again.

105 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: [Uebersetzung] Gouvernement der Bukowina, No. 22 [Calotescus writing to Schellhorn], November 22, 1941.

106 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: Deutsches Konsulat, J. No. 18, November 29, 1941, Schellhorn's letter of response .

the Secureni camp¹⁰⁷ and removed a certain number of Jews from there. On his various travels as an SD operative, Melzer also engaged in gold smuggling, but was caught by the Romanian *Gendarmerie*. He was delivered to the SD to be tried. One gentleman from the SD, who had arrived in Bucharest from Czernowitz, announced a few days later to General [Calotescu] that Melzer had been shot to death. Nevertheless, it was unambiguously decided that this had never happened, and that in fact Melzer had been sent by the SD to Galicia.¹⁰⁸

Schellenberg did not respond to these accusations, which had been discussed in Berlin, until February 1942. By then, the “troublemaker” was already long gone. He tried to refute the accusations against Valjavec by arguing that the latter had even been invited to Bucharest by Mihai Antonescu, the Romanian vice premier. Valjavec, he insisted, should be commended “for the work that he had accomplished in Czernowitz.” The meeting in Bucharest was sufficient to prove that it was “utterly unacceptable that the Romanian side should raise the said allegations.”¹⁰⁹

Undersecretary of State Luther was not prepared to accept this explanation so easily; he was not satisfied with Schellenberg’s personal judgment and demanded an official assessment from the RSHA, via Heydrich.¹¹⁰ Ultimately, this was unobtainable, because it would require “an additional direct questioning of Vice Premier Antonescu.” So as not to aggravate the already tense relations with Romania

107 Cf. BA (Ludwigsburg), Verschiedenes vol. 301j 52: trans.: Matatias Carp, *Cartea Neagra.Facte si documente* (Bukarest: Sorec, 1946). These are two letters from August 1941 in which the management of the Secureni Camp asks the Romanian headquarters how it was that the *Einsatzkommando* 10b was demanding “without specifying the reasons, the handing over of 22 Jews” from the camp. There is also a letter from Department II of the Romanian camp, requiring *Sonderkommando* 10b to present the precise reasons for its demand. The response of the *Sonderkommando* never arrived. See p.180 der Aktenzählung, bzw. p. 69 des Manuskriptes.

108 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 6/4, Allgemein. Rassenfrage, Juden 1936-1942: Aufzeichnung, December 13, 1941 [without signature – but from the context it is probable that it was Schellhorn]. All the quotes appear therein.

109 PAAA Inland II g 93: Der Chef der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD, VI E AZ: 80236/42 (g), February 4, 1942, An das Auswärtige Amt, Betr.: SS-Untersturmführer Prof. Dr. Valjavec (nicht Watzlawek), quote therein.

110 PAAA, Inland II g 93: Schreiben des Legationssekretärs Dr. Neuwirth – im Auftrag Luthers – an Picot, March 30, 1942.

by provoking Antonescu, the matter was initially set aside in April 1942 “inasmuch as the Romanian government has not revisited the matter in question.”¹¹¹

Valjavec himself emerged unscathed from the entire affair. In fact, the RSHA gave him another assignment, this time unrelated to the Foreign Service. Upon his return to Germany¹¹² in December 1941, Steudle was repeatedly in need of his assistance. The desk chief was busy creating a broad-reaching southeastern information center in Bureau VII of the Reich’s Chief Security Bureau, to cover Romania, Serbia, Greece, and adjacent areas. This necessitated an evaluation of all the accumulated material and the preparation of index card files of persons, organizations and issues. Valjavec, who promised his “extensive support in this respect,” was supposed to make the professional literature from his institute available.¹¹³

The conflict between the SS and the Romanian leadership did not culminate in protracted diplomatic unpleasantness. Valjavec was busy on other business in Berlin, and from the middle of December 1941, the Romanians in Czernowitz increased the pressure on the German diplomatic mission. Nicolae Lupu, the *Generalinspektor* of Bukovina, met the Consul-General at the same time, and clarified to him, affably but firmly, that the time had come to put an end to Ukrainian activity within local German headquarters. General Calotescu had been invited – so he reported – to Bucharest, and therefore wished to settle the matter before his meeting with Marshall Antonescu. Schellhorn immediately approached the local German headquarters and requested that

111 PAAA, Inland II g 93: Vortragsnotiz Luthers, February 4, 1942 zur Vorlage bei dem Herrn Reichsaussenminister über den Herrn Staatssekretär. A note from Luther indicates that on April 9 he had informed Ribbentrop of this matter. The quote appears therein.

112 Karl Heinz Roth, “Hedrichs Professor. Historiographie des ‘Volkstum’ und der Massenvernichtungen. Der Fall Hans Joachim Beyer,” in *Geschichtsschreibung als Legitimationswissenschaft 1918-1945* (ed. Von Peter Schröttler, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997), pp. 262-342, esp. p. 270. A critical biography of Nestor which deals with the history of Southern Europe, and especially with Valjavec’s activity during the Third Reich, has recently been published. See Michael Fahlbusch, “Im Dienst des Deutschtums in Südeuropa: Ethnopolitische Berater als Tathelfer für Verbrechen gegen die Menschlichkeit,” in *Südostforschung*, pp. 175-214, esp. pp. 203-14.

113 For the intermediate term they planned to integrate, or in other words, to employ two scientists, while two *Volksdeutsche* students were to sort through the material on Croatia and Hungary. Steudle reserved the task of processing the material on Romania for himself: BStU, FV 2/72, PA, vol. 9/2, Ord. 1: VII B 6, 17.12.1941, Betr.: Arbeitsplanung – Südosteuropa, quote therein. The names of the two *Volksdeutsche* students were Kopenitz and Schweissgut.

it comply with the Romanians' demand. The acting local commander, Dr. Pleschel, and the "Ukrainian leader Bendeana [sic]," approved the "request" and believed that they had thereby put the matter to rest. Both Lupu and Calutesco promised that no harm would befall the Ukrainians if they proved themselves, through their conduct, to be loyal to the Romanian regime.¹¹⁴

This achievement encouraged the Romanians to settle accounts with their opponents. The Romanian security forces in Czernowitz arrested the Ukrainians who "had formerly assisted the SD." The suspects were harshly interrogated, in order to obtain proof that the OUN had "collaborated with the SD" and to once more accuse Himmler's outfit of conspiratorial intrigues "to the detriment of the Romanians." The Polish minority, on the other hand, enjoyed "a favorable attitude on the part of the Romanian authorities," who wished to visibly strengthen its public presence as a counterweight to the Ukrainian movement.¹¹⁵ Ultimately, *Sonderkommando* 10b's network of support for the Ukrainian nationalists was utterly crushed in Czernowitz – that is, it was subjected to the surveillance of the Siguranta.

In the meantime, by the summer of 1941 opposition had arisen to the arrival of Ukrainian exiles in Czernowitz, and in the winter of 1941/42 the measures taken against them were intensified. The head of the Romanian security service, Victor Popescu, regarded the entry of these exiles as an OUN attempt to infiltrate Bukovina (with German assistance in the form of travel permits or German military ID papers), something that he was determined to prevent.¹¹⁶ Romania had deported Ukrainian war refugees and immigrants who had settled in Bukovina and resided there since the revolution of 1918.¹¹⁷ They wished to prevent these deportees from crossing the border back into the country, where they could reinforce the Ukrainian national

114 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: [Czernowitz Consulate] G.J. No. 2/1, December 15, 1941. An die deutsche Gesandtschaft Bukarest. In der Anlage die Aufzeichnung, December 13, 1941 über die verschiedenen Verhandlungen seit dem Vorstelligwerden des Dr. Lupu am November 12, 1941.

115 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: Deutsches Konsulat, G.J. No. 4, February 7, 1942, An die Deutsche Gesandtschaft, Auf den Erlass, 28.v.M. S. Ukraine. Quote appears therein.

116 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: [German Consulate] Aufzeichnung, February 21, 1942. Aus Rumänischer Sicht, *ibid.*: No. 56417 S, December 19, 1941, Generaldirektion der Polizei, Gebietsinspektorat der Polizei, Sicherheitsdienst.

117 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: Deutsches Konsulat G.J. No. 59, August 10, 1941, An das Auswärtige Amt, Betrifft: Rückkehr deportierte Ukrainer.

movement.¹¹⁸ As a result the Ukrainians were under constant surveillance by both Romania and Germany in their respective regions of control.

Although by February 1942 the Romanians had already largely resolved their Ukrainian problem, a conference on the Ukrainian question was underway at the very same time in Berlin. Schellhorn believed – based on a memorandum which had been submitted to the German consulate at the beginning of the occupation by an attorney, Octavian Scalat – that the Ukrainians had applied pressure to hold a referendum. Their aim was to detach Bukovina from the Romanian state and annex it to the *Generalgouvernement*. After the conference in Berlin, the regional leaders of the OUN met in Czernowitz, “in order to formulate a position on this matter.” Banderas’s representatives voted for an immediate referendum, “which must apparently be compelled through an uprising,” while the Melkinists advocated “quiet preparation” before the execution of the joint demand. But the Romanian military and civilian authorities became cognizant of the organization’s plans, probably via “traitors within the Ukrainian leadership.” The latter implemented “energetic measures that resulted in a rude awakening among the Ukrainians.”

Simultaneously, the Germans were doing an about-face. The German liaisons “then distanced themselves from the Ukrainians” and decided “to refrain from explicit support of the Ukrainians, which until that time had worked against the Romanian state.” When, in addition to this, the collapsing Ukrainian leadership in Bukovina¹¹⁹ also received news that Galicia’s similar attempts to gain independence had failed, a final split occurred between the Melkinists and Banderas’s supporters in Czernowitz. The former advocated compliance with German directives, while Banderas’s supporters took up arms “ready and prepared for the decisive moment.”¹²⁰

118 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: Auswärtiges Amt, No. Pol V 4960, December 19, 1941, Betr.: Rück-bezw. Umsiedlung von Ukrainern nach dem deutschen Machtbereich. *ibid.* Deutsches Konsulat, D.R. 5 No. 3/42, July 24, 1942, An die Chestura de Politie in Czernowitz.

119 The following persons are included among the Ukrainian leadership, although none can be associated with either Bandera or Melnik: Lupaschanski, Golotele, Bendak, Chirilow, Huzar and Hostiuk. Other sources also mention Stasiuk and Dr. Tarko. It should be noted that the ties between the Ukrainians in Bukovina and Galicia were facilitated, at least in part, by the German military authorities as well as by individual soldiers.

120 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: [Report] G.J. No. 48/II/42, September 11, 1942, in Anschluss an den Bericht, 17.v.M. G.J. 48/42, all the quotes appear therein. On OUN strategy, see also Frank Golczewski, “Die Kollaboration in der Ukraine,” in *Kooperation und Verbrechen*, pp. 164-67.

The confidence displayed by the Romanian state in its contacts with the German diplomats was evident in the announcement that Calotescu sent to the consulate on July 16, 1942, which stated that “the Ukrainians from Bessarabia and Bukovina were forbidden henceforth from approaching the German authorities on any matter whatsoever.” Schellhorn acquiesced, undoubtedly because he knew that Antonescu himself stood behind the letter.¹²¹ From that point onward the consulate had hardly any opportunity to take political action.

The consulate had nothing to say about policy toward the Jews. While Schellhorn did file several reports at the end of June 1941 about the Jassy roundup, which lasted for several days,¹²² he had no influence on the German army or the Romanian administration. At the same time, he was well-informed about developments, and had even received photographs of the death trains. He estimated that some 3,000-4,000 Jews had been killed in the city and another 4,423 deported. However, he also knew that his information was too uncertain for his numbers to be precise.¹²³ His records reveal that both Romanian army and police personnel, in addition to German troops, bore total responsibility for the mass murders.

As for the persecution of Jewish residents of Czernowitz, it appears that other than drastic formulations here and there, the consulate did not demand harsher repressive

121 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: Gouvernatul Provinciei Bucovina, Secretariatul General, Serviciul Coordonarii Activitatii Directoratelor si Controlui, No. 7467/1942, July 16, 1942, an das Consul General al Germaniei [with German translation, without the head of the document], the quote appears therein; Weiterhin, *ibid.*: Deutsches Konsulat G.J. No. 30/42, July 14, 1942, An die Deutsche Gesandtschaft, Auf den Erlass, 27. Mai d.J., but in the files it was reported that the consulate was active in a few of the cases, despite Calotescu’s “directive,” thus in accordance with Wladimir Zaluziecki’s request.

122 Concerning this issue, see Jean Ancel, “The Jassy-Syndrome,” in *Roman Jewish Studies* I, vol. 1 (1987), pp. 33-49 and Heft 2, pp. 35-52; Radu Ioanid, *Holocaust in Romania*, pp. 63-90 and Alex Mihai Stoenescu, *Armata, Maresalul si Evereii*, pp. 243-82; Angrick, *Besatzungspolitik*, pp. 140-45.

123 For detailed reports from close to the time of the pogrom, see PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 6/4, Allgemeines, Rassenfragen, Juden 1936-1942: Nachschubstab z.b.V., Kommandeur, July 11, 1941, An den Generalkonsul des deutschen Reich. The original photographs were left in the headquarters’ “secret files,” see: *ibid.*, in a memo [by Schellhorn] from July 7, 1941. It is worthwhile to note some of the numbers that appear at the end of the document, which present the calculations of the numbers of victims. See: *Ibid.*, file 4/2, Politische Lage 1931-1943: Deutsches Konsulat, G.J. No. 42, July 9, 1941, Betrifft: Ereignisse in Jassy, 26.VI.-3. VII.d.J.

measures. In the fall of 1941 it soon became clear how important the Jews of Czernowitz were to stimulating the economy. The importance attached to the economy tempered the policies of expulsion and murder. As noted, Schellhorn did his best to protect the veteran Jewish families and individuals with German citizenship from the worst consequences of Germany's antisemitic ideology.¹²⁴ Jewish experts employed in German firms were also meant to be immune from expulsion and extermination, if no "Aryan"¹²⁵ replacements could be found for them. Such replacement was, in fact, impracticable. Then the Romanians ordered – following talks with the Germans – that Jewish professionals would train successors, to be provided by the state, prior to their evacuation.¹²⁶ Calotescu received from Bucharest an order to "completely ... evacuate Czernowitz Jewry" after first concentrating them in a ghetto. The plan was to exempt only five hundred people from this general order. Schellhorn, who sought to protect these Jews from both the Germans and the Romanians, protested vehemently to Karl Pflaumer, the German advisor on administrative matters in the Romanian Interior Ministry.¹²⁷

124 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 6/4, Allgemein. Rassenfrage, Juden 1936-1942: Deutsches Konsulat, G.J. No. 54, August 28, 1941, An die Deutsche Gesandtschaft, Betrifft. On the treatment of Jews possessing German citizenship, he said: "The veteran Austrian Jews cannot be given the same status as the ordinary Eastern Jews. They did not give up their German citizenship even at times when keeping it entailed harm to their own persons. As I have discovered, there are among them some reservist officers from the old Austrian army, many of whom were wounded and many of whom are bearers of military medals, German ones included. Their conduct, as was mentioned above, never afforded any reason for any kind of complaint..."

125 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/2, Politische Lage 1931-1943: Deutsche Gesandtschaft Bukarest, Berater Abteilung, October 17, 1941, An Herrn Gesandten von Killinger d.d.H.d. Herrn Staatsminister Pflaumer [in the original, Plaumer], Bericht über die Lage in der Bukowina, Berichterstatter Bürgermeister Ellgering. *ibid.*: file 6/4, Allgemein. Rassenfrage, Juden 1936-1942: Deutsches Konsulat G.J. No. 22/42 = 24, April 17, 1942, An die Deutsche Gesandtschaft, Betrifft: Judenfrage in Czernowitz, Wirtschaftliche Lage.

126 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/2, Politische Lage 1931-1943: Memorandum [from Schellhorn?], October 16, 1941.

127 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/2, Politische Lage 1931-1943: Aufzeichnung [Reporting], October 15, 1941. *ibid.* Aufzeichnung [Log concerning the conversation with Pflaumer and Ellgering], October 15, 1941. *ibid.* Aufzeichnung [Log concerning his conversation with Calotescu], October 15, 1941.

Following the wave of expulsions decreed by Antonescu in the fall of 1941, the Romanian authorities (and they only) began herding the Jews of Czernowitz – some fifty thousand of them – into a ghetto. But some Romanians, notable among them Czernowitz’s mayor Traian Popovici, were able to prevent the deportation of twenty thousand people.¹²⁸ These events were not the initiative of any German agency, and certainly not of the consulate. Even the brief visit to Czernowitz in March 1942 by Wilhelm Stuckart and Hans Globke, two top figures in the German Interior Ministry, should be viewed as a token visit, lacking any actual political purpose.¹²⁹ Schellhorn was for the most part left merely with the task of reporting the renewal of deportations to the east in June 1942,¹³⁰ and the confiscation of Jewish property.¹³¹ In this context one must take into account that the German embassy had displayed great interest, as of May 1942, in “the continuation of the course of events, i.e. in the organization and execution” of “the expulsion of the Jews,” and expected to receive a greater number of reports from the consulate.¹³² This intensified activity on the part of the embassy was

128 Traian Popovici, “Mein Bekenntnis,” printed in Hugo Gold, *Geschichte der Juden der Bukowina* vol. II (ed. von Hugo Gold, Tel Aviv: Olamenu, 1962), pp. 62-70; Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung*, pp. 394-99.

129 PAAA, Deutsche Gesandtschaft Bukarest A.I.I, file Auskünfte und Berichte des Konsulats Czernowitz 1926-1943 (vol. 3): Deutsches Konsulat Czernowitz G. No. 15/42, March 25, 1942. An das Auswärtige Amt, Betr. Besuch des Staatssekretärs Dr. Stuckart in Czernowitz. BA (Ludwigsburg), 502 AR-Z 16/61, vol. 5 Aussage Dr. Hans Globke, July 9, 1968, pp. 792-93.

130 BA (Ludwigsburg), Verschiedenes vol. 301j 52: Übersetzung von: Carp, *Cortea*, pp. 233-48.

131 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 6/4, Allgemein. Rassenfrage, Juden 1936-1942: Aufzeichnung, June 2, 1942 [on Czernowitz]; *ibid.*: Aufzeichnung, June 5, 1941 [on Radautz and Czernowitz]; *ibid.*: Aufzeichnung, June 17, 1942 [to the currency exchange rates for money of evacuated Jews]; *ibid.* Aufzeichnung, June 16, 1942 [to the Czernowitz events]; *ibid.*: Deutsches Konsulat G.J. No. 33/42, An die Deutsche Gesandtschaft, June 16, 1942, Betrifft: Judendeportierungen; *ibid.* Aufzeichnung, July 3, 1942 [on Czernowitz]; *ibid.*: Deutsches Konsulat G.J. No. 22/24/III, An die Deutsche Gesandtschaft, July 6, 1942, Betrifft: Judendeportierungen; *ibid.*: Deutsches Konsulat G.J. No. 22/42/II=24/42, An die Deutsche Gesandtschaft, June 4, 1942, Auf dem Erlass Abteilung Berater, May 4, 1942; *ibid.*: Deutsches Konsulat, G.J. No. 46, July 28, 1942, An die Deutsche Gesandtschaft, Betrifft: Judenfrage in Nordbessarabien und der Bukowina; *ibid.*: Aufzeichnung, August 13, 1942 [on Czernowitz]. Additional documentation relates to the fates of individual persons.

132 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 6/4, Allgemein. Rassenfrage, Juden 1936-1942:

tied, so it seems, to the activity of its “advisor on Jewish affairs” (*Judenberater*), SS Gustav Richter. In March 1942, the latter presented to Ambassador von Killinger a list of Jews who were expelled from Bukovina, Bessarabia and Dorohoi, which stated that some 30,000 people had been sent to Transnistria from Czernowitz. In May 1942 he also noted that 19,400 Jews remained in the city.¹³³

In the summer of 1942, when deportations resumed and trains once again began crossing the border, Richter thought it his duty to enforce the expulsion of all the Romanian Jews, i.e. also the Jews of the Regat – the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, Romania’s historical nucleus.¹³⁴ In addition, the RSHA was charged with the task of integrating the Romanian transports into the general plan for the “final solution,” and thus putting an end to the Romanians’ independent Jewish policy. Since the RSHA had taken upon itself to coordinate all of the transports to the East, and also wished to obtain direct access to Romania’s Jews – who, instead of being sent to

Deutsche Gesandtschaft, Abteilung Berater, May 4, 1942, An das Deutsche Konsulat Czernowitz, Betr. Deportation von Juden aus Czernowitz nach Transnisterien. Quote appears therein.

133 Berater für Judenfragen, March 21, 1942, An SA-Obergruppenführer von Killinger, Betr.: Zahl der nach Transnisterien deportierten Juden, maschinenschriftlich vervielfältigt in Dokumentensammlung der URO (United Restitution Organization) zur Vernichtung der Juden in Rumänien, bearbeitet von Kurt May, vol. 4. Frankfurt/ M 1960, pp. 564-66. Berater für Judenfragen, May 5, 1942, Aktenvermerk, Betr. Juden in Czernowitz, maschinenschriftlich vervielfältigt, ebd. 567. The persecution of the Roma, which was usually intertwined with the extermination and expulsion of the Jews, played no role in Czernowitz in May 1941, because on the target date, May 25, 1942, no Roma were apprehended, neither nomadic or sedentary members of the group. See Inspectoratul General Jandarmeriei, Servicul Jandarmeriei. Sectia a III-a [undated, September 1942], Nota privitoare la evacuarea tiganilor nomazi [the connected listing of the Romani population in the areas under Rumanian jurisdiction], printed in *Minoritati Etnoculturale. Marturi Documentare. Tiganii din Romania (1919-1944)* (ed. Von Lucian Nastasa und Andreas Varga, Cluj, 2001), pp. 316-19. In all of Bukovina, 320 Roma were registered.

134 BA (Ludwigsburg), 502 AR-Z 16/61, vol. 1, Aussage Gustav Richter, February 27, 1957, p. 107. According to this source a meeting was arranged between Richter and Antonescu in July 1942, after which the expulsion of 25,000 from Arad and Temeschwar was scheduled to begin. See Peter Longrich, *Politik der Vernichtung. Eine Gesamtdarstellung der nationalsozialistischen Judenverfolgung* (München und Zürich: Piper, 1998), pp. 522-23.

Transnistria, were destined for the gas chambers of Belzec¹³⁵ – Bucharest served as the site for these talks. The fate of Czernowitz’s Jewish residents was no longer dependent upon local decision-makers, but on the outcome of these talks between the Reich and Romania.

In August 1942 – the phase of Germany’s summer campaign which led to the conquest of additional territories in the East – the Romanian government signaled that it was now willing to accede to some of the German demands. Emil von Rintelen notified Luther in August 1942 that the Romanian leadership had authorized transports to begin leaving for the Lublin district as of September 10; Jews who were “capable of work” would be assigned to forced labor, and others would receive “special treatment” (*Sonderbehandlung*). In order to facilitate the “cleansing of Romania of Jews,” Radu Lecca (an expert consultant to the Romanian government on Jewish affairs) traveled to Berlin to discuss the final details with the Foreign Ministry and the RSHA. None of the high-ranking officers who were responsible for the plan took the time out to meet Lecca, except for Eichmann, with whom he had a brief meeting. The expert consultant returned to his homeland angry, humiliated, and with no accomplishments to speak of. Germany missed an opportunity to influence Romania’s Jewish policy in its preferred direction.¹³⁶

The advisor on Jewish affairs, Richter, continued to try – so it appears from a conversation that took place on October 22, 1942 – to persuade Romanian Vice Premier Mihai Antonescu about the necessity of Jewish deportation, but in vain. Antonescu argued that the deportation of the Jews beyond the Bug in 1941, which had been carried out by the German authorities, had been halted because of pressure from the German army. He did not understand, he said, why the German position was changing, and pointed out the “contradiction.” Antonescu thus made clear to his interlocutor that it was the Germans who had for months not coordinated their Jewish

135 BA (Ludwigsburg), Verschiedenes vol. 301j 52: Uebersetzung von Carp, *Cartea*, pp. 240-41. According to this source, in September 1942 the Germans planned to concentrate all the Jews from the Adjud and transport them to the Belzec concentration camp, in transports comprising 2,000 people each, which were to be sent out daily.

136 Nürnberger Dokument NG-3985: No. 954, Telegramm Rintelens, August 19, 1942 an Luther, quote appears therein, Aufzeichnung des Unterstaatssekretärs Luther, August 17, 1942, ADAP, Serie E, vol. 3, pp. 337-38. Schreiben des Gesandten von Killinger, August 28, 1942 ans Auswärtige Amt, printed there, 422-23. 141 Js 92131/76 Urteil des LG Frankenthal gegen Gustav Richter, January 11, 1982, p. 21; Ioanid, *Holocaust*, pp. 242-47. According to this letter, Lecca later met with Himmler at the villa in Wansee (after he had spoken with Kaltenbrunner and with the expert advisor, Friedrich Suhr, at the RSHA), in order to clarify the matter once again.

policy. He now demanded a change of direction. Romania refused to sign on to the deportation enterprise and stood its ground, without actually straining relations with Germany.¹³⁷

The Romanians' capacity for independent action became evident at the time of the military crisis in Stalingrad, at the end of 1942 and the beginning of 1943.¹³⁸ Stalingrad coincided with the diplomatic imbroglio that broke out following Horia Sima's escape from a German prison.¹³⁹ Romania's leaders no longer believed that Germany would emerge victorious in the East, and they suspected that Himmler was plotting to topple the regime in Bucharest with the help of the Iron Guard. Although relations were not completely severed, they cooled,¹⁴⁰ and Romania initiated a gradual shift in its international policy. The German influence in Bukovina was also immaterial. Schellhorn was demoted to the rank of vice-ambassador, and was stripped of his executive powers. Exercising a double-standard of sorts, and obfuscating their own repressive policy in Transnistria, Romanian circles were now up in arms regarding the "methods" that the Germans had implemented in the *Generalgouvernement*, "especially in Sniatyn and Kolomea, as a solution to the Jewish question"; the behavior of the Germans in these regions forced even pro-German circles to reconsider their position, and the possibility of a separate peace with the Allies was raised.¹⁴¹

On top of this was the fact that economic relations also were not at their best. At the very time when the Romanian leadership was switching direction out of foreign policy considerations regarding the extermination of the Jews, it in 1943 intensified its struggle against the OUN, which had itself sought a rapprochement with Germany. In their attempt to eradicate the nationalist opposition, the Romanian security organs arrested in Bukovina, in April 1943 alone, some one thousand Ukrainians who were

137 Schreiben des Gesandten von Killinger an das Auswärtige Amt, November 26, 1942 mit einem undatierten Bericht [compiled after October 22, 1942] des Beraters für Judenangelegenheiten als Anlage, printed in ADAP, Serie E, vol. 4, pp. 410-11. BA (Ludwigsburg), 502 AR-Z 16/61, vol. 7 Aussagen Gustav Richter, July 15, 1969, p. 1,258

138 Jürgen Förster, *Stalingrad, Risse im Bündnis 1942/43* (Freiburg: Rombach, 1975).

139 *Der Dienstkalender Heinrich Himmlers 1941/42* (hg. Von Peter Witte et al., Hamburg: Christians, 1999), p. 652; Heinen, *Die Legion*, pp. 460-61.

140 For the perspective of someone who was involved in the events, Romania's last ambassador in Germany, see Ion Gheorghe, *Rumäniens Weg zum Satellitenstaat* (Heidelberg: Vowinkel, 1952), pp. 283-89, 325-29.

141 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/1, Politik Allg. 1926-1942: Aufzeichnung, December 17, 1942, quoted therein.

suspected of “hostile actions against the state.”¹⁴² The Reich, for its part, depended more and more on the Ukrainians, especially when it came to recruiting men who were fit for military service in the SS organizations. This ended in the establishment of a Ukrainian SS division, the “Galicia.”¹⁴³ German-Romanian relations grew even cooler. Romania had begun to make commercial profits from its Jews, for example by imposing taxes on them, and thus did not hand the Jews over to the RSHA’s “immigration” experts.¹⁴⁴

Thanks to Romania’s new policy, the threat that had been hovering over the remainder of Czernowitz’s Jews was removed. Bukovina’s new governor, General Cornelio Dragalina, also had a hand in this, because under his rule the total grip over the city’s Jews weakened.¹⁴⁵ But Romania had remained associated with the German Reich for too long for it to implement a decisive political change of course, whether in the direction of an entente in the Mediterranean region, or in the direction of the Western superpowers.¹⁴⁶ After Antonescu’s fall it was obliged, for better or for worse, to attach itself to the Soviet Union, and to wage war against its erstwhile ally.

With the renewal of Soviet occupation, the terror of the Soviet dictatorship unhinged the evil alliance between Romania and Germany. Those who had lived in relative peace during the crisis years, chiefly Romanians and Poles, now left Bukovina. At the same time, people who had already been exposed to considerable persecution

142 PAAA, Konsulat Czernowitz, file 4/4, Ukraine und Rumänien: [Czernowitz Consulate] Aufzeichnung, April 9, 1943.

143 Golczewski, *Die Kollaboration*, pp. 177-80. See there also a description of the Bukovina battalion of the OUN-M established already in 1941. It was precisely such organizations of armed personnel that aroused the Romanians’ suspicions, and provided further arguments in favor of an uncompromising struggle against the Ukrainian Nationalists. On the involvement of this unit – many of them supporters of Melnik from Northern Bukovina, to whom the battalion owed its name – in the Babi Yar massacres, see Karel C. Berkhoff, *Harvest of Despair: Life and Death in Ukraine under Nazi Rule* (Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press, 2004), pp. 52, 68.

144 No. 6353, Telegramm des Gesandten in Bukarest, December 12, 1942 an das Auswärtige Amt, bspw.: ADAP, Serie E, vol. 4, pp. 492-93; Martin Broszat, “Das Dritte Reich und rumänische Judenpolitik,” in *Gutachten des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte* (München, 1958), pp. 102-83, esp. pp. 169-70; Alexandre Safran, “*Den Flammen entrissen.*” *Die Jüdische Gemeinde in Rumänien 1939-1947. Erinnerungen* (Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 1996), p. 80.

145 Broszat, *Reich*, p. 170.

146 Hillgruber, *Hitler*, pp. 168-71, 173-83.

and repression, and did not want to suffer any more after the return of the Soviet empire, also escaped. The Soviets encouraged immigration, which contributed to the Ukrainization of northern Bukovina and its smooth integration into the USSR.¹⁴⁷ Yet, even though the city's character changed utterly in the context of the redrawn borders of the Cold War in Europe, Czernowitz became a romantic object of longing for its former inhabitants.¹⁴⁸ They continue even today to search the labyrinths of their memories for their lost garden of Eden.¹⁴⁹

* Translation: Ilana Goldberg

147 Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung*, pp. 427-28; Oleksandr Masan, "Czernowitz als regionales Zentrum," in *Czernowitz* (ed. Von Harald Heppner), pp. 145-66, esp. pp. 151-53.

148 "Czernowitz is gewen an alte jidische Schtot..." Überlebende Berichten (ed. Von der Heinrich- Böll-Stiftung, Berlin, 1999); Emanuel Michael Freiherr von Kapri, *Buchenland. Ein österreichisches Kronland verschiedener Völkergruppen* (München: Eigenverlag Landsmannschaft, 1983).

149 This is enhanced primarily by the renewed reception of Jewish literature, renewed publication of texts that are no longer available, lectures, exhibitions, and films. See especially the films of Volker Köpp: "Herr Zwilling und Frau Zuckermann" and recently "Dieses Jahr in Czernowitz." This trend is also enriching tourism. Currently more and more tours to Czernowitz are being offered, and old tour book guides are being reprinted. See *Illustrierter Führer durch die Bukowina von Hermann Mittlemann – Czernowitz 1907/1908*, (new ed. Von Helmut Kusdat, Wien: Mandelbaum, 2002); Martin Pollack, *Galizien. Eine Reise durch die verschwundene Welt Ostgaliziens und der Bukowina* (Frankfurt am Main, Leipzig: Insel, 2001).

