

Chapter 4

‘LOST HOME’ AND ‘AREA OF EXPULSION’

Compensating for Loss at the Height of the Cold War



In the mid 1960s, the Austrian, Bukovinian-German writer Georg Drozdowski wrote a letter to the Bukovinian Jewish writer Alfred Gong, who was by then living in New York. Drozdowski’s attention had been drawn to Gong, whom he had never met, after reading two of his poems about Bukovina in an Austrian literary journal. Drozdowski began by praising the work of this colleague and stressed that they were also fellow countrymen – albeit adding as ‘*Bukowiner* (not “*Buchenländer*”)', as Bukovinian ‘ethnic Germans’ like himself tended to describe themselves. Drozdowski then proceeded in suggesting changes to Gong’s published poems on two counts. First, according to him, the region Gong had referred to in his poem *Bukowina* with the German neuter pronoun ‘es’ should instead, based on the character of its features, be given the feminine pronoun ‘sie’. Second, Drozdowski took issue with the last verse of the poem *Topographie* and the claim that ‘half of the Jews [of Bukovina had] kicked the bucket in Novosibirsk and the other half later in Antonescu’s concentration camps’. Drozdowski acknowledged the millions of Jewish victims, emphasized his closeness to many Jews and even insisted he had no intention of offsetting Jewish against German victims as many tried to do. Nonetheless, he felt the need to point out that ‘two halves constitute a whole’ and thereby suggested that the claim in the last verse was overstated. As he explained, he himself had countless Jewish friends from the region. Evidently, therefore, many but not *all* of them had been murdered.¹

Unfortunately, Gong's side of the correspondence has been lost. Yet Drozdowski's next letter suggests that Gong had answered and been open to discussion. And the fact that it ended with an invitation to Gong to visit Drozdowski in Austria, together with Gong's friend Paul Celan, shows that the tone remained cordial.² However, what we also know is that while Gong took on the first change, he rejected the second.³ He and others had perhaps survived, but this was the exception, not the rule, as his own family's fate proved.

This exchange of letters, like the one quoted at the start of this book, constitutes quite a rare example of direct and personal interaction between a Bukovinian German and a Bukovinian Jew during the first decades of the Cold War. But like the one at the start, it captures critical aspects and problems of this relationship in general: the importance of the shared homeland, memories of the same time period and common acquaintances, but also the incommensurability of the experiences of Bukovinian Germans and Bukovinian Jews during the war and of the meaning being drawn from them. In this exchange, Drozdowski even hinted at this incommensurability by drawing attention to the difference between the inclusive concept of *Bukowiner* and the ethno-regional concept of *Buchenländer*. In short, this exchange points to a developing tension at the heart of what it meant to be Bukovinian – a tension caused by the uneasy combination of nostalgia and guilt and the contested meaning of Germanness.

This dilemma was not new. The issue of how to reconcile the violent past, the pain of displacement, complicity under the Nazis, feelings of nostalgia, and different types and conceptions of identity (national, regional, ethnic and cultural) was a problem Bukovinian communities and the societies they belonged to had faced since the end of the Second World War. Yet, as was described in the previous chapter, such debates had until then mostly been dealt with internally, within the communities and within their respective national arenas. However, as this example shows, as time passed, it became an increasingly public, entangled and international matter. Tellingly, for example, Drozdowski and Gong were awarded the same Austrian literary prize just one year apart in 1965 and 1966, respectively.⁴

The narratives, practices and activities of German and Jewish Bukovinians in the first half of the Cold War were typified by two simultaneous, contradictory trends along with a number of related problems. On the one hand, Bukovina came to be seen as a metaphorical space, invoked to refer to past places, individuals and events – a universe that no longer existed – a deterritorialized space.⁵ In other words, Bukovina, as the lost *Heimat*, became an object of both a physical and 'temporal dislocation' – an object of nostalgia.⁶ However, on the other hand, this period was characterized not only by attempts to idealize the past, but also attempts to achieve distance and closure, and by efforts to compensate for the past in a more practical sense,

which necessitated reckoning with what had happened. In fact, the primary justification for the continued existence of the representative organizations of Bukovinians in Germany and Israel was the issue of financial indemnification. In both countries, these organizations represented the claimants and offered them guidance concerning West German legislation – both the Equalisation of Burdens Act (*Lastenausgleichsgesetz (LAG)*) and the law on reparations for the victims of National Socialism (*Bundesentschädigungsgesetz (BEG)*). For this purpose, Bukovina was even defined legally as an ‘area of expulsion’ (*Vertreibungsgebiet*). Compensation for the past was therefore both figurative and literal. On the one hand, it was a matter nostalgically remembering what had been lost to make up for the trauma of war and displacement, but, on the other hand, it was a matter of obtaining justice, recognition and reparations to make up for past damages and wrongs.

This situation resulted in a range of contradictions. First, there was a contradiction between positive nostalgic memories and memories of violence and suffering. This is the reason why Jewish nostalgia for Bukovina, in particular, is often described as ‘ambivalent’.⁷ Second, there was a contradiction between nostalgia and the imperative of taking responsibility for the past. Indeed, while nostalgia has been defined as ‘history without guilt’, a sentiment devoid of shame,⁸ reparations required a significant revisiting of ‘what had existed’ and ‘what had happened’ and a confrontation with notions of collective responsibility. At the same time, the pervasive character in this period of the discussion of shame and guilt in West Germany often backfired and resulted in feelings of stigmatization and defensive attitudes, including denial and repression.⁹ Finally, there was a contradiction between the visions and aims of Bukovinian Jews and Bukovinian Germans, despite both groups using the same language, German. Indeed, if these groups gave up on the pursuit of immediate and practical political aims, they did not abandon what some have called their ‘ethnified collective memory’ and ‘culturalization of spatial features’.¹⁰ Their memories of the lost homeland were therefore often very selective, if not exclusive or even incompatible, and so were the associated perceptions and definitions of the group to which they belonged and, with this, of Germanness in general.

This chapter explores the characteristics, overlaps and frictions resulting from different attempts to compensate for loss during the 1960s and 1970s. Indeed, as Norbert Frei has argued, the battles for belonging fought out in national arenas were followed by an international ‘battle for memory’.¹¹ The case of Bukovinians illustrates this in a striking way. This was not only because both German and Jewish Bukovinians represented and engaged with the same space in the same language, but also because they dealt with many of the same issues, albeit from very different perspectives. The case of Bukovinians thereby reflects, on its scale, much broader debates and

questions. Indeed, commemorating the past is never a neutral undertaking. But this dilemma was even more acute in West Germany and Israel in the late 1950s and early 1960s, where and when the recent past was intrinsic to the politics of identity and recognition as well as to the relationship between the two states – and, with this, to the relationship between West Germans and Israelis in general.¹² The discourse about Bukovina in the 1960s developed against the backdrop of a highly politicized climate of engagement with the recent past. This atmosphere was created and spurred on by repeated controversies relating to the war and the Holocaust and linked, among other things, to the advancing investigation of Nazi crimes, high-profile trials and scandals, and the ongoing discussion of the domestic and foreign policy issue of reparations. Ultimately, tracing how German and Jewish Bukovinians discussed, presented and conceived of Bukovina during the early Cold War thus not only gives a privileged insight into the German and Jewish identities and interactions in this period, but also helps explain how and why changes to this relationship occurred.

Idealized Visions of the ‘Lost Home’

By the end of the 1950s, most Bukovinians had accepted that the ‘old *Heimat*’ was unquestionably lost. Both Germans and Jews who travelled back to the region argued that it had been transformed beyond recognition.¹³ Those they knew who had remained behind were still pressing to leave; this confirmed that there was no future for Bukovinians in what was once Bukovina and reinforced their sense of belonging as Bukovinians in their new homelands. Isolated behind the Iron Curtain, the region was declared ‘out of reach’, ‘vanished’, ‘sunken’ (*untergegangen*) and irremediably lost.

In both cases, a new chapter of their history had begun. In August 1954, *Die Stimme*, the newspaper of the Organization of Immigrants from Bukovina published in Tel Aviv, headlined the issue with an article titled ‘Ten Years’ (‘Zehn Jahre’).¹⁴ It recapitulated not just the history of Bukovinian Jews during the war, but also the process of immigration and the setting up of institutions in what was to become Israel. This date was not merely the anniversary of a tragedy; what they had done in those ten years was something they celebrated proudly. Similarly, in 1959, the Bukovinian German Landsmannschaft in West Germany published an anniversary booklet celebrating ten years of the organization’s existence and outlining its various achievements.¹⁵ It pointed to different activities, such as the cultural work, political agreements and settlement building; it even identified different phases within the Bukovinian Germans’ postwar history.¹⁶ This period itself was being historicized. The year 1940 might have been the end of one thing,

but it was also the beginning of something else. The Second World War had not marked the end of Bukovinians' history in either West Germany or Israel.

Accepting that the *Heimat* was lost did not mean that it should be forgotten, and as the survival of these organizations and their activities proved, it certainly was not. This acceptance triggered a new wave of memorialization. Since, in both countries, 'integration' and commemoration were no longer regarded as incompatible, there was a notable drive in the second decade after the war to compensate publicly for loss. Not only did 'being integrated' not mean that one should forget what had preceded, but the transformation of the old *Heimat* also made the preservation of what it had once been even more essential and urgent. In turn, this also meant that these were memories that could be enjoyed. The foreword of the *Heimat* book of the village of Deutsch-Satulmare (Satu Mare near Suceava), for instance, read as follows: 'Deutsch-Satulmare is perhaps definitively lost as a *Heimat* for us, but this book should ensure that it lives on forever in our memory and in our hearts.'¹⁷ Around this time, *Der Südostdeutsche*, the newspaper of Bukovinian Germans, also started displaying an increasing number of photographs of landscapes, cityscapes and buildings in Bukovina alongside its texts, providing its readers with visual elements to keep the region's past image alive. *Die Stimme*, in turn, published a growing number of articles about the prewar Jewish institutions and personalities. This type of material was what their readers wanted. In 1961, for example, a professor from Caracas wrote to the editors of *Die Stimme* to say:

I am using this opportunity to tell you how grateful I am to *Die Stimme*, as so many other readers who come from our old *Heimat* must be as well. It connects us to our past and keeps alive in us the memory of ideals that we now experience for real. This is our great fortune. I read *Die Stimme* with particular pleasure and when the postman brings it, I put everything aside to be confronted for a while with people with whom I shared a piece of my life.¹⁸

With other newspapers dealing with the present, reporting on the past was *Die Stimme's* and *Der Südostdeutsche's* main remit and purpose.

To some extent, this nostalgia was contentious. Could Jews feel nostalgic for a place of suffering? Could the Germans feel nostalgic for a place they had willingly abandoned or, indeed, that they had contributed to destroying? Some authors addressed these problems directly. Hermann Sternberg, the author of the small book entitled *On the History of the Jews of Czernowitz*, described *Czernowitzers* as 'prisoners of their memories' because it was both 'only human' and 'unavoidable' to feel longing for one's youth: 'the connections may be severed for good but there is a deep melancholy that cannot be gotten rid of'.¹⁹ However, Sternberg did not comment on the use of

German, which, as in many other Jewish Bukovinian publications, was a matter of course. As for the *Heimat* book regarding the town of Radautz (Rădăuți), entitled *Radautz: The Most German Town in Bukovina (Radautz: die deutscheste Stadt der Bukowina)* and published in 1966, the author's aim was 'to teach all *Radautzer* about the most important events from the life of their hometown and about the creation and constitution of political, cultural and economic institutions' and, in particular, 'to keep alive the memory of their dear old *Heimat*'.²⁰ For the author, the Germans had 'not forgotten their dear hometown of Radautz and still remembered it fondly'. But they had not forgotten what had led them to leave either: 'the lack of rights, persecution, demotion, contempt and abuse' they had endured after Bukovina became part of Romania.²¹ In short, this was nostalgia without homesickness.

Accordingly, this new trend did not challenge the political status quo. The *Heimat* book about the village of Alt-Fratautz (Frătăuții Vechi) was described in its preface as a 'memorial book' (*Gedenkbuch*).²² Its subtitle read 'about the development and the extinction of a German village community in Bukovina', clearly asserting that this history had ended. As Mordechai Rubinstein, the author of *The Jewish Vatican in Sadagora 1850–1950* – a title that incidentally exemplarily captures the exercise of reimagination – explained: 'The sole purpose of this book is just to temporarily amuse my friends from Bukovina – hand them over a mirror of their happily experienced youth – so that they can enjoy recalling stories and anecdotes about the place where they themselves and their forefathers played a role in good times and in bad.'²³ The dates in the title of his memory book made clear that life in Bukovina was well and truly over; the back cover even featured contact details of Bukovinian organizations in Tel Aviv and New York. Besides, Rubinstein, like Hugo Gold, the editor of the Bukovinian Jews' main memory book *History of the Jews in Bukovina*, dealt with this tension between the 'good' and the 'bad' memories by splitting the work into two volumes.²⁴ The separation made it possible to identify, isolate and celebrate positive legacies such as the student and sports organizations Hasmonaea, Hebronia and Maccabi, which were even later re-formed in Israel.²⁵

In the case of *The Jewish Vatican*, the author's use of humour, irony and different genres created additional distance from the 'bad' experiences. The section on the war was entitled 'Expelled from Paradise' (*Vertrieben aus dem Paradies*), and this sarcastic tone was maintained throughout the text. One could, for instance, read: 'In the "Hitler-Stalin" war of the gods, many millions had to bleed to death – half a world collapsed into ruin – and humanity's most significant achievements were thrown to the dogs.'²⁶ As he explained:

It hurts to have to leave the *Heimat* that one spent a whole life constructing. But such was the will of the godlike Stalin, who fears the sunlight of the free

world and hid behind an 'Iron Curtain'. Now we are free! He, however, is not because the murderous gang that are his friends is closer to him than he suspects.²⁷

Rubinstein's way of addressing survivors' inner conflict between remembering and forgetting was also interesting. He set up a fictional dialogue between a 'Jored' (a migrant to Israel) and 'reason' (*die Vernunft*). The former would say 'I want to forget, I want to forget all the horror' and the latter would respond 'don't forget, don't forget who destroyed your happiness'.²⁸ However, in the end, this meant that experiences were discussed in rather general and abstract terms. The poems published in Rubinstein's work dealt with the question of Jewish suffering and mentioned the Nazis, the millions of victims and the persecution they experienced. Yet specifically *Bukovinian* Jewish experiences such as the deportations to Transnistria or persecution under the Antonescu regime, were not tackled.²⁹

Discussing experiences of violence in more detail and, especially, attributing blame more precisely would have distorted the idealized memory of the lost home and detracted from Jewish Bukovinians' aim of lighthearted or at least positive reconstruction. It would have forced them to describe a more complex social reality. As others have noted, Jewish memory books aimed to create an ideal Jewish world in its totality.³⁰ In particular, the authors emphasized the usefulness of the Jews for the functioning of society. Although this was justified by the desire to re-create what had been destroyed, in the process the homeland became a place without Gentiles – a Zionist dream, a Jewish utopia, 'an island of Jewishness'.³¹ As others have noted, these books created a Jewish geography.³² In the case of Bukovinians, this was a Jewish-German geography. Hugo Gold's two-volume history of the Jews of Bukovina alongside his books on the Jews of Vienna and Bohemia are key examples of this phenomenon. The journal, *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden* (*Journal for the History of the Jews*), which he launched in 1964 and appeared in German in Tel Aviv until his death in 1974, is also a case in point. Despite its broad title, the journal focused almost exclusively on Jews in Germany and German-speaking Jews of the former Habsburg monarchy such as Bukovinian Jews. In effect, it brought together the history of German Jews and the history of German-speaking Jews from Central and Eastern Europe, tracing a direct line from the Jewish past in Europe to the present in Israel. Not only did it thereby create a 'German-Jewish' space that had never really existed, but it also removed and isolated the history of Jews from different areas from the history of the respective societies, in which they had lived in Central, Eastern and Southeastern Europe, as well as that of their brethren who spoke other languages (such as Romanian-speaking or Hungarian-speaking Jews).

For quite different reasons, a similar pattern emerged in the writings of some of the Germans from the region. This development had to do with the genre of *Heimat* books that not only contained memories and experiences, but primarily sought to reproduce a vision of the social space of the *Heimat*. As Jutta Faehndrich has shown, the story these books told often functioned as a founding myth for the groups of ethnic Germans, mostly members of village or local communities, and relied on an idealized, even canonized and often also highly ethnocentric, memory of their lost homes.³³ These depictions also entailed creating a new political geography – this time, one that was expressly German. For example, on the hand-drawn street and house map of the village of Alt-Fratautz, which was included in the sleeve of the village's *Heimat* book, the Romanian and Jewish neighbours were nameless.³⁴ Similarly, on the introductory page of his book *Student in Czernowitz*, Hans Prelitsch described the city as the 'Heidelberg of the East' and called on everyone to recall that the two world wars had put an end to German influence in the region.³⁵ The phenomenon of German presence was regarded as more significant than the homeland's multiethnic character or the lives and activities of the remaining 90% of the population. Diversity was a merely folkloric feature. In *Bukovina: Heimat von gestern*, for example, the first section was entitled 'Geography of Bukovina', the second 'The Germans in Bukovina' and the third 'German Achievements and Accomplishments'. Only in section four, 'Bukovina – a Multiethnic Land', on page 223, over halfway into the book, were members of other ethnicities mentioned at any length. As for the 'Prominent Bukovinians of our Time', they were almost all ethnic Germans.³⁶

Faehndrich also notes that it was typical for books belonging to the *Heimat* genre to avoid or elide contentious themes such as the war, interethnic relations, the Holocaust and even, in some cases, the postwar period.³⁷ Indeed, most Bukovinian-German authors steered clear of writing about difficult questions altogether, concentrating on the description of a timeless image of the *Heimat*. Franz Wiszniowski, for example, the author of the *Heimat* book about Radautz, did not tackle the fate of the Germans during the Second World War; he simply stated that the vast majority had been resettled and that, as of 1944, just 230 remained in the town.³⁸ As for the author of the *Heimat* book on Illischestie (Ilișești), Johann Christian Dressler, while he mentioned resettlement, he refused to take a position on its motives or consequences, arguing that:

Whether resettlement was in the interest of the people or whether the only reason for what happened was cold political calculation will not be discussed here and should also not be asked of Germany [*sic*]. The whole resettlement operation, built on the premise of victory in a great war, is still far too shrouded that one could judge it clearly today.³⁹

Dressler nevertheless concluded that the resettlement had ultimately saved many lives: 'And this commits us to thankfulness towards Germany.'⁴⁰

For others, writing about prewar Bukovina was even a means of rehabilitating the image of the Germans in general and in the face of ascriptions of guilt in particular. As Peter Blaß wrote, for example, in the preface to the village chronicle of Deutsch-Satulmare, echoing almost word for word the discourse of the Landsmannschaft: 'We Germans know too little about our past. Particularly in the current climate of haste and agitation, we should ask in contemplative silence about the direction of our people.' Specifically, he addressed 'the Germans from the Reich' (*Binnendeutsche*) who should know that 'in all of the southeastern states, the German settlers brought culture, carried progress, supported the state and, last but not least, were the main bearers of the burdens of the state'. He also stressed they had made great sacrifices in the war, 'even if this did not suffice to save the *Heimat*'.⁴¹

The foreword to the collection of essays about Bukovina *Buchenland: hundertfünfzig Jahre Deutschtum in der Bukowina*, written by the editor, the Bukovinian professor Franz Lang, even had a distinctly defensive tone. Lang first explained that the aim was to give insight into the history of Bukovinian Germans as a group while emphasizing their 'Germanness' and their 'tolerance', which had facilitated their smooth integration. He said he regretted that there had not been enough room in this volume to include contributions on 'other groups', which he named as Romanians and the Ukrainians. He then continued:

If it was only a matter of welfare and comfort, we could easily draw a line under the past. The fact is that there is more to it than this: it is about the highest value of a people, about its responsible independence in freedom, and as our fate is inseparable from the fate of our people as a whole, we are not permitted and should not simply carry the memory of the loss of faraway Bukovina in our hearts, but soberly reflect on how it can counterbalance on the side of credits the large bill that the German people have been given to shoulder after 1945.⁴²

He concluded that it would be nice to forget, but that this would not constitute a 'true peace'. He encouraged Bukovinians to make sure that their children developed love and gratefulness towards their ancestors and their people.⁴³ These statements amounted not only to a direct rejection of the so-called 'topos of collective guilt' but also to a direct attempt to counter it.⁴⁴ In general, such a publication focusing on Bukovinian Germans as a reified group reflected the perpetuation and endurance of old practices, ideas and beliefs about their identity and superiority, something also embodied by the refounding of Bukovinian branches of fraternities and student organizations such as Frankonia, Teutonia and Arminia zu Czernowitz in this period in Austria and West Germany.⁴⁵

Idealization and the attendant gaps and silences were therefore features of both German and Jewish Bukovinian accounts in the second decade after the war. In both cases, discussions of victimhood, suffering and violence retreated into the background, if they appeared at all. Resettlement was narrated according to the Bukovinian German Landsmannschaft's leaders' sanitized version – it was 'ultimately for the best' – and detached from ideological tenets and the political context of its occurrence. The pictures of resettlement in Lang's book, for example, were carefully chosen to avoid featuring any swastikas or National Socialists in uniform.⁴⁶ The fact that hardly any books were published about Transnistria during the Cold War suggests that among Jews too, compensating for loss involved treating Bukovina as an object of idealization or only discussing the causes of its destruction indirectly.⁴⁷ Bukovinian Jews also had to face a lack of interest in and understanding of their unusual experiences on behalf of the wider public. The history of the publication and reception of Edgar Hilsenrath's autobiographical, documentary novel about Transnistria, *Night (Nacht)*, is a case in point. The book, which he wrote in German while living and working in New York in the early 1950s, was not published until 1964, when Munich-based Kindler finally accepted it. Yet, most of the 1,000 copies printed were never distributed because the depiction of Jews was deemed too negative for a German-speaking audience. As a result, hardly any notice was taken of the novel until its translation into English and publication in this language in 1967 and its re-publication in the German original in 1978.⁴⁸

In a sense, both groups were very protective of the image of the region. An interesting illustration of this is another literary phenomenon, namely the reception of the works of Gregor von Rezzori. Having been born in the region in 1914, Rezzori was himself a 'Bukovinian' and, as the son of a Christian member of the Habsburg administration, was widely considered to be of German descent.⁴⁹ His sarcastic writings about the region, starting with the *Tales of Maghrebina (Maghrebinsche Geschichten)*, first published in German in 1953, provocatively and humorously parodied the genre of nationalist *Heimat* literature, and were by far the most popular representations of Bukovina available and circulating at this time in German-speaking Europe.⁵⁰ Initially, Bukovinian Jews in Israel ignored his work, but in West Germany, Bukovinian Germans could not be quite as dismissive of Rezzori's success. In 1955, Franz Lang published a review of Rezzori's 1954 novel *Oedipus at Stalingrad (Oedipus siegt bei Stalingrad)* in *Der Südostdeutsche*.⁵¹ While Lang acknowledged the quality of Rezzori's writing, he vehemently denounced the content. He argued there was nothing Bukovinian about the hero, Traugott von Jassilkowski, aside from the name. He continued:

His meaningless and aimless way of being, his nihilistic view of life, if he has any, is a feature of big-city literature. The Bukovinian expellees who, despite all the strokes of fate, say yes to life and master it, are rightly entitled to reject this Traugott and his entire universe. Rezzori clearly did not write his novel for them. But how about next time he took Bukovina, his hometown Czernowitz and its inhabitants into account and in such a way that their fate and being should be fairly represented. They were not all 'Maghrebinians'!⁵²

With this last comment, Lang was referring to Rezzori's previous work in which Bukovina was described as *Maghrebina* – a cheerful, chaotic and diverse area bearing a resemblance, as the name suggested, to the Orient. This depiction was at odds with the Europeanness that Bukovinian Germans claimed, and, as the review reveals, they felt personally attacked and insulted.

The release of Rezzori's next novel, *An Ermine in Czernopol (Ein Hermelin in Tschernopol)*, heightened tensions further in 1958.⁵³ The nicknames 'Teskovina' and 'Czernopol' hardly concealed Rezzori's real focus. Yet, when it came to characters, he did not even bother to change the names. This book thus led Rezzori to be prosecuted and fined for libel in Austria by Ariadne Buchenthal, who believed he had besmirched her parents' reputation. However, by then, Rezzori had already made a name for himself on West German TV and had appeared on the cover of the major German weekly magazine *Der Spiegel*, with a ten-page feature inside.⁵⁴ This sudden popularity as well as the novel itself triggered a series of articles, comments and reviews in both *Der Südostdeutsche* and *Die Stimme* and beyond. Both papers reported on the trial.⁵⁵ They also published reviews and republished the corrective response of a Ukrainian Bukovinian living in Vienna, Wladimir Zaloziecky, entitled 'What Czernopol Was [Really] Like', which had first appeared in the Viennese daily *Die Presse*.⁵⁶ Bukovinian Germans accused Rezzori of 'throwing dirt', and Bukovinian Jews blamed him for 'blaspheming the world of yesterday'.⁵⁷ *Die Stimme*, in particular, published a series of outraged responses, including a review by the Bukovinian Austrian writer Georg Drozdowski, which bemoaned the book's success and posed the question: 'What can a country do against its defilement?'⁵⁸ Later, they also published the letters exchanged between Rezzori and Zaloziecky, debating the relationship between historical accuracy and artistic licence.⁵⁹

The most virulent and articulate response was a review in *Die Stimme* by Walter Kiesler from Haifa – a response that was met with widespread approval by readers.⁶⁰ Kiesler conceded that the book was 'humorous' and written with 'virtuosic style'. However, he also reminded Rezzori, whom he addressed directly, of his responsibility as the author of 'the only report of the memory of Bukovina in the free world': 'For the sake of historical truth', he wrote, 'the other Czernowitz also deserves mentioning', and this included

‘the peaceful coexistence of the five nationalities, Romanians, Germans, Poles, Ruthenes and, *last but not least*, Jews, who contributed so much to the cultural and industrial flourishing of Bukovina and its capital’. Beyond this, Kiesler noted Rezzori’s stereotypical depiction of Jews as comical traders and merchants. Yet, he was even more bewildered by Rezzori’s depiction of his own group, the Germans, whom he had described as ‘Germany’s larva-like people’ (*Larvenmenschen Deutschlands*). Kiesler had begun his review by mentioning Rezzori’s own shady biography and credentials – in particular, that he had supposedly volunteered to the Wehrmacht in 1938, though he eventually remained a civilian in Berlin and thus, in the author’s words, avoided a ‘hero’s death’ (*Heldentod*). Thereby, Kiesler underscored the hypocrisy of Rezzori’s uncompromising stance towards Bukovinian Germans in particular and Germans in general.⁶¹ He concluded by saying that while Rezzori might be making money or making people laugh, he had not earned their ‘respect’ (*Achtung*).

Conflicting Visions of Bukovina

However, this short-lived congruence of opinions concerning Rezzori’s work did not mean that Bukovinian Jews and Bukovinian Germans agreed with each other concerning what was lost or how to represent it. While in both cases the region was depicted as exceptional – ‘an oasis of civilization’ – for the Germans, it had been ‘an island of Germanness’, and for the Jews, it had been ‘a Jewish Atlantis’. The main feature of the depictions of the region remained their exclusive nature. Both communities attempted to glorify the role of their own group and members, even problematically projecting backwards contemporary reified and hardened conceptions of ethnonational identity. As a result, they also had different spatial and historical reference points. As such, these were two radically opposed visions of what was there, who had lived there and what had happened. Indeed, invocations of the region mostly ignored the existence of ‘ethnic others’ – in particular, that of *other* German-speakers. Since this amounted to an inscription of culture on a particular space, Bukovina not only appeared as two very different places, but also corresponded to and underwrote two very different conceptions of Germanness.

Yet while Gold’s, Rubinstein’s and Sternberg’s publications did not give any space to the region’s ‘ethnic others’, they also did not claim to offer a comprehensive and exhaustive picture. By equating ‘German’ and ‘Austrian’, and therefore ‘Bukovinian’ and ‘German’, German narratives often took ethnocentrism to another level. Franz Lang’s *Buchenland: One Hundred and Fifty Years of German Culture in Bukovina* with its sole focus on the German

ethnic group, despite the title, is a prime example. In effect, ‘German culture’ (*Deutschtum*) had been equated with German ethnicity. However, Erich Beck’s book of photographs, *Bukovina: Land between Orient and Occident*, which remained at the top of the list of books to purchase from the Bukovinian German Landsmannschaft for decades, constitutes another interesting case.⁶² Beck, who was born in 1929 in Rădăuți, had studied business and economics in West Germany and lived, after the war, on the Bukovinian settlement of Büsnau near Stuttgart. He neither had much experience of the ‘old home’, nor was he a historian, so his book mainly relied on existing literature. Yet, it therefore provides a unique insight into what particular aspects of Bukovinian Germans’ history were transmitted to subsequent generations and a wider audience. Indeed, this book demonstrates both the place of Bukovinian Germans’ narratives in West Germany’s highly politicized climate and landscape of memorialization and how, in turn, the politicization of ‘the East’ resulted in a small handful of people obtaining the monopoly and the prerogative over this history. In this sense, it sheds light on West German politics of memory and commemoration in the 1960s, offering a plastic illustration of issues of visibility, marginalization and interpretative authority other scholars have also noted.⁶³

At nearly 200 pages, Beck’s book was a modern and well-made ‘coffee-table book’ (*Bildband*), containing over 150 captioned black-and-white photographs, as well as a historical overview and description of the region and its people. Contrary to the *Heimat* books previously discussed, this publication was neither primarily about constructing a sense of belonging in West Germany, nor did it serve to record the history of Bukovinian Germans as a group in specific localities. Instead, it sought to provide a history of Bukovina on the ground since time immemorial and offer a comprehensive account including all its diverse peoples, landscapes and traditions. At the outset, Beck claimed that this book was not about the present, but was about the past: ‘Bukovina is a land of the past.’ Yet, as he went on to say, ‘its present is composed of memories’ and ‘its future is the hope for the return of freedom’.⁶⁴ Its future was therefore a return to the past. This publication was not a history book in a conventional sense, but a book that collapsed the time-frame. It was a timeless, ahistorical vision the main aim of which was to bring to life an idealized, yet contemporarily relevant vision of an imagined past.

The influence of existing narratives, especially those promoted by Beck’s elders within the Bukovinian-German homeland organization was tangible. Beck, for example, did not conceive of Bukovina or Austria-Hungary as a power-sharing political system, but in terms of an organic mixture of peoples (*Völker*).⁶⁵ At the same time, Bukovina was not only a land of ‘encounters’ (*Übergänge*) between Central and Eastern Europe but also a smaller yet ‘true reflection’ of the Habsburg monarchy; therefore, it might also be a model

for Europe.⁶⁶ The region's diversity was openly discussed. In fact, 'The peaceful coexistence of randomly thrown together different ethnic groups' was described as the hallmark of Bukovina,⁶⁷ and the large portraits of members of different ethnicities throughout the book illustrated this impressively. However, this was a diversity of a specific kind. Both the text and the photographs exoticized the inhabitants and the region's 'ethnic others' in a somewhat primitive manner. The images captured individuals in traditional dress or performing traditional tasks: Romanian and Ukrainian peasants staking hay, Romanian and Ukrainian women washing clothes or painting Easter eggs, 'hardworking' German farmers and craftspeople, Jewish traders standing around at the marketplace and wandering Roma. Those pictured were not only supposed to be generic and stereotypical representations of their ethnicity, but also of their gender and socioeconomic group. Beck especially drew attention to the 'beauty of the women' and the region's 'numerous beggars'.⁶⁸

Even the featured 'Germans' were ostentatiously *Schwaben* (Swabians) and farmers, not city-dwellers, as the author himself or his family had been. There were no members of the middle or upper classes. In general, city inhabitants were not portrayed. Urban life was limited to the few shots of the cityscapes of Suczawa/Suceava and Czernowitz/Cernăuți, including the latter's most famous sites and landmarks such as the town hall, the market square, the university building (formerly the residence of the metropolitan bishop) and the 'German House' – the German (national) cultural centre located on the main pedestrian high street. However, these were captured from a distance and without any people. Mostly, Bukovina was depicted as a picturesque and bucolic rural landscape; the implication was that its diverse rural population was harnessed by a civilizing German culture embodied in a few rather grand but deserted urban centres.

In the opening section on the history of 'Czernowitz' since the Middle Ages, one could read that 'Czernowitz had always been a German city'.⁶⁹ Beck then explained that Germanization had occurred unwittingly, because Austria had never pushed for it and all groups were equal:

The German language was employed by the members of the other nationalities by choice. This was because, on the one hand, they thereby could come closer to the achievements of the West and, on the other, because among the many everyday languages, German was the only and natural means of mutual understanding.⁷⁰

The policy of Romanization of the interwar period was omitted entirely:

Nothing changed in the Romanian period ... In the years until the integration into the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, Czernowitz was a small Babylon, a

mixture between Orient and Occident ... a Black Forest village, a Podolian ghetto, a small suburb of Vienna, a piece of deepest Russia, a piece of the most modern America.⁷¹

As Beck meant to show, Bukovina was a 'land of contradictions'.⁷² However, the nostalgia was not for this, or even for the German presence, but for a premodern world characterized by a fantasy of benevolent German domination over these other peoples that spanned the period of Austrian rule both backwards and forwards.

Most notably, Bukovina was presented as an exclusively Christian region and Bukovinians as Christians. Not only was a cross prominently displayed on the book's front cover, but the main focus of attention was the German areas of settlement and the churches, as well as the famous Bukovinian painted Orthodox monasteries. Sadagora/Sadagura, in contrast, the major centre of Hasidic Judaism just outside Czernowitz/Cernăuți, did not feature at all. The only synagogue photographed was that of Rădăuți captured seemingly by accident in the background of the view of the town's market square.⁷³ Although the majority of the photographs presented rural, traditional, agricultural areas and small towns, there was not a single picture of a Jewish shtetl, let alone a Jewish cemetery.

The absence of Jews in this vision of Bukovina was made explicit in Beck's list of those who were regarded as 'Bukovinian' (*Bukowiner*) – a non-national ideal – from which the Jews were remarkably missing:

Romanians, Ukrainians, Germans, Poles, Hutsuls and the smaller groups of Hungarians, Lipovans, Slovaks, Armenians and, *last not least* [in English in original], gypsies were each with all of their particularities and singularities a variation of the theme 'Bukovinian'. The harmony of these variations was the consciousness of the *Heimat* that was stronger than the national consciousness across generations and world wars.⁷⁴

Beck then explained that 'the fate of Bukovinians during the Second World War had been worse than that of other peoples'. To illustrate his point, he explained that: 'The Germans had been resettled to Germany as early as 1940 but had not been able to establish themselves until after 1945'.⁷⁵ Despite the definition of 'the Bukovinian' given above, this succession of points largely equated 'Bukovinian' with 'German'. Besides, given the assertion that the fate of Bukovinians had been 'worse than that of other peoples', the omission of Jews was all the more astonishing.

Jews were mentioned later on in the text. On page 96, one could read that Jews 'were the group that had taken the least to Bukovinian customs'.⁷⁶ The description of the Jews' characteristics that followed constituted a striking mixture of philosemitic and antisemitic stereotypes:

Afflicted by a certain aversion to hard physical work, they turned to professions that did not involve any physical exertion ... Their fathers taught them to do commerce in all of its variations. It is therefore no surprise that the Jew held a monopoly position in banking in Bukovina. The contribution of the Jews to the cultural life of the region was significant. Equipped with a distinctive ethnic consciousness, they created their own theatres, schools, hospitals and orphanages. The Jews of Bukovina now belong to the elite of the State of Israel.⁷⁷

Aside from the latent racism underpinning the curious mishmash of ethnic characteristics listed here, this cursory outline of the Jews' history also gave absolutely no sense of their experiences, suffering and losses during the war and the Holocaust; on the contrary, it made it sound as though they had fared better than others. As such, not only did the combination of 'civilization', 'Christianity' and 'primitiveness' echoing authentic German understandings of the *Heimat* preclude including the Jews in the picture, but this statement also captures the extent of the author's lasting prejudice towards this group.

None of this was lost on the reviewer of the book in *Die Stimme*, Meier Teich, the former head of the Jewish community in the southern Bukovinian city of Suceava and editor of *Die Stimme* from 1965 until his death in 1975. As he explained, he had at first approached the book with 'great excitement' (*Herzensfreude*), but this had soon turned into 'sorrow and anxiety' (*Leid und Beklemmung*).⁷⁸ He noted all of the above text passages, saddened that this was, as the review of the title read, 'Bukovina's legacy from a German perspective'. For him, this kind of 'mastering of the past' (*Bewältigung der Vergangenheit*) was both 'immature' (*kindisch*) and 'unbelievable' (*unfassbar*). But most problematic in his view were the images used, which added insult to injury. He noted that there was only one labelled portrait of a Jew – that of a sad-looking bearded man wearing a black hat and carrying a wooden stick.⁷⁹ The caption on the previous page simply read 'Jew from Czernowitz'. Then, on page 38, Teich identified the remains of the synagogue burnt down by the Germans in 1941. The confusing caption below it suggested it had been destroyed in the First World War or perhaps under Soviet rule in 1940–41. On the next page, together with the caption 'Czernowitz on 16 August 1941',⁸⁰ there was both a picture of a destroyed building and the picture of a man sweeping the streets. In view of the date, Teich suspected that he too was probably a Jew, though this was not referred to in the caption. Yet, above all, this had led Teich to ask himself where Beck had found these photographs and who had taken them. The answer, according to him, was obvious: some at least had most probably been taken by German troops following the joint Romanian–German attack on the Soviet Union in the summer of 1941.⁸¹

Beck must have known where the images came from. Moreover, as of the early 1960s when the book was published, he can hardly have been unaware of the implications of using them. The first volume of his ambitious *Bibliography of Bukovina*, which appeared just a few years later and aimed to be comprehensive, included the occasional Bukovinian Jewish author.⁸² Yet, he made neither any mention of the photographs' provenance, nor did he comment on their ideological content or try to make up for their biases in other ways. In fact, the text itself was often evocative of National Socialist literature. Aside from overlooking the contributions of Jews to the region's German culture, Beck backed up the claim of Bukovina's Western identity by mentioning that German soldiers who had been posted there during the Second World War had felt 'at home' in this 'unknown province' and that they described it to this day as one of the most interesting places in Europe.⁸³ He even justified his memorial undertaking primarily with reference to these same German soldiers of the Second World War, some of whom had fallen in the region: 'German people in a foreign soil – missing but not forgotten!'⁸⁴ The text ended with this emotional plea, reminiscent of an earlier discourse and period.

Unsurprisingly, the book was well received by members of the Bukovinian German Landsmannschaft. Bruno Skrehunetz-Hillebrand, the then editor of *Der Südostdeutsche*, who reviewed it, celebrated it as evidence that members of the younger generation were interested in the land of their ancestors, that 'small Europe could be a model for big Europe' and that Bukovina 'was truly unique!'. He explained that 'all issues have been dealt with concisely, but very accurately, enthrallingly, and handled clearly', going on to say:

For older Bukovinians, seeing the many pictures will unavoidably elicit feelings of love and melancholy, as they document this beautiful and happy time powerfully . . . There are also two sad pictures from August 1941 after the liberation of the city from the Bolshevist rule of terror [*Schreckensherrschaft*]. They depict poorly dressed people [*sic*] and the ruins of houses [*sic*] on the *Ringplatz* [the main square] (on the corner of Temple Street).

Skrehunetz concluded his review by saying this book 'should not be missing in any household', an expression that remained the slogan in the adverts for the book in *Der Südostdeutsche* in the following years.⁸⁵ The book's positive reception among individual Bukovinians as well as in the wider West German media only served to reinforce this evaluation. A special feature on the book's reception even appeared in *Der Südostdeutsche* two years later.⁸⁶ No mention was made of Teich's review in *Die Stimme*.

Beck's book was unique insofar as there was no other such comprehensive and illustrated account of the region's history. However, its tone and

orientation were typical of representations from this period with respect to how uncritically many expellees mourned their lost *Heimat*.⁸⁷ In particular, it reflected, as others have noted, the exoticism with which Jews were discussed in West German society up until the 1970s.⁸⁸ But it also showed the extent of the continuities in thinking after 1945 in some milieus, including the deflection of German responsibility and guilt and even hardly veiled antisemitism. It is worth noting that when, ten years later, the book was out of print and the idea of making a second edition was floated, Beck was against it, since in his view the text (though not the photographs) needed updating.⁸⁹ Until then, the majority of German publications grossly underplayed the role of Jewish inhabitants as part of the region's German character, let alone the gravity of their experiences during the war. And since no one except the members of this group dealt with this history in West Germany in this period, this version of the past was also largely unquestioned and unchallenged.

One of the ways in which this exclusive interpretation of the region's history was justified was by insisting that Jews should be regarded as a separate ethnic group. In the *Heimat* book on Radautz, a town where 30% of the population, namely the majority of the inhabitants, had been Jews, the author called them 'Israelites' to make sure they were identified as a distinct group.⁹⁰ Similarly, in *Bukovina: Yesterday's Home*, one could read that one should not mistakenly confuse the two groups as nineteenth-century Austrian historians had done.⁹¹ This stance also meant that the depictions of Jews' and Germans' activities and organizations were to be segregated too – something which sometimes proved difficult. In his short history of the press in Bukovina published in 1962, Vienna-based Bukovinian Erich Prokopowitsch warned the reader not to assume that all German-language newspapers in Bukovina were *German*, as many of them had been published by Jews. These, he explained, had been 'Zionist in their outlook' and, according to him, it was this 'Zionism' that had created a rift between Germans and Jews. This happened, he emphasized, before the creation of the Christian Social Party, while conceding that this party had contributed to deepening the differences.⁹²

Despite the famous diversity of the media landscape in Bukovina, Prokopowitsch's small book was largely an excuse to discuss the *Czernowitzer Deutsche Tagespost*, which had been the mouthpiece of the region's ethnic Germans. Prokopowitsch argued that it had been 'one of the most important German-language newspapers in Romania'⁹³ and had benefited from an ethnically diverse readership because it had always stood 'for rights of minorities'.⁹⁴ He used this opportunity to congratulate the two editors, Bruno Skrehunetz and Fritz Poppenberger, and to mention that the former was by then the editor in chief of the Austrian *Salzburger Nachrichten* (as well as the editor of *Der Südostdeutsche* after Prelitsch's death in 1967).⁹⁵ The fact that the *Czernowitzer Deutsche Tagespost* and its editors had supported the far right,

spread ethnocentric and antisemitic ideas and ideals from the turn of the century onwards, and that the paper had been utterly Nazified from the onset of the so-called ‘Movement of National Renewal’ (*Erneuerungsbewegung*) in the mid 1930s, clearly eluded him.⁹⁶ This is all the more remarkable as Prokopowitsch, who had been an administrator at the University of Cernăuți, had himself, like Skrehunetz, been an especially active proponent of National Socialist ideas in Bukovina between 1934 and 1940.⁹⁷ As Mariana Hausleitner has argued, this ultimately also made him part of the network of people whose works received funding after the war.⁹⁸ Indeed, although he lived in Vienna, Prokopowitsch was friends and remained close to the West German Landsmannschaft’s leaders.⁹⁹ This book was therefore very similar to many other of the Landsmannschaft’s publications.

The vast majority of publications about Bukovina in Germany reflected not only the conservatism and *völkisch* worldview of the Landsmannschaft, but also often the unchallenged antisemitism of its elite and leadership. There had been no ‘denazification’ of the Bukovinian German Landsmannschaft, so there was neither any re-evaluation of the wartime actions and attitudes of the group as a whole, nor of those of particular individuals.¹⁰⁰ In the 1960s, these people continued to constitute the group’s close-knit intellectual elite. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the Landsmannschaft generally ignored the existence of Jewish authors from the region. Despite appearing in German and in Germany, the novels of the Jewish Bukovinians Siegmund Last and Jacob Klein-Haparash were not acknowledged by the Bukovinian German Landsmannschaft or in *Der Südostdeutsche*.¹⁰¹ However, there is evidence that both Last, who lived in Vienna after the war, and Klein-Haparash, known as ‘Kubi Klein’, were known *Landsmänner* (fellow countrymen).¹⁰² The success of Klein-Haparash’s book, which was even translated into English in 1963, did not go completely unnoticed.¹⁰³ Yet the ‘book catalogue’ of the Landsmannschaft dating from 1963 only contained one Jewish author, the nineteenth-century Germanophile Karl Emil Franzos.¹⁰⁴ Paul Celan, who had received the Bremen Literature Prize in 1958 and the prestigious Büchner Prize in 1960, and was by far the most famous writer from the region – and even regarded as one of the most influential postwar German-language poets – was not listed there either.

The case of Celan is genuinely revealing. Bukovinian-German leaders were obviously aware of him and his success. In his response to a request for information from the Institute for Political Science of the Technical University of Rhineland-Westphalia in 1965, for a listing of prominent Bukovinians, Rudolf Wagner included him while specifying that he was ‘a Jewish Bukovinian’ ‘without any links to the Landsmannschaft’.¹⁰⁵ But in a letter to the representative organization Bund der Vertriebenen (BdV) that same year, for example, the then managing director (*Bundesgeschäftsführer*)

of the Landsmannschaft Otto Lachmund argued that their *Landsmann* Franz Lang ‘would deserve, in their view, more attention’ than Paul Celan did.¹⁰⁶ In Franz Lang’s own contribution on the topics of language and literature in his book *Bukovina: One Hundred and Fifty Years of German Culture*, he mentioned Celan’s ‘hypermodern literature’, but said that though Celan was born in 1920, he had ‘soon turned away from Bukovina’ (*schon früh der Bukowina entfremdet*).¹⁰⁷ Although Celan’s poems were published in West German national newspapers and his obituary after his suicide in Paris in April 1970 was broadcast on German national television (ZDF), *Der Südostdeutsche* did not even refer to his passing.¹⁰⁸ A rare mention of Celan in a reader’s letter in 1971 bemoaned the fact that the Transylvanian Saxon writer Dieter Schlesak had described Celan as the only famous writer from Bukovina. The author of the letter protested that there were significant others, such as Rezzori, who, in contrast, were ‘ethnic Germans’ (*Volksdeutsche*).¹⁰⁹ Unsurprisingly, none of Celan’s texts were ever published in *Der Südostdeutsche*.

In fact, with the notable exceptions of the Jewish writer Rose Ausländer and German writer Georg Drozdowski, the German and Jewish Landsmannschaften only published texts by members of their own ethnic group.¹¹⁰ This crossover in the case of Ausländer and Drozdowski was only possible because of the character of some of their writings and subjects – in Ausländer’s case, her bucolic poems about the Bukovinian landscape and, in Drozdowski’s case, his generic reflections on the pain of displacement and nostalgia for the Habsburg period – which happened to be suitable for both audiences. However, it is worth noting that only their texts on these topics were reproduced in the respective papers. The writings of German *Heimat* poets such as Heinrich Kipper, Johanna Brucker or Marianne Vincent, with their depiction of Bukovina as an idyllic German homeland, or those of the Jewish writers Immanuel Weissglas, Alfred Gong or Alfred Kittner, with their more direct engagement with the Holocaust, the Jewish experience or Bukovina as a place of suffering, in contrast, were never subject to such a crossover.¹¹¹

The selection of poems published by *Die Stimme* and *Der Südostdeutsche* was symptomatic of their radically opposed approaches to the past and to politics. The two editors of *Der Südostdeutsche* in the 1960s, Hans Prelitsch and Bruno Skrehunetz (in addition to Wagner, who remained important behind the scenes and took on the role of editor of the paper in 1977), were members of the Landsmannschaft, with tainted pasts and unquestionable ongoing sympathies for National Socialist thought. They had close links to the Romanians and Ukrainians in exile in Germany, who were notoriously right wing. They also cooperated with Friedrich (also known as Fritz) Valjavec, a historian and founder of the Südosteuropa Gesellschaft in Munich in 1952 and the Südostdeutsche Historische Kommission in 1957, who, as a member of the SS and the *Einsatzgruppe D*, had participated in the murder of the Jews

of Cernăuți in 1941.¹¹² Beyond this, regular headlines denounced not only the loss of the Eastern territories and the German ‘capitulation’,¹¹³ but also subverted the discourse on German guilt and shame by turning it against ‘Germany’s enemies’: the Left, the Allies and the Jews. In *Der Südostdeutsche* in the 1960s, incidences of Holocaust minimalization, relativization and denial were frequent.¹¹⁴ Occasional mentions of the Jewish suffering by some of their members were even deleted from their contributions.¹¹⁵

In 1961, the Eichmann trial triggered a string of articles in *Der Südostdeutsche*, which called into question the evidence put forward at the trial, set out to challenge ‘the myth of the recent past’ and denied the existence of gas chambers.¹¹⁶ The contrast with the reaction to the trial among Bukovinian Jews could not have been greater. Since the mid 1950s, *Die Stimme* focused almost exclusively on the issue of retribution and reparations for Nazi crimes, from which Bukovinian Jews were long excluded. This quest for compensation and recognition of their suffering and, by the same token, for the recognition of German collective guilt was of extreme importance to them. The editors of *Die Stimme* followed the unfolding of the Eichmann trial and antisemitic reactions to it in Germany closely.¹¹⁷ The perspectives of German and Jewish Bukovinians were truly incompatible: Bukovinian Germans sought exculpation, and Bukovinian Jews sought an apology for what was ultimately the same crime. The election of Willy Brandt in 1969 further confirmed the opposite political positions adopted by the two newspapers and their editors. While *Die Stimme* celebrated Brandt’s election as the symbol of a new Germany, the editors of *Der Südostdeutsche* saw in Brandt the face of what was known as ‘renunciation’ (*Verzicht*) – the abandonment of revisionism – and a national disgrace.

Such stances towards the past undoubtedly led some Bukovinian Germans to distance themselves from their representative organizations. As Pertti Ahonen has argued regarding West German expellee organizations in general, much of the elite came across to many West Germans and potential members as fanatics.¹¹⁸ In the 1960s, the term *Heimat*, associated with the expellee lobby in West Germany, started to acquire negative connotations. At this time, the Landsmannschaften in West Germany experienced significant losses, especially among members of the younger generations.¹¹⁹ In Israel too, if the Eichmann trial raised the status of witnesses, it also heightened many Israelis’ wish to get on with their lives and leave the past behind them. The attitude towards the Diaspora, particularly its German-speaking incarnation, remained highly ambivalent.¹²⁰ But the marginalization of the topic of the former homes in both societies also meant that the communities and their active members maintained their monopoly over representations of the region and were hardly challenged. The few first-hand accounts of Bukovinians, which were not written by or for the purpose of the

Landsmannschaften, substantiate this claim and provide further evidence of the extent of these organizations' influence on the discourse of their members and beyond.¹²¹ Indeed, these narratives highlight the existence of a significant gap, not only between the leaderships and constituencies of the two groups, but also between the perceptions and beliefs of German and Jewish Bukovinians who were not members of these organizations and perhaps even between many non-Jewish Germans and Jews in general. Contact or friendship between German and Jewish Bukovinians, as the exchange of letters between Drozdowski and Gong quoted at the start of this chapter suggests, were rare, emotionally charged and regarded as exceptional.¹²²

The Framework of Material Compensation

Bukovinians' contrasting visions of Bukovina not only corresponded to different understandings of what Bukovina had been but also of community and belonging. With the issue of reparations, therefore, the consequences of this opposition became very real and tangible. Indeed, according to postwar West German legislation, both Bukovinian Germans and Bukovinian Jews were entitled to claim reparations for the damages they sustained during the war – as 'expellees' and as 'victims of the Nazis', respectively. As such, these were two separate procedures. But as scholars have argued, the issue of reparations encouraged contact between the societies of 'the perpetrators' and of 'the victims', not least because the former decided on the parameters of restitution.¹²³ Moreover, in both cases, the assessment of the losses depended not only on a specific interpretation of the circumstances under which they had suffered, but also on specific understandings of both the region's and the claimants' identity. In other words, indemnification relied on an understanding of 'what had existed', 'what had happened' and 'who was a German'. In this context, therefore, Bukovinian Germans' and Bukovinian Jews' differing conceptions of community became extremely important, and the issue even brought members of the two communities into direct contact and conflict.

If it had not been for the question of material compensation, the contrasting visions of Bukovinian Germans and Bukovinian Jews might not have been confronted directly in this period. Yet, while this was an area of confrontation, it also became a field of negotiation and helps explain how their positions could evolve. Indeed, the issue of compensation helped change come about insofar as it became a crucial arena of arbitration of the categories of belonging. In this sense, it was fundamental to recasting Bukovinian and broader German and Jewish identities after the Second World War: just like judicial procedures in postwar West Germany in general, it induced new knowledge and approaches to the recent past. Both the shortcomings

of the reparations policy and the paradigm shift of the mid 1960s have been widely noted.¹²⁴ As Constantin Goschler has argued, whereas the 1950s and 1960s were characterized by an ‘integrationist discourse’ for the victims of the war and the Holocaust, the 1970s were marked by increasing differentiation among victims.¹²⁵ According to Jannis Panagiotidis, 1965 marked the beginning of a transformation period.¹²⁶ As he argues, from this perspective, ‘the post-1965 development ... can be interpreted as a process of progressing entanglement within a common international context’.¹²⁷ This was also the year in which the FRG took up diplomatic relations with Israel. The case of Bukovinians substantiates these claims, giving further privileged insight into the nature of the debate and what heralded the change of political and cultural attitudes, as well as rare insight into the perspective of the victims.¹²⁸

The efforts for compensation of Bukovinian Jews and Bukovinian Germans were the result of two different sets of legislation: the 1953 Equalisation of Burdens Act (*Lastenausgleichsgesetz* – LAG) for the ‘war-damaged’, including ‘expellees’ (*Vertriebene*), and the Federal Law on Restitution to the Victims of National Socialist Persecution (*Bundesentschädigungsgesetz* – BEG – more widely known as *Wiedergutmachung*) for the victims of National Socialist persecution, which followed three years later in 1956. While both sets of legislation in some sense reflected West Germany’s adoption of the role of ‘successor to the Nazi regime’, the implications and rationale for the two laws could not have been more different. The first was related to the consequences of military defeat and a conception of ‘Germans as victims’. The LAG claimants were encouraged to present the image of innocent and deserving victims, and therefore to produce exculpatory accounts and shirk responsibility for the past. This law was mainly perceived as a domestic matter and treated as a West German ‘solidarity tax’.¹²⁹ The second, in contrast, was linked to a conception of ‘Germans as perpetrators’ and appealed to a German collective responsibility of a very different kind – namely, collective guilt for the past. In other words, the LAG and the BEG had conflicting aims: the first compensated ‘Germans as victims’, while the second compensated the ‘victims of the Germans’.

Yet, this distinction between ‘Germans as victims’ and ‘victims of the Germans’ was not as easy to establish in practice as it was in theory. On the one hand, the fact that the legislation for each developed in response to the other demonstrates that the two kinds of victims were perceived to be in competition with one another. But, on the other hand, the wider postwar West German political culture with its ‘politics of the past’ (an awkward combination, as Norbert Frei has argued, of apology and amnesty),¹³⁰ the politics of identity and integration outlined in the previous chapters and the contrasting visions of the communities outlined above all contributed to blurring the distinction. As Goschler has argued, technically the rehabilitation of the victims and the punishment of the perpetrators should have gone

together.¹³¹ But in the context of the 1950s, most Germans felt that the war of annihilation had been an injustice done unto the German people.¹³² Besides, if anything, many conceived of these reparations as a means of achieving distance from the past. In practice, there was a fundamental misunderstanding between the Germans who believed that the payments would reduce their share of guilt and the Jews who felt that the two should not be conflated.¹³³ Indeed, initially at least, reparations to the victims were seen ‘less [as] a moral obligation than an onerous burden’.¹³⁴ Moreover, as the fact that they were exclusively for Jewish victims of the Nazis indicates, reparations were primarily construed as a foreign policy matter, essential to achieving the recovery of West Germany’s international image.¹³⁵ In this sense, as others have argued, reparations can be said to have served less the rehabilitation of the victims than that of the perpetrators.¹³⁶

The complexity of making this distinction was also the result of the difficulty of turning a moral wrong into material compensation within a pragmatic political framework.¹³⁷ While there was obviously a gap between the framework of a past crime and the framework needed to deal with present claims, there was nevertheless a risk of applying the same principles that had led to the injustice in the first place in order to vindicate the wrongdoing.¹³⁸ To avoid this, an overlap between the different categories of victims was inadvertently embedded in the legislation – a conundrum later revealed in legal practice. Indeed, since both laws were conceived of as inner-German legislation, in both cases not only the experience but also the ethnic and territorial belonging of the claimants was taken into account (§141 of the BEG and §11 of the LAG).¹³⁹ In other words, a basic concept of the BEG (and obviously the LAG too) was that only ‘Germans’ should receive restitution.¹⁴⁰ This had two somewhat curious and unforeseen consequences. First, this meant that German-speaking victims were in a better position to claim reparations and that, as others have shown, victims claiming compensation were often required to demonstrate closeness to the culture of their tormentors.¹⁴¹ Second, since in both cases conceptions of victimhood and ethnicity played a role, there was significant terminological overlap (for instance, between ‘expellee’ (LAG) and ‘expellee persecutee’ (BEG)). There was therefore also potential for BEG claimants to feel that they were also entitled to claim via the LAG.

Indeed, although after the Second World War ‘expellee’ had rapidly become a synonym for ‘ethnic German expelled from Eastern Europe’, from a legal point of view, ‘expulsion’ and ‘expellee’ had relatively broad definitions.¹⁴² First came a territorial reference – namely, originating in ‘areas of expulsion’ (*Vertreibungsgebiete*). These included all areas that had belonged to the German Reich or the Austro-Hungarian monarchy as of January 1914 or later to Poland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and to the Soviet

Union, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania and China – that is, most communist states. Then, a number of points explained what *Vertreibung* (lit.: ‘expulsion’ or ‘driving out’) was supposed to mean. These conditions included the forced relocations approved at Potsdam, as well as ‘resettlement’ (*Umsiedlung*) beforehand. However, it also referred to ‘flight’ – a rather vague idea – reflecting a concern not to exclude individuals who had left Germany after the Nazis had come to power. The first point thus included those who had left after 30 January 1933 ‘as a result of political opposition to National Socialism or because they were subject to or threatened by National Socialist persecution on the grounds of race, faith or beliefs’, and the victims of National Socialism were thereby included in the official definition of ‘expellee’. This created what has been described as a ‘legal fiction’, opening the door to applications for compensation on behalf of so-called ‘fictive expellees’ who had in fact been victims of the Nazis.¹⁴³ Although being both a victim of Nazism and of the expulsions was quasi-impossible, the legislation made this legally feasible and hence created the categories of ‘Jewish expellee’ and ‘Jewish ethnic German migrant’ (*jüdische Aussiedler*).

In turn, the ‘ethnocultural’ dimension of the definition of ‘expellee’ was left open to interpretation. Created in the context of the need to integrate millions of ethnic Germans – many of whom had never been German citizens – into Germany after the war, it was intended as a synonym of the Nazi concept of *Volksdeutscher*. However, due to the concept’s well-known ‘overtones of blood and race’, the definition of *Volkszugehörigkeit* used after the war and included in §116a of the Basic Law (Grundgesetz) did not make this as clear as this suggests.¹⁴⁴ Paragraph number 6 of the Federal Law on Expellees (Bundesvertriebnengesetz (BVFG)) explained: ‘From a legal perspective, a German member of the people is someone who commits themselves [lit. “confesses” (*sich bekennen*)] to “German culture” [*Volkstum*] insofar as this commitment is confirmed by markers such as descent, language, education and culture.’¹⁴⁵ However, as it would not have been reasonable to require victims of the Nazis to display ‘a commitment to German culture’, the ethnocultural dimension had two permutations. While the LAG relied on the concept of *Volkszugehörigkeit* (‘ethnic belonging’, ‘ethnic nationality’ or literally ‘membership to the people’),¹⁴⁶ the BEG relied on the slightly different notion of belonging to the *deutscher Sprach- und Kulturkreis* (German linguistic and cultural sphere; hereinafter DSK). The BEG stated that ‘an explicit commitment to German culture is not a condition for belonging to the German linguistic and cultural sphere’. This condition was different from the LAG, which required ‘the explicit commitment’. The distinction was therefore a matter of objective and subjective disposition or, in other words, a matter of active practice and performance of Germanness versus a passive claim to Germanness.

Of course, the fluidity of these terms was at odds with the rigidity with which the law was implemented in practice. This rigidity had several causes, and the case of Bukovina offers a unique illustration of the problems. The first was the reluctance and pusillanimity with which the question of reparations for the victims of National Socialism was approached in general.¹⁴⁷ Indeed, if these definitions were the basis on which millions of expellees, including Bukovinian Germans, almost immediately benefited from generous LAG compensation, they were used to reject outright the claims of thousands of ‘non-German persecutees’, including many Bukovinian Jews. The second, however, was the persistence of narrow and exclusive understandings of German culture and belonging. Since the existence of Bukovinian Germans as a group was acknowledged, there could be no doubt that Bukovina was indeed a *Vertreibungsgebiet*, an ‘area of expulsion’, but some other elements meant that Bukovinian Jews were considered ‘doubtful cases’ (*Zweifelsfälle*) and thus subject to deliberation. This included whether Bukovinian Jews had been ‘expelled’ from their homeland (or left voluntarily), whether West Germany could be held accountable for the persecution of Bukovinian Jews at all, since it had happened at the hands of the Romanians, and, last but not least, their Germanness – whether they belonged to the ‘German linguistic and cultural sphere’ (DSK) and later, for those who applied for compensation via the LAG, to the ‘German people’ (*deutsche Volkszugehörigkeit*).

Not only did compensation laws include a range of conditions, for example, concerning residency and deadlines, but they were also subject to different interpretations, which led to continuous additions and amendments. As Jannis Panagiotidis, for example, explains:

In theory, being ‘of the Mosaic faith’ did not prejudice or preclude belonging to German culture [*Volkstum*]. Yet a 1958 commentary to the Federal Expellee Law added a restrictive condition: ‘Those Jews cannot be considered German Volkszugehörige who belonged to a separate minority which existed alongside the German minority (like, for example, in Galicia and Romania).’¹⁴⁸

The result was that although after 1962, Bukovinian Jews could claim compensation for imprisonment (*Freiheitsentzug*), they could still not claim for damage to their life, work and health like other Jewish victims, let alone for lost property and goods, something that was not covered by the BEG. Only in 1966, after a decade-long battle, was a wholesale territorial principle introduced by which Bukovina obtained the status of ‘linguistic island’ (*Sprachinsel*) for the purposes of the BEG, and applicants’ requirement to prove their belonging to the DSK on a case-by-case basis lifted. Not until 1970 was the reference to belonging to the German *Volk* removed from conditions to qualify as an expellee for the purposes of the LAG.¹⁴⁹ As for the

question of responsibility, only in 1965 (§43 of the 1965 BEG-Schlussgesetz (Final Act)) was the law amended to state that from the spring of 1941 onwards, racist measures in the states of Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary had been implemented under German influence (*Zeitpunkt für den Beginn der deutschen Veranlassung*).¹⁵⁰ Therefore, only from then on were Jews who had been subject to persecution in these countries after April 1941 theoretically entitled to make a claim to the German authorities and benefit from German reparations.

Contesting Germanness

In time, compensation claims thus became the object of vivid and ongoing contests. A triangular relationship developed between the Jewish claimants (backed by their lawyers and representatives of the community, and later the Claims Conference, the United Restitution Organization (URO) and staff of the Israeli Ministry of Finance), the West German compensation authorities and members of the informal 'Homeland Information Bureau for Romania' (Heimatauskunftstelle Rumänien; hereinafter HAS_t) – an advisory body composed of members of the Bukovinian German Landsmannschaft. Indeed, in 1953, when the HAS_t had been created, its purpose had been to check the authenticity and veracity of LAG applications with regard to the extent of material losses of individual ethnic German expellees living in West Germany. However, over the course of the late 1950s and 1960s, they were increasingly called upon to take a position on the background and credentials of people seeking to emigrate from Romania as 'ethnic Germans' (*Aussiedler*) and thereby making a claim to the status of 'expellee', as well as Jews claiming compensation as Germans or as expellees. Bukovinian Jews' battle for justice and compensation, which had been ongoing since the end of the Second World War, became, during the 1950s and 1960s, a dispute between Bukovinian Germans and Bukovinian Jews.

The HAS_t's members' main task was to issue advisory statements, based on whether they knew the applicant or not and their evaluation of the validity of the information provided, as to the latter's *Volkszugehörigkeit* ('ethnic belonging') and *Vertriebeneneigenschaft* ('expellee status'). However, for them, the situation was clear: Hitler had resettled the region's Germans in 1940 and, echoing the logic of the Nazis at the time, those who had not been resettled were therefore not German. Besides, an expellee was an ethnic German and an ethnic German was a Christian. Apart from in some very rare cases, they did not regard Bukovinian Jews as belonging to the same cultural realm, let alone as entitled to the status of 'expellee of the homeland'.¹⁵¹ As they reiterated in the affidavits they wrote for the compensation authorities,

‘the German group [in Bukovina] had nothing in common with the Jewish group, whether in the folkloric, cultural or political sense. Therefore, there were in Romania no German Jews but, rather, Jews residing in Romania’.¹⁵² In essence, they equated Germanness with belonging to a reified and exclusive ethnic community reminiscent of the National Socialist ‘people’s community’ (*Volksgemeinschaft*). Furthermore, despite the delivery of over fifty judgments regarding German participation in the persecution of the Jews of Romania and Bukovina in West Germany between 1954 and 1970,¹⁵³ they insisted that the Germans and Nazi Germany had no influence over the fate of these people insofar as Romania had been a sovereign state during the war with its own policy towards Jews.¹⁵⁴ There was therefore a fundamental discrepancy between the views of Bukovinian Jews who submitted the claims and those called on to evaluate their applications.

The reports exchanged between the then director of the HAST for Romania, the Transylvanian Saxon Erhard Plesch, and a lawyer employed by the Jewish Bukovinians, Dr I.D. Evian, in 1957 give insight into these split, respective perspectives on the issue of Jewish compensation.¹⁵⁵ The areas of disagreement concerned German responsibility in Bukovina (or rather the lack thereof), the character of Bukovinian Jews’ displacement (whether it constituted expulsion) and finally the question of their Germanness.

Evian emphatically insisted on the necessity and righteousness of the recognition of Bukovinian Jews as expellees by emphasizing their Germanness, their suffering at the hands of both the Romanians *and* the Germans, and their unique contribution to the Germanness of the region as members of the urban and educated middle class. He even argued that their displacement was caused ‘by the confiscation of the German-European cultural spirit and their determination to chase after it’.¹⁵⁶ Yet, Plesch countered every single one of these arguments in turn. He made the point that Romanian antisemitism had deep roots that bore no relation to Nazism. He also argued that the fact that Jews had been allowed to leave Romania for Israel after the war not only proved they had not been ‘expelled’, but also that they were not German, since ethnic Germans were not allowed to leave Romania in this period. His main argument concerned the fact that Jews had constituted a ‘national minority’ in their own right in Bukovina. According to him, despite their widespread proficiency in German as their ‘language of everyday use’ (*Umgangssprache*), their native language was the Yiddish ‘jargon’.¹⁵⁷

Finally, drawing on a mixture of philosemitic and antisemitic arguments, Plesch retorted that: ‘The existence of a Jewish culture, a culture a few millennia older than the German one, which was consciously cultivated, both massively by those speaking jargon or by the smaller percentage of the German-speakers, is not mentioned. If it manifested itself religiously during the liberal Austrian period, the Jews became a nation around the

turn of the century.¹⁵⁸ From his perspective, therefore, only a tiny fraction of Bukovinian Jews could be considered German – namely, those who had converted, intermarried or were members of ethnic German institutions or German fraternities. He also argued that the town's 17,000 ethnic Germans had been the cornerstone of Czernowitz/Cernăuți's German character. On this basis, Plesch underscored his duty to take a position as representative of the expellee organizations and oppose the application of Bukovinian Jews as expellees both on the basis of the BEG and the LAG.¹⁵⁹

This argumentation did not settle the dispute. Both sides proceeded in mobilizing further historical sources and arguments for their purposes and sending these to the compensation authorities as evidence. The Jews quoted the former German envoy in Cernăuți, the Consul General Fritz Schellhorn (a figure many Bukovinian Germans admired), who had argued in a report dating from 1937 that 'cultural life [in Cernăuți] was completely dominated by the Jews' and that the city 'would never have maintained the character of a German town without the Jews'.¹⁶⁰ The Germans, in turn, pointed to the census of 1930, when the vast majority of the Jews had declared that Yiddish was their mother tongue rather than German. However, Bukovinian Jews countered this with an appeal from the Zionist *Ostjüdische Zeitung* dating from 24 December 1930, calling on the Jews to declare Yiddish as their mother tongue for the sake of Jewish representation in the face of growing Romanization.¹⁶¹ Besides, they drew attention to the census of 1910, when 70% of Jews had declared that their mother tongue was German and stressed that they had not had Yiddish schools and had rejected assimilation to Romania.¹⁶²

Finally, Bukovinian Jews pointed out that their 'belonging to the German linguistic and cultural sphere' was not only something of the past. In 1962, some of the applicants' lawyers forwarded to Plesch an invitation in German to the Hebronia student organization summer party and emphasized that it was not taking place in Vienna in 1913 but in Tel Aviv in 1960.¹⁶³ In April 1965, members of the Landsmannschaft of Bukovinian Jews wrote a seven-page letter to the district representative in Cologne, in which they stated:

Today we have a large Bukovinian Landsmannschaft in Israel and we have Bukovinian Landsmannschaften in New York, Montreal, in Sao Paulo, Buenos Aires and Santiago, in Sydney and Melbourne and many other parts of the world. Everywhere they have brought their German linguistic and cultural sphere with them. At the social events of all the Landsmannschaften, presentations and speeches are given in German, the protocols of the meetings of these organizations are carried out in German, and it is certainly not a superficial sign of our belonging if we point out that still today – a quarter of a century after 1940 – there is a central instrument of Bukovinian organizations that is published in German, the newspaper *Die Stimme*, which appears in Tel Aviv and cannot be unknown to you.¹⁶⁴

They concluded that ‘German language and culture had no role to play in the crimes of the Third Reich against our people’. Nonetheless, there could hardly be any better evidence of a genuine ‘commitment to Germanness’ than Jews who continued to use German despite and after what they had been through.¹⁶⁵

Eventually, the authorities decided to call upon the expertise of historians and a series of reports (*Gutachten*) were requested from the Institute for Contemporary History (Institut für Zeitgeschichte – IfZ) in Munich. The question of German responsibility for Bukovinian Jews’ ‘expulsion’ was settled in 1958, at least for northern Bukovina. Nazi Germany was said to have exerted considerable influence on Romania, and the imposition of the yellow star was to be considered a ‘*Vertreibungsmaßnahme*’ (a measure amounting to expulsion). Further, the report read that:

It must, therefore, be said that the Third Reich bears a general co-responsibility for the Romanian policy towards Jews in the years 1940–44 because it was a stronger power [*überlegene Großmacht*] and did not limit itself to exploiting the political, military and economic potential of its subordinate allies but also *authoritatively* elevated the persecution and excision of the Jews into a central feature of the European new order and used it as a measure of Romanian loyalty and allegiance.¹⁶⁶

According to the historians, then, the German state shared the responsibility for the persecution of northern Bukovinian Jews.

A second report, dating from 1963 and written by the later Director of the IfZ, Martin Broszat, and entitled ‘The National Cultural and National Political Character and Development of the Bukovinian Jewry before 1933’, tackled the issue of the Germanness of Bukovinian Jews.¹⁶⁷ Broszat set out to establish whether the concept of *Volkszugehörigkeit* as defined in §6 of the BVFG could be applied to the German-speaking Jewry in Bukovina. In other words, he debated the existence of a separate Jewish national minority in Bukovina and the degree and prevalence of Jewish assimilation to German culture in the region. In this paper, he acknowledged the specific historical conditions under which the census of 1930 had taken place and recognized the historical contingency of the notions of *Volkstum* and *Kulturkreis*, as well as the arbitrariness of their definitions. However, he nevertheless adopted a very narrow stance. He argued that the DSK could only be applied to around 60% of Jewish Bukovinians. With this, he meant those of the older generation, born before 1910, who had been less exposed to Zionism and Bundism and had been educated in German. With regard to actual ‘belonging to the German people’ or German ‘ethnic nationality’ (*Volkszugehörigkeit*), he considered that only about 620 of those who had not declared Yiddish as

their mother tongue in the census of 1930 – namely, around 5% of the Bukovinian Jewry – could be included in this category.

Therefore, Broszat's report did not resolve the issue either. For one thing, it was interpreted differently by the two sides: the HAsT focused on the narrow definition of ethnic belonging and continued to underscore the validity of the census of 1930.¹⁶⁸ From their perspective, Broszat had endorsed their view, as he had stated that, any 'Jewish, German *Volkszugehörige*' would have been known to members of the German minority. The Jews, in turn, highlighted the fact that Broszat had ascribed the majority of the Jews of Bukovina to the DSK, refusing to acknowledge the difference between this and 'ethnic nationality'. But, in effect, Broszat's conclusions perpetuated the distinction between the conditions for the BEG and the conditions for the BVFG or the LAG, namely, that a passive 'belonging to the DSK' fell short of an active 'commitment to German culture'. Indeed, although Broszat spoke of a *Deutschtum jüdischer Provenienz* ('German people of Jewish extraction') in the region, he maintained the distinction between the 'claim to' and the 'practice of' Germanness.

This reasoning did not prevent 'doubtful cases' from multiplying and from the early to mid 1960s onwards, they grew exponentially. An ever-larger number of Bukovinian Jews started claiming compensation for their property and material losses (*Hausratsentschädigung*) that were not covered by the BEG in its version for 'foreign Jews', by claiming via the LAG as 'expellees' (*Vertriebene*) and therefore German *Volkszugehörige*. Since the forms were not even designed for their purposes, the result was often incongruous. Applicants were, for example, required to choose from three kinds of damage: 'East damage', 'war damage' or 'expulsion damage' (i.e. flight, eviction or resettlement), but not from 'National Socialist persecution' or 'deportation'. Everything in the form revolved around a non-Jewish, German experience of the war. Applicants were, for instance, asked to provide their address as of December 1944 or the date of their resettlement (*Zeitpunkt der Umsiedlung*). The implication was that the suffering had been at the hands of the Soviets in the midst of the Wehrmacht's retreat. Reflecting the confusion, one Jewish applicant wrote in his affidavit: 'My claim results from damage caused by National Socialist persecution ...', before crossing out the word 'National' so that all that remained was 'Socialist persecution'.¹⁶⁹ In general, Jews' explanations concerning persecution – expropriation, ghettoization, deportation – often fitted awkwardly in the spaces available. Capturing understandable exasperation, one applicant completed the section introduced with the words 'The damage occurred through ...' with the statement 'complete abandonment with deportation' (*durch im Stiche gelassen bei der Deportation*).¹⁷⁰ This practical hindrance only added to the absurd character of the entire procedure.

Enhancing the Kafkaesque character of the scenario was that stakeholders with antagonistic views and goals were involved in the process of deliberation. Until the introduction of the territorial principle, the applications of Bukovinian Jews were considered on an individual basis. It was up to the Israeli authorities (up until 1965, the Ministry of Finance) processing the claims to take a position as to applicants' 'expellee status' and cultural belonging. As José Brunner and Iris Nachum, who analysed these sources, argue, the Israelis assumed that anyone whose mother tongue was German belonged to the 'German cultural sphere'. A language test was therefore deemed sufficient. And since, from their perspective, an applicant could belong to several 'cultural spheres' at once, they approved and forwarded most of the applications.¹⁷¹ But the final decision rested with regional West German authorities (the regional *Ausgleichsamt* or the *Amt für Wiedergutmachung*). Not only did the positions and decisions vary across regional offices, but they also tended to adopt a more exclusive and monolithic understanding of culture: 'the belonging to the German linguistic and cultural sphere prevented the connection to another people'.¹⁷² As such, for these authorities, proficiency in German was not enough and belonging to another culture acted as a disqualification.

Another similar misunderstanding underlay Jewish applications to the LAG. If, from the perspective of German lawmakers, the distinction between belonging to the DSK and *Volkszugehörigkeit* was key to differentiating between claims via the BEG and the LAG, it was largely lost on Jewish applicants, as evidenced by the fact that some would write 'belonging to the German linguistic sphere' in response to *Volkszugehörigkeit* on the form.¹⁷³ Moreover, many supported their claim to the status of 'expellee', not with a number from a *Vertriebenenausweis* (expellee identification card) as expected, but with the file number of their previously successful claim for damage to their person filed under the BEG. They also justified their claim to 'ethnic nationality' in a similar way as they had previously justified their belonging to the DSK: speaking German at home, regularly reading in German or attending a German-language school. However, for the authorities, this was not sufficient: 'Ethnic nationality' required 'full assimilation' and 'speaking German' was regarded as 'neutral from an ethnic standpoint' (*volkstumsneutral*). Yet, the subjective and performative dimensions of *Volkszugehörigkeit* were difficult to establish for the authorities too. Witnesses were called upon, but the criteria they used varied significantly. In some cases, it was a matter of 'spending time in German company'; in others, of having 'shared with a third party the will to belong exclusively to the German people and be treated as a German';¹⁷⁴ in others still, it required 'marriage with a German' or 'study at a university in Germany, Austria or Prague'.¹⁷⁵ Ultimately, however, both the DSK and *Volkszugehörigkeit* relied on the same objective criteria: language, culture, sphere and belonging. The Israeli authorities thus continued, as with

the DSK, to consider belonging to multiple ethnicities as possible. For this reason, the contentious cases accumulated, and the debates continued.

From the perspective of Bukovinian Germans – and not only them – Bukovinian Jews and others were knowingly committing fraud and distorting the past for this purpose. In 1969, following the publication of a positive review of Hugo Gold's book in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (FAZ), none other than the man the Jews so eagerly quoted as a reference for their Germanness, the former German Consul General in Romania Fritz Schellhorn, publicly accused Bukovinian Jews of hypocrisy and opportunism for claiming to be Zionists and members of the German cultural sphere at the same time, and for trying to make Germany look responsible or complicit in their persecution for the sake of financial compensation.¹⁷⁶ Some Jews might indeed have put in false or exaggerated claims. Some, for instance, claimed to have belonged to the Jahn sports organization despite the fact that this was highly unlikely and could be confidently refuted by the Bukovinian Germans.¹⁷⁷ Some also tried to join the German Landsmannschaft for the sake of compensation.¹⁷⁸ But the framework of the law itself was confusing and flawed. In turn, the fact that members of the Bukovinian German Landsmannschaft lobbied for years for the rights of Bukovinian Germans who were Austrian citizens to claim compensation in West Germany via the LAG proves that their opposition to Jewish compensation had nothing to do with the financial burden this may have constituted.¹⁷⁹ The principled rejection of Jewish claims was primarily a rejection of responsibility for the war and the Jewish persecution.

Over time, a link was established between recognizing Jewish Germanness, taking responsibility for the past and accepting the verdict of collective guilt. This development came across in the speech given by Rudolf Wagner at the West German national meeting (*Bundestreffen*) of Bukovinian Germans in June 1969. Entitled 'Bukovina: Land of Encounter between Different Cultures and Religions', the speech mentioned Bukovina's Jews, though Wagner kept them until last because, as he explained, 'they were not Christians'. Wagner acknowledged the contribution of the Jews to the region's German culture, but he insisted, echoing Prokopowitsch's thesis, that they had distanced themselves with Zionism. In this sense, 'the National Socialist excesses in Germany in the Romanian period had only caused an acceleration [of the process of separation] but not the fact in itself'. The fact that this 'acceleration' had not constituted a mere cultural gap or distance, but culminated in genocide was conveniently elided, if nevertheless implicit. Indeed, to illustrate his point, Wagner added that the death of the singer Josef Schmidt (a famous Jewish opera singer from Bukovina who died in a refugee camp in Switzerland in 1942) was 'deplorable', but 'it [could] not be put on Bukovinian Germans' tab'. Viewed in such a narrow way, responsibility could

indeed be evaded. He concluded: ‘The German-Jewish symbiosis became history because it already no longer existed in that location.’¹⁸⁰ While this was all but a concession, it reflected both how the process of reparation and reckoning was understood, and the growing sense of self-consciousness and need for justification among many non-Jewish West Germans.

For Bukovinian Jews, the process of demanding compensation was transformative too. The length and character of the procedure was a source of outrage, disappointment and dismay. Some believed that Germany was hoping for a so-called biological solution to the problem, as people often died before their claims were settled. As some scholars have argued, this whole process may also have been a source of retraumatization.¹⁸¹ The case of Bukovinians certainly resonates with Ralph Giordano’s concept of ‘second guilt’ and Regula Ludi’s argument that the errors of compensation had, if inadvertently, magnified the wrongs.¹⁸² To many Bukovinian Jews, the process was at the very least humiliating and, later, many said they had never submitted claims for this very reason. As Meier Teich stated in his 1961 book on compensation, in which he pleaded for a revision of the Luxemburg Agreement, ‘we stand as beggars at the door of the Germans’.¹⁸³ Similarly, in a memorandum sent to the Office of the Chancellery in the 1960s, Elias Weinstein, at the time the head of the Association of Jewish Immigrants from Bukovina in Israel, argued that ‘there is no legal, moral or financial reason to treat us differently to any of the other persecuted groups. On the contrary: the collective judgement presents an unfathomable wrong’.¹⁸⁴ These feelings repeatedly found expression in *Die Stimme*, which was dominated by this topic throughout the 1960s. Experts attempted to make sense of the regulations, defined and redefined ‘expellee’, ‘expulsion’, ‘DSK’ and ‘*Volkstum*’, and the conditions for making claims for the benefit of their readers. In the 1960s, a group of Jews from Eastern Europe even founded their own Landsmannschaft in West Germany in order to defend their rights.¹⁸⁵

The process of compensation left an imprint in other ways too. In 1970, the author of a long cover article in *Die Stimme* entitled ‘Life without a Homeland’ (‘Leben ohne Heimat’) contested the use of the word ‘immigrant’ to describe the situation of Jews in Israel, since this suggested that their displacement had been voluntary and they were merely trying their luck elsewhere. On the contrary, they argued, they had been forced to leave and had been technically ‘refugees’ (*Flüchtlinge*) and ‘expellees’ (*Vertriebene*) even before they were expelled (*vor der Vertreibung*).¹⁸⁶ Not only was this quite different from the Zionist narrative of Israel as a land of immigrants and settlers, but it also showed how they adopted and appropriated West German terminology to rethink their situation. Moreover, with the centrality of the question of identity, the irony was, of course, that decades of protest had indeed reinforced Bukovinian Jews’ ‘commitment’ to their Germanness. In

effect, Bukovinian Jews came to think of themselves with ever more conviction as standing for the German humanist tradition versus the *völkisch* mentality associated with the figure of *Turnvater Jahn* and their opponents in the process. It strengthened their sense of distinction from Bukovinian Germans or other ethnic German migrants from Eastern Europe with their flawed German language skills.¹⁸⁷ As an article in *Die Stimme* in 1963 stated:

Who went to the German theatre? The Germans from Rosch [a village outside of Czernowitz] – or the Jews of Czernowitz? To whom did the Romanian government forbid the use of German? ... No serious German scholar or cultural expert would contest the belonging of even the less educated Bukovinian Jews to the German intellectual world. The whole truth must for once be told: with the exception of a ridiculous minority of Germans from the West who were ‘sent’ to Bukovina, the majority of the Germans in the province at best belonged to the linguistic sphere and, even then, not all of them, while the majority of the Jews belonged to the German linguistic *and* cultural sphere.¹⁸⁸

The author then went on to quote Goethe, Hölderlin, Schoppenhauer and even Nietzsche, and to mention Buber, Rosenzweig and Einstein. In the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, West Germany featured ever more prominently in *Die Stimme*. On some level, this was a watchful eye, but on another, it reflected an interest in ‘the right kind of German’, a search for a cultural home and a welcoming of West Germany’s democratic development.

Starting in the 1960s, an increasing number of Bukovinian Jews emigrating from Romania also chose West Germany over Israel. While this certainly had to do with the Six-Day War, it also reflected a growing faith in Germany’s democracy and the lessening taboo about Jewish immigration to this country.¹⁸⁹ This migration was made possible by the recognition of Jews as *Aussiedler* (ethnic German migrants), which derived from their classification as *Vertriebene* and *Volkszugehörige*, and therefore their recognition as part of the German people, governed by the same rules as compensation. In turn, these developments and their tangible consequences also forced non-Jewish Germans to reconsider their own ‘identity politics’. As other historians have argued, German–Jewish–Israeli relations were a decade-long ‘learning process’ in which the issue of reparations was central.¹⁹⁰ It was only a matter of time before ‘being the right kind of German’ also meant defending the cause of Jewish claimants in Germany too. Therefore, with a substantial delay, change did occur. The guidelines the compensation authorities received in March 1980 stated that Judaism was a marker of faith rather than nationality, that Zionism should not be a criterion of exclusion and that one should be careful not to apply the ‘National Socialist definition of culture and belonging in contemporary Germany’.¹⁹¹ The same document also reminded the administration that the HASt merely had an advisory role

and that a non-Christian name, immigration to Israel or non-participation in Hitler's 1940 resettlement did not constitute sufficient grounds to disqualify a claimant.

This clarification is indicative of both the recognition of the impossibility of defining Germanness in any definitive manner and of the growing sense of unease among Germans surrounding the use of an exclusive concept of Germanness for the implementation of compensation or immigration policies. Enacting such change was not easy. Indeed, as Günther Hockerts has argued:

The legal figure of the 'damaged national' was judicially fuzzy and is historically questionable, because a particular cause of persecution, 'nationality', could hardly be separated from the racist or political context of the National Socialist regime of occupation in Eastern Europe.¹⁹²

Yet, if the terms of the debate could not be altered, their use and interpretation, at least, could. By the mid 1980s, the absurdities of the compensation process were being publicly discussed.¹⁹³ In 1988, an article on the case of a Jewish *Aussiedler* in a major West German paper was not only remarkably empathetic, but also took the use of the notion of 'Jewish ethnic German' for granted.¹⁹⁴ In the same year, the Berlin Regional Authorities appealed to a professor of law from Darmstadt to advise on the case of a Romanian Jew asking to be recognized as an *Aussiedler* and hence a *Vertriebener*. As the professor put it in the conclusion to his advisory report, in the strict legal sense, being a German from Romania required sharing the typical fate of an ethnic German. Yet, he challenged the authorities, as he put it, 'in the interest of German culture and the German cultural nation' to tolerate this interpretation and to put it into practice.¹⁹⁵ This statement reflected the extent of the shift not so much in the law itself, but in the modalities and context of its enforcement.

Conclusion

During the Cold War, Bukovina became the object of both heightened idealization and increasingly virulent contestation. The self-understandings of Bukovinian Jews and Bukovinian Germans – as Jews, Germans and Bukovinians – derived from their attempts to construct belonging in their respective new homelands in the first decade after the war and resulted in highly ethnicized and exclusive visions of the region's past. Human losses featured ever less prominently in these accounts, and the focus was increasingly on the Habsburg and interwar periods, which they had in common. However, perceptions of what was lost, in either case, were very different.

For the Germans, it was a German-dominated Europe and national pride. For the Jews, in contrast, the loss was that of towns bustling with Jewish life, German-Jewish Central European culture and a Europe in which Jews had a place and a home. Not only were these different visions, but explaining how such ‘losses’ had occurred – and certainly compensating for them – made the acknowledgement of the other perspective virtually impossible. As Anthony Kauders has argued, while most Germans accepted criminal and individual guilt, they did not accept moral guilt.¹⁹⁶ And yet this dimension – the endurance of antisemitism in West German society at large – was precisely what Bukovinian Jews expected Germans in general and Bukovinian Germans in particular to acknowledge and ‘make good’.

For a time, radically different visions of the region and the past coexisted with only sporadic interaction between the two groups. Yet, the antagonism was soon revealed and concretized within the framework of policies of material indemnification for the losses, damages and persecution incurred and experienced during the war. This process opposed representatives of Bukovinian Jews and Bukovinian Germans directly. In the beginning, West German legal practice reflected the narrow conceptions of Germanness and responsibility propagated by Bukovinian Germans after the Second World War. In particular, it equated German culture with German ethnicity. In turn, policies shaped mentalities by officially condoning a reading of history that was apologetic and discriminatory. Challenges to this attitude were linked to generational changes and were slow in coming. But the process of deliberation surrounding this issue also induced change and was transformative for all of those involved. If the Landsmannschaften became increasingly isolated and associated with their own interest groups, this episode nevertheless clarified their purpose and orientation. The focus of the Landsmannschaft in Israel became the defence of German-Jewishness in an ever more self-assured Israel. In turn, the radicalism of the rhetoric of the German Bukovinian Landsmannschaft decreased over time as the mood among the West German public grew increasingly self-conscious and contrite. Ultimately, both organizations moved away from politics and turned to culture.

Notes

1. Letter from Georg Drozdowski to Alfred Gong, 20 June 1964. The letter has been published in full in N. Shchyhlevska, *Verschränkungen: Leben und Werk von Autoren aus der Bukowina anhand von Briefen und Nachlässe* (Aachen: Rimbaud Verlag, 2011), 52–55.
2. Letter from Georg Drozdowski to Alfred Gong, 1 August 1964, published in Shchyhlevska. *Verschränkungen*, 56–58.

3. Shchyhlevska, *Verschränkungen*, 60, 64.
4. This was the Theodor-Körner-Preis; see *ibid.*, 50.
5. This resonates with Andrew Demshuk's concept of 'Heimat of memory' as well as Florence Heymann's notion of Bukovina and Czernowitz as vanished, nonplaces for the Jews after the war. See A. Demshuk, *The Lost German East Forced Migration and the Politics of Memory, 1945–1970* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014); and F. Heymann, *Le Crépuscule des Lieux: Identités Juives de Czernowitz* (Paris: Stock, 2003).
6. E. Keightley and M. Pickering, *The Mnemonic Imagination: Remembering as Creative Practice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 113.
7. See M. Meng, *Shattered Spaces: Encountering Jewish Ruins in Postwar Germany and Poland* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 221; M. Hirsch and L. Spitzer, "We Would Not Have Come without You": Generations of Nostalgia', in K. Hodgkin and S. Radstone (eds), *Contested Pasts: The Politics of Memory* (London: Routledge, 2014), 79–96, here 82.
8. See M. Kammen quoted in S. Boym, *The Future of Nostalgia* (New York: Basic Books, 2001), xiv. See also F. Davis, *Yearning for Yesterday: A Sociology of Nostalgia* (New York: Free Press, 1979).
9. See 'Kollektivschuldthese', in T. Fischer and M.N. Lorenz (eds), *Lexikon der 'Vergangenheitsbewältigung' in Deutschland: Debatten- und Diskursgeschichte des Nationalsozialismus nach 1945* (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2015), 45–49. Most famously, the social psychologists Alexander and Margarete Mitscherlich spoke of Germans' 'inability to mourn': A. Mitscherlich and M. Mitscherlich, *Die Unfähigkeit zu trauern* (Munich: Piper, 1968). This is a contested thesis, but Aleida Assmann, for example, has argued that the period 1945–57 was characterized by 'communicative silencing' and a rejection of memory. See A. Assmann and U. Frevert, *Geschichtsvergessenheit Geschichtsversessenheit: Vom Umgang mit deutschen Vergangenheiten nach 1945* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt), especially 143–44.
10. H. Süßner, 'Still Yearning for the Lost Heimat? Ethnic German Expellees and the Politics of Belonging', *German Politics and Society* 22(2) (2004), 1–26, here 7, 8.
11. N. Frei, *Adenauer's Germany and the Nazi Past: The Politics of Amnesty and Integration*, translated from German by J. Gold (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 311.
12. On this, see I. Zertal, *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). See also Frei, *Adenauer's Germany*; and Frank Stern, who also argues that German–Jewish relations were a foreign policy factor: F. Stern, *The Whitewashing of the Yellow Badge: Antisemitism and Philosemitism in Postwar Germany* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1992), 334. On the relationship with each other, see D. Diner, *Ritueller Distanz: Israels deutsche Frage* (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2015); and J. Hestermann, *Inszenierte Versöhnung: Reisediplomatie und die deutsch-israelischen Beziehungen von 1957 bis 1984* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2016). Diplomatic relations between West Germany and Israel were officially established in 1965.
13. See e.g. 'Die alte Heimat: eine wahre Hölle – Reisende berichten über das Leben im heutigen volksdemokratischen Rumänien', in *Der Südostdeutsche*, August 1956, or the summary of a talk entitled 'Czernowitz heute', *Bukovina Bulletin* 4 (New York: Bucovinaer Cultural Society, March 1968); for the GDR, see A. Haupt, *Meine Reise in die alte Heimat: Erinnerungen* (Eichwalde: Raku Verlag, 2007). This resonates with the findings of Demshuk, *The Lost German East*, who develops the concept of 'the Heimat transformed'.
14. 'Zehn Jahre', *Die Stimme*, August 1954.

15. H. Prelitsch (ed.), *10 Jahre Landsmannschaft der Buchenlanddeutschen 1949–1959: Gründung, Werdegang und Jubiläum* (Munich: Landsmannschaft der Buchenlanddeutschen, 1959).
16. Rudolf Wagner described 'the pre-Landsmannschaft period' (*die vorlandsmannschaftliche Zeit*) as 'the hardest period in the life of German resettlers from Bukovina' since 1945; R. Wagner, 'Die vorlandsmannschaftliche Zeit', in Prelitsch, *10 Jahre Landsmannschaft*, 7–9.
17. P. Blaß, 'Vorwort', in C. Armbrüster, *Deutsch-Satulmare: Geschichte eines buchenländischen Pfälzlerdorfes* (Karlsruhe: n.p., 1962).
18. 'Unsere Leser schreiben', *Die Stimme*, September–October 1961.
19. H. Sternberg, *Zur Geschichte der Juden in Czernowitz* (Tel Aviv: Olamenu, 1962).
20. F. Wiszbiowski, 'Foreword', in F. Wiszbiowski, *Radautz: die deutscheste Stadt des Buchenlandes* (Waiblingen: F. Wiszbiowski, 1966).
21. Wiszbiowski, *Radautz*, 306.
22. E. Massier (ed.), *Fratautz und die Fratautzer: Vom Werden und Vergehen einer deutschen Dorfgemeinschaft in der Bukowina* (Pleutersbach: n.p., 1957).
23. M. Rubinstein (Ben Saar), *Der jüdische Vatikan in Sadagora 1850–1950*, vol. 1: *Werdegang und Glanzzeit 1850–1914. Historische Notizen, Humoresken und Lieder* (Tel Aviv: Verlag Olamenu, 1955); vol. 2: *Auf den Trümmern des Vatikans 1914–1950: Invasionskalender, Humoresken, Lieder* (Tel Aviv: Verlag Olamenu, 1958), here vol. 1, 3.
24. The first volume dealt with the period 1850–1914 and the second volume with 1914–50. In Gold's case, the cutting date was 1939. See H. Gold (ed.), *Geschichte der Juden in der Bukowina: ein Sammelwerk*, 2 vols (Tel Aviv: Olamenu, 1958; 1962).
25. See e.g. 'Festkommers der "Hebroniah": Aus Anlass des 120. Semesters seit Gründung der Verbindung', *Die Stimme*, January 1961.
26. Rubinstein, *Vatikan*, vol. 2, 78.
27. *Ibid.*, 79.
28. 'Nicht Vergessen!', in *ibid.*, 90–91.
29. See, for instance, M. Rubinstein, 'Infiltrantenmörde und das Welt-Gewissen', in *ibid.*, 88; Emma Ausländer, 'Der gelbe Stern', in *ibid.*, 93.
30. See A. Wieviorka and I. Niborski, *Les Livres du Souvenir : Mémoires Juifs de Pologne* (Paris: Gallimard/Julliard, 1983), 171.
31. Dan Miron, quoted in *ibid.*, 140.
32. Wieviorka and Niborski, *Les Livres du Souvenir*, 55.
33. See J. Faehndrich, *Eine endliche Geschichte: Die Heimatbücher der deutschen Vertriebenen* (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2011), 40.
34. *Ibid.*, 228.
35. H. Prelitsch, *Student in Czernowitz: Die Korporationen an der Czernowitzer Universität* (Munich: Landsmannschaft der Buchenlanddeutschen, 1961).
36. E. Massier, J. Talsky and B.C. Grigorowicz (eds), *Bukowina: Heimat von gestern* (Karlsruhe: Arbeitskreis Bukowina Heimatbuch, 1956), 316.
37. *Ibid.*, 15.
38. Wiszbiowski, *Radautz*, 306.
39. J.C. Dressler, *Illischestie: Chronik der Bukowiner Landgemeinde* (Freilassing: Pannonia-Verlag, 1960), 553.
40. Dressler, *Illischestie*, 553.
41. Blaß, 'Vorwort'.
42. F. Lang, 'Vorwort', in F. Lang (ed.), *Buchenland: hundertfünfzig Jahre Deutschtum in der Bukowina* Lang (Munich: Verlag des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerks, 1961), 2.

43. Ibid., 2.
44. Assmann and Frevert, *Geschichtsvergessenheit Geschichtsversessenheit*, 140. Interestingly, this quote was used in the adverts for the book too. See e.g. *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 2, October 1961.
45. On this, see H. Prelitsch, 'Student in Czernowitz. Die Korporationen an der Czernowitzer Universität', in Lang, *Buchenland*, 357–80.
46. Lang, *Buchenland*, 45–47, 512–13.
47. One of the few exceptions is J. Fisher, *Transnistria: The Forgotten Cemetery* (South Brunswick, NJ: T. Yosseloff, 1969). However, it is worth noting that this small book was published in the United States, in English, with a small print run.
48. On this, see Archiv der Akademie der Künste, Vorlass Edgar Hilsenrath, 790. See also 'Grauen im Ghetto', *Der Spiegel* no. 36, 1978.
49. Rezzori prided himself on being of mixed descent and was allegedly stateless for many years after the war. On this, see C. Spinei, *Über die Zentralität des Peripheren: Auf den Spuren von Gregor von Rezzori* (Berlin: Frank und Timme, 2011), especially 25–28.
50. An English translation appeared in 1962: G. von Rezzori, *Tales of Maghrebina*, translated from German by C. Hutter (San Diego: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962). It was reviewed in a major German daily: 'Ein Maghrebiniere', *Die Zeit*, 16 April 1953. On the parodying, see A. Corbea-Hojsie, 'Gedächtnisort Maghrebiniere: Eine Lesehypothese', in M. Csáki and P. Stachel (eds), *Die Verortung von Gedächtnis* (Vienna: Passagen Verlag, 2001), 151–62.
51. G. von Rezzori, *Oedipus siegt bei Stalingrad: Ein Kolportageroman* (Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1954). This book was also reviewed in *Die Zeit*: 'Oedipus siegt bei Stalingrad: Gregor von Rezzoris "Kolportageroman"', *Die Zeit*, 2 December 1954.
52. *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 1, June 1955, also published in: F. Lang, 'Sprache und Literatur der Deutschen in der Bukowina', *Südostdeutsche Heimatblätter* 4 (1955), 192–219, here 217–18.
53. G. von Rezzori, *Ein Hermelin in Tschernopol: Ein maghrebiniere Roman* (Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1958).
54. 'Der Idiotenführer', *Der Spiegel* no. 1, 1959.
55. "Maghrebiniere" und die Justiz', *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 1, March 1959; 'Ist Tschernopol identisch mit Czernowitz?', *Die Stimme*, April 1959.
56. W. Zalozieczyi, 'So war Tschernopol', *Die Stimme*, June 1959 and *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 2, August 1959.
57. *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 1, March 1959; L. v. Semaka, 'Schmähen wir nicht die Welt von gestern!', *Die Stimme*, September 1959.
58. See *Die Stimme*, August 1959 and the review by Drozdowski, *Die Stimme*, October 1959.
59. 'Der "väterliche Freund": zwischen Gregor von Rezzori und Dr Wladimir Zalozieczyi', *Die Stimme*, August 1959.
60. W. Kiesler, 'Was erzählt Rezzori über Tschernopol?', *Die Stimme*, March 1959.
61. Rezzori was indeed famous for having once declared on West German TV that 'whatever you try to do with the German youth, its conscience remains to be found in mass graves' and thus led the show host to cut the programme short. 'Der Idiotenführer', *Der Spiegel* no. 1 (1959).
62. E. Beck, *Bukowina: Land zwischen Orient und Okzident* (Freilassing: Pannonia-Verlag, 1963).
63. See e.g. M. Hausleitner, 'Viel Mischmasch mitgenommen': *Die Umsiedlungen aus der Bukowina 1940* (Berlin; Boston: Verlag Walter de Gruyter, 2018), especially 203–45.

64. Beck, *Bukowina*, 5.
65. *Ibid.*, 16.
66. *Ibid.*
67. *Ibid.*, 5.
68. *Ibid.*, 30.
69. *Ibid.*, 20.
70. *Ibid.*, 22.
71. *Ibid.* Although it is not acknowledged as such, this is largely a quote from Karl Emil Franzos.
72. *Ibid.*, 16.
73. *Ibid.*, 47.
74. *Ibid.*, 84.
75. *Ibid.*, 98.
76. *Ibid.*, 96.
77. *Ibid.*, 96, 98.
78. 'Die Bukowina als historisches Vermächtnis – in deutscher Sicht', *Die Stimme*, July 1965.
79. Beck, *Bukowina*, 93
80. *Ibid.*, 39.
81. While this may certainly be true, some of the photographs appear to have been taken by Willy Prager, a photographer who travelled a great deal in Romania before, during and after the war. His photographs are held in the archives in Freiburg: https://www2.landesarchiv-bw.de/ofs21/olf/einfueh.php?bestand=20677#_1 (retrieved 20 September 2019).
82. E. Beck, *Bibliographie zur Landeskunde der Bukowina* (Munich: Verlag des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerkes, 1966). Turczynski later described it as 'multiculturalism in practice'. See 'Vorwort', in E. Beck (ed.), *Bibliographie zur Kultur und Landeskunde 1976–1990* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999–2003). The first volume in particular referenced very few works by Bukovinian Jews. It was nevertheless quite positively reviewed in *Die Stimme*. See 'Zur Landeskunde der Bukowina', *Die Stimme*, May 1967.
83. Beck, *Bukowina*, 18.
84. *Ibid.*, 190.
85. See e.g. *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 2, May 1963.
86. 'Die Presse urteilt über den Bildband "Bukowina"', *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 2, November 1965; Reader Letter, *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 2, March 1968.
87. On this, see P. Ahonen, 'The Impact of Distorted Memory: Historical Narratives and Expellee Integration in West Germany, 1945–1970', in R. Ohliger, K. Schönwälder and T. Triadafilopoulos (eds), *European Encounters: Migrants, Migration and European Societies since 1945* (London: Ashgate, 2003), 236–54.
88. Y.M. Bodemann, 'The Uncanny Clatter: The Holocaust in Germany before its Mass Commemoration', in D. Michman (ed.), *Remembering the Holocaust in Germany 1945–2000: German Strategies and Jewish Responses* (New York: Lang, 2002), 43–54, here 47.
89. Archiv des Bukowina-Instituts, Augsburg (hereinafter BI), Allg. Korrespondenz Bundesverband, 1975: Letter from Erich Beck to the *Landsmannschaft der Buchenlanddeutschen*, 28 June 1975.
90. Wiszbiowski, *Radautz*, 134.
91. Massier et al., *Bukowina: Heimat von gestern*, 249.
92. E. Prokopowitsch, *Die Entwicklung des Pressewesens in der Bukowina* (Vienna: n.p., 1962), 28.

93. Ibid., 40.
94. Ibid.
95. Ibid., 40–41.
96. On Poppenberger in relation to National Socialism, see *Der Tag* no. 819, 25 December 1934. Retrieved 20 September 2019 from <http://dertag.foreworld.com/viewtopic.php?f=40&t=282>. Poppenberger became the chief editor of the *Frankenpost*. On Skrehunetz, see M. Hausleitner, 'Die Geschichte der Bukowina in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts aus der Sicht von Deutschen, Juden und Rumänen', in *Die Bukowina: historische und ethnokulturelle Studien* [Beiträge der IV. internationalen wissenschaftlichen Konferenz 'Kaindlische Lesungen'] (Chernivtsi: Selena Bukowina, 2007), 122–35, here 123.
97. See Hausleitner, 'Viel Mischmasch mitgenommen', 56–57, 238.
98. This was a group around Fritz Valjavec; *ibid.*, 238
99. BI, Allg. Korrespondenz Bundesverband, 1964: Letter from Rudolf Wagner to Erich Prokopowitsch, 29 May 1964. Prokopowitsch had contributed four articles to Franz Lang's *Buchenland* and was named as one of the people who worked on it (*Mitarbeiter*). See Lang, *Buchenland*, 527. He also published a book: E. Prokopowitsch, *Das Ende der österreichischen Herrschaft in der Bukowina* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1959).
100. In the biographies of important figures, the years 1938–45 were simply omitted or evasively summarized. This was, for example, the case for biographies of Rudolf Wagner. See the contributions to the book published for his eightieth birthday: R. Wagner, A. Armbruster and P. Tiefenthaler (eds), *Vom Moldauwappen zum Doppeladler: Ausgewählte Beiträge zur Geschichte der Bukowina. Festgabe zu seinem 80. Geburtstag* (Munich: Hofmann Verlag, 1991). See also his obituary: 'Das Leben seiner Gemeinschaft prägend mitgestaltet – Nachruf', *Kaindl-Archiv* 53/54 (2003). His membership to the SS only became public knowledge in 2006 when journalists obtained his personal file from the German National Archives. On this, see H.M. Kloth and K. Wiegrefe, 'Unbequeme Wahrheiten', *Der Spiegel* no. 33, 2006, 46–48. See also Hausleitner, 'Viel Mischmasch mitgenommen', 226.
101. S. Last, *Die Letzten Juden* (Rothenburg ob der Tauber: J.P. Peter, 1960); J. Klein-Haparash, ... *der vor dem Löwen flieht* (Stuttgart: Deutscher Bücherbund, 1961). Perhaps less surprisingly, Leo Katz's 1944 novel *Totenjäger*, a Socialist antifascist account published in Mexico in 1944, was not acknowledged either. Republished as L. Katz, *Totenjäger* (Aachen: Rimbaud Verlag, 2005).
102. Last was occasionally mentioned in *Der Südostdeutsche* (see, for instance, issue 2, January 197 and issue 2, August 1971). A text by him was published in R. Wagner (ed.), *Alma Mater Francisco Josephina: Die deutschsprachige Nationalitäten-Universität in Czernowitz. Festschrift zum 100. Jahrestag ihrer Eröffnung 1875* (Munich: Verlag Hans Menschendorfer, 1979), 352–54. A long obituary of Klein-Haparash was published in *Der Südostdeutsche* in March 1971, and the editor, Bruno Skrehunetz, mentioned that he knew him from school.
103. Klein-Haparash was mentioned in a list of books about Bukovina in *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 1, September 1965. Klein-Haparash's book was reviewed in *Der Spiegel* no. 40, September 27, 1961 and appeared in English (and French) in 1963: *He Who Flees the Lion*, translated from German by C. Winston and R. Winston (New York: Atheneum, 1963).
104. BI, Bibliothek des Bukowina-Instituts Augsburg: 'Bücherkatalog (der Landsmannschaft)', 1963. Another notable entry in the list was an account of 'resettlement' dating from 1942 and introduced by an SS general. Interestingly, the date of

- publication did not feature in the list. See W. Lorenz, *Der Zug der Volksdeutschen aus Bessarabien und dem Nord-Buchenland* (Berlin: Volk und Reich Verlag, 1942).
105. BI, Allg. Korrespondenz Bundesverband 1965–66: Letter from Rudolf Wagner, Landsmannschaft der Buchenlanddeutschen to the Institut für politische Wissenschaft der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Technischen Hochschule, 27 October 1965.
 106. BI, Allg. Korrespondenz Bundesverband, 1965: Letter from Otto Lachmund to C.J.N., 9 June 1965.
 107. F. Lang, 'Sprache und Literatur der Deutschen in der Bukowina', in Lang, *Buchenland*, 428.
 108. See 'Entwurf einer Landschaft', *Die Zeit* no. 5, 30 January 1958; *Der Spiegel*, issue 20, 11 May 1970.
 109. *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 2, March 1971.
 110. See e.g. the publication of Drozdowski's letters: 'Georg Drozdowski antwortet', *Die Stimme*, July 1959.
 111. Drozdowski was aware of the exceptional circumstance of him publishing in both papers. As he wrote in his second letter to Alfred Gong on 1 August 1964, they constituted 'two completely opposed papers': See Shchyhlevska, *Verschränkungen*, 57.
 112. On Valjavec's network and links to Bukovinians, see Hausleitner, 'Viel Mischmasch mitgenommen', 236. On Valjavec's role in Cernăuți in 1941, see A. Angrick, 'Power Games: The German Nationality Policy (*Volkstumspolitik*) in Czernowitz before and during the Barbarossa Campaign', *Dapim: Studies on the Holocaust* 24(1) (2010), 89–135, here 113–16. Valjavec's death in 1960 was mentioned in P. Tiefenthaler (ed.), *Festschrift zum 20-jährigen Jubiläums-Bundestreffen Pfingsten 1969; Zwanzig Jahre Landsmannschaft der Buchenlanddeutschen e. V. 1949–1969* (Planegg: Landsmannschaft der Buchenlanddeutschen 1969), 25. See also 'Prof. Dr Fritz Valjavec zum Gedenken', *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 1, November 1961.
 113. On 'capitulation', see: 'Sechzehn lange Jahre: der schicksalschwerste Tag in der Geschichte der Deutschen', *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 1, May 1961.
 114. See e.g. 'Der verhängnisvolle Mythos – 'jüngste Vergangenheit' in anderen Dimensionen – Opfer des Hasses: Deutsche und Juden!', *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 2, April 1961.
 115. BI, Allg. Korrespondenz, 1965: Bericht von Anton Scribiac über den Besuch von Schellhorn in Büsnau, 2 September 1964.
 116. 'Fragmente als Beweise der Dokumentation', *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 1, April 1961; 'Augenzeugebericht über Massenvergasungen', 'Vergangenheitsbewältiger zwingen Naturgesetze', *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 1, May 1961.
 117. See e.g. E. Horowitz, 'Was sagen Sie?...', *Die Stimme*, January 1961; 'Prozess Eichmann – seine geschichtlich Bedeutung', *Die Stimme*, April 1961.
 118. Ahonen, 'The Impact of Distorted Memory', 250.
 119. It is estimated that only 10% of expellees were members of expellee organizations by 1955. See M. Stickler, '*Ostdeutsch heißt Gesamtdeutsch: Organisation, Selbstverständnis und heimatpolitische Zielsetzungen der deutschen Vertriebenenverbände 1949–1972* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2004), 122.
 120. See A. Wiewiorka, *The Era of the Witness*, translated from French by J. Stark (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006); see also T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, translated from Hebrew by H. Watzman (New York: Hill & Wang, 1994).
 121. This is based on the evaluation of various accounts including the four submissions by Bukovinians to the 'Ältere Menschen schreiben Geschichte' competition and launched in 1976 inviting people born before 1920 to write about their experiences. Most

- submissions date from 1977. Hauptstaatsarchiv Stuttgart, J175, 1518; 817; 1310; 1630, as well as testimonies from Yad Vashem Archives, O3 (Yad Vashem Collection of Testimonies; hereinafter YVA), 1732, 3562, 1130.
122. See e.g. the publication of the article signed 'from a grateful Bukovinian German' (*von einem dankbaren Bukowiner Deutschen*), 'Die Juden der Bukowina – Geniewinkel der Donau-Monarchie', *Die Stimme*, October/November 1963.
 123. C. Goschler, *Schuld und Schulden: Die Politik der Wiedergutmachung für NS-Verfolgte seit 1945* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2005), 8.
 124. See C. Pross, *Paying for the Past: The Struggle over Reparations for Victims of Nazi Terror*, translated from German by B. Cooper (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); Goschler, *Schuld und Schulden*; R. Ludi, *Reparations for Nazi Victims in Post-war Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 114–15.
 125. C. Goschler, "Versöhnung" und "Viktimisierung": Die Vertriebenen und der deutsche Opferdiskurs', *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 53(10) (2005), 873–84, here 878.
 126. J. Panagiotidis, 'Laws of Return? Co-ethnic Immigration to West Germany and Israel (1948–1992)' (D.Phil. thesis, European University Institute, 2012), 16.
 127. *Ibid.*, 18.
 128. On the difficulty in gaining access to the perspective of the victims, see Ludi, *Reparations*, 128.
 129. The compensation for the war-damaged was subject to widespread approval. See M. Hughes, *Shouldering the Burdens of Defeat: West Germany and the Reconstruction of Social Justice* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999).
 130. See Frei, *Adenauer's Germany*.
 131. Goschler, *Schuld und Schulden*, 7.
 132. M. Hughes, "Through No Fault of Our Own": West Germans Remember Their War Losses', *German History* 18(2) (2000), 193–213, here 194.
 133. Goschler, *Schuld und Schulden*, 215.
 134. Ludi, *Reparations*, 94.
 135. Frei, *Adenauer's Germany*, 28.
 136. See Stern, *Whitewashing*, 265–384, especially 349.
 137. Goschler, *Schuld und Schulden*, 8.
 138. See E. Barkan, *The Guilt of Nations: Restitution and Negotiating Historical Injustices* (New York: Norton, 2000).
 139. See I. Nachum, 'Reconstructing Life after the Holocaust: The Lastenausgleichsgesetz and the Jewish Struggle for Compensation', *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 58 (2013), 53–67.
 140. Pross, *Paying for the Past*, 67.
 141. See H.G. Hockerts, 'Wiedergutmachung in Deutschland: Eine historische Bilanz 1945–2000', *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 49(2) (2001), 167–214; J. Brunner and I. Nachum, "Vor dem Gesetz steht ein Türhüter": Wie und warum israelische Antragsteller ihre Zugehörigkeit zum deutschen Sprach- und Kulturkreis beweisen mussten', in N. Frei, J. Brunner and C. Goschler (eds), *Die Praxis der Wiedergutmachung: Geschichte, Erfahrung und Wirkung in Deutschland und Israel* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2009), 423–24.
 142. See §11 of the LAG and §2 of the BVFG.
 143. Brunner and Nachum, "Vor dem Gesetz steht ein Türhüter", 391–92.
 144. This was in fact a merely amended version of the one used by the Nazis. The reference to 'blood and race' had been replaced with the more neutral word *Abstammung* ('background' or 'origin') and the sentence indicating that Jews could never be

- Volkszugehörige* had simply been removed. See Nachum, 'Reconstructing Life after the Holocaust', 56. On the concept of *Volksdeutsche*, see D.L. Bergen, 'The Nazi Concept of "Volksdeutsche" and the Exacerbation of Anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe, 1939–45', *Journal of Contemporary History* 29(4) (1994), 569–82.
145. §6(1) of the BVFG.
 146. Brubaker uses 'ethnic nationality': see R. Brubaker, 'Migrations of Ethnic Unmixing in the "New Europe"', *International Migration Review* 32(4) (1998), 1047–65. Emphasizing the literal meaning, Ruth Mandel speaks of 'people belongingness' that should not be 'glossed as ethnicity': R. Mandel, *Cosmopolitan Anxieties: Turkish Challenges to Citizenship and Belonging in Germany* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 207. Nachum argues that it can hardly be translated; Nachum, 'Reconstructing Life after the Holocaust', 55.
 147. See Pross, *Paying for the Past*; Hockerts, 'Wiedergutmachung'. Ludi also notes the obsession with 'compensation fraud' (*Wiedergutmachungsbetrug*); Ludi, *Reparations*, 109.
 148. Panagiotidis, 'Laws of Return?', 170.
 149. Brunner and Nachum, 'Vor dem Gesetz', 412.
 150. On this issue see D. Siemens, 'Juristische Zeitgeschichte *avant la lettre*. Die Frankfurter Dissertation von Max Münz zur 'Verantwortlichkeit für die Judenverfolgungen im Ausland' (1958)', *Zeithistorische Forschungen/Studies in Contemporary History* 15(1) (2018), 184–92.
 151. In some very rare cases, they approved the applications of Jews. See e.g. BI, Allg. Korrespondenz Bundesverband, 1964: Statement by Otto Lachmund (Ay.P 1501 – 9/64), 29 September 1964.
 152. See e.g. BI, Allg. Korrespondenz Bundesverband, 1965–66: Otto Lachmund to the regional branch of the Landsmannschaft der Buchenlanddeutschen RHL/Pfalz regarding the establishing of the ethnic nationality of L.K. (*Feststellung der Volkszugehörigkeit des L.K.*), 10 September 1965.
 153. H. Weber, *Die Bukowina im zweiten Weltkrieg: völkerrechtliche Aspekte der Lage der Bukowina im Spannungsfeld zwischen Rumänien, der Sowjetunion und Deutschland* (Hamburg: Metzner, 1972).
 154. See e.g. BI, Allg. Korrespondenz Bundesverband, 1964: Otto Lachmund to the Compensation Office of the region of Rheinland/Pf. Regarding the compensation of J.W. (A. Z.: W-1473-5/64), no date, May 1964.
 155. These reports were sent to the compensation authorities and are archived here. Bundesarchiv Lastenausgleichsarchiv (hereinafter BArch-LAA), ZLA7/03 – 1234 (*Extra-Dokumentation Rumänien, Jüdische Volkszugehörigkeit*). Plesch headed the HAST from 1957 to 1975. He was preceded by a Bukovinian, Peter Blaß (1953–57) and was replaced by Dr Franz Noll (1976–79), Fritz Krauss (1980–2000) and Wilhelm Spielhauer (2001–4). It was then dissolved. See W. Spielhauer, *51 Jahre Heimatauskunftstelle Rumänien: 1953–2004* (Munich: n.p., 2005) (Bibliothek des Bundesarchivs in Bayreuth).
 156. BArch-LAA, ZLA7/03 – 1234: Letter and Memorandum from Dr I.D. Evian regarding the expellee status of persecutees from Bukovina (*Vertriebenen-Anerkennung Verfolgter aus der Bukowina*) to the regional office for compensation in Mainz, 11 July 1957.
 157. BArch-LAA, ZLA7/03 – 1234: Report from Erhard Plesch regarding information about former relations in Bukovina to the regional Compensation Office in Mainz, 29 November 1957, and report to the regional government office for compensation in Neustadt an der Weinstraße regarding the reparations to the victims of National Socialism (*Bundesentschädigungsgesetz* (BEG)), 12 December 1957.

158. BArch-LAA, ZLA7/03 – 1234: Plesch report from 12 December 1957, 5; given in similar terms in the report from 29 November 1957, 5.
159. BArch-LAA, ZLA7/03 – 1234: Plesch report from 12 December 1957, 8–9 and report from 29 November 1957, 9.
160. BArch-LAA, ZLA 7/03 – 1234. This was also quoted in the memorandum addressed to the German Chancellery by the Landsmannschaft of Bukovinian Jews in 1963: BArch-K, B136/3310 (*Wiedergutmachung Bundeskanzleramt*), 9. Schellhorn was sometimes a guest at the events and meetings of Bukovinian Germans and in 1963 – for example, *Der Südostdeutsche* celebrated his seventy-fifth birthday with a large feature: *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 2, December 1963.
161. Appeal published in the *Ostjüdische Zeitung* (Czernowitz), 24 December 1930.
162. See e.g. BArch-LAA, ZLA7/03 – 1234: Letter from the Landsmannschaft of Bukovinian Jews in Israel (Dr M. Weinberger and Dr J. Mann) to the regional government president (*Regierungspräsident*) in Cologne, 28 April 1965.
163. BArch-LAA, ZLA 7/03 – 1234: Letter from Dr Rossmeissl and K. Weidmann to Plesch, 17 December 1962.
164. BArch-LAA, ZLA7/03 – 1234: Letter from the Landsmannschaft of Bukovinian Jews in Israel (Dr M. Weinberger and Dr J. Mann) to the regional government president (*Regierungspräsident*) in Cologne, 28 April 1965.
165. BArch-LAA, ZLA7/03 – 1234: Letter from the Landsmannschaft of Bukovinian Jews, 28 April 1965.
166. BArch-LAA, ZLA7/03 – 1234: Report of the Institute for Contemporary History, 1958, 177, emphasis in original.
167. BArch-LAA, ZLA7/03 – 1234: Report by Martin Broszat for the regional court in Cologne, October 1963; later published with slight amendments as an article: M. Broszat, 'Von der Kulturnation zur Volksgruppe: die nationale Stellung der Juden in der Bukowina im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert', *Historische Zeitschrift* 200(3) (1965), 572–605.
168. BArch-LAA, ZLA7/03 – 1232: Letter from Plesch (*Heimatauskunftsstelle*) to the President of the Compensation Office Bad Homburg and State Ministry for Work and Social Affairs, Compensation Office Munich, 23 September 1969.
169. BArch-LAA, ZLA1/2200286000: A. L. (born 1886 in Czernowitz) – living in Israel (Ramat Gan); demand received 10 April 1962; rejected 1969.
170. BArch-LAA, ZLA 1/ 2212946000: J. B. (born 1887 in Radautz) – application from 1962 by his daughter in Haifa (born 1908).
171. Brunner and Nachum, 'Vor dem Gesetz', 406.
172. *Ibid.*, 411.
173. BArch-LAA, ZLA1/ 2212946000: J. B. (born 1887 in Radautz), claim made by daughter living in Haifa; application sent 1962.
174. BArch-LAA, ZLA1/2200286000.
175. BArch-LAA, ZLA1/ 2219716 K.K. (born 1871 in Radautz), claim made by daughter living in Holon Israel; application sent 4 October 1962.
176. Dr F.G. Schellhorn, 'Die Juden der Bukowina', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* no. 114, 19 May 1969, a response to the book review by Salcia Landmann: S. Landmann, 'Juden der Bukowina: Eine geschichtliche Dokumentation', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* no. 71, 25 March 1969. Two outraged responses to Schellhorn soon followed: Dr A. Schwarz, 'Ziemlich saures Leben', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* no. 120, 27 May 1969. Dr J. Pfeiffer, 'Die deutsche Kulturzugehörigkeit der Bukowiner Juden', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* no. 152, 5 July 1969. However, in his final response, Schellhorn defended his position: Dr F.G. Schellhorn, 'Jiddisch war die

- Umgangssprache', *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* no. 182, 9 August 1969. Schellhorn also published an article on this topic in *Der Südostdeutsche*: 'Rumänien und die Leiden der Bukowiner Juden', *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 2, July 1969.
177. BI, Allg. Korrespondenz Bundesverband, 1973: Letter from Otto Lachmund to the reporter of chamber no. VI of the administrative court of the free city of Bremen (*Berichterstatter der VI Kammer des Verwaltungsgerichts der Freien Hansestadt Bremen*) regarding membership to the 'Jahn' Sports Organization in Czernowitz/Bukovina, 4 May 1973.
 178. BI, Allg. Korrespondenz Bundesverband, 1966: Letter from the North Rhine–Westphalia regional branch of the Landsmannschaft of Bukovinian Germans to the national office of the Landsmannschaft of Bukovinian Germans regarding the membership in the Landsmannschaft of ethnic German migrants (*Spätaussiedler*) from Romania, 5 October 1966.
 179. See e.g. 'Sind Vertriebene in Österreich Parias?', *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 2, June 1961.
 180. 'Bundestreffen: Der Festvortrag des Bundessprechers Dr Rudolf Wagner', *Der Südostdeutsche*, issue 1, June 1969.
 181. See C. Pross, *Wiedergutmachung: Der Kleinkrieg gegen die Opfer* (Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1988), 240.
 182. Ludi, *Reparations*, 193.
 183. M. Teich, *Für eine Revision der Luxembourger Verträge und der Wiedergutmachungsgesetze* (Tel Aviv: Selbstverlag, 1961).
 184. BArch-K, B136/3310.
 185. On this, see J. Panagiotidis, "'The Oberkreisdirektor Decides Who is a German': Jewish Immigration, German Bureaucracy, and the Negotiation of National Belongings, 1953–1990', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 38(3) (2012), 503–33, here 514–17.
 186. 'Leben ohne Heimat', *Die Stimme*, November 1970.
 187. M. Teich, 'Die Vertriebeneneigenschaft im Sinne der 11. DV zum Lastenausgleichsgesetz', *Die Stimme*, December 1970.
 188. 'Die Zugehörigkeit der Juden aus der Bukowina zum deutschen Sprach- und Kulturkreis', *Die Stimme*, July–August 1963, emphasis in original.
 189. On this trend, see also J. Panagiotidis, 'A Policy for the Future: German-Jewish Remigrants, Their Children, and the Politics of Israeli Nation-Building', *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 60 (2015), 191–206.
 190. M. Brenner and N. Frei, 'Zweiter Teil: 1950–1967 Konsolidierung', in M. Brenner (ed.), *Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland von 1945 bis zur Gegenwart: Politik, Kultur und Gesellschaft* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2012), 242.
 191. BArch-LAA, ZLA 7/03, 1233: Guidelines for the implementation of §6 BVFG (*Richtlinien zur Anwendung des §6 des Bundesvertriebenengesetzes (BVFG)*), 27 March 1980.
 192. Hockerts, 'Wiedergutmachung in Deutschland', 190–91.
 193. See D. von Westernhagen, 'Wiedergutmachung', *Die Zeit* no. 41, 5 October 1984.
 194. See C. Wessel-Hanssen, 'Um frei zu leben unter Deutschen: Wie ein jüdischer Aussiedler an einem bundesdeutschen Sachbearbeiter verzweifelte', *Die Zeit* no. 43, 21 October 1988.
 195. BArch-LAA, ZLA7/03, 1234: Letter from Dr Axel Azzola to the Regional Office for Central Social Affairs regarding the issuing of an expellee identification card of category A (*Vertriebenenausweis A*), 15 August 1988.
 196. A. Kauders, *Unmögliche Heimat: Eine deutsch-jüdische Geschichte der Bundesrepublik* (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2007), 16.