

INTRODUCTION



In late 1950, the Israeli historian and politician Manfred Reifer sent a copy of his latest book to the Austrian writer and poet Georg Drozdowski. The volume was a biography of the Zionist politician Mayer Ebner, published in German in Tel Aviv in 1947. At the time, Ebner and Reifer were both living in Israel, whereas Drozdowski was living in Austria. However, all three men had been born in Habsburg Bukovina, once the easternmost province of the Austrian half of the Habsburg Empire. All of them were native Bukovinians.

The thank-you letter Drozdowski sent in response a few days later read as follows:

I don't quite know how to express my joy. With your letter and your gift, you not only sent me a greeting from our common homeland, you also made clear to me that you include me among the Germans, who can think of themselves as free of any guilt! ... We share something dear despite the distance: our old, beloved Bukovina that lives on in our memory even if we now have a different fatherland.¹

Reifer, too, was quick to respond. On 27 November 1950, he wrote:

Your letter was a source of great joy. A voice from the old *Heimat*. A resonant one, similar to the pretty trill of the nightingale. What images this brought to my mind! Towns, villages, mountains, valleys, forests of our Bukovina.

I saw them like in a photograph. And the people! How close we were to them in this El Dorado of the old monarchy. They came closer again, 'these ghostly figures'.²

Reifer ended his letter with a reference to life in Israel: 'From the literary perspective, our world here is rather narrow – for writers of German in particular.' He then concluded with a somewhat elusive and philosophical remark: 'everyone would like to live in the free world. But does it exist?'³

There is much to unpack in both of these quotes and letters. Reifer's last sentence can seem rather astonishing on behalf of someone who was a well-known Zionist. As for Drozdowski, his self-description as 'a German' and 'free of any guilt' points to both his continued mode of identification as German in the Republic of Austria after the Second World War and the symbolic significance of his Jewish colleague's gesture and gift. However, what is also interesting to know about this exchange is that Drozdowski and Reifer had never even met. Indeed, although they were both born in Austrian Czernowitz and had both lived in what had become Romanian Cernăuți between the two World Wars, the events surrounding the Second World War and the Holocaust had effectively set them on completely different paths. In a way, Drozdowski and Reifer embodied two radically distinct sets of twentieth-century 'Bukovinian' experiences.

Drozdowski, regarded as an 'ethnic German' (*Volksdeutscher*), had been evacuated from the region during the National Socialist mass transfers of Germans abroad known as 'the resettlement home to the Reich' (*die Umsiedlung heim ins Reich*). Drozdowski thus left Bukovina for Germany in the autumn of 1940, as had the vast majority of Bukovina's self-declared ethnic Germans – some 95,000 people – representing, at the time, around 10% of Bukovina's population. Having been granted German citizenship, he was then 'resettled', like many of his fellow German Bukovinians, in newly conquered territories in Eastern Europe. In 1941, he even obtained a job within the German administration in the city of Łódź (then Litzmannstadt). However, declared 'politically unreliable' after the discovery of his earlier marriage to a 'half-Jewish' woman, he was subsequently dismissed and relocated to Vienna. Conscripted into the Wehrmacht in 1943 and deployed in Croatia, he ended up, as the war concluded, in Austrian Carinthia, where he later chose to remain.⁴

Reifer, in turn, identified as a Jew, narrowly survived different waves of anti-Jewish violence and ethnic and political persecution in Bukovina's capital, Cernăuți, during the war. These waves included: the Soviet arrests and deportations to Siberia from northern Bukovina during the Soviet occupation in 1940–41; Romanian and German-instigated pogroms and mass shootings in Cernăuți and the surrounding towns and villages in the summer of

1941; the short-lived German presence in the city following the German attack on the Soviet Union; and, last but not least, the ghettoization and later deportation of the region's Jews to ghettos and camps in Transnistria by the Romanian authorities in 1941 and 1942. These were all events in which thousands of Bukovinian Jews lost their lives; around two-thirds of the 120,000-strong prewar Jewish population of Bukovina did not survive the war and the Holocaust. However, in late 1943, Reifer managed to escape his native region and make his way to Mandatory Palestine, where he arrived in April 1944.⁵

To an extent, Drozdowski's and Reifer's experiences during and in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War mirrored those of their respective postwar communities of 'Bukovinians' – those who, in the ensuing decades, came to think of themselves and be known as 'Bukovina Germans' and 'Bukovina Jews'.⁶ But their trajectories are also representative of the experiences of millions of other displaced non-Jewish Germans and Jewish survivors after the Second World War. The estimated 80,000 Bukovinian 'resettlers' who ended up as refugees on the reduced territory of what would become West Germany, East Germany and the Republic of Austria joined the ranks of approximately twelve million Germans who lost their homelands as a result of the Second World War. In turn, unwilling or unable to return to their homes, most of the 50,000 Jewish survivors from Bukovina left the area and went to Israel as soon as they could, as did an estimated one million other survivors of the Holocaust in the first decade after the war.

Reifer and Drozdowski's exchange in 1950 was therefore symptomatic of the broader postwar situation. Their interaction captures key aspects of the relationship between German and Jewish Bukovinians – as well as among many non-Jewish Germans and Jews in general – after the war and the Holocaust. These aspects include both numerous parallels and undeniable commonalities but also a fundamental kind of distance and associated tensions and inhibitions. Bukovinian Germans' experiences and identification as 'resettlers' and Bukovinian Jews' as 'survivors' reinforced the sense that these were two completely separate groups. During the war, the fact that Germans and Jews from Bukovina had once shared a homeland and a language had meant very little. In hindsight, it seemed that what held them apart, and not what united them, was what had mattered. This distinction had been paramount in determining their diverging options and treatment, often even signifying the difference between life and death. This was why, within just a few years, and from the perspective of their new postwar homes – in what Drozdowski called their 'different fatherlands' – this link to the region and to each other seemed extremely special. Not only had Bukovinian Germans and Bukovinian Jews belonged to two different communities of experience during the Second World War, but, as a result, they belonged to two very different postwar communities of identification too.

Though such an instance of direct and friendly contact between a Bukovinian German and a Bukovinian Jew during the early Cold War was quite rare, focusing in on the protagonists of this encounter and considering its wider circumstances can shed important light on the nexus between Bukovina and German and Jewish politics of belonging after the Second World War. First, both Reifer and Drozdowski were prominent postwar Bukovinian figures in their respective countries and leading members of their respective Bukovinian ‘homeland societies’, the so-called Bukovinian *Landsmannschaften*, established after the war in West Germany and Israel. These men and these institutions, founded with the official aims of keeping the memory of the region and its inhabitants alive in the postwar period, helped the members grapple with and overcome their experiences of loss, suffering and displacement. Their exchange thus testifies to the fact that although Bukovina no longer featured as a geopolitical entity on the map of Europe, it remained an important point of reference for the identities of many displaced Bukovinians in their new, putatively national homes.

Second, this episode shows that while Bukovina Germans and Bukovina Jews commemorated their specific group experiences and primarily defended their distinctive rights and versions of the past in distinct national arenas and ethnic terms, they were always aware of each other and always defining themselves with other stakeholders of the region’s history and identity in mind. This was especially true as German and Jewish Bukovinians shared not only a homeland but also a language, German, and a connection to many of the same people, places, events and even institutions.

Finally, yet importantly, as this example shows, identifying with Bukovina as a *Heimat* – as a home or a homeland – after the Second World War was not merely about the past, or even in spite of the past; it was very much about the present and thereby a source of something new. After 1945, particularly from the perspective of ‘the West’, the region was perceived as ‘lost’, ‘sunken’, ‘submerged’ or having ‘vanished’. In hindsight, after the war and the Holocaust, the relatively peaceful multiethnic society of prewar Romanian Bukovina, and its earlier Habsburg incarnation, seemed all the more exceptional. As a result, Bukovina became a privileged screen for the projection of different, changing and idealized conceptions of Germanness, Jewishness and even Europeaness.

With this in mind, the exchange raises a range of further questions. What did it mean to identify as Bukovinian after the Second World War from the perspective of different postwar contexts? Bukovinians like Drozdowski and Reifer did not simply become Israelis, Austrians or West Germans; they also identified or came to be recognized as ‘refugees’, ‘newcomers’ and ‘new migrants’, as well as ‘expellees of the homeland’ (*Heimatvertriebene*) and ‘survivors of the Holocaust’ (first as *She’erit Hapletah*, ‘the surviving remnant’ and

later as ‘Holocaust survivors’). How did these different labels and their diverse connotations function and fit together? How did they relate to their specific backgrounds and experiences as Germans, as Jews and as Bukovinians? In other words, how did Bukovinians, as ‘coethnics’ and ‘national refugees’, negotiate between notions of similarity and difference; prewar, wartime and postwar modes of identification; experiences of displacement and violence and claims to emplacement and belonging, and ultimately contribute to shaping postwar societies in which they lived?

(Re)Framing the ‘Bukovina Myth’

The historical region of Bukovina and especially its capital – Austrian Czernowitz, Romanian Cernăuți, Soviet Chernovtsy and Ukrainian Chernivtsi – are often said to have been the object of mythification and myth.⁷ This has been captured in the use of different names and spellings of the region and the city, reflecting both different uses of language and the – often anachronistic but also intentional – emphasis placed on specific periods in their history. What is more, the phenomenon has also been reflected in the use of a series of comparisons, nicknames and metaphors, all offering different takes on the region’s exceptional character. Indeed, the associations with Bukovina as a historical space and the region’s associated mental maps have been not only remarkably numerous and diverse but also often competing and even conflicting.

Once the easternmost area of the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy, the Habsburg region, has, for instance, often been compared to ‘a small Austria’, with the capital city accordingly dubbed as ‘little Vienna’ (*klein Wien*) and its inhabitants, following a German play on words, as ‘Buko-Viennese’ (*Buko-Wiener*). However, as the most ethnically diverse and also the ‘most Jewish’ of the empire’s regions, Habsburg Bukovina has also been described as ‘a miniature Switzerland’, Czernowitz as ‘Jerusalem on the Prut River’ and the region’s inhabitants as a ‘motley group’. Indeed, many memoirists have suggested that Habsburg Bukovina was cosmopolitan and profoundly European – ‘the West in the East’. Yet, for many contemporaries, it was, rather, ‘the East in the West’ – an exotic crossroads and meeting point of religions, peoples and cultures, ‘an Austrian backwater’ or even a Habsburg ‘penal colony’, home to a ‘sanguine bunch’.⁸ Similarly, while some have construed it as primarily part of a formerly German-dominated *Mitteleuropa* (Central Europe) and others see it as part of a lost Yiddishland, for most Ukrainians and Romanians, Bukovina, as the home to eminently national monuments, rulers or heroes, belongs decisively and more or less exclusively to the cradle of *their* nation.⁹

Famous literary and artistic portrayals of Bukovina have been equally contentious and fraught. The region has, for instance, often – though mistakenly – been included in the wider area that the native Galician writer Karl Emil Franzos designated as ‘semi-Asia’ (*Halb-Asien*).¹⁰ By caricaturing it as ‘Maghrebinia’ (*Maghrebinien*), the writer Gregor von Rezzori also emphasized supposed ‘oriental’ traits and features, implying that the region was backward and chaotic.¹¹ In contrast, the region’s two most prominent postwar figures, Rose Ausländer and Paul Celan, nostalgically depicted Czernowitz and Bukovina retrospectively as ‘a submerged cultural metropolis’ (*untergegangene Kulturmetropole*) and a region ‘once populated by people and books’ (*wo Menschen und Bücher lebten*).¹² They therefore brought forth an idealized vision of harmony and framed the area in the interwar period as a centre of European and German high culture. This vision resonated with many displaced Bukovinians long after the end of the Second World War but largely overlooked Romanian or Ukrainian presence, influence and even sovereignty in the region. Today, such exclusive and romanticized stereotypes and timeless images are subject to scepticism. Bukovina has been cast as the ‘archetypal borderland’ belonging to the ‘shatterzones of empires’ or even to the ‘bloodlands’; for many, it represents an ultimate example of multiethnic or ‘intermixed’ Central Europe, which was ‘pulverised’ by the events of the first half of the twentieth century – the epitome of a ruthlessly destroyed Central European ‘vanished world’.¹³

Upon closer consideration, it appears that the ‘Bukovina myth’ has many different strands and two main dimensions. On the one hand, the region is associated with harmonious ethnic diversity and the notion of peaceful coexistence, linked to Austrian rule and the German-Jewish symbiosis especially. From this perspective, the Bukovina myth might be understood as a regional variation on the nostalgic ‘Habsburg myth’ identified by the Italian scholar Claudio Magris.¹⁴ Yet, on the other hand, the different understandings of Bukovina suggest that what is exceptional in this case is not so much the memory of harmony – ‘unity in diversity’ – as the degree of dispute over the place. What is striking is the number of claims made on the region and its people, and the consecutive and brutal political shifts and upheavals the territory and its inhabitants experienced as a consequence. Indeed, flourishing retrospectively after the Second World War, the Bukovina myth draws as much attention to the region’s former diversity as it does to its disappearance and destruction. This is all the clearer as the region’s unlikely yet remarkable ‘afterlife’ during and after the Cold War was mainly thanks to German-speaking Jews, who were also survivors of the Holocaust. In a sense, then, the Bukovina myth is characterized by a tension between the paradigm of ethnic diversity and that of ‘ethnic unmixing’ – plurality and its violent dissolution through war, genocide and policies of ethnic homogenization. From

this perspective, rather than resembling the Habsburg myth, the Bukovina myth appears to have more in common with the ambivalent ‘myth of Central Europe’ (*Mitteleuropa*), which has been discussed by Jacques Le Rider, among others.¹⁵

The issue of how to explain, disentangle and eventually reconcile these two constitutive yet seemingly incompatible aspects of the Bukovina myth has been the central intellectual problem driving the study of the region. In recent years, the first dimension of the myth in particular – the conception of prewar Bukovinian society as plural, ‘multicultural’ and peaceful – has been subject to considerable qualification and scrutiny. In line with contemporary concerns for the meaning of multiculturalism and hybridity, many scholars have called for caution and qualification of these terms and claims. They have highlighted the fact that plurality does not equate to pluralism, that concepts of hybridity and diversity may still obey essentialist logics, and that there is a distinction between ‘tolerance’, ‘coexistence’ and actual ‘togetherness’.¹⁶ Moreover, many scholars have explored in detail and critically re-evaluated the history of Bukovina and the character of social and ethnic categories, and interethnic relations during the Habsburg, interwar and wartime periods. They have thereby sought to explain the specificities of Bukovinian society as well as the causes for the disintegration of social relations against the backdrop of broader political settings and developments and in light of new research on the wider region.¹⁷ Finally, reflecting a growing interest in the politics of memory and the phenomenon of imperial nostalgia in postsocialist Eastern Europe as a whole, a great deal of attention has been paid to the mechanics of the revival of regional identity and history both abroad and on the ground, and the resurrection of the Bukovina myth of peaceful coexistence after 1989–91, particularly in Romania and Ukraine.¹⁸

The period of the Cold War, in turn, is almost a blind spot in the research on Bukovina.¹⁹ When I started working on this project, I often heard that there was no topic: the region itself no longer existed as such and many of its original inhabitants had been forced to leave. Due to Europe’s division and policies of ethnic homogenization, genocide and Sovietization, what was once Bukovina no longer had any of its defining features; especially in Romania and the Soviet Ukraine, but elsewhere too, the region had been forcibly forgotten. However, as I pursued my search, there was much evidence to suggest that the opposite was true. The evidence ranged from the existence of hundreds of books and articles about the region published during the Cold War to the establishment and existence of still-active homeland societies of Bukovina Germans and Bukovina Jews in West Germany and Israel, both still issuing, as I started my research, monthly newspapers, *Der Südostdeutsche* and *Die Stimme*, respectively. In this period, self-identifying Bukovinians had met and corresponded, built memorials and housing settlements, founded

cultural institutions and even achieved considerable renown as individuals and as groups. This was the period during which Paul Celan, who was born in 1920 and died in 1970, came to be regarded as one of the most influential German poets, and other Bukovinian writers such as Rose Ausländer, Gregor von Rezzori and Edgar Hilsenrath made their names and careers by writing and speaking, sometimes directly, about their native province. Bukovina may no longer have mattered much as an actual location, but the idea of it had not disappeared.

Therefore, perhaps the emphasis on myth and the attempts to disprove it have been somewhat misleading. How else, if not through myth, are places constituted? Is myth not inherent to any constructed historical narrative or a useful reminder of the constructed nature of any such story? It is the claims made on 'space' that shape the space-time notion of 'place'.²⁰ As Doreen Massey has argued: 'The identity of places is very much bound up with the histories which are told of them, how those histories are told, and which history turns out to be dominant.'²¹ Besides, as Roland Barthes has pointed out, myth is by definition 'falsely obvious'.²² It is therefore not the myth in itself, but the competition over this narrative that deserves our attention. The Bukovina myth, especially in the aftermath of the Second World War, testifies to the range of ways in which people have interpreted, contested and thereby created the region for the purposes of the present. From this perspective, the region's idealization and the celebration of the region's former diversity is quite compatible with a preoccupation with different (national) projects and their contradictory permutations. Indeed, the Bukovina myth has its own dynamics and history, by virtue of which it is at once local, national and transnational.²³ Its diverse elements are a result of its authors' curious mixture of personal and collective traumas, regional and imperial nostalgias and local, national and global agendas and encounters. Ultimately, therefore, this phenomenon says more about the importance of situating oneself spatially and historically than it does about this space's history.²⁴

Bukovina as a Prism

Thus, the period from 1945 to 1989, a period that has been largely ignored but during which the myth thrived, deserves much closer attention. While building on existing insights regarding prewar realities and wartime experiences, the Bukovina myth needs to be analysed as such and placed in the context of its emergence and development. This involves viewing it against the backdrop of the different, and changing political, social, cultural and historiographical settings and questions that informed, animated and restricted its creators and its various manifestations. Such an undertaking therefore

involves tracing the activities of the main stakeholders of Bukovinian identity after the Second World War – first, though not exclusively, the homeland societies in West Germany and Israel – and making sense of the evolving political situation in which they found themselves. Bukovina might then function and be conceived of as a prism thanks to which it is possible to cast new light on these two countries' postwar politics, culture and societies.

Broadly speaking, the postwar period might be divided into two halves. In both West Germany and Israel, though for quite different reasons, many initially regarded the loss of prewar homelands in Central and Eastern Europe and the experiences of the inhabitants of these regions as highly political and sensitive matters. In West Germany, after a first postwar decade of considerably politicized activities and research concerning the estimated twelve million 'expellees of the homeland' (eight million of whom were in the Federal Republic where they represented around 16.5% of the population), the subject started falling out of favour.²⁵ For one thing, the relatively rapid social integration of these 'ethnic refugees' and the growing acceptance of the Cold War status quo defused the urgency of discussing the issue of 'the expulsions' as both a domestic and foreign policy matter.²⁶ For another, by the 1960s, focusing on the victimhood of non-Jewish Germans and German legacies in Eastern Europe came to seem increasingly contentious.²⁷ Indeed, the radicalization of the discourse of what came to be known as 'expellee organizations' over the course of the 1950s and 1960s alienated a younger and more liberal generation of students, scholars and even putative members of these groups. Yet, at the same time, explorations of what these groups had been part of 'in the East' and the experiences of the Germans' victims from these same regions were not welcome either. As a result, over time, 'expellee' discourse became increasingly marginalized and insular. But since their activities nevertheless continued to be institutionally supported and were not critically discussed, for several decades, this discourse was neither replaced nor did it disappear entirely.²⁸

In Israel, in turn, survivors of the Holocaust did a great deal to rehabilitate themselves and contributed significantly to the creation of the state and the country's early political life. Yet the Zionist agenda with its notorious 'rejection' of both narratives of victimhood and the Diaspora largely sidelined these people's experiences and their organizations.²⁹ In effect, the Zionist stance discouraged a critical discussion of the experiences of displacement and 'absorption': the immigrants' choice of Israel was presented as self-evident and the Yishuv's stance as beyond question. For a long time, studying survivors was therefore relatively unpopular too. The language requirements for such research as well as the geopolitics of the Cold War constituted major impediments to exploring these topics. In general, as many scholars have shown, it took time for the Holocaust, not to mention its Romanian chapter, to become the subject of broad public debate in Israel.³⁰ For decades, the immigrants'

homeland organizations were regarded as parochial, curious and short-lived phenomena – relics – that were tolerated but best ignored. Therefore, here too, the position of the newcomers was both insular and marginal, but their activities were nevertheless unchallenged and relatively unhindered.³¹

A gradual shift occurred in both countries over the course of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s under the influence of both domestic and international political developments. Significant turning points include the Eichmann trial in 1961 in Jerusalem, the Auschwitz trials in 1963 in Frankfurt, the establishment of diplomatic relations between Germany and Israel in 1965 and Germany and Romania in 1967, Israel's strengthened international position after 1967, and the political shift to the left in West Germany in the midst of 1968, aligning with generational dynamics. All of these developments spurred on discussions about Jewish suffering and German crimes, as did regular debates and scandals surrounding the issue of financial compensation (*Wiedergutmachung*) for the victims of National Socialist persecution and questions of appropriate historical representation and visibility.³² Historians even coined the notion of the 'era of the witness' to describe this period when Holocaust survivors came to the fore as ultimate victims, as individuals and even as icons.³³ Though this constituted a truly transnational process, it contributed to a change in public historical and political consciousness in and in relation to West Germany and Israel especially. By the late 1970s, in both countries, interest in the history of Jews in Germany and Europe and what slowly came to be known and understood as 'the Holocaust' had grown significantly. This altered the situation of Jews in Germany and elsewhere, attitudes towards Israel and Israelis, and non-Jewish Germans' perception of Jews in general. It therefore also affected conceptions of recent history, of Europe and 'the East', as well as conceptions of Germanness, Jewishness, community and belonging. Together with the policy of détente and the rapprochement with states in the Communist Bloc, these trends all led to the retreat of traditional stakeholders of German, Jewish and Israeli identity into the background. These actors thereby gradually lost their prerogative over representations of the region and the past – a slow process that would only be fully recognized after the end of the Cold War.

In the meantime, work on 'expellees' and what has come to be known as the issue of 'flight and expulsion' has become a sophisticated field and area of research, which connects in meaningful ways the history of displacement, memory and wartime violence, both in terms of German suffering and questions of perpetration. A vast body of literature deals with policies relating to refugees and citizenship in postwar Germany, the experiences of different groups of expellees, their (memory) politics and even their material culture.³⁴ A museum on the topic of 'flight and expulsion', taking the experiences of German expellees as a starting point, is now even under construction

in Berlin.³⁵ A growing amount of work also discusses German minorities broadly defined, beyond Germany's borders, in an increasingly differentiated manner – their experiences in their homelands or their relations to Germany and the states of Eastern Europe over the course of centuries.³⁶ Dealt with more or less theoretically, the subject has rightly come to be seen as offering a new perspective on crucial and interrelated aspects of modern German, European and migration history.

If more discreetly and gradually, the diversity of Israeli society and the experiences of the one million Holocaust survivors who immigrated to Israel from Europe, specifically, have also become the object of increasing interest and scrutiny. Not only has the phenomenon of immigration itself attracted ever more scholarly attention, but so too have immigrants' everyday lives, experiences, practices and beliefs before and after they arrived in Israel.³⁷ The impact of their arrival on the country's origins, political identity, society and culture have also been better accounted for as Israeli national master narratives have been submitted to more critical examination.³⁸ In recent years, Israel's German-speakers in particular have been 'discovered' and, in general, the interest of Israelis in their European roots has grown exponentially together with a rising recognition of Jews' diverse contributions to the culture and history of European countries.³⁹ An increasing number of scholars have provided a sustained investigation into the experiences of Jews who stayed in Europe or who did not immigrate to Israel after the war and the Holocaust. This includes the case of Germany's 'other Germans', pointing to the diverse meanings of Jewishness and Germanness, as well as the combined legacies of National Socialism and Soviet communism on these populations.⁴⁰ In general, Jewish, German, European and Israeli histories have been the object of ever-greater integration.

However, until now, attention has quite naturally been paid to the leading organizations of immigrants and newcomers – larger groups of 'expellees', Jewish survivors and displaced persons (DPs) and a handful of regions or states in Eastern Europe – as well as to the more practical consequences of displacement and wartime violence on society and political life in general. Moreover, although comparative lines of enquiry and integrated approaches have sometimes been pursued, with regard to the histories of 'expellees' or ethnic Germans in general and Jewish immigrants or Holocaust survivors, such a methodology still tends to be regarded as bold and delicate. Given how closely tied these groups and their representative organizations were to the development of Israel and West Germany, as both states and nations, and how their histories relate to the problematic notions of ethnicity, nationality or even race, these subjects are often thought to preclude comparison. However, the few attempts at comparative or integrated histories have been remarkably thought-provoking and insightful.⁴¹ These studies have shown

that this reticence has overshadowed some clear parallels and important convergences regarding the spaces and institutions, but also the policies, processes, rationales, challenges and solutions at stake. Finally, in the last few decades, under the effect of what some scholars have called ‘hegemonic Holocaust memory’ and the focus on Czernowitz, the history of Bukovina and Bukovinians after 1945 has often been viewed and studied through the lens of its comparatively large, emancipated and educated Jewish minority and thereby primarily construed as a former ‘Jewish space’.⁴² Yet, even just a quick glimpse at the discourse about Bukovina during the Cold War reveals that this identification of Bukovina as a ‘Jewish’ – and, by implication, multi-cultural – space is a recent development that deserves to be explained.

Focusing on the yet underexplored activities and discourses of German and Jewish Bukovinians during the Cold War, and thereby juxtaposing relatively small and separate, yet connected, cases of German ‘resettlers’ and ‘Jewish survivors’ thus challenges existing assumptions and throws new light on a range of issues. As separate case studies, German and Jewish Bukovinians offer new insights into the changing politics of identity, memory and belonging in their respective countries, with relevance extending beyond the groups at hand. In combination, these cases open up a new way of thinking about the history of ‘expellees’ and ‘Holocaust survivors’ after the Second World War by showcasing their entangled perspectives and practices. Bukovina, conceived of as a prism, can serve to trace both the development of West German and Israeli modes of identification, and the development and intersections of different cultural, historical and ethnic imaginaries after the Second World War.

First, then, this book enriches our understanding of the social and political history of postwar West Germany and Israel. Both countries were new, ethnonational states that welcomed millions of people in the aftermath of the Second World War. While a great deal has been written on this topic, this study looks at what it meant in practice by offering detailed analyses of different aspects of Bukovinians’ process of social, political and cultural integration. It thereby highlights where some of these newcomers came from and who they became in the reciprocal process of constructing a sense of belonging and an identity as West Germans and Israelis in the aftermath of the war and the Holocaust. Second, with their diverging yet connected experiences of violence, looking at these two groups gives insight into how different communities of experience wrestled with the legacies of the violent past – how they compensated for loss, for suffering and for guilt. In this sense, it contributes to our understanding of the so-called process of reckoning with the past among a group of self-defining ethnic Germans and another of self-defining Jews after the Second World War and tells us about West Germany and Israel as sociocultural spaces with specific moral and emotional regimes and horizons. Finally, tracing Bukovina tells us not just how different communities of experience transmitted the past,

but also *which* history became dominant and why – what images circulated and how and why they changed across space and over time. In this sense, this study contributes to research on the spatial, temporal and generational dynamics of the memory of the war and the Holocaust.

Looking at these two groups together thus opens up new perspectives on how to write the history of the reverberations of the Second World War and the history of the postwar period in general. Indeed, this is not a parallel or a comparative narrative, but a genuinely entangled story in the sense of the French *histoire croisée*.⁴³ German and Jewish Bukovinians not only engaged with the same space but also interacted and reacted to each other and created Bukovina as a place and as a transnational object of memory in the process. This account is therefore not just one possible way of telling their story, but one that proves that the stories of either group need to be told together, creating parallels to other similar intertwined histories, and challenging the national and ethnic paradigms we often take for granted and work within unconsciously.

Therefore, this book shows that, while the Bukovina myth has been widely noted and discussed, its diverse manifestations and ideological uses and meanings have rarely been the object of systematic analysis.⁴⁴ There is a vast amount of literature and research on the region. However, on the one hand, most scholars have failed to account for the fact that Cold War publications were authored, edited and published by Bukovinian Germans in Germany and Bukovinian Jews in Israel, and funded by their respective organizations. On the other hand, the works of literary figures have often been dismissed outright as romanticized without accounting for the fact that these were, in the absence of anyone else, major spokespeople for the region. This study expounds on these issues by seeking to embed the narratives and practices relating to Bukovina in the postwar period. The aim is to provide a new framework for understanding the idealized depictions, which were also efforts to make sense of wartime experiences by displaced Bukovinians. This idealization was an intrinsic part of their postwar lives and therefore relates to the postwar societies in which they lived. This study therefore turns the classic question of ‘what makes Bukovina or Bukovinians special?’ around and asks, instead, how the Second World War and its aftermath affected Bukovinians’ sense of postwar belonging, and elucidates why postwar Bukovinian ‘diasporas’ developed at all.

Beyond Memory: The Politics of Belonging

This study forms part of a collaborative attempt to rethink the widely used but also widely critiqued concept of ‘collective memory’ to make sense of

the reverberations of the Second World War in Germany and Europe.⁴⁵ The shortcomings and limitations of the term ‘collective memory’ have been discussed extensively elsewhere and do not need to be repeated here.⁴⁶ Suffice it to say that, having moved away from its Halbwachsian roots, which emphasized the social character of the production of remembrance, studies of ‘collective memory’ or ‘memory’ more generally have often analysed top-down, frequently national and mostly monolithic narratives about the past. Pierre Nora’s seminal and highly influential work *Les lieux de mémoire* is a case in point.⁴⁷ While Nora usefully drew attention to the abstract, contingent, diversely embodied and always highly political character of practices relating to the past, he concentrated on memory’s national manifestations – often state-led initiatives with an integrative function. Such a conception does not fully do justice to the fluid, concurrent, competing and diverse character of the past’s effects on society and especially memory’s relationship to experience. While some scholars have since qualified the notion of *lieux de mémoire* (places of memory) to account for the contest over them, Bukovina is conceived of here as more than just a repository – even a contested one – of different images and ideas.⁴⁸ Rather, it is a means of enacting social and political choices, identities and even values in an ever-changing present; it is an instrument of the politics of belonging.

The aim of this collaborative research was to concentrate on a broad range of legacies of the past and thereby identify diverse, more or less visible, practices and discourses and different types of continuities and breaks. This involved working with a new and alternative theoretical framework involving the analytical categories of ‘community of experience’, ‘community of connection’ and ‘community of identification’, and seeking to explain the relationship between them.⁴⁹ Central and guiding questions included: how can one conceptualize the relationship between the experiences of an individual or a group (remembering agents) with the later, changing and diverse interpretations of an event’s effects and traces? How does the meaning of experience change over time, across space and among individuals, groups and generations? Specifically, what were the mechanics and dynamics of this process in relation to the experience of violence, genocide and displacement in Europe after the Second World War?

Therefore, rather than a mere ‘history of memory’, this book is conceived of as a ‘history of the aftermath’, analysing in a relatively *longue-durée* perspective the ‘meaning-making processes’ at work in the wake of the conflict.⁵⁰ It deals with what others have called ‘the war after the war’, ‘life after death’ or what Tony Judt powerfully but simply called the ‘post-war’.⁵¹ Writing such a history involves considering a whole range of legacies and consequences of the experience of the war and the Holocaust that cannot be reduced to mere narratives about the past. The notion of reverberations implies that

something resonates and persists and thereby shapes the present, but that, at the same time, new circumstances and beliefs arise in the process. This study thus aims to contribute to a growing body of research on the diverse ways in which the postwar world was moulded by the events of the Second World War. These issues range from human rights principles to the system of states; from decolonization to Cold War confrontations; and from notions of refugee-ness to conceptions of nationhood, historical responsibility and belonging.⁵² These manifold legacies – human and institutional, social and political, as well as cultural, emotional and physical – still resound today. The war and the Holocaust were instrumental not only for the lives of the millions of people directly affected but also for the character of the societies in which these people and the next generations later lived. In many ways, these events and their appraisal determine what many people nowadays believe and cherish, and how they approach the future.

At first sight, this might seem to fit with Paul Ricoeur's description of memory as 'the temporal dimension of identity' or identity through time.⁵³ However, this definition, which blurs the distinction between the two terms, confers to memory identity's notorious ambiguity and slipperiness – a combination of malleability and fixity, individuality and unlimited diffusion – and renders it quite meaningless. As Ricoeur points out, memory, understood as memorization, commemoration or ritual, may have more in common with identity, ideology and justice.⁵⁴ Many other scholars have noted that memory, depending on how one defines it, might easily and alternately be equated with subjectivity, destiny, culture, history or heritage.⁵⁵ Not only does this reveal the term's imprecision, but, in each case, the question this poses is 'whose memory' or 'memory for whom'. From this perspective, the use of an analytical concept of 'communities' and the search for more precise or less loaded alternatives to the word 'memory', as in this study, seems justified and helpful. In particular, such an approach draws attention to the fact that, after the war, references to Bukovina were primarily a matter of belonging, defined as both a proactive dimension of identity and a pattern of interpretation.⁵⁶ The word 'belonging' highlights the collective but also the purposeful, political (inclusive and exclusive), constructed and therefore inevitably unstable character of references to the past. As Nira Yuval-Davis has argued, studying belonging means studying 'social locations; identifications and emotional attachments; ethical and political values'. The politics of belonging thus 'relates to the participatory politics of citizenship as well as to that of entitlement and status'.⁵⁷ As she specifies elsewhere: 'The politics of belonging comprise specific political projects aimed at constructing belonging to particular collectivity/ies which are themselves being constructed in these projects in very specific ways and in very specific boundaries.'⁵⁸ This, then, also resonates with existing research on the German concept of *Heimat*

(lit.: home or homeland), accurately defined in a recent publication as ‘at the intersection of memory and space’.⁵⁹ As a malleable and supposedly politically uncharged projection of home and region, *Heimat* usually implicitly points to ‘longing and belonging’, ‘Germanness’ and even ‘the nation’, carrying with it all of the historical problems and tensions these terms also imply and entail.⁶⁰ This study does not define *Heimat* anew, but draws attention to its manifold uses to highlight the convergences and divergences of German and Jewish Bukovinian discourses and their entangled politics of identity, history and belonging.

The increasingly complex field of ‘memory studies’ has nevertheless been an essential source of inspiration and insight for the approach adopted here, both empirically and theoretically. Based on the concept of ‘memory work’, for example, this study seeks to emphasize what people *do* with their memories (as processed experiences) and draws attention to different forms and expressions – namely when, where and how the past was mobilized and for what purpose.⁶¹ Many memory scholars have also stressed the importance of a differentiated understanding of the actors and their aims, as well as how these relate to one another.⁶² This is an especially helpful impulse to make a distinction between the elite spokespersons of Bukovinian communities, the members of the communities and the surrounding society, and to highlight who benefited from having a voice and visibility at different times. The increasingly complex conceptualizations of ‘Holocaust memory’ – its forms, features and conjunctures – is also a case in point.⁶³ In this connection, analyses of ‘Holocaust memory’ in relation to ‘German memories’ and German national identity, and of the ever more intense and entangled engagement with the legacies of the history of National Socialism and the Holocaust in different communities have been especially insightful.⁶⁴ Not only have these insights aided the identification, interpretation and contextualization of specific sources, but they ultimately also informed the organization and structure of this book’s argument and material.

Part I, titled ‘Backgrounds’, delves briefly into the period before 1945. Chapter 1 offers a broad historical sketch focusing on the experiences of German and Jewish Bukovinians in the Habsburg and interwar periods and during the Second World War. This chapter emphasizes the conditions for the emergence of German and Jewish Bukovinians as two distinct social groups by describing aspects of the region’s changing social and political structure and situation. In particular, it deals with members of these two groups’ relationship to each other, to the changing political leadership and to the region’s other inhabitants and outlines briefly their respective experiences of violence and displacement during the war.

Part II, under the heading ‘Establishments’, then deals with how many of these people came to terms with displacement and constructed belonging

in their respective new national homelands after the Second World War. This part thus explores how postwar host societies reacted to the new arrivals and what meanings those nations were endowed with in the process. Chapter 2 focuses on the situation of ethnic Germans from Bukovina in the first decade after the war in West Germany – the country where most of them chose to settle after 1945. Contextualizing their experiences against the backdrop of those of millions of other displaced persons and refugees in West Germany at this time, as well as with respect to the views of the local population, it highlights the role of German Bukovinians' identification as 'Bukovinian' or even as 'Bukovina German' but also as 'resettlers' (*Umsiedler*), 'refugees' (*Flüchtlinge*) and eventually 'expellees' (*Vertriebene*) for their so-called integration in the first decade after the war. In particular, it traces German Bukovinians' establishment of institutions such as the 'Homeland Society of German Resettlers from Bukovina' (later the 'Homeland Society of Bukovina Germans') (*Landsmannschaft der deutschen Umsiedler aus der Bukowina*; *Landsmannschaft der Buchenlanddeutschen*), founded in 1949, and the concomitant development of narratives framing Germany as both a 'new' and an 'ancestral home', and Bukovina Germans as both victims and 'better Germans'. This chapter thus offers a case study of the activities of ethnic German refugees in West Germany after 1945 and a reflection on the political culture of West Germany in the first decade after the war.

Chapter 3 then turns to the situation of Bukovinian Jews in the first decade after the Second World War. This was a period during which most of the Jewish survivors from Bukovina emigrated from Romania to Mandatory Palestine and later Israel. Starting with a depiction of the situation of refugees repatriated from Transnistria and northern Bukovina to Romania in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, this chapter traces Jewish Bukovinians' struggle for recognition, citizenship and bare survival in postwar Romania. It discusses the gradual development and promotion of a conception of *Eretz Israel*, the Land of Israel, as an 'ancestral home' and a 'solution and salvation' for Bukovina Jews in particular and Jews in general. Here too, the focus is on the creation, activities and narratives of the Bukovinian homeland society, the 'Association of Immigrants from Bukovina' (*Chug Olej Bukowina*) and the later 'World Organization of Bukovina Jews' in Israel from 1944 to the early 1950s. This chapter deals with the tension between the leaders' efforts to protect their heritage and culture, to record and commemorate a past of suffering and persecution and to promote 'absorption' into a new Zionist society. This chapter thereby not only sheds new light on the immediate aftermath of the Holocaust in Romania, but also on Jewish and Israeli politics of identity, history and belonging after the Holocaust and on the situation of Holocaust survivors before they were identified as such.

Part III, entitled 'Entanglements' considers the divergent, convergent and conflicting ways in which German and Jewish Bukovinians sought to compensate for loss, for displacement and for the violent past as the Cold War advanced. Chapter 4 explores the relationship between nostalgia, guilt and Germanness by analysing, juxtaposing and comparing the different representations of the region that developed and prevailed among Germans and Jews from the region in the 1960s. Starting by considering the memorial publications of these respective groups, it highlights their idiosyncrasy and dissonance and the irreconcilability of the images of the region conveyed. This is interpreted as evidence of both prewar ethnic understandings of community and the hardening of ethnonational categories during the war and immediately afterwards. This chapter then links these discourses to the conflict that broke out between representatives of the two communities surrounding the issue of West German reparations for Jewish Bukovinians. Indeed, until the early 1960s, Jewish Bukovinians were not able to claim financial compensation for their suffering and persecution and, even then, the regulations did not foresee compensation for their material losses. When many Jewish Bukovinians started placing claims as though they were ethnic Bukovinian Germans – something the rules developed by the West German state theoretically permitted – a dispute erupted among members of the two groups and beyond about the meaning the Germanness. This chapter shows that the struggle over indemnification arose out of the fundamental opposition between different conceptions of Germanness and related conceptions of historical responsibility. However, it also demonstrates how understandings of the past could change and thus illuminates the major societal shift taking place in West Germany twenty years after the end of the war.

The final chapter, Chapter 5, reconstructs the trajectories of different, mostly Jewish, German-speaking Bukovinian writers and traces the international reception of their work up until the end of the Cold War. Focusing on the figure of Alfred Margul-Sperber and the writers who gravitated around him, the analysis first gives insight into the origins of a concept of a German-language 'literary landscape' in the region during the interwar period. It then draws attention to the growing traction of this 'landscape' idea under the influence of the works of relatively famous German-speaking Jewish writers from the region around the world and their growing popularity during the second half of the Cold War. Emphasizing the transnational character and dynamics of this Bukovinian literary trend, and focusing on the particular self-understanding of the members of this loose association of writers from the region, this chapter sheds light on the development of an alternative concept of 'Bukovinian' to that previously promoted by the established communities of Bukovinians. Indeed, in the context of changing East–West relations and generational change and against the backdrop of changing conceptions

of identity, history and community in West Germany, Israel and elsewhere during the 1970s and 1980s, literature and literary figures challenged and ultimately shaped both the wider image of the region and even the activities and discourses of the existing Bukovinian organizations (*Landsmannschaften*) themselves. This chapter thus traces the transformation of conceptions of Bukovina from a German or Jewish *Heimat* to an ethnically neutral ‘sunken cultural landscape’ and explains how and why, by 1989, the region had come to be reimagined as the site of a unique German-Jewish symbiosis.

A Note on Sources, Terminology and Translation

Setting out to understand the significance of the past in the present and how different individuals and groups dealt with their experiences of displacement and violence, this study is guided by anthropologists’ concern with the gap between what people say and what people do. It therefore necessarily draws on an eclectic body of sources, some of a bureaucratic and institutional, and others of a highly personal and individual nature. This range reflects an attempt to be as multiperspectival and multiscalar – from the bottom-up and the top-down – as possible. The archival material includes documents from local, regional and national archives, as well as specialist and private archival collections. I have also drawn on a wide array of published sources, including pamphlets, newspapers, testimonies and memoirs. The main archives used for this study include: the German Federal Archives in Koblenz and Bayreuth, the Central Zionist Archives in Jerusalem, the Romanian National Archives, the Center for the Study of the History of Romanian Jews (CSIER) in Bucharest, the state and city regional archives of Stuttgart, Darmstadt and Suceava, the Yad Vashem Archives, the USC Shoah Foundation Archive, the Archive of the National Museum of Romanian Literature and the archive of the Institut für Volkskunde der Deutschen im östlichen Europa (IVDE) in Freiburg. Last but by no means least, I drew from the library and archive of the Bukovina-Institute at the University of Augsburg, with the records of the German Bukovinian Landsmannschaft, which I was fortunate to be able to view while reworking the manuscript for publication. The newspapers of the Bukovinian homeland societies, *Der Südostdeutsche* and its precursors published since 1949 and *Die Stimme* published from 1944 to 2017, held by the IVDE in Freiburg and the Bukovina-Institute in Augsburg, constituted a key source, which I was able to draw on consistently and throughout. In addition to this, over the course of my research, I carried out over thirty oral history interviews with people originating from the region, as well as people involved in activities relating to Bukovina. Though these are not extensively or systematically quoted and

analysed in this book, they enabled me to fill in many significant gaps in the material and informed my arguments while substantially enhancing my understanding of the subject as a whole.

Finally, this study posits a distinction between Germans and Jews, which may seem problematic to some readers, especially as 'Jewish' may be both a religious and an ethnic label and many Jews may have identified as Germans or even as both. Yet, as Rogers Brubaker has argued, while ethnicity may merely be 'a perspective on the world', it is a very powerful one, which influences the character of social reality in significant ways.⁶⁵ In the case of Bukovina, it is typical to treat Jews, a religious minority, as a separate group. Besides, these terms are present in the sources and are used by the actors themselves, as indicated by the names of their organizations. Since self-identifying Germans and Jews are the focus of this study, it seems legitimate to use these categories and would be quite challenging to do without. Nonetheless, throughout this book, attempts are made to question and ultimately deconstruct the meaning of these terms by looking critically at the discourse they were mobilized to serve. To an extent, the problem of ascription also applies to the term 'Bukovinian'. As with any study of identity or identification, there is a risk of reinforcing or even creating a category by searching for it and writing about it. However, here too, I repeatedly refer to the fact that all potential Bukovinians (namely anyone born in that region), or even all of those persons the Bukovinian organizations claimed to represent, by no means necessarily identify or identified as such. Yet, ultimately, this study is not about numbers, but rather about the narratives that were developed and disseminated in their name, and their impact on and refraction of a wider historical epoch and sociocultural environment.

Finally, such a study requires a note on translation and the use of place names. This matter constitutes a notable problem when writing about regions such as Bukovina, where sovereignty changed several times over a short period. In general, I have tried to use place names in line with the period discussed, i.e. Czernowitz for Austrian, Cernăuți for Romanian, Chernovtsy for Russian and Chernivtsi for Ukrainian times. However, one cannot ignore that these practices are highly political and that the use of names constitutes an expression of power – not simply a reference to a certain time, but also a statement about who is in power and whose experience is being taken into account.⁶⁶ These terms therefore cannot be regarded as mere translations. In this context, German-language names such as Czernowitz pose a particular problem, as they are both the German and the Habsburg names of these locations. A German transcription of the current Ukrainian name of the city, Chernivtsi (Tscherniwzi), does exist, but is rarely used. With this in mind, I decided to maintain the use of Czernowitz in English when quoting German sources that use this spelling in order to indicate that this is perhaps not just

a reference to the city *in German*, but also a certain characterization of the place.

Notes

1. Georg Drozdowski to Manfred Reifer, 8 November 1950. Letters published in: M. Reifer, *Menschen und Ideen* (Tel Aviv: Edition Olympia, 1952), 364–67, here 364–65. Unless stated otherwise, all translations from French, German and Romanian are my own.
2. Manfred Reifer to Georg Drozdowski, 27 November 1950; Reifer, *Menschen und Ideen*, 366–67.
3. Reifer to Drozdowski, 27 November 1950.
4. For more on Drozdowski and his biography in these years, see G. Guggenberger, *Georg Drozdowski in literarischen Feldern zwischen Czernowitz und Berlin (1920–1945)* (Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2015), 213–15.
5. For Reifer's full biography, see Reifer, *Menschen und Ideen*.
6. These expressions are literal translations of the German collective self-descriptions of German Bukovinians as '*Bukowina Deutsche*' or '*Buchenlanddeutsche*', and Jewish Bukovinians as '*Bukowina Juden*' or '*Bukowiner*', respectively. While this combination of nouns may seem unusual in English, it captures the exclusive and distinctive character of this self-identification (the assumption that 'Germans', 'Jews' and members of other ethnicities constituted separate groups), which is what those who used the German terms implied and meant to suggest. This is why they are occasionally used in this book too.
7. S. Marten-Finnis and M. Winkler, 'Quelle und Diskurs: Czernowitzer Pressefeld 1918–1940: Ein Werkstattbericht des Arbeitskreises Czernowitzer Presse zur Digitalisierung von Czernowitzer Zeitungen 1918–40', in S. Marten-Finnis and W. Schmitz (eds), '*... zwischen dem Osten und dem Westen Europas: Deutschsprachige Presse in Czernowitz bis zum Zweiten Weltkrieg*' (Dresden: Thelem, 2005), 49–64, especially 52; A. Corbea-Hoişie, 'Zum mystizierten Erinnerungsraum Bukowina', in E. Lappin and A. Lichtblau (eds), *Die 'Wahrheit' der Erinnerung: Jüdische Lebensgeschichten* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2008), 132–41.
8. For more on these diverse images and expressions, see J. van Drunen, '*A Sanguine Bunch: Regional Identification in Habsburg Bukovina, 1774–1919*' (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Pegasus, 2015).
9. On this see S. Frunchak, 'Studying the Land, Contesting the Land: A Select Historiographic Guide to Modern Bukovina', *The Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies* 2108, vol. 1 (Essay) and 2 (Notes) (2011); G. Fisher and M. Röger, 'Bukovina: A Borderland Region in (Trans-)national Historiographies after 1945 and 1989–1991', *East European Politics and Societies* 33(1) (2019), special issue, 176–195.
10. K.E. Franzos, *Vom Don zur Donau: Neue Kulturbilder aus 'Halb-Asien'* (Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot, 1877). Though he wrote this about Galicia and the region beyond Czernowitz, this label has nevertheless stuck. See A. Corbea-Hoişie, 'Halb-Asien', in J. Feichtinger and H. Uhl (eds), *Habsburg neu denken: Vielfalt und Ambivalenz in Zentraleuropa. 30 kulturwissenschaftliche Stichworte* (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2016), 73–81.
11. See e.g. G. von Rezzori, *Maghrebinische Geschichten* (Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1953); A. Corbea-Hoişie, 'Gedächtnisort Maghrebinien: Eine Lesehypothese', in M. Csáki and P. Stachel (eds), *Die Verortung von Gedächtnis* (Vienna: Passagen Verlag, 2001), 151–62.

12. R. Ausländer, 'Erinnerungen an eine Stadt', in H. Braun (ed.), *Rose Ausländer: Materialien zu Leben und Werk* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1991), 10. Extract from the speech delivered upon receipt of the Georg-Büchner Prize in Bremen in 1960; P. Celan, *Der Meridian: Endfassung, Entwürfe, Materialien*, edited by B. Böschenstein and H. Schmuil (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1999).
13. 'Archetypal borderland': D. Rechter, 'Habsburg Bukowina: Juden am Rande des Reiches', *Grenzen: Jüdischer Almanach der Leo Baeck Institute* (2015), 84–94, here 85; 'shatter-zones of empires': O. Bartov and E. Weitz (eds), *Shatterzones of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg, Russian, and Ottoman Borderlands* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2013); 'bloodlands': T. Snyder, *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin* (New York: Basic Books, 2010); 'intermixed': T. Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945* (London: Heinemann, 2005), loc. 800; 'pulverised': R. Evans, 'Central Europe: The History of an Idea', in *Austria, Hungary, and the Habsburgs: Essays on Central Europe, c. 1683–1867* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 304. For 'vanished world', see e.g. the blog by Christian Herrmann: <https://vanishedworld.blog/author/cyberorange> (retrieved 6 September 2019).
14. According to Magris, this myth, which was linked to the self-created and self-legitimizing myth of a benevolent Habsburg presence, developed in Europe's postimperial spaces after the First World War and was prevalent among these regions' Jewish intellectuals especially. See C. Magris, *Danube* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1989).
15. J. Le Rider, 'Mitteleuropa as a lieu de mémoire', in A. Erll, A. Nünning and S. Young (eds), *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 37–46, here 42. The literary scholar A. Corbea-Hoişie has also done a great deal to debunk the myth by studying the region's Jewish minority and its writers in particular. See e.g. A. Corbea-Hoişie, *Czernowitzer Geschichten: Über eine städtische Kultur in Mittelosteuropa* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2003); A. Corbea-Hoişie, *La Bucovine: Éléments d'Histoire Politique et Culturelle* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 2004).
16. See K. Werner, 'Euphorie und Skepsis: waren die Bukowina und Galizien 'inter'kulturell? Anmerkung zu einer Debatte', in K. Werner (ed.), *Erfahrungsgeschichte und Zeugenschaft: Studien zur deutsch-jüdischen Literatur aus Galizien und der Bukowina* (Munich: IKGS Verlag, 2003), 11–22; M. Csáky, A. Kury and U. Tragatschnig (eds), *Kultur – Identität – Differenz: Wien und Zentraleuropa in der Moderne* (Innsbruck: StudienVerlag, 2004); J. Le Rider, 'Mitteleuropa, Zentraleuropa, Mittelosteuropa: A Mental Map of Central Europe', *European Journal of Social Theory* 11(2) (2008), 155–69; D. Bechtel and X. Balmiche 'Introduction', in D. Bechtel and X. Balmiche (eds), *Les Villes Multiculturelles en Europe Centrale* (Paris: Belin, 2008), 7–14; and, most recently, J. Feichtinger and G.B. Cohen (eds), *Understanding Multiculturalism: The Habsburg Central European Experience* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2014). On the broader debate, see e.g. C. Taylor et al., *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).
17. For a comprehensive and critical overview of research on the region, see K. Scharr, 'Die Landschaft Bukowina': *Das Werden einer Region an der Peripherie 1774–1918* (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2008), 45–78; and K. Scharr, 'Bukowina als historische Region im Überblick', in O.J. Schmitt and M. Metzeltin (eds), *Das Südosteuropa der Regionen* (Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2015), 411–37. See also Chapter 1 in this book.
18. There is a large amount of literature on this subject. For recent analyses and further references on the case of Bukovina, see the special cluster of articles of G. Fisher and M. Röger (eds), 'Bukovina and Bukovinians after the Second World War: (Re)shaping and (Re)

- thinking a Region after Genocide and “Ethnic Unmixing”, *East European Politics and Societies* 33(1) (2019), special issue, 176–256. See also S. Frunchak, ‘Commemorating the Future in Post-War Chernivtsi’, *East European Politics and Societies* 24(3) (2010), 435–63; U. Blacker, ‘Living among the Ghosts of Others: Urban Postmemory in Eastern Europe’, in U. Blacker and A. Etkind (eds), *Memory and Theory in Eastern Europe* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 173–93; C. Wanner, ‘The Return of Czernowitz: Urban Affect, Nostalgia, and the Politics of Place-Making in a European Borderland City’, *City and Society* 28(2) (2016), 198–221. On other areas and the wider region, see e.g. P. Ballinger, ‘Imperial Nostalgia: Mythologizing Habsburg Trieste’, *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 97 (2003), 84–101; C. Hann and P. R. Magocsi (eds), *Galicia: A Multicultural Land* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005); T. Richardson, *Kaleidoscopic Odessa: History and Place in Contemporary Ukraine* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008); E. Narvselius, ‘Tragic Past, Agreeable Heritage: Post-Soviet Intellectual Discussions on the Polish Legacy in Western Ukraine’, *The Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies* 2403 (2015); and B. von Hirschhausen et al. (eds), *Phantomgrenzen: Räume und Akteure in der Zeit neu denken* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2015).
19. Exceptions include two unpublished doctoral dissertations: P. Weber, ‘Regime Changes, Public Memory and the Pursuit of Justice: The Case of German-Speaking Jews in Bukovina, 1920–1960’ (D.Phil. thesis, University of Sussex, 2006); and S. Frunchak, ‘The Making of Soviet Chernivtsi: National “Re-unification”, World War II, and the Fate of Jewish Czernowitz in Post-war Ukraine’ (D.Phil. thesis, University of Toronto, 2010).
 20. On the distinction between space and place, see D. Massey, *For Space* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2005), especially 130. As Massey argues, places are ‘constantly shifting articulations of social relations through time’ and further that: ‘The identity of places, and indeed the very identification of places as particular places, is always in that sense temporary, uncertain, and in process.’ D. Massey, ‘Places and Their Pasts’, *History Workshop Journal* 39 (1995), 182–92, here 188, 190.
 21. See Massey, ‘Places and Their Pasts’, 186.
 22. R. Barthes, *Mythologies* (Paris: Seuil, 1957).
 23. Cf. V. Glajar and J. Teodorescu (eds), *Local History, Transnational Memory in the Romanian Holocaust* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
 24. This relates to the notion of a ‘spatial turn’. On this, see Y.F. Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001); B. Watf and S. Arias (eds), *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2009).
 25. Many scholars have noted that this shift and most studies of expellee organizations focus on the 1950s and 1960s, and end in the early 1970s for precisely this reason.
 26. The issue of ‘integration’ of expellees is subject to debate, but scholars generally agree that, by the 1960s, political and economic integration had been largely achieved. On this, see R. Schulze with R. Rohde and R. Voß (eds), *Zwischen Heimat und Zuhause: Deutsche Flüchtlinge und Vertriebene in (West)Deutschland 1945–2000* (Osnabrück: Secolo Verlag, 2001); I. Connor, *Refugees and Expellees in Post-war Germany* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007); M. Krauss (ed.), *Integrationen: Vertriebene in den deutschen Ländern nach 1945* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008).
 27. On this, see R.G. Moeller, *War Stories: The Search for a Usable Past in the Federal Republic of Germany* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 51–87; P. Ahonen, ‘The Impact of Distorted Memory’, in R. Ohliger, K. Schönwalder and T. Triadafilopoulos (eds), *European Encounters: Migrants, Migration and European Societies* (Aldershot: Ashgate,

- 2003), 238–56; and G. Margalit, *Guilt, Suffering, and Memory: Germany Remembers Its Dead of World War II*, translated from Hebrew by H. Watzman (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010), especially 186–220.
28. For a comprehensive and critical overview of the debates surrounding the memory of the expulsions after the Second World War and expellee politics in general, see E. Hahn and H.H. Hahn, *Die Vertreibung im deutschen Erinnern: Legenden, Mythos, Geschichte* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2010).
29. On the rejection of the Diaspora and silence surrounding the Holocaust, see e.g. T. Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust*, translated from Hebrew by H. Watzman (New York: Hill and Wang, 1994); I. Zertal, *From Catastrophe to Power: Holocaust Survivors and the Emergence of Israel* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).
30. On this, see B. Cohen, *Israeli Holocaust Research: Birth and Evolution* (New York: Routledge, 2013).
31. On this, see e.g. D. Cesarani and E. Sundquist (eds), *After the Holocaust: Challenging the Myth of Silence* (London: Routledge, 2012); and, most recently, L. Halperin, *Babel in Zion: Jews, Nationalism, and Language Diversity in Palestine, 1920–1948* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015).
32. On this, see e.g. M. Fulbrook, *German National Identity after the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999); M. Brenner (ed.), *Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland von 1945 bis zur Gegenwart: Politik, Kultur und Gesellschaft* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2012).
33. A. Wiewiorka, *The Era of the Witness*, translated from French by J. Stark (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006). For more literature on this topic, see Chapters 4 and 5 in this book.
34. Many of these works are cited throughout, especially in Chapter 2. Key studies in English include: P. Ahonen, *After the Expulsion: West Germany and Eastern Europe 1945–1990* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); and A. Demshuk, *The Lost German East: Forced Migration and the Politics of Memory 1945–1970* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012). For a concise overview of the events and discourses, see M. Beer, *Flucht Vertreibung der Deutschen: Voraussetzung, Verlauf, Folgen* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2011). For a recent and comprehensive insight into different aspects of ‘expellee’ discourse and culture, see S. Scholz, M. Röger and B. Niven (eds), *Die Erinnerung an Flucht und Vertreibung: Ein Handbuch der Medien und Praktiken* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2015).
35. See <https://www.sfvv.de/de> (retrieved 6 September 2019).
36. See e.g. D. Rock and S. Wolff (eds), *Coming Home to Germany? The Integration of Ethnic Germans from Central and Eastern Europe in the Federal Republic* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002); C. Ingrao and F. Szabo (eds), *The Germans and the East* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2008). On Romania specifically, see J. Koranyi, ‘Between East and West: Romanian German Identities since 1945’ (D.Phil. thesis, University of Exeter, 2008); C. Cercel, *Romania and the Quest for European Identity: Philo-Germanism without Germans* (New York: Routledge, 2019).
37. Much of this literature is cited and drawn on in Chapter 3. See H. Yablonka, *Holocaust Survivors: Israel after the War* (New York: New York University Press, 1999); D. Hacohen, *Immigrants in Turmoil: Mass Immigration to Israel and its Repercussions in the 1950s and after* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2003); D. Porat, *Israeli Society, the Holocaust and its Survivors* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2008). Most recently, see D. Ofer, F.S. Ouzan and J. Tydor Baumel-Schwartz (eds), *Holocaust Survivors: Resettlement, Memories, Identities* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012). In recent years, there has been

- significant new research on the experiences of Jewish DPs especially. See e.g. A. Patt, *Finding Home and Homeland: Jewish Youth and Homeland in the Aftermath of the Holocaust* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2009).
38. See e.g. R. Wistrich and D. Ohana (eds), *The Shaping of Israeli Identity, Myth, Memory and Trauma* (London: Frank Cass, 1995); I. Zertal, *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). For a recent, concise overview, see M. Brenner, *Israel: Traum und Wirklichkeit des jüdischen Staates: von Theodor Herzl bis heute* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2016).
 39. For a thought-provoking essay on Israelis' relations to Europe more generally, see D. Pinto, *Israel Has Moved* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).
 40. See e.g. J. Bornemann and J. Peck, *Sojourners: The Return of German Jews and the Question of Identity* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1995); M. Bodemann, *Jews, Germans, Memory: Reconstructions of Jewish Life in Germany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996); more recently, see J. Schoeps and O. Glockner (eds), *A Road to Nowhere? Jewish Experiences in a Unifying Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2011).
 41. Most recently, on the case of expellees, see M. Borutta and J.C. Jansen (eds), *Vertriebene and Pieds-Noirs in Postwar Germany and France: Comparative Perspectives* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016). A number of studies in the last three decades have compared the cases of the migration and displacement of ethnic Germans and Jews and, with this, Germany and Israel. Most recently and systematically, see J. Panagiotidis, 'Laws of Return? Co-ethnic Immigration to West Germany and Israel (1948–1992)' (D.Phil. thesis, European University Institute, 2012). Others working on the cases of expellees or ethnic Germans have also sporadically explored entanglements. See e.g. A. Demshuk, "'Wehmut und Trauer': Jewish Travelers in Polish Silesia and the Foreignness of Heimat', *Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts* (December 2007), 311–35. For a remarkable example of an integrated history, see A. Grossmann, *Jews, Germans, and Allies: Close Encounters in Occupied Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).
 42. The two most important studies of postwar Bukovina in recent years deal with the history of Jewish memory: F. Heymann, *Le Crépuscule des Lieux: Identités Juives de Czernowitz* (Paris: Stock, 2003); and M. Hirsch and L. Spitzer, *Ghosts of Home: The Afterlife of Czernowitz in Jewish Memory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010). The focus on Jewish history constitutes a wider cultural phenomenon in the region. On this, see e.g. R.E. Gruber, *Virtually Jewish: Reinventing Jewish Culture in Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); E. Lehrer (ed.), *Jewish Space in Contemporary Poland* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2015). The 'discovery' of both Jewish survivors and traces of Jewish life on the ground in Romania and Ukraine after 1989–91 has played an instrumental role and continues to capture a great deal of attention. For recent analyses of the case of Bukovina, see N. Bernsand, 'Returning Chernivtsi to the Cultural Map of Europe', *East European Politics and Societies* 33(1) (2019), 238–56; G. Fisher, 'Looking Forwards through the Past: Bukovina's "Return to Europe" after 1989–1991', *East European Politics and Societies* 33(1) (2019), 196–217; and K. Koziura, 'The Spaces of Nostalgia(s) and the Politics of Belonging in Contemporary Chernivtsi Western Ukraine', *East European Politics and Societies* 33(1) (2019), 218–37. See also F. Heymann, 'Voyage à Chernivtsi ou Retour à Czernowitz? Les Paradoxes de la Mémoire et de la Nostalgie', *Teoros* 29(1) (2010), 17–30; M. Hirsch and L. Spitzer, 'The Web and the Reunion: <http://czernowitz.ehpes.com>', in M. Hirsch and N.K. Miller (eds), *Rites of Return: Diaspora Poetics and the Politics of Memory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 59–71.

43. M. Werner and B. Zimmermann, 'Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity', *History and Theory* 45(1) (2006), 30–50.
44. On this, see S. Marten-Finnis and M. Winkler, 'Location of Memory versus Space of Communication: Presses, Languages, and Education among Czernovitz Jews, 1918–1941', *Central Europe* 7(1) (May 2009), 30–55.
45. For more on the context of this research project, see S. Bird, M. Fulbrook, J. Wagner and C. Wienand (eds), *Reverberations of Nazi Violence in Germany and Beyond: Disturbing Pasts* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016); see also <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/multidisciplinary-and-intercultural-inquiry/research/research-projects/reverberations-of-war> (retrieved 6 September 2019). Further studies resulting from this project include S. Bird, *Comedy and Trauma in Germany and Austria after 1945: The Inner Side of Mourning* (Cambridge: Legenda, 2016); and M. Fulbrook, *Reckonings: Legacies of Nazi Persecution and the Quest for Justice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).
46. On the original concept, see M. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, translated from French by L.A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). For a critique of the term, see A. Confino, 'Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method', *American Historical Review* 102 (1997), 1386–403; W. Kansteiner, 'Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies', *History and Theory* 41 (2002), 179–97; Bill Niven, 'On the Use of "Collective Memory"', *German History* 26(3) (2008), 427–36; M. Fulbrook, 'History Writing and "Collective Memory"', in S. Berger and B. Niven (eds), *Writing the History of Memory* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 65–87.
47. Pierre Nora (ed.), *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, 7 vols (Paris: Gallimard, 1984–92).
48. See e.g. M. Csáki and P. Stachel (eds), *Die Verortung von Gedächtnis* (Vienna: Passagen Verlag, 2001).
49. For more on these concepts, see Fulbrook, 'History Writing and "Collective Memory"'.
50. See e.g. F. Biess and R.G. Moeller (eds), *Histories of the Aftermath: The Legacies of the Second World War in Europe* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 5.
51. See D. Cesarani, 'Introduction', in D. Cesarani et al. (eds), *Survivors of Nazi Persecution in Europe after the Second World War* (Portland: Vallentine Mitchell, 2010), 1; R. Bessel (ed.), *Life after Death: Approaches to a Cultural and Social History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Judt, *Postwar*.
52. See e.g. P. Ther and A. Siljak (eds), *Redrawing Nations: Ethnic Cleansing in East Central Europe 1944–1948* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001); M. Mazower (ed.), *Postwar Reconstruction in Europe: International Perspectives, 1945–1949* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); J. Reinisch and E. White (eds), *The Disentanglement of Populations: Migration, Expulsion and Displacement in Postwar Europe, 1944–1949* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); G.D. Cohen, *In War's Wake: Europe's Displaced Persons in the Postwar Order* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). For studies with similarly *longue-durée* perspectives, see P. Ballinger, *History in Exile: Memory and Identity at the Borders of the Balkans* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003); D. Stone, *Goodbye to All That?: The Story of Europe since 1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).
53. P. Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, translated from French by K. Blamey and D. Pellauer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 81.
54. Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting*.
55. Much has been written on the relationship between these terms. Jan and Aleida Assmann have famously established a distinction between 'cultural memory' and 'communicative memory': J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische*

- Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1992). On history, memory and (popular) culture, see W. Kansteiner, *In Pursuit of German Memory: History, Television, and Politics after Auschwitz* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2006); A. Erll, *Memory in Culture*, translated from German by S.B. Young (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). On history, historical consciousness and memory, see P. Burke, *Varieties of Cultural History* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997); H. Welzer (ed.), *Das soziale Gedächtnis: Geschichte, Erinnerung, Tradierung* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2001). On the politics of memory, see K. Hodgkin and S. Radstone (eds), *Contested Pasts: The Politics of Memory* (London: Routledge, 2003). On memory and heritage, see S. Macdonald, *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today* (London: Routledge, 2013). On collective memory and individual subjectivity, see D. Schacter (ed.), *Memory Distortion: How Minds, Brains and Societies Reconstruct the Past* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995). For a synthetic insight into many of these issues and how they relate to one another, see I. Irwin-Zarecka, *Frames of Remembrance: The Dynamics of Collective Memory* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1994); and, more recently, Berger and Niven, *Writing the History of Memory*.
56. G. Rosenthal and A. Bogner, 'Introduction', in G. Rosenthal and A. Bogner (eds), *Ethnicity, Belonging and Biography: Ethnographical and Biographical Perspectives* (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2009).
 57. N. Yuval-Davis, 'Belonging and the Politics of Belonging', *Patterns of Prejudice* 40(3) (2006), 197–214, here 199.
 58. N. Yuval-Davis, *The Politics of Belonging: Intersectional Contestations* (London: Sage, 2011), 10.
 59. F. Eigler and J. Kugele (eds), *Heimat: At the Intersection of Memory and Space* (Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2012).
 60. On the concept of *Heimat*, see C. Applegate, *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); A. Confino, *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory 1871–1918* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); C. Wickham, *Constructing Heimat in Postwar Germany: Longing and Belonging* (Lewiston: Mellen, 1999); P. Bickle, *Heimat: A Critical Theory of the German Idea of Homeland* (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2002). In relation to expellees, see also J. von Moltke, *No Place Like Home: Locations of Heimat in German Cinema* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); P. Maeder, *Forging a New Heimat: Expellees in Post-war West Germany and Canada* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Unipress, 2011); and Demshuk, *The Lost German East*.
 61. A. Confino and P. Fritzsche (eds), *The Work of Memory: New Directions in the Study of German Society and Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002).
 62. B. Niven and S. Berger, 'Introduction', in Niven and Berger, *Writing the History of Memory*, 1–24. Kansteiner emphasizes the importance of interest and power groups, and the distinction between object, maker and consumer of memory: Kansteiner, *In Pursuit of German Memory*. The concepts of 'prosthetic', 'multidirectional' and 'post-memory' also give a more differentiated, qualified view of the actors. See A. Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004); M. Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009); M. Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012); see also E. Knightly and D. Pickering, *The Mnemonic Imagination: Remembering as a Creative Practice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

63. See e.g. S. Friedländer, 'Trauma, Memory, and Transference', in G. Hartman (ed.), *Holocaust Remembrance: The Shapes of Memory* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), 252–65. There has been a considerable amount of work on survivor and Holocaust memory. Seminal works include L. Langer, *Holocaust Testimonies: The Ruins of Memory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991); James E. Young, *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meanings* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993).
64. This constitutes a huge body of literature. Key publications include D. Diner, 'Negative Symbiose: Deutsche und Juden nach Auschwitz', *Babylon* 1 (1986), 9–20; C. Maier, *The Unmasterable Past: History, Holocaust, and German National Identity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988); D. Diner, 'On Guilt Discourse and Other Narratives', *History and Memory* 9(1–2) (1997), 301–20; Fulbrook, *German National Identity after the Holocaust*; P. Novick, *The Holocaust and Collective Memory: The American Experience* (London: Bloomsbury, 2001); B. Niven, *Facing the Nazi Past: United Germany and the Legacy of the Third Reich* (London: Routledge, 2002); D. Michman (ed.), *Remembering the Holocaust in Germany, 1945–2000: German Strategies and Jewish Responses* (New York: Peter Lang, 2002); R.G. Moeller, 'Germans as Victims?: Thoughts on a Post-Cold War History of World War II's Legacies', *History and Memory* 17(1–2) (2005), 145–94; B. Niven (ed.), *Germans as Victims: Remembering the Past in Contemporary Germany* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); A. Assmann, *Der lange Schatten der Vergangenheit: Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2006); M. Zehfuss, *Wounds of Memory: The Politics of War in Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); R. Wittlinger, *German National Identity in the Twenty-First Century: A Different Republic after All?* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); B. Niven and C. Paver (eds), *Memorialization in Germany since 1945* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); J.K. Olick, *The Sins of the Fathers: Germany, Memory, Method* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016).
65. R. Brubaker, *Ethnicity without Groups* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004).
66. On this, see K. Schlögel, *In Räume lesen wir die Zeit: über Zivilisationsgeschichte und Geopolitik* (Munich: Hanser, 2003).