

Refugees and Citizens

New Nation States as Places of Asylum,
1914–1941

16 and 17 June 2016
Bruno Kreisky Forum für internationalen Dialog
1190 Wien, Armbrustergasse 15

WIENER WIESENTHAL INSTITUT
FÜR HOLOCAUST-STUDIEN (VWI)



ŽIDOVSKÉ
MUZEUM
V PRAZE



Simon Wiesenthal Workshop 2016

Abstracts & CVs

Keynote I

- Bernhard Perchinig
Grenzüberschreitende Mobilität und internationaler Flüchtlingsschutz. Spannungsfelder und Herausforderungen 4

Theoretical Approaches to Refugeeedom

- Itai Apter
International Refugee Law and Places of Asylum in the Interwar Period. Utilising Contemporary Tools to Understand the Past 6
- Raphael Heinetsberger
Das deutsche ‚Volk‘ der Staatenlosen. Über den Zusammenhang von Entstaatlichung und Entgrenzung der Gewalt 7
- Aviezer Tucker
Non-territorial States. The Alternative Response to the Refugee Crisis 8

Refugees and Nation States

- Francesco Frizzera
„Verwaltungsobjekte, nicht Staatsbürger“. The Roots of the Refugee Policies Developed in the Habsburg Successor States 10
- Ana Ćirić Pavlović
A Multinational Heaven for Refugees? The Interwar South Slavs' Kingdom 11
- Anisa Hasanhodžić / Rifet Rustemović
Being Refugees. Austrian Jewish Refugees in the Territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina before and during the Second World War 12
- Kinga Frojimovics
Jewish Refugees in the Hospitals of the Jewish Community of Pest from 1938 Onwards 14

First World War and the Challenges of Refugeeedom

- Ines Koeltzsch
Beyond the Cities. East European Jewish Refugees in the Bohemian and Moravian Countryside during the First World War 16
- Kathryn Densford
From Fellow Citizens to Unwanted Foreigners. Refugees along the Lower Austrian-Moravian Border, 1914–1919 17
- Jernej Kosi
Refugees in their Own Homeland. Slovene Population from Austrian Littoral between Evacuation, Repatriation, and Emigration, 1915 –1925 18

Keynote II:

Dieter Gosewinkel

Citizenship. The Principal Form of Political Belonging in Twentieth Century Europe 20

Politics of Political Exile

Wolfgang Schellenbacher

From Political Activism to Disillusionment. Austrian Socialist Refugees in Czechoslovakia, 1934–1938 22

Maria Bychkova

Kulturleben des russischen Exils im Berlin der 1920er-Jahre. Zwischen Kooperation und Abgrenzung 23

Tatiana Teterevleva

Russian Refugees in Interwar Norway. Public Opinion and Development of Government Policy 24

Refugees, Exclusion and Citizenship

Michal Frankl

From Benevolence to Exclusion.

Anti-Jewish Refugee Policy and the Transformation of Jewish Citizenship in Czechoslovakia, 1935–1939 26

Alina Bothe

Polish-Jewish Deportees in 1938. Refugees or Aroysgeshikte? 27

Benjamin Naujoks

Litauen 1917–1941. Exklusion und Verdrängen als Prinzip 28

Naida-Mihal Brandl

Jewish Refugees from 1933 until 1943 in Croatia in the Shadow of the Holocaust 29

Adina Babeş

Between Emigration and Extermination. Solving the 'Jewish problem' in the 1940s Romania 30

Bernhard Perchinig
(Universität Wien)

Keynote I: Grenzüberschreitende Mobilität und internationaler Flüchtlingsschutz. Spannungsfelder und Herausforderungen

Das Referat diskutiert das Spannungsfeld zwischen dem Schutz vor Verfolgung gemäß der Genfer Flüchtlingskonvention (GFK) und der Politik zur Migrationssteuerung in der EU. Aufbauend auf einer Analyse der historischen Entwicklung der GFK diskutiert es die systemischen Widersprüche der EU-Asylpolitik und fordert zur Lösung der Migrationskrise die Eröffnung neuer Wege legaler Migration außerhalb des Asylsystems. Auch wenn dabei die Wiedereröffnung der Arbeitsmigration ein wichtiger Aspekt ist, braucht es angesichts der Digitalisierung und Automatisierung auch neue Wege der Ermöglichung internationaler Mobilität außerhalb von Arbeitsmigration, Familiennachzug und Ausbildung, die in der Folge diskutiert werden.

bernhard.perchinig@univie.ac.at

Dr. phil. (Universität Wien 1986) Bernhard Perchinig, Politikwissenschaftler und Soziologe, Senior Researcher, International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD), Wien; Universitätslektor, Vienna Master of Arts in Human Rights, Universität Wien; Faculty-Member am Department für Wirtschaftsrecht und Europäische Integration der Donau-Universität Krems und im MA Programme in Intercultural Studies der Universität Salzburg. Zuvor Forschungstätigkeit als Research Fellow bzw. Senior Researcher an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und dem Europäischen Zentrums für Wohlfahrtspolitik und Sozialforschung. Beratungstätigkeit im Bereich Migrations- und Integrationsforschung für österreichische Behörden und internationale Organisationen, zahlreiche Publikationen im Bereich Migrations- und Minderheitenpolitik, zuletzt: *Migrationspolitik*. in: Heinrich Neisser; Andreas Maurer; Johannes Pollak (Hg.): *20 Jahre EU-Mitgliedschaft Österreichs*. Wien 2015, 166 -186.
(gemeinsam mit A. König, J. Perumadan, K. Schaur): *Integration, Transnational Mobility and Human, Social and Economic Capital Transfers - Country Report - Austria*. ITHACA Research Report N. 1/2015. ITHACA Project. Florence (European University Institute) 2015, <http://hdl.handle.net/1814/37864>.

Chair: Béla Rásky (Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies – VWI)

bela.rasky@vwi.ac.at

Dr. Béla Rásky, historian, studied history and history of art at the University of Vienna. Contributed to numerous projects and exhibitions in contemporary history, research at the Österreichische Kulturdokumentation. Internationales Archiv für Kulturanalysen, Expert on Cultural Policy for the Council of Europe, until 2003 director of the Austrian Science and Research Liaison Office, Budapest; then freelance and at the Wien Museum. Currently, he is Managing Director of the VWI.

Panel 1: Theoretical Approaches to Refugeeedom

Thursday, 16 June 2016
11:00 – 12:45

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

eva.kovacs@vwi.ac.at

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

Itai Apter

(University of Haifa)

International Refugee Law and Places of Asylum in the Interwar Period. Utilising Contemporary Tools to Understand the Past

Today, when discussing asylum seekers and refugees, international law is considered a key factor, mainly the 1951 Refugee Convention and subsequent international legal instruments. Discussions on the pre-1951 period, particularly post-WWI, tend not to widely address the international law aspect. Acknowledging that at the time international law played a much less significant role than it plays today, this is understandable. Nevertheless, it is still interesting to see what role, if any, international or national law played in decision and policy making on refugees and asylum seekers in the post-WWI period.

The paper utilises modern international law and international relations theories to understand refugee and asylum seekers policies from these understudied and underdeveloped perspectives, to shed light on the relevance of the more formal transnational components to domestic policies.

We begin by discussing post-WWI transnational legal regimes comprised of the international frameworks in the peace treaties as well as international legal instruments directly addressing refugees and asylum seekers. In the paper's second section, debate turns theoretical, analysing the regimes by applying global governance and globalisation theories. Acknowledging that such theories are a modern creature, there is still value in perceptions they offer on international law and international relations.

Based on these frameworks, the paper's third section focuses on linkages between the transnational legal and political regimes to domestic practices. Subsequently, the paper's fourth section, debate questions whether a more strict application of the applicable frameworks, supported by global governance cosmopolitan conceptual ideas, might have resulted in different outcomes. The paper's final section utilises the findings to assess the role of transnationalism in the pre-Holocaust period. Comprehending this aspect of the historical events can contribute to a better understanding of the role of global elements in the run up to the Second World War and the mass deportations which were one of its main characteristics.

Ultimately, the paper argues that early focus in creating the legal instruments protecting displaced persons on the global governance or transnational aspect of the issue, instead of waiting until it was too late, might have contributed to protecting refugees. It could also have created models for better addressing the post-WWII significantly more dramatic refugee issue.

In the past, scholarship on modern history, including events preceding the Second World War, mainly focused on localised domestic events influenced by global ones. Today, there is a shift towards perceiving global events not as merely influencing domestic occurrences but as global or transnational history. Inspired by the way the refugee question is examined in contemporary discourse, the paper suggests utilising this platform to explore the pre-WWII refugee question, highlighting the relevance of the transnational legal and political order. In that regard, the paper's aim is not a detailed listing of the different arrangements and regulations concerning refugees and asylum seekers. Rather, the aim is to illustrate, by using examples, the utility of different innovative approaches to better understand the way the international community and states addresses, or failed to address, the post-WWI refugee crisis.

itaiapter@hotmail.com

Itai Apter is a PhD student at Haifa University. He has completed an LL.M. in International Legal Studies at New York University on 2008 and an LL.B. in Haifa University on 2006. He is Director of International Civil Affairs in the Israel Ministry of Justice. Alongside academic studies and professional activities, he also engages in independent research focusing on interdisciplinary study of international law and international relations. In that context, he has presented papers in academic forums and published articles in peer-reviewed journals and chapters in compilation books. The issues of focus for this work mainly pertain to the intersection between the international legal order and domestic and global politics, as well as historical analysis of international law.

Das deutsche ‚Volk‘ der Staatenlosen. Über den Zusammenhang von Entstaatlichung und Entgrenzung der Gewalt

Mein Beitrag beschäftigt sich, basierend auf Hannah Arendts und Franz L. Neumanns Kritik der völkischen Vergemeinschaftung, mit den gemeinsamen Ursachen von Entstaatlichung und Entgrenzung der Gewalt während der Herrschaft des Nationalsozialismus. Formuliert wird die Überlegung, dass erst unter der Berücksichtigung des völkischen Antisemitismus und Rassismus die spezifischen Auswirkungen der deutschen Herstellung einer ‚Volksgemeinschaft‘ auf die besondere Form der NS-Gewalt verständlich werden.

Für das 19. und beginnende 20. Jahrhundert in Europa kritisierte Hannah Arendt die „Transformation des Staates aus einer legalen in eine nationale Institution“. Nationalismus und Rassismus lösten nicht nur das Versprechen der französischen Revolution universaler Freiheitsrechte nicht ein, das Schicksal der modernen Flüchtlinge offenbarte sogar seine Verkehrung. Staaten- und Rechtlosigkeit waren analog. Unter dem „Gesetzesschutz“ (Arendt) des Staates standen nicht wie es der Abstraktion nach hieß, all jene die sich seiner souveränen Gewalt unterwarfen, sondern ausschließlich jene, die ihre Zugehörigkeit durch nationale Abstammung beweisen konnten. Staatenlosigkeit ging einher mit Rechtlosigkeit.

Hannah Arendt erkannte in dieser Entwicklung eine für den Nationalstaat „tödliche Krankheit“. Wie der Nationalstaat nur als historisch-spezifischer existiert, können auch die Elemente seines Zerfalls nur spezifisch beschrieben werden.

Die nationalsozialistische Herrschaft stellte sich als umfassender Versuch dar, die abstrakt staatsrechtlichen Begriffe vollständig zu „resubstantialisieren“ (Ingeborg Maus). 1939 schrieb Carl Schmitt, die politische Gemeinschaft des Nationalsozialismus bestimme sich „wesentlich volkhaft“. Die Form der politischen Konstitution des nationalsozialistischen Herrschaftsverbandes knüpfte sich an die Frage, wer zum deutschen „Volk“ gehörte. Franz Neumann bezeichnete die sogenannten Nürnberger Rassengesetze, kurz nach ihrer Einführung, einen „Kulminationspunkt in dem doppelten Prozess der Integration und Differenzierung der nationalsozialistischen Gesellschaftsordnung“.

Nationale „Homogenität“ bilde sich Carl Schmitt nach an der „politischer Substanz“, das heißt an der Feststellung der auszuscheidenden oder gar zu vernichtenden „Heterogene“. Dass die Staatslehre der Bestimmung des Politischen, also von Freund und Feind, nachgeordnet sei, kündigte die Folgen einer „rassischen“ Konstitution der deutschen „Volksgemeinschaft“ an: „Wir bestimmen also nicht den Nationalsozialismus von einem ihm vorgehenden Begriff des Rechtsstaates, sondern umgekehrt den Rechtsstaat vom Nationalsozialismus her“ (Schmitt).

Damit hatte bereits die Ideologie des Nationalsozialismus, den Prozess der Entstaatlichung der NS-Herrschaft vorgezeichnet. Die „nationalsozialistische Revolution“ hatte nach Schmitts Verständnis, den „blut- und bodenfremden Gesetzesstaates“ überwunden. Die Gewalt der nationalsozialistischen Gesellschaft war aus den Grenzen souveräner Staatlichkeit entlassen und auf die „organisierten Gemeinschaft“ (Neumann) übergegangen.

Der Ausschluss jüdischer StaatsbürgerInnen aus dem deutschen Staat stellte nicht nur eine Unterbrechung der Rechtsbeziehung zwischen Individuum und Gemeinschaft dar, er zerstörte zugleich die Bedingungen einer Gesellschaft, die unter der Herrschaft des allgemeinen Gesetzes stand und ein „Minimum an persönlicher und politischer Freiheit“ (Neumann) garantierte.

heinetsberger@mailbox.org

Raphael Heinetsberger, MA, ist Politikwissenschaftler und Lehrbeauftragter an der Fakultät für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften, im Programmbereich Politikwissenschaft der Universität Hamburg. 2015 Masterabschluss an der Universität Hamburg mit einer Untersuchung über die herrschaftstheoretische Deutung der alliierten Anklage vor dem Internationalen Militärgerichtshof in Nürnberg 1945–1946 (Titel: *Die „Verschwörung gegen die Welt“ vor Gericht*).

Aviezer Tucker

(Harvard University, Cambridge)

Non-territorial States. The Alternative Response to the Refugee Crisis

The construction of stateless refugees in the political and economic crisis of the thirties led to well-known political and political-theoretical attempts to strengthen and expand states, close borders, restrict citizenship, exclude non-citizens, and fragment, restrict and halt the global movements of people, goods, and ideas. However, at the same time, a less known and much less powerful current in political thought reacted in the opposite direction, attempting to develop a new concept of the state that de-territorialises it. Instead of sovereignty, it proposed to found states on explicit social contracts. Citizens may then 'immigrate' without moving geographically, by signing a new social contract with a different state. They may also 'take' their state with them if they do move geographically and never become 'stateless'. The greater ease in exiting and entering states and geographical locations can then create an incentive for states to serve their citizens or face the prospect of losing them.

The idea of non-territorial states was introduced probably for the first time by the Belgium botanist Paul Émile de Puydt in 1860, though it has had many historical precedents. The most famous advocate of the de-territorialising of the state during the thirties was Moritz Schlick, who is better known as the founder of the Vienna Circle, in his unpublished 1935 book *Natur und Kultur*. Other notable advocates of the idea in the thirties were the members of the Cosmopolitan Union, led by the Austrian Kurt Zube and by the German Werner Ackerman who later immigrated to South Africa. I present their ideas in the context of the thirties and then connect them with the earlier political ideas that offered alternatives to sovereignty and territory as foundations for the relations between citizens and states in the Austro-Hungarian Empire (the Austro-Marxists and Socialists like Adler) and to the later ideas about voice and exit that were developed by Albert O. Hirschman. Needless to add, these ideas are as timely and relevant today as they were then. I put these ideas then in a contemporary philosophical context by comparing them with other cosmopolitan and contractarian (of social contract) positions.

avitucker@yahoo.com

Dr. Aviezer Tucker writes on political philosophy and theory, the philosophy of history, and comparative politics of totalitarianism and post-totalitarianism. His monographs include *The Legacies of Totalitarianism: A Theoretical Framework* (Cambridge University Press 2015), *Our Knowledge of the Past: A Philosophy of Historiography* (Cambridge University Press 2004) and *The Philosophy and Politics of Czech Dissidents: From Patočka to Havel* (Pittsburgh University Press 2000). He co-edited *Panarchy: Political Theories of Non-Totalitarian States* (Routledge 2015). Dr. Tucker is currently an associate of the Davis Center at Harvard University, and teaches at Harvard's Summer Program in Prague. He held research positions and taught in universities in Europe, the United States, and Australia.

Panel 2: Refugees and Nation States

Thursday, 16 June 2016
14:25 – 16:45

Chair: Börries Kuzmany (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften)

boerries.kuzmany@oeaw.ac.at

Börries Kuzmany studierte Geschichte und Slawistik in Wien, Paris und Moskau und promovierte anschließend mit einem Kooperationsdoktorat an den Universitäten Wien und Paris-Sorbonne. Seine Forschungsinteressen liegen in der mittel- und osteuropäischen Geschichte von der Mitte des 18. bis zur Mitte des 20. Jahrhunderts, insbesondere auf der Habsburgermonarchie, Polen, der Ukraine und der Sowjetunion. Thematische Schwerpunkte sind Nationalismusforschung, Stadtgeschichte, Grenzräume und jüdische Geschichte. Derzeit organisiert er ein Symposium zur Kontinuität von Flüchtlingskrisen in der österreichischen Geschichte.

Francesco Frizzera
(Università degli Studi di Trento)

„Verwaltungsobjekte, nicht Staatsbürger“. The Roots of the Refugee Policies Developed in the Habsburg Successor States

The aim of this paper is to demonstrate how the restrictive refugee policies adopted by many nation-states after the 1919 are rooted in the huge refugee movements during the First World War. State authorities created a vast bureaucracy during the war to help the IDPs fled from border regions. Although the borders of central and eastern Europe were reshaped after the war, those in charge of the refugee management in the twenties and thirties could refer to the expertise developed during the conflict. The case study concerning the Cisleithanic portion of Austria-Hungary aims to demonstrate this point.

In September 1914 an uncontrollable mass of refugees (1.1 million) crowded into the hinterland of the Empire. These belonged to minority groups and for this reason they were sometimes accused of conniving with the enemy. Furthermore, authorities and hosting population considered those people as a threat to the housing market and as profiteers. This perception created a negative image of refugees, independent of whether they were citizens or not. Consequently, the authorities decided to create barack-camps with the aim to control them.

The worsening economic conditions of the Monarchy led to the collapse of the weak assistance system created by the Home Office, and the relationship between refugees and local populations got worse. This restrictive trend shows all its implications after the armistice. After the end of the war, the Republic of Austria decided to subsidise only German-speaking refugees, implicitly excluding other refugees who were still displaced on its territory. The newly created Czechoslovakia did the same. Meanwhile the populations of the two new states began to plunder the refugee camps and tried to expel all the evacuees that still were there, who became stateless.

Therefore, this long-standing experience provoked a shift in the perceptions of authorities towards refugee issues. The analysis shows a pejorative trend in the integration process of the IDPs and in the enjoyment of rights connected to the citizenship of these people. Those Italians or Galician Jews still resident in Austria at the end of the war represent well this escalation. They were evacuated by the Austrian Army in 1914/1915 as Austrian citizens. Then, they became subject to physical and verbal violence in (1917) and often expelled by the hosting community. At the end, they were excluded from the social welfare (1918) and even from Austrian citizenship (in 1918/1919).

Austria-Hungary had been an integration laboratory for its IDPs, but did not achieve its goals. The state had proved incapable of protecting its citizens belonging to minority groups and, indeed, had been gradually restricting the invisible boundaries between 'us' (members of the majority) and 'them'. The initial reception had become a will of exclusion. Above all, the bureaucracy had developed legal standards to expel those who did not belong to the new national community. Therefore, starting from 1919, the Austro-Hungarian successor states decided to behave according to the restrictive reception policies developed during the war, especially if we think that the refugees, from this date onwards, were no longer IDPs.

francesco.frizzera.1985@gmail.com

Francesco Frizzera studied at the University of Trento from which he got his degree (2009). In 2013, he applied for a PhD-course at the University of Trento. His research project focused on refugees during the First World War, and in 2014, he received a scholarship by the Gerda Henkel Foundation – Historial de la Grande Guerre – Péronne (France). He got his PhD in March 2016 discussing a thesis on the Italian-speaking refugees of Trentino in Austria-Hungary and in Italy during the First World War. He is member of the research team *World War I 1914-1918. Trentino, Italy, Europe (2013-2015)* at the Italian-German Historical Institute of Trento and collaborates with museums and scientific journals.

A Multinational Heaven for Refugees? The Interwar South Slavs' Kingdom

The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes/Yugoslavia was created after the Great War comprising the Kingdom of Serbia, and parts of the former Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires, thus representing a unique multinational and multiconfessional experiment in the interwar years. This formation was diversified both culturally and ethnically seemingly rather tolerant towards foreigners and refugees. During the 1920s, the Kingdom was proud to receive tens of thousands of Russian dissidents, as well several hundred of Buddhist Kalmyks fleeing from the Bolshevik terror. At the same time, many people of different nationalities, some of them of Jewish origin, were deported as foreigners. During the interwar years, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia portrayed itself as a multiconfessional heaven, which was especially dedicated to the rights of its minorities, with emphasis on its Jewish inhabitants' welfare. Paradoxically, there are even arguments that the dictatorship proclaimed by King Alexander I, forbidding political parties and introducing the melting-pot ideology of 'the integral yugoslavism', was actually favourable for minorities because it suppressed xenophobic and antisemitic movements.

After 1933, there was an increasing number of Jewish refugees from the Nazi-occupied territories and some of them were seeking shelter in the Kingdom, which was considered as safe territory since the Second World War did not arrive here until April 1941. However, not many Jewish refugees stayed here and some were even detained and tragically perished, along with domestic Jews, as happened in the *Kladovo-transport* case with more than a thousand refugees from Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Germany that never reached Palestine. This study will examine these shifting policies of the Yugoslav government and selective approach to the question of refugee asylum in a pre-United Nations era. In addition, the intertwinement among the international trends of right wing political movements, the fulfillment of the international obligations assumed under the League of Nations, and peculiarities of the domestic system in the Kingdom will be analysed.

ana.pavlovic@gmail.com

Ana Ćirić Pavlović is an independent scholar specialised in Jewish History at the Central European University Budapest, Hungary. In addition, she completed an MA in International Law, Human Rights, and International Cooperation in Spain. She received her Bachelor degree at the Faculty of Political Science in Belgrade, Department for International Relations. She works as a professional translator and interpreter for English, Spanish and Serbian languages. In her academic research and publications, she is mainly engaged with social History of the Balkan Sephardim, Jewish History, history of South-Eastern Europe, minority rights, and the methods of the social sciences practical application. Ana is currently implementing a project of the Sephardi Jewry databases digitalisation and integration.

Anisa Hasanhodžić / Rifet Rustemović
(Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien)

Being Refugees. Austrian Jewish Refugees in the Territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina before and during the Second World War

After the „Anschluss“ in 1938 Austrian Jews tried all possible ways to find shelter in safe territories. As written in their applications to the Austrian External Migration Office, they sought refuge in the USA, Canada, France, Australia, Belgium, the Netherlands, Turkey, countries of South and Central America, as well as Shanghai. Those who were not lucky enough to get the visas for these favoured countries, but who were lucky enough to escape the direct transportation to the concentration camps from Austria, decided to travel to nearby Yugoslavia – as a transit point to the other countries.

However, the process of entering a country which was surrounded on all sides by satellite states of the Nazi Germany became increasingly difficult over time. Eventually, it was forbidden. Nevertheless, through the work of the domestic Jewish communities (Zagreb, Belgrade, Sarajevo, Split, Dubrovnik, etc.) – which were financially supported by the foreign social and relief committees (such as the JOINT and HICEM), the Yugoslav authorities again issued entrance permits for Jewish immigrants, and also enabled illegal emigrants to stay. Until the outbreak of war in April 1941 approximately 55,000 Jews from Austria, Germany and Czechoslovakia entered Yugoslavia.

What characterises their entering the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, then part of the former Yugoslavia, were the Yugoslav Laws on the so called „internment camps“ in smaller places, to which these Jewish refugees were directed from larger centres (Zagreb) or initial camps (such as Samobor, Kerestinec, Podravska Slatina, etc.)

In the area of today's Bosnia and Herzegovina there were six „internment camps“ for Austrian emigrants (Banja Slatina, Bosanski Šamac, Brčko, Čapljina, Derventa and Gacko). At these six „internment camps“ there were around 700 Austrian, and German-speaking Jews. Trying to live a common daily life with the domestic inhabitants there, the Austrian emigrants found themselves „between the hammer and the anvil“. There were approximately 4000 persons at the beginning of the Second World War in Yugoslavia and the division of the country into spheres of interest of the Independent State of Croatia – NDH (northern part) and the fascist Italy (southwestern part). The destiny of the domestic Jews – that depended on the NDH politics, did not differ from the destiny of the Jewish emigrants who first lived through the mass dislocations, to the mass executions: from Brčko to the concentration camps of Jasenovac and Auschwitz. Jewish refugees who were in the Italian occupied zone „had luck“ to be dislocated from the internment camps in Gacko and Čapljina to the camps at the islands in the Adriatic sea, being there to see the capitulation of Italy, and if not later captured by the Germans and Ustaša, to live at the free territory of Yugoslavia until the end of the war, and were primarily put in the displaced persons camps after the war.

rifet.rustemovic@oeaw.ac.at

Rifet Rustemović, prof. hist., was born in 1985 in Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina. He studied History at the Philosophical Faculty, University of Tuzla. He graduated with the thesis *The legal status and organisation of the Islamic Community of Bosnia and Herzegovina under Austro-Hungarian rule*. Currently Master Studies in History at the University of Vienna. Since December 2013 research assistant at the Austrian Academy of Sciences – Institute of Culture Studies and Theatre History. In 2015 he (together with Anisa Hasanhodžić) published the book *After the traces of our neighbors: Jews in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Holocaust*.

The question of the Austrian Jewish refugees in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina during the Second World War is a topic that is still relatively unknown in the Austrian and Bosnian-Herzegovinian historiography, and was presented partially in the memoirs of Holocaust survivors, while the mass grave of the Austrian Jews exhumed from Brčko lies forgotten at the *Zentralfriedhof* in Vienna.

Based primarily on archival sources (Austria, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Israel) this paper, by its distinctive methodological approach, offers new knowledge useful for other researchers dealing with such topics and will serve as a base for the cultural memory of the refugee experiences – in this case of the Austrian Jews. However it can also serve as a common basis narrative for refugees all over the world, a narrative that many communities could, having compassion for the others, use to see and feel their own past, as well.

anisa.hasanhodzic@oeaw.ac.at

DI Mag. Anisa Hasanhodžić was born in 1982 in Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina. She studied Political sciences at the University of Vienna and Agricultural sciences at the University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences in Vienna. From 2008 to 2009 she was research assistant at the University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences in Vienna. Currently PhD Studies at the University of Vienna in the field of Cultural Memory Studies. Since December 2013 research assistant at the Austrian Academy of Sciences – Institute of Culture Studies and Theatre History. In 2015 she (together with Rifet Rustemović) published the book *After the traces of our neighbors: Jews in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Holocaust*.

Kinga Frojimovics

(Yad Vashem / Wiener Wiesenthal Institut für Holocaust-Studien, VWI)

Jewish Refugees in the Hospitals of the Jewish Community of Pest from 1938 Onwards

In 1944, the first half of the twentieth century was named the 'Age of Refugees' by two leading experts on Jewish refugees, namely Arie Tartakower and Kurt Grossmann, to a great extent identifying Jewish migration in modern times with the problem of refugees.

From 1933 onwards, but even more so, from 1938 on, about 20,000-25,000 Jewish refugees arrived in Hungary in several waves. The Jewish Community of Pest, the richest and most influential Jewish Community of Hungary, and its relief organisations had a crucial role in aiding and caring for the refugees.

In my presentation, I will focus on one important aspect of aiding the refugees: medical care. I will make use of a special and until now completely untapped source: patient cards that were created in the hospitals of the Jewish Community. The systematic processing and analysis of the information contained in the thousands of patient cards enables us to assess the sociological characteristics of the refugees, such as their marital status and occupation. Moreover, it is possible to explore the differences between the various waves of refugees arriving in Hungary. In addition, comparing the group-specific data of the refugees to the data of local Jews who had been hospitalised at the same time, can also yield interesting results.

Kinga Frojimovics, PhD, Historian and archivist, from 2007, director of the Hungarian Section in Yad Vashem Archives (Jerusalem, Israel), and from 2010 research associate at Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (Vienna, Austria). Field of research: the history of the Jews in Hungary in the nineteenth and in the twentieth century with focus on the history of the Jewish religious trends in Hungary, and on the Holocaust. Co-editor of the MAKOR, the Series of the Hungarian Jewish Archives (Budapest).

Panel 3: First World War and the Challenges of Refugeeedom

Thursday, 16 June 2016
 17:15 – 19:00

Chair: Michal Frankl (Židovské muzeum v Praze)

michal.frankl@jewishmuseum.cz

Michal Frankl is the Deputy Director and the Head of the Department of Jewish Studies and of the History of Antisemitism in the Jewish Museum in Prague. His research interests include modern antisemitism, refugee policy, and the Holocaust. He was the co-editor of two volumes of the *Theresienstädter Gedenkbücher* and is the author of „*Prag ist nunmehr antisemitisch*“. *Tschechischer Antisemitismus am Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Metropol: Berlin 2011), *Unsichere Zuflucht. Die Tschechoslowakei und ihre Flüchtlinge aus NS-Deutschland und Österreich 1933-1938* (Böhlau: Köln 2012; with Kateřina Čapková), *Budování státu bez antisemitismu? Násilí, diskurs loajality a vznik Československa [Building of a State With No Antisemitism? Violence, Discourse of Loyalty and the Creation of Czechoslovakia]* (NLN: Praha 2015, with Miloslav Szabó), edited *Jan Neruda a Židé. Texty a kontexty [Jan Neruda and the Jews. Texts and contexts]* (Akropolis: Praha 2012, with Jindřich Toman) and authored numerous articles. Michal Frankl teaches different courses for the CET Academic Programs in Prague, and at the Charles University. He has extensive experience with educational projects and with digitisation of archival documents and their publication online and serves as the leader of the work package *New views on digital archives* in the European Holocaust Research Infrastructure. In 2015, he was a visiting fellow at the Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Ines Koeltzsch

(Masarykův ústav a archiv Akademie věd České Republiky, Praha)

Beyond the Cities. East European Jewish Refugees in the Bohemian and Moravian Countryside during the First World War

Between 100,000 and 150,000 Jewish war refugees from Galicia and Bukovina were settled in the Bohemian lands during First World War. They represented the largest group of war refugees, who were placed in refugee camps in Moravia and at the Bohemian-Moravian border or were directly sent to the urban centres like Prague, Brno and Plzeň. About a half of the East European Jewish war refugees had to go to small towns and villages in the Bohemian and Moravian countryside. Because of the special settlement structure of Bohemian and Moravian Jews the refugees partly found at least a few co-religionists and sometimes even a certain cultural infrastructure, although many of these small Jewish communities had faced an important loss of its members through migration already before the First World War. Nevertheless, the war refugees were confronted with special circumstances in the countryside that differed from those in the urban centres and which were mainly caused by spatial dispersion and isolation.

In the first part of the paper, I will give an overview over the circumstances of East European Jewish refugees in the Bohemian and Moravian countryside during First World War especially with regard to gender and age. This analysis will be based on documents by the state and regional authorities as well as by the local relief committees, which are relatively well preserved, but also often problematic in their perception of the refugees as bureaucratic objects and/or as cultural others. In the second part of my paper, I will have a closer look on the less preserved sources by the refugees themselves. Despite the significant lack of memories and diaries we can find at least in the holdings of the local relief committees and Jewish communities from various regions a few letters, by the refugees, mainly complaints. How did the war refugees formulate their needs and to which extent can these sources help us to illuminate their everyday experiences in the Bohemian and Moravian countryside?

The paper will contribute to a history of East European Jewish war experiences outside the urban centres like Vienna and Prague – a missing perspective in the research, which is mostly focused on the discourses about the ‚Ostjuden‘ and the reformulation of Central European Jewish identities during First World War.

ines.koeltzsch@gmail.com

Dr. Ines Koeltzsch is a postdoctoral researcher at the Masaryk Institute and Archives of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague. She focuses on the modern history of Jewish/non-Jewish relations in (East) Central Europe and is currently working on a project about Jews in the Bohemian and Moravian countryside and their (trans-)regional migration to the cities between 1860s and 1930s. Her PhD-thesis, *Geteilte Kulturen. Eine Geschichte der tschechisch-jüdisch-deutschen Beziehungen in Prag (1918-1938)* [Shared Culture, A History of Czech-Jewish-German Relations in Prague (1918-1938)], was published in 2012 and won two academic prizes in Germany. In 2014/2015 she was a research fellow at the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies.

Kathryn Densford

(George Washington University, Washington DC)

From Fellow Citizens to Unwanted Foreigners. Refugees along the Lower Austrian-Moravian Border, 1914–1919

From the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, the Habsburg Monarchy faced a refugee crisis. With the Russian advance in the East during the war's opening weeks, thousands of residents – many of them Jewish – fled from the Monarchy's eastern provinces of Bukovina and Galicia to the Monarchy's interior. After the opening of hostilities with Italy in 1915, thousands of additional refugees from the Monarchy's southern provinces also arrived in the hinterland. Many of these refugees spent the war years in Lower Austria and Moravia. The state aided refugees as citizens of the Monarchy, and some residents of the provinces also provided assistance for their fellow Habsburg citizens. However, the refugee crisis contributed to the disorder on the home front and local residents in Lower Austria and Moravia increasingly viewed these refugees as outsiders. The years 1918-1919 marked a turning point in the history of Habsburg Central Europe along the Lower Austrian/Moravian border as the Monarchy came to an end, and the successor states of the First Czechoslovak Republic and German Austria (subsequently Austria) came into existence. The provincial border became a contested and reconfigured international border. At this time, the issue of what to do with the wartime refugees came to the fore as they were not regarded as belonging to the new states.

This paper examines the refugee crisis along the border of Lower Austria and Moravia from the war's outbreak in 1914 into early 1919. It addresses the attitudes of the state and local residents towards these refugees in the war's early years of 1914/1915, how the experience of war shaped this relationship, and how this refugee situation was handled at the local and provincial level in this highly contested space in late 1918 and early 1919. It examines how the refugee crisis complicated the contested process of delineating a new international border and helped shape conceptions of citizenship in this area.

kdensford@email.gwu.edu

Kathryn Densford is a PhD candidate in History at George Washington University. She holds an MA in History from Northern Illinois University. Her dissertation, *Beyond Vienna: The Provincial Collapse of Austria in the First World War* examines the experience of the First World War and its aftermath in Lower Austria and Moravia. She is the recipient of a Fulbright grant to Austria for academic year 2016-2017.

Jernej Kosi
(Univerza v Ljubljani)

Refugees in their Own Homeland. Slovene Population from Austrian Littoral between Evacuation, Repatriation, and Emigration, 1915–1925

On 23 May 1915, Italy declared war on Austria-Hungary. The very next day, the Italian army crossed the border and attacked the fortified positions of Austro-Hungarian armed forces in the Austrian Littoral (*Österreichisches Küstenland*). However, preliminary Italian military operations were not particularly successful and after several weeks of uncertainty a stable zone of engagement along the Isonzo River had been established in the county of Gorizia and Gradisca.

The formation of the Isonzo front shattered the everyday life of the multinational civilian population that had lived under Habsburg rule for many centuries. During the summer of 1915, villages, towns and whole regions on both sides of the front were transformed into a war zone. Such circumstances meant that many civilians had no option but to leave their homes and move to the hinterland, either as a part of organised evacuation that was planned and executed by Austrian interior ministry or in a completely disorganised fashion, mostly out of fear for their lives and sometimes even under heavy artillery fire.

According to sources, the majority of the Slovene-speaking inhabitants of Gorizia and Gradisca fled to Carniola (Krain), the nearest Austrian crownland, and that was mainly populated by Slovenes. But because Carniola has been incorporated into the war zone (*Kriegsgebiet*) – a special administrative region under direct military command – not all of them could stay here. After much deliberation, the Austrian army finally decided that staying within the war zone would be allowed only to those refugees who had the financial resources to support themselves and their families without the help of the state. Those who could stay remained in the area for more than two years and began to return to their demolished villages and towns only after a heavy defeat and retreat of Italian army from Isonzo front in the autumn of 1917.

After the dissolution of Austria-Hungary and as a consequence of the Treaty of London (1915) and the Treaty of Saint Germain (1919), the entire Austrian Littoral was incorporated into the Kingdom of Italy and became a part of the Julian March (*Julisch Venetien*). With such a territorial transformation, the Slovene inhabitants of this area found themselves in a completely new political reality: nationalistic repression and persecution of minorities with the tacit support of the Italian government and bureaucracy, was in a stark contrast to the multilingual and multinational tolerance of the late Austrian era. Thus situation became unbearable for many Slovenes, especially after Benito Mussolini came to power in 1922 and introduced his fascist politics of national exclusivism. Several thousand Slovenes either voluntarily emigrated or were forced to flee to the nearest Slovene region, which had become a part of the new Kingdom of Yugoslavia.

In a time span of several years, Slovenes from the Austrian Littoral endured evacuation, flight, living as refugees, repatriation, political violence and second emigration to the nearest Slovene-speaking region. Which survival strategies did they use? How did the domestic Slovene population accept them? What was the attitude of the government and state bureaucracy towards refugees? Did the state attempt to integrate them? If so, how? How did refugees adjust to the local communities in which they had taken refuge? How did women refugees fight social prejudices and gender discrimination? In my paper, I will present some preliminary answers to these questions.

jkdosi@gmail.com

Dr. Jernej Kosi is a Research Assistant in the Department of History, University of Ljubljana. He was a Junior Researcher and received his doctorate in history from the University of Ljubljana (dissertation title: *The origins of the Slovene national movement and its development until the middle of the 19th century*). As a recipient of a postdoctoral scholarship from the Scholarship Foundation of the Republic of Austria (OeAD), in 2015, he conducted research at the Institut für Osteuropäische Geschichte (University of Vienna) (title of the project: *Das Schicksal weiblicher slowenischer Kriegsflüchtlinge im österreichischen Hinterland nach Eröffnung der Isonzofront*). His current research interests include the formation of the Slovenian nation in the long nineteenth century and the social history of the Austrian hinterland of the Isonzo front (1915–1917).

Dieter Gosewinkel

(Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung / Freie Universität Berlin)

Keynote II: Citizenship. The Principal Form of Political Belonging in Twentieth Century Europe

An individual's affiliation to a politically constituted community is decisive for his or her opportunities in life and often vital to his or her survival. This contribution argues that the primary signifier of political affiliation in twentieth century Europe is 'citizenship'. This means that the legal and sociological category of citizenship is the one which (among a plethora of gradations of political affiliation) is decisive for the justification and distribution of vital opportunities for individuals in a society. The prominent importance attached to citizenship is what distinguishes the twentieth century significantly from previous historical periods and other forms of political affiliation. This hypothesis will be tested by drawing upon and comparing citizenship to a number of other categories of twentieth century political affiliation: namely, religious affiliation, political party affiliation, ethnic and nation-state affiliation, and, finally, social class. The dominant position of citizenship grew out of the politicisation of legal institutions. With the democratisation of political regimen, the expansion of participatory rights, the development of social welfare rights, and states' increasingly closing themselves off to one another, citizenship began to grow in importance for individuals, as it increasingly superimposed or supplanted their respective religions, political parties, ethnicities, and social classes as categories of affiliation. Even the present processes of transnationalisation and globalisation can provoke only gradual and non-essential changes to the preeminence of citizenship, because the necessity to change and delineate political membership remains the primary function of the state, even as it is increasingly losing its nation-state character.

dieter.gosewinkel@wzb.eu

Prof. Dr. Dieter Gosewinkel, historian and legal scholar, co-director of the Center for Global Constitutionalism, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung; professor of modern history, Freie Universität Berlin; main fields of research: contemporary history; European constitutional history; history of citizenship and civil society; main publications: *Adolf Arndt. Die Wiederbegründung des Rechtsstaats aus dem Geist der Sozialdemokratie (1945–1961)*, Bonn 1991; *Einbürgern und ausschließen. Die Nationalisierung der Staatsangehörigkeit vom Deutschen Bund bis zur Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, Band 150)*, 2. Auflage Göttingen 2003; *Sicherheit und Freiheit? Staatsbürgerschaft in Europa im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 2016.

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

jana.starek@vwi.ac.at

Dr. Jana Starek, historian, translator. She works for the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI) since September 2010. Studied history and Slavic studies at the University of Vienna. Co-founded and worked at the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (1982-1990). Director of the Austrian Science and Research Liaison Office Brno (1991-2004). Teaches at the at the University of Defence in Brno and at the University of Vienna. Author of studies and co-author of anthologies on the history of Austro-Czech relations. Contribution to projects on contemporary history, including at the Institute of Contemporary History at the Czech Republic Academy of Sciences, *Documentation of the Fates of Opponents to the Nazi Regime who had to leave Czechoslovakia after the Second World War*.

Panel 4: Politics of Political Exile

Friday, 17 June 2016
11:00 – 12:45

Chair: Victoria Harms

victoria.harms@herder-institut.de

Victoria Harms is a post-doctoral fellow at the Leibniz Graduate School at the Herder Institute for Historical Research on East Central Europe in Marburg, Germany. She specialises in East-West relations during the Cold War and recent European history. Currently, she is working on a project on the social and economic transformations of Eastern Europe from 1979 until 2008. In 2015, she completed her PhD studies at the University of Pittsburgh with a dissertation on *Destined or Doomed? Hungarian Dissidents and their Western Friends, 1973-1998*. She holds a Master Degree in Comparative Central European History from the Central European University, Budapest, Hungary, and a Bachelor Degree in Cultural and Social Sciences from the Europa University Viadrina, Frankfurt (Oder), Germany.

Wolfgang Schellenbacher
(Židovské muzeum v Praze)

From Political Activism to Disillusionment. Austrian Socialist Refugees in Czechoslovakia, 1934–1938

The political exile of Austrian social democrats and communists after February 1934 stands apart from other refugee movements in Central Europe in the 1930s. The most noticeable distinction is the sympathetic approach of Czechoslovakia to the exiles – particularly in comparison to the Jewish refugees fleeing Germany in the late 1930s.

The rapid defeat of the 1934 February Revolt in Austria marked a watershed in the end of the development of the First Austrian Republic. More than 2,000 of those who had fought for the Republican Schutzbund – and therefore facing long prison or detention camp sentences – as well as party functionaries fled over the border into Czechoslovakia near Znojmo, Bratislava or Kaplice.

The Auslandsbüro der österreichischen Sozialdemokraten (Foreign Office of the Austrian Social Democrats – ALÖS) in Brno, with the support of the Czechoslovakian Social Democratic Parties, organised their escape and provided accommodation and support for other at-risk people. By covering most parts of the Czechoslovakian border with so-called border points and collaboration with the Austrian underground Revolutionären Sozialisten (Revolutionary Socialists), the ALÖS was able to maintain a lively level of political activity. The sheer volume of propaganda material produced by the small group of party leaders around Otto Bauer gives an idea of the scale of these activities. In July 1934 – especially given the covert nature of the operations –, Josef Pleyl, a social democrat functionary in exile in Czechoslovakia, kept a list of names and addresses of people, smuggling routes and amount of propaganda materials, giving valuable insight into the scale and nature of the work.

This political activity was however taking place at the same time as disillusionment was growing amongst the regular combatants, waiting in 20 camps all over Czechoslovakia. Around 750 refugees and their families continued to the Soviet Union in 1934 where the prospect of work and permanent visas was higher, whilst others joined the Spanish Civil War. Around 250 of the fighters from the February Revolution living as refugees in Czechoslovakia had returned to Austria by 1937, accepting prison sentences in attempts to resume the lives they left behind. The number of Austrian refugees therefore declined continuously from the middle/end of 1934, so rapidly that by 1937 there were only around one hundred still residing in Czechoslovakia according to the authorities.

A number of factors came together to exacerbate the situation. This talk will address the questions of: What impact did the weakened party structure of the Social Democrats post-February 1934 have on the situation of Austrian refugees in the Czechoslovakian border region? What were the everyday reactions and strategies of the refugees who did not belong to the party elite? How did the situation in the refugee camps and the conditions dictated by the Czechoslovakian authorities contribute to the growing disillusionment amongst the refugees and either their return to Austria or moving elsewhere?

wolfgang.schellenbacher@jewishmuseum.cz

Wolfgang Schellenbacher, is historian at the Jewish Museum in Prague and the Documentation Centre of the Austrian Resistance (DÖW). He has worked since 2011 on the EU-funded international research project EHRI. He is also currently working on the project *BeGrenzte Flucht*, funded by the Future Fund of the Republic of Austria. His research topics to date have focused on the Theresienstadt Ghetto as well as political resistance in Austria against the Nazi regime and exile to Czechoslovakia. His most recent publications on this topic was: *Von Flucht und Abschiebung zur Vertreibung. Der Raum Niederösterreich als Beispiel für den Umgang mit Flüchtlingen und Abgeschobenen in Österreich zwischen 1914 und 1938*, in: DÖW (ed.): *Fanatiker, Pflichterfüller, Widerständige. Reichsgaue Niederdonau, Groß-Wien*, Vienna 2016.

Kulturleben des russischen Exils im Berlin der 1920er-Jahre. Zwischen Kooperation und Abgrenzung

Die sogenannte erste Welle der russischen Emigration – ein frühes Beispiel erzwungener Massenauswanderung im 20. Jahrhundert – kam in Folge der Oktoberrevolution und des Russischen Bürgerkrieges nach Deutschland. Neben anderen Ländern (wie Frankreich, Tschechoslowakei, China) wurde Deutschland von vielen Flüchtlingen als neuer Lebensmittelpunkt gewählt. Für dieses Land sprach nicht nur die geographische Nähe zum ehemaligen Russischen Reich, sondern auch eine starke Inflation und die billige deutsche Währung. Das vom Krieg und von der schwierigen wirtschaftlichen Krise erschöpfte Deutschland empfing die Flüchtlinge aus dem Kriegsgegnerland sehr großzügig: Nach unterschiedlichen Angaben lebten in der Weimarer Republik 1923 bis zu 600.000 russische Exilanten, davon etwa 360.000 allein in Berlin.

Der Abschluss des Vertrags von Rapallo am 16. April 1922, in dem die Weimarer Republik Sowjetrußland offiziell anerkannte, und die kurz danach durchgeführte Währungsreform bedeuteten eine erhebliche Verschlechterung der rechtlichen und wirtschaftlichen Lage der Emigranten. Forscher stellen einen Rückgang der Emigrantenwelle etwa ab 1925 fest. In dieser kurzen Zeitspanne von nicht einmal zehn Jahren entstand auf dem begrenzten Territorium des sogenannten russischen Berlins eine wichtige Zweigstelle der vielfältigen russischen Kultur.

Die einheimische Bevölkerung reagierte oft kritisch auf die zahlreichen Initiativen und Veranstaltungen der russischen Diaspora, die Berlin überfluteten. Z. B. berichteten Berliner Zeitungen über die „Fortschritte in der Russifizierung Berlins“ und „eine friedliche Invasion durch russische Kolonie“. Gleichzeitig bekamen die Exilanten auch Unterstützung für ihre Projekte seitens deutscher Institutionen und Kulturvertreter. Ohne diese Unterstützung und den Zugang zur deutschen Infrastruktur wäre ein so aktives und vielfältiges Kulturleben der Emigranten in Berlin nicht möglich gewesen. Somit war das russische Berlin kein isolierter Kosmos, sondern ein Netzwerk, dessen Komponenten sowohl von russischen Aktivitäten als auch von der deutschen Umgebung geprägt wurden.

Anhand von Presseberichten und Archivquellen werden einige Institutionalisierungs- und Integrationsversuche russischer Emigranten in Berlin, sowie die Reaktionen der einheimischen Kulturvertreter dargestellt.

bychkova.maria@googlemail.com

Maria Bychkova studierte Musikforschung und Musikvermittlung mit dem Schwerpunkt Fach Historische Musikwissenschaft an der Hochschule für Musik, Theater und Medien (HMTM) Hannover. Seit Mai 2012 promoviert sie im Rahmen des Projektes der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft *Deutsch-russische Musikbegegnungen 1917-1933: Analyse und Dokumentation* an der HMTM Hannover unter Betreuung von Prof. Dr. Stefan Weiss und Prof. Dr. Susanne Rode-Breymann. Das Thema ihres Dissertationsvorhabens sind russische Musikinstitutionen im Berlin der 1920er-Jahre.

Tatiana Teterevleva

(Northern [Arctic] Federal University, Arkhangelsk)

Russian Refugees in Interwar Norway. Public Opinion and Development of Government Policy

Post-revolutionary emigration from the former Russian Empire can provide researchers with valuable materials for comparative studies of the state policy towards the 'strangers' appeared in the country, as well as of the attitude of the authorities and public opinion concerning the possibility to integrate them into the political, economical, social and cultural structures of the host community. The paper considers just a small part of this broad theme: the public discussion aroused when the post-revolutionary Russian refugees came to Norway and the policy of the Norwegian authorities towards them in the inter-war period, including the most notorious case of Russian political exile in this country – that of Leo Trotsky.

tat.tet2010@gmail.com

Tatiana Teterevleva is Associated Professor at the Institute of Humanities, Social and Political Science of the Northern (Arctic) Federal University (Arkhangelsk, Russia). She holds a PhD in History (*kandidat istoricheskikh nauk*). Her research focuses on the history of the Russian communities in the a Nordic countries, refugee and emigrant identity in the centres and periphery of the diaspora. T. Teterevleva's publications include numerous articles on the post-revolutionary Russian refugees in Scandinavia and Finland, as well as the formation and structure of the social and cultural space of Russia abroad.

Panel 5: Refugees, Exclusion and Citizenship

Friday, 17 June 2016

14:00 – 17:15

Chair: Wolfgang Schellenbacher (Židovské muzeum v Praze)

wolfgang.schellenbacher@jewishmuseum.cz

Wolfgang Schellenbacher, is historian at the Jewish Museum in Prague and the Documentation Centre of the Austrian Resistance (DÖW). He has worked since 2011 on the EU-funded international research project EHRI. He is also currently working on the project *BeGrenzte Flucht*, funded by the Future Fund of the Republic of Austria. His research topics to date have focused on the Theresienstadt Ghetto as well as political resistance in Austria against the Nazi regime and exile to Czechoslovakia. His most recent publications on this topic was: *Von Flucht und Abschiebung zur Vertreibung. Der Raum Niederösterreich als Beispiel für den Umgang mit Flüchtlingen und Abgeschobenen in Österreich zwischen 1914 und 1938*, in: DÖW (ed.): *Fanatiker, Pflichterfüller, Widerständige. Reichsgaue Niederdonau, Groß-Wien*, Wien 2016.

Michal Frankl
(Židovské muzeum v Praze)

From Benevolence to Exclusion. Anti-Jewish Refugee Policy and the Transformation of Jewish Citizenship in Czechoslovakia, 1935–1939

In a relatively unknown development and in contrast the widespread understanding of Czechoslovakia as a relatively tolerant place for refuge, in 1938, officials at the border and in the interior of the country were busy returning or expelling people fleeing from Nazi-occupied Austria, from the Sudetenland and from other regions. Throughout 1938, refugees were caught in many instances of the no Man's Land on the old and new borders of Czechoslovakia. The aim of the paper is to assess this dramatic shift from an imperfect, yet 'benevolent', policy of temporary refuge to a restrictive policy. Czechoslovakia, however, is just an example of a broader change in East-Central Europe in and around 1938 in which refugee policies increasingly equaled to sealed borders as well as ethnic categorisation and exclusion of Jews. This paper is a part of a broader research project called *Citizens of the No Man's Land* which examines the relationship between the development of restrictive refugee policies, territorial changes and reconceptualisations of (Jewish) citizenship.

To illustrate these developments, the paper will look at the connection between the expulsion of Jews from the Czechoslovak border areas annexed to Nazi Germany after the Munich Agreement and the Czechoslovak revision of the law on citizenship of January 1939 which was tailored not only to exclude Jewish refugees from the Sudetenland but also – in line other European cases of denaturalisations of Jews – called in question any post-1918 naturalisations, thus illustrating how the revisions to territorial order, combined with antisemitism, also destabilised the very substance of inter war citizenship.

michal.frankl@jewishmuseum.cz

Michal Frankl is the Deputy Director and the Head of the Department of Jewish Studies and of the History of Anti-Semitism in the Jewish Museum in Prague. His research interests include modern antisemitism, refugee policy, and the Holocaust. He is the author of several books numerous articles. Michal Frankl teaches different courses for the CET Academic Programs in Prague, and at the Charles University. He has extensive experience with educational projects and with digitisation of archival documents and their publication online and serves as the leader of the work package *New views on digital archives* in the European Holocaust Research Infrastructure. In 2015, he was a visiting fellow at the Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

Polish-Jewish Deportees in 1938. Refugees or Aroysgeshikte?

1938 is a turning point in German-Polish as well as Polish-Jewish relations concerning statehood, refugee rights and expulsions. While expulsions of Eastern European Jewish migrants happened already in the 1920s, between 27 and 29 October 1938 the first mass deportation of Jews took place in the German Reich. Approximately 16,000-17,000 Jews with Polish citizenship were deported from the German Reich in the so-called Polenaktion. The Ministry of Interior took the Polish March Laws of 1938 on Citizenship of Citizens Living Abroad for more than five years as a pretense for this huge scaled action within the whole Reich. This law was a direct response of the Polish National Assembly (*Sejm*) to the German occupation of Austria. The first mass deportation stopped on October 29th and Polish-German consultations ensued. Shortly after this first mass deportation, the persecution of Polish Jews in the German Reich continued. About 10,000-15,000 further Jews with Polish passports were expelled from Germany or otherwise became refugees until August 1939. In September 1939 at least 3,000 Jews were imprisoned during the second Polenaktion.

This paper will discuss Polish Refugee Policies in 1938, the Polish governments response to the mass deportation as well as the response of Jewish organisations. Thereby the paper will not only draw from official records, but from intense biographical research done on Berlin victims of the so-called Polenaktion. It will close with an outlook to the second Polenaktion in September 1939. The main question will be how different agents in the field understood those who were deported: as refugees or as *aroysgeshikte* (expellees) and therefore shift the discussion of refugee politics from the West to the East.

alina.bothe@fu-berlin.de

Alina Bothe studied History, Politics and Eastern European History at Freie Universität Berlin. From 2012 to 2015 she was a research fellow at the Center for Jewish Studies Berlin-Brandenburg. She wrote her Ph.D. thesis about the "digital turn" in Shoah memory, focusing on the Visual History Archive of USC Shoah Foundation. Her research fields include among others Digital Humanities, Gender Studies, Shoah History and Conceptual History. She has published volumes on testimony, gender and digital media and recently edited a Special Issue of the Leo Baeck Yearbook about a conceptual history of the term survivor. Her postdoc research project deals with the persecution of Polish Jews in the German Reich between October 1938 and September 1939.

Benjamin Naujoks
(Universität zu Köln)

Litauen 1917–1941. Exklusion und Verdrängen als Prinzip

Der 1918 entstandenen Republik Litauen kommt eine europäische Sonderrolle in Fragen der Staatsangehörigkeits- und Flüchtlingspolitik zu. Durch seine historische Größe, geographische Lage und multiethnische Bevölkerung geprägt, stellt Litauen das Bindeglied zwischen lateinischem Westen und orthodoxem Osten dar. Mehr noch: als Jerusalem des Ostens bekannt, konnte sich nicht nur im Gouvernement Vilnius auch zuzeiten des Russischen Kaiserreiches eine eigene jüdische Identität – der Litvaken – innerhalb des Ansiedlungsrayons erhalten.

Die dieser Sonderrolle innewohnende Komplexität nimmt der Vortrag zum Anlass, drei grundsätzlichen Fragestellungen nachzugehen: Erstens, worin die Wendepunkte der litauischen Staatsangehörigkeits- und Flüchtlingspolitik zwischen 1917 und 1941 zu sehen sind. Zweitens wird diese Politik in ihren Ursachen und Wirkungen an konkreten Beispielen verdeutlicht. Schließlich soll drittens perspektivisch gefragt werden, ob und wo Kontinuitäten und Parallelen zwischen 1917 und 1941 verlaufen.

Die Auswahl dieser Jahreszahlen bedarf einer kurzen Erklärung. Denn wie alle Nationalgeschichten kennt auch die litauische eine Reihe von Periodisierungsversuchen. Und obgleich zwei der markantesten Jahreszahlen des 20. Jahrhunderts die Jahre 1917 und 1941 sein dürfen und die hiermit verbundenen tiefen Einschnitte unbestritten sind, ist eine Verknüpfung der beiden Daten im litauischen Fall weniger gängig. Indes finden eben 1918 – als Jahr der Unabhängigkeitserklärung – und 1939/1940 – als Jahr des jähen Endes dieser Unabhängigkeit – größere Beachtung. Bisweilen wird noch 1926 als Zäsur genannt, dem Jahr des autoritären Putsches durch Antanas Smetona.

Der litauischen Unabhängigkeitserklärung von 1918 geht allerdings ein grundlegender Paradigmenwechsel in der Politik voraus, bringt das Jahr 1917 doch eine bis heute wirkende Zäsur hervor: Die Geschichte des litauischen Volkes wird politisch wie programmatisch zur Geschichte Litauens deklariert. Mit dieser ethnographischen Beschränkung gehen zentrale Fragen von Inklusion und Exklusion einher, welche die Einordnung des Jahres 1941 gleichermaßen bestimmen wie die Bewertung der gesamten Zwischenkriegszeit.

Es ließe sich dergestalt auch anders fragen: Ist 1917 ein oder gar der (entscheidende) Vorläufer für spätere Entwicklungen?

bnaujoks@gmx.de

Benjamin Naujoks. Doktorand der Osteuropäischen Geschichte an der Universität zu Köln zum Thema *Litauen und Europa*. Studium der Osteuropäischen Geschichte, Slavistik und Philosophie an der Universität zu Köln. Mitbegründer und Chefredakteur des Onlinejournals *Neues Osteuropa*.

The topic of my presentation will be the Jewish refugees from territories under the control of the Third Reich who passed through Yugoslavia on their way toward a safe haven, as well as Yugoslav Jewish refugees who fled Yugoslavia in anticipation of sharing the same fate as the other Jews. I will confine my presentation to the Croatian territory and the focus will be on Jewish self-help and the efforts of Jewish humanitarian organisations during this crisis from 1933 until September 1943.

More than 55,000 Jewish refugees passed through Yugoslavia, mainly to Croatia on their way out of the Third Reich. First came the German Jews, followed by the Austrian, Czech, Slovak, Romanian, Hungarian, and Polish Jews. Most of them succeeded, but approximately 4,000-5,000 were still in Yugoslavia (around 2,000 of them in Croatia) in April 1941, when the war broke out. Most of these perished.

At the same time, during 1930s some of the Yugoslav Jews started to think about emigration. However, only a small number did so until April 1941. After the beginning of the war, a limited number of Yugoslav Jews, as well as some foreign ones, fled to either Italian, or Hungarian occupation zones. Some of them fled further to Italy proper. We can trace the fate of these refugees through different archival sources and follow some of their destinies.

After the occupation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, the creation of the Independent State of Croatia (NDH), and the basic division of Croatia into German and Italian occupation zones, movement toward Croatian cities in the Italian zone intensified. This was due to the essential differences between the Nazi, the *Ustasha*, and the Italian fascist Jewish policies. Some of the Yugoslav as well as foreign Jews also fled to the Hungarian occupation zone to the north.

In this presentation, two of the Jewish communities and their (self) help committees will be covered: the Committee for Aid to Refugees of Zagreb Jewish community, and the Emigration Committee of Split's Jewish community.

mbrandl@ffzg.hr

Naida Mihal Brandl is a research/teaching assistant at the University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy and Social Sciences, Chair of Judaic Studies, as a lecturer of general and Croatian Jewish history. Her teaching and research interests include early modern and modern Jewish history in Croatia and the Eastern Mediterranean region. She is one of the principal authors of the undergraduate and graduate program for Judaic studies at the University of Zagreb, and the principal lecturer in Jewish history on both levels (the Second Temple period, the medieval period, the Modern period and the Croatian Jewish history).

Adina Babeş

(Institutul Național pentru Studierea Holocaustului din România "Elie Wiesel", București)

Between Emigration and Extermination.**Solving the 'Jewish problem' in the 1940s Romania**

The period between September 1940 until August 1944 can be characterised by the issuing of dozens of decree-laws, hundreds of government decisions, resolutions, and ministry orders against the Jewish population.

To pursue this ethnic cleansing objective in Romania, the Antonescu government proceeded in implementing several important measures through which the life of Romanian Jews was fatally transformed and impacted.

In this context, emigration, along with deportation and extermination, was regarded as a viable solution. Therefore, in 1941 the position of the Romanian leadership was in favour of Jewish emigration, as it was seen as another way of getting rid of the Jews.

Considering the internal context as well as the political situation, the Romanian state's attitude towards the emigration of the Romanian Jews in the early 1940s can be analysed considering several factors.

This presentation focuses on: German reactions, reactions of other countries and institutions, the transportation boats and the Romanian authorities' official decisions. I intend to introduce a general and complex image that characterised the emigration to Palestine, with a focus on the institutional and legislative decisions and regulations that surrounded it.

The emigration of Romanian Jews to Palestine in the early 1940s has certain characteristics. The Romanian authorities saw the emigration as a way of ethnic cleansing of Romania, even as deportation was also being considered. Yet, if the deportation was solely in the hands of the Romanian authorities, the emigration of Jews was much more complicated for it depended on the international context as well. For example, the German authorities were against emigration for several reasons: it would jeopardise the relations with the countries in the Middle East, there was the need to use the boats for war purposes only, and the presupposition that Jews would act against the Axis. They were not only against emigration, but their initiatives went towards stopping it.

Adding to this the geopolitical conditions, emigration was during these years supported by Jewish associations, initiated by international organisations, and organised by various private companies.

Among these international organisations, the International Red Cross played a significant role. Through its representatives it pressured the Romanian authorities to allow boats to transport Romanian Jews to Palestine. An important role was also played by the American Government which made several proposals and offered solutions in connection to the fate of Jews in Europe.

The state showed some interest in the fate of Jews and solving their situation in the best conditions but only in discussions, and during the meetings with representatives of other countries and international organisations. Evidence to this effect is found in documents referring to emigration.

The insecurity of travel could have led to a negative image of Romania and the authorities were sensitive to this. This period includes the tragedy of the sinking of boats that were transporting Romanian Jews to Palestine as well as the impediments and dangers other transportations encountered. Therefore, they reacted by trying to bring these transportations under their approval, which eventually meant that the Romanian state received the money the Jews were paying for the trip.

The Romanian authorities allowed emigration during the Second World War, yet this was a risky solution for salvation. The boats used for emigration were in bad condition, they were overcrowded, and sometimes their navigation was not guaranteed. Travel to Palestine was subject to the visa-related decisions of other countries and the trips were not direct most of time. However, this was may have been the only solution at the time and for some 3,000 Jews this became a certainty.

Unfortunately, for almost 1,000 of them, this was their last trip.

adinababesh@yahoo.com

Adina Babeş is a senior researcher at the 'Elie Wiesel' National Institute for the Study of Holocaust in Romania. She holds a PhD in Political Sciences from National School of Political Studies and Public Administration of Bucharest and two MA degrees in Social Sciences from Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel and in Nationalism Studies from Central European University, Hungary. She is presently working on two research projects: *European Holocaust Research Infrastructure* with Horizon 2020–EU funds, and *The Reconstruction of Holocaust Public Memory in Post-Communism* financed by Romanian Ministry of National Education, CNCS-UEFISCDI. Among her current research interests are Holocaust memory, Jewish life and female experiences during the Holocaust, salvation solutions during the 1940s, with particular interest in oral histories. Adina Babeş has authored several articles and research studies published in volumes and academic journals and presented scientific papers during conferences, seminars and round tables. Previously, she held the position of associated lecturer at the National School of Political Studies and Public Administration of Bucharest.