Special issue: Camp Memories. Silencing, Contesting and Memorializing Past Encampments in Africa and Beyond

MEMORY STUDIES

Memory Studies
1–20

DOI: 10.1177/17506980251350256
journals.sagepub.com/home/mss


Constructing, reconstructing and representing communities: Polish and Ukrainian memory activists from displaced person camps in Western Germany and Austria after the Second World War

Sarah Grandke
University of Regensburg, Germany

Abstract

After the Second World War, some Displaced Persons became energetic memory activists. The aim was to identify and commemorate the murdered, to document and collect material about crimes. Memorialization was part of (re)creating a collective identity and important aspect of political agenda(s). Although Displaced Persons built hundreds of monuments, their activities are mostly forgotten. Often the sites were dismantled, their 'cultural footprints' erased, their stories silenced. Whereas research on Jewish Displaced Persons has been done, this is not the case for the 'other' displaced memory activists. Thus, the article focuses on Polish and Ukrainian perspectives. Bringing together migration and memory studies, the history of the Second World War and its aftermath, it sheds light on these so far ignored activists from Eastern Europe. Building on untapped sources from globally scattered diaspora and family archives, a strong focus is placed on self-perception and representation. This provides insight into their narratives and motivations.

Keywords

Concentration camp, Displaced Persons, Jews, Lithuania, memorial sites, memory activism, migration, Nazi persecution, Poland, Ukraine

'Most of all I wanted to [see] the cemetery, but unfortunately, [it] wasn't there'[1] wrote Franciszek Marciniak, a Catholic Pole, in 1979 to the Ebensee town council in Austria. As a former political prisoner, survivor of the concentration camp and also a constructor of a memorial there, the site meant a lot to him. After his liberation in May 1945, Marciniak did *not* initially return to Poland, but remained as a Displaced Person (DP) in Ebensee where he had been liberated by US troops. He lived in collective accommodation, a DP camp, where he was cared for by UNRRA, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In the chaotic time after the war and due to his

Corresponding author:
Sarah Grandke, University of Regensburg, Landshuter Str. 4, Regensburg 93047, Germany.
Email: sarah.grandke@ur.de

status as a DP, his scope for action was limited. Yet, the craftsman Marciniak was not just waiting: he was part of a Polish DP group that built a memorial dedicated to the victims of the Ebensee Concentration Camp in 1945/46. After the inauguration in June 1946 and further months of uncertainty, he accepted repatriation to Poland. Decades later, in the 1970s, when Marciniak returned to Ebensee, he realized that the local authorities had closed the cemetery at the end of the 1940s. They had reburied the bodies and dismantled the memorial. Locals used the sites as farmland (Perz, 2006: 208–2011; Quatember, 2006: 23–24). Nothing was left of the great effort that the displaced memory activists[2] had put into the cemetery memorial. In this respect, Ebensee is not unique. Despite the fact that displaced Eastern Europeans formed a specific group of early memory activists for victims of Nazi tyranny, their efforts were and are largely overlooked today. Few people know that DPs erected hundreds, if not thousands of monuments in the Western Allies' zones of Germany and Austria since most of them were demolished after their builders' departure.

The article focuses on the diverse group of displaced memory activists in the field of victim commemoration of Nazi crimes. What were their motives? Besides being sincerely committed to commemoration, it will be shown how they tried to make their political demands heard. The study highlights how in times of great uncertainty and the beginning of the Cold War, self-declared DP elites tried to structure their exiled communities with the help of memorial projects. Emphasis is placed on Polish and Ukrainian displaced memory activists. They often described themselves as forced migrants, exiles and political refugees as well as Christians, democrats and as such anticommunists, some as freedom fighters. I ask what these projects meant for displaced memory activists, both within their ethnic group and externally.

In the following, I will first briefly outline the challenges that occur in researching the topic, then I will go through three main motives of displaced memory activists. I point out that all DP groups employed the immediate past for the (re)construction of a community as well as a national identity. It was further used for the purpose of self-representation. Before concluding, I give an outlook on the afterlives of the memorials erected by DPs. In the years after most of the DPs emigrated, local authorities dismantled many of the sites. As a result, the 'cultural footprints' of the displaced memory activists were often erased (Grandke, 2022: 47), their stories frequently silenced.

I will mainly focus on two locations here: Ebensee in Upper Austria and Flossenbürg in Bavaria, Germany. In both places, concentration camps were active until the end of the war. Tens of thousands of prisoners were murdered there. In both places, in the postwar era Christian DPs dominated the building of memorial sites. The one in Ebensee, as described, does not exist anymore. Parts were translocated to another designated area. The one in Flossenbürg was broader and more complex in scale. It was changed in the following decades, but mainly remains standing today. Nowadays in both places, a memorial site with exhibitions, archives and staff is functioning and mostly financed by the respective states. Still, this was only made possible in the last two to three decades, mostly from the 1990s onwards and due to huge effort by local civic society in combination with international support as well as pressure on local and state authorities (Wüstenberg, 2020). However, the foundations of commemoration in Ebensee and Flossenbürg were laid much earlier: in the years after liberation by multiple and today often disregarded DP memory activists.

Challenges of research

While the history and memorial initiatives of Jewish DPs are well researched (Feinstein, 2010; Jockusch, 2012; Mankowitz, 2002; Person, 2019), this is not the case for the much larger group of non-Jewish DPs. The majority of these 'other' DPs were Poles and Ukrainians. Also displaced Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians were eager to commemorate the victims of Nazi persecution.[3] Mostly, they referred to themselves as Christians and often their memorial sites and practices had

a strong religious influence. Yet, in academic literature on DPs often just minor reflections can be found on this topic. Studies on Jewish DPs were and are often seen as part of Holocaust research and commemoration. Since liberation – at the latest – an important and impressive amount of material from Jewish collections and private as well as community archives has been composed, found and often rescued. Frequently Jewish survivors themselves were the driving forces behind these endeavours. Although mostly and over decades the dominant societies in which (former) DPs (later) lived did not want to hear these Jewish stories, today sources are available. Now this material is relatively easy to access, often digitized and/or translated. Researchers are happy to use and reuse these sources for new projects. Without any doubt, there are still many open questions on specific Jewish topics and some of these will never be answered due to the immense destruction during the Holocaust. Having that in mind, it is still noteworthy that there were 'other' displaced memory activists as well. Both, Jewish and non-Jewish DPs acted and reacted in close proximity. Sometimes they worked together, sometimes besides each other, sometimes against each other.

Besides today's difficult and late search for sources on the 'other' displaced memory activists (time has proceeded and most of the DPs have passed away), the research gap can also be explained by language and mental barriers. As most of the DPs emigrated from the late 1940s onwards to various countries, today sources are scattered around the globe. Most of the essential material is family owned or located in non-governmental diasporic and community archives. The fact that this material was not the responsibility of a particular state also meant that preservation and archiving was and is often carried out on a voluntary basis. On top of that, tensions between Jewish and other DPs and their descendants cannot be underestimated. Sometimes contradictory narratives, accusations of actual and assumed Nazi collaboration and anti-Semitism, the perception of the Soviet Union as well as mutual resentments can still be felt to this day. Some of the displaced memory activists are controversial. In some cases, they were viewed as victims, sometimes as heroes and freedom fighters – but also partly as perpetrators or Nazi collaborators. It can be assumed that this led to certain mental barriers: the controversial position made the topic uneasy for academic historians and private family researchers alike. Besides that, those DPs who after months or years finally did return to Eastern Europe frequently remained silent about their experiences in the DP camps. During the Cold War, they feared that their time in the 'West' would be perceived as a threat (Bernstein, 2023). Socio-politically, the DP topic remained a taboo in Eastern Europe for a long time. Consequently, historians in the Soviet Union or the People's Republic of Poland were reluctant to research DPs.[4] There are multiple reasons for the lack of research on non-Jewish displaced memory activists, which can also be explained by often unknown, uncatalogued and generally untapped sources.

These challenges, mental and language barriers are reasons why in scholarly literature on concentration camps and their aftermath(s), DPs are either described from an outside perspective or only mentioned as a footnote if at all (Holian, 2017: 33). Although research on concentration camp memorial sites has flourished since the 2000s, the stories of displaced memory activists are still blurred or often not even considered (for example, Eschebach, 1999; Marcuse, 2001; Neumann-Thein et al., 2022; Skriebeleit, 2009). There are only a few exceptions (Liedke and Römmer, 2010; Person, 2019; Rahe, 2014).[5] The issue persists as most studies on commemoration practices on sites of former concentration camps in Germany and Austria are based on German sources. Moreover, they were predominantly written by German speakers with little Eastern European language skills. Literature and sources in languages spoken by displaced memory activists was not considered. Some scholars included British, US-American or UN-material or perspectives coming from known survivors and associations living in 'the West'. Yet, it was not possible to shed full light on the 'other' displaced memory activists, their internal points of view and motives. This oversight by researchers once more manifested in displaced memory activists being forgotten: a

review of the literature currently available may lead one to believe that a comprehensive understanding of the subject has already been achieved. Moreover, it may lead to the conclusion that Jewish DPs were highly engaged in commemorative practices, which, for the others, would have constituted a relatively unimportant subject. However, this is not the case. In some cases, as will be shown, displaced memory activists were sometimes even deliberately ignored and as such silenced already while being active or shortly after (Trouillot, 1995). However, this has not been explored so far, as hardly anything is written or documented about it in German and English sources. The 'other' sources are scattered waiting to be analysed. Thus, the following incorporates a wealth of hitherto untapped sources from Europe and from diaspora and family archives in the US, Australia and Canada.

The category of DPs: reasons for refusing repatriation and global politics

The Allied authorities registered up to 11 million DPs during and after the Second World War. DPs were confronted with very specific hurdles and living conditions. One of them was 35-year-old Antoni Żok who survived various German camps, where he was kept as a Polish political prisoner. After liberation, he was categorized as a Polish DP of Catholic faith and had to live for more than a year with over 2000 others in the Flossenbürg DP camp. In his diary in May 1946, he wrote: 'Truly sad and deplorable is the fact that twelve months after the end of hostilities in Europe, . . . we must continue to look with disgust at the barbed wire surrounding us, at the stinking barracks, full of holes'.[6] But it was not just the inadequate accommodation that weighed heavily on him. Flossenbürg is a village in the Bavarian province. Between 1938 and 1945, there was a large concentration camp where thousands of prisoners were murdered. Later the US military and UNRRA used the same site to house DPs, including former civilian forced labourers, prisoners of war, veterans and survivors of various other concentration camps, like diarist Żok (Grandke, 2022; Köhn, 2012: 168–178; Skriebeleit, 2009, 2014).

Żok reflected on his life after liberation in a former concentration camp. At first, an injured foot prevented him from returning to Poland. Another reason for staying was influenced by politics: Stalin had insisted that Soviet citizens should be prioritized and, if necessary, forcibly repatriated. This meant that Polish citizens had to wait as infrastructure all over war-torn Europe was mostly destroyed (Dyczok, 2000; Fitzpatrick, 2021; Nasaw, 2020). The Allies defined DPs as a group of *non-Germans* who were *outside their country of origin* and in need of *help to be repatriated*. Most of the DP camps were established at the end of hostilities in Germany, Austria and Italy.[7] The assumption was that DPs would wish to return home immediately. Yet, at the turn of 1945/46, over 735,000 DPs remained in DP Camps in Western Germany.[8] Not all wanted or were able to return to their former countries of origin (Balint, 2021; Holian, 2011; Jacobmeyer, 1985).

As Żok wrote, to be 'shifted from camp to camp'[9] became an all-too-common occurrence. This 'wandering' caused great discomfort. New friendships and networks were destroyed that could provide support in times of uncertainty and the beginning of life in exile. From the Western Allies' point of view, DPs were not encouraged to feel calm. Making the stay in DP camps as unattractive as possible became a 'tactic' for Western Allies, especially in 1946/47.[10] Non-Jewish DPs in particular, were supposed to return to their countries of origin and the discomfort was intended to increase the repatriation pressure. Flossenbürg, where Żok wrote his diary, was dissolved after 18 months at the end of 1947. Those who did not want to be repatriated were transferred elsewhere. Often those remaining had little or no contact with their family, lost their possessions and because of border shifts had nowhere to go back to. Many felt, 'trapped between a lost past and unknown

future' (Besemeres, 2014: 412). Many were traumatized and often incapable of deciding where to go and what to do (Stepień, 1989: 78). Staying in DP camps was intended by the Allies as a short transitional solution but became a permanent phenomenon.

DPs were influenced by contradictory news and rumours. This atmosphere was intensified by the overall uncertain global situation. This meant for example for Polish DPs being exposed to propaganda from at least two sides: when Germany attacked Poland in 1939, the Polish pre-war government escaped to London. This government-in-exile was also active *after* the end of hostilities when the Soviet Union installed a new pro-communist Polish government. These Soviet aligned Poles in Warsaw called for repatriation and strove to discredit the government-in-exile, whereas the Polish 'London elites' wanted DPs to stay in the West and campaigned against communism. They believed that a Third World War was imminent. Those who stayed behind were to form a Polish Army to fight with the Western Allies against the Soviet Union. This was to lay the foundation for a new democratic Poland (Holian, 2010, 2011; Nowak, 2023; On Ukrainian nationalists: Shkandrij, 2023). Thus, Polish DPs were in the 'epicentre' of ideological conflicts (Nowak, 2023: 5). Building a community in exile and (re)creating a national 'true Polish' – and in that way anticommunist – identity was key. Revisiting the past and the Second World War, especially the atrocities committed by the Germans – and the Soviets – became central to this.

The reasons for refusing repatriation varied and were often intertwined. Those who stayed were living on the margins of the German-speaking society. Although there was contact with locals, relationships were often conflictual (Grossmann, 2012; Seipp, 2014). Having that in mind, it is important to stress that the respective DP groups were not homogeneous. Even if DP elites – as those who were part of broader networks and dominated discussions and commissions etc. – tried to portray national groups as a unit, they were internally fragmented (e.g. on Ukrainian DPs: Antons, 2014b). Beyond that, while there was some cooperation between different DP groups, often severe conflicts existed between them (Holian, 2011; Person, 2019). The aim of the Western Allies – with additional pressure from the Soviet Union – was to repatriate as many as soon as possible. Still, when the Cold War heated up, it became clear that the 'DP problem' had to be solved differently. It took political will, time, money and effort to organize the emigration of the remaining one million DPs to other countries.

Political activity by DPs was officially forbidden. However, DPs and their elites knew how to navigate the restrictive system. They established wide-ranging networks that lasted. The Polish government-in-exile officially lost the support of the Western Allies by summer 1945. This encouraged a considerable number of Polish anticommunists to act (or stay) underground and in secrecy. Their goal was an independent state. In their view, they had to go beyond the legal framework to achieve what they were fighting for. For the Allies on the other side, political activity by DPs meant anti-repatriation measures. In addition to sincere commemoration and, above all, the need of survivors and relatives to mourn, memorial projects also enabled DP elites to conceal political activities. The cases of Flossenbürg and Ebensee exemplify this.

Community building as a motive for displaced memory activism

The construction of memorials and commemorative services could help 'ordinary' DPs to work on something regarded as important in a time of senseless waiting. Ceremonies of remembrance organized by Polish DPs were often thoroughly Catholic. The clergy was key in these projects. Although other religious leaders and groups were sometimes invited and even actively encouraged to participate, Polish Catholicism dominated. Polish flags and symbols were displayed in abundance at commemorative events, and the anthem and patriotic songs were sung. The intention was to strengthen morale and overcome internal divisions. This was particularly important as many

DPs, especially the traumatized survivors of Nazi camps, often felt unable to become active at all. Most of them needed medical treatment and moral support. General Priest and Prelate Edward Lubowiecki was one of the most important Polish-Catholic clergymen and a concentration camp survivor himself. His main responsibility was the care for Polish-Catholic DPs. In 1946, Lubowiecki summarized the morale of Polish citizens in Germany and noted differences within the Polish DP group. While some belonged to the intelligentsia, the majority was 'a less educated but morally upstanding, calm and hard-working element'. Lubowiecki stated a deep bitterness particularly among liberated prisoners of war and concentration camp inmates. In addition, it was precisely those Polish concentration camp survivors who remained as DPs who had been broken by Nazi imprisonment. Although there were not many of them, Lubowiecki wrote, there were people among these survivors who had committed crimes after liberation, but also *before* and *during* their imprisonment in German concentration camps. This would have a negative impact on the 'image of Poland' in general.[11] In Lubowieckis opinion, the task was to strengthen the community spirit of all Polish DPs. In this, he suggested, the DP elites played an important role as they had the most influence on the mass of DPs. Encouraging people to take independent responsibility was seen as important: to participate in and organize camp life, to take part in cultural activities. The aim was to improve physical and mental health and as such to unite and educate ethnic Polish DPs (Nowak, 2023: 19–42, 94–95, 133–160).

Wolfgang Jacobmeyer described DP camps as an 'accidental society' [Zufallsgesellschaft] in a 'pseudo-homeland' [Pseudo-Heimat] (Jacobmeyer, 1985: 51–52). According to Jan-Hinnerk Antons (2020), Ukrainian DPs formed a 'nation in a nutshell'. Referring to the past was ever-present. Only the selection of events, people and interpretations of the past deemed relevant for the respective groups differed. A common theme is that all DP groups actively participated in remembering the victims of Nazi crimes (Holian, 2011: 153–185; 211–243). In that regard, particularly rich research on Jewish DPs and their activities exist (Bohus et al., 2020; Brenner, 1995; Königseder and Wetzel, 1994; Patt and Berkowitz, 2010). Many Jewish DPs engaged in the Zionist movement and fought for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. Community building in the DP camps was thoroughly orientated towards this (e.g. Mankowitz, 2002). They consistently argued with the hundreds of years of discrimination and persecution and, above all, the Shoah committed by German Nazis and their local collaborators. The memory of these victims was omnipresent in the Jewish DP camps.

Directed towards a different country and with a different background, there are striking parallels to non-Jewish DPs. Many ethnic Polish DP elites aimed for a Poland that was independent from the Soviet Union. Their work was explicitly and secretly directed against the Warsaw government, which they considered illegitimate. Ukrainians as well as Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians, on the other hand, fought for their own independent states without Soviet influence. Nationalists were dreaming of primarily ethnically homogeneous countries. Strengthening the national sentiment and patriotism of the respective DP groups was seen as central by the DP elites across the political spectrum. To varying degrees and with different narratives, they all referred to the past to legitimize their demand for an independent state. The self-declared or sometimes elected DP elites tried to present themselves and their groups as a united community forming a common front against Soviet Communism. Their appeals were directed explicitly and indirectly towards the Western Allies seen as those with power to change the global situation (Holian, 2010, 2011: 231–232).

Community building included commemorative events, concerts, theatre plays, demonstrations and marches, exhibitions and book projects. DP associations were an important tool in this endeavour and were initially supported by the Western military authorities. Various associations, such as former concentration camp prisoners, organized meetings and events, which made it possible to exchange ideas with DPs in other camps and establish networks. After the Allies realized that this

promoted anti-repatriation sentiment, especially among the non-Jewish DPs, they tried to ban these activities from 1946.[12] Yet, exhumation commissions for the murdered as well as memorial and cemetery projects were obviously *not* affected by this. For a Polish-Catholic exhumation commission around Wetterfeld, Bavaria, it was a moral duty to be active. Consisting of concentration camp survivors, they sought justice. The commission wanted to do a 'last loving favour' [Liebesdienst] for those 'fellow sufferers who were murdered in a bestial manner'.[13] At the same time, data on the dead were to be collected to help relatives clarify what happened to their loved ones. Between mid-1945 and 1947, this commission, consisting of Polish DPs, exhumed over 600 victims who had been murdered by the SS in the final days of the war around Wetterfeld. The bodies were solemnly buried in two cemeteries. They hoped that their examinations would be used in upcoming war crime trials against the German perpetrators.[14] Subsequently, the voluntary work centred on the construction of cemeteries of honour and memorials (Bienert and Grandke, 2024). Such initiatives were organized by various DP groups throughout Germany and Austria.[15] DP newspapers in native languages reported widely on their 'work successes'.[16]

The organization of memorials as public events of positive self-representation

Organizing memorials, monuments and cemeteries provided DPs with an opportunity to show their agency as well as strengthening the morale of their community within the camps and beyond (Nowak, 2023: 145). Especially after Germany was defeated, the Allies promoted commemoration and remembrance of the victims of Nazi tyranny. Therefore, DPs who acted as memory activists could count on their support. Furthermore, most of the DPs were in liberated Germany and Austria, in the country of their former persecutors. This also strengthened their engagement in public remembrance of victims of Nazi crimes.

The memorial committee in Flossenbürg was mainly led by Catholic Poles. They were keen to present themselves as those carrying out meaningful actions within, for and with the international community. Next to collective mourning and commemoration, they were concerned with preserving, and to some extent restoring, the reputation of Poles. 'The merit of organizing the whole camp cemetery and giving it a historical prestige belongs to us, the Poles', the memorial committee declared about their ongoing project in Flossenbürg in a Polish-language DP newspaper in 1947.[17] The mostly Polish-Catholic-driven memorial committee had an explicitly international orientation and invited other Eastern Europeans, Western survivor associations, international representatives and various religious leaders as well as Germans. It was clear to these memory activists that they were doing something extraordinary. They had a deep desire to communicate this to the public, outside their own ethnic group.

The targeted groups were wide-ranging: first and as already mentioned, the Western Allies. They were invited to events and organizational meetings but also symbolically addressed. For example, the Polish (exile) Veterans Association in the US Zone financed symbolic grave sites for American and British victims of the Flossenbürg Concentration Camp. In this way – and also engraved on the stones – they pointedly reminded the Western Allies that they were – and continued to be – comrades in arms. Moreover, it was an appeal to the Western Allies to stand up for the Polish (veterans), just as the Poles made it clear that they had not forgotten the American and British (victims). Second, the displaced memory activists in Flossenbürg tried to reach other ethnic groups and nations. The last needs to be stressed, as significant tensions between DP groups of different ethnicities, religions and nationalities did exist. Cooperation between DP groups was not a matter of course. The conflict-ridden partnership between the non-Jewish DP groups in

Flossenbürg was nurtured by their shared anti-communism. The common goal – working against the Soviet Union – and thus a common enemy, helped to overcome existing deep inter-ethnic tensions among DP elites, at least to some extent. Third, displaced memory activists in various places cooperated closely with Germans and Austrians. Some were survivors of Nazi persecution, too. Yet, even more often DPs had to work with local authorities to achieve their goals. Astonishingly, early on the displaced activists in Flossenbürg emphasized the Polish-German cooperation in official letters. They spoke about international friendship and reconciliation as early as 1946.[18]

It is important to note that both Flossenbürg and Ebensee were remote places in rural provinces. Nevertheless, the memory activists managed to get hundreds, sometimes thousands of people to attend commemorative events. This was an extraordinary achievement at a time when infrastructure was destroyed, resources were lacking and communication channels were just established. All of this had to be prepared, organized and carried out. This highlights the significance for the activists as well as for the participants, some of whom travelled long distances to take part in the activities and memorial events.

One might think that these memory activists in Flossenbürg were former inmates of the concentration camp. But having a closer look, we can see that the majority of those involved had *no* experience of persecution in Flossenbürg itself. Some did survive other concentration camps, but the most active driving forces behind the project were soldiers. A considerable part of the DP population in Flossenbürg as well as in the memorial committee was highly organized Polish veterans. Among them were former prisoners of war in German captivity as well as Polish soldiers in Western Forces. One motivation for the Polish memory activists in Flossenbürg was, 'to show [foreign delegations, representatives of the US and the press] our existence outside the crime statistics'.[19] First of all, Flossenbürg Concentration Camp was often described as a camp for 'criminals'. But second, and potentially more important: DPs, and Poles in particular, were often accused of criminality. For the Allies, DPs who were unwilling to repatriate became a huge burden. For most Germans, DPs were seen as a completely undesired group (Panagiotidis and Petersen, 2024). Indeed, there were criminals among DPs, as the Polish priest Lubowiecki reported as well, yet the DPs' crime rate was not necessarily higher than that of the German-speaking population (Schröder, 2005: 202–234; Seipp, 2014: 56–57; Stepień, 1989: 151–164). DPs often felt unjustly accused and tried to defend themselves. An honourable project such as the construction of a concentration camp memorial was supposed to underscore their high morals, their productivity, resourcefulness and help to restore the image of 'true' Poles.

In Ebensee, where former political prisoner Marciniak and others were building a cemetery in 1945/46, they tried to reach the outside world in other ways as well. After several German-language newspaper articles in November 1945 stigmatized foreigners in general and above all Poles as criminals, the Polish-language DP newspaper 'Biuletyn Informacyjny' published a three-page article against these sweeping accusations. In order to give the appeal more emphasis, the text was translated into English and German. The editors obviously intended to influence the German-speaking public as well as the occupying powers and international aid organizations. First, they pointed out that Poland had been a multi-ethnic state before 1939. Not everyone who claimed to be a Polish citizen – and was then officially a Polish DP – was, in their opinion, a 'real' Pole. They argued that young people in particular had been deported by the Germans and thus taken away from their families and upbringing. The fact that some had only experienced this 'camp education' was not due to Polishness or a lack of good (Polish) manners, but caused by the German Nazis. Second, the newspaper editors were referring to the achievement of Polish military organizations in the West: 'we should very much like to find an understanding in the Austrian public opinion that **the Polish people is one of the Allied Nations**, that has participated till final victory in the greatest struggle history knows, offering its total strength and the blood of its best sons, thus gaining,

together with our Allies, the great Victory, whith (sic) brought independence *even to Austria*'.[20] They were primarily thinking of the so-called Second Polish Corps. This unit had achieved significant military victories against Germany alongside the Western Allies. Over 100,000 soldiers from this Second Polish Corps had initially remained in northern Italy after the war. They were closely associated with the government-in-exile and heavily involved in supporting Polish DPs (Davies, 2015; Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann, 2004; Nowak, 2023; Pilch, 1994). Ebensee was one of the most important hubs of the Second Polish Corps in Austria and further north towards the US occupation zone in Germany. It financed the newspaper 'Biuletyn Informacyjny' and it also supported the construction of the 'Polish' memorial.[21] It was precisely thanks to these contributions that DPs in Ebensee had considerably more space for action. Not only did they have a greater reach into the exiled Polish community and access to an extensive network, they also had the necessary financial support. A delegation from the Second Polish Corps travelled to the inauguration of the memorial on 2 June 1946.[22]

Displaced memory activists undertook campaigns to publicize their work. Besides articles and press releases to foreign newspapers, they sold stamps and postcards to raise funds and promote their initiatives. For the inauguration of the memorial in Ebensee, Polish concentration camp memoirs were published. A total of 16 texts were printed, including one from a Jewish perspective. The professionally produced book comprised over 150 pages and included photos and drawings.[23] This was an enormous achievement in times of absolute shortage and rationing of paper, ink and printing plates and was probably financed by the Second Polish Corps. In 1947, the same editors published a memorial book with the names of Jewish and non-Jewish concentration camp victims from Poland who had been murdered and buried in the Ebensee area.[24] This endeavour was understood as an extension of the physical organization of the memorial. The books had a wide circulation.[25] At the same time, there was often great interest in capturing the memorial events in photographs or even film. Through the distribution of reproduced photos as well as by word of mouth, the activities moved to many other places.

Moreover, an inauguration of a monument or a commemoration was not just a one-time event. It was supposed to live on: the memory itself as well as its producers. Very often activists themselves inscribed a plaque with their names onto the monuments. In this way, the sites also explicitly referred to their founders. Both figuratively and literally, the aim was to consciously and purposefully show we are here, we exist, we stand up for our demands (Patt and Berkowitz, 2010). As such public commemorations 'might also be openings for challenge, contestation or transformation' (Drozdzewski et al., 2019: 263). A further aspect is that displaced memory activists orientated their work towards eternity. Cemetery projects were in the organizers' understanding, designed to last forever. Marciniak, survivor and memorial builder in Ebensee, confirmed this in his letter to the council. He emphasized that 'the entire administration from the town' had been present at the cemetery inauguration and promised by signature to 'keep the place in order'.[26] He was convinced that the physical monuments and graves would remain, even if or when they, the memory activists, left. Written agreements on the care of the sites were made with the local authorities. This was done in Ebensee, too. However, these agreements were often not upheld.

Commemoration and memorial building as a tool for (ultra-)nationalists

The prolonged stay in camps made it possible to strengthen group consciousness in a condensed space and framework. Nationalist activities played a crucial role in this. On the one hand, this allowed DPs to overcome the uncertain situation at least to some extent. On the other hand, it also

helped the camp population to homogenize cultural, political and historical perspectives, which in turn increased the sense of belonging (Antons, 2020). Commemoration and raising the respective historical national consciousnesses were therefore crucial for DP elites.

Due to the large-scale efforts to publicize the memorial projects in Flossenbürg, other groups became aware of the initiative and actively took part. In the case of Flossenbürg, however, this turned out to be problematic for the project and the Polish displaced memory activists in the long run. Before and especially *after* the inauguration of a monumental concentration camp memorial complex, nationalist groups and extremists demanded to be involved. Following the scattered sources, the mainly Polish-led memorial committee apparently granted this without hesitation.[27]

Although extreme nationalists will also have been motivated to commemorate their dead, there was another significance for their participation. Often non-Jewish DPs were accused not only of criminality but also of collaborating with the German Nazis. These accusations, sometimes true, sometimes false, came from other survivors as well as from the political left and the Soviet Union in particular. Non-Jewish DPs tried to defend themselves against what they saw as often unjustified accusations. A Lithuanian newspaper from 1946 reads, 'All of a sudden there are accusations from strangers, as if we were former friends of the Nazis. Let them go to that place [Flossenbürg] and see what sacrifices the little Lithuanian nation has made. . . . If a German today dares to accuse us of friendship with the Nazis, we can confidently tell him that he was in the ranks of those torturers and now wants to wash his bloody hands at the expense of others'.[28] The author stressed that being active in memorial projects would be powerful evidence of Lithuanian suffering under Nazi persecution – and as such against accusations of Lithuanian-Nazi collaboration.

However, the fact that some DPs did support the German occupiers and their crimes – at least at times – cannot be denied. This was no secret in the immediate postwar years. Philipp Auerbach, himself German-Jewish, was the Bavarian State Commissioner responsible for the Racially, Religiously and Politically Persecuted. In this function, he was an honorary member of the Flossenbürg memorial committee. In mid-1947, Auerbach refused to attend further meetings in Flossenbürg as, in his view, more and more Nazi collaborators hijacked the memorial project to whitewash their past. 'It is highly out of place for an association [of former political prisoners of the Lithuanian anti-Nazi resistance] to claim 3000 dead, the vast majority of whom were Jewish fellow citizens killed by their own countrymen', he wrote.[29]

The huge distortion among the Flossenbürg memory activists got even more vivid when the League of Ukrainian Political Prisoners started to participate in the project. The League officially claimed to be apolitical. Still, key players in the association, such as Dr. Petro Mirchuk or Prof. Panas Oliynychenko, defined themselves as part of OUNb, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists on the side of Stepan Bandera. Bandera is a controversial Ukrainian political leader of the far-right. In 1934, he was convicted for the murder of Polish Interior Minister Bronisław Pieracki and for a time OUNb cooperated with the German National Socialists. Ukrainian nationalists took part in pogroms against Polish and Jewish civilians as well as communists. They committed these crimes also independently from the Germans. OUNb and thus its leader Bandera justified their actions with the struggle for an independent Ukraine. Cooperation with the Germans was considered useful, but did not go smoothly: Bandera was held as an 'honorary prisoner' in the Sachsenhausen Concentration Camp. Other Ukrainian nationalists were incarcerated too, including future League officials such as Mirchuk and the organisation's important president, Dr. Mykhailo Marunchak (Bruder, 2007; Cyra, 2008; Himka, 2021; Rossolinski-Liebe, 2014; Rudling, 2011).[30]

The League of Ukrainian Political Prisoners claimed to have up to 5000 members and portrayed themselves as the sole Ukrainian representatives. This was also implemented by force against opponents: within the League as well as in the extended deeply rivalled Ukrainian DP

group(s) and outside. As an association of Ukrainian persecutees and as part of OUN, the League fought for recognition as explicitly Ukrainian concentration camp prisoners. They made an enormous effort to make the Flossenbürg memorial also a 'Ukrainian mausoleum'. '[W]e must take part', can be read in the League's minutes from summer 1947.[31] The main motivation for the League's involvement was focused on two aspects: first, to make Ukrainian concentration camp prisoners and even more Ukraine itself visible in an international context and the beginning of the Cold War. Their aim was to be recognized as an independent nation. Like other Ukrainian DP organizations, the League pursued a change in the status quo: they fought for full recognition as a Ukrainian DP group. The latter was particularly virulent, as the Allies initially divided DP categories according to citizenship *before* the Second World War. In this understanding, there was no independent Ukrainian state and therefore no separate Ukrainian DP group. This meant that Ukrainian DPs belonged to those DP groups that only over time were recognized as a national group by the Western Allies (Antons, 2014a). Before that they were officially considered as mostly Polish or Soviet citizens – a circumstance against which Ukrainian nationalists fought. With the construction of their own monuments and the use of state and national symbols as well as their own language, they literally carved Ukraine in stone. A central part of the Flossenbürg memorial is the 'Square of Nations', where various national groups were given symbolic gravestones, often indicating presumed numbers of their compatriots who had died in the camp. The League was eager to be included. Due to their efforts, Ukrainian concentration camp victims (in an ethnonational sense) were given a prominent place in the international community as early as 1947. This was probably the first explicitly Ukrainian commemoration and monument on the grounds of a former concentration camp in the German-speaking world.

A second motivation for the Ukrainian nationalists' involvement in the memorial activities was that they could symbolically oppose the accusation of being Nazi collaborators. They could show that they were concentration camp prisoners: erecting a memorial placed them on the side of the victims – not the perpetrators. Jayne Persian (2024: 28) described in the case of DPs who later migrated to Australia: 'Most nationalist groups were aware that in the context of the Cold War, downplaying their image as wartime collaborators to anti-Soviet activists was useful for them as groups, and as individuals, going forward. . . . Instead of collaborators, then, the argument went that these groups should be seen as homegrown resistance movements: as for wartime collaboration, there had been "no other choice"'. Despite the argument of their anticommunist and democratic attitudes, DPs and especially nationalists could not shake off the accusation of collaboration. In May 1950, Philipp Auerbach openly confronted the League: 'Don't be offended, there are people in your ranks who were probably in a concentration camp, but it has to be checked whether they were in front of or behind the barbed wire'.[32] The League, above all its chairman Marunchak, was not deterred by this and continued to campaign for the commemoration of Ukrainian 'freedom fighters' in Flossenbürg and other places. In doing so, he also prevailed over internal scepticism about the high financial costs.

The Ukrainian nationalists spared neither money nor effort. In the late 1940s, most of the League's members worked from Regensburg and Munich. They had to travel up to 220 km to remote Flossenbürg. Marunchak continued and even expanded his activities for the memorial site after his emigration to Canada in 1948. He opened a foundation in order to manage the funds and used all possible means to raise donations. All 'people of good will' in the DP camps and in the diaspora were to be approached. The League's central aim was reaching 'every single Ukrainian family and the poorest person'.[33] Appeals in North America called on the national sentiment of the Ukrainian diaspora claiming it would be a patriotic duty for all exiled Ukrainians to become – and remain – active in the Flossenbürg memorial.[34]

The Flossenbürg memorial project was not without its controversies. Initially, donations were low, but over time the amounts increased.[35] It can be assumed that it was the League's widespread campaign in Western Germany, Austria, Northern America and Great Britain that made Flossenbürg known in the Ukrainian diaspora. Until mid-1947, Flossenbürg did not play a significant role among exiled Ukrainians. In the League's records of 1945/6, Flossenbürg is not even mentioned. However, after their involvement, they soon started to discuss plans for other places like Ebensee and Hersbruck. Flossenbürg was seen by US-American as well as local Bavarian authorities as a problem as early as 1947: not only because of the participation of various ultranationalists and perhaps Nazi collaborators, but also because of financial inconsistencies on the part of the memorial committee itself. For example, a Polish member was dismissed when it was revealed that he had committed a serious crime and as US military investigations found out, he was operating under a false identity. Another involved and supposedly German journalist fled when it became known that he also was working under a false identity. At the same time, one of the few German members in the memorial committee, Josef Tröger, was accused of anti-Semitism. Social democrat Tröger was a former Flossenbürg inmate and became mayor in the nearby town of Weiden after liberation. As he held a public position, he had to undergo a disciplinary investigation. Philipp Auerbach, the Bavarian State Commissioner, was key to this.[36] Two other influential members of the committee were accused of having been Kapos, prisoners with special functions in the concentration camp. They were blamed of having supported the SS during their incarceration.[37]

Philipp Auerbach remarked in 1949 that he wanted to avoid any further scandals at all costs.[38] Flossenbürg was not a prime example for him. According to the documents of the Bavarian State Commissariat, it was considered dubious.

The afterlives of sites built by displaced memory activists

When speaking about forgetting and silencing displaced memory activists and their projects, it is important to consider what happened to these monuments after most DPs had left. Within the first 2 years after the Second World War, DP memorial projects for Nazi victims lost the support of Western Allies. Directly after liberation the Western Allies regarded it as important to 'denazify' and 'educate' the German population (Skriebeleit, 2012). Later, this became less relevant. For German-speaking societies and especially locals living in proximity to former sites of crimes, the remembrance of Nazi persecution and their victims was discomforting and, in most cases, not wanted. When regional authorities recommended merging monuments and cemeteries, locals were usually in favour. In many cases and especially in the 1950s, authorities in West Germany and Austria dissolved monuments and cemeteries for officially pragmatic reasons. It was said to be financially more affordable in the long term to maintain collective cemeteries. In Ebensee, the reasons were manifold: one was that the site was vandalized several times. Another reason was that German tourists on vacation in the beautiful area of Ebensee complained about the multilingual memorial inscription, which read: 'To the eternal shame of the German people'. As the cemetery and memorial plaques were placed right on the main road, the site could not be missed. The Ebensee town council was obviously carefully listening to the German and possibly also local complaints. Finally, the bodies from the 'Polish cemetery' were translocated. The dedicated area was a couple of kilometres away in another graveyard, which was financed mainly by Italian donors. Austrian authorities subsequently blew up the Polish monument in 1955 (Felber and Quatember, 2005: 198–200; Quatember, 1998). Still, one could say that up until the dismantling of the Ebensee monument, the displaced memory activists remained present in a metaphorical sense – at least by name and even after leaving these places. As long as these physical places remained the memorials formed 'cultural footprints' left by DPs (Grandke, 2022: 47).

However, it was not only the 'pragmatic' dismantling that is important to consider. Crucial is the credibility and standing that most of DPs from Eastern Europe did *not* have in the eyes of the local majority societies. Antislavism among German speakers had and has a long legacy and cannot be underestimated (Panagiotidis and Petersen, 2024). When German or Austrian authorities planned additions, changes or a dismantling of monuments, as far as it can be seen in the scattered documents, locals did not involve the people who had built them in the first place. Even if authorities had contact with some of the DPs, they did not consult them (Bienert and Grandke, 2024). If Western German or Austrian authorities asked any foreigners at all, they approached 'Western survivors' or Jewish communities with whom they were more likely in contact and could talk often without translators. Besides the lack of language skills, especially (non-Jewish) displaced Eastern Europeans were simply not regarded as important.

In contrast, for displaced memory activists, these places were of high significance as seen in the example of Marcinak who undertook a journey in 1979 to see the Ebensee cemetery.[39] Others asked local authorities for information and requested photos of the monuments they had erected.[40] They talked to their families and friends about their achievements, and some of their children made a great effort to visit the places their fathers had built.[41] Others, like Ukrainian or Lithuanian nationalists in associations for political prisoners, used their achievements to show their work within their ethnic group in the following decades to come. They used the sites for meetings and commemorations. As the Cold War heated up, they loudly and openly included the commemoration of victims of Soviet persecution. For example, in 1955 in Flossenbürg Lithuanian former political prisoners living in Germany and Sweden commemorated those who died in 'Communist and Nazi Concentration Camps'[42]. Already in the invitation they stressed their desire to be free and recalled 'the ongoing Soviet genocide in Lithuania'.[43] For their meeting they chose the symbolic date of 23 June. This is Saint John's Day, the most important holiday in Lithuanian culture as well as the day of announcement of the short-lived provisional government of Lithuania in 1941.

The legacy of the involvement in memorial projects went on, sometimes for decades. The Ukrainian League entered a new phase of activities in the 1980s when investigations and war crime trials began in 'the West'. Eastern European diaspora members saw themselves once again confronted with sweeping accusations of Nazi collaboration. The Ukrainian League went public as a concentration camp survivor association. Organizing events, publications and building memorials was part of their work and was further stimulated by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the independence of Ukraine in 1991. Amid all these activities, photos of Ukrainian memorials, above all in Flossenbürg, were published. They advocated memorials for Ukrainian victims in other places in Germany, Austria and Poland and argued by using the 'Flossenbürg example'. As an association, they had a network and some funding to travel to the sites. Their members went to commemorations although most of them were living far away from Europe. For the displaced memory activists who were not part of the organizations, a trip to Europe was very expensive. Still, some of them wanted to know what had happened to 'their' memorials. Some managed to get information and heard about the dismantling. Jerzy/George Goiny-Grabowski, living in Australia since 1949, asked an acquaintance who travelled to Germany for information on a cemetery he built in Rettenbach. He concluded angrily in a report to the Sydney Jewish community, that the Germans wanted to get rid of those cemeteries the activists had positioned 'on purpose on cross roads'. For him it was supposed to be an everlasting reminder of the war crimes. 'They [the Germans] may try as hard as they like to become respectable and civilized citizens again but the mark of their horrendous war crimes will remain attached to them for generations to come . . .'[44] In 1946/7, Goiny-Grabowski, a Polish former political prisoner, had worked closely with the Bavarian authorities and the Jewish DP community to realize the project. The cemeteries in Rettenbach and nearby Wetterfeld were regarded as pioneering projects by Philipp Auerbach, the Bavarian State Commissioner. Auerbach

considered the cooperation between non-Jewish and Jewish DPs as exemplary (Bienert and Grandke, 2024). This can be seen even more clearly in comparison with the Flossenbürg project. Due to his role as a state official, Auerbach was also engaged in Flossenbürg but he did not support the DP driven commemoration there in the long run. The large-scale project in Flossenbürg run by DPs did not only lose support from the US military government but also from Bavarian officials which was only fragile at best anyway.

Conclusion

All DP groups and especially their elites – regardless of ethnicity, religion or political orientation – used the immediate past for the (re)construction of their community. In addition to commemorating the dead and to enable a collective mourning, DPs were also motivated to form an identity based mainly on nationality. Displaced memory activists had different motives for getting involved in commemoration projects, depending on their ethnic, religious, political and ideological backgrounds as well as their personal war experiences. Many working on concentration camp memorial sites were survivors of these camps, but not all: for example, on the Polish-Catholic side, soldiers took an active role, too.

DP elites also engaged in memorial projects as memory activists to make a claim for independent statehood. They often did this in competition or cooperation with other groups. In the midst of uncertainty and the Cold War, DP elites strove to unify and structure their exiled communities. To varying degrees and with different narratives, they all referred to the past to underpin their demand for a free state. Memorials served as a means of etching this into stone. On top of that, the aim was to document crimes, as they expected legal proceedings against the German perpetrators and their helpers. All DP groups used their memory activism to represent themselves. Different ethnic, national and religious groups in postwar Germany and Austria acted and reacted in close proximity. Sometimes they worked together, sometimes beside each other, sometimes against each other. DP memory activists used their involvement in commemorative projects for political purposes. Non-Jewish displaced memory activists especially tried to make their demands for independent, anti-communist states and their anti-Sovietism heard. They stressed that they, the anticommunists, were the true representatives of their nation.

It would be fruitful in future to analyse closely how the elite and displaced memory activists related to the ‘ordinary’ DPs and survivors of concentration camps. Katarzyna Nowak (2023) has already pointed out how elites exploited the insecurity, fear and indecision of the average DPs (pp. 106–107 in particular). For Adam Seipp (2013), the few DP elites were exceptions: they seemed official and dominated the public space but had little in common with most DPs (p. 69). An example of this is Antoni Żok writing his diary in the Flossenbürg DP camp. He was actively reflecting on his situation as a survivor and as a DP living on the grounds of a former concentration camp. Still, he never wrote about the memorial project or the involved elites that he must have known, as they surrounded him every day. This raises the question to what extent DP memory activism was merely an elite project and to what extent this had an impact on ‘ordinary’ DPs. Were these projects ‘successful’? What was actually achieved, especially considering that one of the main motivations of those involved was to convince the Western Allies of their credibility? On a broader scale, these analysed perspectives on and of displaced memory activists and their ambivalences challenge historiography, memorial sites and memory culture as well as narration of the past after 1945.

At places where memorials built by the DPs still stand today, they usually remain unquestioned. Who, why and how they were built or to whom they were actually dedicated seems to be obvious and often above all morally *un*contested. Extensive global research by the author, particularly in diaspora and family archives, has revealed a more nuanced, complicated and conflictual picture.

First, in the early months after the Second World War, nearly all non-Jewish DP groups already saw themselves confronted with sweeping accusations of being Nazi collaborators and/or anti-Semites. Having that in mind, their memory activism can be understood as a method of self-defence (Drozdzewski, 2008, 2012). However, as shown above some of them did indeed support the German Nazis at a certain time. The collective and individual, sometimes false, sometimes true allegations came from a wide variety of people and sources, from survivors in 'the West' as well as from the Soviet bloc. Whether these accusations were true or not played a minor role: the reputation of those projects and their organizers was often damaged. Second, it is important to consider what happened to these places after the DPs left. It is essential to note that while the DPs were often pioneers of remembrance, in many cases their stories have not yet been written. The reasons, as shown above, are multilayered and manifold: sometimes the stories of DP memory activists were forgotten and displaced, but in some cases, it seems much more likely that they were deliberately silenced. One reason is the erasure of these 'DP footprints' by mostly local German or Austrian authorities after DPs had left. Still, this past was, and is, not only unpleasant for local Germans or Austrians. A deeper analysis reveals that in some places controversial memory activists were involved, too: some used the commemoration projects to whitewash their ambivalent past. In this respect, the story of the displaced memory activists illustrates a complex, uncomfortable past for *all* the individuals and institutions involved.

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to Prof. Ass. Anna Holian, Prof. Dr. Konrad Kwiet, Prof. Dr. Guido Hausmann and Dr. Katarzyna Nowak for support. Furthermore, the author would like to thank the editors, in particular Dr. Jochen Lingelbach, as well as the peer reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions on drafts of the paper.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article: The author receives financial support through a doctoral scholarship (2022–2025) from the Heinrich Böll Foundation (Germany).

ORCID iD

Sarah Grandke https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7477-7567

Notes

1. Marciniak to Council, 5.5.1979, Zeitgeschichte Museum Ebensee (ZME), Testimony Marciniak.
2. Memory Activists and activism will be understood as grassroots initiatives of a 'strategic commemoration of a contested past to achieve mnemonic or political change by working outside the state channels'. Memory activism is in that understanding both a goal and a practice. It can be used by activists from all political sides to change dominant narratives or to resist changes (Gutman and Wüstenberg, 2023).
3. For example, for Lithuania, see Ukrainian Free University Archives, Munich, Fond LUPV/Liga, Ziburiai, Lietuviu Savaitratis, Specialus KZ numeris, Ausgburg, 23.8.1947; Translation by PD. Dr. Rüdiger Ritter.
4. The main cesura is 1989. Before the end of communism, displaced persons (DPs) were mostly considered in Polish historiography as 'repatriates'. The communists would not publicly admit that peasants and workers chose to stay abroad. Some changes in this narrative occurred already in the 1980s. After 1989 research increased (Kersten, 1974; Łuczak, 1993; Pilch, 1994).
5. Persons' work must be particularly emphasized as she used a wide range of sources. Her focus was laid on Polish-Jewish DPs and included Polish-Catholic perspectives.
6. Antoni Żok, 3.5.1946, diary, Private Collection Dominika N., copy kept by Sarah Grandke; translation from Polish by Sarah Grandke if not noted otherwise.

7. Besides DPs, up to 13 million Germans were uprooted. A rich historiography exists on the German expellees and refugees (e.g. Kossert, 2008). Adam Seipp (2014) was one of the first bringing both topics, German refugees and DPs, together.
8. About 59 per cent of DPs were (1945/6) considered as (former) Polish citizens. Among ethnic Catholic Poles were different groups, such as Jews, Ukrainians, Belarusians and others. See: Displaced Persons by nationality receiving UNRRA assistance in the Western Zones of Germany, Austria, Italy, China, and the Middle East, December 1945 to June 1947 (Proudfoot, 1957: 259). Numbers on DPs are not reliable, though in general, the majority of DPs were non-Jewish DPs, about ¼ were estimated as Jews.
9. Antoni Żok, 3.5.1946, diary.
10. For example: From a Polish DP perspective, newspaper article 'Metoda bicza i marchewki' [The whip and carrot method], Inf. Pras, Nr. 29, 26.9.1946, in: Józef Piłsudski Institute of America Archives, New York City (PIA), No. 24, syg. 239, Materiały obrazujące życie uchodźców- wyciągi informacji prasowych, wycinki prasowe [Materials depicting the life of refugees – extracts of press releases, press cuttings]; for example, for the British Zone (Vögel and Ehrhardt, 1994: 75–83). See also Samantha Knapton (2020).
11. Lubowiecki, Stan moralny ludności polskiej w Niemczech [The moral state of the Polish population in Germany], November 1946, in: Polish Institute and Sikorski Museum Archives, London, UK (PISM), A.XII.90 Polskie Misje Wojskowe na Kontynencie [Polish Military Missions on the Continent], 90.14.
12. Among other, on the protest against the banning of the Polish Prisoners' Association in the British zone: Liquidation, April 1947, in: PISM, Kol. 289/X/1/1; also, League of Ukrainian Political Prisoner correspondence with Philipp Auerbach, in: Oseredok, Ukrainian Cultural and Educational Centre, Winnipeg, Canada, Marunchak files, Box 1(2), B3-F-8; In general (Holian, 2011: 249, 264).
13. Commission's final report, 3.5.1946, 5.3.3/84621121/84621123/84621124/ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives, translated from German by Sarah Grandke. (Further reading: Stone, 2023, especially chapters 5 and 6).
14. Correspondence George Goiny-Grabowski, 1987-88, Sydney Jewish Museum (SJM), AAJHS X91/35:1-80.
15. Among others, Polish Association of Former Prisoners of German Prisons and Concentration Camps [Polski Związek Byłych Więźniów niemieckich więzień i obozów koncentracyjnych], PISM, Kol 289/XXIV/4/62 and Reports from the camps in Germany a) Material from the delegates' convention in Lübeck Deputy Chief of Staff for Polish Affairs on the Continent [Sprawoydania i meldunki z obozów w Niemczech, a) materiały ze zjazdu delegatów w Lubece Zastępca Szefa Sztabu dla Spraw Polaków na Kontynencie], 1946, PISM, A.XII.47/7a. Also, for example (Feinstein, 2010; Jockusch, 2012).
16. For example, Buchenwald, in: Dziennik Polski (Regensburg), 5.1.1946, Year 2, No. 4 (178).
17. Newspaper clipping 'Flossenbürg', author unknown, 28.8.1947, in: Marian Iwański, Chronicle of Polish Life in Regensburg 1945-48, p. 328/196, https://issuu.com/portapolonica/docs/alles_komplett_nicht_reduziert?e=27035358/44786725, last access 26.12.2023, translation from Polish.
18. For example, Letter from the Committee Flossenbürg to Pope Pius XII., 10.5.1947, in: Iwański, Chronicle, p. 268/157-160, https://issuu.com/portapolonica/docs/alles_komplett_nicht_reduziert?e=27035358/44786725, last access 26.12.2023.
19. Report on Flossenbürg, in: Iwański, Chronicle, p. 256/151, https://issuu.com/portapolonica/docs/alles_komplett_nicht_reduziert?e=27035358/44786725, last access 26.12.2023, translation from Polish.
20. Our replay, Biuletyn Informacjny, Ebensee-Gmunden, 20./21.12.1945, Nr 142 (26).
21. Sprawozdanie z Działalnosci Oddziału Społecznego/Sztabu Ewak./2. Korpusu, [Report on the Activities of the Social Department/Evacuation Headquarters/Second Corps], p. 16., in: PIA, 114\56 Drugi Korpus-Oddział Społeczny [Second Corps – Social Branch].
22. Głos Polski, Tygodnik dla Polakow w Austrii [Voice of Poland, A weekly for Poles in Austria], Salzburg/Gmunden, 10.6.1946, Nr. 14.
23. Wspomnienia z niemieckich obozów koncentracyjnych. Praca zbiorowa, napisana przez bylych wiezniow politycznych niemieckich obozow koncentracyjnych, Ebensee 1946, Osrodek Polski B. Wiezniow OK-Camp 400, Gorna Austria [Memories from German Concentration Camps. Collective work, written by former political prisoners of German concentration camps, Ebensee 1946, Osrodek

Polski B. Wiezniow OK-Camp 400, Upper Austria], for example, in: The Polish Research Collection, Lund University, Sweden.

24. Zbigniew Waruszyński, Polskie Straty w Austrii. Lista obywateli Państwa Polskiego, którzy zginęli w Austrii w latach drugiej wojny światowej (1939 1945), [Polish Losses in Austria. List of citizens of the Polish State who died in Austria during World War II], Gmunden, Austria, 1947, in: Mauthausen-Gusen Klub, Warsaw, Poland.
25. The League of Ukrainian Political Prisoners, for example, closely followed what was written about Ukrainians. In their papers are copies of parts of the text from 'Memories from German Concentration Camps', which was published in Ebensee. The League disliked the description of Ukrainian concentration camp prisoners in general as well as the mentioning of Ukrainian involvement in German mass murder. The League called on its members to write their own stories and also published them. See, Oseredok, Marunchak, Box 1(5), B11-F-6, no date.
26. Marciniak to the Council, 5.5.1979, ZME, Testimony Marciniak.
27. Archives of Flossenbürg Memorial, Minutes of the Memorial Committee (German version), 1946/7, 0000.0692; The holdings of the League of Ukrainian Political Prisoners at Oseredok (see 12).
28. Vaitiekūnas, 26 Sept 1946, Mūsų kelias (Dillingen) 1946. Nr. 38, 47 II. year.
29. Auerbach to Tröger, 14.8.1947. in: Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv München (BayHStA), München, Staatskommissar für rassisch, religiös und politisch Verfolgte, vorl. Nr 45.
30. OUNb's struggle against the Soviet Union continued underground after the end of the war. Bandera remained in Western Germany. In the Soviet Union he was sentenced to death in absentia. In 1959, he was murdered by a KGB agent in Munich.
31. Minutes of the executive board meeting, 23.8.1947, in: Oseredok, Marunchak, Box 1(9), B16-F-8.
32. Auerbach to League, 24.5.1950, in: Oseredok, Marunchak, Box 1(9), B17-F-7.
33. For example, Liga to Committee of the Branch of the Union of Ukrainian Youth, 9.6.1948, in: Oseredok, Marunchak, Box 1(9), B16-F-10.
34. For example, Oseredok, Marunchak, Box 1(18), B-58-F-44, no date.
35. For example, lists of donors and amount, in: Oseredok, Marunchak, Box 1(16), B-54-F-8, no date.
36. Personal file major Josef Tröger, Weiden City Archive, Germany.
37. For example, Documentation of the court of honour, Private Collection, Eugene Hejka, Australia.
38. Auerbach to Kiefer, 10.5.1949, in: BayHStA, Staatskommissar, Vorl. Nr. 26b.
39. Marciniak to Council, 5.5.1979, ZME, Testimony Marciniak.
40. Enquiry by Stanisław Janik about the condition of the graves in Wiesau, Bavaria, 1974, in: Gemeindearchiv Flossenbürg, Nr. 8, Gruppe 1-15, 064 and Nr. 10, 064, 1952-1983, M-Z.
41. In the cases studied, only men were displaced memory activists. Grzegorz Iwulski, Nowy Sącz, Poland, correspondence with Sarah Grandke, 2021/22; Edward Lachowicz to ITS, 30.4.1979, 6.3.3.2/85198615, ITS Digital Archive, Arolsen Archives.
42. Invitation, in: Lithuanian Research and Studies Center, Chicago, IL, USA, V-FLOSSEN-1-2.
43. Mūsų Pastogė, Sydney, NSW: 1950 - 1954, 20 July 1955, p. 2. with special thanks to Australian Lithuanian Archives, Adelaide.
44. Goiny-Grabowski, 11.1.1988, SJM, AAJHS X91/35:1-80.

References

Antons J-H (2014a) *Ukrainische Displaced Persons in der britischen Zone: Lagerleben zwischen nationaler Fixierung und pragmatischen Zukunftsentwürfen*. Essen: Klartext.

Antons J-H (2014b) Ukrainische Displaced Persons und ihr Kampf um nationale Identität. In: Boehling RL, Urban S and Bienert R (eds) *Freilegungen: Displaced Persons; Leben im Transit: Überlebende zwischen Repatriierung, Rehabilitation und Neuanfang*. Göttingen: Wallstein, pp. 228–240.

Antons J-H (2020) The nation in a nutshell? Ukrainian displaced persons camps in postwar Germany. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 37(1–2): 177–211.

Balint R (2021) *Destination Elsewhere: Displaced Persons and Their Quest to Leave Postwar Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Bernstein S (2023) *Return to the Motherland: Displaced Soviets in WWII and the Cold War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Besemeres M (2014) Poles apart? Two Polish Australian women poets, Krystyna Wanda Jackiewicz and Liliana Rydzyńska. *Life Writing* 11(4): 411–422.

Bienert R and Grandke S (2024) Bavarian killing fields uncovered: early non-Jewish Survivors as (forgotten) agents in documenting Nazi crimes and tracing victims. In: Bardgett S, Schmidt C and Stone D (eds) *Survivors of Nazi Persecution*: Cham: Springer, pp. 37–58.

Bohus K, Grossmann A, Wenzel M, et al. (eds) (2020) *Unser Mut – Juden in Europa 1945-48*. Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg.

Brenner M (1995) *Nach dem Holocaust Juden in Deutschland. 1945-1950*. München: Beck.

Bruder F (2007) *'Den ukrainischen Staat erkämpfen oder sterben!': Die Organisation Ukrainischer Nationalisten (OUN) 1929-1948*. Berlin: Metropol.

Cyra A (2008) Banderowcy w KL Auschwitz. *Studia nad faszyzmem i zbrodniami hitlerowskimi* XXX: 383–432.

Davies N (2015) *Trail of Hope: The Anders Army, an Odyssey across Three Continents*. London: Bloomsbury.

Drozdzewski D (2008) *Remembering Polishness: articulating and maintaining identity through turbulent times*. PhD Thesis, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia.

Drozdzewski D (2012) Knowing (or Not) about Katyń: the silencing and surfacing of public memory. *Space and Polity* 16(3): 303–319.

Drozdzewski D, Waterton E and Sumartojo S (2019) Cultural memory and identity in the context of war: experiential, place-based and political concerns. *International Review of the Red Cross* 101(910): 251–272.

Dyczok M (2000) *The Grand Alliance and Ukrainian Refugees*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Eschebach I (1999) Jahrestage. Zu den Formen und Funktionen von Gedenkveranstaltungen in Ravensbrück, 1946-1995. In: Eschebach I, Jacobeit S and Laurence S (eds) *Die Sprache des Gedenkens: Zur Geschichte der Gedenkstätte Ravensbrück; 1945 - 1995*. Berlin: Ed. Hentrich, pp. 69–107.

Feinstein MM (2010) *Holocaust Survivors in Postwar Germany, 1945-1957*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Felber U and Quatember W (eds) (2005) *Zeitgeschichte Museum Ebensee: Republik. Ständestaat. Nationalsozialismus. Widerstand. Verfolgung*. Ebensee: Verein Zeitgeschichte-Museum Ebensee.

Fitzpatrick S (2021) *White Russians, Red Peril: A Cold War History of Migration to Australia*. London: Routledge.

Grandke S (2022) Moving memories – Memories on the move? Erinnerungsinitiativen von Displaced Persons in Flossenbürg 1946/47. In: Beßmann A, Eschebach I and von Wrochem O (eds) *NS-Verfolgte nach der Befreiung*: Göttingen: Wallstein, pp. 45–64.

Grossmann A (2012) *Juden, Deutsche, Alliierte: Begegungen im besetzten Deutschland = Jews, Germans, and Allies: close encounters in occupied Germany*. Göttingen: Wallstein.

Gutman Y and Wüstenberg J (2023) Introduction: the activist turn in memory studies. In: Gutman Y, Wüstenberg J, Dekel I, et al (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Memory Activism*:. London: Routledge, pp. 5–15.

Himka J-P (2021) *Ukrainian Nationalists and the Holocaust: OUN and UPA's Participation in the Destruction of Ukrainian Jewry, 1941–1944: Ukrainian Voices Series, Book 12*. Stuttgart: ibidem.

Holian A (2010) Anticommunism in the streets: refugee politics in cold war Germany. *Journal of Contemporary History* 45(1): 134–161.

Holian A (2011) *Between National Socialism and Soviet Communism: Displaced Persons in Postwar Germany*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Holian A (2017) A missing narrative. Displaced persons in the history of postwar West Germany. In: Wilhelm C (ed.) *Migration, Memory, and Diversity: Germany from 1945 to the Present*. New York; Oxford: Berghahn, pp. 32–55.

Jacobmeyer W (1985) *Vom Zwangsarbeiter zum heimatlosen Ausländer: Die Displaced Persons in Westdeutschland 1945-1951*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Jaroszyńska-Kirchmann AD (2004) *The Exile Mission: The Polish Political Diaspora and Polish Americans, 1939-1956*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
Jockusch L (2012) *Collect and Record! Jewish Holocaust Documentation in Early Postwar Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kersten K (1974) *Repatriacja ludności polskiej po II wojnie światowej: Studium Historyczne*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
Knapton SK (2020) 'There is no such thing as an unrepatriable pole': Polish displaced persons in the British zone of occupation in Germany. *European History Quarterly* 50(4): 689–710.
Köhn H (2012) *Die Lage der Lager: Displaced Persons-Lager in der amerikanischen Besatzungszone Deutschlands*. Essen: Klartext.
Königseder A and Wetzel J (1994) *Lebensmut im Wartesaal: Die judischen DPs (Displaced Persons) im Nachkriegsdeutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.
Kossert A (2008) *Kalte Heimat: Die Geschichte der deutschen Vertriebenen nach 1945*. München: Siedler.
Liedke K and Römmer C (2010) Das polnische DP-Camp Bergen-Belsen. In: KZ-Gedenkstätte Neuengamme (ed.) *Zwischenräume Displaced Persons, Internierte und Flüchtlinge in ehemaligen Konzentrationslagern*. Tampa, FL: Ed. Temmen, pp. 65–74.
Łuczak C (1993) *Polacy w okupowanych Niemczech: 1945 - 1949*. Poznań: PSO.
Mankowitz ZW (2002) *Life between Memory and Hope: The Survivors of the Holocaust in Occupied Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
Marcuse H (2001) *Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp, 1933-2001*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
Nasaw D (2020) *The Last Million: Europe's Displaced Persons from World War to Cold War*. New York: Penguin Press.
Neumann-Thein P, Schuch D and Wegewitz M (eds) (2022) *Organisiertes Gedächtnis: Kollektive Aktivitäten von Überlebenden der nationalsozialistischen Verbrechen*. Göttingen: Wallstein.
Nowak K (2023) *Kingdom of Barracks: Polish Displaced Persons in Allied-occupied Germany and Austria*. Montreal, QC, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Panagiotidis J and Petersen H-C (2024) *Antiosteuropäischer Rassismus in Deutschland: Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Weinheim: BeltzJuventa.
Patt AJ and Berkowitz M (2010) *'We Are Here': New Approaches to Jewish Displaced Persons in Postwar Germany*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
Persian J (2024) *Fascists in Exile: Post-War Displaced Persons in Australia*. London: Routledge.
Person K (2019) *Dipisi: Żydzi polscy w amerykańskiej i brytyjskiej strefach okupacyjnych Niemiec, 1945-1948*. Warszawa: Żydowski Instytut Historyczny im. Emanuela Ringelbluma.
Perz B (2006) *Die KZ-Gedenkstätte Mauthausen: 1945 bis zur Gegenwart*. Innsbruck: Studien-Verl.
Pilch A (1994) *Losy Polaków w Austrii po drugiej wojnie światowej 1945-1955*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
Proudfoot MJ (1957) *European Refugees: 1939 - 52: A Study in Forced Population Movement*. London: Faber and Faber.
Quatember W (1998) Die Geschichte der KZ-Gedenkstätte Ebensee. In: Erinnern in Gedenkstätten (ed.) *Bundesministerium für Unterricht und kulturelle Angelegenheiten*. Wien: Abteilung Politische Bildung Wien, pp. 23–28.
Quatember W (2006) Das DP-Camp Ebensee unter Verwaltung der UNRRA (TEAM 313). *betrifft widerstand. Verein Zeitgeschichte Museum und KZ- Gedenkstätte Ebensee* 79: 23–24.
Rahe T (2014) Polnische und jüdische Displaced Persons im DP-Camp Bergen-Belsen. In: Boehling RL, Urban S and Bienert R (eds) *Freilegungen: Displaced Persons; Leben im Transit: Überlebende zwischen Repatriierung, Rehabilitation und Neuanfang*. Göttingen: Wallstein, pp. 61–72.
Rossolinski-Liebe G (2014) *Stephan Bandera: The Life and Afterlife of a Ukrainian Nationalist: Fascism, Genocide, and Cult*. Stuttgart: ibidem.
Rudling PA (2011) The OUN, the UPA and the Holocaust: A Study in the Manufacturing of Historical Myths. *The Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies*. DOI: 10.5195/cbp.2011.164.

Schröder S (2005) *Displaced Persons im Landkreis und in der Stadt Münster: 1945 - 1951*. Münster: Aschendorff.
Seipp AR (2013) *Strangers in the Wild Place: Refugees, Americans, and a German Town, 1945-1952*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
Seipp AR (2014) The Wild Place. DP Camp Wildflecken, Refugees, and life in transit. In: Boehling RL, Urban S and Bienert R (eds) *Freilegungen: Displaced Persons; Leben im Transit: Überlebende zwischen Repatriierung, Rehabilitation und Neuanfang*. Göttingen: Wallstein, pp. 128–135.
Shkandrij M (2023) *In the Maelstrom: The Waffen-ss* '*Galicia*' *Division and Its Legacy*. Montreal, QC, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Skriebeleit J (2009) *Erinnerungsort Flossenbürg: Akteure, Zäsuren, Geschichtsbilder*. Göttingen: Wallstein.
Skriebeleit J (2012) Exhumierungen und Erinnerungen: Paradigmenwechsel im Umgang mit Gräbern von Todesmarschopfern: Das Beispiel Pleystein. In: Blondel J-L, Urban S and Schönemann S (eds) *Freilegungen: Auf den Spuren der Todesmärsche*. Göttingen: Wallstein, pp. 314–327.
Skriebeleit J (2014) Milieux de mémoire – Gemeinschaften auf Zeit. Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten von Erinnerungspflege am Beispiel des Konzentrationslagers Flossenbürg. In: Doerry J, Kubetzky T and Seybold K (eds) *Das soziale Gedächtnis und die Gemeinschaften der Überlebenden: Bergen-Belsen in vergleichender Perspektive*. Göttingen: Wallstein, pp. 175–193.
Stepień S (1989) *Der alteingesessene Fremde ehemalige Zwangsarbeiter in Westdeutschland*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
Stone D (2023) *Fate Unknown: Tracing the Missing after World War II and the Holocaust*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Trouillot M-R (1995) *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
Vögel B and Ehrhardt A (1994) *Entwurzelt: Displaced Persons im Salzgittergebiet*. Salzgitter: Arbeitskreis Stadtgeschichte e.V.
Wüstenberg J (2020) *Zivilgesellschaft und Erinnerungspolitik in Deutschland seit 1945*. Bonn: Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung.

Author biography

Sarah Grandke is a historian, curator and PhD candidate at the University of Regensburg, Germany. She held multiple fellowships, among others, at the Australian National University, Canberra and the Sydney Jewish Museum in Australia as well as within the ERC-project 'Global Resettlement Regimes: Ambivalent Lessons learned from the Postwar (1945-1951)' at the University of Vienna. She also received a stipend by the German-Historical Institute in Warsaw, Poland. From 2018 to 2023, Grandke was curator at the Hamburg documentation center 'denk.mal Hannoverscher Bahnhof' on deportations of Jewish and Romani people during 1933 and 1945. From 2016 to 2018, she worked at Flossenbürg Concentration Camp Memorial and was previously curator at the Munich Documentation Centre for the History of National Socialism in an exhibition project on the history of Sinti and Roma in Bavaria.