

Tomasz Domański

Institute of National Remembrance Delegation in Kielce

ORCID 0000-0002-9992-4160

## CORRECTING THE PICTURE, CONTINUED\*

Reply to the editors and co-authors of the book *Dalej jest noc. Losy Żydów w wybranych powiatach okupowanej Polski* [Night without End. The Fate of Jews in Selected Counties of Occupied Poland], vols 1–2, ed. by Barbara Engelking and Jan Grabowski (Warszawa, 2018) to their polemics with my review: *Correcting the Picture? Some Reflections on the Use of Sources in the book: Dalej jest noc. Losy Żydów w wybranych powiatach okupowanej Polski, vol. 1–2, ed. by Barbara Engelking, Jan Grabowski, Warsaw 2018* (Warsaw, 2019)

In 2018, the Polish Centre for Holocaust Research, operating as part of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, published *Dalej jest noc. Losy Żydów w wybranych powiatach okupowanej Polski* [Night without End. The Fate of Jews in Selected Counties of Occupied Poland] – a two-volume work edited by Barbara Engelking and Jan Grabowski.<sup>1</sup> The book was met with great interest by public opinion and researchers, spark-

---

\* The review “Correcting the Picture, Continued” (in Polish “Korekty ciąg dalszy”) was published prior to the English edition of the book *Night without End* and was originally added to the *Biuletyn IPN* 9 (2020). The present edition is its faithful translation.

<sup>1</sup> In the text, when referring to the book *Dalej jest noc. Losy Żydów w wybranych powiatach okupowanej Polski* [Night without End. The Fate of Jews in Selected Counties of Occupied Poland], ed. by Barbara Engelking and Jan Grabowski (Warszawa, 2018), I use the abbreviated title *Night without End* in brackets when I refer to some specific replies.

ing several reviews and discussions, including my extensive 2019 review entitled “Correcting the Picture?”<sup>2</sup>

In reaction to my review, the editors and authors of *Night without End* presented their polemical texts published on the Centre’s website.<sup>3</sup> Numerous remarks and opinions, often critical, inspired me to prepare a response. In my reply, the doubts about the significance of the issues I have touched upon could be explained to the authors and interested readers, particularly those concerning the interpretation of the sources used in *Night without End*. Efforts were made to address all matters raised in the responses. It is my genuine hope that no issue was left unanswered. “Reflections” are divided into a general section addressing common threads and detailed sections focusing on individual authors’ remarks.

The general and detailed sections present, step by step, the groundlessness of most objections to my review. Importantly, new examples will be presented of the same mechanisms of using sources, as described in detail in “Correcting the Picture”, serving the authors as a basis for creating even more myths or formulating false theses. Following the scheme proposed in “Correcting the Picture”, the general section will cover the issue of selecting the research areas, the ‘German-Polish’ administration and the significance of omitting the source base in the presentation of tables and statistical data for effecting the quality of scholarly research.

I would like to begin the central part of my reply with the issue that is of utmost importance. Indeed, it is important enough for the authors to echo across almost every page of the individual texts. Various, occasionally offensive and unrefined expressions are far from the principles of academic polemics. The review has

---

<sup>2</sup> T. Domański, “Korekta obrazu? Refleksje źródłoznawcze wokół książki *Dalej jest noc. Losy Żydów w wybranych powiatach okupowanej Polski*, Centrum Badań nad Zagładą Żydów, Warszawa 2018, t. 1–2”, *Polish-Jewish Studies* 1 (2020), pp. 209–314 (English version: “Correcting the Picture? Some Reflections on the Use of Sources in *Dalej jest noc. Losy Żydów w wybranych powiatach okupowanej Polski* [Night without an End. The Fate of Jews in Selected Counties of Occupied Poland], ed. B. Engelking, J. Grabowski, Stowarzyszenie Centrum Badań nad Zagładą Żydów [Polish Center for Holocaust Research], Warsaw 2018, vol. 1–2”, *Polish-Jewish Studies* 1 (2020), pp. 637–743. I use the abbreviated title “Correcting the Picture” throughout the text.

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.holocaustresearch.pl/index.php?show=555> (accessed 15 July 2020). Polemical texts (excluding the part by Professor Jean-Charles Szurek) have been sent to the Institute of National Remembrance in hard copy, with the suggestion they should be printed by the Institute of National Remembrance’s publishing house. The Institute agreed, offering room for polemics in its publications. Ultimately, the researchers from the Centre decided not to have their responses published by the Institute of National Remembrance.

been labelled a “disquisition” (Barbara Engelking), an “essay” (Dagmara Swałek-Niewińska), a *tractatus* and a “Potemkin village” (Tomasz Frydel) or even... a “re-tort” (Alina Skibińska). One may think that the authors were almost competing to come up with the most creative insult. Dagmara Swałek-Niewińska ascertained: “Tomasz Domański’s subsequent reservations concerning the content of the book result predominantly from his erroneous interpretations, oversights and distortion of the text. Domański then battles the enemy he has created, referring not to the content of both volumes, but to his interpretations which, in many instances, are unfounded” (“Response”, p. 2).<sup>4</sup> For Professor Barbara Engelking, the review is “a lampoon-like screed” (“Response”, p. 1). However, the author has not provided any evidence of the scurrilous nature of the review and the manipulations that – in her opinion – I had committed. Professor Dariusz Libionka also made an attempt at discrediting my work, stating that: “it had been written on commission, with the aim to [...] discredit and ridicule the authors and editors of the book, to present them as *ignorami*, charlatans and manipulators, as conmen who are only themselves privy to the sources of financing of their pathetic, joyful creativity which – above all – is hostile to the interests of Poland” (“Response”, p. 2).<sup>5</sup> The cited epithets are obviously far from the language of historical debate and substantive polemics that one should have expected of the Polish and international academic milieux representatives holding professorial degrees. The manner of argumentation, the terms, and the language used are clear evidence of the particularly emotional character of the discourse on the Holocaust and especially on Polish-Jewish relations under the German occupation. These statements’ tone further attests to the urgent need for an academic debate based on the power of argumentation, free of any prejudices and the belief of one’s infallibility. This was, indeed, the purpose of “Correcting the Picture” and is the purpose of this reply, which – hopefully – will inspire the authors to validate their opinions on the topics touched upon in “Correcting the Picture”.

---

<sup>4</sup> The numbers in parentheses refer to the pagination of the responses sent to the Institute of National Remembrance. The pagination in the hard copies sent to the Institute and in the documents produced by pasting the text published in the Centre’s website into Word documents differ. Original spelling is preserved in all quotations, both from the polemics and archived materials.

<sup>5</sup> Anna Zapalec also writes about an attempt at discrediting. Apparently, it is Professor Jean-Charles Szurek who raised the largest number of *ad personam* arguments in his response. They shall be addressed more fully in my detailed response.

It is by all means deeply distressing that, instead of a fact-based exchange of arguments, the editors and co-authors of *Night without End* endeavour to discredit and undermine the reliability of the researcher who 'dared' to write a critical academic review, pointing to manipulations and multiple errors in the analysis and interpretation of historical sources. At this point, it should be mentioned that, in the authors' opinion, this review was not an independent piece of work, and it was prepared by a team of Institute of National Remembrance (IPN) historians. Professor Anna Zapalec is rhetorically wondering, "to whom is my response formulated?" Professor Jan Grabowski is of a similar opinion. However, I find Professor Grabowski's opinions particularly interesting. They help to understand (unveil?) the mechanism of drawing conclusions and putting forward theses irrespective of the object of analysis, be it a historical source, academic publication, an attempt at polemics, or a review, as is the case here. The author of the response indicates that I 'repeatedly' cite 'unpublished typescripts' of other researchers from the Institute of National Remembrance. In fact, out of 213 footnotes, I have made a total of four citations on findings by other Institute of National Remembrance co-workers in „Correcting the Picture”.<sup>6</sup> I doubt that 'repeatedly' is the correct term to use in this situation, as it refers to multiple and extensive citations or quoting. But this is not all. Grabowski used the above utterly false argument to construct a subsequent conclusion where he labelled my review as "the collective effort of officials delegated by their superiors to a special task consisting in – which I intend to demonstrate – an attempt at discrediting the reputation of independent researchers, and not in intellectual polemics" ("Response", p. 1). One would want to paraphrase the opinion of Swałek-Niewińska further: Grabowski subsequently battles with the enemy he has created himself, referring not to the content of the review but to his own interpretations that are unjustified in this case. Elsewhere, Professor Grabowski completed his response with a significant detail, insinuating that "the Polish state in the form of the Institute of National Remembrance" has joined in the discussion on *Night without End* ("Response", p. 1).

---

<sup>6</sup> This refers to the manuscripts by: Tomasz Roguski, Katarzyna Pawlak-Weiss, and Krzysztof Kupeć (jointly), Dawid Golik and Sebastian Piątkowski.

According to Grabowski, on the one side, there are state officials (or an official) *ergo* the Polish state, and on the other, independent researchers – he doesn't see academics arguing their theses. And the term 'officials' is used here by coincidence. In this juxtaposition, it is used not so much as a reference to the workplace but as an insult, as if it was not possible to be a state official and a scholar at the same. Moreover, the publication of reviews analysing his field of research is for Grabowski a reason to claim that I am copying content from Dr Tomasz Roguski (an employee of the Institute of National Remembrance in Warsaw) or Roguski from me ("Response", p. 6). Ultimately, however, he concludes that "Roguski's text is much more detailed than Domański's report. Thus, it is more likely that it is Domański who is copying without due citation. In the academic world, this action would disqualify the author of the review" ("Response", p. 6). Well, Grabowski clearly does not invite the possibility that two historians may have come to a similar, momentarily highly critical evaluation of the manner of analysing the sources presented in "Węgrów County" ("Powiat węgrowski").<sup>7</sup>

An important place in the responses of editors and co-authors of *Night without End* is the issue of the selection of focus areas (administrative units). In "Correcting the Picture", I pointed to a simple methodological error in *Night without End*: the use of the same term of 'a county' (*powiat*)<sup>8</sup> to refer to different administrative

---

<sup>7</sup> Hitherto, the following reviews of *Night without End* have been published: P. Gontarczyk, "Między nauką a mistyfikacją, czyli o naturze piśmiennictwa prof. Jana Grabowskiego na podstawie casusu wsi Wrotnów i Międzyles powiatu węgrowskiego", *Glaukopis* 36 (2019), pp. 313–323; T. Roguski, "Dalej jest noc. Losy Żydów w wybranych powiatach okupowanej Polski", *Glaukopis* 36 (2019), pp. 335–356; R. Gieroń, "Próby przetrwania Zagłady w powiecie bocheńskim. Refleksje po lekturze artykułu Dąmmary Swałtek-Niewińskiej", *Zeszyty Historyczne WiN-u* 47 (2018), pp. 95–108; D. Golik, "Nowotarska noc. Kilka uwag na marginesie artykułu Karoliny Panz", *Zeszyty Historyczne WiN-u* 47 (2018), pp. 109–133.

<sup>8</sup> In "Correcting the Picture, continued", for greater clarity, I use three terms: (1) the German term *Kreishauptmannschaft* in reference to 'counties' (*starostwa powiatowe*) established by the Germans; (2) where the borders of the wartime *Kreishauptmannschaften* overlapped with the Polish pre-war county and are the subject of the analysis of the authors of individual chapters, the term county (*powiat*) is used conditionally; (3) where the authors analyse only a part of the wartime *Kreishauptmannschaft*, forming a pre-war county incorporated into the new German administrative unit, the term 'county' is used. It needs to be clarified here that the German authorities, carrying out an administrative 'reform' in the General Governorate (GG) in 1940, consolidated Polish pre-war counties (usually two or three) into one, called a *Kreishauptmannschaft*, governed by a *Kreishauptmann*, the Polish language equivalent here being: *starostwo/powiat* (county) and *starosta* (county governor). However, this term does not fully convey the actual role and scope of powers that a *Kreishauptmann* possessed in the administrative structure of the GG; it cannot be seen equivalent of the Polish pre-war *starosta*.

units. The problem pertains to Kreishauptmannschaften introduced by the German occupant and the pre-war Polish counties, in some cases picked out for analysis. The editors write: "The administrative units selected by us are located in different regions of Poland, which enables the comparison of the occupant's extermination policy and the analysis of diverse survival strategies adopted by Jewish victims" (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 14). The authors' approach to this issue represented in the response is more than symptomatic. Instead of explicitly admitting to the obvious fact, the authors stubbornly bog down in deliberations proving their correctness. Swaitek-Niewińska writes: "Tomasz Domański doesn't like the fact that some authors have indicated as their field of research the area of the pre-war county, while others of the wartime ones. He writes about it in a sensationalist tone, as if this were a significant discovery and proof of manipulation" ("Response", p. 1). Professor Grabowski: "Domański criticises that our studies, in several instances, refer to consolidated German counties (Kreishauptmannschaften) and, in several others – pre-war Polish counties. The grounds for this accusation are unclear since the decisions concerning the selection of research areas have been expressly stated in the Foreword and each of the subsequent studies" ("Response", p. 1). Neither was the tone of my remarks sensationalist, nor was this a case of whether or not I liked it, but whether it is compliant with the principles of scholarly craftsmanship. My detailed reply to Professor Grabowski will discuss the errors associated with mixing occupant's 'consolidated counties' with pre-war counties.

The argument that the selection of research areas was based on comparing the extermination policy towards the Jews is not convincing if one realises that four out of the nine analysed 'counties' were located in the same district (Cracow District). Thus, the whole area under analysis did not cover 'different regions of Poland' but different regions of the General Governorate (GG) (as well as one county from the Bezirk Bialystok). Obviously, the individual regional studies bring forth significant deliberations from the scope of the course of the Holocaust, but practically solely (aside from Bielsk) within one administrative organism. In this context, the following statement by Zapalec is unjustified:

If the reviewer believes that it is possible to come up with a 'well-thought-out exemplification', ensuring the representativeness of the selection, he should not

conceal this from his readers; I would gladly acquaint myself with his position on this matter' [...] Domański, however, was incapable of bringing anything creative or constructive into the discussion; yet, he recklessly criticised the authors of the book. ("Response", p. 3)

A similar opinion is shared by Swałtek-Niewińska, for whom my remarks concerning the lack of representativeness of research areas are the result "of a certain unfamiliarity with the principles of statistics and selection of the research group" ("Response", p. 1). Anna Zapalec seems to forget that it is not the reviewer's role to act as an editor and enumerate specific counties, and perhaps communes, that the authors should subject to analysis. However, there seems to be quite a lot of ill will and malice in both authors if they are unable to notice the following section of the review:

Except for the already mentioned Złoczów 'county', the Eastern Lands of the Republic of Poland [RP] are hardly represented in the work. The entire Radom District has been omitted from the analysis (one of five administrative units of the GG since 1941), and the lands incorporated into the Third Reich. An experienced researcher of the Holocaust is aware that in each of these omitted areas, the Holocaust and the overall situation of the conquered people in the social hierarchy differed (e.g. the Radom district was characterised by the highest number of Jewish industrial workers in the GG). („Correcting the Picture", p. 7)

And this is where one should search for "well-thought-out exemplification". Generally, scholarly publications or those aspiring to be ones, should not compare administrative units originating from different historical periods covering different territories, having different organisational structures and, at the same time, sharing the same name. This leads to obvious confusion and only feigns research coherence. The review begins with the analysis of this platitude which I consider a general remark.

The editors of *Night without End* should not conceal from the reader that, in fact, the selection of analysed areas was accidental. They should not pretend to be offering a comprehensive discussion of specific administrative units from the

occupation period when they do not. After all, even such incidental selection is a research sample. I do agree, however, with the suggestion of Professor Zapalec (and, very likely, with the views of other authors of *Night without End*, e.g. Alina Skibińska) that: “The only solution [...] I can see, is the continuation of research on other regions/counties, which may bring us closer to getting to know local occupation conditions in different parts of Poland” (“Response”, p. 3). My review begins with highlighting the need for research of a regional/county nature. What is more, the publication of *Night without End*, so bluntly characterising the attitude of the Polish society towards the Jews (in fact, putting forward an explicit theory about the complicity of Poles, on multidimensional levels, in the Holocaust), provoked a fundamental methodological postulate. It’s worthwhile for future works depicting the history of the provinces (‘local-level Poland’) to consider the fate of entire societies subjected to the occupation, not only of the Jews. Otherwise, they will present a smaller or larger portion of the overall picture, which is never sufficient to reflect the complexity or intricacy of mutual attitudes or interactions.

Significant deliberations in the responses of the authors of *Night without End* were made on the concept of the ‘German-Polish administration’ used in this book. It is clear how their individual understandings of what specifically is concealed behind the term they’ve invented differ. Alina Skibińska, referring to the application of this term, stated: “The editors used a mental shortcut to denote Polish officials in the German administration. There is nothing outrageous or ‘misleading’ about it” (“Response”, p. 4).<sup>9</sup> But is that what was meant? In the disquisition presented in his response to “Correcting the Picture”, Professor Grabowski eagerly argues that this is not about the lack of precision. Ostensibly acknowledging that the use of the term ‘German-Polish administration’ did not signify the existence of any Polish administration (‘this only refers to source methodology’ – “Response”, p. 3), Grabowski attempts to defend the terminology and prove – contrary to the

---

<sup>9</sup> The relevant part of the response reads as follows: ‘As concerns the term “German-Polish administration” used in the Foreword (vol. 1, p. 19), for a reader not intent on seeking out the ill will of the authors and editors in every part, it is clear that this refers to those structures of the local administration, whose personnel was fundamentally Polish, often the same as before the war. Staffing all positions by Germans from the Reich was not possible, which is why the editors used a mental shortcut to denote Polish officials in the German administration. There is nothing outrageous or “misleading” about it’ (“Response”, p. 4).



facts – the existence of such an administration or at least the considerable liberty of Poles in their actions within the structures organised by the Germans, i.e. actual Polish agency. Bogging down in these deliberations, he mentions an obvious fact – demonstrating at the same time his failure to understand the historical material described – that a large part of the occupation’s administrative documentation had been produced in Polish. The Germans were well aware that they had conquered areas inhabited by several million speakers of the Polish, not German, language. And although, the official language in the GG which constituted part of the Greater German Reich, was – in principle – German, for practical reasons, they had to declare Polish as (merely) permissible. This only represents a problem which needed to be solved ‘for the time being’, and has nothing to do with ‘power-sharing’. All power in the GG was in the hands of the Germans. The Poles, who were employed as lower-ranking personnel, were to obediently follow German orders. This is elementary knowledge.

Further on, Grabowski admits that the Germans in the conquered lands used and, above all, forced local people to implement German policy. He writes:

For Domański – and this is reflected in the entire official narration of the Institute of National Remembrance – the beginning of the German occupation marks an end to Polish agency on an official or state level. As suggested by the reviewer – faithfully repeating the position of the Institute employing him – with the collapse of Polish statehood, any influence the Poles may have had on administrative activities, ceased to exist. From that time on, the situation was solely under German control, so whatever harm was done, it wasn’t our fault – seems to be saying the author of the Institute of National Remembrance report. (“Response”, p. 4)

Leaving aside this quasi-ironic tone, Grabowski’s perception of the German occupation is astounding. Thus, it is worth asking: what official Polish (state) agency can we speak of in the case of German actions? Did Adolf Hitler consult his moves with Polish authorities of any level in 1939 when making territorial changes and imposing German law?

In the context of Grabowski’s interpretations, it is necessary to recall primary research findings on the operation of the ‘Polish’ judiciary system in the GG,

which Grabowski invokes as another example of considerable freedom of action allegedly enjoyed by the Poles. It should be remembered that after Poland's defeat in September of 1939, the German authorities called pre-war officials in to work. As a rule, lower administrative personnel was left in its position since, for obvious reasons, the occupants were unable to staff all positions with Reichsdeutsche or Volksdeutsche. For purely practical purposes, least of all to secure Polish needs, part of the Polish pre-war judiciary structure was temporarily retained, but fully subordinated to the Germans and German law, with powers to handle only a very limited catalogue of matters. Grabowski forgets that these 'racially lower-ranking' courts delivered judgements not in the name of the Polish state or the Polish administration, but 'in the name of the law' – an unprecedented semantic and conceptual construct. And the law was made by the Germans. There is nothing accidental in the fact the judges' chains bearing Poland's national emblem were abolished. Furthermore, judges and other court staff were required to make declarations of loyalty and allegiance to the German administration. These courts were empowered to settle only cases falling outside the scope of German courts. In practice, each civil case to which a German entity was a party to or a participant of fell within the scope of the German judiciary system. These were all temporary solutions – as was the very existence of the GG. Criminal cases were mandatorily investigated by the German public prosecutor's office, which decided what court division it would be referred to.<sup>10</sup> What were the actual possibilities for resisting German regulations (for acting independently) is evidenced in the fates of the Warsaw Bar members and the arrests of those who dared to express their own opinion and opposed to the removal of Jews from the Warsaw Bar already in 1940.<sup>11</sup> In other words, this same judge who delivered a judgment one day, could find himself in a German jail or concentration camp the next, alongside the person he had sentenced for disobeying German legislation. Where does the author see structures operating in the name of the Polish state? This remains quite a mystery.

---

<sup>10</sup> A. Wrzyszczyk, "Tworzenie okupacyjnego wymiaru sprawiedliwości w Generalnym Gubernatorstwie", *Studia z Dziejów Państwa i Prawa Polskiego* 8 (2003), pp. 264–266.

<sup>11</sup> S. Jagusz, "Czterdziestolecie masowych aresztowań i zsyłki adwokatów warszawskich do obozu zagłady w Oświęcimiu", *Palestra* 7–9 (1981), p. 91.

Professor Grabowski concludes this section of his disquisition as follows:

No historian aware of the powers given to lower-rank local administration will question the autonomy of the actions of Polish rural local governments on the “Jewish” issue. There was the possibility of choice on this particular issue despite severe penalties from the occupant. The same principles governed the local officials’ decisions to be involved (or not) in enforcing the occupant’s decrees concerning security, combating conspiracy, or the broadly understood war economy. (“Response”, p. 4)

And so, instead of a credible analysis of *de iure* and *de facto* situations (under the German occupation) of Poles employed in the occupant’s administration (and of the possibilities of resisting German orders or having decision-making powers), these are suggestions that are completely detached from the reality of the occupation period. It is worth citing how a classic on the subject, Professor Czesław Madajczyk, described this ‘Polish’ administration under German occupation. Writing about the recommendations of Herman Göring and his possible influence on the resolution issued in late June 1940 on the establishment of associations of communes (Gemeindeverbände), Madajczyk stated:

They took over the assets belonging to pre-war county-level units of the local government but were not their legal successors. They were managed by county governors (Kreishauptmanns). No advisors to mayors or commune heads were appointed, nor any departments of associations of communes, collegial bodies advising county governors [...]. **As a result, the existing pre-war territorial local government was eradicated. Communes remained in name as self-governing local government units** with mayors [Polish: *burmistrzowie*] or, in collective communes, with leaders referred to in Polish as *wójtowie*, to whom village heads [Polish: *soltysi*, or sing. – *soltys*<sup>12</sup>] were subordinate. However, **they were, in fact, all officials of the occupying administration**, which used

---

<sup>12</sup> In further part of the text, the Polish term *soltys* (sing.) or *soltysi* (plural) will be replaced by the English equivalent: ‘village head’ or ‘village heads’, as applicable.

the local government as an executive body. The administration's decisions were final. It was a one-instance system. [...] **County governors were empowered to change any mayor's regulation** [emphasis mine – T.D.].<sup>13</sup>

Madajczyk's opinion leaves no doubt as to the actual situation of Poles within the administrative structures. Will Professor Grabowski equally absurdly 'accuse' this author of duplicating the Institute of National Remembrance's alleged official narrative? The validity of my conclusions is also evidenced by documents of the Warsaw Branch Home Army – a part of the area Grabowski was dealing with. It was reported, *inter alia*, that: "The local government is still an auxiliary body of the German administration. This grave and the dangerous role requires of local government employees' considerable tact and a sense of national and personal dignity. At present, local authorities are still preoccupied with imposing and enforcing obligatory quotas".<sup>14</sup> Can one speak of a Polish agency when, acting in an atmosphere of widespread terror and bound by 'law', commune officials were preparing lists of obligatory quotas (for any delays in deliveries of quotas, members of the quota committees could pay with their own lives) or of persons designated by the Germans for deportation for forced labour? Why did the Germans organise commune meetings in the GG, where officials were not allowed to discuss matters but only obliged to accept and fulfil orders and where they were reminded of their absolute obligation (!) to hand over to the Germans any Jews in hiding? Grabowski himself has often written about this, so he must be aware of it. If – as Grabowski claims – those officials 'had a choice' (whether to get involved in anti-Jewish operations or not), why were the village heads in the GG forced to submit the following declarations:

I hereby declare that: 1. There are no Jews in the area under my authority; 2. I will command that, in the future, any Jew appearing in the area under my jurisdiction be held and delivered to the nearest gendarmerie outpost, police station or

---

<sup>13</sup> C. Madajczyk, *Polityka III Rzeszy w okupowanej Polsce*, vol. 1 (Warszawa, 1970), pp. 215–216.

<sup>14</sup> Archiwum Akt Nowych (Central Archives of Modern Records; hereinafter: AAN), Archives of the Home Army (hereinafter: AK), 203/X-67, Report for the period of 15 October to 30 November 1943, [place and date of origin unknown], p. 7.

SS-Stützpunkt; 3. I am aware that I am fully responsible for duly fulfilling this obligation and for the consequences of my failure to do so.<sup>15</sup>

Everybody agrees there were traitors, also among Poles, who, either on their own or within the administration of the occupying forces, acted overzealously or simply disgraced themselves by participating in crimes against the Jews or Poles. In other words, the responsibility for participation in persecution can be assessed only on a case-by-case basis, and not on a structural one. Grabowski apparently confuses two systems: internal autonomy (free will, and the assumed awareness of the consequences of one's own decisions) and the realities of the occupation period. To close this issue, here's the text of the declaration obligatorily signed by every Pole employed in the occupying force's bodies: "I undertake to faithfully and conscientiously carry out my professional duties, acting in obedience to the **German administration**. I do not consider myself bound by any oath of allegiance, service oath, work commitment made towards the former Polish state or its bodies, or any political organisation [emphasis mine – T.D.]"<sup>16</sup> What administration did officials serve in the GG when carrying out their professional duties, then?

Alina Skibińska mentioned at the beginning of this thread also referred to the extent of freedom of action.<sup>17</sup> One can partially agree with her conclusions. For example, in post-war practice, heads of villages were not convicted for merely performing this function but for specific actions, which Skibińska refers to as 'overzealousness'. However, she does not notice the fundamental paradox of the post-war judiciary. On the one hand, the court analysed the "overzealousness" of

---

<sup>15</sup> B. Musiał, *Kto dopomoże Żydowi...*, cooper. O. Musiał (Poznań, 2019), pp. 196–197.

<sup>16</sup> Archiwum Instytutu Pamięci Narodowej (Archives of the Institute of National Remembrance; hereinafter: AIPN), Chief Commission to Investigate the Nazi Crimes in Poland, 3060/5, Collection of files of the Polish Police in Radom District, Kielce, 6 February 1943, item 290.

<sup>17</sup> The entire passage from the response reads as follows: 'Contrarily, it is false to think that Polish officials had absolutely no freedom of action – in some cases it was smaller, in others greater, but it existed. The key word enabling understanding of the degree of their responsibility is "overzealousness". In post-war criminal trials under the so-called August Decree, convictions were for crimes committed during the occupation – not for merely performing one's function (unless it was a function in an organisation considered to be criminal), but for overzealousness in the performance of duties for the German occupying forces, which had certain negative effects. Determination of the degree of responsibility of Poles working in the administrative bodies during the occupation should, therefore, be the aim of the research and reflection of historians, as our knowledge is still insufficient in this respect' ("Response", p. 2).

a given village head. On the other, it did not always mention the compulsion on the same village head to fulfil the German orders to capture Jews under threat of the death penalty, as already mentioned above. Depending on the court, the formal interpretation (in the light of legal provisions) of the extent of possible overzealousness differed.

General issues needing to be discussed in this section include a paradigm of omitting the source base of any statistics and thematic tables observed throughout the book. I do not, by any means, underestimate the data presented by the authors. However, I am not arguing with these numbers for reasons I have already given in “Correcting the Picture”. Simply stated, data without source references are non-verifiable. They render any discussion on their validity or the examination of conscientiousness of the calculations impossible. The authors must be aware of this. In order to allow for polemics, they should list specific sources or the names of those Jews whose fate served to develop these statistics. This is the fundamental issue if such statistics were to be considered research data. Given the size of the work which seemingly meticulously lists the perpetrators of crimes against the Jews, one may get the impression that the authors intentionally deprive other scholars of the possibility to verify the data. After all, nothing stood in the way of adding a list of names of Jewish survivors to whom the data refer. This would give others a chance to point out mistakes or omissions, as is the case with academic papers. In the case of Nowy Targ county researched by Karolina Panz, simple proof of the truthfulness of this statement is provided by the account of Józef Jama concerning the fates of Jews from Szczawnica, available at the Jewish Historical Institute.

In some cases (likely where this has been confirmed), the author informed that the person had survived the war and what was their post-war place of residence he or she had managed to establish. The absence of Jama’s accounts in the sources referred to by Panz provokes two basic assumptions. Either the author used these materials and only failed to cite the reference, or she did not find the account and did not acknowledge the content in her conclusions. A reader of a scholarly paper should not be treated in such a manner. In the absence of clearly and precisely specified sources, a researcher can only guess whether trying to follow the directions of Jama (or any other accounts) will be like reinventing the wheel, or whether it will

contribute to filling in the blanks of the past. In this particular case, the blanks in the past of the Jews of Szczawnica.

A similar case from Bochnia 'County' can be illustrated with the example of the Fragner family. In "Correcting the Picture", I wrote: "The Holocaust 'survivability' statistics (survivors and those killed) have not been analysed. The lack of references for the data provided in the tables as well as the use of the unknown category of 'author's research', make it essentially impossible to verify the figures" ("Correcting the Picture", p. 71). Describing the circumstances of this family's death, Dagmara Swałek-Niewińska referred to two accounts: those of Antoni Łucki and Mieczysław Ledóchowski (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 571–572). According to Łucki, the Fragner family consisted of three people (a married couple and the wife's sister). Ledóchowski spoke of a "Wiśnicz lawyer's family of five" (*ibid.*). Perhaps, therefore, some other Jews perished alongside the Fragners. As Swałek-Niewińska has not decided which of the cited accounts is more credible to her, this remains unknown. This surname did not appear anywhere else in the chapter. On the other hand, the investigation documents show that the Frangers' son, Zygmunt, survived the occupation. Since we do not know the list from Bochnia 'County', we do not know if he has been included in the statistics or whether Swałek-Niewińska, using sources not listed in this chapter, acknowledged the information from the investigation to be unreliable. Such situations put into question any scholarly value of these type of statistics.

This is also the case with Węgrów 'County'. Some materials concerning aid to Jews on the territory of occupied Poland can be found in the fonds on record at the Institute of National Remembrance Archives. They have been recently published by Sebastian Piątkowski<sup>18</sup> and concern the stories of Chaim and Estera Kwiatek (Goldberg) rescued in Drgicz by the Styś family (confirmed not only by Polish witnesses but also before a notary by the rescued themselves); Loni and Chajka Szmul rescued by Władysława Kowalczyk, Katarzyna Molska and a man going by the surname of Trochimiak in the village of Majdan, as well as Władysław Lewensztejn rescued by Stefania Barszcz in the village of Ostrówek.<sup>19</sup> These names do not appear in the description of Węgrów 'County', although they are survivors. It

---

<sup>18</sup> See: *Relacje o pomocy udzielanej Żydom przez Polaków w latach 1939–1945*, vol. 1: *Dystrykt warszawski Generalnego Gubernatorstwa*, sel. and ed. S. Piątkowski (Lublin–Warszawa, 2019).

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 48–49, 103–104.

is, therefore, unknown whether Grabowski confirmed this information in other or perhaps the same sources and only failed to note the references (however, his book came out earlier, therefore, for obvious reasons, he could not refer to the edition) or whether these are new data, supplementing the number of Jews who managed to survive, and the Poles who rescued them. It is also not clear whether he included these people in the 'statistics'? This is yet another example confirming the methodological error consisting in the failure to provide the source basis for statistical compilations.

### A detailed response to the remarks of Professor Jan Grabowski

As already indicated above, in Professor Jan Grabowski's response, there are all types of spiteful remarks and non-academic 'arguments' intended to depreciate the reviewer. Grabowski accuses me of invoking antisemitic brochures 'authored by Mark Paul'. He writes:

The problem is – what every researcher familiar with Holocaust historiography knows – that Mark Paul does not exist. This is a pseudonym of the author (or authors) of brochures filled with anti-Semitic clichés and stereotypes, available on the Internet for years. Unfortunately, Dr Domański is apparently unaware of the fact that referencing anti-Semitic brochures in the review of scholarly work on the history of the Holocaust does not put him or the Institute employing him in a good light. ("Response", p. 2)

Three issues need clarifying here. First of all, Mark Paul exists, at least to the extent there are texts signed with that name. Secondly, in his publications, he is critical of representatives of the 'new Polish school of Holocaust research', including Jan Grabowski, which is why he is met with constant criticism from that circle. Thirdly and most importantly, the primary purpose of referring to Paul in "Correcting the Picture" was to point to the memoirs of Samuel Lipa Tennenbaum,<sup>20</sup> who survived the Holocaust, cited by him. Tennenbaum's book can be read at the United States

---

<sup>20</sup> S.L. Tennenbaum, *Zloczow Memoir 1939–1944. A Chronicle of Survival* (New York, 1986, an edition of 2001).



Holocaust Memorial Museum, and its extensive excerpts are also available on the Internet. The transcript of Tennenbaum's manuscript is available at the Yad Vashem Archives under ref. no. O.33/1579. However, characteristically enough, Tennenbaum's memoirs are also referred to by a co-author of *Night without End*, Professor Anna Zapalec, in the chapter "Złoczów County" ("Powiat złoczowski). The polemics used in this case by my adversary is a classic example of resorting to non-substantive arguments and insinuations of anti-Semitism. Thus, the primary problem should not be Mark Paul's existence and where he may be found, but whether the source cited by Paul exists and, if so, whether the quotation he provides is true to the original.<sup>21</sup> However, attempts at finding such analysis in Grabowski's response are in vain. I will use a longer explanation to facilitate understanding that Paul is just an excuse to attack my review. I am not the only researcher who has reached for Paul's publications. It turns out that Alicja Jarkowska-Natkaniec (Institute of History of the Jagiellonian University) refers to 'anti-Semitic clichés,' i.e. the findings of this author as an authority on the issue of researching deplorable attitudes of Jews during wartime,<sup>22</sup> in the book titled: *Wymuszona współpraca czy zdrada? Wokół przypadków kolaboracji Żydów w okupowanym Krakowie* [Forced Cooperation or Betrayal. On Instances of Jewish Collaboration in Occupied Cracow].<sup>23</sup> Jarkowska-Natkaniec mentions Paul alongside Tomasz Frydel (the author of one of the chapters in *Night without End*) and Israel Gutman. This book's reviewers were professors Jacek Chrobaczyński and Andrzej Żbikowski, whose knowledge of Jewish issues Jan Grabowski will likely not deny. As can be seen, they did not pinpoint the author's reference to a 'non-existent' figure. The findings by Jarkowska-Natkaniec are an important argument in the polemics of Professor Grabowski's co-worker from the Centre – Dagmara Swałek-Niewińska – with Piotr Gontarczyk. One can read about this on the Centre's website.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> To facilitate the task, I provide a description: Yad Vashem Archives (hereinafter: AYV), O.33/1579, Memoir of Samuel Lipa Tennenbaum (1975–1978), p. 227.

<sup>22</sup> This concerns the book: M. Paul, *Patterns of Cooperation, Collaboration and Betrayal: Jews, Germans and Poles in occupied Poland during World War II* (London, 2011).

<sup>23</sup> A. Jarkowska-Natkaniec, *Wymuszona współpraca czy zdrada? Wokół przypadków kolaboracji Żydów w okupowanym Krakowie* (Kraków, 2018), p. 34.

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.holocaustresearch.pl/index.php?mod=news&show=380&template=print> (accessed 7 July 2019).

So, the problem is not quoting Paul; it all depends on who does it. In any case, I am treating these allegations of invoking anti-Semitic ‘brochures’ (and Grabowski also provides such opinions in the media, so this is no coincidence) as a highly-inept attempt at discrediting the polemicist publicly. It is also worth noting that Grabowski writes not about a brochure but brochures. Thus, he creates an impression of a multitude, multiplying facts.<sup>25</sup> I leave these explanations without further comment. On the other hand, I strongly encourage Professor Grabowski, before he accuses anyone of using anti-Semitic ‘brochures’, to read Tennenbaum’s memoirs and his critical view of the attitudes of some members of the Złoczów Judenrat.

A continuation of Grabowski’s reflections on ‘anti-Semitic brochures’ is likely his crowning argument against my study, and above all, personally against me. However, it is formulated only at the end of the response. In his disquisition, he ascertained that my criticism of how the Jüdischer Ordnungsdienst (JOD) and the Judenrats are described in *Night without End* was: “a specific form of [Holocaust] denial, widespread in Eastern Europe today” (“Response”, p. 8). Grabowski writes: “Relieving members of Polish society of responsibility for the fate of the Jews goes hand in hand with rather inept attempts to shift this responsibility onto the representatives of the dying Jewish community” (*ibid.*). He concluded the entire study with an extensive quote from the book by Manfred Gerstenfeld, *The Abuse of Holocaust Memory. Distortions and Responses* (Jerusalem, 2009, p. 58) (“Response”, p. 9). This trick is another attempt to disguise his own shortcomings, errors, and manipulations by affixing a political label, however unfounded, to the author of the polemic. It is astonishing how easily numerous manipulations in the description of the JOD and the Judenrats indicated by me are passed over in silence by Grabowski. The *Night without End* abounds in such descriptions. Afterwards, he ascertains:

And yet Domański is bogging down in it, stating: ‘It is astonishing that there are almost no debates in the book on the operation of the Judenrats in the counties analysed or on the attitudes of their members toward the Germans and other Jews. What predominates is a distinctly positive message about the universally

---

<sup>25</sup> Journalists are repeating this false information after him. See the article “Doktor do zadań specjalnych” in the supplement to the *Gazeta Wyborcza* daily *Ale historia*, 8 April 2019.

understandable difficulties that the Judenrat members had to grapple with and their efforts to improve the lot of the Jewish community' ([“Correcting the Picture”], p. 60). Once again, the ‘Jewish perpetrators’ are being evoked. (“Response”, p. 8)

Unfortunately, Grabowski, trying to find the ‘Jewish perpetrators’ in my words, failed to quote the subsequent part of the analysed section of the review. Only in the next sentence, I recall the opinion of Barbara Engelking (co-editor of *Night without End* and many other publications by the Centre) expressed in 2007 on the topic of the Judenrat. She wrote:

The Judenrats thus engaged in a specific game with the Germans, hoping to survive. It is an illusion to think that this game could have been avoided, that it was possible not to enter into any relationship with the Germans or to oppose them. However, one of the side-effects of this game was the proliferation of violence. In order to meet German demands, the Jewish councils had to resort to the use of force within their own communities. By using force, they placed themselves on the side of the state apparatus and became part of the system of German terror. Therefore, it is no surprise that they were often perceived as institutions collaborating with the enemy, that they were increasingly judged critically or even detested by the Jews. The Judenrats found themselves in a moral trap – while wanting to do good, they contributed to the proliferation of evil. (“Correcting the Picture”, p. 60)

So, is the critical opinion expressed by Engelking towards the actions of the Judenrat in the Warsaw District (and, thus, also in Węgrów ‘County’) also an indication of the “Jewish perpetrators” and “an inept attempt at shifting the responsibility for the fate of the Jews onto the representatives of the dying Jewish community”? Professor Grabowski should first disavow the findings of Professor Engelking rather than, in a primitive way, impute the ‘Holocaust denial’ to the historian who is only citing these findings. As a side note, I will add that any attempt to shift the responsibility for the fate of the Jews, to which they had been doomed by the German Reich onto Jews themselves, will be inept, for it will be

untrue and contradictory to the facts. On the other hand, research questions on the Judenrats are justified, for example, because their activities aroused strong emotions and controversies among the Jews themselves.

Grabowski referred more broadly to the trial of Tomasz F., a “volunteer” firefighter from Stoczek. Simultaneously, this process induced him to general deliberations on the condition of the judiciary system at the time (“Response”, p. 7), which was not the subject of the review. In the case of the trial of Tomasz F. (but also other trials), my objection as a reviewer of *Night without End* applies to what Grabowski providently omits in his analysis, namely the influence of Stalin’s repression apparatus on the course and effect of the proceedings. It must be remembered that an essential part of the “justice system” of the time was made up of Security Department (*Urząd Bezpieczeństwa*, UB) functionaries. Furthermore, they are the ones who gathered evidence and interviewed witnesses and defendants at investigation stage. Methods of operation of the UB functionaries, such as extortion, torture, and the like, are commonly known,<sup>26</sup> and there is no point in dwelling on them. But perhaps that is why a researcher should have limited trust in the content of statements – both by witnesses and defendants, recorded and signed during the investigation, when they differ significantly from the words recorded at the main hearings or testimonies before the public prosecutor.<sup>27</sup>

Yet, Grabowski, in the chapter “Węgrów County” (“Powiat węgrowski”) and in his response to the review, not only fails to inform the reader of the above-mentioned procedural circumstances (doubts) but accuses me (sic!), that I provided the information about the acquittal of Tomasz F. during the court case: “Elsewhere, Domański, carefully searching the footnotes and tracking each, even the slightest, mistake in the transcription of documents, triumphantly discovers that the firefighter F. (whose cruelty towards the Stoczek Jews I mention) was acquitted by the court” (“Response”, p. 7). I honestly do not know where Grabowski sees any ‘triumph’ here. I also do not know what this triumph actually consists of, either.

---

<sup>26</sup> See P. Piątek, *Przestępcze wymuszenie zeznań w postępowaniach przygotowawczych prowadzonych przez organy bezpieczeństwa publicznego w latach 1944–1956. Studium kryminologiczno-prawne* (Katowice–Warszawa, 2018).

<sup>27</sup> See R. Śmietanka-Kruszelnicki, “Protokół przesłuchania jako źródło historyczne”, in *Wokół te czek bezpieki – zagadnienia metodologiczno-źródłoznawcze*, ed. F. Musiał (Kraków, 2006), pp. 357–366.

When analysing any court trial, especially in such serious allegations as with F., elementary scholarly integrity would require one to provide basic facts about the indictment and sentence, especially if there was an acquittal. Indeed, these are principles that every historian should know.

Reading an excerpt from the response dedicated to this sad event, one can conclude that Grabowski fails to understand the essence of the matter, the point the reviewer is trying to make. He writes:

Domański raises this issue as if the arguments put forward in my text did not matter. Referring to the importance of the testimony given in the investigation, I present – on the example of the trial of Polish murderers of Jews from Węgrów – what the trials looked like, where Polish witnesses stood firmly behind the accused. A particular exception to this rule is the material gathered during the investigation; testimonies submitted before the rural (or urban) community agreed on a common line of defence. In the book, this mechanism is shown through the example of the firefighters from Węgrów, using the testimony of the Jewish witness, Moszek Góra, and the diary of a local public prosecutor explaining how the courts were reluctant to punish Poles for such crimes. (“Response”, p. 7)

The above comment leads to two main conclusions. First of all, Grabowski suggested that the defendants and those witnesses testifying in their favour acted as if ‘in collusion’. Hence, it follows that regardless of the facts, witnesses defending the accused become *a priori* complicit in the crime. These are strong accusations, but is not this thesis a bit too hasty and overgeneralized? It seems that, for Grabowski, any procedural doubts (coercion, false testimony, accusations, etc.) do not exist.<sup>28</sup> The second conclusion is related to the question of whether one is allowed to

---

<sup>28</sup> The thesis in response to “Correcting the Picture” is a repetition of journalistic statements by Jan Grabowski about the August trials (*sierpniówki*): “These are highly reliable sources. [...] The Communist government did not wish for these trials because it was afraid that the nation would shout: ‘The Communists are jailing and what for? For murdering Jews?’ [...] I’ve read hundreds of court files concerning the August trials and have found nothing about political manipulation. [...] As a rule, the trials ended in small sentences, often in acquittals. Almost all murderers were freed by 1956 at the latest”. Conversation with Dr Jan Grabowski, *Gazeta Wyborcza* daily, 30–31 July 2016, p. 23.

arbitrarily assume that the tendencies observed in the Siedlce court are actual for all court proceedings in post-war Poland (and I am not, by any means, negating the examples indicated by Grabowski) and, consequently, to ignore the judgments rendered by these courts? I believe that every trial should be thoroughly and meticulously analysed. Perhaps the number of sources analysed would be smaller and would provide more credible substantiation of the author's theses. In the light of Grabowski's above words from his response to "Correcting the Picture", I also have doubts whether the lack of information on the acquittal of F. in *Night without End*, as suggested by Grabowski, is a mistake. Perhaps it is a conscious construct, assuming that the accused was guilty regardless of the judgment.

It is also worth dedicating some space for the memoirs of a 'local prosecutor', because they can be another example of how Jan Grabowski uses already published materials. To better understand this mechanism, it is essential to use the excerpts from the article by Andrew Kornbluth, who had found the memoirs of Władysław Grzymała (a 'local prosecutor') from Siedlce.<sup>29</sup> As can be assumed, sections of Kornbluth's text were the basis for Grabowski's deliberations about the nature of the judiciary system at the time, which he included in *Night without End*. The phrase "can be assumed" is most appropriate here since Grabowski, using Grzymała's memoirs, only once invoked Kornbluth's article directly in the footnote. The remaining portion of his deliberations does not contain any reference (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 457). Since, as already mentioned, Grabowski did not refer to any other documents, I assume that the entire description was derived from Kornbluth's text, where the lawyer, as mentioned above, was described as follows:

Władysław Grzymała, a prosecutor who had worked at the court in Siedlce since graduation from law school in 1934, revealed, in unpublished memoirs, his hatred for the Communists and assured that, before the war, 'the majority' of

---

<sup>29</sup> A. Kornbluth, "Jest wielu Kainów pośród nas". Polski wymiar sprawiedliwości a Zagłada 1944–1956", *Zagłada Żydów. Studia i Materiały* 9 (2013), pp. 157–172. I also refer to this issue in my article from 2016, where I wrote about anti-Semitic tendencies prevailing in the District Court there: T. Domański, "'Sierpniówki' jako źródło do dziejów Armii Krajowej w Okręgu Radomsko-Kieleckim na przykładzie procesów przed Sądem Okręgowym, Sądem Apelacyjnym i Sądem Wojewódzkim w Kielcach. Wybrane problemy badawcze", in *Z dziejów Polskiego Państwa Podziemnego na Kielecczyźnie 1939–1945*, ed. by J. Gapys and T. Domański (Kielce, 2016), p. 210.

his colleagues sympathised with the *Endecja* [the National Democrats] – a profoundly nationalist, anti-Semitic and far-right party. In a meeting with fifty other prosecutors from Poland held in 1948, he noted that everyone comes from ‘the generation which graduated from law school before the war, and therefore sharing mainly the political views represented by Roman Dmowski, [Roman] Rybarski, [Stanisław] Stroński’, i.e. supporters of the ‘National Radical Camp’ (ONR).<sup>30</sup>

From Kornbluth’s text we can only conclude that **Grzymała’s colleagues** belonged to or sympathised with the National Democrats and that he himself claimed to be an anti-communist. While Grabowski, using the above passage, presented this to the prosecutor in the following way: “Grzymała, a prosecutor with pre-war experience, **a fervent supporter of the National Democrats**, did not hide his political views [emphasis mine – T.D.]” (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 457). Is this a fair way of using another author’s text?

Grabowski’s attitude toward the original was even more ‘laid-back’ when he was concluding Grzymała’s activeness during the trials of those accused of crimes against the Jews. In Kornbluth’s published text, one can read:

Grzymała’s attitude toward the prosecution of anti-Jewish crimes was, to put it mildly, sceptical. He wrote that there were only ‘a few exceptions’ among the Poles of persecuting Jews, that ‘more honest Jews, being less resourceful, died’, and those who survived were the ‘riff-raff’ seeking revenge on Poles and Poland. **He also described acting in collusion with the judges to clear the defendants of their allegations, of whose guilt he was not convinced** [emphasis mine – T.D.].<sup>31</sup>

And this is how Grabowski misquoted this section: “He also openly admitted [Grzymała] that the cases against Poles accused of murdering Jews did not constitute, to put it mildly, a priority for the judiciary. Contrarily, a public prosecutor from Siedlce wrote that the “more honest Jews died”, and only the “riff-raff seek-

---

<sup>30</sup> Kornbluth, “Jest wielu Kainów”, p. 163.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

ing revenge on the Poles” survived. **For this reason, wishing to protect Poles accused of murders on Jews, judges and public prosecutors acted in collusion to thwart the most severe allegations** [emphasis mine – T.D.]” (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 457).

Even more astonishing is the use of the text “Jest wielu Kainów” later in Grabowski’s narration, which considerably distorted the content of Kornbluth’s conclusions. Immediately after the passage quoted above, this researcher dedicated a separate sub-chapter to the August Decree, which he began with the words: “However, it would be a great simplification to suggest that the post-war treatment of crimes stemming from anti-Semitism was attributable only to prejudice”.<sup>32</sup> And he pointed out here the fundamental legal flaws of the August Decree (*lex retro non agit*, lack of legal precision in individual articles of the law), which was also reflected in the content of the judgements and which, in turn, caused the dissatisfaction of the Ministry of Justice. Nevertheless, Grabowski, ignoring these conclusions, ascertained:

This resulted in numerous acquittals (or ridiculously low sentences, given the alleged acts), which were not appealed against by public prosecutors. Even the Ministry of Justice interventions did not help because similar lenience towards the murderers of Jews also prevailed in the appeals courts. (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 457)<sup>33</sup>

What did Grabowski base his generalisations on? Nobody knows. Kornbluth’s article does not support such firm conclusions.

Another example of Professor Grabowski’s method of using documents is the reference to an account by Władysław Okulus, the wartime mayor of Węgrów. In the chapter dedicated to Węgrów County, the local firefighters’ case held an important place. Okulus wrote explicitly about their role in the ‘displacement’ of the Węgrów ghetto. His comments as an eye-witness on the behaviour of some Poles towards Jews are very harsh and critical. Grabowski also referred to that account, writing, *inter alia*, that: “The fire brigade chief carried **a briefcase with him all**

---

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> On the August trials see, *inter alia*, A. Pasek, *Przestępstwa okupacyjne w polskim prawie karnym z lat 1944–1956* (Wrocław, 2002).



**day long, which was getting increasingly heavier, with the valuables obtained from the Jews;** the firefighters intended to divide them among themselves after their all-day “work” [*Night without End*, emphasis mine – T.D.]” (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 436). The above sentence leaves no doubt about the intentions of the fire brigade chief. This is not a quote of the mayor’s own words but Grabowski’s summary. Worth quoting here, therefore, are the exact words of Okulus, who wrote only that: “The commander [of the volunteer fire brigade chief] **always had a briefcase with him**. I saw the briefcase but did not look inside, and **I do not know what was in it**. **However, there were rumours in town** that this was where they put the money taken from captured Jews to divide it among themselves at the end of the “working day” [emphasis mine – T.D.]”<sup>34</sup> Thus, Grabowski’s report does not convey the meaning of the mayor’s words, who, as can be seen, made it clear that he is providing information based on hearsay and rumours. Is a historian permitted to treat sources in this way and present assumptions as a certainty?

The example of Okulus also shows Jan Grabowski’s selective approach to source materials. What is meant here is the case of a Judenrat member – Zejman. Barbara Engelking was critical of this figure (see “Correcting the Picture”, p. 61). In *Night without End*, Jan Grabowski only mentioned that Mordechaj Zejman was the head of the local Judenrat. Władysław Okulus devoted a few sentences in his account to the last moments of Zejman’s life, and these were shocking. There seems to be no reason not to believe Okulus. The mayor who did not hesitate to write about some Poles’ shameful behaviour had no reason to exaggerate what he had witnessed:

The Judenrat member, Zejman, acted and died miserably. At the beginning of the operation’s first day, he led his whole family to the market square, where Jews were gathered. For several days, he accompanied the tormentors, talking to them and lighting cigarettes off theirs. After a few days of marching and lively conversation, one of the Germans shot him in the back of the head. The death was instantaneous, and the miserable Judenrat member did not even know that he was dying.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> AŻIH, 301/6043, Władysław Okulus’s relation, [place and date of origin unknown], pp. 4–5.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

Martyna Rusiniak-Karwat also writes about Zejman's behaviour, adding that Zejman had participated in the operation of catching Jews after the ghetto liquidation.<sup>36</sup> Hence, there are sufficient sources available to enrich the knowledge on Zejman's history, capable of contributing to the analysis of the attitudes of Jews who were faced with choices in the reality of 'the Final Solution to the Jewish issue' created by the Germans. With this story, the picture of the survival strategies, which, as the authors of *Night without End* repeatedly point out, was the book's primary purpose, would be so much more complete. Grabowski nonetheless resigns from presenting this story in favour of silence and insinuations.

Professor Grabowski also referred to my method presented in "Correcting the Picture" of describing Polish-Jewish relations during the interwar period. He claims that I am reproaching him for presenting "Polish-Jewish relations of the late 1930s in bleak shades" ("Response", p. 2). In the review, I only ascertained that a: "somewhat one-sided and oversimplified vision of this time emerges. The authors seem to treat it as a kind of prelude to the wartime atmosphere. In many instances, situations of conflict in relations between Poles and the Jews have been highlighted, often in a manner quite far from balanced scholarly assessment" ("Correcting the Picture", p. 8). I have not changed my opinion; Grabowski's clarifications only confirm this for me. He writes: "But all I said was that the Jewish community was severely weakened economically at the outbreak of the war, and the relations between Poles and the Jews were significantly eroded" ("Response", p. 3). Yet the author, contrary to what he is writing now, in the chapter titled "Węgrów County" ("Powiat węgrowski") in *Night without End*, combined cases of pre-war anti-Jewish attitudes in one sentence with wartime violence against Jews, thus creating a kind of continuum.<sup>37</sup>

Jan Grabowski also referred to my criticism of the description of the Polnische Polizei in *Night without End*. Unfortunately, this time he did not see the highlighted problems indicated by me, but directed the discussion to issues I had not mentioned. Again, his tone is very emotional and journalistic ("Response", p. 5). A verbatim

---

<sup>36</sup> <https://sztetl.org.pl/pl/miejscowosci/w/1028-wegrow/99-historia-spoleczności/183071-historia-spoleczności> (accessed 1 June 2020); for a selection of literature, see *ibid.*

<sup>37</sup> The interpretation presented by Jan Grabowski also resonates with the statements of other researchers. In an interview for the magazine *Forum*, when referring to Polish-Jewish relations in the 1920s, Elżbieta Janicka ascertained that: 'In social and economic terms, the Holocaust was a shock. In moral terms, there was no shock, but a continuation'(!), *Forum* 14 (2019), p. 14.

quotation of Emanuel Ringelblum (in the light of present knowledge on the number of Jews murdered during the Holocaust and those who had managed to survive) can lead one astray. Ringelblum's words, who, after all, did not have any opportunity to draw up accurate statistics about the responsibility of the Polnische Polizei for the "death of hundreds of thousands of Polish Jews", point to a specific phenomenon, a social problem. I did not deny anywhere in "Correcting the Picture" that the Polnische Polizei (PP) functionaries committed crimes against the Jews. They committed crimes both against the Jews and Poles. My objection related to the presentation of the Polnische Polizei as a strictly Polish formation, which the authors of the "Foreword" wrote on pp. 25–26. This is the issue Professor Grabowski should refer to.

On this occasion, Grabowski's calculations concerning the number of Polnische Polizei in Węgrów 'County' attract attention. It is not only a matter of statistics, but the underlying assumption of the chapter, which the author has outlined as follows: "Major support for German and Polish police officers [i.e. Kriminalpolizei] were members of the Polish Police GG ('the blue police'), i.e. over one hundred officers deployed at eight outposts on the territory of the former Węgrów County" (*Night without End*, vol. 1, pp. 420–421). Professor Grabowski included a footnote for this section. However, the indicated sources fail to confirm the above data and even to lend any credence to them.<sup>38</sup> Characteristically enough, when presenting his own calculations, Grabowski also refers to the Home Army report, allegedly meaning the Polnische Polizei outpost in Sokołów. ('See also the staff composition of the outpost in Sokołów [...] – *Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 421, fn. 90'). Indeed, under the indicated signature, there is a table (untitled), but with the names of more than 90 people: women, men, and children. This is by no means a list of policemen. It is difficult to work out who these people are. Professor Grabowski likely is not trying to say that Maria Schultz, born on 24 February 1879, or Barbara Anna Szczęśna, born on 16 October 1941, served at the outpost in Sokołów, or Wilhelmina Kobyłko, born on 2 April 1866<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> For example, in the protocols of interrogations of Józef Maleszewski and Tytus Czarnecki, the names of Czesław Sałek and Józef Guzek do not appear (*Night without End*, vol. 1, 421). See AIPN, Archives of the Chief Commission (hereinafter: GK), 318/568, Protocol of the interrogation of witness Józef Maleszewski, Węgrów, 20 May 1954, pp. 2–3; *ibid.*, Protocol of the interrogation of witness Tytus Czarnecki, Liw, 31 August 1954, pp. 10–11.

<sup>39</sup> AAN, AK, 203/III-115, [List of persons], [place and date of origin unknown], pp. 19–20a.

(and these are not all of the older women and children on the list). Grabowski has repeated this theory regarding the number of PP officers some pages later (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 500). He based his conclusion on the testimony of Cezariusz Łukaszewski, who, according to Grabowski, was the “district commander of the PP in the Węgrów area” (*ibid.*). Łukaszewski quoted that 115 police officers were reporting to him. Grabowski acknowledged that this figure should be approached with ‘scepticism’ and ultimately unjustifiably stated that a total of “over a hundred and several dozen uniformed police officers served at the outposts as mentioned earlier” (*ibid.*).

How did he arrive at these figures? The phrase “over a hundred and several dozen” suggests a significant range, approximately 120 to 199. Professor Grabowski also claims that, on the territory of the former Węgrów County, eight outposts of the Polnische Polizei operated during the occupation in: Bojm, Miedzna, Węgrów, Wyszków, Łochów, Sadowno, Stoczek, and Grębków (*Night without End*, vol. 1, pp. 420–421). A little later in the same paragraph, he also mentions the outpost in Prostynia as belonging to Węgrów ‘County’ (*ibid.*). So, this would be the ninth one, which seems more likely. Grabowski does not specify the timeframe to which his calculations relate, and precision is essential here. We do not know whether these hundred and several dozen officers worked in the county in 1939, in 1943, or perhaps it is the aggregate number of all the policemen who had ever worked there. Naming specific officers from Węgrów County, Grabowski sometimes forgets that there was a rather large staff rotation in the General Governorate service. For example, when he mentions Władysław Babulewicz as serving in Miedzna, the same police officer is mentioned by another officer, Stanisław Kanciała, as serving in 1942 at the outpost in Węgrów.<sup>40</sup> Out of the sense of duty of a reviewer, I will add that the outpost commander in Węgrów was Julian or Józef Oleracki.<sup>41</sup> On the other hand, it follows from Piotr Grochal’s testimony that, during the occupation, he changed his place of service several times.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> AIPN GK, 318/568, Minutes of the interrogation of suspect Stanisław Kanciała, Węgrów, 17 August 1954, p. 30v.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, Minutes of the interrogation of suspect Stanisław Kanciała, Siedlce, 28 September 1954, p. 51v.

<sup>42</sup> AIPN GK, 318/460, vol. 2, Minutes of the interrogation of suspect Piotr Grochal, Lubań, 4 April 1951, pp. 8–9.

Hence, are the figures indicating the number of the PP officers in Węgrów County, supplied by Professor Grabowski, factual? Grabowski did not review essential documents deposited in the Central Archives of Modern Records in Warsaw, in the GG Government fond. The financial documentation shows that the number of PP officers in Kreishauptmannschaft Sokolow-Wengrow,<sup>43</sup> in June of 1940 amounted to 88,<sup>44</sup> and at the end of 1941, there were 95 (Polish and Ukrainian) ‘police officials.’<sup>45</sup> These are figures relating, as mentioned above, to Kreishauptmannschaft Sokolow-Wengrow and not only to ‘Węgrów’ county or ‘Sokołów’ county. One of the Home Army reports contained detailed statistics presenting a list of the Polnische Polizei members in Sokołów ‘County’ (the pre-war Polish county is meant here). According to the report, the county headquarters had 20 officers, including the outpost in Jabłonna – 3, the outpost in Elżbietowo – 3, Bielany – 3, Kosowo – 6, Sterdynia – 5, Sabnie – 3, Repki – 4, Prostyń – 3, and Miedzna – 3. Thus, a total of 53 “blue policemen”<sup>46</sup> served at one time at the outposts listed in the Home Army report and at the county headquarters. Prostyń and Miedzna were erroneously included in Sokołów ‘County’; therefore, the number of PP policemen in this part of Kreishauptmannschaft Sokolow-Wengrow amounted to 47. However, it appears from Grabowski’s information that the average number of staff should be at approx. 15–20 policemen per outpost. This is an important difference in presenting the forces available to the Germans. As he reported, Grabowski had at hand other material significantly ‘verifying’ the number of a hundred and several dozen police-

---

<sup>43</sup> This official name was given in the document. Later on, the name of Sokolow-Wengrow was given up for Kreishauptmannschaft Sokolow. The name Kreis Sokolow-Wengrow originates from the merger of two pre-war Polish counties into one administrative body.

<sup>44</sup> These figures correspond to studies by Jan Popławski, who established that on 1 March 1940, there was one high rank PP policeman (officer) and 83 lowest rank policemen in Kreis Sokolow, see J. Popławski, *Ustrój Policji Polskiej Generalnego Gubernatorstwa w latach 1939–1945*, TS (Warszawa–Poznań, 1977), p. 283.

<sup>45</sup> AAN, The Government of the General Governorate (RGG), 1162, Letter to the Head of the Finance Department of the Governor General’s Office, Sokołów, 10 June 1940, p. 162; *ibid.*, Letter from the Main Finance Department of the GG Government to the Sokołów county governor (*starosta*), Cracow, 10 February 1942, p. 185.

<sup>46</sup> AAN, AK, 203/III-115, [Report], [place and date of origin unknown], pp. 17–18. For comparison, it can be reported that, in 1943, the navy-blue police forces in Grójec county amounted to 75 policemen. See: AAN, Government Delegation for Poland (hereinafter: DR), 202/II-23, Folwark VII, Situational report on the organisational status and activities of subversive organisations, national minorities, and the occupying forces from 1 until 31 July 1943, p. 14.

men in the form of testimonies by Łukaszewski, the wartime county commander of the Polnische Polizei with its headquarters in Sokołów. For reasons known only to himself, Grabowski appointed Łukaszewski as commander of the PP in some nondescript 'Węgrów' area (!). Łukaszewski served in the specific occupation administration unit – Kreishauptmannschaft Sokolow. This is what he testified during the trial against another policeman, Wincenty Kołodziejski<sup>47</sup> – “As the District Police Commander at the time, I had 115 policemen serving under me”<sup>48</sup>. The same data regarding his position during the occupation were provided in his personal file prepared by the UB, but this is due, above all, to the occupation reality, when there was one county PP headquarters in Sokołów (!).<sup>49</sup> In literature or other documents, I have not come across a situation where separate county headquarters were established for two or three pre-war Polish counties combined by the Germans into one Kreishauptmannschaft. However, the Home Army often used the pre-war Polish county structure in its documentation.<sup>50</sup> The County PP headquarters for Kreishauptmannschaft Sokolow (Sokolow-Wengrow) was located in Sokołów. When the relevant number (46 – after deducting the commander) of policemen assigned to the 'Sokołów part' of this area is deducted from the total number of 115<sup>51</sup> police-

---

<sup>47</sup> The case against Kołodziejski undoubtedly deserves a detailed discussion. It is full of ambiguities, including the testimony of the key and, in principle, the only witness to the prosecution, Bolesław Abczyński. At the main trial, the former investigating officer of the PUBP in Węgrów testified, accusing Abczyński of giving false testimony. It is worth adding here what Professor Grabowski failed to say, namely that this policeman was acquitted of the act described in *Night without End* (vol. 1, p. 508), i.e. shooting the fleeing Jew, Szolek Goldsztejn, during the 'displacement' of Jews from the factory in Baczki. Suppose Abczyński's testimony and the 'deliberate acquittal' of Kołodziejski are considered credible. In that case, it is worth pointing to another part of this testimony, where the witness presented critical circumstances of displacement, also depicting the possibilities to help the Jews and the general atmosphere of Polish-Jewish relations. These circumstances, however, seemed irrelevant to Grabowski. Commencing the operation in 1943, the Germans announced that, after the specific hour by which the Jews were to report, they would kill three or four Poles for each captured Jew. See: AIPN GK, 209/57, vol. 1, Minutes of the interrogation of a witness Bolesław Abczyński, Węgrów, 30 March 1945, p. 25; *ibid.*, vol. 25; *ibid.*, vol. 2, Testimony of Bolesław Abczyński at the main hearing, 2 July 1945, pp. 29–31; *ibid.*, Operative part of the Judgment, 2 July 1945, pp. 33–35; *ibid.*, Testimony of Stefan Kresa at the main hearing, 25 June 1945, p. 26.

<sup>48</sup> AIPN GK, 209/57, vol. 2, Testimony of Cezariusz Łukaszewski at the main hearing, 25 June 1945, p. 27.

<sup>49</sup> AIPN 2911/1, [Personal file: Łukaszewski, Cezariusz].

<sup>50</sup> This was consequent upon the Home Army's refusal to recognise changes implemented by the invaders.

<sup>51</sup> And these data also correspond to the findings of Jan Popławski, according to whom the PP forces at the time amounted to 113 policemen in the entire Kreis Sokolow. See: Popławski, *Ustrój Policji Polskiej*, p. 290.

men in Kreishauptmannschaft Sokolow (Sokolow-Wengrow), it appears that around 70 officers may have served during the war at the PP outposts in the 'Węgrów part' of this area – much fewer than purported by Grabowski (this proves again that one should not mix territorial units from different periods).

The number as mentioned above of “a hundred and several dozen” appears in a vital part of the narrative developed in the book. Grabowski painted a picture of the occupying forces and enumerated the structures involved in the liquidation of ghettos in Kreishauptmannschaft Sokolow, of which the Węgrów area formed a part and the subsequent murdering of the Jews. “A hundred and several dozen” policemen in a part (Węgrów ‘County’) of the Kreishauptmannschaft Sokolow alone would be considerable. The data quoted by Łukaszewski, which, as can be seen, correspond with the statistics of the German occupation authorities, pertained to Kreis Sokolow as a whole. The simultaneous observable increase in numbers shows the apparent trend of consolidating the PP forces across the entire GG. Most likely, in Kreishauptmannschaft Sokolow, this number of policemen increased to 115. However, Grabowski did not make use of any of this information. Instead, he created the non-existent ‘Węgrów area’ and ‘a hundred and several dozen’ PP policemen.

However, Grabowski correctly indicates that the German authorities used Węgrów ‘County’ policemen in anti-Jewish operations and the pacification and persecution of Poles throughout Kreishauptmannschaft Sokolow. All oppressive operations targeted directly against the Polish population also encompassed the Jews.

In the sub-chapter titled “The Polish Underground State vs the Jews” (“Polskie Państwo Podziemne wobec Żydów”), Professor Grabowski attempts to deal with the existing literature which, in his opinion, wrongfully and unjustly draws attention to the Home Army intelligence reports on the fate of the Jews (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 519). At the same time, Grabowski argues that Home Army reports promoted an allegedly false theory about the widespread denunciation of Poles by ‘forest Jews’ (*ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 520). The critical evidence in support of Grabowski’s arguments is apparently a Home Army intelligence report dated 1943, quoted in his study:

the gendarmerie and blue police surrounded [14 July 1943 – T.D.] the following villages in the commune of Wyszaków: Wyszaków, Proszew [Proszew is situated in

the commune of Grębków – J.G.]<sup>52</sup> and Polaków [the correct name is Polków-Daćbogi – T.D.]. The residents were rounded up in one place, and subsequently, their households were searched. The reason was their failure to deliver the required meat and egg quotas. As a consequence of the search, 98 cows and 140 pigs were confiscated from the farmers. Two Jews were caught on that occasion. Before they were shot dead, they were interrogated to reveal the names of the Poles who had hidden them. The Jews did not turn anybody in and were shot immediately after the interrogation. (*Night without End*, vol. 1, pp. 520–521)

The use of quotation marks is a clear indication that the above is a quote – a verbatim citation of another person’s words – which reflects not so much the veracity of the details provided as, but above all, the perception of the events and their course and the gradation of problems in the assessment of an anonymous intelligence agent – in other words, the Home Army. The logic behind the disquisition and argumentation is inexorable. The Jews behave extremely heroically, refusing to turn anybody in. They perish. The above description must finally awaken outrage, as the intelligence agent, which is seen from the above quote, predominantly focuses on the pigs and cows. This is what he presents at the beginning of his report. In this sense, the Jews are of minor importance; receding into the background makes the marginalisation of the ‘Jewish issue’ even more evident.

However, it would be erroneous to think Professor Grabowski’s quotation is faithful. The excerpt describing the operation in these villages is much longer, and the reader is presented with a summary faking a quote, which – to put it mildly – is far from scholarly integrity. In the source cited by Grabowski, the description reads as follows:

On 14 July, an expedition consisting of a division of Kalmyks, gendarmerie, blue police, Gestapo and officials from the Labour Office surrounded three villages in the commune of Wyszków: Wyszków, Proszew, and Polków. The Kalmyk squad arrived at 3:00 a.m. and surrounded all three villages simultane-

---

<sup>52</sup> This is currently the case, but during the analysed period, it was located in the commune of Wyszków. This is also how its location was presented on the map in the chapter titled “Węgrów County” (“Powiat węgrowski”) (vol. 1, map after p. 416).



ously. The residents were gathered at one place, and then individual farmers were called out and escorted to their households to carry out the search. After all of the farms in the village were searched, the residents were rounded up again for the Gestapo and Labour Office to check their files. Nine men and 20 women were detained in Wyszków, and six men in Polków. The women were sent to Treblinka. In addition, two Jews found hiding in the village were shot dead. They were first asked about their hideouts but said nothing. The gendarmes lined 20 men up against the wall, demanding they turn in the one who hid the Jews. After five minutes, they were released even though nobody had said anything. The described roundup was intended as ‘punishment for failure to deliver the required meat and egg quotas’. 98 cows and 140 pigs were confiscated.<sup>53</sup>

A slightly longer account of these events can be found in the Home Army’s report, which Grabowski must have read, judging from the reading of “Węgrów County” (“Powiat węgrowski”). Here is the relevant excerpt:

On 14 July, an expedition consisting of a division of “Kalmyks”, gendarmerie, blue police, Gestapo and officials from the Labour Office surrounded three villages in the commune of Wyszków: Wyszków, Proszew, and Polków. The Kalmyk squad arrived at 3:00 a.m. and surrounded all three villages simultaneously. At 6:00 a.m., the gendarmes, police, Gestapo, and Labour Office officials arrived. The residents were gathered at one place, and then individual farmers were called out and escorted to their households to carry out the search. After the entire village was searched in this way, the residents were once again rounded up, their ID cards checked, and the Gestapo and Labour Office reviewed their files. Nine men and 20 women were detained in Wyszków; six men in Polków. The women were sent to Treblinka. At one of the farmers (head of the village), a B.I. Bulletin dated 1941 was found under the palliase. His son was arrested [?] and a friend who happened to be there. In addition, two Jews, who had been

---

<sup>53</sup> AAN, DR, 202/II-23, Folwark VII, Situational report on the organisational status and activities of subversive organisations, national minorities, and the occupying forces, 1 July – 31 July 1943, p. 5.

hiding in the village, were shot dead. First, they were interrogated about their hideout location.[? – document partially damaged]. They did not say anything. Then the gendarmes lined 20 men up against the wall [?] demanding they turn in the one who had been hiding the Jews. They were released after five minutes [?], although nobody said anything. The operation was intended to punish for the failure to deliver the required contingency [?] and egg quotas. Ninety-eight cows and 140 pigs were confiscated at the time.<sup>54</sup>

Reading the ‘abridged’ account provided by Professor Grabowski and the reports prepared by the Home Army intelligence, one may think they describe two different situations. The selection of issues is at the forefront. For the Polish underground, it is not cows or pigs that are the most important, but the people. The livestock thread has been as if added at the very end, as a sheer formality. Nevertheless, the author of the report began with a detailed description of the course of events during the pacification operation and the number of arrested Poles. Eventually, he added that, in the course of the operation, two hiding Jews were captured. However, Grabowski disregarded the way these events are described in the source. He went further and omitted the information about the Poles who, despite being lined up “against the wall”, did not disclose who had hidden the Jews. Their bravery was excluded from the investigator’s area of interest revealed to the reader. What a reader (devoid of all the details I have provided) will remember are only the heroic Jews.

Also, the omitted data on the pacification forces provoke questions about information selection. Professor Grabowski called the attack on the villages mentioned above an operation of the “gendarmerie and blue police” (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 520). The groups of perpetrators evidence the absurdity of such an approach, so scrupulously listed by the Home Army intelligence yet omitted by the author. It is hard to imagine that the onsite Gestapo and other representatives of the apparatus of repression carried out the orders of the blue police from Grębkowo. Furthermore, this is the picture one gets reading about the operation of the “gendarmerie and blue police” – after all, Grabowski clearly perceives the two

---

<sup>54</sup> AAN, AK, 203/X-72, Situational report, 1 July – 30 September 1943, p. 61.

formations as equal. Also, the number of Polnische Polizei functionaries was too modest for such an extensive operation. The staff of the PP outpost in Grębków was not around 20 policemen, as Grabowski's calculations might suggest, but barely a few. For anyone familiar with the realities of rural spatial development patterns (and one can hardly assume that Professor Grabowski is not familiar with the subject), it is evident that carrying out such an extensive operation, encompassing three villages, required the involvement of considerable forces. And they were involved. It is difficult to find a better example of image distortion. Perhaps Grabowski sought to demonstrate the PP's role in exploiting the Polish countryside by 'trimming off' the sources. Alternatively, perhaps, the purpose was to highlight the PP's part in exterminating Jews. And, although the source does not state which formation specifically found the Jews and in what circumstances, who interrogated and who murdered them, the narrative does indicate the current location of the village of Proszew in the commune of Grębków (Grabowski reported in detail, a little earlier in the book, on the role of the Grębków PP in the murder of the Jews). After removing the key forces (the Kalmyks, who were the most numerous and the Gestapo as the commanders) from the picture, the Polnische Polizei is featured as a significant, perhaps even the leading force of the operation in which two Jews were murdered.

The narrative in this book excerpt is not developed only by 'trimming' down sources. There is a kind of continuation related to the appropriate accentuation of problems attracting the attention of the Home Army intelligence. Their reports were discussed by Grabowski in the sub-chapter entitled 'The Polish Underground State vs the Jews in the Węgrów County' [Polskie Państwo Podziemne a Żydzi w powiecie węgrzowskim] (*Night without End*, vol. 1, pp. 518–523). The numerous factual errors and interpretations found in this text and the omissions of literature have already been discussed by Alicja Gontarek.<sup>55</sup> One example of Grabowski's creativity, contrary to sources, is highlighting the alleged preoccupation of the quoted Home Army intelligence agents with the issue of 'catching Jews,' Grabowski concludes:

---

<sup>55</sup> A. Gontarek, 'Akcja zbrojna Armii Krajowej w czasie buntu w obozie Treblinka II w sierpniu 1943 roku – rekonesans badawczy', *Studia nad Totalitaryzmami i Wiekiem XX* 3 (2019), pp. 48–97 (in particular, 52–59).

Having discussed the reports of the gradual liquidation of the death camp in Treblinka [report dated September 1943], the authors of the reports re-focused on the captured Jews, and their turning in of the farmers hiding them to the Germans: "A Jew is being kept in prison in Węgrów, captured in the commune of Łochów, who has already turned in eight people. They are probably shot dead by now. The Jew is to be released and serve as an informer to the gendarmerie". (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 522)

However, the account of the liquidation of the death camp in Treblinka is, in fact, much longer. If the intelligence agents had explicitly focused on a particular issue in this section, it had been precisely the Treblinka II camp. The 'Jewish betrayal' was yet another piece of information in the report, a much less significant one mentioned at the end, in Point 4. In the first place (Point 1), they presented information concerning Treblinka II:

From 1 September [19]43, all construction work at the death camp in Treblinka was interrupted. The camp commander demanded 17 covered wagons; it was not possible to establish why. The Ukrainians categorically claim that the camp is being liquidated and will soon cease to exist. The camp area is to be razed to the ground and planted over with rye. There is a palpable sense of anxiety among the Ukrainians. It is reported that the Ukrainians are preparing to flee. They have stocked up on civilian clothing and even reportedly Polish identification documents. On 28 and 30 August of this year, two Ukrainians took their own lives by rifle shots. The Ukrainians who took part in the liquidation of Jews in the Białystok region have already returned to Treblinka. The D[epu]ty commander of the Treblinka camp, who is simultaneously the death camp commander, left in an unknown direction at the end of September.<sup>56</sup>

The descriptions of Treblinka I and Treblinka II camps, presented in *Night without End*, lead to another fundamental conclusion. In the narrative of Professor Grabowski, as Gontarek rightly pointed out, there is a significant shortcoming

---

<sup>56</sup> AAN, DR, 202/II-23, Situational report, 1-30 November 1943, p. 53.

in academic research skills, consisting in the omission of essential parts of Home Army documents concerning this region.<sup>57</sup> Grabowski selected the quotes in such a manner as to confirm his theory on Home Army intelligence focusing on the issue of ‘catching Jews’. In fact, the analysis in this part of “Węgrów County” (“Powiat węgrowski”) is based on the records from the Government Delegation for Poland funds. However, there are many more documents preserved from that time concerning Węgrów ‘County’. A report of the Bureau of Information and Propaganda (BIP) from August 1943 contains quite an extensive and detailed account of an “escape of a large group of Jews”.<sup>58</sup>

On 8 August 1943,<sup>59</sup> a large group of Jews escaped from Treblinka. This escape was planned by Jews held in Treblinka not only as ‘patients’ of the death camp but also as those who were there almost from the beginning, performing different fixed functions. They organised themselves into two combat groups. On 8 August, taking advantage of the fact that 16 Ukrainians from the camp crew had gone to bathe in the Bug River, they began implementing the plan. One group attacked the barrack with arms on the signal, killing several Ukrainians. After demolishing it, they started destroying equipment by setting fire to the barracks. The few Ukrainians who were in the Jewish camp at the time did not offer any resistance. Only machine gun operators on the observation towers opened fire. There were about 1500 Jews in the escape group. Many died during the very escape from the camp, the rest scattered around the adjacent area. On the same day, extensive gendarmerie reinforcements were called in, and a massive manhunt was carried out in the vicinity of Treblinka. About 120 Jews were shot as a result.<sup>60</sup>

Regarding the situation in October and November 1943, contrary to the truth, Grabowski wrote that Home Army intelligence was mainly interested in ‘Jewish gold’. However, he missed yet another significant part of the report, showing the

---

<sup>57</sup> Gontarek, “Akcja zbrojna”, pp. 53–54.

<sup>58</sup> This document was published by Gontarek, “Akcja zbrojna”, pp. 87–88.

<sup>59</sup> The report contains the wrong date. The events took place on 2 August 1943.

<sup>60</sup> AAN, AK, 203/X-69, Report, TS, 31 August 1943, p. 215.

enormous tragedy of the Holocaust of the Jewish people and the extreme complexity of the situation. It was written in the report:

Recruitment and terrorist operations recently carried out in the area [by the Germans] contributed to the undoing of many Jews still in hiding. Finding themselves engulfed [surrounded] in a trap set up around the town or driven out of hiding by their terrified helpers, they become easy prey to the now numerous gendarmerie patrols. Incidents of shooting Jews by [sic! – should be: in] groups consisting of several people [are] now quite common. Jews are often members of gangs currently on the prowl.<sup>61</sup>

Reports of the Government's Delegation for Poland or the Home Army, to which Grabowski refers in this passage of his text, were not created on a whim, composed of issues that had just dawned on intelligence agents from the Węgrów area, as the author appears to suggest. The structure of the reports was based on the template prepared by Headquarters. The Headquarters determined the issues to be addressed in the reports.<sup>62</sup> However, he is right that it is unknown who selected the material and filtered the content, which was subsequently sent to the Headquarters (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 520).

I would also argue with the theory that intelligence agents focused only on minor and major sabotage, attacks on Germans, and the retaliatory acts by the

---

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 216; Grabowski also quoted the following excerpt from Samuel Rajzman's account: 'The peasants from Treblinka area were generally very hostile toward the Jews. They turned Jews in, captured children, and, like animals on a rope, they led them to Treblinka, to death. They got perhaps 1/4 kg of sugar, or maybe nothing in return' (vol. 1, p. 480). The quoted account contains rather questionable information in some passages. For example, Rajzman claimed that one of the local Polish foresters 'murdered probably a few thousand Jews himself' (AYV, O.3/561, Testimony of Samuel Rajzman, [place and date of origin unknown], p. 10). What Teresa Prekerowa wrote about Rajzman's account (Grabowski omitted this article in his "Węgrów County" ["Powiat węgrowski"]): 'information about the children is not confirmed in any Jewish or Polish accounts. It is also worth noting that the author, publishing his memoirs in the collection entitled *The Death Camp Treblinka* thirty years later, omitted both of these pieces of information', T. Prekerowa, "Stosunek ludności polskiej do żydowskich uciekinierów z obozów zagłady w Treblince, Sobiborze i Bełżcu w świetle relacji żydowskich i polskich", *Biuletyn Głównej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Hitlerowskich w Polsce Instytutu Pamięci Narodowej* 35 (1993), p. 102.

<sup>62</sup> More on the subject can be found, for example, in the information manual for 'BIP. Wydry'. See: AAN, AK, 203/X-65, Information manual for BIP. Wydry, [place of origin unknown], 15 October 1943, p. 79.

Germans (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 521). Naturally, the issue of terror was important. Still, reports were devoted to the entirety of life under occupation, including everyday life (prices, food, contingency quotas), political events, or reconnaissance of the occupying forces (and also provocative operations). Often information about the resistance and crimes was supplied very laconically, even as a one-liner.<sup>63</sup> A similar pattern in this respect was followed in other areas of the occupied Polish lands, e.g. the Kielce Region.<sup>64</sup>

Grabowski ‘overlooked’ one more section of the Delegation’s reports – this time, from the October 1943 report. It focused on provocative operations. The following was reported about Węgrów ‘County’:

It was established that two individuals displaced from the Poznan region stayed in the county, allegedly Jews, trying to make a connection with our people. They are under threat because of their careless behaviour and may be arrested. As they are to a certain degree familiar with the operations of the independence movement, there is some concern that they may rat should they be arrested.<sup>65</sup>

I mentioned in my review the insufficient preliminary survey. This issue is closely related to the history of the uprising in Treblinka II and the escape of the Jews. One could draw up an entire catalogue of omitted existing publications.<sup>66</sup> In his study, Grabowski described “the rebellion in Treblinka and the fate of the Jews who reached the territory of Węgrów ‘County’” (*Night without End*, vol. 1, pp. 476–481). When presenting the events that unfolded following the escape (*ibid.*), he did not find it appropriate to consider the BIP reports mentioned above. When writing about the attitude of the Polish Underground State towards the Jews in ‘Węgrów County’, Professor Grabowski omitted in his deliberations a fundamental source article authored by Krystyna Marczevska and Władysław Ważniewski. This source identifies a series of documents developed (or published) by the Polish

---

<sup>63</sup> See the report from the Warsaw region: DR (202/II-23) and the Home Army: AK (203/X-68; 203/X-69; 203/X-70).

<sup>64</sup> T. Domański, A. Jankowski, *Represje niemieckie na wsi kieleckiej 1939–1945* (Kielce, 2011).

<sup>65</sup> AAN, DR, 202/II-23, Situational report, 1–31 November 1943, p. 58.

<sup>66</sup> This issue is discussed in more detail in Gontarek, “Akcja zbrojna”, *passim*. I omit the critical analysis of Grabowski’s findings done by Gontarczyk, “Między nauką a mistyfikacją”, *passim*.

Underground State (PPP) structures concerning Treblinka II.<sup>67</sup> Finally, he completely omitted the memoirs of a vital witness – a Home Army soldier and train dispatcher at the Treblinka station, Franciszek Ząbecki.<sup>68</sup> Grabowski's description also insufficiently (*ibid.*, p. 476) accounts for the specific actions undertaken by German civil and police authorities. He focused, and not always credibly, principally on the Polish population and the blue police. Had Professor Grabowski, in his description, accounted for the content of the reports on German-led search operations (and the accompanying atmosphere of terror) and acquainted himself with the archival material deposited at the Institute of National Remembrance,<sup>69</sup> his description would be closer to the truth and reality of the time. The last-mentioned source contains, among other things, the minutes of interrogation of Marianna Postek, who lived at Stoczek during the war. The Postek family hid Jews already before the rebellion in Treblinka (six people). After this event, about ten more Jews took refuge in special hideouts built by the father of the Postek family, Stanisław. They were likely escapees from Treblinka,<sup>70</sup> who were found by the Germans and murdered, as was Julianna Postek, beaten to death. Brothers Henryk and Waław Postek were abducted by the Germans and most likely murdered because all traces of them disappeared. At the same time, Stanisław Postek died in KL Auschwitz on 8 December 1943.<sup>71</sup> Postek's testimony casts more light on the fate of the escapees from Treblinka on the territory of Węgrów 'County'. Grabowski determined the fate of 17 of them (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 481). Another ten or so, hiding in Postek's farmyard, significantly increases this number. Information about the deaths of four members of the Postek family also further increases the knowledge of the Polish death toll among those helping Jews in this area.

I hope that the documents mentioned here and adequate interpretation of the sources already analysed will help Professor Grabowski substantively supplement

---

<sup>67</sup> K. Marczevska, W. Ważniewski, "Treblinka w świetle akt Delegatury Rządu RP na Kraj", *Biuletyn Głównej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Hitlerowskich w Polsce* 19 (1968), pp. 129–164.

<sup>68</sup> F. Ząbecki, *Wspomnienia dawne i nowe* (Warszawa, 1977).

<sup>69</sup> This refers to the materials from the so-called Bielawski investigation, kept in the AIPN, file ref. no. 392.

<sup>70</sup> Witness M. Postek associates a relatively large number of Jews in hiding with the rebellion in Treblinka, see *Relacje o pomocy*, p. 172.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 171–173.



his knowledge of the Polnische Polizei as well as the Home Army and structures of the Government Delegation for Poland, which he discussed so extensively in his description of the 'County'. I also hope that he will revise his findings, should he ever decide to publish a study on the fate of the Jews in Węgrów 'County' during the occupation in the form of a monograph.

In response to the review, Grabowski allows himself the wholly unsophisticated sarcastic comment that "Polish 'onlookers' acted as directed by the Germans" ("Response", p. 6). However, the circumstances in which Poles found themselves during the Holocaust are a significant research problem which – approached with journalistic irony – does not speak too well of the author claiming to present scholarly comments. The manipulations he is capable of in this regard are best evidenced in his description of the role of 'onlookers' – entirely of his own creation – at the farm belonging to the Ratyński family in Ziomaki (see: "Correcting the Picture", p. 35).

And finally, a brief reflection of a different nature. Professor Grabowski does not understand, or, at least, so he writes: "why the following sentence is 'journalistic' in its tone: 'the intervention of a local village head, teacher or parish priest could, at least to some extent, have cooled the murderous passions and appeal to the conscience'" ("Response", p. 7). The journalistic tone is manifested in the language, building emotions and, in consequence, shaping a picture wholly detached from historical realities, where a Catholic priest or any other representative of the local Polish intelligentsia, seeing the German forces proceeding to liquidate the ghetto in the town, calls upon them to reflect upon their actions. I do not know how many people could have mustered up such an act of courage, carrying the threat of death. Moreover, I do not intend to defend the words of Rev. Czarkowski calling Commander Ajchel a 'good Pole'. However, I would like to focus on another element of the description presented in this story. Since Rev. Czarkowski "did not leave the house", he could not (and certainly not from the position of a witness) describe Ajchel's role in the 'displacement' of Jews from Węgrów during the trial as he simply had not witnessed it. There is yet one more issue that aroused my interest. Grabowski wrote about Ajchel in his response to the review: "he was one of the cruellest murderers and tormentors of Jews in Węgrów" (*ibid.*, p. 7). There is no reason to defend anyone's criminal act, but it is difficult to accept the blurring (intentional or reckless?) of the Germans' responsibility for the Holocaust. When

reading “Węgrów County” (“Powiat węgrowski), the unbalanced emphasis on the viciousness of the acts described therein became increasingly evident (I mean calling the perpetrator a murderer). It turns out that Grabowski relatively rarely uses the term when referring to Germans, while disproportionately often when referring to Poles. As a purely intellectual exercise, I have counted all instances. It appears that, in descriptions of the events and the Holocaust (including the period after the Soviet invasion, as described by the author), Grabowski uses the term ‘murderer(s)’ of a Jew/Jews in relation to Germans extremely sparingly, barely twice, and to Ukrainians – not even once, but as many as nineteen times, when meaning Poles. Perhaps this is a coincidence. I am not saying that this is intentional. On the other hand, it seems rather characteristic of the author, whose emotions and journalistic ornamentation often take precedence over the requirements of scholarly integrity.

In his response, Jan Grabowski acknowledged some of my “detailed critical remarks”. It is a pity he did not mention which ones specifically, as I could then have commented on them. Naturally, in Professor Grabowski’s belief: “their revision in no way changes the conclusions presented, and it certainly does not undermine in any way the value of the reviewed text” (“Response”, p. 8). Well, it does, actually, and in a fundamental way at that. Omitting important source information inconsistent with the constructed thesis or providing completely incorrect descriptions, and the reader encounters such cases in *Night without End*, are fundamental flaws in the academic craft. The same practices are observed in my current reply’s new examples discussed in detail. The methods used by Grabowski have severe implications for the historical narrative or presentation of people’s attitudes during the German occupation. However, one needs the integrity to notice them.

### A detailed response to the remarks of Professor Anna Zapalec

Professor Anna Zapalec’s opinion of the review has been expressed in the following words: “In general, the review in the section concerning Złoczów county is a series of wishes of the author about greater detail of the content. However, taking these wishes into account would not change anything in my conclusions, aside from adding a few more examples documenting them” (“Response”, p. 7), and “Don’t the examples of Jewish collaboration so meticulously cited by him, without

deeper analysis and understanding, prove his particular tendency of highlighting such phenomena and lack of understanding of the conditions of the occupation period?" (*ibid.*). The above sentences indicate that Professor Zapalec either has not read my text very carefully or is deliberately attempting, in this not a quite substantive manner, to avoid confrontation with the academic craft errors pointed out in her text. After all, I indicated in my review instances of lack of credible analysis of historical sources and the use of various 'tricks' concerning the archival material, which can be best seen in specific, seemingly minor examples "which would not change anything much".

In my approach, it is difficult to find any 'inclinations' to highlight examples of collaboration among the Jews without considering the conditions of the occupation. In fact, the very opposite is true. Throughout my review, I highlight the significant impact of the occupation reality and the system created by the Germans on individual and collective behaviours of the occupied populace without undermining the need for researching individual attitudes. After all, it was the German authorities enacting occupation 'law' who profoundly shaped the relations among different parts of Polish society, subjected to the occupation and racial segregation (Ukrainians, Poles, Jews). I have made it clear that the root cause of pathological attitudes among the Jews was the conditions administratively imposed on them. They had to live in this reality and, above all, try to survive despite being doomed to death by the Germans unwaveringly implementing their *Endlösung* policy. Then, there is no reason to resort to unjustified practices of 'trimming' or omitting essential sections when analysing the sources concerning the relevant research area and, in this way, concealing facts that do not fit in with the pre-established thesis. Numerous examples of such practices can be found throughout the book. Anna Zapalec's chapter is no exception here. However, she tries to disavow my conclusions, claiming I suggested "some kind of conspiracy among the co-authors" ("Response", p. 6). I have not formulated any such non-scholarly allegations, and there is no need to accuse me of such behaviour.

According to the author, in "Correcting the Picture", I call for "nuancing negative behaviour of the Polish 'blue' policemen or Ukrainian policemen by presenting similar Jewish behaviours and [...] generally to equate them" ("Response", p. 11). Further, Professor Zapalec imputes to me an opinion "that the negative image of

the ghetto communities is underrepresented and, therefore, a negative picture of Polish attitudes, in particular, is exaggerated and unfair” (“Response”, p. 12). I have made no such suggestion anywhere, although I must say that I can see no reason to distinguish between similarly vile behaviour based on the nationality of the perpetrators and, consequently, to divide them into those that can be described and those subject to self-censorship. This would be far from the standards of academic research. Still, I observe this process of shaping the image of ghetto communities in *Night without End*, which I’ve discussed in detail in “Correcting the Picture”. There is a sufficient number of testimonies – also Jewish ones – showing that, at that time, vile acts of members of one’s own community were assessed equally harshly. However, in the review, I pointed out quite clearly the problem of terror, fear, growing indifference to the fate of others, and a perfectly natural focus on one’s own survival. These phenomena are or should be evident to every World War II researcher. Recognising the importance of the occupation circumstances, I have pointed to the need to analyse pathological phenomena, not to equate anything, but to call them out what they were by name and how contemporaries perceived them. I also pointed to the noticeable cause-and-effect relationship between the mass impoverishment of people in the GG, resulting from the growing economic exploitation by the Germans and increasing demoralisation, common crime, and other amoral phenomena in the occupied areas. On the other hand, I agree with Professor Zapalec that “the problem of Jewish cooperation with the German occupying forces is a difficult field of research” (“Response”, p. 9), which is also visible, as highlighted by Zapalec, in the post-war judiciary in Israel. Cases of cooperation were investigated and punished, yet there was a large group of acquitted persons (*ibid.*).

Through the specific way the narrative is constructed, Professor Zapalec, in her description of Złoczów county, deprived the readers of the opportunity to understand the impact of external circumstances on individual human decisions. May the case of Lonek Zwerdling serve as an example yet again. Zapalec writes:

For example, when I discuss the construction of the Strassler family bunker from Złoczów [...] the reviewer expects me to, in this very place, include, above all, an extensive description of Lonek Zwerdling, hiding out along with the others, a trusted man of SS Obersturmführer Friedrich Warzok – commander of labour

camps in Kreis Zloczow, as well as the circumstances of the murder of one of the Jews in that bunker. (“Response”, p. 5)

I genuinely do not know what has made Professor Zapalec think that I demand the description of Zwerdling’s story “in this very place”. I wrote no such thing. In fact, I requested supplementing the book with Zwerdling’s character, as its omission would be of significant detriment to the description of the history of the Złoczów Jews during World War II. This issue has no connection at all with the place in which this figure should be introduced. As an intermediary between the Złoczów Judenrat and German authorities, he played a vital role in the lives of the local Jews. Many witnesses mentioned him. An image of his ‘career’, the path he chose (‘survival strategy’), would undoubtedly be a valuable supplement to the impact of war circumstances (the ongoing Holocaust) on individual human choices. Yet, as I mentioned in “Correcting the Picture”, Professor Zapalec removed any mention of this character, even modifying sources skilfully. All the more unconvincing are the words of the author when she tries to explain the reasons for the ‘absence’ of Lonek Zwerdling in the book:

The description was lacking not out of a desire to avoid the topic but because no person living in the bunker was explicitly described. Nor did I analyse in detail the living conditions of this group underground; however, I emphasised the fact of designing and constructing the shelter. This was important in presenting the critical factor in this survival strategy. It is another example of the reviewer’s criticism not accounting for the context of the narrative and the purpose of individual examples. (“Response”, p. 5)

And here again, Professor Zapalec is not true to the facts in her allegations. Supplementing the description of the bunker’s construction with a picture of life inside would be an excellent addition to this story. Finally, the description provided by Szymon Strassler proves that the bunker’s construction was only half the battle. The other half was based on the circumstances left out by Anna Zapalec: iron discipline and the issue of “the communalisation of food”.<sup>72</sup> The argument for failing

---

<sup>72</sup> AYV, O.3/253, Account by Szymon Strassler, MS, pp. 48–50.

to describe the individuals who found themselves in the Strasslers' bunker in detail becomes especially weak in juxtaposition with the reading of Efraim Halpern's account, describing the circumstances of getting to the craftsman's workshops in Złoczów. In the chapter by Professor Zapalec, the part about Zwerdling's role as an intermediary disappears from Halpern's account. Here is a significant quote:

[...] it was by no means easy to get to this camp. I was helped by Zwerdling, for \$700 or \$800, which my family from Lviv transferred via Mr Fink. ("Correcting the Picture", pp. 66–67)

However, in the book, one will read:

One of the witnesses said that to get to work in these workshops; one supposedly had to pay a hefty bribe, i.e. \$700–\$800. (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 705)

The source's author had expressly stated: who, to whom, and how much. Anna Zapalec, however, leaves all of this information out, replacing it with the word 'supposedly'. Seeing such methods, one naturally begins to wonder why they are used. Will it be "another example of reviewer's criticism not accounting for the context of the narrative and the purpose of individual examples' for Professor Zapalec" ("Response", p. 5)? It is clear that the context of the actions of people attempting to get to the workshops is explained only after quoting the complete account.

Another example of ignoring the impact of the occupation situation on human choices comes from the account of Meyer Perlmutter. The reader could learn from it about the specific contacts of some Jews with Friedrich Warzok, which, in turn, provided a chance for survival. It is precisely the essence of studying the fate of the Jews under German occupation. Behind each experience, there was some crucial detail, a stroke of luck, some good people, all that combined with one's activeness and overwhelming desire to survive. It is incredibly awkward to be reminding the author, who declares herself a specialist in 'micro-world' research, of these dependencies. Yet, Zapalec oversimplifies the picture in *Night without End*, for example, by presenting the story of Frojko N., who "failing to see the possibility of survival in the forest, returned with another Jew to the labour camp in

Żłoczów” (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 711). The researcher failed to explain the fundamental doubt in the book, namely how Frojko ‘returned’ to the camp after being away for a while? Here is the situation: first, nobody noticed his prolonged absence or escape with other Jews. Then, as if nothing had happened, nobody also noticed his return? Is Professor Zapalec saying that it was possible to leave and enter the camp at any time, just like that? Well, the truth is that Frojko, who “did not see the possibility of survival in the forest”, decided to return to the camp because commander Friedrich Warzok guaranteed his safety and all but begged for his return; Frojko immediately grabbed this opportunity. All these details can be found in the accounts that Professor Zapalec read yet chose to leave out their content. This is openly creating a non-existent reality. Depriving the story of these elements, at times so colourfully presented by witnesses, distorts their meaning and undermines the narrative’s veracity.

In her response to “Correcting the Picture”, Anna Zapalec criticises my reflections on the Żłoczów Judenrat, where I drew attention to what I believe to be an unfounded generalisation (“Correcting the Picture”, p. 61). Professor Zapalec, based on one of the accounts mentioned in the footnote, concluded: “The Żłoczów Judenrat was famous in the entire area as it truly took care of its people. The Ordnungsdienst was not as well respected” (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 681). She also mentioned other accounts in the footnote, the authors of which had a rather critical approach to the Judenrat’s activities. This produced an apparent contradiction. In her response, Zapalec listed some examples of positive actions but failed to specify the sources, and she accused me of relying on the opinions of “two individual witnesses” (“Response”, p. 7). So, let me repeat once again – in a footnote to the text in the book, Zapalec mentioned two negative and one positive opinion. The author is also wrong in her response. Indeed, if we consider the words of Maria Cukier, which she removed, we already have three negative opinions. I, therefore, suggested that it would be desirable to present this matter more extensively. The reader could then learn why critical voices had emerged. Nevertheless, Professor Zapalec still does not see the need for a broader discussion of the problem.

This issue is undeniably related to the account of Maria Cukier. Zapalec’s explanations concerning my allegation of ‘trimming’ down this account are not convincing. Let us recall: the author has left out the highly critical words of Cukier

concerning the chairman of the Złoczów Judenrat (simultaneously including her own positive opinion of this body). This account appears on p. 741 (*Night without End*, vol. 1), where Zapalec discusses the attitudes of Poles and Ukrainians toward the Holocaust, which leads her to the unauthorised insinuations that I had taken Cukier's account out of its broader context. She explains omitting Cukier's very critical words about the chairman of the Judenrat in the following words: "I want to point out that a section of Maria Cukier's account was quoted to document the positive attitudes of some members of the Polish intelligentsia from Złoczów toward helping Jews and the quote referred to the heart of the matter" ("Response", p. 7). Even assuming that the researcher truly wanted to emphasise the attitudes of the Polish intelligentsia, there was even less reason to remove Cukier's opinion of the chairman of the Judenrat – she should have been quoted *in extenso*. Indeed, the attitude of Polish hospital personnel in Złoczów, who, despite threatening penalties, helped a Jewish woman, would stand out even more against the chairman's behaviour. Moreover, there was nothing to prevent that opinion from being cited elsewhere and included in the author's own conclusions. But nothing of the sort took place.

On the topic of Cukier's account, Anna Zapalec attempts to demonstrate that I am placing unrealistic and unfounded demands: "An example is an allegation that the figure of Father Jan Pawlicki from Zborów, who helped Maria Cukier, was not presented" ("Response", p. 6). According to the author, "the reviewer may as well have requested the presentation of all priests who helped Jews from areas adjacent to Złoczów county, and perhaps even more distant" ("Response", p. 7). Reducing to absurdity the issue of the help given to Maria Cukier by Father Jan Pawlicki does not place Professor Zapalec in the best light. After all, she, no one else, titled one of the sub-chapters: "Escape beyond the county boundaries" ("Ucieczka poza granice powiatu"). As examples of successful escapes, she described more broadly the story of Helena Kitaj-Drobnerowa and Dr Bernard Gaerber with his wife and son, who were hiding in... Warsaw (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 737). The much closer Zborów, however, did not deserve mention. One more thing of fundamental importance must be mentioned here. Presenting Maria Cukier's account and leaving out the description of the help she had received from Father Pawlicki creates an impression that this woman had been deserted. However, this was not the case.



Once again, the book's narrative contradicts the actual events when confronted with the verbatim citation of sources.

Finally, using Maria Cukier's account and the story of the help given to her by Father Pawlicki, Professor Zapalec claims that I have not authored any micro-historical publications. It is awkward for me to argue with that. I can only say that the author simply has not become acquainted with any of them.<sup>73</sup>

Finally, in "Correcting the Picture", I did not call for "including even little-explained cases of Jewish collaboration [...] in the chapter" ("Response", p. 9). For example, Zapalec mentioned the escapes from craftsmen's workshops in Złoczów (*Night without End*, vol. 1, pp. 711–712). In her response, when writing about doubts concerning a specific person who had allegedly turned in the escapees, Zapalec creates the impression that I was making every possible effort to find negative attitudes among the Jews. And that is not the point at all. Moreover, it is impossible to consider this issue as little-explained. Indeed, the sources are inconsistent as to the names, but not the facts. The source of the leak was the Jews. The Germans forced some of them to cooperate, which could also have been a survival strategy. This, in turn, also led to the destruction of resistance attempts. After all, this issue was presented not to stigmatise anybody but to shed as much light as possible on the situation of the Jews in the workshops. Struggling to survive, faced with hunger and daily repression, they had to be wary of their fellow countrymen.

Regarding the craftsmen's workshops mentioned elsewhere, Professor Zapalec accuses me of having supplied the wrong number (12) of Jews murdered by the Germans during one of the escapes. This is another example of the author's determination in searching for errors in my review. When mentioning this event, I referred to an excerpt from the chapter "Złoczów County" ("Powiat złoczowski") (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 712), and that twelve people perished in connection with the escape of Eng. Hillel Suffran's group from the workshops in Złoczów.

---

<sup>73</sup> Here are some examples of micro-historical studies by me: T. Domański, "Pozaetatowa placówka policji niemieckiej w Bodzentynie w okresie II wojny światowej", in *Z dziejów Bodzentyna w okresie II wojny światowej. W 70. rocznicę pacyfikacji 1943–2013*, ed. by L. Michalska-Bracha, M. Przeniosło, and M. Jedynak (Kielce, 2013), pp. 159–180; *idem*, "Miejsca masowych straceń na Kielecczyźnie na przykładzie Nowej Słupi i Świętej Katarzyny", *Polska pod Okupacją* 2 (2016), pp. 55–77; *idem*, "Akcja policji niemieckiej w Koniecznie 26 sierpnia 1943 r.", *Świętokrzyskie Studia Archiwalno-Historyczne* 3 (2014), pp. 265–279.

A few quotes will be helpful to explain better the mechanism of creating false allegations. The chapter's relevant section reads as follows:

Unfortunately, they were caught and shot dead by the Ukrainian police. Twelve people died then, reportedly. However, this version of events has not been confirmed by other sources. According to the testimony of an eyewitness, Benjamin Hochberg, five engineers from this conspiracy group were shot dead 'on the market square'; he himself was 40 m away from the place of execution; one more person was shot along with them. (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 712)

In "Correcting the Picture", I wrote as follows:

Finally, we will not learn who should be blamed for the failed escape of the second group from Złoczów. The author stated only that: "in May 1943 they were betrayed and arrested". Subsequently, 12 of them perished, murdered by the Germans (p. 712). ("Correcting the Picture", p. 67)

In the relevant section of the book, Zapalec only wrote that she had not found any confirmation about the twelve murdered persons in other sources. In contrast, an eyewitness reportedly had seen the murder of six people (five engineers and one other person). From what she writes, it is unclear which version Zapalec considers correct. One can even assume that she sees them both as equally probable. It may have been this way or that way. The whole topic in "Correcting the Picture" was not dedicated to deliberations on the number of murdered Jews but to the issue of a possible betrayal. However, seeing her chance to attack the reviewer, it did not prevent her from writing:

The reviewer also reported that 12 people had been shot during the execution, but this figure does not seem correct to me (the reviewer has misread the relevant passage) because in this case, the number given by Benjamin Hochberg is more certain, as he was an eyewitness to the execution and mentioned six victims [...]. This approach is another occasion for evaluating the reviewer's scholarly craftsmanship and research attitude in the footnote to this text. (In

response, I listed all the sources dealing with the preparations for this escape and execution of Jewish engineers, which I had found and which the reviewer used only to a limited degree. (“Response”, p. 10)

In response to the review, Professor Zapalec writes that Hochberg’s version seems ‘more credible’ to her because this allowed Zapalec to criticise the reviewer for his alleged lack of scholarly craftsmanship.

Anna Zapalec (as well as other authors) also accuses me of inaccurately reading the chapter and drawing false and unfounded conclusions. As an example, she mentions Kripo’s activities and the involvement of Poles in this formation. As described in *Night without End*, the Kripo’s outpost in Złoczów was located at 7 Wały Street and had 20 police officers. In the chapter entitled “Złoczów County” (“Powiat złoczowski”), the author lists several operations involving the Złoczów Kripo but without providing any information about the individual responsibilities of non-German functionaries. In one case (p. 721), she mentions the likely denunciation of an unknown Jewish woman to the Germans by a Polish Kripo member. Again, I must say that my aim is not to defend anyone involved in criminal activities. My opinion referred to a type of summary included further in the text, which I believe is illogical. The author stated there:

A mainly negative role was also played by policemen (including Polish ones) serving in the Złoczów Criminal Police, some of whom probably had signed the Volkliste. [...] Unfortunately, during the preliminary survey, apart from the minutes of interrogations from post-war investigations, I did not find any other detailed administrative documentation from the Złoczów Kripo, which would shed some light on this issue. (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 743)

She went on to state that her findings were based on an analogy with other occupied Polish lands (*ibid.*). In response to the review, proving her reasons, she reiterated the information acquired from one of the Home Army soldiers who claimed that 90 per cent of the outpost staff were Poles, and it was called the Polish Police (“Response”, p. 11). It takes a simple calculation to find out that there must have been eighteen Polish Kripo policemen (90 per cent of 20) and only two

Germans. According to other sources, there were more than two Germans (not to mention that they constituted the command),<sup>74</sup> and there were also Ukrainians and Volksdeutsche (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 667). Herman Grünseid claimed that the criminal police consisted mainly of Volksdeutsche.<sup>75</sup>

Still on the issue of nationality, I do not understand the sense in indicating and reminding me that Otto Zigmund was of Austrian origin (“Response”, p. 11). The events should be analysed in the context of the times when they occurred. After the war, the Austrian origin was relevant for the prosecution of war criminals (e.g. to determine the court competent for the suspect’s place of residence). So, let us only recall here that, following the Anschluss, Austrians automatically became Reichsdeutsche – Germans from the Reich. Moreover, the place of origin of a Reichsdeutsche, be it Austria (Ostmark in Nazi terminology) or any other place, was of no importance. During the occupation, no one referred to the perpetrators of crimes from the Reich using any term other than simply ‘Germans’. I am not even going to mention Hitler himself.

In her response, Zapalec attempts to suggest that I do not discern the analysis of the attitudes of Ukrainians or Belarusians in *Night without End* and, therefore, I likely did not read the book very carefully. Well, I did read it carefully. I wrote that we would not find much information about Belarusians or Ukrainians in the study due to the area of interest defined by the authors. My conclusion in the review concerned a comprehensive look at the selection of research areas in *Night without End* (I wrote about this in the initial part), as well as specific ‘critical’ issues defined in the “Foreword” (“Wstęp”), where the research on the participation of Poles in the Holocaust is mentioned. Ukrainians and Belarusians are added in parentheses (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 25). Reading the following part of the “Foreword” proves that this is no accident. Not once (!), not even in the sub-chapter devoted to “perpetrators and their helpers” (*Night without End*, vol. 1, pp. 24–27), did the editors of the volume consider it appropriate to mention the Ukrainian Auxiliary Police (Ukrainische Hilfspolizei). However, they especially highlighted the role of

---

<sup>74</sup> In the light of the occupation realities, Zigmund’s testimony argued that ‘Kripo officials’ had a Polish commander and that his role boiled down to passing on orders, which is an apparent attempt at avoiding responsibility. See AYV, O.5/61, Testimony of Otto Zigmund, p. 60.

<sup>75</sup> AYV, O.5/61, Testimony of Herman Grünseid, [n.p.], 2 June [?], p. 24.

‘Polish formations’, such as the Polnische Polizei or Volunteer Fire Brigades, and Polish civilians in the Holocaust. When sketching their picture, the editors could also have mentioned the ethnic composition of factory or camp guard services and the role of the Ukrainian minority. I will not dwell on the issue of calling Belarusian guards Poles and omitting in the research analysis of the eastern part of Bielsk ‘County’ by Professor Engelking.

### A detailed response to the remarks of Professor Dariusz Libionka

I agree with Professor Dariusz Libionka that it is customary for ‘academic’ reviews to present the author’s achievements and discuss the structure or assumptions of peer-reviewed work. I have already discussed the latter two elements. Perhaps not as thoroughly as the author would have liked, but technical considerations have been decisive here. A detailed discussion of the nine chapters would make my already extensive review article even longer. That is why I focused primarily on the use of sources.

Dariusz Libionka’s response to “Correcting the Picture” could be summarised in a laconic statement: Domański does not note the factually consistent description of the role and activities of the Polnische Polizei, the Baudienst, as well as the JOD and the Judenrat. Thus, any comments he has made, which are generally “of little importance”, serve to “ridicule” the researcher and demonstrate his “treachery” and “methods” in “covering up the role of the Germans” in the Holocaust. Moreover, an inherent feature of Professor Libionka’s response is personal insinuations: that I am “prejudiced” against him, my writing is emotional, I am steered by “inquisitorial impulses” or “drastically inquisitorial impulses”. “In Domański’s world – Libionka writes – there are no mistakes, errors or a lack of diligence. A perfidious intention must be present in every act and omission”. For example, Libionka cited my criticism of his use of Meier Goldstein’s account (in his summary description, he ‘reduced’ the Germans’ role to photographing some Poles’ anti-Jewish behaviours) or the intentional use of Father Dobiecki’s account. It is difficult to argue with non-scholarly jibes and misinterpretations.

In response to general remarks of “Correcting the Picture”, Dariusz Libionka has two essential allegations against me. He claims that my review lacked significant fact-based additions, and that I did not refer to any of his theses, nor do I argue

with his estimates and figures (“Response”, pp. 2–3). The first of the above allegations demonstrates a misunderstanding of my review’s assumptions and objectives laid out in the preliminary part of “Correcting the Picture”. The *Night without End* has been presented as a well-documented scholarly work, being the effect of many years of research. This, almost automatically, provokes the desire to analyse the reference database (precisely the one indicated by the authors) and the way it was used. Subsequently, it shares one’s observations with *Night without End* readers. The verification results – described on 70 pages of print – proved astounding to me. Simultaneously, in some sections of “Correcting the Picture”, particularly regarding the presentation of the Righteous Among the Nations or Jüdischer Ordnungsdienst, I supplemented the picture painted by Libionka, providing the information omitted by him, which significantly modified his conclusions and interpretations. Later in this text, I will present several new additions to the factual layer of the chapter about ‘Miechów county’. These relate, among other things, to the displacement of the Jewish population in 1942 and the local community’s attitudes towards this event.

In light of the content of “Correcting the Picture”, the second allegation about the lack of polemics with Libionka’s theses and estimates (“Response”, p. 2) is unfounded and illogical. In fact, it was impossible to comment on any calculations and statistical data in his part of *Night without End* because he had not provided a source basis for these statistics, following the footsteps of the editors and co-authors. Any discussion is, thus, impossible. Finally, Libionka’s argument that I did not polemicize with any of his theses is not valid. One of the main theses from *Night without End*, with which I argue from almost the first to the last page of “Correcting the Picture”, refers to the presentation of the Polnische Polizei as “the Polish Police force in the GG”, rather than a German formation composed of Poles. Similarly, the Volunteer Fire Brigade or the Baudienst have been presented without considering the realities of the occupation. This is precisely how Libionka described them. It seems that my arguments, at least partially, convinced Professor Libionka because, in response to “Correcting the Picture”, he wrote:

But, there is no need to repeat the obvious constantly in a scholarly text, and the one published in a collective volume. After all, no one of sound mind and with a basic

knowledge of the occupation's realities will try to prove the thesis about the independence of the Polish Police in any operations in which it was involved (which does not preclude independent actions undertaken by individual policemen). [...] The same is true for the Baudienst. [...] 'Individual operations were led by the Gestapo and Kripo officers and commanders of local gendarmerie posts. They had dozens of gendarmes under their command, at least a dozen members of the Sonderdienst, about three hundred blue policemen, and several hundred Junaks'. I am presenting here the implementation of the scenario repeated throughout the GG. I do not conceal the participation of the Germans; on the contrary, I devote much space to the officer in charge of the displacement from the local Security Police, Martin F. Beyerlein, and individual gendarmes. ("Response", pp. 4 and 5)

Of course, I fully agree with Professor Libionka that there is no need to keep reminding about subordination to the Germans. On the other hand, one can and even must keep this in mind when discussing events and guiding the reader through the intricacies of wartime reality. The Baudienst is first mentioned in the "Foreword" on p. 23, in the following sentence: "Most commonly [reference to displacement operations in 1942 – T.D.] – Miechów county will serve as an example here – the Germans used a combination of different extermination tactics, basing on – primarily due to their own slim police force – the Polish blue police, units of the Volunteer Fire Brigade and Junaks from the Construction Service (the Baudienst) accommodated in local barracks" (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 23). Further on in the "Foreword", the editors do not even dedicate a word to explain the origins of these formations. In the case of the Baudienst, they failed to inform that this was a formation based on forced slave labour created by the Germans, where service was compulsory, and evasion was sometimes even punished with death. Let's say the editors of the volume did not consider it worthwhile to provide at least basic information on the status of the Baudienst in the structures of the occupying forces. In that case, it should be done by the author who so broadly describes the participation of Junaks in anti-Jewish operations. However, he did not make any substantial introductory reference. And I do not mean writing the history of the Baudienst, as Libionka suggests, but acknowledging, even in one sentence, the degree of subordination to the German occupational authorities. My assessment

of the presentation of the Polnische Polizei is similar. I have discussed this extensively in “Correcting the Picture”. No reflection accompanies the narrative of the authors and editors on the organisation of the Polnische Polizei or the scope of responsibilities of its functionaries, which is all the more surprising as the authors mention the role of the PP in the Holocaust on practically every page of the book.

On the other hand, the authors and editors constantly suggest the allegedly Polish character of this formation. It is downright incomprehensible to comment extensively on the operations of a formation without providing the reader with basic knowledge about the formation itself. I refuse to even comment on Professor Libionka’s argument about using Wikipedia to find the basic information about the Polnische Polizei. It is precisely the role of a scholarly researcher to present the issue so that the reader does not have to browse the Internet and wonder what the author actually meant. Furthermore, Libionka still appears to be unaware of this problem.

Continuing the reflections on the operations of the Baudienst, Libionka is surprised that I allegedly had failed to notice him mentioning the German units (and specific officers) present on-site when discussing the displacement of the Jews from Działoszyce. Likely to seem more convincing, Libionka has meticulously re-mentioned German units in his polemic. “What is more – he wrote – on that day, 3 September 1942, all the most important German officers and officials from local structures and Cracow were present in Działoszyce” (“Response”, p. 5). This proves the obvious: “The Junaks were not an independent force, not subordinated to anybody. How could this escape Domański’s notice?” (“Response”, p. 5). Comforting is Libionka’s recognition of (albeit belated) and emphasis on the Germans’ leadership role found in his response. I fully agree that “no one of sound mind and with a basic knowledge of occupation realities will try to prove the thesis about the independence of the Polish Police in any operations in which it was involved” (“Response”, p. 4). Except that we will find no such words or suggestions in his text, while the narrative sometimes moves in the opposite direction – and that is what my allegations pertained to. An example is his description of the liquidation of the Działoszyce ghetto (*Night without End*, vol. 2, pp. 78–79).<sup>76</sup> Libionka did,

---

<sup>76</sup> ‘On 2 September, in the evening, a “liquidation team” arrived by a narrow-gauge railway. Chaim Iczhak Wolgelernter speaks of 200 Germans and 300 Junaks. According to a Polish witness, this team consisted of several Gestapo members, “several German gendarmes”, as well as blue policemen and



indeed, mention the Germans present at the scene as the executions' perpetrators when discussing the events. However, this obvious fact does not reflect the historical narration he gave in the book. Every reader of *Night without End* will be able to see that what the author currently states does not correspond with the content of his text. I partially verified this description in "Correcting the Picture". However, a reminder of this seems necessary to understand my arguments. So, what picture of the displacement of Jews from Działoszyce does the reader of Libionka's chapter see? In the presented narrative, formations composed of Poles act almost autonomously.

We see the expulsion of Jews. We do not know who is doing it. This is quite clearly said by an eyewitness, Chaim Icchak Wolgelernter, but Libionka just happened to leave out this section of his account. Then horse-drawn wagons [*podwody*] are mentioned. We do not know who ordered them to come here or who the wagon drivers [*podwodziarze*] were. We will not learn that the Polish population could even be punished by death for failure to follow such orders or that the occupation rules strictly governed the obligation to provide *podwody*. There are no Germans in the description of the displacement operation. Perhaps they are standing somewhere on the side, and once they appear in this description, it is to protect the Jews from the 'Polish police'. Professor Libionka based these sections on the memories of the 'displaced' Jews. Without denying the Holocaust victims their right to an individual assessment of events and their own perception of the

---

Junaks. The mayor was ordered to hang out notices "stating where Jews are to gather and what they can take with them – as well issuing a warning to Poles not to touch anything as they would face the death penalty". With no sense of shame, farmers arrived in town and bought out property for next to nothing. The Junaks were brought in from Słomniki. It was the same group, equipped with shovels and pickaxes. On the morning of 3 September, they began driving the Jews out of their apartments and catching them on the streets. Rabbi Mordka, who could not walk, was shot down, along with Icek Staszewski and many others. A member of the Judenrat testified after the war that "the operation was carried out by the Polish Police rather than the Germans. They shot at Jews, who were led to the narrow-gauge railway". Allegedly, "a German asked one policeman not to shoot". There was no counting on the neighbours: "Even though we left them [the Poles] our entire property for safekeeping, they did not want to know us. Why would they save us? What do they care if we die? After all, the property in their hands will remain with them anyway", reported Wolgelernter. The only way to survive was by escaping to the countryside. Horse-drawn wagons [*podwody*] were provided. "We thought", Meyer Zonnenfeld recalled, "that they would take us to the train station. However, they drove us directly to the Jewish cemetery, to the area where dogcatchers shot dogs and sick, old horses. It turned out that the Junaks had already prepared three giant pits overnight". The execution thus began' (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 78).

tragedy they experienced, it is difficult to resist the impression that putting such quotations without appropriate commentary and clarification may lead to the conclusion that it was the 'Polish Police' who were the main driving force here. Libionka failed to inform the reader that various German forces – the gendarmerie, Gestapo, and others had complete control over what was happening. Moreover, finally, from the leftover section of Wolgelerntner's description, we learn that the Poles cannot be counted on. They took Jewish property, and the Junaks dug the holes overnight. We will not know that the Junaks did so at the behest of the Germans, and Wolgelernter wrote not only about the negative attitudes of Poles but also a great deal about the positive behaviour and complexity of the situation. And that is what Libionka failed to mention.

Continuing the subject of the Baudienst and its operations, I wish to inform that my allegation from page 14 of the review concerns how the interrogation protocol of witness Roman Kowalski (Salomon Kołatacz) was used.<sup>77</sup> I do not intend to prove that there were no amoral individuals among the Junaks, overzealous individuals, or those who, to varying degrees, wished to please the Germans. It would be implausible for there to be no such people, taking into account the number of those forced to barracks and to participate in the operations. In that part of "Correcting the Picture", I referred in detail to the events and role that Franciszek Kitowski, at the time a Junak from the Baudienst, reportedly played in the 'displacement' of Jews from Skała. Dariusz Libionka claims not to have cited in his chapter Roman Kowalski's (Salomon Abram Kołatacz's) claims that Kitowski had organised the dislocation operation on his own accord. The problem, however, lies in the way Kołatacz's testimonies were used. And a certain clarification is due here. The previously mentioned Kowalski testimonies concerned, in their entirety, the role Kitowski had played in the displacement of Jews and was one great accusation against this man. Kowalski reported that Kitowski had not only incited the Junaks to anti-Jewish actions but even arrived in Skała in 1941 as commander of this group.<sup>78</sup> Kowalski's

---

<sup>77</sup> These are testimonies given in the investigation. Libionka wrongly stated that they had been submitted at the main hearing, as indicated in fn. 202.

<sup>78</sup> Archives of the Institute of National Remembrance Branch in Cracow (hereinafter: AIPN Kr), District Court in Cracow (hereinafter: SOKr), 502/1318, Minutes of the interrogation of witness Roman Kowalski [Salomon Kołatacz], Cracow, 5 March 1945, p. 5.

testimonies were subsequently acknowledged by the court to be completely unreliable. In the chapter “Miechów County” (“Powiat miechowski”) Libionka linked the section of the testimonies to the figure of a German named Matkaj and, on their basis, constructed a description of the activities of the Junaks:

The Baudienst division counted ca 150 Junaks under the command of a German named Matkaj. The Night before the dislocation – as Judenrat worker Salomon Abram Kołatacz testified – ‘incited, they ran into houses, dragged out Jews and took them, as well as those found on the street, to the barracks of the Baudienst’. One of their victims was Rabbi Lejb Seidmann and his family. He was killed by Matkaj. (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 74)

The rabbi becomes a victim of the Junaks, which is obvious to any reader when put this way. Is the above description true to the facts when the investigation refers to the forced herding of Jews selected by the Germans? Furthermore, who had incited the Junaks: Kitowski – as Kołatacz testified – or perhaps their German commanders? I also see an analogy here to the all too frequent occupation situations. During a gendarmerie’s raid, a Polish village head is forced to point to a farm of another Pole, where the Germans subsequently make arrests or commit murders. In such a situation, is he complicit in the death of these people? Finally, had Libionka fully recognised the need to consider the degree of subordination of the Junaks from the Baudienst to German authorities, would he have called (even if in quotation marks) the forced participation in the displacement of Jews as a ‘baptism of fire’? (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 75).

Moving on to other detailed remarks, I will begin with an observation I made while reading the chapter “Miechów County” (“Powiat miechowski”). One may think that the author of this part of *Night without End* has a problem with being *sine ira et studio* [“without anger and passion”]. Again, it is not my aim to justify (as the authors of *Night without End* repeatedly impute) the crimes committed by anyone against Jews but to highlight the importance of thorough research analysis and examination of the events from the cause-and-effect perspective. The sub-chapter entitled “‘Hunting for Jews’ – local perpetrators and their victims” (“Polowanie na Żydów’ – lokalni sprawcy i ich ofiary”) (in the section titled: “The blue police

and the Jagdkommando” (“Policja granatowa i Jagdkommando”), Libionka begins with the following observation:

The blue police, as has already been mentioned, played a significant role in carrying out both displacement actions. For Jews seeking refuge, a dense network of outposts posed a severe threat from the outset. On 1 December 1942, thirty officers from different posts were promoted, which **must have had** something to do with ‘merit’ in anti-Jewish operations [emphasis mine – T.D.]. (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 145)

The ease with which such theses as this are stated here is astonishing. According to the proposed interpretation, PP’s active involvement in displacement operations is allegedly confirmed by thirty promotions to higher ranks from the hands of the Germans. It would seem that a better argument is hard to find. However, Libionka himself wrote, 100 pages earlier, that from April 1942 to March 1943, three officers and 350 policemen served at the PP in Miechów county (!) (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 43). Taking Libionka’s findings as an attempt at some sort of quantitative analysis, it would seem that fewer than ten (precisely 8.5) per cent were promoted. There are no premises for specifically considering this as proof of merit during the displacement operation. The document constituting the basis for these promotions does not contain a word of justification. There is just a list of who was promoted and where.<sup>79</sup> The link between the rise and policemen’s attitudes during the displacement of Jews is Libionka’s own, somewhat arbitrary, interpretation. It might well have been related to completing other tasks. This we do not know. Referring to 30 PP policemen ‘merited for’ displacement operations does not fit with the image built on the previous pages. In terms of figures, it is

---

<sup>79</sup> Archiwum Narodowe w Krakowie [National Archives in Cracow; hereinafter: AN Kr], PPPNB, 9, Order no. 6, Miechów, 9 January 1943, p. 13. It is also worth supplementing Libionka’s record with the information that the order signed by Commander Nowak only notified about the promotions of policemen because these, naturally, were granted in the orders of the gendarmerie commander for the Cracow District. Similarly, in other districts of the GG, e.g., in the Radom district, no substantiation was provided in the promotion orders, only the list of names with the indication of the current and new (after promotion) rank. See: AIPN, 3060/26, list of non-German policemen promoted to new ranks, Radom, 9 December 1943, pp. 141–142.

approaching Adam Hempel's slightly obsolete thesis that around ten per cent of the blue police were lackeys to the Germans.<sup>80</sup> Moreover, the ten per cent makes the researcher wonder about the attitude and behaviour of the remaining 90 per cent of policemen from Miechów county.

Commenting on the PP officers' involvement in displacement operations, Dariusz Libionka used another example attesting to the highly negative image of this formation. There is no reason to ignore in scholarly work the negative examples of actions of such or other police formations if they have taken place. There is no reason to advance clear-cut theses in an ambiguous situation. Professor Libionka writes: "During the period of the liquidation operation, over a dozen police officers were punished for various reasons, and several were dismissed from service. However, these punishments had nothing to do with the Jewish context" (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 145).<sup>81</sup> The author's words cannot be interpreted differently than as a belief in the lack of any form of resistance on the part of the PP policemen against participation in anti-Jewish operations. But is it an indisputable conclusion? In light of the materials that Libionka likely knew and failed to use in *Night without End*, there was some boycott of the German orders or a relatively passive service among the blue police officers from Kreishauptmannschaft Miechow. Importantly, it relates directly to the analysed period. In the order of 16 February 1943 by the commander of the PP in Kreis Miechow, Lt Władysław Szaciłło, one can read:

The Kommandeur [Commander] of the Order Police [*Policja Porządkowa*] pointed out on the occasion of handing over Mannlicher 88/90 rifles that many of them are damaged, in both their wooden and steel parts, and he recommended imposing severe consequences which, I believe, will not be pleasant for the policeman returning a given rifle. Since the arming of Polish policemen with rifles in this county has not been 100 per cent completed, as two or three men were sharing one rifle, it was difficult to establish the culprit for the improper handling

---

<sup>80</sup> A. Hempel, "Policja granatowa" w Generalnej Guberni", *Wiadomości Historyczne* 6 (1987), p. 495.

<sup>81</sup> They mainly concerned disciplinary and moral offences. Nevertheless, here, too, it is necessary to examine whether or not they were a deliberate action, as indicated by the examples from the Radom district – simulation of alcoholism, disease, etc.

of the weapon. Therefore, the Commanders of the Outposts and Groups will bear the consequences of the improper supervision of the entrusted weapons. To avoid similar situations in the future, I recommend the Outpost Commanders assign each rifle to an individual policeman who would be responsible for its condition and maintenance. The name of the relevant policeman is to be indicated on the weapon's belt, next to the rifle number. Subsequently, it is necessary to assign the rifle to other policemen who will use it and be equally responsible for its condition. The Group Commanders will check the condition of the weapons entrusted to the Outposts and ensure due allocation to policemen, i.e. 1st-degree and 2nd-degree responsibility. The same applies to the maintenance and conservation of ammunition. I would like to point out that those police officers who carry a rifle fixed to their frames must have special hooks padded with leather or thick cloth to protect them against abrasion or damage. Any damage to the weapon will be subject to meticulous investigation.<sup>82</sup>

A picture emerges from the above order of the formation of poor discipline and considerable shortage in armament, with 'many rifles' carrying signs of damage.

I am glad that Libionka will "take a look" at the omitted sections of Wolgelerner's diaries containing descriptions of the 'displacement' of Jews from Działoszyce, which omission he called "unfortunate". At the same time, I was intrigued by the author's reference in this part of his response to the then "excellently informed" blue policeman from Wolbrom, Michał Subocz, whom the author calls one of the "key witnesses". It is a shame that Professor Libionka, referring the reader to Wikipedia to find information on the PP's origins, did not quote Subocz's first sentence from the interrogation protocol of 23 June 1969: "In February 1940, as a member of the Polish underground organisation and at its command, I joined the service of the then Polish police [...]"<sup>83</sup> Subocz was, therefore, not a random person at the Wolbrom outpost. He conducted situational reconnaissance for the resistance movement and, as he emphasised, destroyed all handwritten notes. I know of such

---

<sup>82</sup> AN Kr, PPPNB, 9, Order no. 2 of the District Commander of the PP in Miechów, Miechów, 6 February 1943, p. 17v.

<sup>83</sup> Archiwum Ośrodka Karta (Archives of KARTA Centres, hereinafter: AOK), Ds. 24/68, vol. 3, Minutes of the interrogation of witness Michał Subocz, Cracow, 23 June 1969, p. 61.

cases from Jędrzejów county. There have been cases of Home Army soldiers joining the ranks of the *Polnische Polizei* and working undercover reported in detail on criminal acts committed against Jews by other members of the same formation.<sup>84</sup>

Let us again return to Subocz and the details he provided on the Wolbrom 'displacement', which, strangely enough, are nowhere in Libionka's description. It is pretty similar to the one concerning the Działoszyce 'displacement', analysed earlier. Libionka writes: "On 5 September, Jews began to appear on the market square from the early hours of the morning. According to some testimonies, an SS unit arrived at the scene. The commander reportedly 'explained' that the Jews were to go to the meadows near the train station, from where they would be taken to work. In the testimony of the well-informed Subocz, however, there is no mention of this. Allegedly, there were only six foreign gendarmes (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 82). At this point, Libionka used Subocz's testimony submitted in the investigation concerning the former District Commission for the Investigation of Nazi Crimes (*Okręgowa Komisja Badań Zbrodni Hitlerowskich* – OKBZH) in Cracow. The same witness presented a completely different account to the Jewish Historical Institute (*Żydowski Instytut Historyczny* – ŻIH): "There were no onlookers in the market square. Full of Gestapo officers, German gendarmerie, Special Service (*Sonderdienst*), several Polish policemen and the Jewish police"<sup>85</sup> These descriptions are mutually exclusive. Therefore, they should be validated, or, at the least, the existing source differences should be indicated. Subocz's recollections of the event could, at this point, become an important contribution to the reflections on the degree of terrorization and cynical engagement by the Germans of surviving Jews to participate in dislocation operations if only Libionka were willing to take them into account. Subocz pointed to the high level of activity of JOD members: "Jews are gathering from all over the city. The market square slowly fills up. The Jewish police, supervised by so many Masters, are rushing left and right, making up columns of Jews arriving from different streets. Each row is made up of ten

---

<sup>84</sup> T. Domański, "Proces z dekretu sierpniowego policjantów granatowych z Wodzisławia oskarżonych o popełnienie zbrodni na Żydach", *Polish-Jewish Studies* 1 (2020), pp. 77–105 (English version: "The trial of the *Polnische Polizei* functionaries from Wodzisław accused of crimes against Jews (held according to the regulations of the 31 August 1944 decree)", *Polish-Jewish Studies* 1 (2020), pp. 500–529).

<sup>85</sup> AŻIH, 302/211, Wolbrom. The fate of the Jews described by the Polish Catholic Michał Subocz, p. 22.

people”.<sup>86</sup> Elsewhere, he added: “The Jewish policemen shouted out to everyone and each person separately that they were to leave Wolbrom forever the following day”.<sup>87</sup> Subocz also made critical remarks about the search for Jews, trying to save their own lives at all costs. He described one of the stages of extermination as follows: “Time is pressing, they have to hurry because the wagons are constantly bringing in more ill ones, meticulously searched out by the SS and the Jewish Police with the assistance of firemen”.<sup>88</sup> The report mentions that the list of sick Jews known to the JOD was passed on to the Germans, who did not check each home but immediately directed wagons to the indicated address.<sup>89</sup> Yet, in Libionka’s description (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 82), we will not find a word on these essential details depicting the situation’s horror.

The analysis of Subocz’s memoirs is another example of Professor Libionka’s selective approach to the source material. Two things can be seen here. In his response to “Correcting the Picture”, Libionka accuses me of not noticing the description, quoted after Subocz, of local Polish people’s looting of Jewish property in Wolbrom. Naturally, I do not do anything of the sort. The review only analysed how events are described, demonstrating far-reaching simplifications or disproportionate quantifiers. Libionka states that “The Germans struggled to control the situation” (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 87) with the Poles’ looting of Jewish property. In “Correcting the Picture” (p. 21), I pointed out that such a presentation of the problem would be no surprise in a German propaganda presentation. After all, they were ‘protecting’ the property of the Reich. Libionka himself is aware of this (quoting Sałabun presenting an attitude quite common at that time of Poles to former Jewish property: “It is better if the majority remains in the hands of the town residents, the poorer the enemy, the richer the subjugated nation” (*ibid.*, p. 87), nevertheless, in his narrative, Poles are the looters while the Germans only keep order (a similar opinion *ibid.*, pp. 75–76).

The other disputed issue concerned the attitude of the Wolbrom Judenrat members towards the dislocation operation. In “Correcting the Picture”, I pointed to Henryk Herstein’s account. When quoting Herstein, Libionka did so to enable

---

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.



him to avoid writing that it was the Judenrat that ordered the Jews to gather in the square, thus becoming an involuntary participant in the events directed by the Germans. Responding to this allegation, Libionka downplayed the problem and stated: "I do not know what to think about this, since this sentence, on the one hand, demonstrates the determination in seeking faults, whilst on the other, it is reinventing the wheel. After all, the role of the Judenrats was precisely to carry out German orders" ("Response", p. 11). If, therefore, the role of the Judenrats was to carry out German orders, what is the point of removing from the quoted sources sections confirming this phenomenon?

Libionka equally dismissively notes the problem I have raised on interpreting Berk Finkelstein's 'complaint' of the Judenrat in Miechów. It is a shame that the author of "Miechów County" ("Powiat miechowski") did not directly write in the book the words directed at me in his response to my review. They say a lot about the reality of the time and the human dramas in the conditions created by the German authorities: "The actions of the Miechów Judenrat did not differ from others. And human reactions, especially of those whose relatives were taken, were unequivocal: they felt betrayed and outraged" ("Response", p. 11). Finkelstein was even more emphatic when stating that the Miechów Judenrat members wanted to primarily save themselves by sacrificing other Jews. And that was precisely the point of the complaint and his perception of reality. Moreover, this analysis was missing on the pages of "Miechów County" ("Powiat miechowski").

This selective description, compatible with the "regime of an extremely one-sided presentation of events" I pointed out in *Night without End*, can be observed in other examples of the tragic episodes of Jewish displacements in 1942. One section of "Miechów County" ("Powiat miechowski") concerned the deportation of Jews from Słomniki in early June 1942. The 'Reinhardt' Operation preceded this dislocation in the area. First, the gendarmes and blue police officers gathered Jews and imprisoned them in the local synagogue and school for two days. Subsequently, those 'unfit' to work were sent to the death camp in Bełżec. While still in Słomniki, "The victims – wrote Libionka – got nothing to eat or drink. Eleven people were killed" (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 65).

The only source for the description of the deportation from Słomniki here is Stanisław Krupa's account. Suppose Libionka had additional information concern-

ing the Jews locked up in the school or synagogue. In that case, he should not have concealed these details from the reader but presented them and commented on them. He did not do this. In the book, where one of its principal theses refers to the Polish community's attitudes (the attitude of Poles as a condition for the survival of the Holocaust), this omission is grave negligence. Nevertheless, Krupa's account contains a substantial section about the efforts undertaken by local Poles to supply the Jews with food and drinks. Krupa wrote as follows:

Here I must comment, Krupa wrote – not without surprise – on the local population's behaviour. We knew some people in Słomniki who were filled with hatred for Jews during the interwar period. Today, seeing the misery of the Jews, these people rushed to their aid. It was not easy to help because the blue police did not even allow them to approach the buildings. Poles and, in particular, the residents of Słomniki are quite cunning; therefore, a large amount of food and drink reached the poor wretches. Whoever could, they organised some aid for the Jews. The school was accessed through the attic from the side of the Bekczyński's garden, where there were no blue police guards, while to the synagogue – through the cellar.<sup>90</sup>

The very fact that these efforts were made seems indisputable and unmistakable, and leads to the obvious conclusion that the narrative created by Libionka should be nuanced.

Krupa's account could also be a fundamental argument describing the Poles' attitudes towards Jews during the concentration in Słomniki in late August and early September 1942. The Germans created a camp-like interim place there for the Jews. Krupa wrote over three manuscript pages about the attempts to undertake organised assistance operations by the Poles (water, food; Krupa devoted much space, particularly to the issue of supplying water), about the activities of the local fire brigade, about raising money in consultation with representatives of the Judenrat, and generally about wheedling the Germans in charge of the operation into permitting any type of help. Especially memorable is the conversation with

---

<sup>90</sup> AŻIH, 301/6276, S. Krupa: *Kreis Miechow ist judenrein*, TS, April 1966, pp. 2–3.

a female doctor who “worked at the camp overnight”, reported by Krupa. The doctor’s words provide but a glimpse at the real drama inside the ‘camp’ for those several days. “She told me – Krupa reported – that there were eight normal births, six premature births, and a dozen or so miscarriages in the camp that night. Four women died within hours of giving birth. Three babies also died.”<sup>91</sup> There is no reason not to believe Krupa. This post-war mayor of Słomniki hides nothing in his account comprising over a dozen or so pages. He does not conceal an extremely critical opinion about the Polnische Polizei functionaries he labelled German minions. He also saw the negative role of some Junaks.<sup>92</sup> This information was not used by Libionka, who reduced the part of Poles to passive observers, ‘onlookers’, and described the attitude of the local people as follows: “The Polish residents watched the deportations” (*Night without End*, vol. 2, pp. 75–76). It clearly follows from the narrative created in the book *Night without End* that the Polish people did nothing, not a single gesture, not a single attempt to help. The only Poles to whom Libionka devotes some space in this part of his chapter are the Junaks of the Baudienst (including an alleged looter) and the blue police.

Libionka’s ‘reductionist’ research can also be seen in describing the dislocation of Jews from Wolbrom. In the context of bilateral Polish-Jewish relations, he wrote: “Commercial agreements were hastily concluded with the Poles, and property *en masse* was given to them for safekeeping” (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 82). A little later in this chapter, he discussed the ‘staging point’ for the Jews of the town during the dislocation operation. The author did not analyse the event in terms of the behaviour of the Poles. He merely mentioned that several thousand Jews had no water or food. The description of the first deportation from Słomniki draws attention here. The presence of several thousand Jews for several days did not go unnoticed by Wolbrom’s population. The Germans’ actions, who strictly forbade any assistance to the Jews, always played a decisive role. Libionka, however, passed over the files of the former OKBZH in Cracow in silence, though they contained information that some Poles attempted to provide food or water. Karol Tracz recalled: “My friend, a Jewish woman named Ziegler and her child, were

---

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 2–15.

also there. I wanted to take some milk for Ziegler's baby. Along the way, however, I was stopped by the gendarme Arndt mentioned above who did not permit me to give this milk to Ziegler".<sup>93</sup> Helena Szczygieł had had similar experiences: "The local Polish people wishing to help the Jews gathered at the rallying point were not allowed near there. The gendarmes also did not allow me to enter with the water I wanted to give these Jews".<sup>94</sup>

The author of "Miechów County" ("Powiat miechowski") 'thunders' (to imitate the style of his response) that as regards the issue of hiding Jews by Aleksander Kisiel and searching for them, I pointed out to the author that: "Naturally it does not make any difference for the results of the searches, whether the Germans were alone or with their subordinate blue policemen, but it is not acceptable in scholarly work to 'supplement' the source records in this way" ("Correcting the Picture", p. 46). I must say I am puzzled by Libionka's explanations as to why the blue police officers appeared in the quoted source. In his response, Libionka first mentions the *Polnische Polizei* outposts operating in the area, which makes the presence of blue policemen in Kisiel's household more probable, to finally conclude: "My intention was not to correct the sources. Like most of the accounts included in the 301st group of the ŻIH fonds, Kisiel's account was noted down by a clerk, and its content must not be taken literally" ("Response", p. 6). With his explanations, Libionka seems to be saying: "OK, Kisiel does not mention the blue police, and so what? The PP posts were not far away, so they could have been there". Of course, they could. However, adopting an attitude where if something is inconsistent with the source, all the worse for the source, is not the best explanation here. I am not sure if Professor Libionka is fully aware of the meaning of his own words. Following the method of treating documents presented in this interpretation, all testimonies, accounts, and minutes of interrogations, as well as the resulting quotes, should be simply thrown in the trash because they are nothing more than transcripts (notes taken by clerks) and "their content cannot be taken literally". This would constitute an extraordinary research paradigm that would challenge all scholarly

---

<sup>93</sup> AOK, Ds. 24/68, Vol. 1, Minutes of the interrogation of witness Karol Tracz, Cracow, 9 September 1970, p. 129.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, Minutes of the interrogation of witness Helena Szczygieł, Cracow, 9 September 1970, p. 122.

research, including that of Professor Libionka. I hope that is not his intention. Naturally, one may distance oneself from the wording contained in the minutes of interrogations if the investigative method included torture, beatings, extortion, and the interrogated had no influence on how their testimony was reported – this is often the case with the ‘August trials’ (*sierpniówki*) (which, as if contrary to his own words, are so widely used in *Night without End* also by Libionka himself). However, the author probably does not suggest that these were the methods used when obtaining the accounts kept in the ŻIH.

Another thing is that Libionka uses insinuation as to my ignorance about the post-war judicial system, particularly of the so-called *sierpniówki* – the August trials, to undermine my academic credibility. In the review (“Correcting the Picture”, p. 29), I clearly stated how complex and challenging it was to research this material. Libionka, ignoring my explanations and defending himself against – so obvious – an accusation of the lack of in-depth analysis of specific processes, advanced a surprising thesis: “Had Domański been more experienced in analysing court cases of the occupation period, he would have known that this was a very complex problem” (“Response”, p. 8). It is always an awkward situation when one quotes their own publications. I can only politely recommend that the author read my research papers concerning the problem area in question.<sup>95</sup> The author is aware of the need for an in-depth analysis of the processes and yet, for reasons known only to himself, does not do so in “Miechów County” (“Powiat miechowski”). And why? He failed to present the complexity of the problem and substantiate his decision to ignore the investigation’s formal findings and the court proceeding and present his own interpretation of the events instead, without even advising the reader of this fact. Without referring to the archives (and let me ask a rhetorical question

---

<sup>95</sup> T. Domański, “Z historii oddziału ‘Wybranieckich’ czyli o wiarygodności materiałów śledczych i operacyjnych UB”, *Arcana* 106–107 (2012), pp. 253–279 (part 1); *Arcana* 109 (2013), pp. 120–144 (part 2); *idem*, “‘Sierpniówki’ jako źródło do dziejów Armii Krajowej”, pp. 167–215; *idem*, “Z dziejów policji granatowej. Proces Edwarda Krepskiego”, in *225 lat policji w Polsce. Geneza i ewolucja policji*, ed. by P. Majer and M. Seroka (Olsztyn, 2017), pp. 219–243; *idem*, “Polish ‘Navy Blue’ Police in the Kielce county”, in *The Holocaust and Polish-Jewish Relations*, ed. by M. Grądzka-Rejak and A. Sitarek (Warsaw, 2018), pp. 53–93. More papers on ‘August trials’ have been published, see: T. Domański, “Postępowania sądowe z dekretu z 31 sierpnia 1944 r. jako źródło do dziejów relacji polsko-żydowskich, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem procesów tzw. sierpniówkowych. Na przykładzie powiatu kieleckiego”, in *Relacje polsko-żydowskie w XX wieku. Badania, kontrowersje, perspektywy*, ed. by T. Domański, E. Majcher-Ociesa (Kielce–Warszawa, 2021); and Domański, “Proces z dekretu sierpniowego”.

here – how many readers actually do that?), the picture presented in “Miechów County” (“Powiat miechowski”) is self-evident and beyond any doubt. However, when juxtaposed with the source material, this picture becomes shattered. I hope that Libionka will resolve these shortcomings in an extended version that he has already announced.

The same perspective should be taken with the interpretation of my review concerning the murder of Jankiel Liberman by Aleksander Kuraj in the village of Rogów, or the turning in of Estera Zilberband or Moszek Wahadłowski provided in the response. According to Libionka, I want to blur the responsibility of the actual killers of Liberman because “it is not the conditions that kill”, and I allegedly do not see Kuraj’s tragedy: “He [i.e. Domański] does not see the tragedy of a Pole, the father of a large family, forced to commit the murder” (“Response”, p. 8). This comment shows Libionka’s misunderstanding of what I wrote in “Correcting the Picture” about the events in Rogów, Wolica, and Wierzbica. And yet, it is Libionka’s text that tells us nothing about these dramatic events’ background. His terse account of the events given in the chapter “Miechów County” (“Powiat miechowski”) only justifies the title: “Murders without the involvement of the police” (“Mordy bez udziału policji”). Indeed, no German police-like formation – be it the blue police, the gendarmerie, or any other – was present at the crime scene or committed the crime. But was Liberman murdered in a space-time vacuum? And weren’t the ‘incidents’ from the neighbouring villages of the Kozłów area, though taking place a year earlier, widely known to the villagers of Rogów? Couldn’t these events affect the decisions of the villagers, and make them fear for their lives? Or perhaps, in this particular village, the murderous German law had not applied? Furthermore, does not a detailed analysis of Liberman’s murder help paint a fuller picture of the occupation’s tragedy, where a former benefactor becomes – against his own will – a murderer? Is the presentation of circumstances in which the perpetrators had lived a diffusion of responsibility?

As for turning in Zilberband, in his response, Libionka regretfully failed to specify the exact file sheets from the proceeding against Natalia Wójcik, which proved her and her husband’s guilt. Underlying the book’s conclusions, the documents mentioned in the footnotes are simply mutually contradictory. Perhaps Libionka should once again carefully examine the documents mentioned in the footnotes. Regarding the investigation against Stanisław B., I highlighted a signifi-

cant methodological error of Professor Libionka. One cannot merely summarise the events in a few sentences (making references to case files) and pronounce somebody guilty of this or that crime without informing the reader that it is only the author's interpretation of the events (or source material to be more specific) and give a mere footnote referring to the whole case – the more so that the case files point to a different perpetrator, which is confusing. I do not see any point in ridiculing the issue and making comments which do not conform to the conventions of academic discourse. Case in point: “I discussed the subject briefly and – what is even worse – I pronounced the guilt of a Pole (informer) whereas, in 1953, he was acquitted by the County Court in Miechów, which accused a different person” (“Response”, p. 8). Well, one Pole was acquitted, and another Pole was accused. It is only a matter of a name, not worth arguing about... Libionka can see something in “Correcting the Picture” that is not there, and he suggests that I agree with the court as to the guilt of Stanisław B. because he writes: “My opinion on individual responsibility also differs from the one of the reviewers” (“Response”, p. 8). In “Correcting the Picture”, I do not point to any specific perpetrator, only to the facts mentioned above. Anyway, I am curious about how Libionka will handle this case in a book version [of his chapter]. Will he resort to “discussing it briefly” or elaborate in detail on individual witnesses’ testimonies, indicating the relevant interrogation transcript, transcript date, and sheet number in the footnote?

Libionka ended his analysis of the ‘August trials’ with an interesting jibe: “There is yet another problem: if someone is acquitted in a Jewish context, for some historians, the court suddenly is no longer a tool of Stalinist oppression against the Poles” (“Response”, p. 8). It is a shame that Professor Libionka did not name the researchers using such a paradigm, but he again resorts to insinuation. Demanding a researcher to present the actual legal situation, even if we perceive it as unreliable and inadequate, is not, by any means, a matter of evaluating the quality of the court (regardless of the time it operates in). Is it good practice to declare, as Libionka did, a specific person guilty of significant crimes without any thorough analysis of the facts and subsequently, in a footnote, refer the reader to the case file containing diametrically different conclusions?

Commenting on some of the issues addressed in “Correcting the Picture”, Libionka attempts to divert the criticism of his obvious methodological errors in

a different direction. It is challenging to adopt a different view on this issue, having read the author's opinions on the history of the Konieczny or Federman (and Matuszczyk) family. It is not the 'compact style' or 'lacking details' that I objected against, but unjustified abbreviations distorting the words of those doing the act of saving and those saved, and, in a sense, diminishing the significance of the Righteous Among the Nations. The abbreviations used by Libionka present these noble individuals as mere money-grubbers for whom money and valuables were the key drivers, particularly "as they were promised more after the war". I have discussed this extensively when talking about Jews paying for help. If Professor Libionka is aware of any source material confirming his theses – he should present it, for instance, anything undermining the words of Hymen Federman, instead of creating fiction. This story is yet another element affecting the credibility of the picture produced in the book. As it happens, the cause of my consternation was the following sentence: "As regards the Konieczny family, I have dared to quote an account from which it follows that some Jews hidden by them paid for their upkeep" ("Response", p. 11). I cannot see any purpose in this irony. The problem of living costs is commonly found in Polish and Jewish sources (witness accounts), which Professor Libionka is perfectly aware of. Allow me to raise one point here. In the case of the Konieczny family, it was not, in fact, about "paying for their upkeep", as Professor Libionka puts it, but rather "covering the costs of living". The difference between the two expressions is subtle yet significant. The juxtaposition of the accounts of hidden Jews with the author's original narrative in "Miechów County" ("Powiat miechowski") and the response's content is a perfect occasion for demonstrating the logic behind Professor Libionka's argumentation. In "Miechów County" ("Powiat miechowski"), Libionka left out all details presenting the Righteous as noble and decent people. Let us juxtapose the relevant paragraphs and leave the conclusions of Professor Libionka to the reader. In *Night without End*, the issue of paying is presented by Libionka in the following way: "There were seven of them, and they were given food once a day. Borys Ickowicz, who was hiding with them, too, mentions paying in cash and with objects of value. When they ran out of money, they agreed that they would reimburse the costs incurred after the war" (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 129). Moreover, this is how the money issue was presented by Ickowicz, quoted by me in the review:



We were paying for our safety with money and whatever we had of value. Six months before the end of the war, we ran out of money and valuables. We were not thrown out to face certain death. [...] Maciej Konieczny was a rich farmer. He had 44 morgens, so he was not financially motivated [...].

The money issue was explained with more empathy by Sidney (Szymche) Olmer in his account given on 31 December 1986:

For the first six months, we paid only for our food. When we ran out of money, **Mr** Konieczny agreed to my promise to reimburse his food costs after the war. He never took any money other than food costs, and I knew he was not hiding us for money. Mr and Mrs Konieczny were religious and liberal and helped us for humane reasons. [...] Mr and Mrs Konieczny explained to their children that human life was sacred and that it was their duty to save us. ("Correcting the Picture", p. 54)

Suppose Professor Libionka does not see a difference between his 'abbreviations' and the presentation of the issue of the saved ones. In such a case, this fact does not speak well about the credibility of his research papers. The same would apply to Libionka's description of the relations between a farmer, Jan Makola, and Marian Sonnenfeld's group.

Finally, Dariusz Libionka is surprised by my pointing to the existence of provocative German units. As an experienced researcher, Libionka surely knows that this was one of the elements of the then-contemporary reality affecting human attitudes and actions (the sense of threat, uncertainty, fear, and German omnipotence, even if it was an impression and not the reality). The German 'masqueraders' were commonly talked about in the Miechów area and across the entire GG.

I would like to add at this point that one cannot agree with the interpretation of Helena Lindzinowa's account made by Libionka (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 123). It is yet another abbreviation contradictory to the sources. According to Lindzinowa mentioned above, a small boy named Leopold Brajnes survived in the Miechów orphanage run by nuns during the occupation. Libionka, referring to the account, writes: "Despite the Gestapo's investigation, his origin had not been

discovered”. It is only partly true. Actually, the investigation had been conducted, and the person behind this ‘non-discovery’ of the boy’s Jewish origin was a Gestapo soldier of unknown name, as Lindzinowa clearly states:

A few days later, the Gestapo came to Miechów, looking for a supposedly Jewish child. After three doctors confirmed it, the child was to be killed. A nun [forced to do so] dressed the boy in white clothes, put a white medallion on his neck, and took him to the Gestapo in Cracow, in Pomorska Street. The Gestapo officer to whom the child bowed politely must have liked the boy because he smiled at him. Nevertheless, he ordered to undress the child. Sensing something wrong would happen, the child hung on the nun’s neck and started screaming and crying, not letting anyone take him from the nun. She had to undress him and cried as she was doing it, along with the child. The Gestapo officer took the child, but he soon returned, declaring to all present that the child is of Aryan origin and only had had surgery due to a serious injury. The child was saved and taken back to the Miechów orphanage [...].<sup>96</sup>

I also hope that Professor Libionka will include in his subsequent publications more details on the “very well documented” structures of the Kriminalpolizei (Kripo). Still, in his response, he wrote that one of his objectives was to “describe the German occupation forces in this area”. If so, I will add that, based on the Statistical Journal of Office V, prepared by the Reich Main Security Office, Kripo’s outposts operated not only in Miechów, as could be concluded from the account given in the chapter titled “Miechów County” (“Powiat miechowski”) (vol. 2, pp. 40–41), but also as field outposts (Aussenposten) in Wolbrom, Proszowice, and Kazimierza Wielka.<sup>97</sup>

And finally, one more comment concerning the accusation that I perfunctorily addressed on how underground units and their attitude towards the Jews had been discussed in *Night without End*. This is how Libionka interprets my view:

---

<sup>96</sup> AŻIH, 301/4573, Account of Józef Jama, Szczawnica, 11 June 1946, p. 1. Perhaps it was the same child mentioned in detail by Philipp Riedinger during his interrogation. He testified that it was county governor (*starosta*) Kalpers who opposed the ‘destruction’ of the child, AIPN Kr, 075/1, vol. 24, Translation. Ref.: Philipp Riedinger, Cracow, 15 August 1951, pp. 73–74.

<sup>97</sup> See: *Jahrbuch Amt V (Reichskriminalpolizeiamt) des Reichssicherheitshauptamtes 1939–1940*, p. 142.

There may be two reasons for Domański's dodging: either some other expert was delegated to explore this issue, and we will know his or her opinion some time later, or he had decided that the issue is too complicated or perhaps too controversial. ("Response", pp. 13–14)

My polemics with the publication of Joanna Tokarska-Bakir and Alina Skibińska, mentioned by Libionka, clearly prove that I do not avoid 'too complicated' or complex problems. Moreover, I cannot see any alleged inconsistency. I am not aware that the unit of Marian Sołtysiak, aka 'Barabasz', was engaged in any conspiracy activity in the Cracow vicinity. I was very precise in stating that naturally, a review could not discuss in great detail every problem addressed by the authors, mainly when one person engages in simultaneous polemics with nine other authors. Perhaps, I will also analyse Professor Libionka's achievements in this field in the future. I have presented another example of Jan Grabowski's description of the Home Army's attitude (in this particular case, intelligence dispatches) from Węgrów 'County', apart from the topics discussed in "Correcting the Picture", earlier in this text.

Finally, I will refer to the opening quote from Professor Libionka: "In Domański's world" – writes Libionka – "there are no mistakes, errors, lack of diligence. Every act and omission must be accompanied by a perfidious intention" ("Response", p. 2). I do not know what Professor Libionka's conception was; however, the number of various errors should provoke some reflection. I am glad that Libionka has noticed some shortcomings I highlighted. He recognised in his response the need to establish cause and effect relationships between the facts and events, with care for details. Because it is often in the details where the circumstances behind people's choices can be found. I am also glad that Libionka has admitted that at least some of his statements were inappropriate and that he would modify them in the monograph on "Miechów County" ("Powiat miechowski"). After all, it is not about merely providing details but about giving a historic account reflecting the time's actual reality.

### A detailed response to the remarks of Doctor Alina Skibińska

In her response to "Correcting the Picture", Alina Skibińska pointed to several issues of a general nature. I have already discussed the right to choose the geographic areas for the research or the concept of the existence of the 'German-Polish'

administration in the opening section. At this point, I would like to focus on yet another general objection against the setting of thematic accents in analyses of individual counties. Skibińska notices the disproportions identified by me but dubiously justifies the adopted arrangement by the “course of the liquidation operations”. These disproportions, called a “false accusation”, are unimportant to her because “it surely wasn’t our intention to present a full picture of the Holocaust” (“Response”, p. 2). What, then, was the intention of the authors of the book given the sub-heading: *The Fate of Jews in Selected Counties of Occupied Poland*, vols 1–2 (*Losy Żydów w wybranych powiatach okupowanej Polski*, t. 1–2)? This is expressly explained by the authors of the “Foreword”, calling the Jewish survival strategies during the Holocaust their “main research objective”. The title itself and another declared objective of the book (“recreation of the fate of whole Jewish communities”) is the cause of another objection in “Correcting the Picture” – an absence of in-depth analysis of the situation of Jews in the years 1939–1941/42, manifesting itself in failure to describe internal relations within the community and contacts with ‘local’ people. The disproportions mentioned above may give a false perspective on the Holocaust. Hence, either the book’s objectives should be different, or the title should be more like “Jewish survival strategies on the ‘Aryan’ side”.

The issues mentioned above concerning ‘survival strategies’ correspond with yet another general problem highlighted by Skibińska in her response. On page two of the response, she made a rather laconic attempt to defend the central thesis of the book, expressed in the “Foreword”: “It was the time [1942–1945] when attitudes of Poles had an enormous impact on Jewish chances to survive” (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 13). Let me say it once again: it was not the Poles who decided about the life and death of the Jews; it was the Germans. Every Holocaust researcher knows the arguments among German decision-makers concerning the fate of Jews in labour camps. One decision was all it took to have them all killed. It was not the Polish people who created “the German occupation system”, but the Germans. German authorities’ actions, the ‘law’ established, and their draconian enforcement shaped Poles’ attitudes towards the Jews. In other words, the thesis that attitudes of Polish society were the decisive factor conditioning the survival of the Jews is questionable, as it is based on two fundamental errors: it places both nations (the Poles and the Jews) in a time-and-space vacuum. It suggests that any external

circumstances did not hinder the actions of Poles. And the words contained in Skibińska's response: "[...] the accusation that the thesis is "questionable" would have to be proven, because our publication proves just the opposite' only confirm their detachment from the historical background.

Unfounded and offensive is the accusation that I had revealed the identity of a rape victim reported by Tema Wajnsztok. In my research, I never disclose any so-called sensitive data – and this is undoubtedly the case here. In my work at the Institute of National Remembrance, I often come across sensitive data in the preliminary surveys and job-related correspondence. I recommend that, before making serious accusations against me, Alina Skibińska first carefully reads her section of the book *Night without End* and then "Correcting the Picture". It would be most effective to juxtapose the two sections – Skibińska's words from the chapter "Biłgoraj County" ("Powiat biłgorajski") and my comment from "Correcting the Picture". The relevant paragraph of the collective work reads:

Such custodians for the survivor – Tema Wajnsztok of Frampol – were the women: Aniela Chmiel and her daughter, Janka, and a woman named Ducherka (Janina Sitarz). She shared with them the experience of unending hunger, cold, and fear. In her [Tema Wajnsztok's] story, we can find an encounter with a 'guerrilla raid' and a violent rape, hours spent motionless under a bed, stealing food from other people's fields, and everyday work together, sewing and cleaning. Tema was moving from one place to another, often changing her place of stay, but Chmielowa's house was always a safe harbour where she could return. (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 323)

In "Correcting the Picture", I wrote:

This passage could benefit from greater precision since not all the situations mentioned here were experienced by Wajnsztok, as this narrative could suggest. In a detailed account of the facts, the author should inform the reader that this is a description of both the Jewish and Polish experiences. Indeed, the victim of the rape during the raid was not Tema, but a Polish girl. ("Correcting the Picture", p. 48)

It is clear from the context that I had not revealed the victim's personal details. Nor had I given any hints which could ensue such speculations. This 'Polish girl' could be any Polish girl Tema Wajnsztok had met or had heard about, as she kept changing her place of stay. Regrettably, the author herself, unthinkingly, disclosed the details of the victim, writing:

I wish to explain that I used an impersonal form fully consciously and deliberately, without revealing who had been raped. I consider such information sensitive data, and I am not sure if there are any living descendants of Janina Chmiel. Unfortunately, the reviewer pointed to that person, showing no consideration for this fact. ("Response", p. 3)

It could be hard to be more precise, entirely unnecessarily, too.

This case of using archived materials reminds me of the level of understanding of the case file from the trial of one of the subordinates of Lt Col Marian Sołtysiak, reflected in an article "Barabasz i Żydzi" ("Barabas and the Jews"), which Alina Skibińska co-authored with Professor Joanna Tokarska-Bakir. I engaged in polemics with the authors on that occasion. They quoted a section from the transcript of the interrogation of Edward Skrobot alias 'Wierny', in 1951. Skrobot claimed that he had been told by another Home Army officer, 2<sup>nd</sup> Lt. Czesław Łętowski alias 'Górnik' about an order issued by the Home Army Headquarters, "to liquidate all Jews, whether a Home Army member or hiding from the Germans".<sup>98</sup> Not only didn't Skibińska and Tokarska-Bakir notice the total non-credibility or even absurdity of this order, but they thought they were revealing "shocking details" from the history of the Home Army (AK) Headquarters.<sup>99</sup>

Later in the response, Alina Skibińska strongly emphasises that she had no intention to diminish or ignore the context of the occupation in *Night without End*. Skibińska's assurance has been provoked by my comments on Florian Wójtowicz alias Listek's comments, presented by her. Wójtowicz's account, as presented in

---

<sup>98</sup> Archives of the Institute of National Remembrance Delegation in Kielce, District Court in Kilece (SWK), 128/48, Transcript of the interrogation of suspect Edward Skrobot, Kielce, 21 April 1951, p. 59v.

<sup>99</sup> A. Skibińska, J. Tokarska-Bakir, "Barabasz i Żydzi. Z historii oddziału AK 'Wybraniec'", *Zagłada Żydów. Studia i Materiały* 7 (2011), p. 80.

“Biłgoraj County” (“Powiat biłgorajski”), lacks a section where he compared or, actually, presented as equivalent to the poverty of the Jews from “Jankiel’s squad and the situation of the Peasants’ Battalions [*Bataliony Chłopskie* – BCh]”. My comment pertained to the ‘here and now’. But the ‘here and now’ of Skibińska, having cut out that piece from Wójtowicz’s recollections, obviously did not convey the BCh guerilla fighter’s message for posterity. In her response, Skibińska claimed that she had shortened the quotation only because, at that point, she had been focusing on the living conditions of Jews hiding in the woods (“Response”, p. 2). Skibińska’s argument doesn’t seem convincing. In the above-quoted sentence, she admits that the broader context is not that important to her. Later in her response, she assures that “concealing Polish misery” under the occupation was not her intention – she is not very convincing, either (“Response”, p. 2). Indeed, Skibińska did mention compulsory deliveries of agricultural produce in her chapter. On two occasions, she, in one sentence, explains that the evasion of that ‘obligation’ was punishable by sentencing to a labour camp. However, on the same occasion Skibińska, for instance, claims:

When talking about restrictions, obligations and prohibitions, one must not forget that tributes, repressions, curfew, labour obligations, imposed levies and registration of livestock (animal ringing) applied not only to Jews but the whole population of an invaded country, although, in the case of Jews, these restrictions were more severe, oppressive and economically devastating. (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 211)

This statement is true about the years 1939–1941. However, she did not put the book’s main period, namely the years 1942–1944/45, in a similar perspective.

To finish my response to Dr Skibińska, I will take at face value her declarations to account for the issues suggested by me in her subsequent research (“Response”, p. 2).

### A detailed response to the remarks of Professor Barbara Engelking

In her response to “Correcting the Picture”, Professor Barbara Engelking did not address most of my numerous objections concerning the analysis of source material. However, she did refer to the language of the arguments *ad personam*. Questions, which she describes as “non-substantive”, are left unanswered. These are questions about abbreviations of documents, distorting their sense (the most

obvious example being the recommendations of Reinhard Heydrich dated 29 June 1941 for the Einsatzgruppen operating in the East), unprecedented in research work, ignoring the existing literature or labelling all Polish peasants 'Holocaust volunteers' in her earlier research.<sup>100</sup>

Now and then, in her love for irony, Professor Engelking seems to deprecate the efforts of people saving Jews. She writes:

For me, fascinating is also the discussion on self-help and mutual help among Jews: after all, it was not that all Jews were hiding in closets, and each had two or more Poles working their tails off and attending them. There were many Jews who had been perfectly managing on their own and helping others – provided that no one had interfered... ("Response", p. 3)

The discussion about self-help (mutual help) among Jews is, naturally, exciting and vital. Still, it should be conducted with respect for the source material and consideration for the specificity of individual stages of the Holocaust. After all, the chances for self-help differed considerably in closed and open (provincial) ghettos; they differed even more in the villages until the final stage of the Holocaust – ghettos had not been formed – and in the period of operation of the Judenjagd.

However, Professor Engelking did respond to two problems that she considered "the basis for substantive discussion": the difference between helping Jews and saving Jews, and fear as a moral category. The author broadly discussed various sorts of help. However, she sums up all her conclusions in a single sentence: "saving' is a much broader term as not all extended help meant 'saving'" ("Response", p. 1). I still believe that any form of helping Jews, particularly at the third stage of the Holocaust, was equivalent to saving lives and involved putting the helper's and their family's life at risk. The occupation context is crucial here. Engelking's deliberations in her response ("Response", pp. 2–3) only obscure the picture instead of clarifying it. It should be repeated and emphasised that any form of helping Jews, despite the risk of punishment by death, which prolonged life, was saving this life.

---

<sup>100</sup> B. Engelking, *Jest taki piękny słoneczny dzień... Losy Żydów szukających ratunku na wsi polskiej 1942–1945* (Warszawa, 2011), p. 257.



Moreover, Professor Engelking's reflections on 'fear' can hardly be considered revealing ("Response", pp. 4–5). I wish to add here that every researcher dealing with the Second World War, not only in the context of the Holocaust, is faced with complicated issues of fear, heroism, and wickedness. I agree with the author that fear does not justify destructive acts against Jews or representatives of other nations, such as murders, blackmail, or pillage. Although fear is not an excuse, it does explain many situations. A historian has to provide a substantive explanation of past events, accounting for the context in which they were taking place. I also hope that the need for an in-depth analysis of mechanisms affecting mutual behaviours/attitudes of Poles and Jews during the German occupation that she mentions will not be a mere declaration on her part.

### A detailed response to the remarks of Karolina Panz

Karolina Panz, in a surprising way, deprecates substantive guidelines as manifestations of lack of refinement, concluding her disquisition in the following way: "I shall pass with silence over the level of propriety emanating from this comment [...]" ("Response", p. 1). She is not able to justify her quasi-literary and not-so-scholarly descriptions.<sup>101</sup> Nevertheless, she attempts – distant from the principles of substantive discussion – to deprecate the reviewer:

I do not know what language Domański will use to describe it [the Holocaust], as he has not published any major work on the subject so far. Before he decides on his language, I recommend familiarising himself with the long-going scholarly debate on how to talk about the Holocaust. ("Response", p. 2)

My answer to this must be the same as to the authors mentioned above: my scholarly work on the German occupation is available; one can easily become acquainted with it. I am also open to discussing critical reviews. I am convinced

---

<sup>101</sup> This is how Karolina Panz 'deals with' serious research problems: "In each of the places Poles witnessed the death of the Jews they had known – they heard their screaming, touched their corpses, and smelled their death. It left no one indifferent. To no one, were these victims distant or anonymous. In the subsequent stage of the Holocaust, the attitudes of these people, Polish witnesses, were crucial for Jews trying to save their lives" (vol. 2, p. 275).

that a historian should write about the object of their research interests in a subject-matter style, following the principles of research methodology, without resorting to emotional figures of speech.<sup>102</sup>

In detailed comments, I shall first address the thesis on the Poles' attitude as a factor decisive for 'survivorship' of the Holocaust. Panz categorically elaborated on it on several occasions in "Nowy Targ County" "Powiat nowotarski". Indeed, the horror of the German occupation deserves more gravity and maturity. Panz talks about it as if she was completely unaware of the reality of the time and place: "In the first weeks after the operation, Jews were killed not only due to organised round-ups and individual denunciations. Frequently, simple lack of help from the Poles, out of fear or indifference, was enough to lead to death by starvation or the cold" (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 291). Does fear for one's life and the life of the family caused by the German announcement of the death punishment for any help to Jews mean nothing to the author? Panz continues in a similar tone in subsequent passages of *Night without End*: "Even saving the most helpless Jewish children was unacceptable for people around" (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 344). This shocking sentence is a part of the author's comment preceding recollections of a Jewish girl, Roza Rawid:

In the first months of my stay there, I would go out and play with other children, but after the German announcements about the death penalty for hiding Jews, other people from the townhouse did not want me there. From that moment on, I was hiding. When someone came, I used to hide under the bed, and when a visitor was staying longer, I stayed in a small attic.

The juxtaposition of the source material with the author's commentary leads to an obvious conclusion that, in this way, Panz shifts the responsibility for the death of Jews from the German occupation authorities imposing murderous 'laws' upon the local people. This shift is detached from reality but, most importantly, is simply unfair towards the people living under pressure of the occupation and omnipresent

---

<sup>102</sup> I encourage the author to become acquainted with the following publications: T. Domański, A. Jankowski, *Represje niemieckie na wsi kieleckiej 1939–1945* (Kielce, 2011); *'I nie widziałem ich więcej wśród żywych...'. Pacyfikacja Michniowa 12 i 13 lipca 1943 r. w dokumentach i relacjach*, preface and ed. T. Domański (Kraków, 2013).

terror. This is where the historical analysis lacks the link with the impact of the General Governorate's occupation reality upon some people's attitudes. Panz provides verbatim quotations of the German announcements about the death punishment for helping Jews, but now and then, she fails to account for them in her comments. Nevertheless, at their discretion, German authorities could administer the death penalty regardless of the age of a Jew or the form of help. Being a historian dealing with the Second World War, I would never dare to judge people's choices in such dramatic circumstances and create an opposition: 'my life' vs 'your life'. Moreover, it does not matter whether I am writing about Poles helpless in the face of murders committed on other Poles, Poles powerless in the face of murders committed on Jews, or Jews helpless in the face of murders committed on other Jews – as such situations equally occurred every day during the period in question.

Karolina Panz does recognise that "Fear of repressive measures was justified – punishments for helping Jews were administered in Kreis Neumarkt promptly and mercilessly" (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 344). The author does not notice that what she disrespectfully states in one sentence contradicts what she writes in another. This is what my comment from "Correcting the Picture" (p. 31) referred to. It is hard to grasp Panz's understanding of the occupation since, in one paragraph, she can include two contradictory statements.

Her deliberations are sometimes truly astonishing in this respect. She writes:

'The Final Solution' took place in front of Polish residents of cities, towns, and villages of Nowy Targ county, who often watched the fate of their Jewish neighbours with terror and sympathy. Nevertheless, following German orders, local governments organised horse wagons [*podwoły*] and gravediggers, put up German announcements, and looked after and allocated abandoned Jewish houses. Heads of the villages arranged groups of peasants to make thorough inspections of the woods, and they did it dutifully. Therefore, from among hundreds of Jews trying to survive in their familiar neighbourhoods, so very few had managed to survive. (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 343)

Simplifications contained in such a presentation are very far-reaching. After all, the same 'local governments' in the same way obeyed the orders given throughout

the GG and applied to Poles. Had the author carried out a more in-depth analysis of the region's history, she would have seen the instances where Polish villagers had been sent under supervision to search for Polish peasants hiding from Germans in the mountains. As a result of focusing principally on the Jewish community alone, the context had been entirely ignored. It is a similar perception of reality as in the case of Jean-Charles Szurek, which I mention in "Correcting the Picture".

Nevertheless, in her response, Panz firmly claims that she had perfectly explained the complexity of the occupation: "I write about repressive actions, fear, dilemmas and dramatic choices made by people who did help and those who did not. Therefore, I do not know why the author of "Correcting the Picture" claims that I have not done so" ("Response", p. 2). I hope that the explanations provided in my response will help Panz to understand the internal contradictions in her discourse.

Another example illustrating the distortion of the historical context presented directly in the source material, resulting from focusing, in principle, on the Jewish issue alone, is the account of Roman Dattner speaking about the situation of the Jews in Zakopane. Panz quotes: "Courses for Ukrainians were held at that time [...], they were telling what Krüger had been doing to the Jewish people in Zakopane" (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 236, p. 113). Seemingly, it is just a statement of fact. And the omitted part of the sentence reads: "Courses for Ukrainians were held at that time. They were trained to be future executioners of Jewish and Polish people and those Jewish craftsmen [...] <sup>103</sup> were telling what Krüger had been doing to Jewish people in Zakopane".<sup>104</sup> Another nuance that can lead to a conclusion that Dattner was aware that German violence was directed not only against Jews but also against Poles is left out. The quoted sentence would not fit in with a biased picture of the Polish community created in "Nowy Targ County" ("Powiat nowotarski"). After analysing the passages mentioned above, one of the research declarations made by Panz sounds truly ironic: "The reality I describe is the reality I saw in the source material" („Response", p. 3).

Such emphatic advancements of Panz's thesis make it worth confronting the accounts given by Jews who survived. Like Chana Windstrauch (Panz makes

---

<sup>103</sup> Their names are given in the passage.

<sup>104</sup> AŻIH, 301/3272, Account by Roman Dattner, Cracow, 2 July 1947, TS, p. 1.

extensive use of her diary), those seeking help were usually critical of the Poles who, whether voluntarily or under compulsion, participated in anti-Jewish operations (catching, denunciation). However, Windstrauch pointed to the objective external circumstances compelling people to behave as expected by the occupation authorities: “We decided we would go through the forests and fields at night, to Łętownia, to some peasants we knew. We approach one of them, and another, and then another. They all refuse to put us up for the night; they say they fear the Germans. – What are we going to do now? Tired, hungry, homeless, chased – you won’t believe it unless you have experienced it”.<sup>105</sup> They were eventually helped by another peasant who was “shaking with fear. Nevertheless, they had to leave because “a more stringent order [it should have been: announcement] was put up that day that any family hiding a Jew will be punished by death”.<sup>106</sup> Panz omits such details. Why?

A different approach is adopted by Panz when she describes the actions of some representatives of the Jewish community. Let us analyse the displacement of Jews from Jordanów. This act of the Holocaust was preceded by the demand to pay a tribute which – as the author aptly points out – was common in such operations in the GG. When presenting these dramatic events, Panz refers to the account by Ozjasz Szachner, who recollects:

I saw it in Lviv that one day before the operation, the Germans demanded a tribute to be paid by the Lviv Jews, and the next day Jews were being murdered on the streets or taken outside the city and murdered, and I warned them not to pay the tribute, that it was *schitegeld*, that they should instead use the money to build hide-outs or run away from the town. A chairman of the Judenrat, Erwin Kögel, agreed with me [...] and hid in the woods, while deputy chairman, Kappner, argued that we had nothing to fear [...] and we should just pay the tribute. I did not trust the Germans and hid my whole family, my father, sister, sister-in-law and two children, in the woods. (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 278)

---

<sup>105</sup> AYV, O.3/2300, Account by Chana Windstrauch, Tel-Aviv, January 1964, p. 29.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*

The details of the displacement operation are quite different if we take under consideration the full version of the account by Szachner.<sup>107</sup> In the version quoted by Panz, the passages about gathering the money to pay the tribute are not included. Neither are the words presenting a broader picture of the attitude of the chairman of the Judenrat as a representative of the Jews at the moment decisive for the Jewish community of Jordanów. Panz actually does not clarify whether the tribute was paid or not.<sup>108</sup> Furthermore, Szachner was very precise about that. From what he says, we learn how dramatic an attempt to survive this tribute was. It was paid in the hope that the displacement would be abandoned or, at least, postponed. At the same time, it was a considerable material loss, as the money could have been used to prepare hide-outs. He was leaving out the words “who left the town immediately” totally changed the meaning of Kögel’s attitude description. According to Szachner, the chairman of the Judenrat abandoned the Jews as soon as he had received reliable information about the planned displacement, which took place a few days later. At the same time, other members of the Judenrat forced the Jews to pay the tribute. Isn’t that relevant for drawing conclusions on the occupation reality or personal motives of some representatives of the Jewish elites? These complex and difficult behaviours are not different from the reality elsewhere in the GG, where ‘new elites’ were being formed.

I have been extremely surprised by the argumentation presented by Panz, insistently claiming that there were no elites in Kreis Neumarkt. Analysing her arguments, one may arrive at a regrettable conclusion that Panz cannot define what

---

<sup>107</sup> “I had seen it in Lviv, that one day before the operation, the Germans demanded tribute to be paid by the Lviv Jews and the next day Jews were being murdered on the streets or taken outside the city and murdered, and I warned them not to pay the tribute, that it was ‘*schitegeld*’, that they should rather use the money to build hide-outs and run away from the town. A chairman of the Judenrat, Erwin Kögel, agreed with me, a very decent man, who abandoned the town immediately and hid in the woods, while deputy chairman, Kappner, argued that we had nothing to fear [...] and we should just pay the tribute. I did not trust the Germans and hid my whole family, father, sister, sister-in-law, and two children in the woods. I, myself, continued to go to work. The Judenrat imposed the tribute on all the Jews, and even the poorest gave away whatever they had and were left with nothing. I remained in the town to organise everything for my folks in the hide-out. The tribute was paid on Thursday”, AŻIH, 301/3453, Account by Ozjasz Szachner, Cracow, [no date], pp. 1–2.

<sup>108</sup> The sentence following the quotation does not explain anything: ‘He [a blue policeman] called him when Furman walked by his post (the man was returning from Nowy Targ where during the whole night he had sorted money before taking the tribute to the bank)’, *Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 278.

elites in a given community were or are. 'Elitism' is quite a complex phenomenon. Being a member of the elite does not have to be related to "making a fortune" or social background („Response", p. 3). In the occupation's reality, because this is what we are talking about, Judenrat members' social background was of little importance. Important was the very membership in this body ('new elites'), artificially created by the Germans, which was supposed to represent the Jews and, most importantly, serve as an intermediary in forcing them to obey various orders and regulations. These people were forced to assume responsibility for the lives of their fellow men. Hence, they were becoming the 'new elite', a 'new leading class', because of their performed function. Was it not the reason why in the post-war 'settling of accounts' attention was paid to the functioning of the Judenrats and the level of their submissiveness to the Germans? I doubt that anyone could deny, as Panz suggests in her response by claiming that there were no new elites, that Kögel or Kappner had been the elite of this community. They had been. This view is also present in the accounts given by the survivors mentioned above. In the context of the displacement of Jews from Jordanów, Chana Windstrauch recollected:

The Chairman of the Jewish Council (Judenrat) E[rwin] Koegel did a runner that day for good. Moreover, his deputy, Kap[p]ner, returned that day from Nowy Targ and assured people that nothing bad would happen in Jordanów and that the tribute was duly paid. The tribute imposed on our family was five thousand zlotys, and we had no money to pay. Dearest Iziek gave away his beautiful golden Schaffhausen.<sup>109</sup>

It is clear from the tone of Windstrauch's words that she saw the members of the local Judenrat as leaders. Otherwise, she would not have written that the chairman "had done a runner", as this phrase has strong negative connotations. In this particular reality, 'did a runner' simply means 'he left' or 'he abandoned' the town. Later, Windstrauch emphasises, as Szachner did, the role played by the Judenrat member, Kappner, in convincing the Jewish community that the tribute had to be paid. Had the Judenrat not been trusted by Jews and, on the other hand,

---

<sup>109</sup> AYV, O.3/2300, Account by Chana Windstrauch, Tel-Aviv, January 1964, p. 26.

had it not felt responsible for the fate of Jews, would they have engaged in actions that they believed could save their fellow men?

Let me quote Roman Dattner to sum up my conclusions on that issue:

In 1940, [in Rabka], after Krüger's arrival, the Germans ordered the organisation of the Judenrat comprised of 12 members. The Judenrat was to act as an intermediary between the Germans and the Jewish community. A liaison between the Judenrat and the Germans was Jakób Beck, a baker, a character the Gestapo officers brought with them from Zakopane.<sup>110</sup>

This man (killed in 1943 in Cracow by the Germans) was a known collaborator of the Germans, helping them steal Jewish property. Some of Beck's actions are also mentioned by Panz. However, she does not note his 'privileged' position. She cannot see that Beck's 'social advancement' in the new occupation reality substantially contradicts the opinion she so diligently tried to prove. As follows from Stefan Blasberg's account,<sup>111</sup> Beck was not the only Jew in Rabka who demonstrated such behaviour. The similarity between Beck's fate and choices in Rabka and those of Zwerdling in Złoczów is quite astonishing. Fortunately, Anna Zapalec does not question the existence of such 'new Jewish elites'.

Karolina Panz also argues that "Representatives of the local intellectual elites [this refers to the Jews from the Kreis Neumarkt area] – including a few doctors and lawyers – fled to the East when the Germans were coming and remained there under the Soviet occupation" ("Response", p. 3). Obviously, the author is correct that they had fled, but did they all do it? Panz must have forgotten what she wrote based on Dattner's account. One of the persons tortured by Wilhelm Rosenbaum in Zakopane was ... "a lawyer from Zakopane" (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 236). Ignoring one's findings to get the right 'effect' is rather depressing.

In her attempts to prove there were no Jewish elites in Kreis Neumarkt, Panz also writes: "The Judenrats were formed by the same petty merchants and craftsmen, who were members of pre-war kahals" ("Response", p. 3). These "petty merchants

---

<sup>110</sup> AŻIH, 301/3272, Account by Roman Dattner, TS, Cracow, 2 July 1947, p. 1.

<sup>111</sup> AŻIH, 301/221, Account by Stefan Blasberg, Sosno[wiec?], 3 June 1945, p. 2.



and craftsmen” forming the Judenrats – councils administrating Jewish communities – automatically became the managing class, the ‘new elite’ which could have little in common with the concept of ‘elitism’ as understood before September 1939. Perhaps the elite’s issue was not very noticeable in the county in question, yet their formation mechanism is typical.

Elsewhere in her response, Karolina Panz accuses me of forming mutually contradictory opinions: “In one review, Domański, on the one hand, claims we had a ‘pre-assumed thesis on Polish complicity’ (“Response”, p. 4), and, on the other, that we had ‘on principle, focused exclusively on the fate of Jewish victims’ (*ibid.*)”. Then Panz attempts to prove that she had never used the term ‘complicity’. Naturally, there was also an empty platitude in the form of an accusation that I (as well as my colleagues from the Institute of National Remembrance) defend the “myth of an innocent Poland” (*ibid.*). Repeating the platitudes, the author has not explained what she meant by “the myth of an innocent Poland” – whether she referred to the Polish state or the Polish people. The Polish state is clearly not responsible for the crimes committed by the German occupation authorities (now and then, the authors seem to be unaware of that – *vide* Jan Grabowski) and how the occupied people were used. Individual responsibility rests with those Polish citizens who, for whatever reason – whether as an official of German police-like forces or as intentional informers and sometimes even murderers – acted against Jews, Poles, or Roma people. No one is trying to deny the facts. I may refer Panz to my article in *Polish-Jewish Studies* (which will be published soon) on the crimes against Jews committed by the PP members from Wodzisław and a farmer from the same village. Having first deprived Jews of their property, they subsequently caused their death. An unbiased reading of the Institute of National Remembrance’s publications is undoubtedly better than repeating *de facto* political slogans slandering the Institute and its employees. I have defended professionalism in historical research, and I always will. In “Correcting the Picture” and the present response, I have pointed out numerous areas that need to be corrected before it could be said that the presented picture is the effect of diligent and rigorous research.

But at this point, I would like to explain that the section about “focusing, in principle, on the fate of the Jews”, is a classic example of taking the words out of context. In „Correcting the Picture”, I repeated the authors’ declarations made

in *Night without End*, pointing out that its presentation may be oversimplified when the problem is narrowed down to this single aspect. No one can – or at least should – deny that the major part of the book (if not most of it) is devoted to the fate of Jews in the Polish-Jewish context. Hence, it is somewhat problematic for me to explain to Panz the “thesis on complicity”. The assurance that the authors did not use the term only proves her problems with understanding the main theses and the perception of the book that Panz had co-authored. I have discussed this in detail in “Correcting the Picture”. I suggest looking close into how the Polnische Polizei and other ‘Polish’ formations are described in *Night without End*. Or one may limit oneself to reading the last sentence on the fourth page of the cover of the said book.

### A detailed response to the remarks of Dagmara Swałek-Niewińska

I have discussed the general observations of Dagmara Swałek-Niewińska in the introductory part. One of the major issues addressed in her detailed comments is the Polnische Polizei. In her clarifications, the author defends her description and explains:

I cannot agree with the reviewer’s impression that the authors claim and suggest that the Polish Police during the occupation was “a Polish state structure independent of the Germans” ([“Correcting the Picture”], p. 10). For a reader with some knowledge about the Second World War, it is evident that the Polish Police or rather Polnische Polizei, was formed to pursue goals and follow orders of the German occupation authorities. However, the reality was not as simple as Tomasz Domański sees it. (“Response”, p. 2)

I must explain here that I see a highly complex reality, free of simplifications and distortions. In one of my articles, I have shown that, e.g. in Kielce county, nearly 80 per cent of PP officials were pre-war state police officers. Moreover, over half of them (51.78 per cent) served in the police for more than ten years.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> T. Domański, “Policja granatowa w Kielcach i powiecie kieleckim w latach 1939–1945”, in *Policja granatowa w Generalnym Gubernatorstwie w latach 1939–1945*, ed. by T. Domański and E. Majcher-Ociosa (Kielce–Warszawa, 2019), pp. 125–126.

Hence, these were experienced policemen, familiar with the ‘routines’, which is crucial in this service. I agree with the author, and I have also proved it, that not all PP officials were equally committed to participating in anti-Polish or anti-Jewish actions. Hence, naturally, there have been and will be questions about the reasons for active involvement in performing German orders. Therefore, an in-depth and thorough analysis of this occupational milieu would be required in terms of social background and unique features. Such a ‘research questionnaire’ would be helpful to determine certain common elements which could substantiate a thesis on the reasons for subordination, or perhaps non-subordination, in implementing German policy.<sup>113</sup> I do agree with Swałtek-Niewińska on yet another issue. The ‘Germanness’ of the *Polnische Polizei*, that is to say, the placement of this formation in the occupation structures and the degree of its subordination to the German authorities and implementation of the German goals, does seem a bit vague. A PP policeman spoke Polish; often, he would be a pre-war policeman who people knew personally, working in the same building as before the war. No wonder that PP policemen were often treated as being ‘ours’ (“Response”, p. 5).

I am happy that Swałtek-Niewińska has noticed the complexity of the PP’s functioning. Still, the elements mentioned above are the only common points in my and hers (and the other authors’ of *Night without End*) understanding of the realities of the *Polnische Polizei*’s functioning. There are many examples in “Bochnia County” (“Powiat bocheński”) and elsewhere in *Night without End*, where events involving PP policemen are interpreted as if the author was not aware of these realities. Moreover, Swałtek-Niewińska attributes the following statement to me: “the analysis of operations of Polish policemen is irrelevant in the context of our knowledge about the involvement of some Poles in killing Jews” (“Response”, p. 3).

I have not written anything like that. It is evident to any researcher dealing with the occupation that persecution of the Jews with the involvement of the PP (including in displacement operations, round-ups, or executions) happened

---

<sup>113</sup> Important findings on the operation of the *Polnische Polizei*, its members and structures, and its position within the German occupation system, can be found in the Institute of National Remembrance’s collective publication mentioned in the preceding footnote.

everywhere in the GG where the Polnische Polizei existed. It was one of the tasks assigned to the formation by the occupation authorities, just like various persecutions of native Poles. My, allegedly erroneous, approach to the description of the PP in *Night without End* is supposedly manifested in the description of the murder of the Fragner family. Swałek-Niewińska writes in “Bochnia County” (“Powiat bocheński”): “But when the Polish Police and German Gendarmerie was called to the captured [Jews], they were executed in the nearby forest, field or cemetery, without sending to a ghetto” (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 571). Only, in such a presentation of events – as I pointed out in “Correcting the Picture” – the Polnische Polizei (or, according to the authors of *Night without End*, ‘the Polish Police’) is not a German formation made up of Poles (as it was, in fact, the case and what, as they insistently claim to be in their response to “Correcting the Picture”, the authors have indeed meant), but a different formation acting side by side with the German Gendarmerie. The official separation of the two formations assumed in this narrative is evidenced by the following sentence – a quotation from Antoni Łucki. The author accurately quotes the witness describing the Fragner family’s shooting by the “blue police assisted by one German”. Another witness’s account (Mieczysław Ledóchowski) saying that two German policemen killed the Fragner family from Bochnia (*ibid.*, p. 572) is irrelevant to the discussion. After all, Ledóchowski’s words have nothing to do with the issue of official subordination (or autonomy) of the PP police officers and only state a simple fact. However, Swałek-Niewińska does not say which version of the story about the murder of the Fragner family is more credible to her. She leaves it for the reader to decide.

Having analysed the court files concerning the murder of the Fragner family, used by the author, I feel embarrassed at the interpretation of these facts given in the book (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 572). Perhaps other sources could negate or confirm my conclusions, but the issue of the denunciation of this family is rather apparent. The investigation did not prove in any way that Olga K. turned in the people who could be in the future her parents-in-law because, in the light of these materials, she was helping them considerably. It is most likely that the person who had triggered the events was a farmer from the village of Muchówka, who was hiding the Fragner family, and the reason was that he feared the death penalty for helping Jews. Olga K. testified:

As far as I know, B.<sup>114</sup> had been hiding the Fragner family for a v[ery] short time, just three days. He had not kept them longer because the Germans put up announcements reading that people who were hiding Jews would be punished by death, and so he, out of fear, told them to go away. In the morning, the said farmer let them out from their hide-out and the Fragner family, that is Fragner, Izajasz, his wife Franciszka and her sister named Wiselman, went towards the woods in the direction of Rajbrot. Later I was told by people whose names I don't remember that local people attacked the Fragner family, robbed them of all their valuables, and took them to the state police [Polnische Polizei] station in Lipnica Murowana, where a German gendarme shot them at Lipnica cemetery.<sup>115</sup>

The same B. was named as the perpetrator, in the same circumstances, by another witness, Władysław Mikulski.<sup>116</sup>

According to Swałtek-Niewińska, I raise the case on the Baudienst presented in *Night without End* in a sensational tone. I can even notice a pattern here. Swałtek-Niewińska and the other authors perceive my critical remarks concerning their book as a sign of the reviewer's "excitation" and "sensational tone". I should be happy that Swałtek-Niewińska provided information about the death punishment for fleeing from the Baudienst. Indeed, the problem of the Baudienst is considerably more concealed in the texts by Tomasz Frydel and Dariusz Libionka. I have devoted a long passage in that section of "Correcting the Picture" to Libionka's description in his "Miechów County" ("Powiat miechowski") chapter. I suggest that Swałtek-Niewińska should read the relevant sections of Professor Libionka's writings because I still believe that it is a distortion of history to present the Junaks forced to participate in the Holocaust operations nearly as autonomous actions ("Correcting the Picture", p. 14).

---

<sup>114</sup> No farmer named B. from the village had ever admitted to the MO (People's Militia) that he had hidden Jews. See: AIPN Kr, Sąd Apelacyjny w Krakowie (Court of Appeal in Cracow), 1940–1945, 502/3569, Letter of the chief of the MO station in Nowy Wiśnicz to the Prosecutor's Office in Cracow, Branch Office in Bochnia, dated 11 October 1948, p. 27.

<sup>115</sup> AIPN Kr, 502/3569, Minutes of the interrogation of suspect Olga K., Gliwice, 2 September 1948, p. 11v.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, Minutes of the interrogation of witness Władysław Mikulski, Bochnia, 2 September 1948, p. 31v.

Dagmara Swałtek-Niewińska also accuses me of “making every effort to find manipulation”, which “is a general characteristic” of my text (“Response”, p. 6). Once again, there had to be remarked that I had been driven by “emotions” – this time of a “journalistic” nature. Let us carefully analyse the piece where I am supposedly making every effort to find manipulation. I pointed out that, in the description of a displacement of the Jews from Niepołomice, in August 1942, Swałtek-Niewińska omitted from the quoted account given by Anna Steinberg the information on JOD officials taking part in the operation. I wrote in the footnote that this was the only place in the book where the author referred to the Steinberg account archived in Yad Vashem. In other cases, she only provides the reference number of the account from the Jewish Historical Institute (ŻIH) (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 575; “Correcting the Picture”, p. 58). Such presentation of the source clearly suggests that two different accounts given by the same person existed, which would not be unusual. But, in fact, we have one account having different reference numbers in different archives. It’s a shame that Swałtek-Niewińska did not account for these doubts in the book.

Given the above, one can only guess. Perhaps the author wanted to ‘gild the lily’ of the scope of the preliminary survey performed, or maybe she had other reasons, like trying to omit the information on JOD’s involvement in the displacement operation? Or maybe it was about Steinberg’s words: “The Jewish militia did not insist on people to move on” (“Correcting the Picture”, p. 58)? This statement means that there must have been situations where the “Jewish militia” was more active. Many survivors talk about this, but these testimonies, showing the genuinely complicated reality of the time, have been frequently omitted in *Night without End*.

Swałtek-Niewińska provided some explanations for her quoting Anna Steinberg in response to “Correcting the Picture”. It appears that the researcher was not interested in the situation of the Jews as a whole because “the main figure described on the occasion of the Niepołomice displacement operation was the Ratajczak mentioned above” („Response”, p. 6). As she puts it: “I am not referring in this sentence to the behaviours of other policemen and their involvement in the deportation taking place there” (*ibid.*). One can get the impression that the author is unsure what the book’s main subject is. It seems that the discussion on Jews being displaced from Niepołomice should focus on that community and not on this or that policeman, regardless of their behaviour. Here, particularly surpris-

ing is the authors' statement that any attempt to interpret the book in the context of Polish-Jewish relations is incorrect:

Naturally, as a reader, he [i.e. Domański] may find this theme the most interesting or the most important, but it is worth remembering that this is not a book about Polish-Jewish relations or Polish attitudes towards Jews, and even less so an attempt to give a complete picture of the occupation reality. ("Response", p. 4)

What is, then, the main subject of the book? What is its pivot? Swałtek-Niewińska's words prove that the remarks from the review on her ignoring the occupation context or the choices made by some Jews – the choices negatively perceived by other Jews – are correct. Since the author herself admits that she intentionally omitted the JOD's involvement in the displacement operation in Niepołomice and focused only on the role of the local 'Polish police' chief, Ratajczak, what else, if not the Polish-Jewish relations, comes to the foreground?

As for other detailed remarks, Swałtek-Niewińska did not comment on the trial of a policeman named Filipowski, discussed by me in "Correcting the Picture". I still do not know what source material was the basis for her opinion that he killed a Jew in Zabierzów because, indeed, such conclusions cannot be drawn from the case file. The Filipowski case is also clearly contradictory to the final declarations made by Swałtek-Niewińska: "I have not found in this extensive text ["Correcting the Picture"] any substantial guidelines or corrections of sources or methodology used" ("Response", p. 6). These words of Swałtek-Niewińska are like repeating empty phrases that have little to do with reality. It is hard to find a better example of specific methodological guidelines than the Filipowski case comments.

I could continue by paraphrasing the author's words: I am embarrassed seeing how inattentively Dagmara Swałtek-Niewińska has read my review and her own book. The author attempts to prove that she has extensively described the issue of smuggling food to the ghettos, which I postulated in my review. She even provided the page numbers. On this occasion, she also referred to the basic principle of academic research: the choice and selection of archived material ("Response", p. 5). So, she has seemingly proved that the author of the "composition" [i.e. the reviewer] is biased and "picks on her" for no reason. Let us, therefore, return to the

sections of “Bochnia County” (“Powiat bocheński”). On pages 534–537, Swałtek-Niewińska talks about the relocations of Jews to the county, the establishment of ghettos in the county, and the functioning of Jews in locations where ghettos were not organised until 1942. Indeed, the author does mention one instance, the village of Turek, where local people reacted positively to the arrival of the Jews. And that’s it. We have not learned anything more. She does not discuss the Christian population’s attitudes in other places, although numerous questions can be asked: What were these positive reactions? Was it giving food or medicines? Offering free accommodations?

And I wouldn’t call her description of food smuggling extensive since she only devoted the two sentences to the issue:

In the case of Romek Marber’s family, maintaining the pre-war acquaintance with a Catholic neighbour from Turek, also relocated to Bochnia, proved extremely important. After the ghetto was established, together with Romek Marber’s grandfather, he smuggled goods between the Jewish district and the rest of the town. (*Night without End*, vol. 2, pp. 534–535)

The researcher did not elaborate on the theme and did not try to analyse whether this was an isolated case or rather an element of a broader phenomenon that considerably affected the Jews’ chances for survival. In “Correcting the Picture”, I wrote more about the subject. Using the source material not used by Swałtek-Niewińska, I demonstrated that the actions of the two men from Bochnia, Marian Rotkopf and Jan Lorek, gave reasons to believe that there could have been more (unknown by name) people involved in the smuggling than just an acquaintance of Romek Marber. A lot depended on the Jewish side as the most interested in obtaining food or medications. It would perfectly fit in with the methodological approach of *Night without End*, where the authors quite strongly highlight self-reliance and the self-organisation of Jews. The theme of Marber has been cut short by Swałtek-Niewińska, who stated in the following sentence:

But, in most cases, the financial situation of people displaced from the areas incorporated into the Third Reich was bad because they were brutally torn away



from their places of work and sources of income. The Jewish Social Mutual Help organisation made considerable efforts to help the newly arriving Jews in the county towns. (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 535)

Finally, I would like to respond to one more comment of Dagmara Swałtek-Niewińska: “But I am certain that the review will be used as a tool in contemporary journalist and political discussion” (“Response”, p. 6). Well, many scholarly publications stir up discussion. It is vital that all judgements and opinions, particularly of a journalist nature, are formulated with respect for diligence and truth and not meant just to discredit the reviewer who has dared to disagree with the authors.

### A detailed response to the remarks of Tomasz Frydel

I will start my response to Tomasz Frydel with something he considers a “trifling mistake”. It is a perfect exemplification of this author’s model of thinking and argumentation as well as the other ones. They call minor or trifling mistakes all identified errors (but also manipulations and distortions). I naturally agree with the author that every researcher has the right to make mistakes (as we all do), but to confuse *Selbstschutz* with *Sonderdienst* is a severe substantive error. *Selbstschutz* and *Sonderdienst*, although both comprised of representatives of the German minority in Poland, are considerably different formations. The *Selbstschutz* was a paramilitary organisation established in 1939, based on a national socialist ideology dominated by hatred against the Poles and known for its bad reputation. Members of the *Selbstschutz* actively participated in and committed many crimes against their Polish neighbours from the first moments of the war. In contrast, the *Sonderdienst* was a police-like formation of Governor General Hans Frank, created after the occupation structures had become more firmly established.

Moving on to the point, Tomasz Frydel sees in my review “the crux of erroneous reasoning”:

For, he [i.e. Domański] adopts a dictionary (or common) definition of terms usually used in social history and then eagerly applies such literary sense, deprived of historiographical connotations, to the reviewed text and uses it as the foundation for his criticism. (“Response”, p. 4)

Unfortunately, the author does not specify which terms I have misinterpreted. I assume this also applies to the history of the Bäumer und Lösch camp. Regrettably, Frydel has not addressed any of my critical comments, namely calling a survival strategy any action aimed at saving one's own life, even *par excellence*, the betrayal of one's fellow man. I asked a fundamental question in my review, which Frydel fails or does not want to notice: did Jews kept in the said camp or hiding in the villages of Dębica county in 1944 understand and interpret the actions of Izaak Kaplan's group as a survival strategy? I stated rather clearly that Kaplan's contemporaries had a completely different perception (not to mention experience) than the one presented in Frydel's analysis. The 'dissonance' among various 'survival strategies' was probably the most noticeable to the Jewish community members. They, after the war, most categorically demanded the establishment of Community Courts and squaring accounts with the dark occupation history.<sup>117</sup>

The activities of Kaplan's group, or precisely the number of Jews captured and turned in by himself and his accomplices and then murdered by the Germans, have not significantly affected the content of the table titled 'Perpetrators and Circumstances of Death of Jewish Fugitives' drawn up by Frydel (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 450). I agree with the author that the exact data are not available, yet the author estimated the number of the group's victims at "dozens of people" (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 510). However, it is surprising that due to the lack of detailed data, the author had ignored Kaplan's victims entirely in the figures concerning Jews hiding in villages and had not accounted for those data in his estimates. Failure to account for this information is a significant substantive error. A table is used not only to provide specific numbers, but it should also accurately reflect the facts: in the absence of exact numbers – estimates. In this situation, in the context of "own estimates based on gathered documentation", the total of 952 seems questionable. It can be assumed that more people were trying to survive but were eventually killed (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 452).

This unjustified interpretation of the occupation reality as "competing" survival strategies (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 509, 518) is also evidenced by the author's

---

<sup>117</sup> A. Żbikowski, *Sąd Społeczny przy CKŻP. Wojenne rozliczenia społeczności żydowskiej w Polsce* (Warszawa, 2014), pp. 33–36.

omission of a more detailed account of the second liquidation operation of the Dębica ghetto. In his chapter, Frydel devoted two sentences to that event: “The Gestapo carried out the second liquidation operation in the ghetto on 15–16 December, with the help of the Immerglück and Order Service. Among people transported to the Bełżec death camp, there was the chairman of the Dębica Judenrat, Józef Taub, with his wife and two children” (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 502). The ‘displacement’ operation’s dramatic details are found in the omitted section of Berl Stur’s account, whom the Job family later hid.

Sturm recalled:

On 15 December 1942, during the Dębica ghetto liquidation, I was hiding with my daughter, Anna Sturm, with a group of six people, in a bunker in the ghetto. At 6:00 am, two Jewish militiamen – Monek K. and Pulek G. from Dębica – came to say they had to reveal our bunker. My son, Izaak, who worked in the same building in a shoemaker’s workshop and was ‘legal’, cried before them, begging them not to do that, but to no avail. They told him to reveal the bunker. These two militiamen dragged all six of us out to the hall; my son had to go back to work in the workshop. The militiamen stood in front of me with long sticks in their hands. I begged K. to let me go to the workshop and say goodbye to my son, but he categorically refused. They led us to an empty field, in the direction of the hospital, where they executed people every night. As we walked there, Pulek G. went away to get other Jews. K. was leading us alone. It was at daybreak. The fog was so thick that one could hardly see another person. Then I decided to run away. I managed to run with my daughter to the woods, where someone robbed me of all my money.<sup>118</sup>

This passage, shocking but perfectly depicting the tragedy of those events, provokes another question about Frydel’s concept of “two competing survival strategies” being justified (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 511). ‘Competitiveness’ ended where the ‘strategies’ were mutually exclusive, when ‘the strategy’ of two Jewish policemen ‘leads to death’ – as it clearly follows from Sturm’s account – of

---

<sup>118</sup> AŻIH, 301/4596, Account of Sturm Berl, [place unknown], 17 June 1946, TS, p. 1.

the 'strategy' of the Jews hidden in a bunker. Sturm – and the voice of this witness should be decisive – did not see any 'competitiveness' here, but a brutal fight for life, for another day, in the conditions created by the Germans. Sturm does not mention the Germans in his account. However, does it mean they were not there?

The omitted section of Sturm's account provokes further questions about the statistics provided on page 413 (*Night without End*, vol. 2) and the reliability of the author's phrase – "own estimates based on gathered documentation". It can be assumed from Sturm's account that eventually, some Jews were murdered during the second displacement. However, we don't know what Frydel's thoughts on that subject are.

Inaccurate are the author's comments – naturally spiced up with the accusation of my alleged ignorance. "Correcting the Picture" –

is an example of a fundamental lack of understanding of the discussion on the social dynamics and mechanisms of extreme violence in the community context, which is evidenced by the reviewer's knowledge or rather his lack of broader historiographical competences concerning the Holocaust. ("Response", p. 18)

Frydel writes: "In the sub-chapter concerned (and the chapter as a whole), I consistently apply the fundamental heuristic principle – empathy for all authors – both Poles and Jews, entangled in the hellish dynamics of the German occupation" ("Response", p. 7). Frydel is right when he emphasises the impact of the occupation conditions on human behaviours. Unfortunately, his final theses deny the facts and, most importantly, the logic of his arguments.

Moreover, they run against a properly conducted analysis. In his response, but most importantly, in his chapter, the author writes about terror, the death penalty, and pacifications for helping Jews and turning in or hunting for Jews by Polish villagers. He seems to recognise the complexity of the problem. He points to human action mechanisms and admits that Poles began to perceive Jews as a threat to their own, particularly collective, existence due to German repressive actions. Still, at the same time, he can trivialise the problem, contradicting his argumentation. According to Frydel, the fundamental source of Poles turning in Jews was Polish anti-Semitism: "Deep changes in social relations consequent upon extreme

terror could only enhance (or trigger) anti-Semitism existing since pre-war times” (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 476), and exclusion of the Jews “from the Polish nation’s *universum* of its moral obligations”. A Jewish life, as Frydel argues, was interesting for Polish neighbours “as long as they [the fugitives] were the source of money and valuables” (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 477). He easily bandies accusations like that around. Is his generalisation founded in any way? Certainly, it is not based on his argumentation. It would be appropriate if the author adopted a more individualised approach and accounted for the problem’s nuances. Perhaps he could give examples of actual denunciations or murders by local people, which were the effect of hidden anti-Semitism breaking out after pacification actions. To present the evil done to Jews by Poles (because, regardless of our judgements, turning someone in to the Germans was evil) as coming down to anti-Semitism, in the light of “hellish wartime entanglements” the author writes about, is a huge misunderstanding. What is, then, the author’s assessment of the reasons for disregarding ‘Jewish life’ by the above-mentioned Jewish members of the Jüdischer Ordnungsdienst?

The above conclusions bring us close to another general ‘discovery’ made by Frydel:

The data [*Night without End*, vol. 2, the table on p. 450] help notice different conditions of unsuccessful attempts to survive in the provinces. Both the number of victims and the perpetrators of these crimes confirm the thesis about the decisive role of the rural self-defence system and local factors in political actions. In all three categories of murders committed by police-like forces, most victims had been ‘turned in by the locals’. The pressure to capture and turn in Jews was exerted from the bottom – by villagers and, most importantly, by people engaged in self-protection structures. Police-like round-ups of Jews initiated without the involvement of the village security system were much rarer. If they happened, they resulted from activities of a network of informers or happened by accident [...]. (*Night without End*, vol. 2, pp. 450–451)

The problem is that Frydel’s general disquisitions here considerably undermine what he writes later about German actions and the reaction of the conquered

people. Equally strongly manifested here is one of the book's key themes, namely that the survival of Jews in the years 1942–1945 depended on the attitudes of Poles towards Jews. Frydel's thesis is entirely detached from the motivation and, most importantly, from the circumstances in which the 'perpetrators' – in this case, villagers – functioned. Pressure on turning in the Jews and other suspicious persons was not exerted by village watches or villagers but by the German occupation authorities enacting their murderous 'law' and imposing obligations (including on village watches). The pressure was from the top, and acting was ascribed to the bottom. To lose this hierarchy is putting the well-known and described occupation system upside down. Had the pressure been exerted from the bottom, pacification actions with killing innocent people, organised by police-like forces to remind the villagers of their duty to capture Jews, would have been redundant. Moreover, there would be no sense in organising briefings in the GG, where representatives of the German administration reminded people of their 'duty' to capture Jews (Grabowski or Skibińska mention this duty in their respective chapters) or any suspicious persons posing a threat to the village's security.

The thesis so strongly advanced by Frydel, actually shifting the responsibility from the Germans upon the rural community, is all the more astonishing that it is put forward by the researcher who, later in the book, among other things, points to an essential link between terror and turning in Jews. Frydel's thesis is also noticeable in the following sentence: "It is hard not to conclude that the lion's share of the victims in the county was killed by the German police" (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 452). Given the brutality of the German occupation in Poland and one of the critical tasks the occupation and the Third Reich authorities assigned to themselves, namely total extermination of the Jews, the above statement is instead an obviousness, not a revelation. Naturally, one must also consider personal responsibility, overzealousness, initiative, etc. (which was strongly emphasised during the post-war trials – there are numerous publications on the subject, which Frydel could use) from the villagers' side.

So, instead of making unjustified generalisations, in his table entitled 'Perpetrators and Circumstances of Death of Jewish Fugitives' and, subsequently, in the comments to the table, Frydel could have differentiated between instances of denunciations and murders of Jews in his focus area, motivated by fear or an 'imaginary'

fear and those being simply acts of banditry or anti-Semitism. Such an approach to the crime and its dynamics would be closer to reality. The author established that at least 32–35 Jews were captured in the villages of Dębica county after the pacification action in Podborze (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 474). When we refer this data to Table 9 (*ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 450), we will see that out of the 96 ‘local’ Jews turned in, approximately one-third of them were turned in after the pacification action carried out by German soldiers in Podborze. How do these numbers correspond with the generalisations about anti-Semitism and “pressure from the bottom”?

Since Tomasz Frydel has deigned to evoke Leopold von Ranke in his response and call me a supporter of his method, I would like to remind the words written about Ranke’s narrative: “although every sentence used by Ranke to create his picture is true, the picture itself is not”.<sup>119</sup> And this is precisely the case with the presentation of some of Frydel’s research outcomes. However, I do not see any contradiction between empiricism (Ranke) and the need for a broader presentation of everyday existence. This particular remark pertains to the work’s title, namely the fate of Jews under the German occupation. Is it possible that Frydel finds it inappropriate to identify research needs in a review that mainly addresses the problems related to source materials?

This part of the chapter “Dębica County” (“Powiat dębicki”) also shows that the way the authors describe the *Polnische Polizei* suggests its Polish character (which would be justified only in terms of the nationality of its members), and not to say – it’s an emanation of the Polish state. Naming the perpetrators of individual crimes committed against the Jews, Frydel mentions apart from the German police – also “Polish police forces” (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 451). It is impossible not to repeat the words of Swałek-Niewińska here: “To a reader having some knowledge about the Second World War, it is obvious that the Polish Police or rather the *Polnische Polizei*, was formed to pursue goals and obey orders of the German occupation authorities” (“Response”, p. 3). The blue police was a police-like force of the German GG and not Poland.

Coming back to Frydel’s thesis about pacification actions being a catalyst for anti-Semitism, which is controversial, to say the least, one must ask, following the

---

<sup>119</sup> J. Topolski, *Prawda i model w historiografii* (Łódź, 1982), p. 25.

logic of such a concept, about the existence of any anti-Dutch feeling before the war in the village of Straszęcín or its vicinity, since, in 1943, two Dutchmen were captured there. When referring to the events of 1943 in Straszęcín, the author made the following comment in the main text: “Similar concerns and situations consequent upon repressive actions were also observed concerning other groups of fugitives, e.g. prisoners of war who had escaped from captivity” (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 476). A footnote is added to this sentence, while the main text reads:

In the village of Straszęcín, the village head with the night-watchmen captured two Dutch prisoners of war, who had escaped from Pustków, and handed them over, chained, to the blue police in Dębica. Both men had been hiding in the village, but after the pacification action in the nearby village of Bobrowa, on 8 July 1943, the villagers’ attitudes changed. (*ibid.*)

The testimonies of witnesses and other findings show that the Dutchmen were captured because they had been suspected of collaboration with the Germans and apparently because of their suspicious behaviour. Nevertheless, Frydel’s conclusions leave no doubt. Omitting suspicions of possible collaboration with the Germans, Frydel treats testimonies of witnesses and official findings (based on these testimonies) as an apparent excuse justifying the capture and delivery of the two men from the village where they first had found help. He claims that the only reason was fear caused by pacification actions in the area. Good that at least in the response, the author is less radical and admits that it could have also been the suspected collaboration with the Germans. Perhaps my suggestion was too firm, as well; nonetheless, I cannot entirely agree with Frydel that the idea of “the Dutchmen as German agents” was formed later in the course of the trial because he had forgotten to mention the essential testimony of one of the accused, Ludwik Adamowicz, dated 22 May 1951:

One day, I do not remember what day it was, when I was on the road, I saw people running in the direction of the buildings where Andrzej Wój lived.<sup>120</sup> I went there,

---

<sup>120</sup> The correct name is Wojko. See: Archives of the Institute of National Remembrance in Rzeszów (hereinafter: AIPN Rz), 358/59, Testimony of witness Andrzej Wojko given at the main trial, Dębica, 25 September 1951, p. 292.



too, and learned that at Wój's, there were Germans in civilian clothes – instigators. A moment later, Jan Skowron, deputy commune leader [deputy village head], came out, the ringleader in the village of whom everyone was scared, and Stanisław Kolbusz – chief of the county watch. Skowron or Kolbusz told me, “Come here. We have some Germans that need to be delivered to the police.” Skowron and Kolbusz explained that they were instigators, snoopers who wanted to check whether people here were willing to hide fugitives. I went with them to the village head's room, where there were many peasants and two men – allegedly Germans.<sup>121</sup>

This was the accused's first testimony. These words were also repeated in Adamowicz's application for release from remand at his final interrogation on 21 July 1951,<sup>122</sup> but also in the applications (there were two), filed with the prosecutor's office in Rzeszow by the wife of the accused, Stanisław Kolbusz, named Stefania, concerning her husband's release.<sup>123</sup> So, witnesses talked about “suspicious persons” at a relatively early stage. Frydel omitted Adamowicz's testimony and applications, using only the testimony given during the main trial. Having done so, it was easy for him to accuse me that I had anticipated the trial findings to support my thesis. As shown above, it was not true at all.

Simultaneously, in his response to “Correcting the Picture”, Frydel presented some testimonies of witnesses and suspects, allegedly proving his theses' validity. Nevertheless, he omitted all the rest. Witness Bronisława Dymska-Mazur testified:

I heard that before they captured the Dutchmen in Bobrowa, the Germans had killed some people and burnt houses, so we were scared because, as Ignacy Lipa told my husband and my husband then told me, a piece of paper had been pinned to Lipa's house reading that my husband, Jan Dymski, along with Stanisław Golema and Stanisław Kolbusz, had been accused of communism. Kolbusz was

---

<sup>121</sup> AIPN Rz, 358/59, Transcript of the interrogation of a suspect Ludwik Adamowicz, Oleśnica, 22 May 1951, p. 64.

<sup>122</sup> AIPN Rz, 358/59, Letter by Ludwik Adamowicz to the county prosecutor's office in Dębica, Wrocław, 5 July 1951, pp. 198–199; *ibid.*, Transcript of the final interrogation of suspect Ludwik Adamowicz, Dębica, 21 July 1951, pp. 161–162.

<sup>123</sup> AIPN Rz, 358/59, Request by Stefania Kolbusz, Bobrowa, 6 June 1951, p. 76; *ibid.*, Letter by Stefania Kolbusz to regional prosecutor in Rzeszow, Dębica, 6 June 1951, pp. 77–78.

even more frightened because he hid a Russian in his house. After the occupation, I heard that there had been Jews hiding at Szostak's. I also heard that there were Dutchmen in the village, and the people were scared of them because they did not know who they were. People were saying they were buying some duvets from them. I guess that after burning the houses in Bobrowa, the acc[used] Ludwik Adamowicz was hiding from the Germans, and even once wanted to spend a night at our home but we refused because we had once seen the Germans coming for him, in a car. I cannot remember if it was before capturing the Dutchmen.<sup>124</sup>

Witness Tadeusz Pytynia testified:

I saw these two men once [...] talking to a village girl who, as I heard later – told me they used to come to her. I saw the same two men who had been talking to her a few days later, sunbathing by the Wisłoka River. When I saw them for the first time, they were well dressed. I heard that the Germans had carried out a pacification action in Bobrowa, where they had killed 18 people and burnt some buildings.<sup>125</sup>

Witness Julia Szostak testified:

Some three months before capturing those Dutchmen, as they had been called, they were roaming about the village, and came to me several times. I once even purchased a pair of trousers from them, and they were also coming to see my daughter, Michalina, now married and named Dymska. People in the village said that they were spies, and my daughter was even hiding from them. About a month after being captured, my late niece told me she used to see them on the road, in a car, with the Germans, already after being captured [...]. My daughter got a letter from one of them.<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> AIPN Rz, 358/59, Testimony of witness Bronisława Dymska-Mazur given at the main trial, Dębica, 25 September 1951, pp. 293–294.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, Testimony of witness Tadeusz Pytynia, given at the main trial, Dębica, 25 September 1951, p. 294.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, Testimony of witness Julia Szostak, given at the main trial, Dębica, 25 September 1951, pp. 294–295.

Witness Józef Rak testified:

It was summer, I do not remember the year, there were two men in the village. People called them 'the Dutchmen' because they told them they were Dutch. Actually, they used to visit the village and later go away in the direction of Pustków. I saw them a few times at Wójek's, Jan Szostak's and Krzywak's. They once came to my mother's house with a suitcase. In it were German striped duvets for sale. I reprimanded my mother for buying because my cousin from Bobrowa and others were sent to a prison camp for a few months for purchasing blankets from such men. I saw them once in front of Jan Szostak's house, drinking vodka. People from Pustków warned us against these Dutchmen because they were roaming about Pustków openly, in broad daylight, and drinking vodka and selling things. I have no direct information about capturing the Dutchmen. I only know it was known from the morning what would happen to them. That afternoon, maybe around 3:00 pm, I heard from Jan Skowron that he told them [he had told them, i.e. the Dutchmen? – T.D.] to move [go] further away, or they would be taken away. Those Dutchmen were well dressed, roamed openly around the village, and looked well fed. I was hiding away from the Germans because I had escaped from a transport to a labour camp, often fleeing with Ludwik Adamowicz when the Germans were coming by the village.<sup>127</sup>

Witness Ignacy Lipa testified:

From about spring until they were captured, two young men used to come to the village – people were saying they were Dutchmen. They came to my house a few times, once they had a coat to sell, but I was afraid that others would take it away from me if I bought anything from them. Besides, they came because of my daughters, whom I forbade to have any contact. We communicated a bit in German and with gestures. People were scared of them because they did not know "who they were". After all, they could have been Germans pretending

---

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, Testimony of witness Józef Rak, given at the main trial, Dębica, 25 September 1951, pp. 294–295.

they did not understand Polish. At that time, a piece of paper was pinned to my house, along with my name and the names of Stanisław Golema, Stanisław Kolbusz, and Jan Dymski, announcing that we were communists or suspected communists. The Dutchmen worked at the Wojko's; they were threshing with a machine. Those Dutchmen were well-dressed in civilian clothes; they were good-looking, with haircuts. They walked around the village openly. Prisoners from Pustków had their hair cut short.<sup>128</sup>

Witness Michalina Dymka testified:

It was summer, I do not remember the year, it was still bright. Seeing a horse cart going to Wojko's, I watched because I knew they would take two young men away, who used to often come there. From about 100 meters, I saw the cart pulling up in front of Wojko's house, and the two men got into the cart. Piotr Golema alone was in the cart, no one else. I went away before the cart left. I had known those two young men since spring. For about four months, they came to the village, selling things. They came several times to my house, and I spoke with them a little in German and also communicated by gestures. They said they lived in Lignoza. I bought half of a military duvet and trousers from them; they also had shoes; one of the neighbours bought them. Besides, they came because of my daughters, whom I forbade to have any contact with. They came cause they wanted to buy vodka and butter, too. When I worked in the garden in Lignoza, I saw them there, walking around, well-dressed. I did not see them doing anything. On the day they were taken away on a cart from Wojko's, I saw them there and told them to go away from the village or be taken away, but they only laughed. They were visiting the Wojkos, Stanisław Golema, Adam Lipa, Piotr Krzywak, who bought a jacket and mantle from them, and others. Someone bought a camera from them. When I warned them to go away from the village, I spoke Polish and used hand gestures, and they told me they understood. Moreover, they understood when they wanted to buy vodka and were told there was no vodka, which they also understood. They did not speak Polish; they only

---

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, Testimony of witness Ignacy Lipa, given at the main trial, Dębica, 25 September 1951, p. 295.

knew a few words. They used to come at various times during the day. I never heard that they stayed for the night in the village; they came during the day. I saw them going away in the direction of Ligoza. After they were captured, I did not see them either in Ligoza or the village. After they were captured, I worked in Ligoza for a short time. Before they were captured, they had been to Cracow, and I got a letter from Cracow written to me in German. When they returned from Cracow, I avoided them, so they did not come anymore. In Bobrowa, some people came with religious medallions and prayer books, and then came the pacification. Some 20 people were shot dead and buildings burnt down, and the people thought it was all because those peddlers got information from people about what was going on in the village. The prisoners' barrack working under armed guard in Ligoza was in the forest, some 2 km away surrounded by barbed wire. I saw those men whom people called the Dutchmen, speaking freely with the Germans in Ligoza. They looked like some experts. People called them the Germans, too. They were well-dressed, wearing elegant shirts, and the camp prisoners had work clothes with side stripes, a star on the back, and a number.<sup>129</sup>

It is clear from the above that the Dutchmen's behaviour seemed 'strange' to the people of Wola Bobrowska. They roamed the village openly; they were well dressed, well-fed, were selling things, did not run away, and even sunbathed by the river. All this conflicted with the image of people chased and persecuted by the Germans – Jews, Soviets – runaway prisoners. If we link the facts with the testimony of Michalina Dymska about 'peddlers' and of Jan Skowron (given at the main trial), the sequence of events seems obvious. Frydel ignores yet another important detail in his response and the book. One of the people accused of turning in the Dutchmen, Stanisław Szostak, had been hiding a Jew in his attic for a long time – Tewel Knie. (Szostak called him, apparently by mistake, Tehelkni), as claimed during the trial by a relative of the family – Juda Preker (he was talking about the Knie family).<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, Testimony of witness Ignacy Lipa given at the main trial, Dębica, 25 September 1951, p. 295.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, Testimony of Stanisław Szostak given at the main trial, Dębica, 25 September 1951, p. 288; *ibid.*, Testimony of witness Juda Preker given at the main trial, Dębica, 25 September 1951, p. 294.

This information is found in the chapter “Dębica County” (“Powiat dębicki”) (vol. 2, p. 431), but without specifying that it pertains to Szostak, accused of capturing the Dutchmen. Moreover, although it seems reasonable in the book, as the case of the Dutchmen is only mentioned there, then it is certainly not in the response, which is to prove that the reason for turning in the Jews was the pacification action in Bobrowa. Szostak was involved in capturing the Dutchmen because he was so ordered (as he testified)<sup>131</sup> by Jan Skowron and because the Dutchmen’s behaviour was suspicious, not because of fear or panic. After all, he had already risked his and his family’s life hiding Tewel Knie.

A fascinating question about the Dutchmen is why the information about their alleged collaboration with the Germans had appeared before the court trial only in the testimony of one of the accused. Perhaps because the testimonies of the other accused (and of those accused in other, similar cases) pertained to who (and where) captured the victims, how they behaved (demonstrated active or passive behaviour), who tied up the victims, who ordered their capturing. Perhaps this is because the investigation was conducted by the People’s Militia (MO) functionaries taking a very narrow ‘perpetrator–victim’ perspective. These details, totally obscuring the background, must have been extremely important for the trial, as strongly evidenced by the example of Piotr Golema, one of the farmers accused of capturing the Dutchmen. The proceedings against him were discontinued because – as stated by the prosecutor’s motion – the man was only performing a ‘technical’ function as a coachman, so he only drove the captured Dutchmen. “And since – the prosecutor argued – in light of the judgement of the Whole Criminal Chamber of the Supreme Court dated 2 February 1951 [...], a coachman who only performed the actual act of driving a cart is not guilty of a crime punishable under the August Decree of 1944, and this was the action performed by Piotr Golema – an application for discontinuation of this proceeding is justified”.<sup>132</sup> It only shows how very vague the provisions of the August Decree were. It also confirms the conclusions drawn by the attorneys in the 1940s and 1950s, mentioned by Kornbluth.

---

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, Testimony of witness Stanisław Szostak given at the main trial, Dębica, 25 September 1951, p. 288.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, Application for discontinuation of the proceeding against Piotr Golema, Dębica, 23 July 1951, p. 166.

Also, note that, for the people living in the country at that time (and later), who were often uneducated, illiterate, or almost illiterate, an event like a pacification action served as a point of reference (something happened before or after the pacification action). Frydel does not seem to understand it. Therefore, in this case, and hundreds of others, in transcripts of interrogations conducted by the former District Commission to Investigate Nazi Crimes or for the 'August trials' (*sierpniówki*), expressions like "I do not remember the day" or "I do not remember the year" are pretty frequent. The events in Bobrowa served as a point of reference, a warning about what may happen if the threat is not taken seriously. One of the accused, Kolbusz, testified that they had been forced to sign investigation reports. It is also how the other accused explained the differences between the investigation reports and their testimonies given before the court.<sup>133</sup>

In another string entitled 'Gontarczyk – good, Frydel – bad', Tomasz Frydel refers to the murder of Jankiel Liberman described by me. The event is presented in *Night without End* by Professor Dariusz Libionka. My objections to this author resulted from the analysis of this particular case and the occupation reality, which – I believe – Libionka has ignored. I only mentioned that Piotr Gontarczyk had already commented on the description of the murder of Liberman and that I simply agreed with his opinion ("Correcting the Picture", pp. 38–39). This is not something extraordinary when one researcher agrees with the theses of another.

I have the impression that Frydel also agrees with the interpretation provided by Gontarczyk, but here comes the most interesting reflection of Frydel making the following, most unusual, accusation against me:

At the same time, this point of view is rejected by the reviewer when it is used in my article. It should be added that the publication of our book has preceded Gontarczyk's article, and the mechanisms in question have been described in the book more thoroughly and extensively. The article by Gontarczyk, referred to by Domański, addresses the issues already discussed in *Night without End*.

---

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, Testimony of witness Stanisław Kolbusz given at the main trial, Dębica, 25 September 1951, p. 286.

[...] An unbiased reader would admit that this is exactly the subject matter of two sub-chapters in my text. The reviewer only processes the findings, presenting them slightly differently, as if unaware, he was just reinventing the wheel. (“Response”, p. 8)

Every reader of “Correcting the Picture” and my present response will notice that I acknowledge Frydel’s research findings and correct interpretation of the events (where it is correct). It applies to these ‘hellish entanglements’ and the awareness of the link between German pacification actions and denouncing Jews. However, Frydel simply directs his accusations to the wrong person, concurrently making erroneous generalisations (I shall not comment on the language he uses). Suppose similar analyses of complex occupation realities and mechanisms of human behaviour are present throughout *Night without End*. Why are they not observable in Dariusz Libionka’s description of Liberman’s case? Why are there no reflections of that kind in the chapter by Jean-Charles Szurek? Perhaps Tomasz Frydel does not know this book – apart from his chapter. Alternatively, maybe he has not read it attentively enough. He should address his comments, not to me but to the co-authors of *Night without End*.

Later in the same part, Frydel makes further accusations against me. This time the comments have been triggered by my opinion expressed in “Correcting the Picture” that *Night without End* lacks deeper reflection about the pressure exerted on local people to make them obey German orders (“Correcting the Picture”, p. 16). Frydel claims I haven’t noticed his “deepened reflection” on creating the atmosphere of fear (“Response”, p. 9). The author of “Dębica County” (“Powiat dębicki”) has not read “Correcting the Picture” carefully enough. Otherwise, he would have found the following passage there:

The majority of ‘county’ texts generally lack deepened reflection on that subject ‘although this full responsibility’ commonly referred to local representatives of the ‘authorities’ in the area where Jews – illegally from the perspective of German laws – were seeking refuge. Fortunately, the problem has been noticed by Tomasz Frydel, who expressly speaks of the threatening death penalty. (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 446)



Doesn't it sufficiently prove that I see Frydel's text's analytical value when such analytical value is manifested? I believe that making imaginary accusations and engaging in polemics is pointless for its sake. Again, I recommend that Tomasz Frydel abandons his desperate attempt to defend *Night without End* and simply read the whole book. At this point, I would like to refer to one of Frydel's final comments about my alleged *Gleichschaltung* of the entire mentioned book. Well, no, I will not do it anywhere. However, I see numerous examples of a similar way of describing past events detached from the facts and sources.

Frydel also accuses me of using too far-reaching generalisations. To prove it, he is quoting my words: "the analysis of source materials actually used in 'county' descriptions shows that the most common source materials are various accounts and recollections of the survivors (and rarely Polish memoir-type works)" ("Correcting the Picture", p. 28). Later, Frydel provides detailed information on the number of Polish memoir-type works 'used' in his chapter and stated:

Sticking to the main point of the discussion, I would like to deny that I used mainly the accounts and recollections of Jewish survivors. My primary sources are testimonies of Poles in the so-called 'August' trials, Home Army dispatches, reports of the Central Commission to Investigate Nazi Crimes, and Polish memoirs, chronicles, and diaries. ("Response", p. 7)

Frydel's thesis does not hold because the author slightly 'adjusted' his sentence (omitted its continuation) where, among the essential sources used by the authors, I mention the 'August trials' materials.<sup>134</sup> I broadly discussed the problem of founding theses on 'trimmed' quotations in "Correcting the Picture". As you can see, I have not omitted the 'August trials' in my description. Still, I mentioned them in the first place as the primary source. When I wrote: "other documents mentioned there", I simply did not want to repeat what the editors had written in the "Fore-

---

<sup>134</sup>The sentence reads as follows: "Yet, the analysis of source materials actually used in 'county' descriptions shows that the most common source material is various accounts and recollections of the survivors (and rarely Polish memoir-type works) kept in several archives, published in printed form, available on the internet (e.g. remembrance books in abbreviated English language version) complemented by the 'August trials' files, and – to a much smaller degree – other documents mentioned there" ("Correcting the Picture", p. 28).

word”. Frydel’s criticism follows from an erroneous understanding of the section concerned. My analysis referred to the book as a whole and not only his chapter. There is not, and there cannot be any automation in this respect. Various sources may dominate individual sub-chapters or sections, but the sources I mentioned are from the source materials’ core body.

The author (and also other authors of *Night without End*) tries to divert the polemic to issues of secondary or even lesser importance, while the objections raised are considerable. It is, for instance, the case with the use of Berl Sturm’s account. The comments in “Correcting the Picture” pertain to Frydel’s deliberations on Poles being motivated by their “imaginary fear of denunciation by the Jews” (“Correcting the Picture”, pp. 39–40). In his response, Frydel quotes an extensive passage from the book, emphasising that not the whole Job family escaped after hearing that the Sturm family they had been hiding was caught (“Response”, pp. 9–10). Nevertheless, my entire conclusion referred to using this story as an example of imaginary denunciation – based on the story’s ending, the Sturm family did not turn in anyone. The Germans conducted no repressive action and even gave the Jews some food – hence the threat was imaginary. Such a manner of drawing conclusions and advancing research theses is an example of ahistorical thinking. After all, the whole paragraph Frydel begins with the words: “There are some examples of situations where the actions of Poles were motivated by their imaginary fear of denunciation by the Jews” (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 456). Moreover, I mentioned the Job family as the first example. Had the Sturm family turned in the Job family, could their actions (escape) still be described as motivated by an imaginary fear of denunciation? All their names would likely be included in Table 10 for Dębica county (‘Cases of Denunciation Found in Source Materials’ – *Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 463). Hence, one could conclude that members of underground organisations running away or changing hideaways and points of contact after a ‘leak’ were motivated by an imaginary fear of danger. But these were just basic safety precautions, just like in the case of the Job family. Unfortunately, in his analysis of the past, Frydel fails to understand these fundamental issues and tries to devalue the problem, using empty phrases like “what has that got to do with anything?” (“Response”, p. 11).

The history of the Job family is also a source of conclusions related to covering the costs of help. This is similar to using sources as the one discussed in “Correcting the Picture” in my remarks to Libionka’s text. Frydel writes:

It should be assumed that paying was the most effective, combined with such favourable circumstances as a pre-war acquaintance or closer relationship with the helpers, i.e. when paying for help was not the only element of the strategy. Sometimes a person kept hiding Jews even when they ran out of money **because some ties or bonds were formed between them** [emphasis mine – T.D.]. Having escaped with his daughter from the Dębica ghetto, Berl Sturm met 17-year-old Stefania Job in Łęki Dolne and promised ‘compensation’ for hiding them. ‘I had paid her money for a few months’, Sturm wrote after the war. ‘When I ran out of cash, Stefania Job did not stop helping’ – he added, and the determination in saving Sturm and his daughter was even greater. (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 432)

From this narrative, it follows that initially, Job decided to help Jews only for financial reasons. Only later did a particular bond develop between the saving and the saved. A post-war account of Sturm, evoked by Frydel, reveals quite different reasons for this assistance. Decisive for Stefania Job’s decision was the Sturms’ tragic situation and her sympathy for them, and the compensation was suggested only by Berl Sturm. These are his own words:

On the road to Tarnów, I met a 17-year-old girl, Stefania Job, from Łęka Dolna. **I did not know her, and she did not know us. Seeing our tragic situation (my daughter was limping because of exhaustion), she took pity on us and, having heard our story, promised to help us.** We went with her to her home, where she promised to hide us. **On the way, I declared compensation for her help** [emphasis mine – T.D.].<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup> AŻIH, 301/4596, Account by Berl Sturm, Cracow, 17 July 1946, TS, p. 2.

Then Sturm talks about paying and then further help despite the subsequent lack of money. However, he had been promised help by a stranger before any money was mentioned or a bond developed.

There is an error in Frydel's text that needs to be corrected: "Stefania Job twice volunteered to go to Germany when the police surrounded the house to 'avoid searching of the house where we were hiding'. Her father stood up for her the first time, and the second time – her brother" (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 432, p. 201). Such a description is illogical and not true to the facts. It is not true that Stefania Job twice volunteered to go to Germany. Had she volunteered, police raids on their home would have been pointless. She was simply included in the list, and she did not want to go. Hence, the police were after her. Stefania's brother and father volunteered to go instead of her. The second time, to prevent further police raids and save the Jews they had been hiding, she did not run away and was arrested as a result. Then her brother volunteered to go instead of her, and she was released.<sup>136</sup>

The Leopold Trejbicz account I evoke as evidence of the commonly experienced sense of fear of denunciation Frydel calls a poor example ("Response", p. 12). Let us recall the facts. Trejbicz mentioned that, as a precaution, he had not revealed to another Jew (nor that Jew had revealed to him) the exact address 'on the Aryan side'. In specific occupation conditions, Jews could, and sometimes did, denunciate other Jews. I mention Trejbicz's account (as naturally corresponding with the one of the Job family) to present how Frydel, perhaps unintentionally, coins some vague concepts such as the 'imaginary fear of denunciation' as opposed to a real impending threat, when every situation he described was as real as it could only be. Let me remind this once again: in every historical circumstance, every human being entrusted with a secret may reveal the secret in the face of an extreme situation. Furthermore, for people whose life depends on that secret being kept, realising that possibility is not an 'imaginary fear of denunciation' but retaining the basic sense of reality.

However, Frydel is right when he writes that I have ascribed to him the information about a possible death punishment for evading the service in the Baudienst, while Dagmara Swałtek-Niewińska actually provided the information. Frydel was

---

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 2–3.

long-emphasising the significance of a thorough analysis and frequently demonstrated a good understanding of the studied reality. Unfortunately, he did not mention the death punishment for escaping from the Baudienst. If he did, he would have come closer to the description of the actual functioning of the Baudienst, as the author of the book he refers to. Instead, he has chosen to quote Mściśław Wróblewski and present detailed calculations in the footnote of the earnings of the Junaks during Katastrophendienst and the amount paid by the Dębica governor (*starosta*) to the Baudienst for the “‘work’ during the ‘displacement of the Jews’” (*Night without End*, vol. 2, p. 400).

Finally, I would like to give one more example of an argument *à la* Tomasz Frydel, focusing on page numbering in the documents: “Trying to correct my initial mistake, Domański introduces his own. In the relevant footnote, he refers to page 520 of the case file, which is supposed to contain the testimony of Aleksandra Kocoń (*née* Bryk) with the correct marriage date (p. 47, fn. 116). But the testimony of Aleksandra Kocoń is on page 519, while page 520 contains the testimony of Stanisław Kocoń”<sup>137</sup> (“Response”, p. 10). As it turns out, I did not make a mistake in the page numbering. Aleksandra Kocoń’s testimony begins and ends on page 520. Stanisław Kocoń’s testimony begins on the same page and ends on page 527. How bitter in this confrontation the words about “Potemkin villages” and “banging one’s head against the wall” sound. Tomasz Frydel, providing quotes from the case of Jan Skowron and others in his response, gives wrong page numbers himself.<sup>138</sup> Moreover, he does not see the difference between sheets or folios (foliations) and pages (pagination) in documents.<sup>139</sup>

Making light of all his mistakes, Frydel states that “Correcting the Picture”, as I already mentioned, is a “Potemkin village” trying to pass as a review. This opinion

---

<sup>137</sup> AIPN Rz, 353/72, Testimony of Aleksandra Kocoń given at the main trial, Rzeszów, 7 June 1950, p. 520; *ibid.*, Testimony of Stanisław Kocoń given at the main trial, Rzeszów, 7 June 1951, pp. 520–527.

<sup>138</sup> Frydel claimed in his response that page 285 (he uses the incorrect term *folio* [sheet]) contained the statement of the village head of Bobrowa, while, in fact, the page contains a section of the transcript of the main trial and testimony of Jan Skowron. Folio 294 was supposed to contain witness testimony of Stanisław Kolbusz, but it contains the testimony of Józef Kolbusz; folio 296, according to Frydel, contains testimony of Ludwik Adamowicz, but it contains testimonies of Józef Zaręba and Józef Dymski.

<sup>139</sup> On page 433 (vol. 2), he stated that the testimonies were to be found on folios, while the case files have pagination.

is repeated in various forms in many parts of the response. I wish to assure the author that pointing out inaccuracies is not a matter of my favourable or unfavourable attitude towards the book. It is merely a method of verifying the quality of research commonly applied in scholarly and scientific work. It is a matter of facts and only it should be considered in this context.

### A detailed response to the remarks of Professor Jean-Charles Szurek<sup>140</sup>

In scholarly and scientific work, the readiness to submit one's research outcomes for a critical review should be natural. Professor Jean-Charles Szurek begins his polemic by attempting to convince the reader that his and his colleagues' work is unreviewable. He justifies this opinion by announcing that the review's tone is "opinionated and disrespectful", is "strewn with shockingly insulting comments", and its style "does not meet basic standards and is unacceptable in academic milieu" ("Response", p. 1). Immediately afterwards, he uses the strange argument that "the current managers of the Institute of National Remembrance" are my employers and then authoritatively pronounces that: "It is, therefore, above all a **political** text [emphasis mine – T.D.]" ("Response", p. 1). Szurek illustrates all this in the following way:

Here are some interesting specimens found during reading, referring to all authors: "This information is available in source materials [...] – provided that they are used conscientiously and not selectively", "violating the principles of research diligence", "lacking in academic skills", "manipulation of source information", "Is the presented image one aspiring to scholarly subjectivism? It is not". ("Response", p. 1)

This attempt to classify a critical analysis of how source materials were used as a political move is astonishing. It appears to discourage the reader from familiarising themselves with its substantive content. It is not a form of polemic accepted in

---

<sup>140</sup> The response of Professor Jean-Charles Szurek has not been sent to the Institute of National Remembrance. I am referring to the version published at: <http://www.holocaustresearch.pl/index.php?show=555&strona=564> (accessed 10 December 2019).

scholarly or scientific discourse. Professor Szurek does not specify which political option I am to represent. Is it pointing to evidence of factual carelessness in using source materials, deficiencies in methodological skills in some authors, and lack of scholarly objectivity in approaching source materials political? As I endeavoured to verify the sources referred to by the authors in the footnotes, I looked forward to exchanging arguments. After all, this is why scholarly texts contain footnotes. In footnotes, authors can explicitly identify the sources of their information, also to be better prepared for the verification of how the author uses these source materials.

I also do not know which of my comments can appear disrespectful. I do not derive any satisfaction or sense of superiority from the fact that someone else's conclusions presented to readers, with references made to specific source documents, are, in fact, inconsistent with the content of such documents. There was nothing disrespectful in stating these facts. However, I believe that Jean-Charles Szurek knows perfectly well how to demonstrate disrespect. Let me offer some examples of the phrasing he uses in his text. He refers to me, among other things, as "an author who fulfils, in such a caricatural way, the order of party-state 'historical politics'", adding that "[my] conduct is particularly perverse", and concludes that "this hostile attitude [of mine] is deplorable". He also uses the phrase: "Dr Domański and the heralds of his camp (e.g. the President of the Institute of National Remembrance, Dr Jarosław Szarek or Jan Pospieszalski, a journalist)" ("Response", p. 2). I leave the issue open whether this type of language used should be left unanswered in a scholarly debate.

The manner in which Szurek evoked the Paris conference (21–22 February 2019) is quite awkward. When I arrived at the conference, my review had already been published. I was looking forward to a fact-based historical discussion in the allotted timeframe. I always believed that fact-based academic debate is the best way to exchange opinions and views. After all, the conference was open to the public. One of the presented papers was entirely devoted to the Institute of National Remembrance, which was the subject of a barrage of insults hurled at it during the conference. These insults were not so hateful as simply far removed from the truth. During the time allotted for discussion, I repeatedly asked for the floor to be able to respond to the papers delivered. I was blatantly ignored and denied the floor as soon as it became apparent that I was the author of "Correcting the Picture". These are strange standards for a scholarly conference.

Similarly, what is surprising is the strictly enforced ban on filming and recording the conference, while the conference itself was open to the public. In his text, in the context of my presence at the conference, Szurek attempts to ungraciously apply – putting it mildly – a quote from Professor Boucheron, kindly including me in the “disgraceful retinue of professional practitioners of belligerent ignorance” (“Response”, p. 1). Was this because I had dared to analyse the sources referred to by the authors and identify some instances of their carelessness in using them? Does Professor Szurek believe that his works cannot be subjected to scholarly reviews?

Concerning the Institute of National Remembrance, he rehashes false and absurd insinuations formulated on numerous occasions – with equal disrespect for the facts – by Jan Grabowski. I can only report that none of my scholarly works has been subject to any interference by the Institute of National Remembrance management because it is not, and has never been, the Institute’s practice to do so. Factual studies that do not satisfy the standards of research methodology (and this is determined in the course of the review procedures) have no chance of being published. However, each author is responsible for their scholarly work, as I am. Regrettably, Professor Szurek is not aware of this. On this occasion, I wish to add that every author of academic papers takes responsibility for the accuracy and reliability in applying source materials. Moreover, they are open to critical review.

The work of people performing clerical tasks stemming from obligations imposed by statutory duties (e.g. erecting monuments, administrative issues) is separate from the research work performed by researchers and scholars employed by the Institute. Similarly, at any university institute (department), the clerical tasks, e.g. of the Institute’s director, are by no means connected to their scholarly research. It is astounding that Professor Szurek does not understand this. Similarly, he fails to realise that the Institute does not enact laws, even those affecting its operations. It is worth relying on facts and not on emotionally formulated rumours and unfounded accusations in scholarly debate.

Finally, Jean-Charles Szurek denied me my right to participate in a scholarly debate, claiming that “its style [“Correcting the Picture”] does not meet elementary standards, [...] has no right to exist in academic circles” (“Response”, p. 1). He has also noticed... some delusions in my analysis. Eventually, I became a member of a group of “doctors named Domański” that he classified among the “Holocaust



deniers” and other groups. The accusation of ‘Holocaust denial’ binds all epithets. It serves as a warning (for how else should it be understood?) to any other potential reviewer of his texts and the texts of other authors included in *Night without End*, because one simply does not speak to deniers. What can I say? My research work is open to critical review and debate. If Professor Szurek is willing to make an effort and read my publications, I will welcome any fact-based comment he would make. Furthermore, I will be grateful for identifying at least one phrase in my texts which could be classified as an example of ‘Holocaust denial’.

Although the author of „Łuków County” (“Powiat łukowski”) refers to some of the issues I have raised, like his colleagues – the co-authors of *Night without End* – he diverts reader’s attention to the fringes, merely touching upon problems I mention or ignoring them altogether. He failed to respond to numerous minor and critical issues, and he concluded his response by including me – as I have already mentioned – in the group of ‘Holocaust deniers’. Instead of addressing factual remarks, he accuses me of allegedly removing Polish responsibility for the fate of the Jews, a lack of understanding of statistical data, scholarly dishonesty, presenting a false image of relations between Jewish survival groups and the Polish people, as well as the lack of sufficient sensitivity to Jewish suffering. I shall address these accusations in the same order.

One of the foundations of Szurek’s response to “Correcting the Picture” is the accusation concerning ‘delusions’ purportedly characterising my perception of *Night without End*. Even when first made, this accusation is embellished with the phrase: ‘as usual’. Hence, then, allegedly ‘as usual’, I make the delusional accusation against the co-author of *Night without End*, accusing him of transferring the responsibility for the Holocaust from the Germans to the Poles (“Response”, p. 2). Furthermore, he claims that I attempt to “remove the issue of Polish responsibility from sight by any means” (*ibid.*). In the latter case, in the opinion of the French researcher, my attitude is motivated by ideology. It also stems from my lack of understanding of the statistics he provided in “Łuków County” (“Powiat łukowski”). Since the author has not stated *expressis verbis* which statistics he means, I assume he means the data concerning Jewish ‘survivorship’ of the Holocaust and persons responsible for the deaths of Jews. The above assumption is based on the following passage:

The statistics concerning Łuków county show the distribution of accountability across categories of perpetrators. However, from the perspective of Jews seeking help at the third stage of the Holocaust, the Polish presence is the most important. Therefore, the attitudes of Poles are examined in great detail. Jews who had managed to escape from the trains heading for Treblinka, who had been hiding in villages and forests, had direct and decisive contacts with Poles, mainly peasants. (“Response”, p. 2)

In his interpretation, Szurek agrees with the opinions expressed in the “Foreword” to *Night without End* (vol. 1, p. 32), presenting the attitude of the Poles as a factor decisive for the ‘survivorship’ of Jews in the years of 1942–1945. Szurek bypasses the occupation context of the events in silence. One may assume from the image created by the French researcher that, in his eyes, German terror (its scale so very different between Poland and France), the role of the German authorities and police-like structures, their anti-Jewish policy and practices, were far less critical for the fate of Jews than the attitudes of local peasants. He appears to forget that the German authorities unwaveringly implemented *Endlösung*. Removing the Holocaust from the context provided the researcher with the basis for another conclusion, namely that: “[...] the Polish countryside in this area was **an open-air prison for Jews** [emphasis mine – T.D.]”. However, it would be worth adding who had built this prison.

I agree with Professor Szurek that the Jews who had managed to escape from the trains heading for Treblinka and subsequently hid in villages or forests had the closest and most direct contact with the peasants. This is not an original observation. However, I disagree that this contact was decisive. It was not the representatives of the conquered nation who, in principle, decided the fate of Jews. It was the Germans, their laws, and murderous practices (also addressed against non-Jews willing to help Jews in any way). The Germans, particularly in the brutal occupation reality of the East (unknown to the western part of Europe), decided about the life and death of the conquered nations. Moreover, this cannot be changed by the fact that there were people who – in the occupation reality created by the Germans – for various reasons (fear for one’s own and one’s family’s fate is not the

same as the desire for enrichment or anti-Semitism) had turned in or murdered Jews.<sup>141</sup> And nobody denies this.

Nevertheless, I do have a problem with recognising the value of these statistical perspectives. And the reason is the lack of source data for these statistics. The authors of *Night without End* (and Professor Szurek is not an exception here) have not supplied any source material for their tabular calculations. There is no information on the criteria applied to qualify attitudes and events in each category. For example, we do not know how Szurek counted the individual perpetrators. The basis for a scholarly discussion is creating opportunities to validate quoted data. I highlighted this significant shortage and its consequences in “Correcting the Picture” and the need for providing detailed responses to individual authors. Unfortunately, also in his response to my review, the author of “Łuków County” (“Powiat łukowski”) did not cure this defect. In “Correcting the Picture”, I asked, for example, whether the number of victims of Polish denunciations provided by Professor Szurek includes Jews killed by the Germans after stealing a hog from one of the farmers by some men in hiding (“Correcting the Picture”, pp. 65–66). Does the number of informers include the peasants from Krynka terrorised by local bandits collaborating with the Germans (*Night without End*, vol. 1, pp. 608–609)? The author did not indicate the sources for his ‘statistical’ calculations, which consequently undermines or at least reduces their value. He has not made the slightest effort to reflect upon or respond to these – seemingly – quite simple and obvious questions. Lack of response provokes some doubts and additional questions. For, it may turn out that an in-depth analysis of circumstances of individual denunciations questions the credibility of “fundamental findings” for ‘Łuków County’.

I am writing all this because I agree with Professor Szurek that it is generally difficult to precisely develop (based on ‘hard’ data) Holocaust statistics for, as he emphasises – “no one is able to provide them” (“Response”, p. 2). Nevertheless, he is heading in such a direction – as if ignoring his own argumentation. Therefore, the absence of source data is even more striking. How could other researchers refer

---

<sup>141</sup> The above conclusions pertain to the Radom District and were formed on the basis of my research for the publication entitled: “Proces z dekretu sierpniowego” and “Postępowania sądowe z dekretu z 31 sierpnia 1944 r.”

to these findings in the future? How could they add something new or confirm the opinions of the author? At the same time, Professor Szurek aptly concludes that there is no other way to develop statistics than “by collecting grass-roots data on every Jew who had managed to escape a liquidation operation”. These undoubtedly impressive views on the analysis of source data expressed *ex-post* is not only incompatible with the author’s words in “Łuków County” (“Powiat łukowski”) but simply undermine them. After all, Szurek himself states: “These statistics cover a small number of people, which – apart from illustrating the scale of the Holocaust – is not representative of anything, but it points to characteristic phenomena and major tendencies”. Again, I agree that statistics may show predominant tendencies or specific patterns. Nevertheless, in *Night without End* (vol. 1, p. 590), using the statistics which – as he admits – are not representative of anything, with an accuracy of two decimal places (!), the author calculates the percentage of deaths of Jews attributable to the Poles and the Germans, respectively. Therefore, is it a justified statistical data analysis method that, depending on the author’s needs, sometimes are and some other times not arguments forming the research thesis?

Without providing source information, we will not know what archived materials (we do not even know to what period they pertain, and this is important) served as a basis for preparing the final annexe on historical events in Łuków county. Hence, we will never know what is based on reliable scholarly research and what is not.

Moving on to detailed remarks from Professor Szurek’s response, I must explain that the critical issues raised in “Correcting the Picture” referred mainly to how the source materials were analysed and interpreted. This problem is already apparent in the sub-heading of “Correcting the Picture: Reflections on source analysis” (“Korekta obrazu: Refleksje źródłoznawcze”). Therefore, on numerous occasions, I have been – I must admit – quite critical of the selected sections. However, it would be difficult not to. When the author of the reviewed publication omits important sections of source material in his quotations or information crucial for understanding the described events, I had to point out such instances. Szurek has used my critical approach to sections of “Łuków County” (“Powiat łukowski”) to accuse me of alleged ‘declining, as usual, Polish responsibility’ for the fate of the Jews. This applies, among other things, to the problem of the village heads. First of

all, I wish to repeat that both older and contemporary historical literature defines the status of village heads as, *de facto*, German administration officials.<sup>142</sup> Already the use of the term ‘German official’ alone entirely indicates somewhat limited decision-making powers of people holding such offices. Secondly, I asked in my review whether the two examples (trials) discussed by Szurek are an excellent source basis for extrapolation to the whole studied area – ‘Łuków County’ – and for arguing that: “Some of them implemented German orders with zealotry. Numerous trials initiated under the PKWN’s [The Polish Committee of National Liberation] Decree of 31 August 1944 demonstrated frequent cases of subordination by village heads to the Judenjagd, often done actively and for personal gains. Others were inflexible regarding implementing the occupant’s rules” (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 608).

In my opinion, this was too small of a research sample to illustrate the complexity of Polish-Jewish relations in the occupation reality. Naturally, I asked about the number of convicted or, at least, accused village heads. It would provide a broader context for concluding. I did not demand – as Professor Szurek claims in his response – “presenting all relevant court trials (August trials, i.e. *sierpniówki*) in Łuków County” (“Response”, p. 3). Consequently, I pointed to the unjustified narrative sequence consisting of Professor Szurek using inappropriate generalisations founded on isolated facts (“Correcting the Picture”, p. 30). In other words, when Szurek writes about numerous trials, he should enumerate them and not hide the data away from the reader. Regrettably, neither my appeals mentioned above nor my pointing to the need to account for the situation of rural communities meet with any understanding from Professor Szurek; they also served as a basis for his fierce criticism.

Nevertheless, the material and spiritual situation of people also subjected to the brutal occupation policy, who had to fight for their own survival, must have profoundly affected the decisions whether to help Jews or not. According to Szurek, my – rather apparent – demand concerning the need for a difficult but necessary multi-dimensional presentation of the problem is a ‘classic method of deceiving

---

<sup>142</sup> See the opinion of Professor Madajczyk referred to in the preface. This opinion is shared by some co-authors of *Night without End* (e.g. Alina Skibińska).

a reader who is not an expert on the subject”. I am afraid I have to disagree with this point of view.

Defending himself against the accusation concerning unfounded generalisations, Szurek adds: “I based my analysis on two trials because they perfectly illustrate my typology of survival strategies. Hence, overall trial statistics are in this case of no use to me”. That does not convince me. Szurek seems to sustain the view that one can easily write about ‘numerous trials’ and ‘frequent cases’ without providing a sufficient source basis. Let us, therefore, analyse how these ‘statistics’ compare to the total number of village heads in the county during the occupation and to precise requirements. Based on Professor Szurek’s findings, in the 1920s, Łuków county consisted of 18 rural communes. Every commune consisted of several to a dozen or so villages (which remains true about the Polish administrative structure). If we assume the average of ten villages per commune, one may easily assume the total of 180 village heads in Łuków ‘County’. I should add here that usually, every village head had a deputy, which doubles the number of German officials. Estimating the number of people called to account could help, at least, in determining the approximate scale of subordination to the Judenjagd. A precondition for such an analysis would naturally draw attention to the nature of the August Decree and its imprecise provisions.<sup>143</sup> The course of the trials would also call for a close examination because of how the officials of the apparatus of oppression had conducted them. The reader can only assess the consequences of presenting the problem by using two examples.

One of the trials served for Professor Szurek as a basis for formulating yet another accusation against me – an accusation of scholarly dishonesty. My ‘dishonesty’ supposedly manifests itself in my alleged intentional misunderstanding of the “logic of the argumentation” presented in “Łuków County” (“Powiat łukowski”) and concerning the trial of Bolesław Przeździak (and others). I already discussed this (exhaustively) in “Correcting the Picture”. However, since the author uses this example to illustrate my ‘dishonesty’, let us return to the events in the village of Krynka in Celiny county. Let me begin with *an in extenso* quotation of the relevant sections from the chapter and a response by Professor Szurek. This is important,

---

<sup>143</sup> Kornbluth, “Jest wielu Kainów”, pp. 157–172.

for the juxtaposition of what he writes in this response and the book demonstrates the inconsistency of his message. In *Night without End*, Szurek writes:

Instances of peasants' disobedience [to the Judenjagd] are rare. An example is the trial of peasants (the case of Bolesław Przeździak, Jan Markowski – deputy village head, Antoni Walczak, Feliks Walczak and Stanisław Kamecki) from the village of Krynka, Celiny county, which commenced on 19 May 1951 in Lublin. Two peasants had opposed denouncing and hunting for Jews. In autumn 1942, this group was ordered to chase and catch Jews who had escaped from the trains, usually during stopovers (Krynka is situated near the railway route), and hand them over to the Germans. **Some peasants, including deputy village head Markowski, obeyed the German orders and robbed the captured Jews.** Still, two of them – Stanisław Czubaszek and Stanisław Wilczek – opposed to taking the risk and let the Jews go [emphasis mine – T.D.]. (*Night without End*, vol. 1, pp. 608–609)

And that is it. Only in response to “Correcting the Picture” did the author present some circumstances he had previously omitted, which I pointed out in my review. Szurek wrote:

In the incriminated passage, I was explaining the difficulties faced by peasants hiding Jews, stemming from various reasons: fear of the occupant, the duty to turn in the Jews to the Germans, hostility against Jews, etc. In this particular case, I wanted to show that in the village of Krynka, suffering from extreme repressive actions, two men – Stanisław Czubaszek and Stanisław Wilczek – had taken an enormous risk and helped to escape the Jews held by Przeździak. Czubaszek's and Wilczek's behaviour was that of the Righteous. The village of Krynka was situated near railroad tracks. A group of local collaborators fiercely operated there, led by a local policeman named Przeździak, who engaged in the merciless hunting for Jews. Having assumed that the whole group hunting for Jews had acted out of fear, all members of that group, except Przeździak, were acquitted in court after the war. What is important is that most of those local collaborators were **killed by the Home Army near the end of the war**. Przeździak was not.

The deputy village head, Jan **Markowski**, was forced by one of the armed **collaborators** to hand over three Jews to Przeździak who had escaped from a death transport. Markowski told two men, Stanisław Czubaszek and Stanisław Wilczek, to escort the Jews to Przeździak, which, fearing repression, they did. However, on the way, they enabled the Jews to escape, causing distress to the police collaborators who severely battered Wilczek for that. The Jews were eventually captured and handed over to the Germans. In some trials conducted based on the August Decree, the village head obeying German orders may have ended up convicted, even if the testimonies of witnesses were objectively favourable for them. This, however, was not the case here. **Tomasz Domański claims that I had unjustly treated Markowski** when I wrote: “Some of the peasants, including the deputy village head, Markowski, obeyed the German orders and, additionally, robbed the captured Jews, but two of them – Stanisław Czubaszek and Stanisław Wilczek – opposed to that, took the risk and let the Jews go” (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 609). Domański believes that, since Markowski was acquitted, I should not mention his involvement in actions against Jews. Even if **Markowski did not personally take part in robbing the Jews**, which I eagerly confirm, he was accused **because he *de facto* ordered others to look for the Jews** [emphasis mine – T.D.]. (“Response”, p. 4)

A simple comparison of two excerpts – one from *Night without End* and one from the response to my review – clearly shows how many ‘gaps’ there are in this short, but quoted in its entirety, section from “Łuków County” (“Powiat łukowski”). Contrary to the author’s response, *Night without End* does not mention any events crucial for the case concerned. The narrative of *Night without End* does not account for the direct pressure exerted on the villagers. The Germans are far in the background, and anti-Jewish actions are carried out independently by local people. We do not see any activity of local bandits directly collaborating with the police. We are not told they terrorize and harass local peasants, forcing them to participate in hunting for runaway Jews. It is worth reminding that one of these men even wore a German uniform. Finally, we will not learn from *Night without End* that the group was chased and gradually eliminated by a local Home Army unit. As much as reminding that I am glad that, having read “Correcting the Picture”, Szurek accounts for the facts



mentioned above in his narrative, I am astonished that he actually accuses me of ... 'dishonesty'. With such behaviour (I will leave the assessment of this behaviour to the reader), he refuses to admit that the reviewer is right. Still, instead, he uses the opportunity to attack the reviewer again. Omitting facts crucial for the events he calls 'the logic of argumentation', he accuses me of my inability to understand it. Nevertheless, the situation is straightforward: there is no justification (even in the 'logic of argumentation') for omitting details crucial for the described events if a historian wants to give a reliable account of these events. Therefore, neither I nor any reader could 'understand' something simply not present in the text.

Finally, regarding the events in the village of Krynka, Jean-Charles Szurek claimed that I had accused him of unjust treatment of deputy village head Jan Markowski. I uphold it because it follows from the complete court files that Markowski had nothing to do with robbing the Jews or turning them in ("Correcting the Picture", p. 44). If Szurek knows of any other documents, he should disclose them, but he did not do it in *Night without End*. Furthermore, he did not inform the reader that Markowski was acquitted of all accusations and only presented his own vision of the events based on abbreviations of source materials. After reading "Correcting the Picture", it seems that he withdraws from accusing Markowski of robbing the Jews, gladly – as he put it – admitting that "Markowski was not personally involved in the robbery". Still, with stubbornness worthy of a better cause, he continues accusing him of "*de facto* ordering others to look for the Jews". However, this is also a groundless accusation. What a strange approach to practising scholarly work it is!

On the one hand, Szurek admits that an armed collaborator forced Markowski to order capturing Jews. However, on the other, he claims that "he *de facto* ordered the others to look for the Jews". Who, then, *de facto* ordered capturing Jews? This question seems crucial. Was it Markowski or perhaps the Germans *via* a group of their collaborators? Moreover, in Szurek's opinion, who is guilty of instigation or ordering the acts that had caused the death of these Jews?

Another 'example' of my alleged dishonesty is my opinion expressed in "Correcting the Picture" on Szurek's way of presenting the account by Rubin Rosenberg concerning the displacement of Jews from the village of Adamów in 1942. Again, the inevitable insinuation was made that I was 'deluded', and accusations

were made against me, which, to put it mildly, went against the facts. Rosenberg's account has been so 'trimmed' by Szurek that out of a more extended passage in *Night without End* there is only a piece about Poles participating in a liquidation operation against the Jews in Adamów. Szurek explains that this was not a mistake since: "the complexity of the situation in Adamów was described earlier, in the part of the text devoted to the role of the Germans, Ukrainians, and Polish policemen" ("Response", p. 3). Moreover, he also adds: "When Rubin Rosenberg talks about the liquidation operation, he does not mean that the Poles were the authors, but that they participated in it". Moreover, later: "I'm not writing here **about Jews turned in by other Jews** because **I have done so elsewhere in the text**. Furthermore, my intention is not to 'accuse', but to understand, including the dilemmas of the village heads, as some of them, in fact, did try to help the Jews" ("Response", p. 3). It is only true that Szurek earlier did describe the role of the Germans and Ukrainians. However, after 'abbreviating' Rosenberg's account, the information about Jews turning in other Jews to save their lives completely disappears. So, Szurek has removed an essential element from Rosenberg's account. And my intention is not – as Professor Grabowski imputes – to look for 'Jewish perpetrators' but to present the reality as it was. Such is the duty of a historian. Rosenberg presents an apocalypse where the Germans wrote the scripts and, most certainly, decided on their contents. It perfectly shows the gradation of the events and actions of representatives of individual nations. Finally, my point is not to deny the involvement of the Polnische Polizei in the displacement where it did take place, as in many other cases. I do not make any such omissions, and I see no reason for doing so.

One more aspect of the displacement of the Jews from Adamów is worth analysing. Without specifying the source of information,<sup>144</sup> Szurek writes that soon after the displacement operation, the village of Adamów was attacked by Jewish guerrilla fighters who freed several dozen Jews from prison and killed Poles who "helped in the deportation".<sup>145</sup> The attack in Adamów and the freeing of Jewish prisoners

---

<sup>144</sup> Professor Szurek wrote that 'Yakov Keselbrener gave the most important testimony' concerning the events. Unfortunately, he did not state where exactly Keselbrener's testimony could be found, see J.Ch. Szurek, "Powiat łukowski", in *Dalej jest noc*, p. 596.

<sup>145</sup> The authors of the "Foreword" to *Night without End* (Barbara Engelking and Jan Grabowski) used the description of the events as the evidence that sometimes Jews organised retaliatory actions against 'local murderers and informers' (*Night without End*, vol. 1, p. 41).

is mentioned in recollections of Kiliński's GL [People's Guard] commanded by Serafim Alekseyev and of the commander himself.<sup>146</sup> The events allegedly took place in August 1942.

The same month, Kiliński's GL squad commanded by Serafim took control over Adamów. The county office was destroyed, and documents were burned. In addition, a requisition dairy was destroyed, a blue police post was shot at, and 200 Jews were freed. One policeman was injured, and one gendarme was killed. Participants of the operation were, among others, Jan Janiszek from Niedźwiedź, Henryk Wojciechowski from Krzywda, Józef Kornacki, Iwan Kurylenko and Aleksander Łogaczew. The unit withdrew towards the village of Cisownik. After leading out the last group of Jews, Józef Kornacki and Aleksander Łogaczew stayed in Szczałb forest and were killed while being pursued by the Germans.<sup>147</sup>

Not a word is mentioned here about killing Polish civilians. However, the killing of a German gendarme is mentioned, which would explain the immediate retaliatory action of the German police in the form of the pursuit of the guerrilla group. Similar events are described in "Kartki dziennika nauczyciela w Łukowie z okresu okupacji hitlerowskiej", but dated at the end of October 1942:

On 30 October [1942], I went to the village of Burzec to inspect the cooperative. When I was approaching the village, I was stopped by some peasants who had escaped from the village because gendarmes had arrived there to seek and capture Jews. I was told that some Jews had escaped from Adamów, managed to secure some weapons, and attacked and destroyed the county office; they were also looking for the village head whom they wanted to kill. They did not find him, so they wrecked his house. They killed one gendarme and injured another one. The rest, along with the blue police, escaped. A transport of Jews was passing there at night. It was stopped, and some Jews escaped again from about ten wagons. They hid in the forests. The Germans are chasing them at

---

<sup>146</sup> S. Alekseyev 'Serafim', "Zginęli bez wieści", *Biuletyn ŻIH* 65–66 (1968), pp. 235–247.

<sup>147</sup> Recollections of J. Granztof, <http://deblin.cal24.pl/wspomnienia.php> (accessed 19 December 2019).

the moment. As a result, 25 Jews were killed. I know that by 4 November, they had not been buried yet.<sup>148</sup>

It is a shame that Szurek did not confront these words with Keselbrener's account, which he also hid rather carefully.

Nevertheless, entirely surprising are other disquisitions of Professor Szurek. In this part of the response, he says: "There are no reasons to believe that any relation existed between Serafim Alekseyev and orders from Moscow, and even more so, that his saved Jewish brothers-in-arms shared his views" ("Response", p. 4). So far, I have been convinced that we are past the stage of identifying the circumstances of forming communist guerrilla troops and whose orders the Red Army officers followed when they formed the GL units. There is no doubt about the group's affiliation in question with Soviet communist guerrillas. And Moscow? It is enough to reach for the published memoirs of Serafim Alekseyev, alias 'Serafim':

At Stachurski's, we often listened to **radio programmes from Moscow**. They had a wind turbine producing energy for the radio kept in a beehive. If we had explosives – I told him once – the Germans would not behave with such impunity at the railway station. Henryk thought for a moment and said with full conviction. "Don't worry, Serafin [so stated in the text]. Soon we will. **I will have reliable radio contact with Moscow** [emphasis mine – T.D.]."<sup>149</sup>

Even if the contact was not established, 'Serafim' persistently tried to convince the readers of the need to contact the 'Headquarters'. Every historian with a basic knowledge of communist guerrillas understands that the purpose of listening to Moscow radio was to be up to date with the current political line of the party, while the purpose of radio contact with higher rank officials via a radio station was to receive instructions and guidelines.

Professor Szurek uses yet another way to repudiate my review. He tries to convince the readers that I do not understand the tragic experience of Jewish girls

---

<sup>148</sup> "Kartki dziennika nauczyciela w Łukowie z okresu okupacji hitlerowskiej", <https://www.lukow-historia.pl/?p=6461> (accessed 19 December 2019).

<sup>149</sup> <http://deblin.cal24.pl/wspomnienia.php> (accessed 19 December 2019).

who – having chosen to fight for their lives – had to hide away and change their identity from Jewish to Polish. Szurek described this process as double violence inflicted upon Jewish girls. He included among them Estera Borensztejn hidden, *inter alia*, collectively by the village community of Osiny. My alleged lack of understanding he additionally described as ‘nit-picking’. However, in my review, I quote Borensztejn’s recollections:

In the evening I went to the people who once had bought my grandfather’s estate. I told them who I was: they were astonished but afraid to let me stay. I had nowhere to go. Finally, they agreed with other people in the village that they would hide me for some time and so, they all would be guilty, and no one would turn others in. They united themselves in a way. It was the village of Osiny. I had stayed there until the spring. (“Correcting the Picture”, p. 48)

From this account, the Poles hiding Borensztejn were perfectly aware of her nationality, and they must have been aware of the possible punishment under German regulations.

In his response, Szurek argues: “I don’t mention Borensztejn’s story in my text. I do not even mind that Dr Domański attaches her example to my quoted sentence. He solemnly concludes: “In this absurd way, he [Szurek] refers to peasants hiding the girl and treating her like a member of the family, which meant participating in all everyday activities with the rest of the family” (p. 49). This is dishonest. The process of deculturation is often a necessary final step, frequently saving a life, although very painful, particularly for a small girl” (“Response”, p. 6). There is nothing dishonest in the story of Estera Borensztejn presented by me. It clearly follows from „Łuków County” (“Powiat łukowski”) that Professor Szurek included Estera Borensztejn along with other girls in the same category of ‘successful transformation to Aryan identity’, which he subsequently calls violence of deculturation<sup>150</sup> (*Night without End*, vol. 1, pp. 597–598). Therefore, I presented

---

<sup>150</sup> The relevant passages read as follows: “We know five examples of successful transformation to Aryan identity, three of which involve the changing of one’s name. It is worth emphasising that all mentioned survivors who changed their identity were women. They included two young girls: Lilian Fenster (born in 1926, so she was 16) and Ryszka Huberman-Iwan (date of birth unknown) and three

the circumstances constituting the background for the girl's saving, which are not shown in the book. I have never claimed that the transformation of identity is easy for anyone, let alone a child. A small but crucial supplement is needed to analyse the girls' stories. Guilty of the violence of deculturation are the Germans who condemned Jews to the Holocaust. They created the reality in which clergymen or peasants, out of human kindness and compassion (or Christian love for one's neighbour), in the hope of saving their lives, taught Jewish fugitives the principles of Catholicism so that they could be absorbed into the social background. In this particular reality, Estera Borensztejn and Irena Krawczyk, driven by the instinct of self-preservation, become so deeply rooted in their new identity that they feel Polish (which they equate with Catholicism) and do not want to return to their Jewish tradition. This background (with German presence in it) is nowhere in Professor Szurek's narrative. The whole story again is reduced to Polish-Jewish relations.

At the end of his text, Jean-Charles Szurek, fighting with my alleged ill-will and yet unable to suppress his poorly concealed spite, wishes me to find a researcher identity in Sartre's tone. As I see it, this is not the language of debate and should never be used in scholarly discourse. To sum up, let me repeat that critical reviews and polemics are standard practices in scholarly and scientific work and not an attack. I can only hope that the insults aimed at me have resulted from excessive emotions, far from the standards expected of history researchers.

## Conclusions

In one of her comments to "Correcting the Picture", Anna Zapalec assumed an ironic tone which does not fit in with academic discourse – and went beyond the limits of the absurd in formulating the following opinion:

Having read the review, I have the impression that, in his criticism, Tomasz Domański does not engage in discourse on equal terms with the authors, and only tries to prove that he would write the book better. Moreover, he seems convinced that other researchers' publications presenting different points of view

---

kids: Marianna Adameczek (born 1930), Estera Borensztejn (born 1932), and Irena Krawczyk (born 1932)". Later in the text, Szurek writes about two forms of violence related to acculturation, Szurek, "Powiat łukowski", pp. 597–598.

are redundant since he has mastered the truth. Such an approach to scholarly research and in reviews is methodologically wrong. Naturally, nothing prevents Domański from writing such a model book and presenting his own findings, confronting them with ours. (“Response”, p. 3)

I do not think I have a monopoly on infallibility. No one has it, not even the editors and co-authors of *Night without End*.

Nevertheless, every professional researcher should be aware of the importance of research standards. Therefore, when reading the book, confronting it with the sources, and, eventually, writing the review, I was deeply convinced that scholarly research needed to be conducted in line with the principles of a fair analysis of archived materials. I was convinced that it called for describing past events on such a basis, whether they pertain to Jews, Poles, Germans, or any other nation. Every historian must treat historical sources with respect and avoid simplifications, distortions, and manipulations. Can a researcher analyse source materials without accounting for the time and circumstances in which they have been created? Can we ignore the facts stated there if they do not fit our thesis? Is it good practice to omit crucial source information and immediately afterwards use abbreviated source material to draw general conclusions and create a picture of the occupation reality? When writing about operations of the Polnische Polizei, the Volunteer Fire Brigades, or the Baudienst, can we ignore the occupation interrelations affecting their functioning and immediately afterwards suggest that the reader may find more information on the Internet? Are these research standards? Is it good practice to promote false terms, such as ‘German-Polish administration’, or to describe the circumstances of persecuting Jews and helping Jews, detached from the then reality? Is it good practice to present tabular data without providing a data source and then accusing this or that researcher of refusing to engage in a polemic on such data?

I discussed all these general observations in detail, pointing to relevant examples and source materials in “Correcting the Picture” and the present response.<sup>151</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup> Perhaps many of these errors would have been avoided had the publication been subjected to the review procedure. Perhaps the editors of *Night without End* could reveal the names of the reviewers, if any, as it is commonly done in the case of books with scholarly aspirations.

Given the number of objections to *Night without End* raised and documented by me, I must say I am embarrassed by the intellectual quality of the heading published on the Polish Centre for Holocaust Research website, announcing 'correction of a failed correction.'<sup>152</sup> As it is commonly accepted in the academic world, a researcher open to constructive criticism does not need to use such methods to label his or her adversaries. Nonetheless, I hope that the editors and authors of the book will use hints about the source materials, suggestions, and critical comments.

---

<sup>152</sup> <https://www.holocaustresearch.pl/index.php?mod=news&show=381> (accessed 12 August 2019).