Introduction: New Approaches to Research on Everyday Life in Eastern Europe during World War II: The Case Studies of Poland and Lithuania

Gintarė Malinauskaitė

KEYWORDS: everyday life, World War II, Poland, Lithuania, research report

Declaration on Possible Conflicts of Interest
The author has declared that no conflicts of interest exist.

Funding Statement
The author received no specific funding for this work

Dr. Gintarė Malinauskaitė, Vilnius Branch of the German Historical Institute Warsaw, malinauskaite@dhi.lt, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5716-7256

Introduction: New Approaches to Research on Everyday Life in Eastern Europe during World War II: The Case Studies of Poland and Lithuania – ZfO / JECES 71/2022/2
(received 2021-02-18, accepted 2021-06-23)
DOI: 10.25627/202271211162 – eISSN 2701-0449, ISSN 0948-8294

1 World War II, Occupation, and Post-War Myth-Making in Western and Eastern Europe

Tony Judt calls World War II "a war of occupation, of repression, of exploitation and extermination."[1] He perceives this military conflict to have been primarily "a civilian experience"[2] with hundreds of millions of people living under foreign occupation. Nevertheless, Europeans experienced this warfare very differently, as both personal circumstances as well as the forms of occupation and violence varied enormously across Europe. The historian István Deák, referring to the German-occupied areas within Europe, argues that there were sharp regional differences. For instance, he ascertains that "most onerous occupation" was concentrated in Eastern Europe[3] and claims that one could even speak of two wars—a more traditional approach in the West and "the massive German colonization" and "racial crusade against Jews, Slavs and other people" in the East.[4] Additionally, many East European states experienced more than two or even three invasions and occupations and "were forced to choose repeatedly between accommodation, resistance, and collaboration."[5]

In both parts of Europe, however, German and Soviet occupational policies overturned the existing order and altered the daily life of civilians, restricting their freedoms and rendering them dependent on the occupiers' administrative regulations. Local inhabitants from all levels of society were impacted, and population losses were an everyday occurrence due to the war. People were executed, imprisoned, displaced, and deported. The reality of the war was likewise marked by food and supply shortages, expropriations of property, and forced labor, as well as changed societal norms and values.[6] According to the historian Jan T. Gross, these wartime experiences "profoundly affected notions of commonweal, collective good, and group interests in the societies of the region" in the post-war years.[7] Thus the Soviet and Nazi occupational

---

1 Tony Judt: Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945, London 2005, pp. 13–14.

2 Ibid., p. 13.

3 István Deák: Introduction, in: István Deák, Jan T. Gross et al. (eds.): The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and Its Aftermath, Princeton 2000, pp. 3–14, here p. 7.

4 István Deák: Europe on Trial: The Story of Collaboration, Resistance, and Retribution during World War II, Philadelphia 2015, p. 7.

5 Ibid., p. 3.

6 For the latest research on everyday life under German occupation, see Tatjana Tönsmeyer, Peter Haslinger et al. (eds.): Coping with Hunger and Shortage under German Occupation in World War II, Basingstoke 2018; Tatjana Tönsmeyer, Peter Haslinger (eds.): Fighting Hunger, Dealing with Shortage: Everyday Life under Occupation in World War II Europe. A Source Edition, Leiden—Boston 2021.

7 Jan T. Gross: Themes for a Social History of War Experience and Collaboration, in: Deák/Gross, pp. 15–36, here p. 23.

regimes during World War II affected "the social fabric"[8] of these societies and led to changes in the social structure in the post-war years.

In the war's aftermath, not only did social and economic changes occur, but also the myth-making of the war began. In the post-bellum landscape, the narrative of a primarily German perpetration and the history of resistance of local inhabitants were constructed in many European countries, including "the myth of wartime anti-fascist resistance"[9] in the Soviet Union. Germany and its occupational regime were often blamed for everything. In the Western countries, for instance, consider the case of France and its post-war identity, which focused on the victory against the Nazi regime: the occupiers were designated as the main perpetrators and the local population as active participants in the resistance movement. Such narratives often ignored the fact that non-Germans also participated in acts of extermination, worked in the concentration camps, and carried out various duties in the local administration.

This post-war myth of one-sided German guilt during the war was also fostered by the retributive justice in both Western and Eastern European countries. For example, the Nuremberg trials enhanced a "victor's justice," and, according to Donald Bloxham, served as a "facet of the broader agenda of legitimating the assertion of political control" of the Allied powers.[10] Similarly, Judt argues that the "selectivity and apparent hypocrisy with which the Allies pursued the matter contributed to the cynicism of the postwar era" and, more importantly, it eased "the consciences of many non-Germans (and non-Nazis) whose activities might easily have been open to similar charges."[11] In this manner, the focus was laid on the agency of Nazi Germans and their institutional framework, whilst the actions of local populations and their complex interrelationships with the occupational regime were disregarded.

2 Everyday Life Experiences under Occupation: The Interaction between the Occupier and the Occupied

Therefore, the micro-historical perspective, based on the experiences of ordinary people during the war, is needed to understand different systems of occupation rule and the social processes that took place in the immediate aftermath of the war. As Gross notes, scholarly literature has often focused more on "the political histories of wartime regimes" than on the study of

8 Ibid., p. 19.

9 Tony Judt: The Past is Another Country: Myth and Memory in Postwar Europe, in: Deák/Gross, pp. 293–324, here p. 307.

10 Donald Bloxham: Prosecuting the Past in the Postwar Decade: Political Strategy and National Myth-Making, in: David Bankier, Dan Michman (eds.): Holocaust and Justice: Representation and Historiography of the Holocaust in Post-War Trials, Jerusalem 2010, pp. 23–44, here p. 25.

11 Judt, The Past is Another Country, p. 297.

"social histories of countries under occupation."[12] Similarly, historians have often used sources that focus on political structures of occupying powers and ignore the activities and experiences of local inhabitants. The history of World War II has thus been often dominated by the perpetrator's perspective and lacked the agency of local populations.[13] For this reason, other scholars have asserted that there is a need to investigate the war from the "micro-level view."[14] This perspective is often also described as "history from below" or as "a shift in the historian's agenda from impersonal social processes to the experiences of human actors."[15]

Applying this perspective of the history of everyday life to the study of World War II thus has the potential to yield insights into the various relationships that could develop between the occupier and the occupied and diverse form that occupation could take. An *Alltagsgeschichte* approach not only emphasizes the agency of human actors but also allows the stories of these individuals to provide the structure for a historical narrative.[16] Historians of everyday life argue that the use of methodologies that disregard individual human experiences actually replicate "on paper the violence of the recent past it sought to explain" and erase those people from historical scholarship.[17] Therefore, when studying the history and histories of wars and occupations, it is important to "view civilians as historical objects"[18] and analyze how the war affected ordinary people. According to the historian Belinda J. Davis, who investigated the interrelation of food, politics, and everyday life in Berlin during World War I, the history of everyday life allows historians not only "to detect unofficial relations of power" but also "to examine how these relations promoted change."[19] In other words, it provides a glimpse into "the mi-

12 GROSS, p. 15.

13 LAURIE L. COHEN: Smolensk under Nazis: Everyday Life in Occupied Russia, Rochester 2013, p. 2.

14 Ibid.

15 GEOFF ELEY: Labor History, Social History, "Alltagsgeschichte": Experience, Culture, and the Politics of the Everyday. A New Direction for German Social History?, in: The Journal of Modern History 61 (1989), 2, pp. 297–343, here p. 317.

16 PAUL STEEGE, ANDREW STUART BERGERSON, MAUREEN HEALY, PAMELA E. SWETT: The History of Everyday Life: A Second Chapter, in: The Journal of Modern History 80 (2008), pp. 358–378, here p. 361.

17 Ibid., p. 360.

18 BELINDA J. DAVIS: Home Fires Burning: Food, Politics, and Everyday Life in World War I Berlin, Chapel Hill 2000, p. 4.

19 Ibid., p. 5.

crophysics of power" ("Mikrophysik der Macht")[20] and highlights how power was "produced, experienced and contested in different social contexts."[21]

In a similar vein, the French historian Talbot Imlay has suggested studies of the German occupation of France during World War II should not only ascribe agency to the occupied but also pay closer attention to the interaction and wartime experiences of both the occupier and the occupied.[22] Imlay, referring to recent scholarship on the German occupation of France, notes that there is "a danger of simply replacing a focus on the French with one on the Germans." Therefore, he suggests that historians should explore "the intertwined experiences of occupiers and occupied." Imlay ascertains that this intertwining is evident not only "in the economic and industrial realms" but "even more so in the social realms," where the occupiers and the occupied communicated and interacted with one another on a daily basis.[23] The German historian Tatjana Tönsmeyer proposes a concept of "occupied societies" and similarly asserts that scholars should investigate these "complex interdependencies" of different sides of the conflict.[24] She argues that "it is impossible to confine either of them to separate spheres,"[25] as the daily life of the occupiers and occupied was interconnected in many different ways.[26] According to the scholars, such investigation of the occupied societies "might contribute to widening historiographical scopes" and help "to overcome national narrowness."[27]

Therefore, the purpose of this volume is to illuminate these manifold relations and encounters between the occupier and the occupied, focusing on less researched aspects of everyday life practices during the German occupation of Poland and Lithuania. In both Poland and Lithuania, the historiography of everyday life during World War II has been dominated by research on the violent aspects of the war, such as the violence executed against local non-Jewish inhabitants and the history of the Holocaust. The German historian

---

20 PHILIPP SARASIN: Arbeit, Sprache—Alltag. Wozu noch "Alltagsgeschichte"?, in: WerkstattGeschichte (1996), 15, pp. 72–82, here p. 73.

21 MARIA FRITSCHE: Spaces of Encounter: Relations between the Occupier and the Occupied in Norway during the Second World War, in: Social History 45 (2020), 3, pp. 360–383, here p. 363.

22 TALBOT IMLAY: The German Side of Things: Recent Scholarship on the German Occupation of France, in: French Historical Studies 39 (2016), 1, pp. 183–215, here p. 183.

23 All quotes ibid.

24 TATJANA TÖNSMEYER, KRIJN THIJS: Introduction: Dealing with the Enemy, in: Francia: Forschungen zur Westeuropäischen Geschichte 44 (2017), pp. 349–359, here p. 356. See also TATJANA TÖNSMEYER: Besatzungsgesellschaften: Begriffliche und konzeptionelle Überlegungen zur Erfahrungsgeschichte des Alltags unter deutscher Besatzung im Zweiten Weltkrieg, Version: 1.0, in: Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte (2015), http://docupedia.de/zg/Besatzungsgesellschaften (2020-12-18).

25 TÖNSMEYER/THIJS, p. 354.

26 Ibid.

27 Ibid., p. 356.

Maren Röger, who investigated sexual contacts between the occupiers and the local inhabitants in German-occupied Poland, notes that "for a long time the methods used in military and administrative history have dominated research" on the German occupation of Poland. According to her, it is only in recent years that the daily life of local inhabitants during this period and their wartime experiences have begun being investigated.[28] Röger notes, however, that such historical research has often focused exclusively on the occupiers or the occupied and simply "tracked real-life separation of the German occupiers and the Poles suffering under the occupation."[29] Similarly, in Lithuania, the research on the German occupation still lacks the analysis from the perspective of studying everyday life. The history of the German occupation of Lithuania has often been told from the perspective of international politics with attention paid to historical geopolitical constellations,[30] the participation of Lithuanians in the occupational administrative structure,[31] and, as mentioned above, the history of the Holocaust.[32] Here it is important to distinguish the comprehensive study of German-occupied Lithuania, conducted by the German historian Christoph Dieckmann, that could be seen as the first attempt to investigate not only the administrative history of the German occupation but also the agency and behaviors of different parts of society in their interactions

---

28 MAREN RÖGER: The Sexual Policies and Sexual Realities of the German Occupiers in Poland in the Second World War, in: Contemporary European History 23 (2014), 1, pp. 1–21, here p. 3. Cf. MAREN RÖGER: Kriegsbeziehungen: Intimität, Gewalt und Prostitution im besetzten Polen 1939 bis 1945, Berlin 2015.

29 RÖGER, The Sexual Policies, p. 3.

30 See ARVYDAS ANUŠAUSKAS, ČESLOVAS LAURINAVIČIUS (eds.): Lietuva Antrajame pasauliniame kare [Lithuania in the Second World War], Vilnius 2007.

31 See ARŪNAS BUBNYS: German Security Police and the SD Vilnius Special Squad 1941–1944, Vilnius 2020; ARŪNAS BUBNYS: Lietuvių policijos batalionai 1941–1945 m. [Lithuanian Police Battalions, 1941–1945], Vilnius 2017; PETRAS STANKERAS: Lietuvių policija Antrajame pasauliniame kare [Lithuanian Police in the Second World War], Vilnius 2008.

32 See VYGANTAS VAREIKIS (ed.): Holokaustas nacių okupuotose Rytų ir Vakarų Europos valstybėse: Tyrimai ir atmintis / The Holocaust in the Eastern and Western European States Occupied by the Nazis: Studies and Memory, Kaunas 2017; CHRISTOPH DIECKMANN: Deutsche Besatzungspolitik in Litauen 1941–1944, 2 vols., Göttingen 2016; ALEKSANDRAS VITKUS, CHAIMAS BARGMANAS: Holokaustas Žemaitijoje [Holocaust in Samogitia], Vilnius 2016; ARŪNAS BUBNYS (ed.): Holokaustas Lietuvoje 1941–1944 [Holocaust in Lithuania, 1941–1944], Vilnius 2011; ROBERT VAN VOREN: Undigested Past: The Holocaust in Lithuania, Amsterdam 2011; CHRISTOPH DIECKMANN, SAULIUS SUŽIEDĖLIS: Lietuvos žydų persekiojimas ir masinės žudynės 1941 m. vasarą ir rudenį: šaltiniai ir analizė [The Persecution and Mass Murder of Lithuanian Jews during the Summer and Fall of 1941], Vilnius 2006; VINCAS BARTUSEVIČIUS, JOACHIM TAUBER et al. (eds.): Holocaust in Litauen: Krieg, Judenmorde und Kollaboration in Litauen im Jahre 1941, Köln 2003; WOLFGANG BENZ, MARION NEISS (eds.): Judenmord in Litauen: Studien und Dokumente, Berlin 1999; ARŪNAS BUBNYS: Vokiečių okupuota Lietuva (1941–1944) [The German-Occupied Lithuania (1941–1944)], Vilnius 1998.

with the occupiers.[33] Nevertheless, in both Polish and Lithuanian historical research, there is still a lack of studies that investigate more thoroughly different aspects of everyday practices and the experiences of local inhabitants as well as their multifaceted contacts with the occupiers. Therefore, this thematic issue of JECES represents a unique possibility to examine different aspects of daily life under the occupational regime in both countries, and more importantly, these contributions enlarge the research corpus of both Polish and Lithuanian historiography by addressing the issue of everyday life during the German occupation.

The authors of this issue investigate the history of the German occupation from the perspectives of individual actors and their experiences and present the occupation as multidimensional. The articles analyze the occupation from many different viewpoints, starting with sport and its function within the occupational regime; hygiene and sanitation policies and the impact of their implementation for local societies; German practices of criminal prosecution of ghetto inhabitants; and sexual violence and abortion practices in these contexts. The volume asks how these individual, and often, marginalized experiences can be situated within established historical metanarratives of World War II in Poland and Lithuania and what insights the study of these individual experiences might yield regarding the social history of this war in general. How did the occupiers enforce their rule? How did local inhabitants deal with foreign rule? How did the experiences of civilians under German occupation vary across different spatial settings? And how did local populations privately and/or publicly confront the enemy regime and the policies it imposed during occupation?

Such terms as "collaboration" and "resistance," which do not accurately reflect the complexity of the wartime relations in these countries, are intentionally avoided. Gross notes that historians do not have "a well-calibrated instrument to deal retroactively with the experience" of war and occupation and argues that scholars "need to rely primarily on middle terms," i.e., those situated between collaboration and resistance.[34] Similarly, Tönsmeyer argues that these concepts are terms of "social self-description," and therefore, cannot adequately serve as tools to analyze occupied societies.[35] In the case of Lithuania under German occupation, Dieckmann likewise concludes that the term "collaboration" is misplaced and that one should focus instead on the interrelation of the occupiers and the occupied.[36] He claims that it is the category of space that plays a significant role in defining these constantly shifting social

33 DIECKMANN, Deutsche Besatzungspolitik.

34 GROSS, p. 31.

35 TÖNSMEYER, Besatzungsgesellschaften.

36 CHRISTOPH DIECKMANN: Kollaboration? Litauische Nationsbildung und deutsche Besatzungsherrschaft im Zweiten Weltkrieg, in: JOACHIM TAUBER (ed.): "Kollaboration" in Nordosteuropa: Erscheinungsformen und Deutungen im 20. Jahrhundert, Lüneburg 2006, pp. 128–139, here p. 130.

relations under German occupation and suggests focusing on the abstract and concrete spaces in which there was a possibility of taking action (*Handlungsräume*).[37] Thus, these articles not only reveal the complex relationships between the local inhabitants and the occupiers but also demonstrate how the roles of local inhabitants and their relations with occupational powers were constantly shifting.

3 Sources

The choice of sources also plays an important role in how the history of the Second World is narrated. Scholars have correctly noted that the extant histories of the war have mostly concentrated on Nazi Germany and its institutions and have generally relied on German documents that tend to exclude the perspective of local populations.[38] Laurie L. Cohen, who has investigated the history of daily life during World War II and in the Soviet Union, even suggests that such German documents "treat locals as 'nonpersons'"[39] and do not reveal the interaction between the occupiers and the occupied. Therefore, the human experience of war can only be understood by integrating both German documents and other sources, such as oral history interviews, memoirs, diaries, and photographs. According to Cohen, these sources can provide "more sincerity and unconventionality" in our accounts of the war, revealing that the "primary motive people have in such extreme situations is not self-sacrifice (heroism or martyrdom)," as metanarratives and "myth-making memories" often present, but rather survival.[40] Thus incorporating this historical material in scholarship on the era gives a voice to neglected or marginalized people and their experiences and enables subaltern narratives of war and occupation to emerge and to be heard.

Historians working with such sources have frequently been criticized for creating fragmentary (hi)stories that cannot be contextualized within broader narratives. Historians of everyday life, however, claim that "all history is fragmentary" and that it is essential to acknowledge this fragmentation.[41] Walter Benjamin, whose work discusses the principle of montage within the writing the history, declares that the issue of history is to "discover in the analysis of the small individual moment the crystal of the total event."[42] Therefore, historians of everyday life claim that "we must interpret one fragment in the context of other fragments" and fill up "the space in between the

37 Ibid.

38 COHEN, Smolensk, p. 2.

39 Ibid.

40 Ibid., p. 3.

41 STEEGE/BERGERSON/HEALY/SWETT, p. 375.

42 Walter Benjamin, cited by: ROLF TIEDEMANN: Dialectics at a Standstill, in: WALTER BENJAMIN: The Arcades Project, Cambridge, MA 1999, pp. 929–945, here p. 931.

fragmentary historical artifacts, to make it into a recognizable human place."[43] When writing the history of the war and occupations it is thus important to analyze and "hear" different types of historical documents, even if they are fragmentary and incomplete. Without the synthesis of different sources, it is impossible to get closer to the practices of everyday life and human experience.

For this reason, the authors of this publication engage with different types of research materials, such as German documents, eyewitness accounts, memoirs, and local media reports. The authors combine these varied historical accounts to present the history of the war, in both Poland and Lithuania, from the perspective of ordinary people, including women who were sexually abused and raped, Jewish ghetto inhabitants, underground sportsmen, and other members of the local population. In addition to including the kinds of sources that have often been neglected, the authors seek to interpret the documents produced by the Nazi regime from a new perspective. For instance, Judith Vöcker, in her article on criminal prosecution in the Jewish ghettos, suggests that the court proceedings of the Special and German Courts should not be read solely in terms of the agency and supremacy of the perpetrators, but can also be viewed as "as testimonies of ordinary ghetto inhabitants, whose voices and fates often remain unheard."[44] The scholarly interpretations of this historical material reveal not only how the war impacted the living conditions of the occupied societies in Poland and Lithuania but also depict changing social and legal norms. Likewise, they show the multidimensionality and complexity of daily social encounters under occupation. The authors of this issue conclude that the daily encounters and everyday life activeities were overwhelmingly multifaceted. Local inhabitants sought not only to fight and resist the occupational regime, but rather they sought primarily to survive and retain a certain sense of everyday normality.

4 The Individual Contributions

The articles of this thematic issue portray the history of occupied Poland and Lithuania from the multiple perspectives of individual human actors and marginalized societal groups, as well as through the lenses of local populations. Martin Borkowski-Saruhan focuses on the intersection of sports, violence, and everyday life in East Upper Silesia during World War II. He shows that the investigation of sports under occupation allows for the occupation to be framed as a dynamic relational system between the occupiers and the occupied and presents the multifaceted experiences of the occupied societies. He

43 Steege/Bergerson/Healy/Swett, p. 375.

44 Judith Vöcker: Criminality in the Face of Life and Death: Crime and Criminal Prosecution as a Part of Everyday Life in the Warsaw Ghetto, in this issue, pp. 201–233, here p. 203.

analyzes sports both as means to exercise violence against the local population and as a way for the occupied to attain certain privileges in difficult times. Borkowski-Saruhan thus suggests that sports under occupation could be understood through the concept of *Eigen-Sinn* that was developed by the everyday-life historian Alf Lüdtke. In his article, he suggests that wartime sport activities provided people not only with a possibility to achieve normalcy but also a method of distancing themselves from the violent regime and its rule, for instance by protecting themselves from forced military service. This article, through the study of underground sport activities of selected sportsmen, reveals that a wide range of behavioral practices existed simultaneously in the occupied societies—ranging, for instance, from affirmative participation, through opposition and also resistance against the occupying regime. Therefore, the author argues that the study of sports under occupation using a historical approach that addresses everyday life not only sheds the light on "marginalized experiences, ambivalences, and coincidences"[45] but also enables us to understand wartime experiences in a way that transcends national historiographies.

Judith Vöcker analyzes crimes and criminal prosecution as part of everyday life in Jewish ghettos in occupied Poland. The author, using such primary sources as court proceedings and testimonies of ghetto inhabitants, aims to reconsider the perception of everyday life through this criminal perspective in Jewish ghettos. This paper investigates how German courts during the Nazi occupation constructed a new legal sphere and criminal code in the General Government. The author attempts to explain why the Nazi regime in the form of the General Government established their own justice system and jurisdiction. She argues that classifying some actions as criminal offenses served to create "a façade of legality" in the occupied territories and "to officially prosecute any misconduct and to impose a sense of 'law and order.'"[46] The article shows how these new legal practices turned the ghetto inhabitants into criminals, turning everyday practices— such as ensuring the basic supply of essential goods and food in the interest of preventing starvation and death—into criminal acts. Vöcker also examines what the German occupying authorities considered a criminal offense and which penalties were introduced to punish any misbehavior. She reveals that the crimes most often prosecuted included illegal border crossing, smuggling, and the illegal trade of smuggled goods, as well as bribery of police officials. Therefore, the author ascertains that new legal orders pushed the inhabitants of ghettos into a legal gray area. Nevertheless, the paper also identifies "major inconsistencies and contradictions within the German judicial system": identical crimes often incurred vastly

45 MARTIN BORKOWSKI-SARUHAN: Sport und die Ambivalenz von Besatzungserfahrungen in Warschau und Ostoberschlesien im Zweiten Weltkrieg, in this issue, pp. 177–200, here p. 197.

46 VÖCKER, p. 209.

different punishments and verdicts often depended on the specifics of the defendant and the circumstances surrounding the crime.[47]

The third article, by Jakub Gałęziowski, discusses the issue of sexual violence and abortions resulting from wartime rapes in Poland in 1945. The paper argues that until today the experiences of sexual violence and abortions "have not become part of the shared memory of Polish men and women" and thus have not been incorporated into the master narrative about World War II.[48] The author demonstrates that rape and the resulting venereal diseases and pregnancies were part of the daily experience of women and affected many families during World War II in Poland, especially those who spent the wartime years in the territories incorporated into Poland to the west and north. Gałęziowski thus hypothesizes that abortion among Polish women reached very high levels in the immediate aftermath of the war and depicts how in 1945 the Polish state intervened in the liberalization of postwar abortions, justifying it by the "sense of justice and need for eugenics."[49] The paper argues that it was not the criminal nature of wartime rape that most disturbed post-war Polish state, but its consequences, namely, the pregnancy evoked by the sexual relations with the enemy, that motivated the state's intervention.

In the volume's final article, Mantas Šikšnianas analyzes the use of saunas and the transformation of lice eradication habits in Lithuania during the Nazi occupation. He outlines how the occupying German authorities influenced the development of the sauna network and the formation of hygiene habits among the local inhabitants. The German authorities, who were largely concerned with sanitation and hygiene policies in occupied Lithuania, sought to ensure protection from epidemic diseases, especially from typhus, which is transmitted by lice. The occupying regime saw the use of the sauna as an important tool to achieving this aim. Šikšnianas shows that policies related to bathing and delousing were carried out in some cases by force, revealing that the German authorities thus sought to change the everyday habits of the local population by restricting their civil rights. For instance, those citizens who had been cleaned in this manner were issued a certificate from the delousing center that was a prerequisite for crossing the border into Germany. Those who refused to undergo the delousing procedure at the German border could be punished with imprisonment or sent to perform hard labor in prison for up to five years. Nevertheless, Šikšnianas notes that these measures imposed under occupation "were merely an external solution" and "had no deeper effect on the culture of cleanliness in Lithuania."[50]

---

47 Ibid., p. 28.

48 JAKUB GAŁĘZIOWSKI: "The Sense of Justice and the Need for Eugenics Require Instant and Effective Intervention": Terminating Pregnancies Resulting from Wartime Rapes in Poland in 1945, in this issue, pp. 235–259, here p. 256.

49 Ibid., pp. 237–238.

50 MANTAS ŠIKŠNIANAS: Saunas and Lice in Lithuania in 1941–1944, in this issue, pp. 261–279, here p. 277.

These four articles not only provide ample examples of the practice of everyday life during the German occupation of Poland and Lithuania but also ascribe the local population with agency. They depict the everyday behavior of different groups of society: from sportsmen and Jewish ghetto inhabitants to raped women and civilians living under the strict policies of the occupation. These contributions reveal the manifold relations between the occupying regime and the occupied. Most importantly, the authors expose how the power of the German authorities was not only implemented from "above" but also show how it was experienced and disputed from "below" by different members of local populations in occupied Poland and Lithuania.

Bibliography

Literature

ANUŠAUSKAS, ARVYDAS—LAURINAVIČIUS, ČESLOVAS (eds.): Lietuva Antrajame pasauliniame kare, Vilnius 2007.

BARTUSEVIČIUS, VINCAS—TAUBER, JOACHIM et al. (eds.): Holocaust in Litauen: Krieg, Judenmorde und Kollaboration in Litauen im Jahre 1941, Köln 2003.

BENZ, WOLFGANG—NEISS, MARION (eds.): Judenmord in Litauen: Studien und Dokumente, Berlin 1999.

BLOXHAM, DONALD: Prosecuting the Past in the Postwar Decade: Political Strategy and National Myth-Making, in: DAVID BANKIER, DAN MICHMAN (eds.): Holocaust and Justice: Representation and Historiography of the Holocaust in Post-War Trials, Jerusalem 2010, pp. 23–44.

BUBNYS, ARŪNAS: Vokiečių okupuota Lietuva (1941–1944), Vilnius 1998.

BUBNYS, ARŪNAS (ed.): Holokaustas Lietuvoje 1941–1944, Vilnius 2011.

BUBNYS, ARŪNAS: Lietuvių policijos batalionai 1941–1945 m., Vilnius 2017.

BUBNYS, ARŪNAS: German Security Police and the SD Vilnius Special Squad 1941–1944, Vilnius 2020.

COHEN, LAURIE L.: Smolensk under Nazis: Everyday Life in Occupied Russia, Rochester 2013.

DAVIS, BELINDA J.: Home Fires Burning: Food, Politics, and Everyday Life in World War I Berlin, Chapel Hill 2000.

DEÁK, ISTVÁN: Introduction, in: DEÁK/GROSS, pp. 3–14.

DEÁK, ISTVÁN: Europe on Trial: The Story of Collaboration, Resistance, and Retribution during World War II, Philadelphia 2015.

DEÁK, ISTVÁN—GROSS, JAN T. et al. (eds.): The Politics of Retribution in Europe: World War II and Its Aftermath, Princeton 2000.

DIECKMANN, CHRISTOPH: Kollaboration? Litauische Nationsbildung und deutsche Besatzungsherrschaft im Zweiten Weltkrieg, in: JOACHIM TAUBER (ed.): "Kollaboration" in Nordosteuropa: Erscheinungsformen und Deutungen im 20. Jahrhundert, Lüneburg 2006, pp. 128–139.

DIECKMANN, CHRISTOPH: Deutsche Besatzungspolitik in Litauen 1941–1944, 2 vols., Göttingen 2016.

DIECKMANN, CHRISTOPH—SUŽIEDĖLIS, SAULIUS: Lietuvos žydų persekiojimas ir masinės žudynės 1941 m. vasarą ir rudenį: šaltiniai ir analizė, Vilnius 2006.

ELEY, GEOFF: Labor History, Social History, "Alltagsgeschichte": Experience, Culture, and the Politics of the Everyday. A New Direction for German Social History?, in: The Journal of Modern History 61 (1989), 2, pp. 297–343.

FRITSCHE, MARIA: Spaces of Encounter: Relations between the Occupier and the Occupied in Norway during the Second World War, in: Social History 45 (2020), 3, pp. 360–383.

GROSS, JAN T.: Themes for a Social History of War Experience and Collaboration, in: DEÁK/GROSS, pp. 15–36.

IMLAY, TALBOT: The German Side of Things: Recent Scholarship on the German Occupation of France, in: French Historical Studies 39 (2016), 1, pp. 183–215.

JUDT, TONY: The Past is Another Country: Myth and Memory in Postwar Europe, in: DEÁK/GROSS, pp. 293–324.

JUDT, TONY: Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945, London 2005.

RÖGER, MAREN: The Sexual Policies and Sexual Realities of the German Occupiers in Poland in the Second World War, in: Contemporary European History 23 (2014), 1, pp. 1–21.

RÖGER, MAREN: Kriegsbeziehungen: Intimität, Gewalt und Prostitution im besetzten Polen 1939 bis 1945, Berlin 2015.
SARASIN, PHILIPP: Arbeit, Sprache—Alltag. Wozu noch "Alltagsgeschichte"?, in: WerkstattGeschichte (1996), 15, pp. 72–82.
STANKERAS, PETRAS: Lietuvių policija Antrajame pasauliniame kare, Vilnius 2008.
STEEGE, PAUL—BERGERSON, ANDREW STUART—HEALY, MAUREEN—SWETT, PAMELA E.: The History of Everyday Life: A Second Chapter, in: The Journal of Modern History 80 (2008), pp. 358–378.
TIEDEMANN, ROLF: Dialectics at a Standstill, in: WALTER BENJAMIN: The Arcades Project, Cambridge, MA 1999, pp. 929–945.
TÖNSMEYER, TATJANA: Besatzungsgesellschaften. Begriffliche und konzeptionelle Überlegungen zur Erfahrungsgeschichte des Alltags unter deutscher Besatzung im Zweiten Weltkrieg, Version: 1.0, in: Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte (2015), http://docupedia.de/zg/Besatzungsgesellschaften (2020-12-18).
TÖNSMEYER, TATJANA—THIJS, KRIJN: Introduction: Dealing with the Enemy, in: Francia: Forschungen zur Westeuropäischen Geschichte 44 (2017), pp. 349–359.
TÖNSMEYER, TATJANA—HASLINGER, PETER et al. (eds.): Coping with Hunger and Shortage under German Occupation in World War II, Basingstoke 2018.
TÖNSMEYER, TATJANA—HASLINGER, PETER (eds.): Fighting Hunger, Dealing with Shortage: Everyday Life under Occupation in World War II Europe. A Source Edition, Leiden—Boston 2021.
VAREIKIS, VYGANTAS (ed.): Holokaustas nacių okupuotose Rytų ir Vakarų Europos valstybėse: tyrimai ir atmintis / The Holocaust in the Eastern and Western European States Occupied by the Nazis: Studies and Memory, Kaunas 2017.
VITKUS, ALEKSANDRAS—BARGMANAS, CHAIMAS: Holokaustas Žemaitijoje, Vilnius 2016.
VAN VOREN, ROBERT: Undigested Past: The Holocaust in Lithuania, Amsterdam 2011.