

11 “Robbery and Murder”: Conflicts at the Polish-Romanian Border in the Aftermath of the War

Elisabeth Haid

Abstract

Though political relations between Poland and Romania were quite good in the aftermath of the First World War, conflicts occurred at the newly established Polish-Romanian border at a local level. Based on the example of the border region Pokuttya, this chapter investigates local conflicts—including conflicts between the local population and state officials, between Polish and Romanian border officials, but also between different Polish institutions like the customs guard and the state police—in the context of the postwar settlement and state building processes. It points to continued wartime practices like requisitions and to problems with the demarcation of the border and the building of functioning state institutions. As the reputation of the Polish state was concerned, the Polish authorities in the region took complaints by the local population seriously. The restoration of the rule of law was regarded as a matter of the legitimacy of the state.

Romanian soldiers [...] took 11 head of cattle by force. Iwan Węgier, who lived in Żabie, began to ask them not to take the cattle, thereupon one of the Romanian soldiers hit the shepherd with a gunstock in his chest. The shepherd began to plead for the second time, but the other soldier put a rifle on his face threatening that, if he said anything else, they would immediately shoot him.¹ This seems to be a typical episode from the First World War when requisitions and violence against civilians were a common occurrence, in particular, at the Eastern front.² However, the cited episode took place as late as August 1923, namely in the mountainous region Pokuttya in

the south east of the former Austrian province Galicia which was part of the Polish Republic at that time. Considering that the battle for the borders of the new Polish state ended earlier in Pokuttya than in some other regions, this exemplifies that wartime practices like requisitions continued for several years after the end of hostilities and might have given the impression of a war that never ended to the local population. The aim of this paper is to take a closer look at local conflicts in this border region in the aftermath of the war and to investigate relevant factors of these conflicts at the newly established Polish-Romanian border. First, I will give a short overview of the establishment of the border. In the following, I will trace different lines of conflict. Based on archival materials of the voivodeship administration in Stanisławów (today's Ivano-Frankivsk) as well as on press reports, I will outline conflicts between the local population and state officials—be it Polish or Romanian ones, between Polish and Romanian border officials, but also between different Polish institutions like the customs guard (*Straż Celna*) and the state police (*Policja Państwowa*). How did these conflicts reflect different aspects of state building? And how were they perceived by local actors?

The Establishment of the Polish-Romanian Border

The territories of the Polish Republic had been heavily affected by the First World War and the mobile warfare at the Eastern front. Moreover, the dissolution of empires and the formation of nation states resulted in border conflicts which prolonged the state of war for several years.

While virtually all borders of the new Polish state were contested,³ warfare lasted the longest in the East. The Polish-Soviet War ended only in 1921.⁴ Eastern Galicia had also been touched by these developments. Between 1914 and 1919, the borders of this embattled area changed frequently. The Russian Empire occupied large parts of the Austrian provinces Galicia and Bukovina in autumn 1914 and again in summer 1916.⁵ After several months of Russian

occupation, the region was both times recaptured by the central powers and remained part of the Habsburg monarchy until its dissolution in autumn 1918. However, Eastern Galicia was not only a battlefield between the Austrian and Russian Empires but experienced different attempts for nation-state building after the dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy. Nationality conflicts in the multiethnic region culminated in a Polish-Ukrainian War in 1918/1919, as both sides claimed Eastern Galicia for their nation-states coming into being—the Polish Republic or the West Ukrainian People’s Republic.⁶ The war ended with the defeat and dissolution of the West Ukrainian state in summer 1919.⁷ Romania had annexed Bukovina and Poland Galicia. In Pokuttya, fighting ended earlier than in other parts of Eastern Galicia, since Romanian forces occupied the region in May 1919 and handed it over to Poland three months later.⁸ The Polish-Soviet front came close to the region in 1920, but Pokuttya was not directly affected. Thus, it was more or less the former borderline between the two Austrian provinces Galicia and Bukovina that now became the Polish-Romanian state border. In contrast to Poland’s tense relations with its other neighbours, relations between Poland and Romania were quite harmonious in the aftermath of the First World War. Both states had common interests in the fight against Soviet Russia and cooperated at the Paris peace conference in 1919.⁹ Nevertheless, conflicts occurred at the Polish-Romanian border at a local level.

Relations between the Local Population and State Officials

Border conflicts in the region were reconciled as Poland and Romania pursued an amicable solution of their border question. But state consolidation was not limited to the consolidation of borders. Internal difficulties were equally important. The First World War had caused severe problems, and border conflicts had prolonged the state of war and its side effects. Besides war damage and economic crisis, the war had resulted in a deterioration of the rule of law, in

arbitrariness and violence against civilians. Accordingly, a restoration of peace meant also to restore the rule of law. This was an important task and major challenge of the new states.¹⁰ Even after the settlement of border disputes, violence remained a problem. The Polish-Soviet border, for example, was a hot spot even after the end of the Polish-Soviet War and the Peace of Riga in 1921. Besides politically motivated violence, criminality and smuggling were major problems. Due to these severe difficulties, the Polish state deployed special units within this region in order to enforce state authority.¹¹ But conflicts occurred also at the Polish-Romanian border, though on a smaller scale.

In Eastern Galicia, relations between the local population and state officials were, on the one hand, shaped by the uncertain status of the region. The incorporation of the Eastern Galician territories into the Polish Republic still was contested. Though militarily defeated, Ukrainian politicians tried to assert their claims in international negotiations. They appealed to the Allies, arguing with the right of self-determination. However, the Allies rather favoured a statute of autonomy for the Eastern Galician territories within the Polish Republic. Already, in fall 1919, they conceded a temporary annexation of this territory to Poland, but an ultimate decision was postponed. The final incorporation of Eastern Galicia to Poland was internationally acknowledged only in March 1923.¹² Thus, Polish state authorities—as well as the Romanian ones at the other side of the border—feared resistance by the local Ukrainian population. The authorities' mistrust of the local population also affected the border regime. Despite the relatively good political relations between Poland and Romania, especially Romania established a restrictive border regime limiting the formerly intense exchange between Galicia and Bukovina. An agreement on the local border traffic between Poland and Romania was signed only in 1929.¹³ The aim of this strict border control was not only to prevent smuggling but also

to inhibit political influences of Galician Ukrainians to the mainly Ukrainian inhabited border region of Bukovina. The status of Bukovina was resolved earlier than that of Eastern Galicia, as the borders of Greater Romania were internationally recognized end 1920. And after the collapse of the West Ukrainian People's Republic, there was no noteworthy irredentist movement in Bukovina. Nevertheless, the predominantly Ukrainian Northwestern part of Bukovina remained under a permanent state of emergency for a decade. This opened the door to an intense surveillance of the population and arbitrary actions by the authorities. The fight against bolshevism often served as an excuse to violate the rights of minorities like Ukrainians and Jews.¹⁴ The Polish authorities closely observed the activities of Ukrainian and Jewish associations as well.¹⁵ They reinforced the surveillance over the region in particular during the parliament elections in 1922, as Ukrainian politicians called for a boycott of the elections to the Polish parliament in Eastern Galicia that was not part of Poland at that time.¹⁶ Indeed, local authorities noticed Ukrainian agitation for a boycott of the elections, including some violent incidents. But the fear of popular unrests turned out to be overestimated.¹⁷

On the other hand, the mistrust between the local population and state officials was often mutual. Apart from repressive measures against members of national minorities who were suspected of disloyalty, the state authorities strove for the population's trust in the state and its institutions. However, the relations between the local population and Polish officials left much to be desired. In the early 1920s, Polish authorities faced several complaints about the behaviour of state officials. Appeals to the district authorities as well as press reports in local newspapers illustrate these conflicts. Locals complained about tactless behaviour by Polish officials towards the civilian population, alleged abuse of authority, bribery and illegal requisitions of food, essentials, carts or horses from the local population.¹⁸ A frequent target of complaints was border officials.

Indeed, accusations of illegal actions were not one-sided. The commissariat of the customs guard in Horodenka, for example, assumed that complaints about customs officials could be traced to smugglers, for whom the customs guard was inconvenient. According to this, it was not the customs officials but the local population who committed illegal actions.¹⁹ On the other hand, accusations against Polish officials recurred too often that they could be considered as completely unfounded.²⁰ One might argue that a major reason of conflicts between the local population and state officials was opposition to Polish rule in these predominantly Ukrainian territories. But also local Polish newspapers complained about illegal requisitions by Polish officials as well. “Where do we live?”, the *Gazeta Kołomyjska*, for example, commented on a case of illegal requisitions by the Polish military police in May 1922. Calling for the rule of law, the newspaper pointed out that any requisitions were legally forbidden, and searches were allowed only with a special permission of the relevant authorities or a court order.²¹ Thus, requisitions seemed to be a problem of discipline of state officials and an aspect of continued wartime practices in peacetime. Polish district authorities were concerned about these allegations: Improper behaviour by officials would harm the reputation of Polish rule—all the more in such a sensitive region as the Ukrainian inhabited borderlands, whose affiliation to Poland was not yet definitive.²²

However, the local population at the Polish side of the border complained not only about abuses by Polish officials but also by Romanian ones. In summer 1923, the Polish authorities in Kosów (Kosiv) district, a mountainous region at the Romanian border, faced frequent complaints by the local population as well as by Polish officials about “robberies” by Romanian soldiers.

Romanian border guards allegedly penetrated Polish territory and abducted cattle from Polish citizens at pastures near the border, often hassling and threatening the shepherds.²³ The district

administrator (*starosta*) of Kosów demanded strong measures against the Romanian perpetrators. He argued that these incidents gave rise to bitterness among the locals and that their anger would be directed also against the Polish authorities, who did not defend them.²⁴ Accordingly, the Polish authorities instructed the state police in the border region to prosecute abuses by Polish as well as by Romanian officials and regularly report to the authorities.²⁵ The population's trust in the authorities was seen as a matter of the legitimacy of the state.

Polish-Romanian Conflicts

Moreover, Romanian "robberies" had yet another aspect: This was not only a conflict between the local population and state officials, but at the same time, a problem of border violations and thus a Polish-Romanian conflict. One reason of this problem seemed to be problems of demarcation of the new border. Despite the generally good Polish-Romanian relations, the conclusion of a border treaty between Poland and Romania was delayed, as Romania repeatedly argued for smaller revisions, aiming to establish a better connection between Bukovina and Maramureş. Poland opposed these suggestions, considering them disadvantageous for Poland. Moreover, the Allies prohibited any border changes in Eastern Galicia. Thus, the final protocol of the Polish-Romanian border commission was signed only in 1935.²⁶ These unresolved issues sometimes resulted in uncertainty at the local level. In August 1922, for example, the Polish authorities dealt with misunderstandings about the accurate line of the Polish-Romanian border, pointing to the problem that the line of the border was not yet finally determined. Misunderstandings occurred especially at the Cheremosh River, which marked the border between the two states, but at some places run deeper into Polish territory; Romanian border guards allegedly advanced to the river, thus crossing the provisional demarcation line.²⁷

In the context of increasing complaints about Romanian “robberies”, the district authorities in Kosów also paid greater attention to border crossings by Romanian soldiers. In August 1923, the district administrator gave instructions to disarm and arrest Romanian soldiers venturing into Polish territory, emphasizing that border violations were a matter of authority and sovereignty of the state.²⁸ When the customs directorate (*Dyrekcja Ceł*) in Lwów (Lviv) drew attention to the fact that, there was a path at Polish territory about 500 m from the border, which was used by Polish as well as Romanian border officials, and tolerated by the Polish authorities, the district administrator considered the existence of such a path without his knowledge and permission to be illegal. He considered any border crossings by Romanian officials to be border violations, all the more as the Romanians did not even allow Polish citizens owing land on the other side of the border to cross the border and sometimes even fired at them.²⁹

The mentioned conflicts illustrate problems at the local level, related to the establishment of a new state border. At the same time, these examples make it clear that local conflicts not necessarily coincided with external relations at the state level. Though political relations between Poland and Romania were significantly better than those between Poland and Czechoslovakia, reports of the Polish district authorities in the border regions paint an entirely different picture. While the district administrator of Kosów complained on the attitudes of the Romanian border guards towards Polish citizens, the district administrator in Nadwórna (Nadvirna) praised the Czechoslovakian officials for their liberal behaviour towards Polish citizens: They did not create any obstacles to peasants tilling their fields at the other side of the border or searching for their cattle.³⁰

Polish-Romanian relations in Kosów district get worse when a Polish customs official was murdered. The customs official had to accompany a Romanian official, met at Polish territory

about 500 meters from the border (apparently at the mentioned path) and intended to hand him over to the police. However, he never arrived at the police station. The Polish customs official was found killed the next day, and the Romanian had disappeared. Moreover, Polish officials blamed the Romanian authorities for being uncooperative. During the search for the missing Polish official, Romanian border guards had allegedly started to shoot the searching Polish patrols and forced them to retreat.³¹ Appeals to the responsible Romanian prefect to prosecute the Romanian perpetrators and prevent further delinquencies were in vain. Therefore, the district administrator in Kosów asked for an immediate reinforcement of the Polish-Romanian border to stop this “robbery and murder”.³²

Hence, conflicts with Romanian border officials also raised issues of the border regime. Whereas the Romanian border guard surveilled the border very strictly, the district administrator in Kosów identified deficiencies of the Polish survey of the border and warned against ceding the field to the Romanians. He complained especially of a serious lack of staff: A continuous surveillance by the state police had not yet been established, and the customs guard had to fill in the gaps in some places³³; beside resource constraints, a lack of cooperation between these two institutions played an important role as well. Thus, beside the demarcation of the border, the building of functioning state institutions seemed to be a major problem at the Polish-Romanian border.

Tensions between Different Polish Institutions

Tensions between the Polish state police and the Polish customs guard came to light not only in the context of Romanian “robberies”. When locals complained about illegal actions and abuse of power by Polish border officials, the two institutions often shifted the blame on each other.³⁴

Police officers accused customs officials of unlawful behaviour and assumption of power. Rejecting accusations against customs officials, the commissariat of the customs guard in

Horodenka, for example, pointed to misunderstandings between the local commandant of the state police and officials of the customs guard in October 1922: Instead of collaborating for the benefit of the state, the police commandant had instigated the local population against the customs guard and pretended to be the only representative of state authority. Police officers sometimes even considered the customs guard to be totally unnecessary.³⁵ These mutual recriminations turned out to be an aspect of a power struggle between different Polish state institutions that were coming into being.

In this regard, the situation at the Polish-Romanian border (as well as at other border sections) differed from the situation at the Polish-Soviet border. Due to severe problems with criminality, smuggling and politically motivated violence in this region, the Polish authorities created special units, the Border Protection Corps (*Korpus Ochrony Pogranicza*), deployed at the Soviet border in 1924. These units, consisting of selected military staff, served at the territory of a 30 km wide border strip and also performed tasks of internal security.³⁶ So, the units performed a broad range of functions and responsibilities. In contrast, the responsibilities of the Customs Guard serving at the other state borders were much more restricted. Tasks of border surveillance were divided between the Customs Guard and the State Police. This raised the question of the delimitation of competences. An aggravating factor was that the Customs Guard had been created recently, namely in 1922. The new institution assumed the responsibilities of the former Customs Battalions (*Bataliony Celne*) at the western and southern borders. While tasks of border surveillance at the Eastern border remained in the hands of military units subordinated to the ministry of the interior, the new Customs Guard at the western and southern borders was a civil institution subordinated to the Ministry of the Treasury (*Ministerstwo Skarbu*). The different regulations of border management were justified by the differing security situation and

requirements at the respective borders.³⁷ The Customs Guard was responsible for monitoring compliance with customs regulations that is preventing smuggling and preventing illegal border crossings. The concrete competences of the new institution, however, remained vague, due to a lack of legal provisions. Only in December 1923, controversial issues were clarified by a new law.³⁸ And as late as 1925, the Polish authorities worked at a plan for the unification of the procedure of border controls.³⁹ Thus, especially the Customs Guard was still in the establishment phase in the years 1922–1923 and had to find its role. The Polish State Police, created in 1919, was more established at that time. However, the formation of the State Police had been quite a lengthy process as well. In the first years of the Polish Republic, several rudimentary police groups and self-governing police formations existed and competency conflicts occurred between competing police organizations. In order to rationalize the state structure and make it more efficient, the State Police Act passed on 24 July 1919 established a unified, centrally controlled police system under the orders of the Minister of Internal Affairs and his representatives at the district and regional levels. The first units of the State Police were established in Central Poland. Yet, the institution was successively extended to the whole country.⁴⁰

Problems of the delimitation of competences fuelled tensions between the customs guard and the state police at the local level. However, the conflicts were not limited to local officials of the two institutions. Occasionally, superior authorities get involved. Due to repeated complaints by the customs guard about unfriendly behaviour and unobjective attitudes of lower officials of the state police towards the customs guard, the fiscal office (*Izba skarbową*) for the Eastern Galician territories in Lwów stepped in. The fiscal office, which was the higher office to the customs guard, stated that investigations had proved that information by the State Police against the customs guard was exaggerated and even unfounded and aggravated tensions between the two

institutions. Though the fiscal office also appealed to the customs guard to behave correctly and to strictly observe their scope of functions, it ascribed these problems mainly to the ignorance of the police officials about the duties and responsibilities of the customs guard. The representative of the fiscal office argued that the attitudes of the state police undermined the confidence of the local population. Thus, he appealed for appropriate instructions to the Police officials. In order to prevent further conflicts of competence, the fiscal office issued a communiqué about the scope of functions of the customs guard in October 1922. A contentious point was the question, if officials of the customs guard had the right to search persons and houses in the interior. Officials of the state police classified these actions of the customs guard as unlawful assumption of authority. Thus, they supported the view among the local population of arbitrary actions by customs officials and undermined the reputation of the customs guard. The communiqué, in contrast, underlined the competences of the customs guard, referring to its provisional regulations as well as to the Austrian law on the fiscal guard as predecessor of the Polish customs guard. The fiscal office requested the district department of the state police to inform the relevant police stations about the content of this communiqué and to instruct them to appropriately cooperate with the customs guard. Appropriate cooperation between the two institutions would be the precondition for a more effective surveillance of the border and for a complete control of smuggling. Conflicts would undermine the authority of both state institutions in the eyes of the public.⁴¹ While the fiscal office considered conflicts between Polish state institutions to be a major problem, representatives of the state police and of the district authorities blamed most of all the customs guard. The district administrator in Kosów, for example, called the customs guard a “corps without any discipline”, that did not command the population’s respect and should not be entrusted with such an important task as the security of

the state border. However, besides concerns about state security, a struggle of power presumably played a role in this case as well. The district administrator attempted to extend his powers, demanding that the customs guard should be subordinated to the district authorities in matters of public security, like the state police was.⁴² Though the law on the competences of the tax authorities' executive bodies in December 1923 aimed to resolve controversial issues,⁴³ similar conflicts occurred in the following years.⁴⁴

Occasionally, the competing Polish state institutions took on a conciliatory tone. When the need for an effective surveillance of the border increased due to supposed robberies by Romanian soldiers in summer 1923, the district department of the state police in Kosów ordered a closer cooperation with the customs guard.⁴⁵ But the customs guard anew became discredited, when Polish customs officials were suspected to collude with the Romanian soldiers concerning robberies of cattle.⁴⁶ Thus, Polish-Romanian conflicts did not sustainably reconcile conflicts between different Polish institutions, but rather lead to further suspicions.

Conclusion

“Robbery and murder” were a matter of concern not only at hotspots like the Polish-Soviet border but also at relatively quiet segments of the border, like the Polish-Romanian border in Pokuttya. However, a main concern of the Polish authorities in this region was not on criminality and large-scale smuggling like at the Polish-Soviet border (probably due to the relatively strict controls from the Romanian side), but rather on illegal actions by state officials. A major subject of complaints by the local population were continuing requisitions by Polish as well as by Romanian officials, which were perceived as a continued wartime practice in peace times. Expectations of a peaceful everyday live were closely connected to requests for legal security.

As the reputation of the Polish state was concerned, the Polish authorities in the region took these complaints seriously. On the one hand, they had to get to grips with conflicts with Romanian border officials and ensure a control of the border. On the other hand, they were concerned on the discipline of Polish state officials and rivalries between different state institutions. From this point of view, conflicts at the Polish-Romanian border were closely connected to different aspects of state building: on the one hand to the establishment of a new border and the demarcation of the border and on the other hand to the establishment of functioning state institutions. The local Polish authorities acknowledged that the task to enforce the state authority of the new Polish state also meant to meet expectations regarding the rule of law.

Bibliography

Archive

Deržavnyj Archiv Ivano-Frankivs'koï oblasti (DAIFO) [State Archive of Ivano-Frankivsk region]:

Fond 2: Voivodeship Administration of Stanisławów

Newspapers

Gazeta Kołomyjska

Покуття

Secondary Literature

[Bezstronny] *O system ochrony naszych granic* (Warszawa, 1927).

Anghel, Florian, "Okupacja Pokucia przez armię rumuńską (24 maja–początek sierpnia 1919).

i początki stosunków polsko-rumuńskich”, *Przegląd Historyczny* 89, no. 2 (1998), pp. 251–261.

Benecke, Werner, *Die Ostgebiete der Zweiten Polnischen Republik*. Beiträge zur Geschichte Osteuropas (Köln, Wien: Böhlau, 1999), p. 29.

Böhler, Jochen, Włodzimierz Borodziej, and Joachim von Puttkamer (eds.), *Legacies of Violence: Eastern Europe's First World War* (München: Oldenbourg, 2014).

Borodziej, Włodzimierz and Maciej Górny. *Der vergessene Weltkrieg*. Vol. 1. *Imperien 1912–1916*, and Vol. 2. *Nationen 1917–1923*, trans. Bernhard Hartmann (Darmstadt: wbg Theiss, 2018). Originally published as *Nasza wojna*. Vol. 1. *Imperia 1912–1916*, and Vol. 2. *Narody 1917–1923* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo WAB, 2014–2018).

Borzęcki, Jerzy, *The Soviet-Polish Peace of 1921 and the Creation of Interwar Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017).

Conrad, Benjamin, *Umkämpfte Grenzen, umkämpfte Bevölkerung. Die Entstehung der Staatsgrenzen der Zweiten Polnischen Republik 1918–1923*, Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des östlichen Europa (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2014).

Deak, John and Jonathan E. Gumz, “How to Break a State: The Habsburg Monarchy’s Internal War, 1914–1918”, *The American Historical Review* 122, no. 4 (2017), pp. 105–1136.

Hagen, Mark von, *War in a European Borderland. Occupations and Occupation Plans in Galicia and Ukraine, 1914–1918* (Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press, 2007).

Hausleitner, Mariana, *Die Rumänisierung der Bukowina: die Durchsetzung des nationalstaatlichen Anspruchs Grossrumäniens 1918–1944* Südosteuropäische Arbeiten; 111 (München: Oldenbourg, 2001).

Hrenciuc, Daniel, “Approaches on the Inter-War Romanian-Polish Relations (1919–1939)”, *Codrul Cosminului* 13 (2007), pp. 223–240.

- Klimecki, Michał. *Wojna polsko-ukraińska: Lwów i Galicja Wschodnia 1918–1919. Pierwszy konflikt zbrojny odrodzonej Polski* (Warszawa: Bellona, 2014).
- Konrád, Ota, and Rudolf Kučera, *Cesty z apokalypsy. Fyzické násilí v pádu a obnově střední Evropy 1914–1922* (Praha: Academia, 2018).
- Krywieńczyk, Ludomir, *Zbiór ustaw, rozporządzeń i tymczasowych przepisów obowiązujących straż celną pełniącą ochronę północnych, zachodnich i południowych granic Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej* (Lubliniec: Nakładem autora, 1926).
- Marc, Dorel, “Z historii gospodarczej splawów drewna na granicy polsko-rumuńskiej na Czeremoszu w latach 20. i 30. XX wieku”, *Rocznik Przemyski. Historia*, 56, no. 1 (2020), pp. 81–102.
- Misiuk, Andrzej, “Miejsce policji państwowej w strukturze aparatu państwowego II Rzeczypospolitej w okresie 1919–1926”, *Dzieje Najnowsze* 23, no. 2 (1991), pp. 49–58.
- Misiuk, Andrzej, “Police and Policing Under the Second Polish Republic, 1918–39”, in Gerald Blaney (ed.), *Policing Interwar Europe. Continuity, Change and Crisis, 1918–40* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), pp. 159–171.
- Olas, Feliks. *Ustawa z 14. grudnia 1923 r. o uprawnieniach organów wykonawczych władz skarbowych (Dz. Ustaw Nr 5 z 1924 r.) i instrukcja co do przestrzegania przez organy Straży Celnej przepisów ustawy z dnia 14. grudnia 1923 r. (Rozp. Min. Skarbu Dep. Cel Nr. D. C. 1397/V/24 z 30. czerwca 1924)* (Lidzbark–Pomorze, 1924).
- Roguski, Rafał. “Pokucie pod okupacją rumuńską oraz podczas przejmowania nad nim kontroli przez Wojsko Polskie (maj–sierpień 1919 roku)”, in Adam Adrian Ostanek and Aleksander Smoliński (eds.), *Kołomyja, Pokucie i Huculszczyzna w II Rzeczypospolitej: wybrane zagadnienia* (Warszawa: Adam A. Ostanek, 2017), pp. 47–63.

Wehrhahn, Torsten. *Die Westukrainische Volksrepublik. Zu den polnisch-ukrainischen Beziehungen und dem Problem der ukrainischen Staatlichkeit in den Jahren 1918 bis 1923* (Berlin: Weißensee-Verl., 2004).

Зайцев, Олександр, “Вибори 1922 року у Західній Україні”, *Україна модерна* 2–3 (1999), 194–205.

Notes

¹ Deržavnyj Archiv Ivano-Frankivs'koï oblasti (hereinafter: DAIFO) [State Archive of Ivano-Frankivsk region], f[ond] 2, o[pis] (description) 1, sp[rawa] (case) 306, a[rkusz] (sheet) 85.

² See Włodzimierz Borodziej and Maciej Górny, *Der vergessene Weltkrieg*. Vol. 1. *Imperien 1912–1916*, trans. Bernhard Hartmann (Darmstadt: wbg Theiss, 2018), pp. 210–218, 253–263. Originally published as *Nasza wojna: Imperia 1912–1916* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo WAB, 2014). On war and violence at the Eastern front, see also Jochen Böhrer, Włodzimierz Borodziej, and Joachim von Puttkamer (eds.), *Legacies of Violence: Eastern Europe's First World War* (München: Oldenbourg, 2014); Ota Konrád and Rudolf Kučera, *Cesty z apokalypsy. Fyzické násilí v pádu a obnově střední Evropy 1914–1922* (Praha: Academia, 2018).

³ Benjamin Conrad, *Umkämpfte Grenzen, umkämpfte Bevölkerung. Die Entstehung der Staatsgrenzen der Zweiten Polnischen Republik 1918–1923*, Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des östlichen Europa (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2014).

⁴ On the course of the Soviet–Polish War and the peace treaty, see Jerzy Borzecki, *The Soviet-Polish Peace of 1921 and the Creation of Interwar Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017).

⁵ Mark von Hagen, *War in a European Borderland. Occupations and Occupation Plans in Galicia and Ukraine, 1914–1918* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007).

⁶ Torsten Wehrhahn, *Die Westukrainische Volksrepublik. Zu den polnisch-ukrainischen Beziehungen und dem Problem der ukrainischen Staatlichkeit in den Jahren 1918 bis 1923* (Berlin: Weißensee-Verl., 2004).

⁷ On the course of the war, see Michał Klimecki, *Wojna polsko-ukraińska: Lwów i Galicja Wschodnia 1918–1919. Pierwszy konflikt zbrojny odrodzonej Polski*, Historia (Warszawa: Bellona, 2014), pp. 116–243.

⁸ Rafał Roguski, “Pokucie pod okupacją rumuńską oraz podczas przejmowania nad nim kontroli przez Wojsko Polskie (maj–sierpień 1919 roku)”, in Adam Adrian Ostanek and Aleksander Smoliński eds.), *Kołomyja, Pokucie i Huculszczyzna w II Rzeczypospolitej: wybrane zagadnienia* (Warszawa: Adam A. Ostanek, 2017).

⁹ Daniel Hrenciuc, “Approaches on the Inter-War Romanian-Polish Relations (1919–1939)”, *Codrul Cosminului* 13 (2007); Florian Anghel, “Okupacja Pokucia przez armię rumuńską (24 maja–początek sierpnia 1919) i początki stosunków polsko-rumunskich”, *Przegląd Historyczny* 89, no. 2 (1998), pp. 260–261.

¹⁰ John Deak and Jonathan E. Gumz, “How to Break a State: The Habsburg Monarchy’s Internal War, 1914–1918”, *The American Historical Review* 122, no. 4 (2017), pp. 1105–1136; Włodzimierz Borodziej and Maciej Górny, *Der vergessene Weltkrieg. Vol. 2. Nationen 1917–1923*, trans. Bernhard Hartmann (Darmstadt: wbg Theiss, 2018), pp. 280–286. Originally published as *Nasza wojna: Narody 1917–1923* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo WAB, 2018).

¹¹ Werner Benecke, *Die Ostgebiete der Zweiten Polnischen Republik*, Beiträge zur Geschichte Osteuropas; 29 (Köln, Wien: Böhlau, 1999), pp. 41–80.

¹² Wehrhahn, *Westukrainische Volksrepublik*, pp. 287–352.

¹³ Conrad, *Umkämpfte Grenzen*, 288.

¹⁴ Mariana Hausleitner, *Die Rumänisierung der Bukowina: die Durchsetzung des nationalstaatlichen Anspruchs Grossrumäniens 1918–1944*, Südosteuropäische Arbeiten; 111 (München: Oldenbourg, 2001), pp. 138–142.

¹⁵ See e.g. DAIFO, f. 8, o. 1, sp. 114.

¹⁶ Олександр Зайцев, “Вибори 1922 року у Західній Україні”, *Україна модерна* 2–3 (1999).

¹⁷ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 82.

¹⁸ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 6, sp. 11, a. 3; DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 57–58, p. 167.

¹⁹ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 57–58.

²⁰ *Покуття*, July 24, 1921, p. 3; *Gazeta Kołomyjska*, 15 July 1922, p. 3; *Gazeta Kołomyjska*, 9 December 1922, p. 3.

²¹ “Gdzie żyjemy?”, *Gazeta Kołomyjska*, 27 May 1922, p. 3.

²² DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 92.

²³ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 84–85.

²⁴ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 82–83.

²⁵ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 6, sp. 11, a. 3.

²⁶ Conrad, *Umkämpfte Grenzen*, pp. 247, 288.

²⁷ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 6, sp. 11, a. 1; see also: Dorel Marc, “Z historii gospodarczej splawów drewna na granicy polsko-rumuńskiej na Czeremoszu w latach 20. i 30. XX wieku”, *Rocznik Przemyski. Historia*, 56, no. 1 (2020), pp. 81–102.

²⁸ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 95.

²⁹ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 94–95.

³⁰ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 195, a. 66.

³¹ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 80–81.

³² DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 82–83.

³³ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 82–83.

³⁴ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 46–48; 57–58; 128; 144; 167.

³⁵ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 57–58.

³⁶ Benecke, *Ostgebiete*, 77f.

³⁷ [Bezstronny], *O system ochrony naszych granic* (Warszawa, 1927).

³⁸ Feliks Olas, *Ustawa z 14. grudnia 1923 r. o uprawnieniach organów wykonawczych władz skarbowych (Dz. Ustaw Nr 5 z 1924 r.) i instrukcja co do przestrzegania przez organy Straży Celnej przepisów ustawy z dnia 14. grudnia 1923 r. (Rozp. Min. Skarbu Dep. Cel Nr. D. C. 1397/V/24 z 30. czerwca 1924)* (Lidzbark-Pomorze, 1924), p. 3; Ludomir Krywieńczyk, *Zbiór ustaw, rozporządzeń i tymczasowych przepisów obowiązujących straż celną pełniącą ochronę północnych, zachodnich i południowych granic Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej* (Lubliniec: Nakładem autora, 1926), 3f.

³⁹ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 195, a. 48–66.

⁴⁰ For an overview on the establishment of the State Police, see Andrzej Misiuk, “Police and Policing Under the Second Polish Republic, 1918–39”, in Gerald Blaney (ed.), *Policing Interwar Europe. Continuity, Change and Crisis, 1918–40* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); “Miejsce policji państwowej w strukturze aparatu państwowego II Rzeczypospolitej w okresie 1919–1926”, *Dzieje Najnowsze* 23, no. 2 (1991), pp. 49–57.

⁴¹ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 46–48.

⁴² DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 128.

⁴³ Olas, *Ustawa z 14. grudnia 1923 r.*, p. 3.

⁴⁴ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 167; 183; 202.

⁴⁵ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 97.

⁴⁶ DAIFO, f. 2, o. 1, sp. 306, a. 90; 92.