

UDC 930:[351.74:341.223.1](477)“1941/1944”

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2786-5118/2026-55-8>

THE CONCEPT OF “LOCAL AUXILIARY POLICE” IN THE REICHSKOMMISSARIAT “UKRAINE” IN CONTEMPORARY HISTORIOGRAPHICAL DISCOURSE: TERMINOLOGICAL PROBLEMS AND THEORETICAL JUSTIFICATION

Shamrai Oleksandr Hryhorovych,
*Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor, Department of History and Law
Cherkasy State Technological University
shamraiog@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0003-2515-0673*

The purpose of this study is to provide a systematic analysis of the concept of the “local auxiliary police” in the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine” (hereinafter – RKU) within contemporary historiographical discourse, to identify its main structural characteristics, and to provide a theoretical justification for its use as a generalized historiographical category in the study of the Nazi occupation regime of 1941–1944. The **methodological framework** is based on general scientific and specialized historical methods, including the comparative-historical, structural-functional, and terminological methods. The comparative-historical method was employed to compare different scholarly approaches to defining local police formations. The structural-functional method was used to identify the organizational, personnel, and functional characteristics of the local auxiliary police. The relationship between historical concepts and their historiographical interpretations was examined through terminological analysis. The **scientific novelty** of the study lies in the theoretical analysis of the organizational, legal, personnel, and functional characteristics of local police formations in the RKU. The **main outcome** of the study is the formulation of a generalized historiographical category of “local auxiliary police” that may serve as an effective analytical tool for studying the Nazi occupation regime. The **conclusions** demonstrate that, despite differences in the authorities responsible for their establishment, official designations, and organizational structures, local police formations shared common principles of recruitment, subordination, and formally defined functions. The attributes “local” and “auxiliary” characterize the territorial principle of recruitment and the institutional dependence of these formations on the German occupation authorities.

Keywords: local auxiliary police, Reichskommissariat “Ukraine”, Hilfspolizei, Schutzmannschaft, local police formations, occupation administration, historiographical discourse, terminology, Nazi occupation regime.

ПОНЯТТЯ «МІСЦЕВА ДОПОМІЖНА ПОЛІЦІЯ» РАЙХСКОМІСАРИАТУ «УКРАЇНА» У СУЧАСНОМУ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ: ПРОБЛЕМИ ТЕРМІНОЛОГІЇ ТА ТЕОРЕТИЧНОГО ОБГРУНТУВАННЯ

Шамрай Олександр Григорович,
*кандидат історичних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри історії та права
Черкаського державного технологічного
університету
shamraiog@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0003-2515-0673*

Метою статті було визначено проведення системного аналізу поняття «місцева допоміжна поліція» Райхскомісаріату «Україна» (далі – РКУ) у сучасному історіографічному дискурсі, визначення його основних структурних ознак та теоретичне обґрунтування можливості використання у якості узагальнюючої історіографічної категорії при вивченні нацистського окупаційного режиму 1941–1944 рр. Методологічною основою дослідження виступали загальнонаукові та спеціальні методи, такі як історико-порівняльний, структурно-функціональний і термінологічний. На основі історико-порівняльного методу було зіставлено різні наукові підходи до визначення місцевих поліційних формувань. Через структурно-функціональний метод визначалися організаційні, кадрові та функціональні характеристики місцевої допоміжної поліції. Співвідношення між історичними поняттями та їх історіографічними інтерпретаціями встановлювалось на основі термінологічного методу. Наукова новизна полягає у теоретичному аналізі організаційних, нормативних, кадрових та службових характеристик місцевих поліційних формувань РКУ. Результатом роботи є сформований узагальнюючий термін «місцева допоміжна поліція», який може стати ефективним інструментом у вивченні нацистського окупаційного режиму. У висновках доведено, що місцеві поліційні

формування, незважаючи на їх різну суб'єктність створення, офіційні назви та організаційну структуру, мали єдині підходи до комплектування, підпорядкування та службового призначення. Прикметники «місцева» та «допоміжна» характеризують територіальний принцип формування та залежність від німецьких органів влади.

Ключові слова: місцева допоміжна поліція, Райхскомісаріат «Україна», допоміжна поліція, охоронна поліція, місцеві поліційні формування, окупаційна адміністрація, історіографічний дискурс, термінологія, нацистський окупаційний режим.

1. Introduction

Problem Statement. Over the past several decades, the reconstruction of the Nazi occupation regime in Ukraine during 1941–1944 has become one of the most dynamic areas of research in Ukrainian historiography. The substantial expansion of the source base through the introduction of archival documents into scholarly research, the active development of studies of the everyday life of local communities, the functioning of military and civil occupation administrations, collaboration, and the Holocaust have significantly deepened scholarly understanding of the functioning of German administrative and police structures in occupied Ukraine. Local police formations became one of the key components of the occupation regime. Despite their official “auxiliary” status, they played an important role in implementing the policies of the occupation authorities throughout the territory of the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine” (RKU) and in various spheres of occupation administration.

The aim of this article is to provide a systematic analysis of the concept of the “local auxiliary police” in the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine” (RKU) within contemporary historiographical discourse, to identify its main structural characteristics, and to provide a theoretical justification for its use as a generalized historiographical category in the study of the Nazi occupation regime of 1941–1944.

Developing clear definitions of this concept will help eliminate terminological inconsistencies, facilitate the correlation of historical concepts with their historiographical interpretations in contemporary historiographical discourse, and contribute to the development of a unified theoretical and methodological approach to studying the specific features of local police structures within the Nazi occupation regime.

The methodological framework of the study included general scientific and specialized historical methods, including the comparative-historical, structural-functional, and terminological methods. The comparative-historical method was used to compare different scholarly approaches to defining local police formations. The structural-functional method was employed to identify the organizational, personnel, and functional characteristics of the local auxiliary police. The relationship between historical concepts and their historiographical interpretations was examined through terminological analysis.

Analysis of Research. The establishment, transformation, and functioning of local police structures within the occupation apparatus have been examined by O. Honcharenko (Honcharenko, 2005, 2011a, 2011b; Honcharenko et al., 2014), I. Dereiko (Dereiko,

2012), S. Stelnykovich (Stelnykovich, 2016), D. Sytnyk (Sytnyk, 2024), I. Kovalchuk (Kovalchuk, 2018), Yu. Radchenko (Radchenko, 2024), and M. Urakin (Urakin, 2025). These studies have made a significant contribution to the development of contemporary Ukrainian historiography on the Nazi occupation regime in Ukraine during 1941–1944.

European and North American scholars have also made a substantial contribution to the study of this issue. Among the most significant works are those of Martin Dean (Dean, 1996, 2000, p. 64–73), Alexander Statiev (Statiev, 2010), Aviel Roshwald (Roshwald, 2023), Wendy Lower and Ray Brandon (Brandon & Lower, 2008), John-Paul Himka (Himka, 2021), Dieter Pohl (Pohl, 1997), Frank Grelka (Grelka, 2005), Johannes Spohr (Spohr, 2022), Thomas Sandkühler (Sandkühler, 2020), and Christian Schmittwilken (Schmittwilken, 2024).

Although a substantial body of scholarship has examined various aspects of local policing in the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine”, contemporary historiographical discourse still lacks a unified conceptual framework for defining these structures. Scholarly literature employs such terms as “Ukrainian police”, “auxiliary police”, “local police”, “local auxiliary police”, “Schutzmannschaft”, “security police”, and “police formations”, sometimes using them interchangeably. At the same time, these terms may refer to historical concepts that differ substantially in meaning, while the processes of establishment, transformation, and institutional integration of local police structures operating in Nazi-occupied Ukraine are not always taken into account.

This lack of terminological consistency can be explained not only by the complexity of the process through which local police formations were established in the summer of 1941 and subsequently transformed following the establishment of the RKU’s civil administration but also by the specific features of German administrative and legal practice and the use of different official designations in contemporary documentary sources. An additional difficulty arises from the uncritical transfer of historical terms, including official German terminology, into contemporary historiographical discourse. Such an approach may lead to excessive fragmentation of the subject of research and obscure the common organizational and functional characteristics of different local police formations.

2. Official Legal and Regulatory Narrative

The conceptual reconstruction of the notion of “local auxiliary police” requires the development of

a scholarly model of the corresponding institution within the Nazi occupation regime. “Local auxiliary police” is a contemporary generalizing concept used in contemporary scholarship addressing the occupation regime in the territory of the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine” (RKU). At the same time, this concept was never used in German occupation legal and administrative practice. Most of the key concepts used to characterize the German occupation regime are generalized analytical constructs developed for the purposes of scholarly inquiry. They should therefore be treated primarily as analytical tools rather than as categories whose application is constrained by secondary terminological distinctions.

When relying on official organizational and legal terminology, researchers encounter a multiplicity of designations for the relevant police structures, which may lead to their treatment as separate institutional entities. This, in turn, creates difficulties in reconstructing their practical functioning. There is therefore a need to develop a model that would allow the various local police formations of the RKU to be analyzed within a single conceptual framework. Exceptions may include specialized and departmental police formations that also operated within the territory of the RKU. These included the fire police, railway police, water police, the SD Criminal Police, and several police battalions established within the territory of the RKU. At the same time, in terms of their jurisdiction and service functions, the railway and water police also closely resembled local police formations of the RKU. There is also evidence of attempts to establish an auxiliary border police in Ukraine whose task was to guard the border with Romania (Honcharenko, 2011a, p. 392).

3. Main Criteria for the Analytical Parameters of the Formation of the Concept of “Local Auxiliary Police”

In light of the circumstances outlined above, an integrative approach should be employed to develop a single generalizing concept as an analytical tool for understanding the occupation past of 1941–1944. At the same time, the specialized police formations mentioned above, namely the SD Criminal Police, as well as departmental police formations, should be excluded from this concept.

The main criteria defining the analytical parameters for studying the specific features of the functioning of local police structures include: chronological boundaries and the actors responsible for initiating their establishment; official designations; the subordination of the occupied territories to the German provisional military administration or the civil administration of the RKU; the legal and regulatory basis for their establishment, or the absence thereof; formally defined service functions and their actual implementation; the voluntary or coercive nature of recruitment;

chain of command; the predominant composition of personnel; the presence of a vertical administrative structure; and the powers and professional and legal status of personnel.

Accordingly, the concept of “local auxiliary police” should be defined using organizational, personnel, legal, and functional analytical parameters. At the same time, contradictions between historical concepts and historiographical concepts must also be taken into account. Thus, German original documentation employs institutional and organizational designations whose key attributes include “Ukrainian,” “auxiliary” (*Hilfspolizei*), and *Schutzmannschaft*. Yet even at this level, discrepancies can be observed between the regulations adopted by the German authorities and the official designations of police units actually used in practice. Quite often, such attributes as “auxiliary” or “security” were not used in contemporary practice. Most designations referred exclusively to the territorial location of the units – district or municipal – while also emphasizing the “Ukrainian” affiliation of the police units. The designation “people’s” was also used quite frequently (Honcharenko, 2011, p. 392). Thus, even at the level of historical terminology, its lack of consistency can be observed.

The establishment of police formations in Ukraine occupied by the Wehrmacht began as early as the initial stages of the invasion. The actors involved in their establishment included representatives of the German military commandant’s offices, cells of the OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists) “marching groups,” and initiative groups representing the local population. Quite often these three groups coordinated their respective organizational efforts, although the final decision was made by the German side. The military authorities were not consistent in their decisions and therefore frequently revised them.

Each of the actors involved in initiating the establishment of police formations pursued its own interests. The heads of military commandant’s offices needed to maintain public order, organize transportation and the operation of industrial and municipal infrastructure, register the population, control its movements, and perform other related tasks. Since they lacked sufficient resources of their own, military administrators initiated the establishment of the relevant law-enforcement structures (Honcharenko, 2006c).

Representatives of the OUN “marching groups” of both factions – the Bandera and Melnyk factions – pursued their own political interests, viewing local police formations as a foundation for the future armed forces of an independent Ukrainian state. Taking advantage of a period of relatively conflict-free coexistence with the German military authorities, they succeeded in establishing the relevant police formations (Honcharenko, 2006b). The establishment of these formations involved distinctive electoral procedures in which the local population also participated. However,

the personnel of the police formations had to be approved by higher-ranking bodies of both the German and local authorities (Honcharenko, 2008b).

The initiative to establish police formations could also originate from the local population, particularly during periods of a “power vacuum,” when Soviet authorities had withdrawn but the German military administration had not yet managed to consolidate its control. Such initiatives by the local population were prompted by the disorganization of the administrative system during the first months of the war, the withdrawal of Red Army units, and the deterioration of the security situation.

In the summer of 1941, there were also attempts to establish police authorities at the oblast level. The initiative came from oblast administrations (regional administrative bodies), which at the time were under a degree of control by OUN cells. However, the German military administration quickly suppressed these attempts, as it had no intention of strengthening the influence of the oblast administrations (Honcharenko, 2010b).

Both the military and German civil administrations sought to transfer security and guarding functions to the local population. This involved both the organization of crop protection and the monitoring of strategically important infrastructure, such as railway communications. Individuals formally enrolled in these formations were not police officers in the strict sense and were not armed; nevertheless, they were held strictly accountable for organizing the relevant forms of control.

Following the transfer of the respective territories to the jurisdiction of the civil administration of the RKU, the situation regarding local police structures changed fundamentally. First and foremost, these structures were removed from the influence of OUN cells and placed under the authority of German administrative bodies. At the same time, their organizational and legal status, principles of personnel recruitment, and arrangements for the performance of their duties were standardized.

Depending on the period and on whether the respective territories of Ukraine were under military or civil administration, approaches to recruiting personnel for local police structures also changed. The local population was, naturally, the key source of recruitment. However, during the first months of the Soviet-German war, recruitment from prisoner-of-war camps was widely practiced. Faced with the brutal conditions of captivity, many prisoners sought to escape the conditions of captivity and were therefore willing to enter service in the relevant police structures (Honcharenko, 2010a). Following the establishment of the RKU, personnel purges were carried out within local police structures. There were plans to reduce the overall number of local police personnel. Individuals suspected of having ties to OUN cells were dismissed. Restrictions were also introduced with regard to age and health status (Honcharenko, 2007).

The establishment of militia and order police at the beginning of the occupation is discussed in the work of Martin Dean. Initially, these institutions had a temporary status and were subsequently transformed into *Schutzmannschaft*, which was incorporated into the German *Gendarmerie*. At the same time, the researcher uses the term “local police” as a generalizing category. This allows him to encompass all local police formations that operated under German control. In another study, Martin Dean uses the term “Ukrainian *Schutzmannschaft*.” Alexander Statiev employs the term “Ukrainian auxiliary police.” Referring to the *Schutzmannschaft*, Aviel Roshwald describes this structure as the “Ukrainian auxiliary police force.” Auxiliary police are also discussed in the collective volume edited by Wendy Lower and Ray Brandon. Canadian historian John-Paul Himka, in examining the history of Ukrainian nationalism, also addresses the establishment of auxiliary police formations.

Thus, in contemporary English-language historiographical discourse, the concept of “Ukrainian Auxiliary Police” has become relatively well established. This allows one to regard the concepts of *Schutzmannschaft* (“protection police”), *Hilfspolizei* (“auxiliary police”), *Ukrainische Polizei* (“Ukrainian police”), *Ordnungsdienst* (“order service”), and *Miliz* (“militia”) as non-identical and to distinguish their specific historical designations from the broader analytical category of “auxiliary police.”

German-language scholarship likewise employs a range of different terminological designations. Dieter Pohl, examining the functioning of local police formations in the District of Galicia – which was not part of the RKU but was incorporated into the General Government on September 1, 1941 – uses two related but non-identical categories: *einheimische Hilfspolizei* (“local auxiliary police”) and *Schutzmannschafts-Verbände* (“*Schutzmannschaft* formations”). Frank Grelka’s study suggests that police formations referred to as *Miliz* should not be equated with the later auxiliary police formations established by the German occupation authorities. The concept of “Ukrainian auxiliary police” (*ukrainische Hilfspolizei*) is also used in the work of Johannes Spohr. He treats this concept as a broader analytical category and does not equate it with the paramilitary *Schutzmannschaften* (Schuma) units.

Thus, an analysis of contemporary English- and German-language historiography demonstrates the absence of complete terminological consistency in the designation of local police structures established in the occupied territories. At the same time, these studies reveal a tendency to use the concept of “auxiliary police” (*auxiliary police*, *Hilfspolizei*) as a broader analytical category. By contrast, the concepts of *Miliz*, *Ordnungsdienst*, *Ukrainische Polizei*, and *Schutzmannschaft* should be treated as specific historical designations of police structures whose content,

organizational form, and chain of command changed depending on the period of occupation. This approach makes it possible to avoid conflating these terms and to trace more precisely the process of organizational transformation of local police within the system of the German occupation apparatus.

The service status of personnel serving in local police formations was auxiliary in nature, although this did not imply their “lack of rights” or restrictions on the performance of professionally prescribed duties. The term “auxiliary police” also requires further clarification. The use of the adjective “auxiliary” does not mean that these structures were secondary or subordinate in terms of their functional importance. Rather, it denoted their status as institutionally dependent structures operating under the authority of the German administration and the relevant police services.

The auxiliary nature of the local police was determined by its institutional dependence on and subordination to German police authorities and the occupation administration. Depending on the period and organizational form, local police formations operated under the authority of German military and civil occupation administrations and, following their institutional standardization, primarily within the sphere of the Order Police (*Ordnungspolizei*), the *Gendarmerie* and the *Sicherheitspolizei*. Thus, the adjective “auxiliary” characterizes the system of institutional and service subordination rather than the functional significance of local police formations.

At the same time, an analysis of the practical activities of the local police demonstrates that they performed a wide range of administrative, security, and repressive functions. They were responsible for maintaining public order, guarding important facilities, combating crime, monitoring the movements and conduct of the local population, participating in the fight against the partisan movement, and implementing certain aspects of the occupation policy. Thus, their auxiliary status did not imply a secondary role in the functioning of the occupation apparatus of power; rather, it defined their position within the system of German administrative control.

A defining element of the concept under examination is the adjective “local.” We consider its use more appropriate than the designation “Ukrainian.” The recruitment of personnel for the relevant structures was not determined by ethnicity. Rather, recruitment was carried out primarily through the involvement of the local population of the respective administrative-territorial units (Honcharenko, 2008a). Therefore, the concept of “local police” refers to the territorial principle underlying personnel recruitment rather than to the national composition of the personnel. This approach helps avoid the historical and political connotations associated with the use of the term “Ukrainian police” and more accurately reflects the actual mechanism through which these formations were organized.

In the context of the functioning of police structures under the occupation regime, it is important to clarify the meaning of the terms “unit” and “formation.” A unit is characterized by its incorporation into a specific organizational structure, the existence of a standardized staffing structure, and a unified approach to personnel recruitment. In reality, however, the situation in this sphere prior to the autumn of 1941, when the structures of the RKU began to take shape, was fundamentally different. The local auxiliary police was established exclusively at the local level; its organizational structure and personnel strength varied considerably, and it underwent continuous reorganization and integration into the system of the German occupation administration. Consequently, we can speak of local police formations rather than specific police units. The use of this term is therefore more appropriate for the period from the summer through the autumn of 1941. After the transfer of administrative authority to the RKU administration, however, the situation changed, as police structures transformed into a unified system increasingly acquired the more clearly defined characteristics of “units.”

Police formations established at the beginning of the occupation were subordinate to local authorities (Honcharenko, 2010c). Thus, in Lutsk, the Order Service was subordinate to the local administration. At the same time, the establishment of a “Ukrainian auxiliary police” began in the city (Honcharenko, 2011a, pp. 142–143). Naturally, strengthening local administrative bodies was not part of the plans of the German occupation authorities (Honcharenko, 2006b). Accordingly, in most regions of Ukraine, local police structures were subordinate to the military gendarmerie (Honcharenko, 2006a). Following the establishment of the RKU structures, they operated in accordance with the instructions of the heads of the gendarmerie, which had been established at the level of the *Gebietsskommissariate* (Honcharenko, 2011a, p. 144).

4. The Categories of “Local Auxiliary Police” and “Local Security Police”

By late autumn 1941, the status of the local police had changed. Pursuant to Joint Order No. 257/41 II of the Commander-in-Chief of the Occupation Forces in Ukraine, dated December 19, 1941, and Order No. 5/41 of the Higher SS and Police Leader in the RKU and Commander of the German Order Police, dated November 20, 1941, a new formation designated as the “Auxiliary Security Police” (*Hilfsschutzmannschaft*) was established (Honcharenko, 2010d).

Despite the official reorganization of local police formations and their acquisition of the status of “security police,” this change had little effect on the service status of the respective structures or on their official designations. In practice, the previous names of local police formations continued to be used. Thus, within the General District of Kyiv (a structural component

of the RKU), the local police in Uzyn was designated the “Ukrainian People’s Police”; in Boryspil, the “Boryspil District Police”; in Baryshivka, the “Ukrainian Police of the Baryshivka District in the Kyiv Region”; in Cherkasy, the “Cherkasy District People’s Police”; and in Chyhyryn, the “Chyhyryn District Order Service.” One exception was Kyiv where the Ukrainian Security Police (*Schutzmannschaft*) was established (Honcharenko, 2011a).

Accordingly, the concept of “local auxiliary police” should be regarded as a historiographical category encompassing the totality of local police formations that operated within the German occupation apparatus, regardless of their official designation, organizational form, or period of establishment. In this sense, *Hilfsschutzmannschaft* should not be regarded as a synonym for local auxiliary police, but rather as a specific type of local auxiliary police that emerged as a result of its legal and organizational standardization by the civil administration of the RKU.

The work of Thomas Sandkühler is particularly important for refining the conceptual framework. In his study of the involvement of non-German police personnel in implementing the Nazi policy of extermination of the Jews of Lviv, he uses the terms “Ukrainian auxiliary policemen” (*ukrainische Hilfspolizisten*) and “auxiliary police units” (*Hilfspolizeieinheiten*). At the same time, he does not equate them with the *Schutzmannschaften*, which he treats as a separate category of militarized police formations. This approach demonstrates that contemporary German-language historiography uses the concept of *Hilfspolizei* as a broader analytical category.

In this context, the research of Christian Schmittwilken is also relevant. He examined the structures of the Commanders of the Security Police and SD at the level of the General Districts of the RKU (*Kommandeure der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD*, KdS). These bodies had under their authority the so-called *Schutzmannschaften der Sicherheitspolizei* (“Security Police auxiliary formations”) and *Kriminalpolizei aus Einheimischen* (“Criminal Police recruited from the local population”). This demonstrates the complexity of the organizational structure of local police formations and the need to distinguish formations subordinate to the *Ordnungspolizei* from auxiliary structures operating within the sphere of competence of the *Sicherheitspolizei und SD*. Consequently, the use of the concepts *Hilfspolizei* and *Schutzmannschaft* requires consideration not only of their designation but also of the specific chain of command of the respective police formations.

Christian Schmittwilken distinguishes between *Schutzmannschaften der Sicherheitspolizei* (“Security Police auxiliary formations”) and *Schutzmannschaften der Ordnungspolizei* (“Order Police auxiliary formations”). The battalions of the *Schutzmannschaften der Sicherheitspolizei* primarily guarded labor education

camps (*Arbeitserziehungslager*) and KdS facilities, and were also involved in combating Soviet partisans and in punitive operations. They were militarized formations, and their personnel were housed in barracks. By contrast, the *Schutzmannschaften der Ordnungspolizei* comprised territorial police formations whose functions corresponded more closely to those of the local auxiliary police defined in this study.

Thus, the work of contemporary German scholars allows the conceptual framework to serve as an analytical tool to characterize local police structures in the occupied territories. The concept of *Hilfspolizei* should be regarded as a broader analytical category, whereas the term *Schutzmannschaft* requires mandatory consideration of the institutional affiliation of the specific formation. In particular, a clear distinction should be made between the *Schutzmannschaften der Ordnungspolizei* and the *Schutzmannschaften der Sicherheitspolizei* which belonged to different branches of the German police apparatus and differed in their chain of command and the functions they performed. Such a distinction helps avoid mechanically equating all local police formations with auxiliary police and allows their place within the occupation police apparatus to be determined more precisely.

Accordingly, the local auxiliary police of the RKU may be understood as a contemporary historiographical category denoting a body of police formations composed predominantly of members of the local population, institutionally and operationally subordinated to the German police authorities, and entrusted with maintaining public order, performing administrative, security, and repressive functions, and carrying out tasks assigned by the German military and civil administrations of the Nazi occupation regime.

The proposed definition integrates the historical characteristics of the functioning of local police formations with contemporary historiographical concepts. It takes into account the dynamics of organizational change, official designations, and institutional subordination. It also avoids identifying particular types of local police with the broader historiographical concept.

5. Conclusions

The results of the study demonstrate that the concept of “local auxiliary police” did not form part of the official legal and regulatory terminology of the German occupation regime but was developed in contemporary historiography as a generalizing scholarly category. The use of this concept provides a common conceptual framework for integrating the various local police formations established by the Provisional Military Administration and the relevant administrative structures.

The conceptual reconstruction presented here was based on a comprehensive consideration of the organizational, legal, and personnel aspects involved in the

establishment, regulatory framework, and functioning of local police formations. This approach makes it possible to overcome discrepancies between the historical concepts used in the original documents of the occupation authorities and contemporary historiographical terminology.

The adjectives “local” and “auxiliary” characterize the territorial principle of personnel recruitment and the institutional dependence of local police formations but do not determine either their national affiliation or the scope of their powers. The designation *Schutzmannschaft* is not synonymous with the concept of “local auxiliary police” but represents one of its organizational forms that emerged through the legal and

organizational standardization of the police system. The formations subordinate to the *Schutzmannschaften der Sicherheitspolizei* should not be included within the category of local auxiliary police. Within the proposed analytical framework, local auxiliary police structures are understood primarily as formations operating within the sphere of the *Ordnungspolizei* and subordinate to its corresponding structures.

Thus, the use of the unified historiographical concept of “local auxiliary police” turns the conceptual framework into an analytical tool for studying the Nazi occupation regime and provides a more comprehensive understanding of the place and role of local police formations within the occupation apparatus of the RKU.

Bibliography:

1. Гончаренко О. М. Голокост на території Київщини: загальні тенденції та регіональні особливості (1941–1944 рр.): дис. ... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01 – історія України. Черкаси, 2005. 175 арк.
2. Гончаренко О. Взаємодія підрозділів польової жандармерії та місцевої поліції у знищенні євреїв України. Десяті Запорізькі єврейські читання: збірник наукових праць. Запоріжжя: Диво, 2006. С. 90–96.
3. Гончаренко О. Організаційно-політична діяльність ОУН на Київщині в 1941–1944 рр. за документами спецслужб: спроба критичного аналізу. Україна Соборна: збірник наукових статей. 2006. Вип. 4. Т. 2. С. 168–173.
4. Гончаренко О. Роль, місце та функції органів місцевого управління у системі каральних заходів нацистів в окупованій Україні (1941–1944 рр.). Сумська старовина. 2006. Вип. XVIII–XIX. С. 95–102.
5. Гончаренко О. Окремі проблеми формування кадрового складу місцевих окупаційних адміністрацій та органів поліції Райхскомісаріату «Україна»: непрості відповіді та нові інтерпретації. Література та культура Полісся. 2007. Вип. 38. С. 180–187.
6. Гончаренко О. Місцева поліція Райхскомісаріату «Україна»: проблеми кадрового забезпечення в системі нацистського окупаційного режиму. Історія в школах України. 2008. № 1. С. 48–54.
7. Гончаренко О. Похідні групи ОУН (Б) на теренах Наддніпрянщини: до питання про результативність спроб інтеграції до окупаційних органів влади (1941–1944 рр.). Галичина. 2008. Вип. 14. С. 234–241.
8. Гончаренко О. Діяльність військових комендатур тилових районів групи армій «Південь» у сфері створення місцевих поліційних формувань (червень 1941 – вересень 1942 рр.). Історичні записки: збірник наукових праць. 2010. Вип. 26. С. 49–55.
9. Гончаренко О. Міські управи в системі окупаційного апарату влади Райхскомісаріату «Україна»: організаційна структура та проблеми службової компетенції (1941–1944 рр.). Сторінки воєнної історії України. 2010. Вип. 13. С. 137–153.
10. Гончаренко О. Органи обласного управління на теренах Райхскомісаріату «Україна»: організаційна структура, компетенція та досвід функціонування (1941–1944 рр.). Часопис української історії. 2010. Вип. 17. С. 37–41.
11. Гончаренко О. Українські поліційні формування в системі гітлерівського окупаційного режиму на теренах Райхскомісаріату «Україна»: організаційна структура та службова компетенція (1941–1944 рр.). Наукові записки з української історії: збірник наукових статей. 2010. Вип. 24. С. 124–130.
12. Гончаренко О. М. Організаційно-правове забезпечення функціонування окупаційної адміністрації Райхскомісаріату «Україна» (1941–1944 рр.): дис. ... доктора іст. наук: 07.00.01 – історія України. Переяслав-Хмельницький, 2011. 500 арк.
13. Гончаренко О. М. Функціонування окупаційної адміністрації Райхскомісаріату «Україна»: управлінсько-розпорядчі та організаційно-правові аспекти (1941–1944 рр.): монографія. Київ: НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова, 2011. 600 с.
14. Гончаренко О. М., Куницький М. П., Лисенко О. Є. Система органів місцевого управління на території Райхскомісаріату «Україна» та «військової зони». 1941–1944 рр. Київ: НАН України, Інститут історії України, 2014. 151 с.
15. Дерейко І. Місцеві формування німецької армії та поліції у Райхскомісаріаті «Україна» (1941–1944 роки). Київ: Інститут історії України НАН України, 2012. 174 с.
16. Ковальчук І. Формування місцевої допоміжної поліції і залучення її підрозділів до каральних операцій нацистських окупантів на території Житомирської області у 1941 році. Інтермаріум: історія, політика, культура. 2018. Вип. 5. С. 219–239.

17. Радченко Ю. Допоміжна поліція, місцева адміністрація, СД та Шоа на українсько-російсько-білоруському пограниччі (1941–1943). Київ: Фенікс, 2024. 288 с.
18. Ситник Д. О. Українська допоміжна поліція міста Києва: формування, склад, діяльність (1941–1945): дис. ... доктора філософії: 032 «Історія та археологія». Київ, 2024. 274 арк.
19. Стельникович С. В. Нацистський окупаційний режим на території Житомирсько-Вінницького регіону і місцеве населення: паралелі існування й боротьби (1941–1944 рр.): дис. ... доктора іст. наук: 07.00.01 – історія України. Київ, 2016. 522 арк.
20. Уракін М. Г. Колабораціонізм на території Житомирсько-Вінницького регіону у роки нацистської окупації, 1941–1944 рр.: дис. ... доктора філософії: 032 «Історія та археологія». Київ, 2025. 266 арк.
21. Brandon, Ray, and Wendy Lower, eds. *The Shoah in Ukraine: History, Testimony, Memorialization*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2008. IX, 378 p.
22. Dean, Martin C. *Collaboration in the Holocaust: Crimes of the Local Police in Belorussia and Ukraine, 1941–44*. New York: St. Martin's Press / Palgrave Macmillan, 2000. 234 p.
23. Dean, Martin C. *The German Gendarmerie, the Ukrainian Schutzmannschaft and the «Second Wave» of Jewish Killings in Occupied Ukraine: German Policing at the Local Level in the Zhitomir Region, 1941–1944*. *German History*. 1996. Vol. 14. Issue 2. P. 168–192.
24. Grelka, Frank. *Die ukrainische Nationalbewegung unter deutscher Besatzungsherrschaft 1918 und 1941/42*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005. 507 S. (Studien der Forschungsstelle Ostmitteleuropa an der Universität Dortmund; Bd. 38).
25. Himka, John-Paul. *Ukrainian Nationalists and the Holocaust: OUN and UPA's Participation in the Destruction of Ukrainian Jewry, 1941–1944*. Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2021. 540 p. (Ukrainian Voices; Vol. 12).
26. Pohl, Dieter. *Nationalsozialistische Judenverfolgung in Ostgalizien 1941–1944: Organisation und Durchführung eines staatlichen Massenverbrechens*. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1997. 455 S. (Studien zur Zeitgeschichte; Bd. 50).
27. Roshwald, Aviel. *Occupied: European and Asian Responses to Axis Conquest, 1937–1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023. 466 p.
28. Sandkühler, Thomas. *Das Fußvolk der «Endlösung». Nichtdeutsche Täter und die europäische Dimension des Völkermords*. Darmstadt: Academic, 2020. 431 S.
29. Schmittwilken, Christian. *Zentralen des Terrors. Die Dienststellen der Kommandeure der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD im Reichskommissariat Ukraine*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2024. IX, 304 S. (Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte; Bd. 145).
30. Spohr, Johannes. «Evakuierende» und «Evakuierte»: Die doppelte Rolle der ukrainischen Hilfspolizei im Kontext der Kriegswende 1943/44. *Militärgeschichtliche Zeitschrift*. 2022. Bd. 81. H. 1. S. 116–145.
31. Statiev, Alexander. *The Soviet Counterinsurgency in the Western Borderlands*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 368 p.

References:

1. Honcharenko, O. M. 2005. *Holokost na terytorii Kyivshchyny: zahalni tendentsii ta rehionalni osoblyvosti (1941–1944 rr.)* [The Holocaust in the Kyiv Region: General Trends and Regional Features (1941–1944)]. Candidate's dissertation, specialty 07.00.01, History of Ukraine. Cherkasy. 175 pp. [in Ukrainian].
2. Honcharenko, O. 2006a. «Vzaiemodiia pidrozdiliv polovoi zhandarmerii ta mistsevoi politzii u znyshchenni yevreiv Ukrainy» [Interaction between Field Gendarmerie Units and the Local Police in the Destruction of the Jews of Ukraine]. In *Desiati Zaporizki yevreiski chytannia: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats* [Tenth Zaporizhzhia Jewish Readings: Collection of Scholarly Papers], 90–96. Zaporizhzhia: Dyvo. [in Ukrainian].
3. Honcharenko, O. 2006b. «Orhanizatsiino-politychna diialnist OUN na Kyivshchyni v 1941–1944 rr. za dokumentamy spetssluzhb: sproba krytychnoho analizu» [Organizational and Political Activities of the OUN in the Kyiv Region in 1941–1944 Based on Intelligence Service Documents: An Attempt at a Critical Analysis]. *Ukraina Soborna: Zbirnyk naukovykh statei* [United Ukraine: Collection of Scholarly Articles], no. 4, vol. 2, 168–173. [in Ukrainian].
4. Honcharenko, O. 2006c. «Rol, mistse ta funktzii orhaniv mistsevoho upravlinnia u systemi karalnykh zakhodiv natsystiv v okupovanii Ukraini (1941–1944 rr.)» [The Role, Place, and Functions of Local Government Bodies in the System of Nazi Repressive Measures in Occupied Ukraine (1941–1944)]. *Sumska starovyna* [Sumy Antiquity], nos. XVIII–XIX, 95–102. [in Ukrainian].
5. Honcharenko, O. 2007. «Okremi problemy formuvannia kadrovoho skladu mistsevykh okupatsiinykh administratsii ta orhaniv politzii Raikhskomisariatu «Ukraina»: neprosti vidpovidi ta novi interpretatsii» [Selected Problems of Staffing Local Occupation Administrations and Police Bodies of the Reichskommissariat «Ukraine»: Complex Answers and New Interpretations]. *Literatura ta kultura Polissia* [Literature and Culture of Polissia], no. 38, 180–187. [in Ukrainian].

6. Honcharenko, O. 2008a. “Mistseva politsiia Raikhskomisariatu «Ukraina»: problemy kadrovoho zabezpechennia v systemi natsystskoho okupatsiinoho rezhymu” [The Local Police of the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine”: Staffing Problems within the Nazi Occupation Regime]. *Istoriia v shkolakh Ukrainy* [History in Ukrainian Schools], no. 1, 48–54. [in Ukrainian].
7. Honcharenko, O. 2008b. “Pokhidni hrupy OUN (B) na terenakh Naddniprianshchyny: do pytannia pro rezultatyvnist sprob intehratsii do okupatsiinykh orhaniv vlady (1941–1944 rr.)” [OUN(B) Expeditionary Groups in the Dnipro Region: On the Effectiveness of Attempts to Integrate into the Occupation Authorities (1941–1944)]. *Halychyna*, no. 14, 234–241. [in Ukrainian].
8. Honcharenko, O. 2010a. “Diialnist viiskovykh komendatur tylovykh raioniv hrupy armii «Pivden» u sferi stvorennia mistsevykh politsiinykh formuvan (cherven 1941 – veresen 1942 rr.)” [Activities of Military Commandant’s Offices in the Rear Areas of Army Group “South” in Establishing Local Police Formations (June 1941 – September 1942)]. *Istorychni zapysky: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats* [Historical Notes: Collection of Scholarly Papers], no. 26, 49–55. [in Ukrainian].
9. Honcharenko, O. 2010b. “Miski upravy v systemi okupatsiinoho aparatu vlady Raikhskomisariatu «Ukraina»: orhanizatsiina struktura ta problemy sluzhbovoi kompetentsii (1941–1944 rr.)” [Municipal Administrations in the Occupation Apparatus of the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine”: Organizational Structure and Problems of Official Competence (1941–1944)]. *Storinky voiennoi istorii Ukrainy* [Pages of Military History of Ukraine], no. 13, 137–153. [in Ukrainian].
10. Honcharenko, O. 2010c. “Orhany oblasnoho upravlinnia na terenakh Raikhskomisariatu «Ukraina»: orhanizatsiina struktura, kompetentsiia ta dosvid funktsionuvannia (1941–1944 rr.)” [Regional Administrative Bodies in the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine”: Organizational Structure, Competence, and Experience of Operation (1941–1944)]. *Chasopys ukrainskoi istorii* [Journal of Ukrainian History], no. 17, 37–41. [in Ukrainian].
11. Honcharenko, O. 2010d. “Ukrainski politsiini formuvannia v systemi hitlerivskoho okupatsiinoho rezhymu na terenakh Raikhskomisariatu «Ukraina»: orhanizatsiina struktura ta sluzhbova kompetentsiia (1941–1944 rr.)” [Ukrainian Police Formations within the Nazi Occupation Regime in the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine”: Organizational Structure and Official Competence (1941–1944)]. *Naukovi zapysky z ukrainskoi istorii: Zbirnyk naukovykh statei* [Scholarly Notes on Ukrainian History: Collection of Scholarly Articles], no. 24, 124–130. [in Ukrainian].
12. Honcharenko, O. M. 2011a. *Orhanizatsiino-pravove zabezpechennia funktsionuvannia okupatsiinoi administratsii Raikhskomisariatu «Ukraina» (1941–1944 rr.)* [Organizational and Legal Framework for the Functioning of the Occupation Administration of the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine” (1941–1944)]: Doctoral dissertation, specialty 07.00.01 – History of Ukraine. Pereiaslav-Khmelnyskyi. 500 pp. [in Ukrainian].
13. Honcharenko, O. M. 2011b. *Funktsionuvannia okupatsiinoi administratsii Raikhskomisariatu «Ukraina»: upravlinsko-rozporiadchi ta orhanizatsiino-pravovi aspekty (1941–1944 rr.)* [Functioning of the Occupation Administration of the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine”: Administrative, Managerial, Organizational, and Legal Aspects (1941–1944)]. Kyiv: NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova. 600 pp. [in Ukrainian].
14. Honcharenko, O. M., M. P. Kunytskyi, and O. Ye. Lysenko. 2014. *Systema orhaniv mistsevoho upravlinnia na terytorii Raikhskomisariatu «Ukraina» ta «viiskovoi zony». 1941–1944 rr.* [The System of Local Government Bodies in the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine” and the “Military Zone,” 1941–1944]. Kyiv: Institute of History of Ukraine, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. 151 pp. [in Ukrainian].
15. Dereiko, I. 2012. *Mistsevi formuvannia nimetskoi armii ta politsii u Raikhskomisariati «Ukraina» (1941–1944 roky)* [Local Formations of the German Army and Police in the Reichskommissariat “Ukraine” (1941–1944)]. Kyiv: Institute of History of Ukraine, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. 174 pp. [in Ukrainian].
16. Kovalchuk, I. 2018. “Formuvannia mistsevoi dopomizhnoi politsii i zaluchennia yii pidrozdiliv do karalnykh operatsii natsystskykh okupantiv na terytorii Zhytomyrskoi oblasti u 1941 rotsi” [Formation of the Local Auxiliary Police and the Involvement of Its Units in the Punitive Operations of the Nazi Occupiers in the Zhytomyr Region in 1941]. *Intermarium: Istoriia, polityka, kultura* [Intermarium: History, Politics, Culture], no. 5, 219–239. [in Ukrainian].
17. Radchenko, Yu. 2024. *Dopomizhna politsiia, mistseva administratsiia, SD ta Shoa na ukrainsko-rosiisko-biloruskomu pohranychchi (1941–1943)* [Auxiliary Police, Local Administration, the SD, and the Shoah in the Ukrainian–Russian–Belarusian Borderland (1941–1943)]. Kyiv: Feniks. 288 pp. [in Ukrainian].
18. Sytnyk, D. O. 2024. *Ukrainska dopomizhna politsiia mista Kyieva: formuvannia, sklad, diialnist (1941–1945)* [The Ukrainian Auxiliary Police of Kyiv: Formation, Personnel, and Activities (1941–1945)]: PhD dissertation, specialty 032 – History and Archaeology. Kyiv. 274 pp. [in Ukrainian].
19. Stelnykovych, S. V. 2016. *Natsystskyi okupatsiinyi rezhym na terytorii Zhytomyrsko-Vinnytskoho rehionu i mistseve naselennia: paraleli isnuvannia y borotby (1941–1944 rr.)* [The Nazi Occupation Regime in the Zhytomyr–Vinnytsia Region and the Local Population: Parallels of Coexistence and Resistance (1941–1944)]: Doctoral dissertation, specialty 07.00.01 – History of Ukraine. Kyiv. 522 pp. [in Ukrainian].

20. Urakin, M. H. 2025. Kolaboratsionizm na terytorii Zhytomyrsko-Vinnytskoho rehionu u roky natsystskoi okupatsii, 1941–1944 rr. [Collaborationism in the Zhytomyr–Vinnytsia Region during the Nazi Occupation, 1941–1944]: PhD dissertation, specialty 032 – History and Archaeology. Kyiv. 266 pp. [in Ukrainian].
21. Brandon, R., & Lower, W., eds. 2008. The Shoah in Ukraine: History, Testimony, Memorialization. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, in association with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. IX, 378 pp.
22. Dean, M. C. 1996. “The German Gendarmerie, the Ukrainian Schutzmannschaft and the ‘Second Wave’ of Jewish Killings in Occupied Ukraine: German Policing at the Local Level in the Zhitomir Region, 1941–1944.” *German History* 14 (2): 168–192.
23. Dean, M. C. 2000. Collaboration in the Holocaust: Crimes of the Local Police in Belorussia and Ukraine, 1941–44. New York: St. Martin’s Press / Palgrave Macmillan. 234 pp.
24. Grelka, F. 2005. Die ukrainische Nationalbewegung unter deutscher Besatzungsherrschaft 1918 und 1941/42 [The Ukrainian National Movement under German Occupation Rule in 1918 and 1941/42]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag. 507 pp. (Studien der Forschungsstelle Ostmitteleuropa an der Universität Dortmund, vol. 38). [in German].
25. Himka, J.-P. 2021. Ukrainian Nationalists and the Holocaust: OUN and UPA’s Participation in the Destruction of Ukrainian Jewry, 1941–1944. Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag. 540 pp. (Ukrainian Voices, vol. 12).
26. Pohl, D. 1997. Nationalsozialistische Judenverfolgung in Ostgalizien 1941–1944: Organisation und Durchführung eines staatlichen Massenverbrechens [National Socialist Persecution of Jews in Eastern Galicia, 1941–1944: Organization and Implementation of a State Mass Crime]. Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag. 455 pp. (Studien zur Zeitgeschichte, vol. 50). [in German].
27. Roshwald, A. 2023. Occupied: European and Asian Responses to Axis Conquest, 1937–1945. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 466 pp.
28. Sandkühler, T. 2020. Das Fußvolk der «Endlösung». Nichtdeutsche Täter und die europäische Dimension des Völkermords [The Foot Soldiers of the “Final Solution”: Non-German Perpetrators and the European Dimension of Genocide]. Darmstadt: Academic. 431 pp. [in German].
29. Schmittwilken, C. 2024. Zentralen des Terrors. Die Dienststellen der Kommandeure der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD im Reichskommissariat Ukraine [Centers of Terror: The Offices of the Commanders of the Security Police and SD in the Reichskommissariat Ukraine]. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Oldenbourg. IX, 304 pp. (Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, vol. 145). [in German].
30. Spohr, J. 2022. “Evakuierende” und “Evakuierte”: Die doppelte Rolle der ukrainischen Hilfspolizei im Kontext der Kriegswende 1943/44” [“Evacuators” and “Evacuees”: The Dual Role of the Ukrainian Auxiliary Police in the Context of the Turning Point of the War, 1943/44]. *Militärgeschichtliche Zeitschrift* 81 (1): 116–145. [in German].
31. Statiev, A. 2010. The Soviet Counterinsurgency in the Western Borderlands. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 368 pp.

Date of initial submission: 20.07.2026
Date of acceptance after peer review: 14.08.2026
Publication date: 05.10.2026