

Ethnic issues in the western part of Czech Silesia from the perspective of state security forces in the years 1946 to 1948

Lubomír Hlavienka¹

<https://doi.org/10.25167/brs4502>

Submitted: 13 Aug 2021; Accepted: 19 Dec 2021; Published: 22 Dec 2021

Abstract:

The article is aimed on the security problems connected with ethnic issues in the region of western part of Czech Silesia in years 1946–1948. After the end of World war II came to the Czech borderland great number of new residents. The article deals with the security corps' attitudes towards members of individual nationalities and examines the differences in their perceptions.

Keywords:

Czechoslovakia; Third Republic; national minorities; Silesia; security.

Citation (APA):

Hlavienka, L. (2021). Ethnic issues in the western part of Czech Silesia from the perspective of state security forces in the years 1946 to 1948. *Border and Regional Studies*, 9(4), 223-251.

The end of World War II is a milestone for the Czech lands in their historical development, as it brought fundamental social, political and economic changes that significantly changed the character of the Czechoslovak Republic and meant the transformation of the originally liberal democratic system into a system of limited democracy (Balík, Hloušek, Holzer, Šedo, 2011, p. 110–117). Due to adoption of so call Košice government program, the government program, created by blending the plans of Western and Eastern exile, the right wing parties were in Czech lands prohibited and the whole political scene were controlled by four left wing and central parties: KSČ, ČSNS, ČSSD and ČSL². These parties formed the National Front (NF), the ruling bloc, which banned the existence

1 Lubomír Hlavienka, Ph.D. – Silesian University in Opava, Institute of Public Administration and Social Policy. E-mail: lubomir.hlavienka@fvp.slu.cz

2 KSČ (Komunistická strana Československa) – Communist Party of Czechoslovakia; ČSNS (Česká strana národně socialistická) – Czech National Social Party; ČSSD (Československá sociální demokracie) – Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party; ČSL (Československá strana lidová) – Czechoslovak People's Party.

of any opposition party. During period between May 1945 and February 1948 Czechoslovakia adopted many reforms which affected the live of whole society. The most significant were dercees of the President of the Republic that dramatically changed the constitutional regime and meant essential changes in property tenure of German and Hungarian people, launched the nationalization process, set up the net of extraordinary courts to prosecute the Nazi and war crimes, introduced the new form of public administration, etc³. Other significant transformation of Czechoslovakia were connected with the status of national minorities, in Czech lands especially Germans. Already during the last days of war, started the process of expulsion during which more than 3 millions of Germans had to leave the republic. The process of expulsion had two different phases, the first (Wild phase) were took place in 1945, were more or less non-organized and is characterized by the most of events of violent and murders⁴, the second phase (Organized phase) took place between 1946 to 1947, most of Germans leave the republic in this years and is characterized by the less number of violent excesses⁵.

Very dramatically, these changes manifested themselves in the border area, which was traditionally inhabited by a predominantly German-speaking population. On the basis of the constitutional decrees of the President of the Republic, the property rights of Germans, and collaborators were restricted and those who accepted German citizenship were deprived of Czechoslovak citizenship. This series of changes made the Germans inhabitants of the second category, which can be perceived as a prelude to their forced displacement, which was required not only by political representation, but also the vast majority of the Czech and Slovak population of the country. Overall, the views of most Czech society were strongly influenced by tumultuous nationalism and anti-Germanism, which resulted in a series of violent excesses and savage deportation shortly after the end of the war. And while the German population was gathered in concentration camps at the border and subsequently deported, there was a loud call throughout the Czech society for the settlement of the border areas by the Slavic population to replace the Germans. This call was strongly intertwined with Czech nationalism and was presented as atonement for various historical injustices as well as a key moment in the history of the Czech nation (Spurný 2011, p. 32–33). For this reason new settlers headed to the border, among whom we would find both Czechs and

3 The collection of the most important decrees in: Jech & Kaplan 2002.

4 To the role of Czechoslovak army and State security corps on the first phase of expulsion more: Von Arburg & Staněk, 2005; 2006a; 2006b.

5 The collection of most important documents connecting to the expulsion of Germans from Czechoslovakia: Staněk & Von Arburg, 2010. The literature about the expulsion, for example: Padevět, 2016; Staněk, 1991.

Slovaks, as well as members of a number of other nationalities, for whom the border became a new home. The structure of the new settlement were very varied due to the borderland were heading not only people from Czechoslovakia but also Czechs and Slovaks from Romania, Hungary, USSR or Yugoslavia which we collectively call re-emigrants. Outside them to the borderland in years 1945 to 1948 came residents of Sub-Carpathia Ukraine, Hungarians, Gypsies and others. Many of those to hear of the call of Czechoslovak government to repopulate Czech, Moravian and Silesian borderland. Totally by February 1947, 1.7 million new settlers had gone to the borders of the Czech lands, a large part of whom were re-emigrants (Kalinová 2009, p. 68).

This article builds on an older study dealing with similar issues in 1945 (Hlavienka, 2021) and aims to map how this newly formed settlement, composed of a diverse range of nationalities, was built by a newly formed state security corps and in what context members of each nationality appeared in documents from the provenance of state security forces. Attention will be dedicated to citizens of the Czechoslovak Republic of other than Czech and Slovak nationalities, as well as to members of other nations who were not citizens of the Czechoslovak Republic, but for any reason appeared in the monitored districts and for various reasons became the subject of interest of security forces. Due to the fact that a large number of members of different nations appeared in the territory of selected districts in the studied years, attention will be paid to those that appear most frequently in the materials. As the above-mentioned article proved, the attitudes of the security corps towards members of other nations differed significantly during 1945 and were shaped primarily by state policy, which in the form of directives and orders put into practice by the Ministry of the Interior, provincial National Security Corps (SNB)⁶ headquarter in Brno and the headquarters in the Ostrava branch of the Moravia-Silesia provincial national committee. Therefore, our goal is to expand the current state of research and map the attitude of state security forces to individual nationalities until 1948, but also to clarify whether the attitude of security authorities to various nationalities has not changed since 1945, and if so, how that was the way. We will want to achieve this by analyzing orders issued by the ministry, central headquarters and SNB headquarters in the branch, as well as studies of specific cases in which members of the SNB came into contact with members of various national minorities in the region at the time. The aim of the study is not to compile an absolute list of all cases, nor to reconstruct the living conditions of selected minorities, but only to map the attitude of state security authorities to them, so the selected cases are not a full list of all reported cases

6 Sbor národní bezpečnosti (SNB).

related to the minority, but only examples applicable to the attitude of security authorities to these groups of the population.

Territorially, the article deals with the western part of Bohemian Silesia, specifically the districts of Opava-venkov, Hlučín, Bruntál, Krnov and Frývaldov, whose name was changed to Jeseník in 1947⁷. This region were a part of Moravia-Silesia province, especially the part of Ostrava branch of Morava-Silesia Provincial National Committee. Although named districts never formed a unified territory from an administrative or historical point of view, it was chosen because it is an area where (with the exception of the Hlučín district) the most complex population exchange took place and instead of displaced Germans came the widest range of members of various nationalities, which created excellent conditions for our research. Specifically, the change in population is shown by the result of the census of May 1947, according to which a total of 195,000 people immigrated to the monitored districts after May 1st 1945, while over 117,000 of them did not reside in the Czech lands on May 1st 1945. Even if we accept that some of them were Czechs, forcibly deployed in Germany, or prisoners, then it is still a large wave of migration, which was largely not based on the Czech lands. To a large extent, they were Slovaks, then repatriated, who, based on the call of the Czechoslovak governments came to Czechoslovakia from Volyn, Hungary, or Romania and settled in the displaced border. Specifically, post-war migration to the studied regions is summarized in the Table 1.

Table 1. Post-war migrations to the Western-Silesian districts

District	After May 1st 1945, it was newly immigrated		
	Total	From the Czech lands	From the Czech lands in %
Bruntál	23 983	16 268	67,91
Jeseník	33 778	21 633	64,04
Opava-venkov	64 190	14 438	22,49
Krnov	33 620	22 635	67,33
Hlučín	39 946	2 675	6,7
Total	195 517	77 649	45,69

Source: *Soupis obyvatelstva Československa v letech 1946 a 1947*. Praha, Státní úřad statistický 1951, p. 536.

7 D. Janák call these districts like the western part of Ostrava´s branch of Morava-Silesia Provincial National Committee (Janák, 2003, p. 411).

Another factor why these units were selected is the fact that with the exception of district Bruntál is located in selected districts on the border with the newly acquired Polish territories, which, due to tense Czech-Polish relations and frequent border incidents, represented another axis of our research. And last but not least, the selected districts are also connected by the fact that it is an area with predominant agricultural production and a majority of smaller settlements, which significantly differs from the industrial east of Silesia, which only enhances the landscape in most of the Hrubý Jeseník massif or its foothills.

National Security Corps in the region are the subject of our interest. The state security authorities, which operated in the years 1946 to 1948 in the territory are the examined districts. In this case, it is primarily the National Security Corps, which was established in May 1945. From the organizational point of view, the SNB command hierarchy was the main headquarters in Prague, which was subject to provincial headquarters, based in Prague and Brno, it is essential for us that for The headquarters of the Ostrava branch of the Provincial National Committee (ZNV)⁸ also created a headquarters based in Moravian Ostrava (Kvapilová, 2003, p. 78–80). The Ostrava branch of Moravia-Silesia National Committee were established by a government decision of May 15th 1945 and confirmed by Decree of the President of the Republic No. 121 Coll. of October 27th 1945. The Territorial Ostrava branch office managed the territory of the Silesian districts and some selected adjacent Moravian districts. In total, these were the districts of Bílovec, Český Těšín, Bruntál, Fryštát (Karviná), Frývaldov (Jeseník), Hlučín, Krnov, Opava-venkov, Nový Jičín and Místek, and two statutory towns, which were Moravská Ostrava and Opava (Janák 2003, p. 409). The management and supervision of the activities of the security service belonged to the administrative offices of national security, which fell within the competence of the political administration of national committees at all its levels, except local ones. The Provincial National Committee was therefore responsible for deciding on fundamental issues of internal provincial security, issuing orders and directives for the performance of service, etc., which was carried out through the provincial security department.

Similar unions were formed at lower levels of administration, so the SNB's activities were subordinated to national committees, as each district commander was subject to District National Committee (*Okresní národní výbor*; ONV) through the ONV security commission, with the commission chairman being a security officer and leading the security department at the relevant ONV.

8 Zemský národní výbor. The national committees were the state administration bodies at the level of municipalities, cities, city districts, districts, regions and, until 1949, provinces. More to the National committees: Hledíková, Janák, Dobeš, 2007.

This meant that national security administrations had the right to assign tasks and supervise their implementation to the relevant SNB headquarters, but could no longer interfere in their implementation from a technical and professional point of view (Kvapilová 2003, p. 78–79). Viktor Linhart held this very important position of chairman of the security commission within the branch from the summer of 1946 (ABS, f. 304-131-5 denní rozkaz č. 74 velitelství SNB expozitura Ostrava, August 5th 1946).

In addition to the uniformed corps, the State Security also operated in the region. It was also established in 1945 as one of the non-uniformed units of the National Security Corps. At the provincial level, there were individual provincial offices, to which regional and in selected districts, district offices were subordinated. According to the applicable standards, it approached the State security (*Státní bezpečnost*; StB)⁹ case if it was an anti-state activity that could be covered by any criminal law (Kvapilová 2003, p. 81). As the activity of some national minorities at the border was perceived as a potential threat to national security, the StB often came into contact with members of foreign nationalities.

The construction of the state security corps in the monitored territory encountered a number of obstacles including a lack of personnel, which prevented a larger occupancy of some stations. These initial problems were solved by establishing special schools in Bruntál and Krnov, where several dozen attendees were preparing for future service from March 1946, who strengthened the ranks of the congregation in the summer of 1946 (ABS, f. 304. inv.č. 304-134-4, denní rozkaz č. 54 velitelství SNB expozitura Ostrava z 24. května 1946; ABS, f. 304. inv.č. 304-131-5, denní rozkaz č. 89 velitelství SNB expozitura Ostrava, August 31st 1946). Another problem was the quality of the new members of the corps. As soldiers and guerrillas, who did not have much experience with policing, were admitted to the ranks of the corps in addition to former members of the defunct security corps, various problems arose in their activities. The district headquarters of the SNB Opava-venkov directly pointed out that the new members of the corps, who had no experience from the pre-war years, did not know the regulations properly and it was necessary to continue training them (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 183, inv.č. 288, Zpráva o situaci a bezpečnosti v okrese Opava-venkov, September 17th 1946). In April 1946, the provincial headquarters in Brno even complained that there were a growing number of cases in which members of the corps were revealing the

9 Non-uniformed part of National Security Corps, established at June 30, 1945. The StB focused on the fight against the enemies of the state and mainly investigated the crimes of infestation against the republic, its security and the state establishment. Until 1948 it was controlled by the Communist Party. More about StB: Kaplan, 2015.

names of informants to the accused or having them inspected in the files, listing the names of the people who had filed the case (ABS, f. 304-134-4, denní rozkaz č. 37 velitelství SNB expozitura Ostrava, April 9th 1945). Drunkenness of corps members on and off the service can also be considered a problem. We do not have more precise data on the extent of this problem, however, the orders of the SNB headquarters in the branch mention several similar cases in the monitored period and Article 4 of daily order No. 93/1946 directly stipulates that if any member of the corps conceals the drunkenness of another member, criminal prosecution against him. Despite this order, similar cases continued to occur, with the most serious incident being the case from Bílovec, where in October 1946 a drunk member of the corps shot a local citizen (ABS, f. 304-131-5, zvláštní rozkaz č. 5 velitelství SNB expozitura Ostrava, October 29th 1946). However, despite all these problems, the corps was able to establish itself, during the years examined, oversaw the maintenance of security and order in the region and gradually its members became more professional in the performance of their service, although partial problems and shortcomings understandably occurred throughout the period.

Attitudes towards nationalities

From the point of view of state security, the border area was a very sensitive area, which was to be inhabited primarily by a nationally and politically reliable population. This was also confirmed by Presidential Decree No. 28/1945 Coll. on the settlement of agricultural land, which stipulated in §2, paragraph 1, that only a state and nationally reliable member of the Czech, Slovak or other Slavic nation may apply for the allocation of land at the border (Jech & Kaplan, 2002, p. 331). The same national appeal is directly mentioned in the land ownership decrees received by farmers. Here it is stated that land reform means cleansing Czech land of Germans, Hungarians and traitors, creating a solid wall of the state from the border and it is therefore the duty of farmers to maintain the land and defend it against the enemies of the Czech and Slovak nations (Spurný, 2012, p. 35). However, a report by the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party on Settlement, addressed to the Minister of the Interior V. Nosek, stated in November 1946 that despite these attitudes, large numbers of Germans still lived at the border, Roma, Hungarians and re-emigrants came here illegally. To address this issue, security authorities needed to pay close attention to them. Due to the negative attitude towards the USSR, it was also to be devoted to Jews coming mainly as optants from Subcarpathian Russia (ABS, f. 304-17-1, dopis komise pro otázku osídlování ÚV KSČ ministru vnitra V. Noskovi, November 18th 1946). Due to this unhappy situation, the Ministry of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Ministry

of the Interior, issued an instruction requiring settlers to inform ONV security officers about persons to whom land was issued at the border. This included all future cases also requiring addresses of residence, national opinions and state reliability to be known before the allocation of land (ABS, f. 304-17-1, *Osídlování v pohraničním celním pásmu*, December 23rd 1946).

However, the attention of the security forces did not turn only to the settlers. The individual state headquarters of the SNB were also warned that increased attention at the border should be paid to foreigners, even those who come from friendly states. The reason was the fear that among them may be hiding fugitive soldiers who fought against the USSR, as happened in February 1946, when two men in Yugoslav army uniforms were detained, but it turned out that they were former members of the Croatian Ustasha movement (ABS, f. 304-17-1, *zpráva o nežádoucích cizincích v ČSR*, February 27th 1946).

Germans

The presence of the Germans was, of course, perceived most fervently in the borderland. The chaotic and violent wild deportation from the summer 1945 were criticized by Western Allies authorities so Czechoslovak government and security authorities prepare new conditions for the transfer of the rest of German population in Republic. So-called organized transfer were prepared at the end of 1945, and the first transports to the Allied occupation zones in Germany departed in December 1945, others followed for much of 1946. During this phase of displacement were transported to the Germany approx. 2.2 millions of Germans and together with the wild phase of the displacement approx. 2.5 to 2.6 millions of Germans, who lived in September 1939 on the territory of Czechoslovakia, were forced to leave the republic (Staněk, 1993, p. 21–22). At the territory under the rule of Ostrava branch of Moravia-Silesia National Committee were expelled during the wild phase approx. 30 to 35 thousands of Germans and in January 1946 lived there approx. 230–240 thousands of Germans, most of them on the territory of following districts (Janák, 2003, p. 506).

The main interest of the state authorities in relation to the Germans was to continue their expulsion. On the process of displacement to a large extent participated the SNB, so it is in this context that the Germans appear very often in documents of the national security corps provenance. The state's attitude towards this minority was primarily influenced by the experience of the recent war, and Czech nationalism was reflected in orders to members of the security forces, who were strong nationally and anti-German oriented (Čapka, Slezák, Vaculík, 2005,

p. 28). This sharpest nationalism eased a little by 1946, however, the German minority was still considered a major security problem, which was reflected in the actions of members of the corps. In the event of deportation, the members of the SNB had to supervise not only their smooth course, but also to check the displaced population for money or other valuables. Unlike the expulsions of 1945, which were often accompanied by various acts of violence, corps members were required to run the process without excesses, to seize German property, loot their homes, divide families, etc. (Staněk, 1991, p. 173). To take all steps within the limits of their powers in the places where the expulsion took place, in order to protect the property of the displaced Germans, especially their flats. (ABS, f. 304-131-5, Denní rozkaz velitele SNB v expozituře č. 78, August 15th 1946). It should be noted, however, that it was not so much a question of protecting German property, which had to be left in the place from which they were removed, but rather of protecting property belonging to the national administration.

In reality, the removal from the examined districts was relatively calm, as was the case on January 26th in Krnov, when the participants of the SNB school accompanied the Krnov-Cvilín collection center to the main railway station of about 1,200 Germans, where they were taken over by military guards and transported. As the report stated, the removal took place without any problems and was gladly received by the local Czech population. Other similarly implemented relocations followed in the course of the subsequent days. (ABS, f. 304-7-1, hlášení o odsunu Němců z Krnova, September 28th 1946). The first expulsion of Germans from the Frývaldov district, which took place on February 6th, 1946, when 1,218 people were taken from the concentration camp in Mikulovice, was similarly calm. Certain complications occurred during the gathering and transport of the Germans to this camp, which took place on January 25th. During the event, two local Germans chose suicide rather than being forced to leave their home. Except for this incident, the relocation was relatively orderly (ABS, f. 304-7-1, první odsun Němců z Frývaldova). The actions of SNB members during a total of 19 transports sent from the Opava-venkov district were also assessed as successful. The task of the SNB in this case was to collect people destined for removal, transport them to the station and guard the property left to the state (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 183, inv.č. 288, Zpráva o situaci a bezpečnosti v okrese Opava-venkov, September 17th 1946).

However, not all transports went well. One of the serious problems occurred on May 23rd, 1946, when the first expulsion of the Germans from Hlučín took place. The main problems were found in the conduct of a personal search of deported German women, which, despite the instructions, were carried out

by members of the Local National Committee (*Místní národní výbor*, MNV). In addition, according to the statements, the searches were conducted in such a way that the searchers: „fell to the level of Nazi perverts... And they used methods that ... were used only by the Gestapo and SS.” Subsequent investigations revealed that the violation was at the expense of the deportation commander, who ordered these physical examinations, despite the instructions in force. The commanders approached these inspections because, despite the bans, the displaced Germans exported not only money but also other valuables, which they tried to prevent by thorough inspections. Another problem was that not all displaced Germans had all official formalities settled, so when they had to be sent back to Hlučín from Moravská Ostrava, from where the transport was to depart, it caused a storm of enthusiasm among the local Germans, which was accompanied by Nazi greetings (ABS, f. 304-7-1, Odsun Němců z Hlučínska – závady, July 4th 1946).

In general, compared to the situation of 1945, the conditions of deportation in 1946 improved considerably, which was largely due to the pressure of the American side to comply with standards. However, the problems persisted and included mainly the confiscation of personal property or the non-assembly of displaced families (Staněk 1991, p. 177). However, it can be said that the SNB's attitude towards the expelled Germans had improved somewhat, as can be seen in the case from Hlučín, the security authorities tried to maintain a correct approach to the Germans and investigate possible excesses.

Although we can observe a certain improvement in the treatment of the Germans during the expulsion compared to 1945, overall the security forces continued to view the German population, primarily as a source of danger, which should be taken care of. To control the German population, a department for German affairs was established in 1945 at the district headquarters of the SNB, which continued to operate even after the expulsion, as was the case in Krnov, where the department supervised the remnants of the German population that remained in the district as necessary. Experts in industry or Germans in mixed marriages with a Czech spouse were allowed to remain (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 183, inv.č. 288, zpráva o inspekční cestě zemského bezpečnostního referenta, September 11th 1946). Due to distrust of the Germans, the corps command took care to avoid extracurricular contacts between them and members of the corps. In practice, however, this regulation was violated, as evidenced by the case where the provincial commander of the SNB in the branch punished one chief guard for ten days in prison for maintaining contact with the German population (ABS, f. 304-131-5, Příloha k dennímu rozkazu č. 69/1946, July 11th 1946). Even in the following years, however, this problem did not disappear, so in the spring of 1948

the SNB described contact of its members with the Germans as a threat to discipline and their reputation. An order was issued that any out-of-service contact of corps members with the Germans would be handed over to the prosecutor for resolution (ABS, f. 304-134-4, Denní rozkaz velitele SNB v expozituře č. 48, April 21st 1948).

As in 1945, the SNB tried to map any illegal activity of the Germans, but compared to the post-war months, the number of incidents with German perpetrators or alleged perpetrators has decreased significantly. Even so, the SNB offices focused on monitoring the activities of the German minority in the Czechoslovak Republic. We continue to encounter warnings about Werwolf's activities. Werwolf were German para-militant organization establish at the late of war to fight to occupying forces in Germany. The small groups of Werwolf were also active in Czech borderland. The largest attack in Czechoslovakia contributed to the Werwolf groups took place at July 31st 1945 in Krásné Březno (district Ústí nad Labem). In addition, many other incidents were attributed to Werwolf, although there were no evidence that Werwolf were really involved.

Due to fears of further attacks, the SNB attached great importance to monitoring and recording activities of Werwolf groups. According to Interior Ministry reports from the fall of 1946, the group's activity shifted mainly to Germany, where its members organized displaced Germans, practiced shooting, and spread propaganda about Hitler's early return to power (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 288, inv.č. 183, zpráva o činnosti Werwolfu v blízkosti hranic, September 25th 1946). The incident in July 1947, when a forest worker in the district of the village of Kutlberk was supposed to be raided, two unknown Germans were identified as the perpetrators. As the final search for the perpetrators was fruitless, there is no way to confirm the statement (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, hlášení o přepadení Tomáše Kašpaříka ozbrojenými Němci, July 12th 1947). In this case, it can be said that it was most likely not a member of Werwolf, but rather the action of escaped German prisoners of war, or a common criminal act. The situation was probably similar in the case of February 1947, in which a local citizen was attacked by gunmen in German uniforms. Even in this case, the search yielded no results (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, dálnopis ZNV Brno o přepadení Karla Dihela). On the contrary, a very common example of everyday problems that security and state authorities had to solve in relation to the Germans was the deliberate damage to property that the displaced in the Czechoslovak Republic had to leave, or hiding valuables or other property in the hopes could return for (Staněk 1991, p. 179). Another example of the normal activities of the security forces in relation to the Germans was the control of their living conditions, control of the state of food supply, etc. (ZAO, f. ZNV exp.

Ostrava, krab. 185, inv.č. 290, Měsíční situační zpráva oblastní úřadovny StB za období 28. dubna až 28. května 1947).

It is also possible to observe how in some cases the German issue began to be connected with an ecclesiastical issue, which can be seen most clearly in the Frývaldov/Jeseník region and then in the Hlučín region. In the Jeseník district, for example, on July 26th 1947, a pilgrimage of German Catholics took place to the Church of Our Lady Help of Christians near Cukmantl, which was attended by 400 people. The pilgrimage caused great outrage, because according to the Czech civilians who were present, it had a manifestation character, aimed to strengthen the resistance of the Germans to the Czechoslovakian state. The pilgrimage also became the subject of interest of the SNB Cukmantl and the service of the StB Jeseník. An investigation was initiated against Alois Kunz, a former member of the German Christian-Social Party, who held the position of churchman in Cukmantl (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 146, inv.č. 283, Němci – shromažďování na poutních místech, August 3rd 1947). Other religious gatherings of Germans in the Jeseník region were therefore closely monitored by SNB members in the following months (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 146, inv.č. 283, Náboženská shromáždění Němců, August 28th 1947). Cases where local clergy conducted their sermons in German were perceived very critically by both the Czech population and the security authorities. According to the SNB and StB materials, these were not isolated cases and the security authorities evaluated such cases, at least, as provocations (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 146, inv.č. 283, Bohoslužby pro Němce v pohraničí, July 9th 1947). The fact that preaching in German was widespread in the Jeseník region caused discord among the Czech population and was evidenced by the instructions of the office of the archbishop's commissioner, who stipulated that German may not be used in sermons and sermons should only be conducted in Czech (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 146, inv.č. 283, německé modlitby a kázání v kostelích, June 1st 1947). In other cases, Catholic priests of German nationality were monitored by security authorities because they believed that they were in written contact with displaced Germans and supported anti-Czechoslovak propaganda abroad. This was the case of the parish priest Jan Blaschke of Rudoltice in the district Krnov, whose activities were investigated by the Krnov service station StB (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 146, inv.č. 283, Jan Blaschke – písemný styk s cizinou a informování odsunutých Němců o hospodářském životě v ČSR, July 22nd 1947). In the Jeseník region, the most pressing case was the parish priest from Heřmanovice, Reinhold Wolný, who, as a veteran of the Wehrmacht, evoked a strong aversion among the Czech population, which he deepened with his contacts with the local Germans. Also for this reason, the security officer of ONV Jeseník recommended to reject his application for

Czechoslovakia citizenship and recommended deportation to Germany (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 146, inv.č, 283, zpráva o politické závadnosti Reinholda Wolného, September 18th 1947).

The issue of German priests and their loyalty to the Czechoslovak Republic was particularly sensitive in the Hlučín region. This territory were joined to interwar republic in 1920 but local population had very complicated relation towards Czechoslovakia. In 1938 Hlučín region became the part of German empire again and residents gain German citizenship. Many of them served during the war in Wehrmacht or SS and therefore after May 1945 were the opinion of Czech majority towards local people very negative¹⁰. An investigation by the StB was carried out in early 1947, according to which many local clergy cannot be trusted, as their positions were mentioned with the German government and therefore must be viewed with skepticism. Pro-German priests acted as support for other pro-German-minded inhabitants, which made it difficult to establish the authority of Czechoslovakian state. The report directly suggests that out of the ten clergy examined, five were transferred inland and one was directly relocated outside the Czechoslovak Republic. In only two cases were members of the StB found clergy to be nationally reliable and could remain in their positions (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 146, inv.č, 283, zpráva o poměrech katolického duchovenstva na Hlučínsku, February 4th 1947). The case of the pastor from Velké Hoštice served as proof of the anti-state attitudes of some clergy, who after the Mass refused to listen to Czechoslovakian anthem and according to testimony, he was making anti-Czech statements. The case was eventually investigated by the StB, and the local commission of inquiry was not willing to grant the Czechoslovak citizenship to the clergy in question had applied (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 146, inv.č, 283, protistátní postoj Floriána Dedka, October 8th 1947 a Námítky předsedy prověřovací komise ve Velkých Hošticích k žádosti F. Dedka o přiznání češství a obnovení čl. občanství).

As the Hlučín region posed a certain problem for the security forces due to the local ethnic composition, increased attention was paid to it. The ethnic situation raised concerns about the loyalty of the local population, and although, the periodic report on the situation on the Silesian borderland said that the loyalty of the local population could be expected (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 295, Situace ve slezském pohraničí 14-19 dubna 1946), the security forces were not so sure and paid increased attention to the region. The national and cultural identity of the region was underlined by the attitude of the locals towards

10 More about the Hlučín region: Plaček, 2000; 2007; 2016.

the newly settled settlers, who were ignored and represented a foreign element not only for the local Germans, but also for the Czechs, who had family relations with the Germans (ABS, f. 304-7-1, hlášení o poměrech na Hlučínsku, October 26th 1946). Even for these reasons, there were attitudes among the Czech population, flatly condemning all the inhabitants of the Hlučín region. This is one of the reasons why the SNB and the StB paid attention to the events in the Hlučín region, which manifested itself not only in periodically recurring reports on local conditions, but also in the fact that local SNB members compiled the opinions of elected members of local national committees. Such was established in August 1946 in Hošťálkovicích and evaluated the individual members of the MNV in terms of national and political reliability (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 183, inv.č. 288, zpráva velitele stanice SNB v Hošťálkovicích, August 1st 1946). A similar inspection took place in Hlučín and in most cases the inspection did not find any problems with the elected representatives (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 183, inv.č. 288, prověření členů MNV v Hlučíně, August 22nd 1946). From a security point of view, the funeral of the convicted war criminal Adolf Theuer, who served as a member of the SS in the Auschwitz concentration camp during the war, became a very specific case. After the war, the Opava MLS found him guilty of murder and other crimes, for which he was hanged on April 23rd, 1947 (Kolář, 2019, p. 61–76). His body was then handed over to his family so that he could be buried in the Catholic cemetery in Bolatice in the district Hlučín. Shortly after this decision, however, rumors began to spread among the population that Theuer had been convicted without evidence and the like, which was stirring up problems in the ethnically complex territory of the Hlučín region. There were also fears that the funeral and the grave itself could become a memento of the anti-Czech mindset of some of the locals. For this reason too, members of the SNB made it impossible to hold a funeral and transported the body to Opava (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 185, inv.č. 189, zpráva o převozu těla a pohřbu Adolfa Theuera, April 29th 1947).

While working with the German population, members of the security forces also encountered complaints from settlers against some Czechs. The main reason was the alleged or even actual favoring of the Germans by some national administrators or members of the administration. Such a case occurred, for example, at a steam sawmill in Dolní Grunt near Cukmantl in 1947. According to complaints that reached the SNB provincial headquarters, the Czechs were neglected by the national administrator at the expense of the Germans. In nearby Cukmantl, the remnants of the local German population were also very closely monitored by their surroundings, and the costly lifestyle, or the removal of foreign newspapers and debates about the political situation, became the subject of security forces' inquiries (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 146, inv.č. 283, zpráva

o poměrech v Cukmantlu a Dolním Gruntě, August 20th 1947). Emanuel Skalík, commissioner of the village of Waldek near today's Javorník, was also accused of harboring the Germans and of love affairs with local Germans. According to the accusations, he was to advocate for local German workers in the Czechoslovak Republic to remain, by not intervening against the rude behavior of the Germans and by maintaining personal relations with them. All these allegations reached the SNB headquarters in Ostrava, which launched an investigation. The conclusions of the SNB investigation in this case was found in favour of the complainants. E. Skalík was removed from the position of commissioner and his national reliability was questioned (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 146, inv.č. 283, zpráva SNB o E. Skalíkovi, July 25th 1947).

As can be seen, the German population remained in the spotlight of the security forces. Compared to 1945, this no longer appeared in the materials as perpetrators of various crimes. Fear of Werwolf's activities subsided, however, the attitude towards the Germans remained cautious and hostile. From the amount of material, it can also be judged that the German minority continued to be the most common type of contact between members of the security forces and representatives of other nationalities.

Poles

The attitude of Czechoslovakian Security forces was very contradictory towards Poland and persons claiming Polish nationality. Poland was, on the one hand, an allied country in the victory over Germany, but on the other hand, the Czechoslovak Republic and Poland shared the historical problems around Těšín/Cieszyn and also the claims of Czechoslovakia parties in the territory of Hlubčicko, Ratibořsko and Kladsko. The history of Czechoslovakia-Poles struggle goes to back to years after the World war first when was this region divided among Czechoslovakia and Poland. After World war second the disputes came to live and both states to claim not only Těšín/Cieszyn but also other regions in Silesia. This territory were originally the parts of Germany but according Yalta conference the new German-Polish border were move on the rivers Oder and Lusatian Neisse, so all German territories eastern of this line fell to Poles and German residents were in years 1945 to 1949 expelled (Vykoukal, Litera, Tejchman, 2000, s. p. 161–166). In addition, throughout the period from May 1945 to the end of the year, we can observe a number of incidents at the common border¹¹. These were not limited to the areas of Eastern Silesia, but a large number of them can be registered in the Hlučín, Krnov and Jeseník regions.

¹¹ For more informations about Czech-Polish incidents in 1945 see: Szymkowicz, 2002.

These problems continued in the years 1946 to 1948, claims to some territories in Upper Silesia, while the Polish side also did not give up its territorial ambitions in Cieszyn. The two countries tried to negotiate on these points of contention, and under Soviet pressure, a treaty of friendship was concluded on March 10th, 1947. On the basis of it, there was a certain settlement of mutual territorial disputes, institutions supporting territorial claims in Upper Silesia ceased to exist in the Czechoslovak Republic, and at the same time Polish associations were established in the Těšín region. On the other side of the border, for example, a Czech-language language school was opened in Kłodzko (Binar & Jirásek 2012, p. 71–72). However, against the background of these negotiations, various border problems continued to occur. Among them we can include both the escape of people from Upper Silesia to the territory of Czechoslovakia and various partial incidents that took place along the Czechoslovak Republic and Polish state border (Janák, 1993). For these reasons, the Poles remained the object of interest of the state security forces as well.

In the case of Poles, the security forces and the state administration tried to distinguish between Czechoslovakian citizens of Polish nationality and citizens of Polish, as shown, for example, by records of the national composition of the branches of the branch of April and August 1946 (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 221, inv.č. 317, přílohy 1–31 výkazu evidence obyvatel okresu Hlučín, August 22nd 1946). Members of the security forces serving in selected districts met, with a few exceptions, mainly with Poles who were not citizens of Czechoslovakia. That is why Poles and citizens of Poland appear in the documents of the security forces mainly in the context of crossing the state border and also in connection with various security incidents.

The most common example of crossing the border between Poland and Czechoslovakia was the flight of the people from the territory of Racibórz, Hlubčicko and Kladsko, but in this case they were not Poles. Since 1945, security authorities have registered a number of cases of border crossing by refugees from newly acquired Polish territory, and the composition of these refugees was diverse and we would find Czechs close to Moravia, Germans and also Poles fleeing Poland to the American occupation zone in Germany (Janák, 1993, p. 152). Apart from economic migrants, in many cases they were people who responded to the changes in the political regime in Poland in an effort to go west. This category included, for example, a group detained on September 21st, 1946 in the district of the SNB station in Mikulovice, numbering about 30 people, mostly women and children (ABS, f. 304-223-4, zpráva o překročení hranic polskými státními příslušníky u Mikulovic, September 22nd 1946). For political reasons, members

of resistance organizations from the years of the war also crossed the border, which after its end became uncomfortable for the emerging communist regime. Increased attention was paid mainly to members of the resistance organization Armija Krajowa, against whom the border security authorities were warned that they were nationally unreliable and hostile to the USSR. They were said to engage in smuggling and espionage against the Czechoslovak Republic and in case of detention should be immediately returned to Poland (ABS, f. 304-223-1, Polští státní příslušníci – odsun nežádoucích osob, April 17th 1946). Apart from political reasons, the violation of the common border was also motivated by smuggling, in which members of both nations, living on both sides of the border, took part. Apart from men, women also took part in smuggling, as shown by the case from December 1946, when Antonia Pazdziorová, who wanted to sell a large number of cigarettes in the Czechoslovak Republic to buy various textiles, was detained in Cukmantl (ABS, f. 304-223-4, protokol sepsaný s A. Pazdziorovou, December 12th 1946).

A special sort of refugees from Poland were the Jews. The Czechoslovak security corps known that the immigration of the Jewes is organized by Polish authorities and afraided that hostile element could to sneake to the Republic among the Jewes. According SNB the hostile elements were members of UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army), Poles hostile towards USSR etc. The motive for their departure was poor conditions in Poland. Some just wanted to find refuge in Czechoslovakia, but most of them went to Palestine. (Friedl, 2020, p. 269). According to the materials of the security corps, attempts by Jewish refugees from Poland to penetrate Czechoslovakia were relatively frequent. In the monitored years, the members of the SNB informed about the detention of a number of Jewish refugees, or even the discovery of an organized network ensuring their transport from Poland to Czechoslovakia (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 129, inv.č. 271, Odhalení organizace pro podloudnou dopravu osob židovské národnosti z Polska do ČSR, June 6th 1946.). In the event that these refugees were detained, they were initially returned to Poland, which caused very emotional scenes at the borderline. The Ministry of the Interior tried to respond to these border crossings by instructing them that these refugees were hostile elements (mainly members of the AK and NSZ) and to take appropriate action against them and return them to Poland. However, as early as April 18th, it eased this attitude with respect to the Jews. According to the new instruction, the subordinate authorities were not to prevent Polish Jews from continuing their journey to the west, they were to treat them with respect and dignity. (ABS, f. 304-17-1, Polští státní příslušníci – odsun nežádoucích osob, April 17th 1946; ABS, f. 304-17-1, Odsun osob židovského původu, polské státní národnosti, April 18th 1946.). The number of fleeing Jews

increased even more after the Kielce pogrom of July 1946. Although the main wave of Jewish refugees went to the Broumov and Náchod regions, a number of attempts to cross the border were monitored by SNB members in the monitored districts. In response to these attempts to cross the border, a September 1946 directive from the Ministry of the Interior ordered the SNB authorities to return the refugees to Poland after their arrest (ABS, f. 304-17-1, *Nezákonné přechody čs.-polské hranice polskými občany*, September 20th 1946.). The escapes of Jews from Poland through Czechoslovakia to the west can be traced back to 1948, however, the Silesian region was only marginally affected by this phenomenon and the main wave went to the region of Orlické Mountains (Friedl, 2020, p. 314).

In addition to attempts to cross the border illegally, members of the security forces came into contact with Poles during various border incidents involving Polish border units. There were fewer of these incidents than in 1945, but they occurred. On May 4th, 1946 near Nové Vilémovice near Javorník, a Polish patrol captured a group of forest workers, consisting of several Germans and a Czech. After several hours spent in Poland, all concerned were released and sent to the Czechoslovakian side of the border (ABS, f. 304-223-3, *zpráva o odvezení Františka Peterky a dalších do Polska*, June 3rd 1946). In another case, a Bulgarian worker working on a farm in the village of Stundorf in Osoblažsko was detained (ABS, f. 304-223-3, *služební záznam č. 2 velitelství SNB v exp. ZNV*, April 23rd 1947). In another case on the territory of the SNB station in Vlčice, district Frývaldov, several Polish soldiers led by a civilian crossed the state border on April 28th 1946, according to the SNB records, tried to steal several head of cattle on a nearby farm. This incident led to the strengthening of the border patrols of the SNB and the Financial Guard in the entire district to fall under the station in Vlčice (ABS, f. 304-223-5, *hlášení o překročení hranice polskými pohraničníky*, April 29th 1946). Rarely there were cases of shooting at the common border, as was the case on April 18th 1946, when in the district of the village of Oldřišov near Opava, Polish border guards opened fire on a woman working in a field near the state border. Fortunately, no one was harmed in this incident (ABS, f. 304-223-5, *střelba polské pohraniční hlídky přes státní hranici*, April 19th 1946). In another case, there was not so much luck and on March 17th 1947, Zdeněk Stařinský was shot by Polish border guards near the village of Pišť in the Hlučín district. The reason could be either the attempt of Polish border guards to stop several children who crossed the border, or it was an unfortunate accident. The exact motives of the shooting could not be determined (ABS, f. 304-223-5, *zpráva o postřelení Zdeňka Stařinského palbou z polského území*, March 17th 1947).

As follows from the above cases, it can be stated that persons of Polish nationality were perceived very differently by the security authorities. On the one hand, it was an allied country, from whose territory, however, a large number of people of various nationalities fled. Since the Poles also fled not only from the Germans, Czechs or Moravians, in many cases the Poles appear in the documents of the SNB and the StB as violators of the state border, against which, the security forces tried to intervene. The perception of Poles was greatly influenced by their political orientation and in connection with the turnover of the Czechoslovakian political scene. To the left, the worst perceived were members of underground organizations, which after the occupation of Poland by the Red Army became redundant, the new Poland and tried to escape to the west. In other cases, Poles appeared in documents in connection with various border incidents, a phenomenon that has persisted since 1945, although not to such a large extent.

Ukrainians

Compared to 1945, in the years 1946 to 1948, members of the security forces began to clash with the Ukrainians to a greater extent and especially in 1947. In this case, they are mainly members of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which is known in the Czech environment as The Banderas, after their commander Stepan Bandera. This organization sought to establish an independent Ukrainian state and, with the support of the Germans, fought against renewed Soviet power in Ukraine established in 1944. NKVD units were deployed against UPA units and the fighting moved to southern Poland and then to Czechoslovakia between 1944 and 1946, when the remnants of the UPA tried to break through to the west, but the first reports of Ukrainian troops penetrating the Czechoslovak Republic date back to August 1945, when these fighters reached eastern Slovakia (Fiala 2004, s. 59). At first, were the UPA groups presence at Slovakia connecting with their fight towards Poles and Soviets, therefore their raids on Czechoslovakia territory were only short-term. The first UPA group stay on the Slovak territory to the September 1945, the second raid on the Slovak territory took place in April 1946 (Šmigel', 2007, p. 128).

Despite the fact that until 1947 the UPA raids on the territory of Czechoslovakia were not large, the UPA groups posed a threat to the state, which was trying to face it, and already in the course of 1946 military units were sent to eastern Slovakia to ensure state sovereignty over this territory, as ordered by the government in April 1946 to the Ministries of Defense and Interior (Fiala 2004, s. 77.) The situation worsened in 1947, when UPA units in Poland and Ukraine were defeated. Their members tried to save themselves by fleeing to the west, which meant

passing through the territory of the republic (Šmigel, 2007, p. 174–176). During the year 1947 the remnants of UPA forces, numbering about 300 men, went across the Czechoslovak Republic to the west, towards Bavaria (Řepa, 2019, p. 109). Although the advance of Ukrainian troops was directed mainly to southern Moravia and further to the west, the vast majority of fighting was not conducted in the districts we monitored, so these events partially affected the region under the study. In July 1947, the SNB Provincial Headquarters in Brno issued a decree drawing attention to the imminent danger of UPA members entering the Czech lands and describing the methods of their actions. The main measures implemented to defend against these groups were to fall to the commanders of individual SNB stations and to the chairmen of the MNV. These measures mainly meant increasing vigilance in the outskirts of the villages and in solitude, as well as deeper cooperation with the local population, which was to provide the security forces with information on the movement of unknown persons (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, opatření proti Banderovcům, August 8th 1947). After the first experience with Ukrainian fighters, further instructions requesting the vigilance of the local population and rapid communication with the security forces were issued in early October 1947. These instructions had already warned that members of the UPA may try to get into the republic through the district. Hlučín, where there must have been increased vigilance (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, Banderovci – opatření, October 4th 1947).

The first incidents with the UPA were reported from Moravia at the end of July 1947, and according to reports, Ukrainian fighters advanced toward South Moravia, where the largest number of various clashes took place (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, Informace o tzv. Banderovských tlupách podle situace, August 21st 1947, p. 7–8). Cases apparently related to UPA members can be identified in the districts examined during August in the district of Bruntál and partly in the neighboring district. There had been several incidents attributed to UPA units in Rýmařov district. On closer inspection, it turned out that in at least two cases there were fake assaults, in other cases the investigation did not reveal the perpetrator and witnesses spoke of the presence of armed men in military uniforms, which immediately caused rumors of the presence of Banderas (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, Kriminální zpravodajství, August 20th 1947). Their identities were not confirmed, but fears of the Banderas quickly spread throughout the Krnov and Bruntál regions. People considered all unknown foreigners to be Banderas, although there was no evidence for this. This was probably the case on August 18th at Brantice in the district Krnov, where a local peasant was stopped and interrogated by two gunmen. Although the initial enquiry implicated UPA members, the investigation showed that they were more likely poachers (ZAO, f.

ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, fonogram VS-SNB Loučky a ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, Ozbrojená tlupa u Brantic, August 20th 1947). This occurred in some of the other cases registered in the district Krnov is not clear whether it is possible to identify groups of Ukrainian fighters as perpetrators, or whether they were poachers or someone else (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, hlášení o výskytu Banderovců, September 3rd 1947). The shootout near Dolní Moravice in the district is equally unclear. In Rýmařov, which took place on August 20th, 1947, a SNB patrol from Bruntál was sent to the scene, but the search for the perpetrators was fruitless. In this case, too, UPA members were identified as perpetrators, although the evidence did not support this suspicion (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, fonogram, August 20th 1947).

We have more credible reports about the presence of the Bandera's family from the Opava-venkov district, from where several incidents were reported in the last decade of August. After one of such instance, on August 21st 1947, a body of a probable Ukrainian warrior remained near the village of Veselí. Other incidents in the area are reported on August 26th, when an armed group requested food from a local peasant. According to the SNB investigation, the group planned to proceed further to Šumperk (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, hlášení o Banderovcích v okr. Opava-venkov, August 27th 1947). Similar incidents were also reported in the Hlučín district, where the risk of UPA members should be highest. On September 13 and 14th 1947, a scattered UPA group allegedly moved in the area of the village of Hať, trying to break through to the road leading to the Czechoslovak Republic injuring at least one Polish border guard. In the following days, one armed member of the group was detained in Dolní Benešov, the rest of the group escaped (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, zpráva o výskytu tlupy UPA v čs. – polském pohraničí z September 14th 1947; šetření výskytu tlupy UPA v pohraničí, September 15th 1947). Reports on the movement of armed groups and individuals in the monitored districts appear in the records of the SNB and StB in the following months. For example, in early November 1947 there were reports of fighting of UPA members with Polish forces near the station in Bílá Voda (district Jeseník) (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, fonogram oblastního velitelství Opava). With the arrival of the winter months, these reports disappeared from security forces.

As mentioned above, the SNB not only recorded incidents committed by members of the UPA, but also cases in which members of the UPA served as perpetrators of fictitious assaults, such as on the August 21st 1947 in Světlá in the district Bruntál. Here, a local drug dealer, Jan Godenčuk, was shot and robbed of a large sum of money. However, the investigation showed that the whole case was

fabricated for the purpose of insurance fraud (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, Loupežné přepadení v obci Světlá, August 21st 1947). Additionally on August 22nd 1947, Vladislav Orság from Mnichov near Vrbno pod Pradědem announced that he had been attacked by the Banderas. In this case, the investigation showed that this was a fictional statement that was supposed to disguise his relationship with a local woman (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 186, inv.č. 293, nepravdivé zprávy o Banderovcích od V. Orsága, August 22nd 1947). Apart from these cases, we could find several other, similar incidents. We can say that during the summer of 1947, when UPA units also appeared in the Czech lands and paranoia from their attacks was ubiquitous. The Ukrainians replaced the Germans in the role of perpetrators of imaginary assaults.

In summary, it can be stated that the Ukrainians appeared in the records of the SNB and StB for a short time, in the summer and autumn of 1947, which was related to the transition of UPA units to the west and the attitude of security forces towards them is therefore logically hostile. The propaganda of the time represented the Banderos exclusively as an ally of Nazi Germany which, in the eyes of the population and the security forces, posed a threat to be wary of. The entry of UPA units into the territory of Moravia thus provoked a strong response in the examined districts and, as can be seen, in several cases a scattered group of UPA fighters probably passed through here, which probably reached the Czechoslovak Republic via the Hlučín region.

Romani

Among the settlers of the monitored districts were also Roma. This minority was formed by the ruins of the original Roma population of the Czech lands who survived the war, but the majority was represented by Slovak Roma, who went to the border both for work and as part of their nomadic way of life. The Roma were a problematic element on the part of the security forces and were viewed with distrust. There were not very good attitudes towards the Roma in society, as opinions were spread among the majority that claimed that members of this ethnic group were perpetrators of crimes and avoided work. The view of official places and political parties towards the Roma was not positive either and remained influenced by a number of stereotypes, as documented by their designation as a rural broom, as used in the report of the Secretariat for Settlement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (ABS, f. 304-17-1, zpráva sekretariátu ÚV KSČ pro osídlování, November 18th 1946). These views, shared by the general public, put pressure on the SNB to keep members of the Roma minority under the scrutiny of local SNB services upon their arrival at the border. Officially,

the attitude of the security forces towards the Roma was modeled primarily by the fact that Act No. 117/1927 Coll. on itinerant gypsies, which in practice meant that the approaches and methods applied in the years of the First Republic were further used towards the Roma (Sommer 1996, p. 248). This meant that the SNB leadership and national committees required corps members to follow the norms of the 1920s in relation to the Roma, which was confirmed by a report from December 1946, according to which the SNB members' approach to the Roma minority 117/1927 and subsequently by Government Decree No. 68/1928 (ABS, f. 304-17-1, Očištění pohraničního pásma od živlů státně a národně nespolehlivých a škodlivých, December 10th 1946). On the basis of these standards, the ZNV issued a decree in Brno in the summer of 1946, according to which Roma were forbidden to settle in the 30 km zone from the state border (Pavelčíková, 2004, p. 28). However, even this distance was not considered adequate and the security forces demanded a 50 km zone from the state border. The result of these standards was an effort to regulate the movement of Roma and prevent them from settling in sensitive border zones if possible (Spurný, 2011, p. 244).

Despite the fact that the security forces tried not to allow the Roma to move to the border, members of this minority began to settle in small numbers in the monitored districts as early as 1945, and although they did not represent a large group of inhabitants, due to the fact that they were considered unreliable, the security forces showed eminent interest in them. Already in the autumn of 1945, the ZNV issued a requirement that the SNB services regularly send quarterly reports on the Roma population living in their district, which was regularly fulfilled in the following years (Pavelčíková 2004, p. 29). Thanks to these records, we have an overview of the development of the number of this minority in the monitored districts. The most important records of the Roma population took place from August 18th to 23rd 1947 and provided the first specific data on the number of Roma population not only in the border area, but since it was centrally coordinated, so in the whole Czechoslovakia (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 221, inv.č. 318. Výkaz o počtu cikánů v zemi české a moravskoslezské). In addition to recording the number, the security forces tried to keep track of where the Roma living in their district worked, what their financial situation was, what is the number of descendants, or where they went to the border. This information was obtained during various other inventories, carried out by individual district headquarters (ZAO, f. ZNV exp. Ostrava, krab. 221, inv.č. 318, Soupis cikánů a osob žijících kočovným životem, December 17th 1946).

In addition to the records of the Roma population, members of this minority appear in documents of the security forces in other contexts, often as

perpetrators of various crimes. These problems include, for example, field thefts, which spread in 1946 in the districts of Opava, Krnov and Frývaldov. A somewhat different problem was the allocation of uninhabited farms to Roma families, which, according to a complaint from the Opava branch of the Union of Farmers, were only stealing from them and moving on. This testimony is also confirmed from other places on the border, where similar cases had taken place (ABS, f. 304-17-1, *Nutnost nové úpravy kolonisace pohraničí*). On the basis of these complaints, a measure was issued in June 1946, on the basis of which the Roma were not to be given national stewardship of companies or farmsteads (SOkA Opava, f. JNV Opava-venkov, krab. 287, inv.č. 328, *Opatření proti cikánům*, June 26th 1946). The Roma became the subject of interest also because there were often cases in which members of this group deliberately avoided work. For this reason, the branch's security department ordered the SNB services to secure the unemployed and job-avoiding Roma workers and supply selected enterprises as labor (SOkA Opava, f. ONV Opava-venkov, krab. 287, inv.č. 328, *Cikáni, zařazení do práce v oboru průmyslu kamene*, March 4th 1947).

As we can see, the Roma, despite their relatively small number, were a minority that was at the center of the security forces' attention. They viewed them primarily negatively in the records. They were understood as a state unreliable population, whose lifestyle is associated with various criminal acts. For this reason, too, the Roma appear in the records of the state security forces primarily as people suspected of various nefarious acts then they are registered by name and an overview of their place of employment was recorded.

Re-emigrants

The large amount of uninhabited space on the border and the effort to change the local ethnic composition so that the Czechs had a majority (and the Slavic element in general) led to the fact that in 1945 the Czechoslovakian government issued a call to foreign compatriots to return to their homeland. The task of re-emigration was to help overcome labor shortages and complete the settlement of border areas (Čapka, Slezák, Vaculík, 2005, p. 161). As part of this process, the Czech and Slovak compatriots from Romania, Hungary, Yugoslavia and the USSR received the border. There was also a re-election of the inhabitants of Subcarpathian Russia, which was resigned after the war in the USSR for the arrival of the Volhynian Bohemians, serving in Czechoslovakia army in the east. In total, more than 200,000 people arrived during the re-emigration, most of them from Hungary, Volyn and Romania (Čapka, Slezák, Vaculík, 2005, p. 166).

Although re-emigration was supposed to contribute to the stabilisation of the border, not all re-emigrants were treated equally by the authorities and security forces, and some groups were considered politically unreliable and their settlement on the border was considered a security threat. The national reliability of the re-emigrants therefore had to be checked. Specifically, this meant that re-emigrants from Romania considered the security forces to be state-reliable only after an unspecified period of time (Kreml & Jirásek, 2015, p. 335). Reemigrants from Hungary were perceived by the Ministry of the Interior directly as state unreliable persons. Concerned about the security breaches of these returnees, the Ministry of Agriculture was instructed that settlers not be allocated entire villages to persons from these countries, but that their settlement be divided into a number of settlements where they would live next to inland settlers (Nosková & Vácha, 2000, p. 208–209). After February 1948, the Volhynian Czechs were also perceived as unreliable, as they were perceived as supporters of non-communist parties (Nosková & Vácha, 2000, p. 261–262). Some state officials were very critical of optants from Subcarpathia Russia of Jewish origin, who criticized them for their negative attitude towards USSR (ABS, f. 304-17-1, dopis komise pro otázku osídlování ÚV KSČ ministru vnitra V. Noskovi, November 18th 1946).

In addition to national and state reliability, the security forces, in cooperation with national committees, tried to keep records of re-emigrants, their places of residence and the number of this group of inhabitants. This obligation stemmed from a decree of the Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare of 1945 and registered repatriates and re-emigrants who were issued a registration card. Thanks to this evidence, we have at least a general idea of the number of individual re-emigrants living in the monitored districts (ZAO, f. KNV Ostrava, krab. 2555, sign. 454, Evidence repatriantů a reemigrantů, April 9th 1948).

As can be seen, in the case of re-emigrants, the security forces focused on verifying their reliability, with the country of origin significantly influencing how they were viewed. To maintain safety, it was also preferred that some groups of re-emigrants not be settled together, but only in smaller groups, where they would remain isolated among the majority. In addition, re-emigrants appeared in documents from the provenance of the SNB and StB mainly during their registration.

Summary

As in 1945, we can observe in the years 1946 to 1948 that the attitude of the security forces towards individual nationalities changed fundamentally. It can be said that the security forces did not hold clearly positive attitudes towards any

minority. However, we can still see some differences, the attitude towards Germans, Ukrainians and Roma was significantly worse than towards re-emigrants and Poles. These negative attitudes have always stemmed from other reasons. In the case of the Germans, it was the occupation and the recently ended war. For these reasons, they were seen either as a security threat, or as a nationally unreliable element that must be removed from the Czechoslovak Republic, or carefully controlled. Equally problematic was the perception of Ukrainians who entered the territory of the monitored districts as members of the UPA. The attitude towards them was thus influenced mainly by political attitudes, and the security forces perceived them as a significant threat, they paid close attention to any mention of their occurrence in the monitored districts. The security forces also had very negative attitudes towards the Roma, who were perceived as disturbers of peace and perpetrators of various crimes.

In contrast, the relationship with the other two groups was somewhat less negative. In the case of Poles, we could call it cautious, as Poles appeared in the SNB and StB materials often in the context of various attempts to cross the state border. Attitudes towards these people varied depending on whether they were political refugees or smugglers. Furthermore, Poles appeared in the records of various border incidents with members of the Polish Armed Forces. We could also talk about a cautious attitude towards re-emigrants. Although their arrival at the border was in demand, there was generally no confidence in their reliability, which resulted in various regulations regarding their establishment at the border. Re-emigrants appeared primarily in the records of the security forces during their registration.

Literature:

Balík, S., Hloušek, V., Holzer, J., Šedo, J. (2011). *Politický systém českých zemí 1848 – 1989*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Binar, A., Jirásek, Z. (2012). Slezsko v československo – polských vztazích v letech 1945 až 1947. *Slezský sborník*, 1-2, p. 63–90.

Čapka, F., Slezák, L., Vaculík, J. (2005). *Nové osídlení pohraničí českých zemí po druhé světové válce*. Brno: CERM.

Fiala, J. (2004). *Zpráva o akci B*. Praha: Vyšehrad.

Friedl, J. (2020). *Domů, a za svobodou. Role Československa v migracích obyvatel Polska v letech 1945–1948*. Praha: Academia.

Hlavička, L. (2021). National Minorities in the Western Borderlands of Czech Silesia from the Perspective of State Security Corps in 1945. *Border and Regional Studies*, 9, 1: 7-37.

- Hledíková, Z., Janák, J., Dobeš, J. (2007). *Dějiny správy v českých zemích od počátků státu po současnost*. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Janák, D. (1993). Neklidná hranice II. (Slezské pohraničí v letech 1945 – 1947). *Časopis Slezského zemského muzea, série B*, p. 147 – 168.
- Janák, D. (2003). Územní a správní vývoj. In D. Gawrecký (Ed.). *Dějiny českého Slezska 1740–2000* (p. 409–421). Opava: Slezská univerzita v Opavě.
- Janák, D. (2003). Národnostní vývoj. Německá menšina. In. D. Gawrecký (ed.). *Dějiny českého Slezska 1740–2000* (s. 506–507). Opava: Slezská univerzita v Opavě.
- Kalinová, L. (2009). *Společenské proměny v čase socialistického experimentu. K sociálním dějinám v letech 1945–1969*. Praha: Academia.
- Kaplan, K. (2015). *Protistátní bezpečnost 1945–1948. Historie vzniku a působení StB jako mocenského nástroje KSČ*. Praha: Plus.
- Kolář, O. (2019). Nacističtí dozorcí před Mimořádným lidovým soudem v Opavě 1945 – 1948. *Historica: revue pro historii a příbuzné vědy*, 1, p. 61–76.
- Kreml, A., Jirásek, Z. (2015). Osídlení okresu Bruntál v letech 1945–1949. *Slezský sborník*, 2, p. 315 – 338.
- Kvapilová, I. (2003). *Přehled organizačního vývoje Sboru národní bezpečnosti v letech 1945–1950 se zaměřením na veřejnou bezpečnostní (resp. pořádkovou a kriminální) složku*. Sborník Ministerstva vnitra. s. 68–90.
- Nosková, H., Váchová, J. (2000). *Reemigrace Čechů a Slováků z Jugoslávie, Rumunska a Bulharska (1945–1954)*. Studijní materiály Ústavu pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR. Praha: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR.
- Padevět, J. (2016). *Krvavé léto*. Praha: Academia.
- Pavelčíková, N. (2004). *Romové v českých zemích v letech 1945–1989*. Praha: Úřad dokumentace a vyšetřování zločinů komunismu.
- Plaček, V. (2000). *Prajzáci aneb k osudům Hlučínska 1742–1960*. Hlučín: Kulturní dům.
- Plaček, V. (2007). *Prajzáci 2, aneb, Hlučínsko ve staronové vlasti 1920–1938*. Háj ve Slezsku: Máj-Tiskárna.
- Plaček, V. (2016). *Prajzáci III, aneb, K osudům Hlučínska v době nacistické okupace 1938–1945*. Opava: Sdružení obcí Hlučínska.
- Řepa, T. (2019). *Banderovci. Politické souvislosti, následky zneužití tématu komunistickou propagandou, návaznost na hybridní válku v současnosti*. Praha: Academia.
- Sommer, K. (1996). Poznámky k problematice výzkumu cikánské (romské) otázky v českých zemích po roce 1945. *Slezský sborník*, 3, p. 246–252.
- Spurný, M. (2011). *Nejsou jako my. Česká společnost a menšiny v pohraničí (1945–1960)*. Praha: Antikomplex.

Staněk, T. (1991). *Odsun Němců z Československa 1945–1947*. Praha: Academia – Naše vojsko.

Staněk, T. (1993). *Německá menšina v českých zemích 1948–1989*. Praha: Institut pro středoevropskou kulturu a politiku.

Staněk, T., Von Arburg, A. (2010). *Vysídlení Němců a proměny českého pohraničí 1945 – 1951: dokumenty z českých archivů*, Issue 1 and 2. Středokluky.

Szymkowicz, P. (2002). *Polsko-czechoslowacki konflikt na granicy na odcinku Śląska Opolskiego w latach 1945–1947*. Opole.

Šmigel, M. (2007). *Banderovci na Slovensku 1945–1947*. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateje Bela v Banské Bystrici.

Von Arburg, A., Staněk, T. (2005). Organizované divoké odsuny? Úloha ústředních státních orgánů při provádění evakuace” německého obyvatelstva (květen až září 1945). (1. část: Předpoklady a vývoj do konce května 1945). *Soudobé dějiny*, 3–4, p. 465–533.

Von Arburg, A., Staněk, T. (2006a). Organizované divoké odsuny? Úloha ústředních státních orgánů při provádění evakuace” německého obyvatelstva (květen až září 1945). (2. část: Československá armáda vytváří „hotové skutečnosti”, vláda je před cizinou legitimizuje). *Soudobé dějiny*, 1–2, p. 13–49.

Von Arburg, A., Staněk, T. (2006b). Organizované divoké odsuny? Úloha ústředních státních orgánů při provádění evakuace” německého obyvatelstva (květen až září 1945). (Snaha vlády a civilních úřadů o řízení „divokého odsunu“). *Soudobé dějiny*, 3–4, p. 321–376.

Vykoukal, J., Litera, B., Tejchman, M. (2000). *Východ. Vznik, vývoj a rozpad sovětského bloku 1944–1989*. Praha: Libri.

Archives:

Archiv bezpečnostních složek (ABS).

Fond 304 Různé bezpečnostní spisy po roce 1945.

Zemský archiv v Opavě (ZAO).

Fond Zemský národní výbor, expozitura Ostrava 1945 – 1948.

Fond Krajský národní výbor Ostrava 1949 – 1960.

Státní okresní archive v Opavě (SOKA).

Fond Okresní národní výbor Opava-venkov.

Fond Jednotný národní výbor Opava-venkov.

Printed sources:

Jech, K., Kaplan, K. (ed.). (2002). *Dekrety prezidenta republiky 1940–1945. Dokumenty*. Brno: Doplněk.

Soupis obyvatelstva Československa v letech 1946 a 1947. Praha, Státní úřad statistický 1951.



© 2021 by the author. Published by University of Opole.
This work is an open access article licensed and distributed
under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-
ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC-BY-NC-SA)