

Martin VESELÝ

Sudetská župa jako protiletický kryt Říše? 1939–1945

Scientific editor PhDr. Jaroslav Rokoský, Ph.D.

Ústí nad Labem: Jan Evangelista Purkyně, University in Ústí nad Labem 2011.

864 pages.

[Acta Universitatis Purkynianae, Facultatis Philosophicae, Studia Historica 12]

ISBN 978-80-7414-383-0

Mgr. Martin Veselý, Ph.D., who is at present a respected historian with focus on the military history of Northern Bohemia and the history of air fights of World War II in that space, focused his new work (published as the output of the post-doctoral project of the Czech Grant Agency) on substantial extension and completion of his thesis published under the name: *Do krytu! Protiletická obrana v severozápadní části sudetské župy 1939–1945* (To shelter! Anti-aircraft Defence in North-western Part of the Sudeten Province, 1939–1945) in Ústí nad Labem in 2008. This time, he described in detail not only the anti-aircraft defence on the whole territory of the Reich province of Sudeten and the development of the air war on that territory, as well as all significant influences with which the air war over Germany affected the events in the Sudeten Province, but he also created a comprehensive survey of all forms of anti-aircraft protection on the territory of the province. It can be stated just at the beginning that he completed his plan successfully.

The above stated issue became subject to historians' interest only sporadically, usually only in context with the air war, and the comprehensive topic of anti-aircraft protection and the related transfer of people and industrial production to the space of the Sudeten Province has remained completely aside from historical research so far. Only thanks to the author who started paying systematic attention to the topic, the Czech historiography has finally come close to the European historiography in this area.

The extensive work is divided into three main chapters processing minutely the author's plan. Each of them has its own introduction, conclusions and table enclosures. The author has added also a fourth chapter, an excursus, a part of the conclusion or an epilogue, as the author himself called it; he performed a useful comparison of the attitudes of the inhabitants of the Sudeten Province and of the inhabitants of the Protectorate to the air strikes of the Allied in it. He concluded his work with a concise conclusion; it includes a list of abbreviations, sources and references and local index. The text is accompanied by short explanatory notes and consistently stated references to sources in an extraordinary extent of 1572 items. The tables, organization schemes and very numerous picture materials including historical photographs and posters or copies of archive documents constitute a very positive feature of the work. The reader of the published work will certainly appreciate also the hard cover and the sewn-in bookmark that used to constitute a good habit in all large books.

The author has described in detail the organization of anti-aircraft protection in the Sude-

ten Province, its structure and bonds to the Reich-wide system of protection, the types of services including self-reliant and factory protection, the involvement of NSDAP bodies, the construction of shelters, the role of blackout, etc. He pointed out the differences between the towns and the country; he characterized the everyday war life affected by the threat of air strikes in a number of examples. He observed step by step how the Sudeten Province was becoming the proverbial „air-raid shelter of the Reich“ and what problems were caused by the evacuation of the Reich Germans and by the relocation of the Reich arms industry to the Sudeten Province. Most of those topics were opened by the author for the very first time; by assessing the whole issue, he has established a firm base for all subsequent studies. When describing the air war over the Sudeten Province, he could partially work on broader references and complement them with his archive studies, thus presenting also there a very competent survey of the whole issue that, unlike the preceding topics, keeps attracting extraordinary interest of the public. Finally, he tried to summarize the opinions on the efficiency of the air war, coming to the conclusion that although the influence of the air war on the Sudeten Province is usually considered not to be too important, the air war seriously affected the local social and economic situation, changed the local industry and impacted the attitudes of local inhabitants, and the measures to protect their safety were not sufficiently effective.

The author based his study particularly on broadly conceived archive research. In the introduction, he characterized in detail the employed funds of Czech and German archives, assessing their completeness and contents value in relation to his work and mentioning also specific problems related with it. The survey of the Czech central, regional and district state archives, including also the funds of town, municipal and factory archives, is really representative for the relevant issue. Essential items were chosen also from German archives; my only small complaint concerns the fact that in the final list of sources, their funds are marked only with a pressmark and not by words, like the case of the Czech archives is. Also the insight in the funds of the Washington National Archive is useful. To potentially extend the heuristic base, I would suggest also an insight in the Polish archives of Lower and Upper Silesia because that area is mentioned very often in the work due to its closeness to the Sudeten Province. I mean the state archives of Wrocław, Opole and Katowice. I know the latter from my own experience and I suppose that something useful could be found for example in the fund of Oberpräsidium Kattowitz 1941–1945 (f. 117) or Provinzialverwaltung Oberschlesien in Kattowitz 1942–1945 (f. 118). Some of those presidial records even got to Moscow as spoils of war and are stored in the Russian State Military Archive (RGVI) in Moscow, in the fund of Oberprezidium provincii Verchnaya Sileziya, g. Katowice 1935–1945 (f. 1232, copy 1) at present. The archive includes for example the correspondence of the Reich representative for defence with the head of anti-aircraft protection buildings, concerning repairs of air-raid shelters in 1944–1945 and sending of official reports; the correspondence of the Presidium with regional heads of NSDAP concerning establishment of operative headquarters for elimination of consequences of air strikes, 1942–1944, etc. Further utilizable materials include for example the very extensive funds of RSHA Berlin (they include a lot of documents from Sudeten, particularly from the beginning of the occupation) and of Zentralbauleitung Waffen SS und Polizei Auschwitz, as well as Reichskommissar für Überwachung der öffentlichen Ordnung, torsos of Reichsluftfahrtministerium

Berlin, Reichskanzlei Berlin, etc. But I do not expect that documents changing anything substantial on the author's findings could be found there. But the materials may be useful to potential broader comparison of the situation in the Sudeten Province with that of other regions; the author performed meritorious comparison of the attitudes of the inhabitants of the Province to air strikes and anti-aircraft protection with the attitudes of the inhabitants of the Protectorate; but it would be also interesting to compare the situation in the Old Reich (Altreich) and in the eastern regions included in the Reich territory („eingegliederte Ostgebiete“), i.e. for example the differences between Lower and Upper Silesia that probably existed particularly in the attitudes of the inhabitants.

I assess positively the use of the historical press including the small protectorate comparison of *Národní listy*. The use of expert literature corresponds to the status of processing of the issue; the author used, additionally to a broad range of historical literature and general surveys, mainly German, also the sparse existing expert literature on anti-aircraft protection and on the related phenomena, as well as the substantially more numerous literature on the air war. Also unpublished sources and theses as well as Internet sources were used. I assess as positive that the author states consistently also the administrator of the specific websites and the citation dates. But I am a little surprised by the fact that sites in English are completely missing, as well as by the fact that there is only one English work among the references, without place of publication and publisher stated. That is a little surprising, in view of the fact that the author criticizes, just on the first page of his book, that the topic of anti-aircraft defence has been dedicated no interest in our country so far, „unlike for example Germany or Great Britain“. A fleeting glance in the Internet suffices to see that the author is right; he could have made use of a lot of English works both for theoretical issues and methodology and for comparison of organization of anti-aircraft defence and attitudes of the inhabitants and for the development of the air strikes of the Allied against Germany, including the Sudeten Province. The list of references is a little unsystematic; for example some monographs have, additionally to the year of publication, only the place of publication, while others only the publisher stated. All articles and studies have their extent of pages missing (except for the study by K. Kocourková, where only one page is referenced). Although the introduction explains the goal of the work shortly, describing the causes of existing lack of interest of the Czech historiography in the topic of the work, emphasizing its necessity, characterizing archive, literary and other sources of information, suggesting terminological problems, etc., I would rather welcome a self-standing methodological chapter in which the author would, additionally to the above stated facts, characterize in more detail the existing status of research of the issue, formulate his plans more accurately, delimit chronological and territorial limits and their possible overlaps, suggest methodological procedures and assess their suitability for the plan, as well as their possible pitfalls, etc. The introduction of his work certainly includes some of those points; it suggests the structure of the work and asks questions that should be answered by the work. Further methodological accessories are included in the prologues to the relevant chapters, so that I do not reproach the author for their absence; my only small complaint concerns the fact that not everything is concentrated on one spot and that I have to seek it in the text. The situation of the conclusions is better; the partial conclusions at the chapters have their substantiation, and the final summary (together with the epilogue) will also stand the test.

However, the conclusion should not assess only the issue described, but also the actual work could be directly mentioned as well: to what extent the author has succeeded in fulfilling his plans, what obstacles he had to overcome, what could not be overcome and why, what of the issue remains unverified or unresearched, where further research could be directed, etc.

In the introduction to the work, the author explained why the comparison of the development of the anti-aircraft protection components, of the construction of shelters and other related phenomena in the individual regions of the Reich was difficult and often impossible (the fragmentary character of the documents does not allow continuous survey); I believe nevertheless that some comparison could still succeed, at least at the level at which he succeeded in comparing the attitudes of the inhabitants of the Sudeten Province and of the Protectorate to the air strikes of the Allied. The turn of the above suggested comparison with Britain must come some day too.

I appreciate very highly the author's creative approach to professional terminology where he had to choose independently suitable translations of German terms, which certainly was not easy at all. But he mastered that pitfall quite well. Further, I appreciate excellent mastering of archive sources that brought a lot of so far unpublished interesting insights in different areas of life of that time of war. Also the historical photographs are mostly original and have distinctive information value. But for the picture materials to be perfect, I miss map schemes of the administrative segmentation of the Province and of the border areas dealt with by the work; they would facilitate orientation very much.

The work includes only small formal errors: the first subchapter of chapter 1, a partial complex is erroneously superscribed as Sudeten Province, although it discusses civil anti-aircraft protection in prewar Czechoslovakia (p. 30); the table on p. 497 is marked as No. 1, but it is table No. 2.

The language of the work is quite adequate to its plan; it is fitting and accurate but sometimes too descriptive. In that context, the third chapter on air war constitutes the „icing on the cake“, as the text finally starts having some swiftness in it. Small errors in the Czech language including grammar errors remained uncorrected, e.g.: „jak se na ní připravovala“ („na válku“, 9), „v **případě**, které vyžadovaly“ (105), „bychom **jí** mohli přirovnat“ („válku“, 105), „zdravit svojí mámu“ (374), „vedoucí **byl odejit**“ (392), „rozhodnutí, **které se dotkly**“ (448), „**dokáž** to“ (449), „dobrovolníci **prošly**“ (596), „označit **zas** zanedbatelné“ (837), etc. But such errors are rather exceptional.

Non-homogeneous use of local names and their Czech-German-Polish colour cause slight complications. The author states for example in the introduction, that he will use the historical name of Falknov for the current town of Sokolov. But he does not do it consistently; for example on p. 352, he used the word Sokolov several times. But I do not understand why he did not proceed in the same manner also in a very similar case of Jeseník, whose historical name, Frývaldov, disappeared officially even one year earlier than Falknov (in 1947). But the work uses only the later name, Jeseník (except for Frývaldov on p. 453). There were also minor errors in names, e.g. incorrect accents on vowels in the names of villages of Dolní Lípová (375), Zábřušany (864), Žířeč (864), or on the contrary missing accent in the name of the village of Komarov (92, 253). The village of Střebovice is currently a part of the town of Ostrava called Třebovice (it has that name since 1922), and a thermal power station

finished in 1939, when it was the biggest one of the republic, is situated there; the error was originated probably at translating the name from the German name of Strebowitz (95; the scheme situated on p. 89 has the correct form). Another mistake, caused by translation from German, can be seen on pp. 632-633 where it is written that one of the pilots who had jumped from the aircraft shot down near the village of Nový Les in the region of Krnov hid in the forest near Kravaře-Dolní Povelice. But Dolní Povelice is situated at more than 30 km from Kravaře (it is situated farther than Krnov and Opava, in the region of Hlučín, i.e. outside the Sudeten Province), so that the pilot could hardly glide so far. But Dolní Povelice is situated near the village of Koberno, whose German name was Kawarn, so that it could easily be confused with Krawarn, Kravaře, which actually occurred.

There were also mistakes in the names of the villages situated in Poland at present. Some of those names are erroneously declined in singular, although in Polish they are pluralia tantums, so that they should keep the form of pluralia tantums also in Czech, where the following declination is incorrect: „v Gliwici (633), v Branici (650), ve Wigancice (736), do Glubczyce (652), do Koźlu (205)”. There are frequent mistakes in accurate transcription of Polish alphabet - e.g. Kozle 89 or Koźle 205 (correct form should be Koźle), Glubczyce 652 (correct form should be Głubczyce), Legnica 143 (it is stated also in the correct form of Legnica 290), Myslowice 77, 79, 83, 89 (correct form should be Mysłowice), Wałbrzych 79 (correct form should be Wałbrzych like on pp. 296, 631), Wrocław 89 (correct form should be Wrocław), Wigancice Żytawskie 736 (correct form should be Żytawskie), Zdieszowice 630 (correct form should be Zdieszowice), Blachównia Śląska 630 (correct form should be Blachownia Śląska), Medzylesie 378 (correct form should be Międzyzylesie). In case of some villages, the reader never learns that they are situated in Poland because only their German form is stated; the reader cannot know that the frequently stated Heydebreck is Kędzierzyn, Sagan is Żagań or Zaháň in Czech, etc. Other names are stated parallelly either in their Czech or Polish forms, e.g. both Pačkov (284) and Paczków (462).

Also the German names are not used in consistent manner. Although the author had stated that he would use the Czech names, keeping the German word only in disputable and questionable cases, he does not always stick to it. So we can find here both Drážďany and Dresden (539), both Hamburk and Hamburg (538), both Cheb and Eger (565), both Most and Brůx 566), both Řezno and Regensburg (538), both Lipsko and Leipzig (539), both Berlín and Berlin (498-509), both Magdeburk (468, 470) and Magdeburg (582, 668, 732), both Krakov and Krakau (360), etc. The names were even confused in some cases, for example the small town named Křemže (579) is situated in the region of Český Krumlov, but as the text probably deals with the Austrian mining town of Krems an der Donau, formerly famous with its mustard, it should be written as Kremže in Czech.

Although we have given the work predominantly positive evaluation so far, it is not the case if we are to deal with the quality of the accompanying system, i.e. of the index. The work would certainly benefit also from a personal or geographic index; nevertheless, at least a local index is absolutely indispensable for a work of this type. Without it, the reader could hardly get grasp of the text and seek the necessary context. But, in view of the quality of the work, it is quite surprising that the local index accompanying it has extraordinarily low quality. It is completely missing a unified system of references; everything suffers from too evident randomness and lack of consistency. So the local index, unfortunately, does not

meet the basic requirements on the form of this auxiliary system; it is unsystematic, incomplete and inaccurate, reducing markedly the value of the whole work.

The index almost does not make use of the reference option, perhaps except for one entry, „Sokolov see Falknov“. Only about three names have the translation stated in brackets – Mnichov (München), Medzylesie (Mittelwalde), Odertal (Zdzieszowice); but there are dozens of such cases in the text, and the index does not deal with them at all. It could be overlooked if a German-Polish-Czech dictionary of the names of the villages used in the work would be included, compensating the drawbacks of the index at least a little. Actually, it is quite normal in works from Sudeten and Silesian environment.

The town districts are listed in the index as self-standing villages - Přívoz and Vítkovice of Ostrava, Aspern of Vienna, Kobylisy of Prague, but also Podmokly has fallen under Děčín-Podmokly; Wannsee of Berlin is missing, etc. Some names are completely lacking any paging; the data have probably fallen out during editing of the index; that is the case of Albrechtice, Čankov u Karlových Varů, Lučany nad Nisou, Paseky nad Jizerou, Roudnici nad Labem. Other names are lacking paging only partially because the author missed some other occurrence of the name in the text. I did not check the quality of the index from this perspective in the whole text; I have recorded only very sporadically some missing data; but many, many more of them will be missing. I can state e.g. Benešov nad Ploučnicí 329, 503, Berlín 383, 823, Blechhammer 692, 812, Bohosudov 611, Bohumín 806, Boletice nad Labem 329, 504, 519, Branice 649, Brumovice 649, 651, Bruntál 703, Břvany 747, Bukovec 487, Bystřice 638, Casablanca 826, Černovice 756, Česká Kamenice 329, 760, Dětrichov 487, Dobřany 441, 733, Duchcov 582, Dvory u Karlových Varů 547, Frankfurt nad Mohanem 360, Háj u Duchcova 710, Háj ve Slezsku 253, Hora Sv. Kateřiny 660, Hora Sv. Šebestiána 745, Horní Benešov 651, 693, Hradec nad Moravicí 253, 652, Hudcov 678, Hynčice 703, Chabařovice 639, 699, 721, 749, Chudeřice 700, Jablonec nad Nisou 728, Janov nad Nisou 616, 709, Jílové 477, Jindřichov 703, Jirkov 330, 499, 500, 509, 522, 524, Jizerka 407, Kamenický Šenov 329, Kiel 360, Klášterec nad Ohří 538, Komořany 655, Kozolupy 538, Krásné Březno 699, Lichnov 331, Lipová 323, 773, Loučná nad Nisou 748, Ludwigshafen 646, Magdeburk 582, Měděnec 545, Město Albrechtice 632, 711, 788, Mnichov 823, Mníšek 763, Mšeno nad Nisou 502, Mysłowice 77, Nová Ves nad Nisou 355, Nysa 704, Odry 703, Okna 515, 728, Osek 638, Oskava 704, Petrovice 704, 745, Rothenburg na der Saale 345, Rýmařov 692, Slezské Rudoltice 652, Souš 709, Staré Křečany 658, Svatava 539, Svárov 434, 525, Světec 283, 345, Teplá 414, 710, Těšín 461, 565, Toužim 382, Trmice 699, Třebušice 568, Třemešná 632, Velichov 756, Velké Hamry 455, Višňová 731, Wanne-Eickel 401.

I consider completely inexcusable the absolute omission of more than two hundred names whose existence in the text is hidden from the reader in the index, e.g. Arnsdorf, Bečov, Bedřichov, Bělá, Bezděkov, Blížejev, Boč, Bohušov, Brantice, Brůx, Břeclav, Březeneč, Budyň, Bukovany, Coburg, Čepisty, Čerkassy, Česká Ves, České Zlatníky, Dalešice, Dalovice, Dasnice, Dělouš, Dobříčany, Dolní Hanychov, Dolní Lipová, Dolní Povelice, Dolní Žďár, Drahek, Dresden, Dübendorf, Duisburg, Eger, Fláje, Foggia, Fojtovice, Frývaldov, Geilsdorf, Gmünd, Habrovany, Háje, Hamburg, Heldburg, Hirschberg v Duryňsku, Hirschberg (Jelenia Góra), Hlavnice, Hněvín, Holešice, Horní Brusnice, Horní Jiřetín, Horní Žďár, Hörsching, Hrabačov, Hranice u Aše, Hrbovice, Hrobce, Huť, Chotěbuz, Chotěvice, Chranišov, Janov

v severozápadních Čechách, Janská, Jestřebí, Jezeří, Jezvé, Jičín, Jindřichovice, Jištěrpy, Karlova Ves, Klíny, Kluček, Kocléř, Kolín, Kostomlaty, Kožle, Krakau, Krbice, Krupka, Křim, Křížatka, Kühnheide, Laa an der Thaya, Lenggries, Lhota, Libčeves, Libínky, Libocký Důl, Li-bochovice, Libotice, Líčkov, Lückendorf, Lubenec, Luhačovice, Lützkendorf, Lužice, Magde-burg, Machnín, Malé Zálezly, Mantov, Maršov, Martiněves, Martinov, Maxičky, Měcholupy, Menhartice, Mestre, Mistrovce, Míšeň, Mittelwalde, Moldava, Moskva, Mradice, Mukov, Německá Brusnice, Německá Metuje, Německé Kralupy, Německý Brod, Neštědice, Neu-burg, Nová Role, Nové Křečany, Novosedlice, Oberpfaffenhofen, Obora, Oelsnitz, Oloví, Opole, Opatov, Ostrov, Paczków, Palačov, Pasov, Pláň, Plavy, Podbořany, Podmokly, Pohoří, Pohradice, Pohrady, Polouvsí, Potočná, Prácheň, Preetz, Předlice, Ratiboř, Regensburg, Rhein-Mein, Rochlice, Rösselwald, Roudníky, Rychnov, Scheffau, Schneidemühl, Skupice, Slatinice, Sloup, Sobkovice, Spořice, Srbská Kamenice, Stan, Stargard, Strážná, Strkovice, Střekov, Sudkov, Suchá, Svádov, Sylvarov, Šenov, Šumburk, Šumná, Šumvald, Telnice, Temný Důl, Těchonín, Terezín, Tišnov, Trnovany, Třeskovice, Ublo, Úlice, Úpořiny, Úštěk, Úvalno, Užín, Václavov, Varvažov, Velehrad, Velenice, Velká Polom, Velká Štáhle, Větrov, Větruše, Víchová, Vikvice, Vilejšov, Víška, Vochlice, Volfartice, Vráclavek, Vranov, Vrskaň, Vršany, Všeboř, Výmar, Vysoká, Vysoké Mýto, Vysoké Třebušice, Wałbrzych, Wi-esau, Zákupy, Zálezly, Zámecká, Zátor, Zeitz, Zwickau, Žabokliky, Želenice, Žireč, Žirovice.

I must emphasize that I started following the names missing in the index during reading only from the second third of the text approximately, and only at random; therefore their list is not complete, and there will be a lot more of them missing, additionally to the 220 ones that I am stating here. I must state that we usually cannot see such a low quality of auxiliary system in professional literature; and it is therefore startling that the University of Ústí allows publishing an index at such level in its scientific edition. It need not be added that it harms also the good name of the author and the high quality of his work. The work does not state who prepared the indexes; but even if the author did it himself, somebody from the editorial office of university studies could verify the result and give the author professional assistance.

The above stated reproaches concern the accompanying editorial system and editorial activity related to the publication of the book rather than the very contents of the work, the quality of which I described and emphasized above in sufficient extent. The author proved in his work that he can search and evaluate properly all sources needed for research and that he is able to critically generalize historical phenomena, to outline and verify hypoth-eses and to find probable development tendencies. In my opinion, his work ranks among high-quality contributions to the Czech historiography of recent years and I can only hope that the author will learn due lessons from the above stated reproaches and that in his next monograph on a similar topic, which I am looking forward to now already, he will find sufficient time and attention to ensure that the editorial processing of the text and of the accompanying system are at equally high level as the work itself.

Mečislav BORÁK