

INTRODUCTION



On the day when the ‘Jewish star’ (Judenstern) decree came into force in the Greater German Reich, Petr Ginz, a thirteen-year-old resident of Prague, wrote in his diary: ‘It’s foggy. The Jews have to wear a badge ... I counted sixty-nine sheriffs on the way to school, and then mummy saw more than a hundred’.¹ So far, historical studies on anti-Jewish policies in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia have viewed the introduction of the ‘Jewish badge’ as the application of a German law and nothing more. In fact, it had a far more interesting and complex background. The impetus for this Reich-wide decree actually came from the capital of the Protectorate in July 1941 rather than Berlin, where Goebbels merely adopted the proposal.

As we will see, however, the German Reich protector (Reichsprotektor) did not come up with this idea on his own. It was in fact proposed in earlier submissions from Czech fascists and had been discussed by the ruling Czech party. The present study thus seeks to answer a number of new questions. What was the relative importance of German and Czech persecution within the Protectorate? What scope and significance did local and regional initiatives have? How autonomous and radical were developments in the Protectorate in comparison with Germany, Austria and occupied Poland? How did discriminatory policies affect the Jewish population? And – especially important – how did the Czech Jews respond to worsening persecution?

As yet, scholars have ignored the significance of anti-Jewish policies in annexed Bohemia and Moravia both to the overall development of such measures in the Greater German Reich and their escalation. This applies not just to the initiatives of the Reich protector and other German agencies but even more to measures implemented by the Czech government, the Czech ministries and Czech organizations. After the Munich Agreement and the acquisition of the Sudeten region, the Nazi state occupied 'rump Czechoslovakia' on 15 March 1939, with Hitler declaring the newly established 'Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia' a semi-autonomous part of the Reich. Of more than 118,000 Jews living in the Bohemian and Moravian part of what had been the Czechoslovak Republic, only around 25,000 managed to flee by October 1941. Once the occupation had begun, the German and Czech authorities quickly stepped up their anti-Jewish activities in the territory. Jews were divested of their property and – a fact rarely acknowledged – had already been partially ghettoized by 1940. Later, when plans for early deportation foundered, Jews were used as forced labour. Finally, from 1941, they were either transported east or to the Theresienstadt Ghetto; in the latter case they were deported on to other destinations. During the Holocaust, around eighty thousand Jews from Bohemia and Moravia lost their lives.²

Surveys of the Third Reich or the Holocaust have often included detailed accounts of anti-Jewish policies in Austria, due to the brute violence and the radical measures implemented during the first few weeks after the 'Anschluß' in 1938, their effects on the Reich government's policies and Austrians' active involvement in the annihilation of Jews.³ Yet the persecution of Jews in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia was absent from the early overviews by Raul Hilberg⁴ and Uwe-Dietrich Adam⁵ as well as the main studies published over the last twenty years, such as the books by Peter Longrich and (Prague-born) Saul Friedländer.⁶ The 2004 book on the historiography of the Holocaust edited by Dan Stone also has virtually nothing to say about this element in the Nazi persecution of Jews. Its thematic chapters, written by international historians, include just two brief mentions of the Protectorate.⁷ While Christian Gerlach's recent book on the annihilation of the Jews makes several brief references to conditions in the Protectorate to comparative ends, David Cesarani's comprehensive posthumous volume dedicates just a few pages to the topic, instead focusing on Poland.⁸

For many historians, the Nazi regime's attack on Poland just five and a half months after the establishment of the Protectorate overshadowed, indeed obliterated the history of persecution in the Czech part of what had been the Czechoslovak Republic. The mass killings

by the SS (Schutzstaffel, literally Protection Squadron) task forces (Einsatzgruppen) immediately after the invasion, the extreme persecution of Jews and, finally, the establishment of the extermination camps in occupied Poland probably made events in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia seem insignificant to understanding the burgeoning genocide of Europe's Jews.⁹ The sheer mass of Jewish victims in Poland seems to have precluded the possibility of comparison.

In contrast to Austria and Poland, which historians generally viewed as virulently antisemitic both before and after the German occupation, Czechoslovakia appeared to be a success story in the treatment of its Jewish minority. The state, which emerged after the collapse of the Habsburg Empire, was considered to be a democracy and, from a comparative European perspective, largely free of antisemitism; if it did arise, it was immediately tackled. Recent research, however, has called this idyllic picture into question, contending that much of the legend propagated by state founder Tomáš Masaryk and embodied in the cult surrounding him was more ideal than reality.¹⁰ And one must not overlook the fact that the short-lived Second Czechoslovak Republic, established in the autumn of 1938, had an authoritarian system of government and – as we will see – implemented antisemitic measures. In 1939, the Czech Protectorate regime absorbed a number of ministers and state president Emil Hácha from the Second Republic. They represented continuity in anti-Jewish policy rather than merely doing what the Germans told them.

These insights require us to revise a number of traditional assumptions that have moulded our understanding of the Holocaust. The persecution of Jews in the Protectorate was not solely directed from Berlin, though central plans emanating from there influenced policies in the Protectorate, on deportations for example. In line with the conclusions reached in a number of publications in the 1990s with respect to Poland and Germany,¹¹ the present study of the Protectorate brings out the significance of regional and local initiatives to the development and radicalization of the persecution of Jews, with non-German institutions coming prominently into play for the first time. Many officials in German and Czech government agencies participated in the design and acceleration of persecution policies, not, as is often assumed, in an attempt to enhance their power in competitive situations, as suggested by the theory of polycracy, but in light of a variety of interests, either in close cooperation with one another or independently.¹² Some of the initiatives in the Protectorate influenced policies in other annexed territories, while others even shaped the decisions made in Berlin. This was partly because of the personnel involved. Many of the key actors in

the persecution of Jews in occupied Europe, including Joseph Bürckel, Adolf Eichmann and Reinhard Heydrich, worked in Prague for lengthy periods.¹³

The present study documents in detail the effects of persecution on the Jewish population in the Protectorate, their impoverishment and diminishing prospects of emigration. It proves that rather than an element in their annihilation, Jewish forced labour was a response to Jews' enforced unemployment. It was a fundamental feature of anti-Jewish persecution in which specific social and economic interests often outweighed ideological goals.¹⁴

This study also demonstrates how the Jewish Communities¹⁵ in the Protectorate and their functionaries, their every move scrutinized by the Security Police (Sicherheitspolizei), actively sought to alleviate the effects of persecution by expanding welfare services, providing emigration aid and facilitating labour deployments, in part by exploiting the diverging interests of different authorities. Previously, when it comes to the Protectorate, Jewish resistance has generally been described as an underground activity involving the dissemination of prohibited literature, the acquisition of forged papers and sabotage,¹⁶ but I instead employ a definition originally formulated by Yehuda Bauer, modified through the addition of 'individual activities'. When I refer to Jewish resistance, I mean every *individual* and collective action taken against the German and Czech authorities' anti-Jewish laws, campaigns and plans.¹⁷ This opens up a new perspective on the actions of Jewish community representatives and the conduct of countless individuals.

Jewish Czechs' diverse acts of resistance as documented in this book place a major question mark over the traditional idea that they passively accepted Nazi persecution. All the topics discussed here with respect to the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia thus modify our overall view of the persecution of Jews during the Second World War in Europe.

So far, historians have discussed the Theresienstadt Ghetto as the only feature of anti-Jewish persecution in the Protectorate of general historical significance, but often only because large numbers of deported German Jews arrived there. From a German perspective, including the discipline of history in the GDR, the Protectorate generally seemed interesting either as an example of Nazi policies of Germanization or of Czech resistance to the Nazi occupation. As in most states occupied by the German Reich, after the Second World War historians tended to focus on the fate of the majority population and their war of resistance rather than the suffering of their Jewish citizens. This is because, both in Western European states and the later communist ones, their countrymen were always partly responsible for persecution, having

cooperated with the Germans, involved themselves in anti-Jewish activities or acquired the property of their Jewish fellow citizens. Evidently, in the immediate postwar period the prosecution of certain perpetrators resulted in often dramatic verdicts, but it was not until the 1990s that indigenous persecution and collaboration received serious attention throughout Europe, including the Czech Republic.¹⁸

Historians, therefore, have been unanimous in assuming that at the time of a given annexation Germany simply extended the anti-Jewish policies then current to the new territories. At an early stage, in fact before the war had ended, in both Europe and the wider world a limited external perspective gave rise to the myth that the Germans had dictated anti-Jewish policies to the Czechs.¹⁹ In Germany, more detailed research on the Protectorate appeared to have been rendered superfluous by Detlef Brandes's important 1969 volume on Nazi rule in the territory and his assessment that the Czechs had refused to draft anti-Jewish laws, prompting the German Reich protector for Bohemia and Moravia to do so.²⁰ Referring to the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, Eva Schmidt-Hartmann asserted in the early 1990s that 'similar and in principle the same regulations' applied as 'in every other country occupied by Germany'.²¹ Variations on this view dominate to this day.²²

Until now, historians have ignored the possibility of autonomous developments in the Protectorate, as well as in other annexed territories, despite the fact that complex demographic constellations, varying economic conditions and the differing political interests of institutions and actors, whether German or local, must have affected the persecution of Jews. As I demonstrate in what follows, detailed analysis of anti-Jewish policies and the agents involved in them renders obsolete the assumption that Berlin or the Nazi Party (NSDAP) were solely responsible for what happened in the annexed territories.²³ Rather than the Nazi persecution of Jews becoming ever more extreme from one annexation to the next in accordance with a preset ideology emanating from Berlin, an array of German and non-German actors responded to specific economic, social, demographic and political constellations in local settings. As a result, specific measures were introduced in the various territories at quite different points in time, and in some cases not at all.²⁴

Before the war was over, some contemporaries already appear to have been aware of this autonomous political development in the Protectorate. This applies to Vojta Beneš and Roderick Ginsburg in their book *10 Million Prisoners*, published in the United States in 1940, and to the volume *Racial State* published by Gerhard Jacoby in 1944, which was concerned with the occupation of the Protectorate

of Bohemia and Moravia and the persecution that occurred there.²⁵ The territory also played an important role in early overviews such as *Hitler's Ten-Year War on the Jews* (1943), Raphael Lemkin's *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe* (1944) and *The Black Book: The Nazi Crime against the Jewish People* (1946).²⁶

The same time period, however, saw the emergence of the myth that the Czech government had merely done what the Reich protector told it to when it came to anti-Jewish policies. Even documented initiatives by the Czech government or local agencies were claimed to have borne a German impress. On this view, while local authorities expedited the segregation of Jews, they had always acted under pressure from the Nazi county commissioners (Landräte).²⁷

The State of the Research

Up to 1990, only a few historians had tackled the period of Nazi rule in the annexed territories, while in Germany they focused exclusively on German occupation policy.²⁸ It was not until the 1980s that studies appeared on anti-Jewish policies in these areas.²⁹ In the GDR, 1988 saw the publication of the first volume in the sourcebook series 'Europa unterm Hakenkreuz' ('Europe under the Swastika'), in which the Protectorate played an important role. The series remained uncompleted at the time of German reunification.³⁰ Work on another series of source materials, 'Die Verfolgung und Ermordung der europäischen Juden durch das nationalsozialistische Deutschland 1933–1945' ('The Persecution and Murder of the European Jews by Nazi Germany, 1933–1945'), which is to include an eventual total of sixteen volumes, began in 2005. A collaborative project involving the German Federal Archive (Bundesarchiv), the Berlin-Munich Institute for Contemporary History (Institut für Zeitgeschichte Berlin-München) and the Chair of Modern and Contemporary History (Lehrstuhl für Neuere und Neueste Geschichte) at the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg im Breisgau, this contains key documents from German and international archives on the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, relating not just to occupation policy but to the experiences of the Jewish population as well.³¹ The latter applies in particular to another sourcebook series recently published by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.³²

In Germany a range of studies have appeared over the last two decades that mention the Protectorate but rarely analyse it specifically. In her 2003 book on the SS Race and Settlement Main Office (Rasse- und Siedlungshauptamt), Isabel Heinemann examined its

'racial' survey in Bohemia and Moravia.³³ Recently Detlef Brandes has provided a detailed study of the Nazi regime's 'Volkstumspolitik' (ethnic policy) in the Protectorate.³⁴ 'Volkstumspolitik' and 'Jewish policy', as elements in Nazi occupation policy in Bohemia and Moravia, have also been explored in the new biographical studies by René Küpper on Karl Hermann Frank, secretary of state under the Reich protector and from 1943 minister of state in the Protectorate, and by Robert Gerwarth on Reinhard Heydrich, who carried out the functions of the Reich protector from late September 1941 until his death in early June 1942.³⁵ In a 1994 essay, meanwhile, Austrian historian Gabriele Anderl described the three central agencies for Jewish emigration of significance to the history of persecution in Vienna, Prague and Berlin.³⁶

Economic developments have been explored in more depth, with a number of texts investigating the theft of Jewish assets in Bohemia and Moravia. Initially these studies were pursued within the framework of comparative overviews or company histories and they were often the result of collaborative efforts by German and Czech scholars. More recently, Czech scholars have produced similar studies within the Czech Republic.³⁷ In addition, over the last few years researchers in a number of countries have analysed the question of national identity and the coexistence of Czechs, Germans and Jews in Bohemia and Moravia, particularly in Prague.³⁸

In the Czechoslovak Republic, meanwhile, early accounts of the policy of persecution were written by authors, such as H.G. Adler, who had themselves been among its victims,³⁹ while systematic research began in the mid 1970s thanks to the efforts of Miroslav Kárný.⁴⁰ Yet a tendency towards suppression long held sway in the field, and this seems not to have been due solely to communist historiography, as it also applies to memoirs and accounts produced beyond the Iron Curtain and (in particular) to the historiography of the Sudeten Germans.⁴¹ Since the early 1990s, the persecution of Jews has received substantially more attention, alongside the previously dominant focus on the fate of non-Jewish Czechs and their resistance to the occupation.⁴² Czech researchers, with Miroslav Kárný once again leading the way, have now published important monographs and collections of documents relating to anti-Jewish measures,⁴³ a field of research that has received new impetus from the Institut Terežinské Iniciativy (the Terežín Initiative Institute) founded in Prague in 1993.⁴⁴ Meanwhile, the Department of Jewish History at the Institute of Contemporary History of the Czech Academy of Sciences has edited, among other things, a volume of source materials and a collection of essays on the situation of Jews in the Protectorate.⁴⁵

The first major non-Czech overview of the history of Jews in the Protectorate was produced by Livia Rothkirchen in Israel in 2005. She analysed numerous reports from Jewish institutions and diplomatic missions but wrote astonishingly little about anti-Jewish policy, the situation of the Jewish population and their everyday lives.⁴⁶ Often, her account fails to clarify when anti-Jewish measures were implemented, when riots occurred and who was responsible for them.⁴⁷ Unfortunately, due to limited source materials, the research presented in Marc Oprach's *Nationalsozialistische Judenpolitik im Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren* (2006) is rather superficial.⁴⁸ So far, we have no studies analysing not just anti-Jewish policy itself but its effects on Jewish institutions and the Jewish population in Prague and the so-called provinces, and there is also a dearth of scholarship on the history of the Jewish Communities in Prague and other cities.⁴⁹

Methodological Approach

Since 2005, the present author has published initial studies emphasizing the development of an independent anti-Jewish policy in the Protectorate as well as ascribing to the Czech government and its subordinate local authorities a substantial role in drafting and implementing this policy, alongside the German occupation authorities.⁵⁰ The existence of such autonomous regional varieties of persecution in occupied Europe, which even influenced the policies pursued by Berlin to some extent, was confirmed by the comparative research on a number of territories annexed by the Nazi state presented in the 2010 volume edited by the present author and Jörg Osterloh, *Das Großdeutsche Reich und die Juden* (published in English in 2015 as *The Greater German Reich and the Jews*).⁵¹

As set out in the introduction to the above volume, the Nazi state established the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia as part of the Reich by edict of the Führer (Führererlass) but granted it autonomy. The Czech Protectorate government was to make 'its own laws in every legal field not directly administered by the Reich', including Jewish policy. At the same time, the (German) Reich protector was directly answerable to Hitler and not subject to the directives of the Reich authorities, allowing him considerable room for manoeuvre. Every German residing in the territory immediately received citizenship of the Reich, while the non-Germans became 'members of the Protectorate' ('Protektoratsangehörige') with fewer rights.⁵² It was not until 1942, when every resident was required to carry an identity card, that the

Protectorate's ambiguous constitutional position ended and it was subsumed fully into the Reich.⁵³

The administration of the annexed territories required a tremendous bureaucratic effort: in the months after the various annexations, relevant laws and decrees filled the *Reich Law Gazette*. While the central offices for the various annexed territories within the Reich Ministry of the Interior, all headed by State Secretary Wilhelm Stuckart, were supposed to guarantee the effective harmonization of laws throughout the Reich, the timing and form of the various anti-Jewish measures differed significantly due to diverse local conditions and interests.⁵⁴

In the 'Old Reich' (Altreich), from 1939, all Jews became compulsory members of the Reich Association of Jews in Germany (Reichsvereinigung der Juden in Deutschland), which – supervised by the Gestapo (Geheime Staatspolizei or Secret State Police) – had to organize Jewish schools, welfare and emigration. In the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, however, beginning in 1940 the Jewish Religious Community (Kultusgemeinde) of Prague was made responsible for all Jewish Communities. Here Prague followed the example of Vienna, though the Jewish population was less concentrated in the Protectorate than in Austria, where most Jews lived in the capital. In some cases, the experiences gained through the annexation of Austria, carried out just a year earlier, led to the modified application of the policies developed there in annexed Bohemia and Moravia. At other times, negative experiences arising from the Austrian case engendered a very different approach in Prague. For example, in order to prevent 'wild' looting as in Austria and ensure that the state received its share of plundered assets, Berlin took charge of the 'Aryanization' of Jewish property in the Protectorate from the outset.⁵⁵

Even more than the experiences of previous annexations or the direct effects of conditions in the Protectorate, it was the initiatives pursued by various institutions that moulded the persecution of Jews in Bohemia and Moravia. As in the 'Old Reich' and Austria, in the Protectorate the interaction between different agencies shaped the development of anti-Jewish policies, though in an occupied territory one might have expected there to be less room for manoeuvre, with central directives dominating. But the radicalization of anti-Jewish policies did not just result from an interplay between measures introduced by local, regional and central institutions.⁵⁶ It occurred within a fraught framework determined by four key factors: the policies of the Reich government in Berlin, the actions of the German Protectorate authorities, the steps taken by the Czech government in Prague and the restrictions imposed

by an array of local and regional authorities, often leading to autonomous developments in the Protectorate.⁵⁷

This is a new research perspective on the persecution of Jews in the Protectorate between 1939 and 1945. As we will see in this book, the Czech authorities and the Czech government, as well as the German Reich protector plus his administration and Eichmann's Central Office for Jewish Emigration (*Zentralstelle für jüdische Auswanderung*), operated by the SS Security Service (*Sicherheitsdienst* or *SD*), enjoyed great room for manoeuvre in formulating anti-Jewish policies on the ground. As in Germany and Austria then, here too we find that it was by no means Berlin alone or the typical institutions of persecution such as the SS and the Gestapo⁵⁸ that dominated anti-Jewish policies or directed their development.

In the Protectorate, the Czech government, the Czech ministries and the Czech municipalities on the one hand, and the Office of the German Reich Protector, the German chief county commissioners (*Oberlandräte*) and mayors along with Eichmann's Central Office for Jewish Emigration, founded in Prague in July 1939, on the other, all participated equally in initiating discrimination against Jews. While the Reich protector and the Security Police focused on expediting the 'Aryanization' of Jewish firms, the Czech Protectorate government, the chief county commissioners and the municipalities pressed ahead with the public segregation of the Jewish population. German and Czech antisemites perpetrated acts of violence on a near-unprecedented scale and put pressure on German and Czech authorities to intensify persecution. A number of initiatives emanating from the Protectorate influenced decision-making within the German Reich, while others had an impact on measures introduced in other occupied territories. The Protectorate, therefore, occupies a hitherto unacknowledged, important place in the radicalization of Nazi anti-Jewish policies.⁵⁹

Chapter 1 foregrounds the situation prior to the German annexation, beginning with the birth pangs of the Czechoslovak Republic after the First World War. It deals with the social, demographic, economic and political conditions in the new state, along with the situation of Jews, Germans and Czechs. It also challenges the traditional assumption of a very low level of antisemitism there in comparison with other European countries, while examining the growing power of the German minority and its attempts to destabilize the country. The chapter concludes by analysing the politics of the Second Republic after the Munich Agreement, particularly the debate on the growing number of Jewish refugees and the anti-Jewish measures initiated by the Czech government months before the occupation.

Chapter 2 provides an account of the German occupation of March 1939, the persecution of Jews during the first few weeks and the first constitutional measures following annexation by Germany. The focus here is on anti-Jewish impulses, which – as noted earlier – did not come solely from Germany. Ethnic Germans and Czechs carried out acts of violence from the outset. The discussion centres on the institutions that initiated the first persecution measures and the fields of society affected. The chapter also examines why, surprisingly, after the occupation the Gestapo initially prohibited the emigration of Jews from the Protectorate, despite the fact that their expulsion was an avowed goal of German policy.

The territory's incorporation into the German Reich and the establishment of key institutions are the focus of chapter 3. Among other things, it discusses the following questions. Which individuals and agencies expedited anti-Jewish policies? How did anti-Jewish measures impact on Jewish communities and how did the latter respond? As we will see, many of these initiatives came from Czech actors, while the Germans focused chiefly on banishing Jews from the economic and financial spheres. Another significant topic dealt with here is the lifting of the ban on Jewish emigration and the belated establishment of Adolf Eichmann's Prague Central Office.

Chapter 4 is concerned with the radically different situation that pertained after the start of the war. For a brief period, central measures emanating from the Reich capital, Berlin, dominated: this chapter explores in detail when and why Hitler and his regime – contrary to the received wisdom – quickly made the strategic decision to deport Jews from the Greater German Reich to the occupied territories, and how Eichmann put these plans into practice through the newly established Reich Security Main Office (Reichssicherheitshauptamt) in Berlin. The chapter discusses how, after Heinrich Himmler suspended deportation in November 1939, the Protectorate authorities rethought persecution, reinstating the option of forced emigration. It also examines the activities of the Jewish Religious Community of Prague with respect to the emigration, welfare and schools of the impoverished Jewish population.

Chapter 5 assesses subsequent central policies and their root causes, such as the extension in the authority of Eichmann's Central Office from Prague to the entire Protectorate in early 1940. It also discusses the transformation of the Jewish Religious Community of Prague into an organization with compulsory membership for all 'racial Jews' (Rassejuden) that was now responsible for all the Jewish Communities in the Protectorate and explores the dissolution of Jewish associations or their incorporation into the new institution. The analysis shows how

this organization actively sought to counter the burgeoning impoverishment of the Jewish population – resulting from forced unemployment and ‘Aryanization’ – by stepping up its provision of welfare services and organizing teams of workers for agricultural and roadbuilding duties. Other topics examined are early, little-known ghettoization measures and the first cases of Jewish resistance.

Chapter 6 investigates growing ghettoization in dozens of small towns in the Protectorate, the incipient concentration of Jews in certain districts of Prague and the Czech government’s new policies of isolation within the public sphere. Both the increasingly dim prospect of forced emigration, which the German authorities nonetheless prioritized because of the now indefinite suspension of deportation, as well as their attempts to step up the centralization of Jewish policy within the Protectorate will be examined. The chapter also shows how, in the autumn of 1940, the Prague Jewish Community centralized its activities and sought to place work details with private businesses in an attempt to reduce a welfare burden spiralling out of control as resettlement and Aryanization plunged Jews ever deeper into poverty.

Chapter 7 explores why, from early 1941 onwards, the German and Czech authorities prioritized centralization and sought to adapt anti-Jewish policies to the model in Germany, for example by making the Jewish Communities responsible for the provision of welfare and terminating retraining (Umschulung) as a means of preparing Jews for emigration. The Central Office came to play a more prominent role in this process, particularly in the concentration and ghettoization of the Jewish population, which it now extended beyond Prague to other major cities. The complex political situation becomes evident in the fact that when the Czech Ministry of Social and Health Administration introduced the German model of compulsory labour deployment for Jews in 1941, it was subsequently managed by the German labour offices in the Protectorate. Many of the steps taken by the Czech government and German authorities now served the purpose of strictly separating Jews from non-Jews.

From the late summer of 1941, plans were hatched to expedite this segregation within the Protectorate by introducing the ‘Yellow Star’ and stepping up the process of ghettoization, as described in Chapter 8, which also discusses the increased use of forced labour, those involved in it and its main characteristics. The account will illuminate Reinhard Heydrich’s assumption of power and his draconian measures, involving hundreds of death sentences and mass arrests. As we will see, these nevertheless failed to quell the opposition and resistance of many Jews, who defended themselves against the countless forms of persecution,

whether by non-compliance, open refusal or flight. More and more Jews embraced such options after the resumption of mass deportations to the east and to the Theresienstadt Ghetto, which was established within the Protectorate partly as a way station on the eastward route.

The penultimate chapter highlights the work of Jewish Community representatives: how they sought to alleviate the well-nigh overwhelming burdens of persecution and how they resisted anti-Jewish measures. At this point, the study demonstrates how Eichmann's Central Office and other authorities forced the Prague Jewish Community and its branch offices to take part in many forms of persecution, whether in organizing forced labour, preparing mass deportations or processing stolen Jewish property. Surprisingly, at this late stage, individual Jews still carried out numerous acts of resistance, whether through flight, fighting restrictions or sabotage.

The final chapter deals with the years 1943 to 1945, demonstrating how the German Protectorate authorities increasingly took charge of Jewish policy, such as forced labour and the residential concentration of Jews in 'mixed marriages'. As we will see, even in the final stages of the war, Jewish resistance to persecution played a role. The chapter concludes with a look at the early postwar period, which saw the trial of perpetrators, an ambivalent attitude on the part of the new Czechoslovak state (already evident during the war), and survivors' efforts to document what had happened.

The present book thus goes beyond previous studies on the persecution of Jews within the Protectorate. Surprising new findings include the fact that before the occupation started the Czechoslovak Republic had independently expelled Jews of Polish origin and that by 1940 Czech towns had already begun to ghettoize Jews in specific streets or abandoned buildings, in much the same way as in occupied Poland.

This study, however, not only analyses the diversity and originality of anti-Jewish policies within the Protectorate, their origin and background, but also compares them with developments in Austria, Germany and Poland. This brings to light some unique characteristics with respect, for example, to forced labour. In the Protectorate, this was introduced in 1941 rather than in 1939 as in Germany and its use then increased substantially until May 1942, despite the mass deportations that greatly reduced the Jewish population from month to month. Against previous assumptions of an anti-Jewish policy laid down in Berlin, the study shows that the Protectorate authorities had room for manoeuvre until well into the war, opening up to both German and Czech officials and citizens a broad field for individual initiatives and thus personal responsibility.

The present study, however, seeks to examine the agency not just of the perpetrators but also of the victims of persecution, namely Jews themselves. In an attempt to write a truly ‘integrated history of the Holocaust’,⁶⁰ this account not only includes the voices of the persecuted, but also explores the direct consequences of persecution for the Czech Jews and documents the responses of Jewish organizations and Jews’ resistance with the aid of new sources.

Sources

After more than a decade of intensive study of Nazi Jewish policies in Germany⁶¹ and Austria,⁶² during a lengthy research stay at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in 2002 I began to examine more closely conditions in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. I sought to determine whether here too municipal politics exercised an influence on the design of anti-Jewish persecution, a question rapidly answered in the affirmative by examination of copies of records from the Prague State Archive. An invitation to speak at a conference in Terezín in 2004 triggered a more intensive engagement with the topic and prompted me to write an article that amounted to a preliminary study.⁶³ My knowledge of the material on the Protectorate that I had found in the archive of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum initially inspired me to write a comparative study on Jewish forced labour in Germany, Austria and Poland. One chapter in the resulting book, published in 2006, outlines for the first time the largely uncharted history of Jewish forced labour in Bohemia and Moravia.⁶⁴ The surprising results of this in-depth comparison of just one component of anti-Jewish policy in the Greater German Reich revealed the need for a comprehensive analysis. This ultimately resulted in a volume, co-edited with Jörg Osterloh, in which invited specialists – aided by a strict set of questions – examined anti-Jewish policies in every annexed territory in a comparable way.⁶⁵

This conscious effort to integrate the Protectorate into the ‘Greater German’ context facilitated a more precise and also more contextualized look at conditions within this annexed territory, giving rise to the key questions I seek to answer in the present book. What consequences for anti-Jewish policies resulted from the mutual dynamics between local, regional and central institutions, between German and Czech officials and authorities, between periphery (Prague) and centre (Berlin)? Which institutions were responsible for which aspects of persecution policy in the Protectorate? Who initiated the radicalization of these measures,

where, when and why? When exactly did shifts in the balance of power occur and why? Was there mutual interaction between policies in the Protectorate and those in Austria or occupied Poland? How did Berlin view persecution policies in the Protectorate, and when did the central government make decisions or intervene? What was the impact of inconsistent power structures on the Jewish population? How did Jews respond when persecution worsened?

Addressing these questions required the comprehensive study of a wide range of sources. The answers to most of them were to be found in the documents, predominantly in German, produced by a wide range of authorities, contemporary newspaper reports published in German or English and survivors' diaries, memoirs and interviews. My limited knowledge of the Czech language prevented me from describing in more detail the interaction between Jews and Czechs or the activities of the low-ranking, mostly Czech administrative personnel.⁶⁶ To a degree, this linguistic lacuna also impeded access to the untranslated results of Czech research. However, the *Theresienstädter Studien und Dokumente*, published in both Czech and German, provided me with a decent grasp of the state of Czech research. In a number of recent cases, I received help with translations.

This shortcoming, however, was more than offset by a source that furnishes us with unforeseen findings about the formation and impact of anti-Jewish policies. In 2010, in the archive of the Yad Vashem Holocaust Memorial in Israel, I discovered the weekly reports of the Prague Jewish Religious Community (which was of course responsible for the Jewish population of Prague until early 1940 and subsequently for Jews throughout the Protectorate). Previously unknown to researchers, these were produced for Eichmann and his Central Office for Jewish Emigration. The weekly reports, which inform the present study seamlessly from the summer of 1939 until late 1942 with the exception of one quarter, have enabled me to analyse for the first time not just the complex and sometimes contradictory anti-Jewish policies in the Protectorate, but above all their effects on the lives of Jews. The present study is also the first to scrutinize monthly, quarterly and annual reports composed by the Prague Jewish Community, correspondence between Jewish Communities outside Prague and the local Gestapo and other authorities, along with materials such as the records of the Jewish Religious Community in Olomouc (Olmütz) concerning summonses from the Gestapo. Other sources originate in a variety of archives: Czech ministerial records mostly in the archive of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (copies of documents from the Státní ústřední archiv [State Central Archive] in

Prague); reports by the chief county commissioners and other documents in the Bundesarchiv Berlin-Lichterfelde; materials produced by Jewish Communities and organizations in the Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People Jerusalem, the Central Zionist Archives Jerusalem, the Leo Baeck Institute Archive in New York, the Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi voennyi arkhiv (Russian State Military Archive or RGVA), Moscow, and the Vojenský historický archiv (Military History Archive) in Prague. The study gained a broader perspective by analysing contemporary English- and German-language newspapers, the reports of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, first-hand accounts in the Wiener Library and twenty-two video interviews with survivors in the USC Shoah Foundation Visual History Archive, Los Angeles. Finally, previously unknown photographs and charts from the Prague Jewish Religious Community's weekly reports also enrich the book.

Notes

1. Entry of 19 September 1941 in Petr Ginz, *The Diary of Petr Ginz 1941–1942*, ed. Chava Pressburger, trans. Elena Lappin (New York, 2007), 28 (translator's note: the English translation has been amended for style).
2. On the figures, see Miroslav Kárný, 'Die tschechischen Opfer der deutschen Okkupation', in Detlev Brandes and Václav Kural (eds), *Der Weg in die Katastrophe: Deutsch-tschechoslowakische Beziehungen 1938–1947* (Essen, 1994), 151–64, here 152–53.
3. The first general accounts of the Nazi persecution of Jews, however, failed to take account of the radicalizing influence of events in Austria and especially Vienna in the spring of 1938. See, for example, Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution: The Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe 1939–1945* (London, 1952); Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (Chicago, 1961); Uwe-Dietrich Adam, *Judenpolitik im Dritten Reich* (Düsseldorf, 1972). In recent accounts, by way of contrast, Austria occupies an important place, examples being Peter Longerich, *Politik der Vernichtung: Eine Gesamtdarstellung der nationalsozialistischen Judenverfolgung* (Munich, 1998) (in English as *Holocaust: The Nazi Persecution and Murder of the Jews* [New York, 2010]); Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews: The Years of Persecution, 1933–1939* (New York, 1997) and *The Years of Extermination: Nazi Germany and the Jews, 1939–1945* (New York, 2007).
4. Although one chapter is entitled 'The Reich Protectorate Area', his standard work includes just a few remarks on the topic. See Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, 106.
5. Adam, *Judenpolitik im Dritten Reich*.
6. Longerich, *Holocaust*; Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*. See also Martin Dean, Constantin Goschler and Philipp Ther, *Robbery and Restitution: The Conflict over Jewish Property in Europe* (New York, 2007).
7. Dan Stone (ed.), *The Historiography of the Holocaust* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, 2004), 327, 428.

8. Christian Gerlach, *The Extermination of the European Jews* (Cambridge, 2016), e.g. 320–23, 343; David Cesarani, *Final Solution: The Fate of the Jews 1933–1949* (London, 2016), 225–28, 425 (536–42, 682–86 on Theresienstadt), 789.
9. On Poland, see esp. Christopher Browning, *The Origins of the Final Solution: The Evolution of Nazi Jewish Policy, September 1939–March 1942* (Lincoln, NE, 2004).
10. Andrea Orzoff, *Battle for the Castle: The Myth of Czechoslovakia in Europe 1914–1948* (New York, 2009), 24, 30, 131.
11. On occupied Poland, for example, see Dieter Pohl, *Nationalsozialistische Judenverfolgung in Ostgalizien 1941–1944* (Munich, 1996); Thomas Sandkühler, *‘Endlösung in Galizien’: Der Judenmord in Ostpolen und die Rettungsinitiativen von Berthold Beitz 1941–1944* (Bonn, 1996). On Germany, see Frank Bajohr, *‘Aryanisation’ in Hamburg: The Economic Exclusion of Jews and the Confiscation of Their Property in Nazi Germany* (New York, 2002) (German original 1997).
12. The polycracy thesis contends that the persecution of Jews intensified due to power struggles between rival institutions. The suggestive idea of a polycratic system comes from Hans Mommsen, *Beamtenum im Dritten Reich: Mit ausgewählten Quellen zur nationalsozialistischen Beamtenpolitik* (Stuttgart, 1966).
13. See Wolf Gruner and Jörg Osterloh, ‘Einleitung’, in Wolf Gruner and Jörg Osterloh (eds), *Das Großdeutsche Reich und die Juden: Nationalsozialistische Verfolgungspolitik in den angegliederten Gebieten* (Frankfurt a. M., 2010), 25–26. Throughout the book the citations refer to the updated and expanded English edition: Wolf Gruner and Jörg Osterloh (eds), *The Greater German Reich and the Jews: Nazi Persecution Policies in the Annexed Territories 1935–1945* (New York, 2015).
14. The idea that forced labour meant extermination from the outset can be found in Daniel J. Goldhagen, *Hitler’s Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York, 1996), 283–92.
15. I capitalize the term Community throughout the book to denote the Jewish religious institution as opposed to the Jewish community in a general sense.
16. See Jiří Kosta, Jaroslava Milotová and Zlatica Zudová-Lešková (eds), *Tschechische und slowakische Juden im Widerstand 1938–45* (Berlin, 2008), 17–90.
17. Wolf Gruner, “‘The Germans Should Expel the Foreigner Hitler’: Open Protest and Other Forms of Jewish Defiance in Nazi Germany”, *Yad Vashem Studies* 39(2) (2011), 13–53, here 18; Wolf Gruner, ‘Verweigerung, Opposition und Protest: Vergessene jüdische Reaktionen auf die NS-Verfolgung in Deutschland’, in Alina Bothe, Monika Schärfl and Stefanie Schüler-Springorum (eds), *Shoah: Ereignis und Erinnerung* (3. Jahrbuch Zentrum Jüdische Studien Berlin-Brandenburg) (Berlin, 2019), 11–30.
18. Gruner and Osterloh, ‘Introduction’, in *The Greater German Reich*, 8–9. On the historiography, see Dieter Pohl, ‘Die Holocaust-Forschung und Goldhagens Thesen’, *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 45 (1997), 1–48, here 3–4; Christoph Dieckmann and Babette Quinkert, ‘Einleitung’, in Christoph Dieckmann and Babette Quinkert (eds), *Kooperation und Verbrechen: Formen der ‘Kollaboration’ im östlichen Europa 1939–1945* (Beiträge zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus, vol. 19) (Göttingen, 2003), 9–21. For a critical discussion of the Czech research, see Stanislav Kokoška, ‘Resistance, Collaboration, Adaptation ... Some Notes on the Research of the Czech Society in the Protectorate’, *Czech Journal of Contemporary History* 1 (2013), 54–76.
19. For examples of this assumption, see Vojenský historický archiv (VHA) Prague, fonds 140, carton 19, no. 2, fol. 306: Report ‘The Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia in light of its daily press’, carbon copy, n.d. (c. spring 1940), 20; Eugen V. Erdely, *Germany’s First European Protectorate: The Fate of the Czechs and Slovaks* (London, 1942), 142–43; Institute of Jewish Affairs (ed.), *Hitler’s Ten-Year War on the Jews* (New York, 1943), 56–57.

20. Brandes refers solely to the decree of 21 June 1939 while failing to cite sources or provide further evidence. Detlef Brandes, *Die Tschechen unter deutschem Protektorat. Part 1: Besatzungspolitik, Kollaboration und Widerstand im Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren bis Heydrichs Tod (1939–1942)*, ed. Vorstand des Collegium Carolinum, Forschungsstelle für die böhmischen Länder (Munich, 1969), 45.
21. Eva Schmidt-Hartmann, ‘Tschechoslowakei’, in Wolfgang Benz (ed.), *Dimension des Völkermords: Die Zahl der jüdischen Opfer des Nationalsozialismus* (Munich, 1991), 353–79, here 359.
22. Kárný writes that certain decrees came from the Reich protector, while other measures implemented by the Czech government bore a clear German thumbprint, but in many cases, he states, it is unclear whether they were issued in response to German pressure or on the initiative of the Czechs. There was, he goes on, a clear tendency on the part of the Germans to monopolize the ‘Jewish question’: Miroslav Kárný, ‘The Genocide of the Czech Jews’, in *Terezín Memorial Book: Jewish Victims of Nazi Deportations from Bohemia and Moravia 1941–1945* (Terezín, 1996), 27–88, here 37. Frommer asserts that the German occupiers rapidly took charge of anti-Jewish measures previously pursued by the Czech government: Benjamin Frommer, *National Cleansing: Retribution against Nazi Collaborators in Postwar Czechoslovakia* (New York, 2005), 17. Küpper investigates only German actors, as if there had been no Czech policies. See René Küpper, *Karl Hermann Frank (1898–1946): Politische Biographie eines sudetendeutschen Nationalsozialisten* (Munich, 2010), 178–89; Cesarani writes that the Germans quickly took control of Jewish policy, introducing a whole package of measures: Cesarani, *Final Solution*, 227.
23. An example being Diemut Majer, ‘Non-Germans’ under the Third Reich: The Nazi Judicial and Administrative System in Germany and Occupied Eastern Europe with Special Regard to Occupied Poland, 1939–1945 (Baltimore, 2003) (German original 1981), 204. Opposing arguments are put forward by Gruner and Osterloh, ‘Conclusion’, in *The Greater German Reich*, 347–49.
24. For an in-depth account, see Gruner and Osterloh, ‘Conclusion’, 344–61.
25. Vojta Beneš and R.A. Ginsburg, *10 Million Prisoners (Protectorate Bohemia and Moravia)* (Chicago, 1940); Gerhard Jacoby, *Racial State: The German Nationalities Policy in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia* (New York, 1944).
26. Institute of Jewish Affairs, *Hitler’s Ten-Year War*; Raphael Lemkin, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress* (reprint of original 1944) (Clark, NJ, 2008); The Jewish Black Book Committee (ed.), *The Black Book: The Nazi Crime against the Jewish People* (New York, 1946). On early efforts at documentation, see Elisabeth Gallas, ‘“Facing a Crisis Unparalleled in History”: Jüdische Reaktionen auf den Holocaust aus New York 1940 bis 1945’, *S.I.M.O.N. Shoah: Intervention. Methods. Documentation* 2 (2014), 5–14, here 6–11.
27. See, for example, Moses Moskowitz, ‘The Jewish Situation in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia’, *Jewish Social Studies* 4(1) (January 1942), 17–44, 19.
28. The main example being Brandes, *Die Tschechen unter deutschem Protektorat. Part 1*.
29. See the updated research overview in Gruner and Osterloh, *The Greater German Reich*, 371–86.
30. See, for example, *Europa unterm Hakenkreuz: Die faschistische Okkupationspolitik in Österreich und der Tschechoslowakei (1938–1945)*, document selection and introduction by Helma Kaden, with the assistance of Ludwig Nestler et al. (Berlin [East], 1988); *Europa unterm Hakenkreuz: Die faschistische Okkupationspolitik in Polen (1939–1945)*, document selection and introduction by Werner Röhr, with the assistance of Elke Heckert et al. (Berlin [East], 1989).

31. Of the volumes published so far, the following have proved particularly relevant to the Protectorate: *Die Verfolgung und Ermordung der europäischen Juden durch das nationalsozialistische Deutschland 1933–1945* [VEJ], vol. 2: *Deutsches Reich, 1938–August 1939*, ed. Susanne Heim (Munich, 2009); VEJ, vol. 3: *Deutsches Reich und Protektorat, September 1939–September 1941*, ed. Andrea Löw (Munich, 2012). An English translation of the whole series is underway, with the first volumes to be published in 2019. An overview of the sourcebook project can be found at: www.editionjudenverfolgung.de.
32. See, for example, Alexandra Garbarini et al. (eds), *Jewish Responses to Persecution: Vol. II 1938–1940* (Lanham, MD, 2011).
33. Isabel Heinemann, ‘Rasse, Siedlung, deutsches Blut’: *Das Rasse- und Siedlungshauptamt der SS und die rassenpolitische Neuordnung Europas* (Göttingen, 2003).
34. Detlef Brandes, ‘Umvolkung, Umsiedlung, rassische Bestandsaufnahme’: *NS-‘Volkstumspolitik’ in den böhmischen Ländern* (Munich, 2012).
35. Küpper, *Karl Hermann Frank*; Robert Gerwarth, *Hitler’s Hangman: The Life of Heydrich* (New Haven, CT, 2011).
36. Gabriele Anderl, ‘Die “Zentralstellen für jüdische Auswanderung” in Wien, Berlin und Prag – ein Vergleich’, *Tel Aviver Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte* 23 (1994), 276–99.
37. See several chapters in Dieter Ziegler (ed.), *Banken und ‘Arisierungen’ in Mitteleuropa während des Nationalsozialismus* (Stuttgart, 2002); also Christoph Kreuzmüller and Jaroslav Kučera, ‘Die Commerzbank und die Vernichtung der jüdischen Gewerbetätigkeit in den böhmischen Ländern und den Niederlanden’, in Ludolf Herbst and Thomas Weihe (eds), *Die Commerzbank und die Juden 1933–1945* (Munich, 2004), 173–222; Harald Wixforth, *Die Expansion der Dresdner Bank in Europa*, with the assistance of Johannes Bär et al. (Munich, 2006), 306–50; Drahomír Jančík, Eduard Kubů and Jirí Šouša, with the assistance of Jiří Novotný, *Arisierungsgewinnler: Die Rolle der deutschen Banken bei der ‘Arisierung’ und Konfiskation jüdischer Vermögen im Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren (1939–1945)* (Wiesbaden, 2011).
38. Kateřina Čapková, *Czechs, Germans, Jews? National Identity and the Jews of Bohemia* (New York, 2012) (in Czech) (Prague, 2005); Ines Koeltzsch, *Geteilte Kulturen: Eine Geschichte der tschechisch-jüdisch-deutschen Beziehungen in Prag (1918–1938)* (Munich, 2012).
39. The first significant text on the Protectorate was H.G. Adler’s monumental 1955 study of the Theresienstadt Ghetto: H.G. Adler, *Theresienstadt 1941–1945: Das Antlitz einer Zwangsgemeinschaft. Geschichte, Soziologie, Psychologie* (Tübingen, 1955) (English translation 2017); H.G. Adler (ed.), *Die verheimlichte Wahrheit: Theresienstädter Dokumente* (Tübingen, 1958).
40. For an overview of Kárný’s oeuvre, see the ‘Auswahlbibliographie der Arbeiten von Miroslav Kárný 1971–2001’ in *Theresienstädter Studien und Dokumente* 2002, 33–44.
41. Eva Hahn, ‘Verdrängung und Verharmlosung: Das Ende der jüdischen Bevölkerungsgruppe in den böhmischen Ländern nach ausgewählten tschechischen und sudetendeutschen Publikationen’, in Brandes and Kural, *Der Weg in die Katastrophe*, 138–45. For a recent, more nuanced account, see Peter Hallama, *Nationale Helden und jüdische Opfer: Tschechische Repräsentationen des Holocaust* (Göttingen, 2015).
42. However, the latter themes continue to receive plenty of attention: Pavel Maršálek, *Protektorát Čechy a Morava: Státoprávní a politické aspekty nacistického okupačního*

- režimu v českých zemích 1939–1945 [The Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia: Constitutional and Political Aspects of the Nazi Occupation Regime in the Bohemian Lands 1939–1945] (Prague, 2002); Jan Boris Uhlř, *Ve stínu říšské orlice: Protektorát Čechy a Morava, odboj a kolaborace* [In the Shadow of the Imperial Eagle: The Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, Resistance and Collaboration] (Prague, 2002). On the historiography, see also Chad Bryant, *Prague in Black: Nazi Rule and Czech Nationalism* (Cambridge, MA, 2007), 6–8; and for a critical take, see Jaroslav Kučera and Volker Zimmermann, ‘Zum tschechischen Forschungsstand über die NS-Besatzungsherrschaft in Böhmen und Mähren: Überlegungen anlässlich des Erscheinens eines Standardwerkes’, *Bohemia* 49(1) (2009), 164–83.
43. Miroslav Kárný, ‘Konečné resení’: *Genocida českých židů v nemecké protektorátní politice*, vol. 1 (Prague, 1991); Kárný, ‘The Genocide of the Czech Jews’; *Osud Židů v protektorátu 1939–1945*, ed. Milena Janišová (Prague, 1991); Helena Petrův, *Právní postavení židů v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava (1939–1941)* (Prague, 2000); Miroslav Kárný and Jaroslava Milotová (eds), *Protektorátní politika Reinharda Heydricha* (Prague, 1991); *Deutsche Politik im ‘Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren’ unter Reinhard Heydrich 1941–1942: Eine Dokumentation*, ed. Miroslav Kárný, Jaroslava Milotová and Margita Kárná (Berlin, 1997); Helena Krejčová, Jana Svobodová and Anna Hyndráková (eds), *Židé v Protektorátu: Hlášení Židovské náboženské obce v roce 1942. Dokumenty* (Prague, 1997).
 44. *Theresienstädter Studien und Dokumente* (TSD) (Prague, 1994–2008; German edition); *Terezínské studie a dokumenty*, (Prague, 1996–2008; Czech edition).
 45. Krejčová et al., *Židé v Protektorátu*; Helena Krejčová and Jana Svobodová, *Postavení a osudy židovského obyvatelstva v Čechách a na Moravě v letech 1939–1945: sborník studií* (Prague, 1998).
 46. Livia Rothkirchen, *The Jews of Bohemia and Moravia: Facing the Holocaust* (Lincoln, 2005).
 47. See, for example, *ibid.*, 100–102.
 48. Marc Oprach, *Nationalsozialistische Judenpolitik im Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren: Entscheidungsabläufe und Radikalisierung* (Hamburg, 2006).
 49. This is a view shared by Magda Veselská, “‘Sie müssen sich als Jude dessen bewusst sein, welche Opfer zu tragen sind ...’: Handlungsspielräume der jüdischen Kultusgemeinden im Protektorat bis zum Ende der großen Deportationen’, in Andrea Löw, Doris Bergen and Anna Hájková (eds), *Alltag im Holocaust: Jüdisches Leben im Großdeutschen Reich 1941–1945* (Munich, 2013), 151–66, here 152.
 50. Wolf Gruner, ‘Protektorát Čechy a Morava a protizidovská politika v letech 1939–1941’, in *Terezínske Studie a Dokumenty 2005* (Prague, 2005), 25–58 (German: ‘Das Protektorat Böhmen/Mähren und die antijüdische Politik 1939–1941: Lokale Initiativen, regionale Maßnahmen und zentrale Entscheidungen im “Großdeutschen Reich”’, in *Theresienstädter Studien und Dokumente 2005*, 27–62); and the chapter ‘Protektorat’, in Gruner and Osterloh, *Das Großdeutsche Reich*, 139–73 (in updated form as ‘Protectorate’, in Osterloh and Gruner, *The Greater German Reich*, 99–135); see also the chapter on Jewish forced labour: ‘The Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia’, in Wolf Gruner, *Jewish Forced Labor under the Nazis: Economic Needs and Racial Aims (1938–1944)* (New York, 2006), 141–76. Recently Benjamin Frommer put forward a similar hypothesis regarding the active involvement of the Czech authorities: Benjamin Frommer, ‘Verfolgung durch die Presse: Wie Prager Bürokraten und die tschechische Polizei halfen, die Juden des Protektorats zu isolieren’, in Löw, Bergen and Hájková, *Alltag im Holocaust*, 137–50, esp. 138, 149–50.
 51. On what follows, see Gruner and Osterloh, ‘Introduction’ and ‘Conclusion’, 1–9, 340–65.

52. Minutes of the meeting of state secretaries on 25 March 1939 and appendix in VEJ/3, doc. no. 240, 574–80, here 579; appendix appears separately in *Europa unterm Hakenkreuz: Österreich und Tschechoslowakei*, doc. no. 36, 110–12. See also Decree concerning the edict issued by the Führer on the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, 22 March 1939, in *Verordnungsblatt des Reichsprotectors in Böhmen und Mähren* 1939/No. 6, 32.
53. Announcement concerning the decree on identity cards, 3 March 1942, in *Reichsgesetzblatt* (RGBl.) 1942 I, 100.
54. Gruner and Osterloh, 'Introduction', 348.
55. For more detail on this, see the contributions in Gruner and Osterloh, *The Greater German Reich*.
56. Wolf Gruner, 'Die NS-Judenverfolgung und die Kommunen: Zur wechselseitigen Dynamisierung von zentraler und lokaler Politik 1933–1941', *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 48(1) (2000), 75–126; Wolf Gruner, *Öffentliche Wohlfahrt und Judenverfolgung: Wechselwirkungen lokaler und zentraler Politik im NS-Staat (1933–1942)* (Munich, 2002); Wolf Gruner, *Zwangsarbeit und Verfolgung: Österreichische Juden im NS-Staat 1938–1945* (Innsbruck, 2000); Wolf Gruner, 'Local Initiatives, Central Coordination: German Municipal Administration and the Holocaust', in Gerald D. Feldman and Wolfgang Seibel (eds), *Networks of Nazi Persecution: Bureaucracy, Business, and the Organization of the Holocaust* (New York, 2005), 269–94.
57. For some initial thoughts on this, see Gruner, 'Das Protektorat Böhmen/Mähren und die antijüdische Politik', 27–62.
58. This common misconception appeared most recently in Gerwarth, who assumes that Eichmann led Jewish policy as Heydrich's expert: Gerwarth, *Hitler's Hangman*, 220.
59. On the broader context of these developments, see Gruner and Osterloh, *The Greater German Reich*.
60. See his statement in Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, 2.
61. Wolf Gruner, *Der Geschlossene Arbeitseinsatz deutscher Juden: Zwangsarbeit als Element der Verfolgung 1938–1943* (Berlin, 1997); Gruner, *Öffentliche Wohlfahrt*.
62. Gruner, *Zwangsarbeit und Verfolgung*.
63. See Gruner, 'Protektorát Čechy a Morava', 25–58 (German: 'Das Protektorat Böhmen/Mähren und die antijüdische Politik', 27–62).
64. See chapter 5 in Gruner, *Jewish Forced Labor under the Nazis*.
65. Gruner and Osterloh, *The Greater German Reich*.
66. For an in-depth look at this level of persecution, see the forthcoming work by Benjamin Frommer, *The Ghetto without Walls: The Identification, Isolation, and Elimination of Bohemian and Moravian Jewry, 1938–1945*.