

CHARLES UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES



BACHELOR THESIS
Liberal Arts and Humanities

**Everyday Life and Rationed War Economy in Slaný
during the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia (1939-
1945): Administration and Everyday Life of the Local
Population**

Marie Ryjáčková

Supervisor: Dr. phil. Jan Vondráček, M.A.
Prague 2023

DECLARATION

I declare that I have written this thesis myself and on my own. I have duly referenced and quoted all the sources and literature that I used in it. I have not yet submitted this work to obtain another degree. I will sign this declaration and consent by handwritten signature.

In Prague, Czech Republic, 23 June, 2023

Signature:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. phil Jan Vondráček for his patience, support, and feedback. It truly would not be possible without his knowledge in my field of research.

I would like to extend my gratitude to Mgr. Robert Novoný from Státní Okresní Archiv Kladno. His knowledge of archival sources led me through yet unpublished material from Slaný.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family for their undying support, my friends for their help during my studies. My boyfriend Owen Downey for his love and constant support, and his parents for their final feedback and comments.

ABSTRACT

With the creation of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, many aspects of everyday life changed. This thesis will explore two sides of the implementation of the rationed economy in the political district of Slaný. First, the everyday practices of the local administration will be explored. Second, black market practices of the local population will be analysed by exploring five cases from 1942. These will provide an example of everyday life, how the local population dealt with the new rationed economy, and how an offence of the rationed economy was punished. Past research already explored the topic of everyday life; however, it has not been explored on the regional level. During the research, unpublished archival sources were analysed. The results showed that the stability of the system was based on the incentives and hard work of mainly Czech office clerks. This thesis is a further exploration of the everyday lives of local populations and will provide examples of everyday life in the political district of Slaný.

KEYWORDS

Local history, Everyday Life, Rationed Economy, Administration, Black Market, Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	6
1.1	Research question	9
1.2	Current state of research	9
1.3	Archival sources	10
1.4	Methodology	11
1.5	Structure.....	12
2.	Historical context.....	15
2.1	Main events from the town of Slaný.....	18
3.	Administration system	23
4.	Offences against the nutritional regulations	28
4.1	Unregistered domestic slaughter of a pig.....	28
4.2	Overpricing and under-the-counter trade of flour.....	34
5.	Offences against the supply regulations	40
5.1	Unregistered use of charcoal.....	40
5.2	Other offences of the supply regulations	42
6.	Offences against the pricing regulations.....	44
6.1	An unregistered stock of shoes	44
6.2	Overpricing and chain trade with bakery baskets	47
7.	Conclusion	52
7.1	Results.....	52
7.2	Questions for future research	54
	Bibliography	55
	Appendix.....	62

1. Introduction

The crossing of the Czech and Moravian borders by German military units on March 15, 1939, signified major changes for the general population. Only a day after, the land was now occupied and understood to be a part of the German Reich as the new Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia.¹ This major event changed the daily life of the local population and political administration.² The newly introduced rationed economy began limiting trade. This created the population's incentive to deal on the black market.³ To efficiently establish and control the rationed economy, Czech office clerks created a new administration system.

Research over the last ten years has shown that the analysis on the local level was crucial in understanding how society under occupation changes.⁴ That is why, in this thesis, the everyday lives of the local population in Slany will be explored with a focus on the black market in particular.

¹ Government decree no. 75/1939 col. *Výnos Vůdce a říšského kancléře ze dne 16. března 1939 o Protektorátu Čechy a Morava* [Decree of the Führer and the Reich Chancellor of 16 March 1939 on the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia].

² More in Bryant, Chad, "Making the Czech German: Nationality and Naz rule in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, 1939-1945" (PhD dissertation, University of California, 2002); Moskowitz, Moses. "Three Years of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia." *Political Science Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (1942): 353-375. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2144345>; Vajskebr, Jan, and Radka Šustrová "Německá bezpečnostní opatření v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava na začátku války." In *Paměť a dějiny* 3(2009): 90-107; Wixforth, Harald. "The Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia under German Control, 1939-1944." In *Economies under Occupation: The hegemony of Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan in World War II*, edited by Marcel Boldorf and Tetsuji Okazaki, 161-177. London: Routledge, 2015.

³ Boulding, K.E. "A Note on the Theory of the Black Market." *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 13, no. 1 (1947): 115-118. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/137604?origin=JSTOR-pdf>.

⁴ More in: Bryant, Chad. *Prague in Black: Nazi Rule and Czech Nationalism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007; Ševcová, Dana. *Sociální politika nacistů v takzvaném protektorátu v letech 1939-1945. Dějiny socialistického Československa* 7 (1985): 167-208; Šustrová, Radka. "'It Will Not Work without a Social Policy!' Research on Social Policy Practice on the Territory of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia." *Czech Journal of Contemporary History* 2, no. 1 (2014): 31-56. <https://doi.org/10.51134/sod.2013.003>; Vondráček, Jan, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945* (Praha: Academia, 2021); Vondráček, Jan. "War Economy, Local Administration and Everyday Life under German Occupation in Bohemia and Moravia: New Approaches for Digital Humanities through Digitization, Databases and Digital Analysis." *Journal of East Central European Studies* 70, no. 3 (2021): 439-465. <https://doi.org/10.25627/202170311019>;

Generally, a war economy is understood as a state in which “the public obligation is to do what is necessary.”⁵ It can be understood as a focus on supporting the military effort and protecting and defending the home territory. It is also important to maintain the morale and physical and mental well-being of the people. The rationing system was implemented to prevent the situation from the First World War when people bought foodstuffs and other products in panic and fear of hunger.⁶ Shortly after the Occupation, a new protectorate government was created. It was under the occupational government leaving it little power in enforcing new laws and legislations. The Protectorate lands were chosen to become a source of labour, land, and capital.⁷ During the War, the Protectorate lands and workforce were incredibly significant for the German military effort⁸, especially at the beginning and at the end of the War.⁹

In the Fall of 1939, only half-year after the occupation began, the new rationing system was introduced, and during the years of the Occupation, an increasing number of foodstuff and other products were separated into categories for which people received a number of food vouchers. The newly established Supreme Price Office¹⁰ created consumer categories based on gender, age, occupation, and many other distinct factors.¹¹ In addition, to the creation of ration stamps, the prices of foodstuffs and products were set by the NÚC. These were fixed. Shop and restaurant owners were not able to change them – if they did,

⁵ Galbraith, James K. “The Meaning of a War Economy.” *Challenge* 44, no. 6 (2001): 5. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40722105>.

⁶ Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, 13; More in: Tönsmeier, Tanja, Peter Haslinger and Agnes Laba. *Coping with Hunger and Shortage under German Occupation in World War II*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

⁷ More about the lives of labourers in Kučera, Rudolf. *Život na přiděl. Válečná každodennost a politiky dělnické třídy v českých zemích 1914-1918*. Praha: NLN, 2013.

⁸ More in Mainuš, František. “V protektorátě po 15. březnu 1939.” *Totální nasazení: Češi na pracích v Německu 1939-1945*. Brno: Universita J.E. Purkyně, 1970.

⁹ Vondráček, “War Economy, Local Administration and Everyday Life under German Occupation in Bohemia and Moravia: New Approaches for Digital Humanities through Digitization, Databases and Digital Analysis,” 440.

¹⁰ Nejvyšší úřad cenový (NÚC).

¹¹ Further explanation and examples in Štěpek, Jiří. *Přídělové doklady z období tzv. Protektorátu*. Praha: Odbor archivní správy a spisové služby MV ČR, 2010.

they faced many difficulties such as a fine or jail – depending on the seriousness of the offence.¹² The implementation of the rationing system¹³ was primarily a bureaucratic process that was, on one hand, set by the government decrees and its control, while on the other hand, relying on the already existing system of the regional administration.¹⁴ The existing research showed that these office clerks were usually Czechs. The implementation and the stability of the economy were based on the initiatives of these office clerks.¹⁵ This topic will be discussed in a chapter exploring the administrative system and their process of recording offences of the war economy.

Past research describes the black market as an unregulated trade, where products were sold for a higher price or were exchanged for other products or ration vouchers. During the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, these laws were the decrees released by the Protectorate government which introduced changes and various ration stamps.¹⁶ However, even when people had the proper ration stamps, there was no guarantee they would obtain certain goods because shortages were ever-present.¹⁷ Past research showed that black market practices were more common among neighbours and co-workers than among people of no mutual connection,¹⁸ as there was a mutual understanding and, therefore, a lesser chance of being denounced. Desired items could be obtained either by

¹² Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, 52-56.

¹³ More in Král, Václav. *Otázky hospodářského a sociálního vývoje v českých zemích v letech 1938-1945*. Praha: ČSAV, 1959; Štolleová, Barbora. *Pod kuratelou Německé říše: Zemědělství Protektorátu Čechy a Morava*. Praha: Charles University, 2015; Šustrová, Radka. “A Dilemma of Change and Co-Operation: Labour and Social Policy in Bohemia and Moravia in the 1930s and 1940s.” In *Nazism Across Borders: The Social Policies of the Third Reich and their Global Appeal*, edited by Sandrine Kott and Kiran K. Patel, 105-140. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

¹⁴ Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, 16-17.

¹⁵ Explored in Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*.

¹⁶ Štěpek, Jiří. *Přídělové doklady z období tzv. Protektorátu*, Odbor archivní správy a spisové služby MV ČR, 2010.

¹⁷ More in Musilová, Dana. “Zásobování a výživa českého obyvatelstva v podmínkách válečného řízeného hospodářství (1939-1945).” In *Slezský sborník 4* (1991): 255-266.

¹⁸ Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, 214.

paying a much higher price, by the exchange for ration stamps the seller desired, or by the exchange of goods. It was a free market controlled purely by what people needed and what risks they were willing to undertake.¹⁹

1.1 Research question

The goal of this thesis is to answer the question of how the local population of the political district of Slaný dealt with the changes implemented by the rationed war economy, and how the administration of the local economy, black market in particular, functioned. This thesis will present five cases from 1942 in which the nutritional, pricing, and supply regulations were violated.

1.2 Current state of research

In the last ten years, a couple of studies have been published on everyday life in the Second World War in general²⁰ and in the Protectorate specifically.²¹ These published works contain the topics of the war economy,²² black market,²³ rationed economy,²⁴ and

¹⁹ Taylor, Lynne. "The Black Market in Occupied Northern France, 1940-4." *Contemporary European History* 6, no. 2 (1997): 153, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20081623>; Galbraith, "The Meaning of a War Economy." 5-12; Klemann, Hein, and Kudryashov. *Occupied Economies: An Economic History of Nazi-Occupied Europe, 1939-1945*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2013.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Vondráček, Jan. *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, Academia, 2021; Vondráček, "War Economy, Local Administration and Everyday Life under German Occupation in Bohemia and Moravia: New Approaches for Digital Humanities through Digitization, Databases and Digital Analysis," 439-465.

²² More in Galbraith, James K. "The Meaning of a War Economy." *Challenge* 44, no. 6 (2001): 5-12. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40722105>.

²³ Boulding, "A Note on the Theory of the Black Market." *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 115-118.

²⁴ More in: Novotný, Jiří. *Státní finanční hospodaření v období protektorátu v letech 1939–1945*. Praha: Národohospodářský ústav Josefa Hlávky, 2006.; Tauchen, Jaromír. "Vývoj Obchodního Práva v Období Protektorátu Čechy a Morava (1939–1945)." In *Vývoj Soukromého Práva Na Území Českých Zemí*, 704-719. Brno: Masarykova Univerzita, 2012.; Vondráček, Jan. *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, Academia, 2021; Vondráček, "War Economy, Local Administration and Everyday Life under German Occupation in Bohemia and Moravia: New Approaches for Digital Humanities through Digitization, Databases and Digital Analysis," 439-465.

social policies²⁵ in the context of the Protectorate and other occupied nations. Further unpublished works consist of defended thesis and dissertations exploring the topics of the war economy,²⁶ the history of the Protectorate concerning law and public authorities,²⁷ and the reactions of society.²⁸

Since everyday life is a broad field of research and has been already studied, this research will focus mainly on the everyday economy of the local population of Slaný, black market in particular. The field of local everyday life on a regional level has yet to be explored. This topic, previously explored by Vondracek in his work about the political district of Kladno, will be further explored in the political district Slaný.

1.3 Archival sources

The main research consisted of archival material from the municipal office Slaný. This was comprised of Elench XII,²⁹ a criminal record in 1942,³⁰ cartons of uncategorised cases and filing cabinets.³¹ Furthermore, the chronicle of Slaný from 1952³² was used to

²⁵ More in: Bryant, *Prague in Black: Nazi Rule and Czech Nationalism*. Cambridge, 2007; Ševcová, “Sociální politika nacistů v takzvaném protektorátu v letech 1939-1945,” 167-208; Šustrová, “‘It Will Not Work without a Social Policy!’ Research on Social Policy Practice on the Territory of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia.” 31-56; Šustrová, Radka. *War Employment and Social Policies in the Protectorate Bohemia and Moravia 1939-1945*. Prague: Charles University, 2018; Šustrová, Radka. *Zastřené počátky sociálního státu: Nacionalismus a sociální politika v protektorátu Čechy a Morava*. Praha: Argo, 2020.

²⁶ More in: Aujezdský, Jiří. “Válečné řízené hospodářství v protektorátu Čechy a Morava” (Bachelor’s thesis, Technická univerzita Ostrava, 2012).; Ludlová, Nikola. “Scientific Management of Labour and Production in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, 1939-1945” (Master’s thesis, Central European University, 2016).

²⁷ More in: Hružová, Klára. “Protektorát Čechy a Morava” (Bachelor’s thesis, Masarykova universita, 2010).

²⁸ More in: Fránek, Adam. “Vznik Protektorátu Čechy a Morava a reakce společnosti” (Bachelor’s thesis, CEVRO Institut, 2015).

²⁹ Elench is a filing aid recording, according to the identification data of a person or according to subject passwords, in alphabetical order or in an arrangement according to storage, the files of a particular filing department or the entire filing cabinet, possibly with further internal division; number XII indicates that it contains records of offences against rationed economy.

³⁰ Trestní rejstřík; this source contained the offences against rationed economy in 1942.

³¹ These were established later to organise people’s offence and keep track of them.

³² The chronicle was re-written in 1952, the true year of origin is unknown as it is not clear whether the contents were written during the Protectorate year, or were embellished later.

provide contextual events in the broader history of the Protectorate. In the end, from the cartons of cases, five were chosen to be presented in this thesis.³³

1.4 Methodology

Research has shown that administration³⁴ on the local level played a significant role in the implementation of the rationed and war economy. It was the regional offices' obligation to control if the population follows new legislation and record it. The local administrative system was compared to the system from the political region of Kladno, and it was concluded that, although the main elements were common, each office created its unique system.

The concept of *history of everyday life*³⁵ as a form of social history was strongly influenced by Alf Lüdke which he developed in several studies.³⁶ With the political shift in Germany in the 1990s, the focus of researchers has shifted to historical *everyday life*. However, the question of what *everyday life* is arose. A precise definition of everyday life is not simple, as *everyday life* is borderless³⁷ and it deals with the question of how people lived and how they experienced history.³⁸ The *history of everyday life* can be compared to *history from below*,³⁹ however, there is no emphasis on common people or marginalised

³³ Presenting more cases would prove a challenge and it would exceed the limits of a bachelor's thesis.

³⁴ More about the administration of the Occupational powers in Šisler, Stanislav. "Příspěvek ve vývoji a organizaci okupační správy v českých zemích v letech 1939-1945." *Sborník archivních prací* 13 (1963): 46-95.

³⁵ German: Alltagsgeschichte.

³⁶ Lüdtker, Alf. *The History of Everyday Life*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989; Lüdke, "Alltagsgeschichte – ein Bericht von unterwegs." 278; Lüdke, Alf. "Alltagsgeschichte – ein Bericht von unterwegs." *Historische Anthropologie* 11, no. 2 (2003): 278. <https://doi.org/10.7788/ha.2003.11.2.278>.

³⁷ For example: work, nutrition, clothing, school etc.

³⁸ More in Lüdtker, Alf. *The History of Everyday Life*.

³⁹ The phrase "history seen from below and not from above" was first used by Lucien Febvre in 1932. More on the topic of everyday life in Gebhart, Jan and Jan Kulík. *Dramatické všední dny Protektorátu*. Praha: Themis, 1996; Hubble, Nick. *Mass-Observation and Everyday Life: Culture, History, Theory*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.

groups. Everyday life history focuses on the lives and interactions of individuals and their experiences in understanding and dealing with a new situation.⁴⁰

The topic of *everyday life* is intricately connected to political administration, as changes affected everyone. The concept of *Herrschaft*⁴¹ was introduced by Max Weber in his work *Die drei reinen Typen der legitimen Herrschaft*. Weber divides authority into three basic types: traditional, charismatic, and rationally legal, which differ in their structure by the types of relationships between the master, the power apparatus and the controlled. Rational legal *authority* in conjunction with everyday life means administration.⁴² These administrative measures were the main support system for the *authority*.

It is important to define what kind of political authority will be used. For the purpose of this thesis, the understanding of administration by Thomas Ellwein *lernende Verwaltung*⁴³ will be used. His idea is based on the fact that the administration structure does not begin with a single command, however, it is built from the actions of office clerks. This complex process includes the relationship between the local population and office clerks.

1.5 Structure

In the first chapter, a historical background⁴⁴ comprised of the Occupation in 1939 and the beginnings of the Protectorate, the years between occupation and liberation, and

⁴⁰ Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, p. 19.

⁴¹ Approximate translation: authority.

⁴² Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, p. 16.

⁴³ Živá správa [learned administration]. Ellwein, Thomas. *Der Staat als Zufall und als Notwendigkeit: Die jüngere Verwaltungsentwicklung in Deutschland am Beispiel Ostwestfalen-Lippe*. Opladen: Springer, 1993.

⁴⁴ More about the history of the Protectorate in Hédlová, Luba and Radka Šustrová. *Česká pamět: Národ, dějiny a místa paměti*. Praha: Academia, 2015; McDonald, C. and Jan Kaplan. *Praha ve stínu*

finally, the liberation in 1945 will be provided. This chapter will provide sufficient historical background to the examination of the Protectorate's new war economy and black market practices of the local population. It will be completed by the addition of major events from Slaný during the Protectorate.

To understand the frame in which everyday life economy took place, it is important to get an overview of the administration and the rationing system in the political district Slaný. Here it will be explained how the system worked and how the officers were able to control and document offences.

The main three chapters will focus on the offences and practices of the local population in coping⁴⁵ with the newly established rationed economy in the political district Slaný. These will be divided into three subchapters with diverse types of offences. Each offence will follow a similar structure of first introducing the person and the general problem, then the initial protocol will be explored, names of the officers will be mentioned, and following this, further statements or appeals from the offenders will be presented along with the responses of the officials. Finally, it will be mentioned whether they paid a fine or were imprisoned, followed by a short conclusion of the offence.

First, offences against nutritional regulations. From the 554 recorded cases in 1942, two will be presented. Their significance is based on the importance of pork and flour. The case of Alois Adlta and the unregistered domestic slaughter of a pig will explore how this particular case happened, marking the importance of pork⁴⁶ for the population. Similar

hákového kříže: pravda o německé okupaci 1939-1945. Praha: Melantrich, 1995; Schelle, Karel, et al. *Protektorát Čechy a Morava: Jedna z nejtragičtějších kapitol českých novodobých dějin.* Ostrava: KEY Publishing s.r.o., 2010.

⁴⁵ More about adaptation, collaboration and also resistance in Kokoška, Stanislav. "Resistance, Collaboration, Adaptation... (Some Notes on Research of the Czech Society in the Protectorate)." *Czech Journal of Contemporary History* 1, no. 1 (2013): 54-76.

⁴⁶ Ration stamps for pork were introduced on September 29, 1939, in government decree no. 211/1939 col. as opposed to poultry on January 13, 1940m in government decree no. 20/1940 col.

significance carries the case of Antonín Král who sold over-priced flour under-the-counter. Flour was one of the main ingredients and its trade was very regulated.⁴⁷

Second, offences against the supply regulations. Only one case, out of the 113 recorded, was complete. This was the case with Terezie Štauchová whose company had been delivered a significant amount of charcoal. This fuel source was regulated and because of its wrong use without the appropriate documents, the company was investigated.

Finally, offences against the pricing regulation will be analysed, from the 345 records two will be explored. These were chosen for their curiousness. As accumulating a larger stock of items was against the government decree no. 121/1939 col., unregistered shoes found in Bedřich Strnadel's attic were confiscated, and he received a fine. This case showcased that excessive complaints were not dealt with lightly. The final case of Vladmír Loula and the initial accusation of over-pricing bakery baskets was chosen because of Loula's appeal which led to him being accused of chain-trade and receiving an additional fine.

⁴⁷ Government decree no. 213/1939 col. from September 29, 1939.

2. Historical context

With the signing of the Munich Agreement on September 30, 1938, the Czechoslovakian border area⁴⁸ was no longer a part of Czechoslovakia. However, as this was not enough for Adolf Hitler, his army moved to Prague on March 15, 1939. Just the next day, March 16, 1939, the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia were proclaimed.⁴⁹ The decree in which Hitler annexed Bohemia and Moravia was comprised of thirteen articles. The preamble justifies Hitler's intervention as "the necessity to establish "peace and order" in the territory torn by national struggles."⁵⁰ In article one, the rest of Bohemia and Moravia, as the border lands were already a part of the German Reich, was declared a part of the 'Greater German Reich.' Article Two defines the difference of nationality between the members of the Protectorate and German citizens who were subjected to German jurisdiction as opposed to Protectorate jurisdiction. Articles four and five are about the rights and obligations of the Protector:

The Führer and the Reich Chancellor appoint the Reich Protector in Bohemia and Moravia as protector of the Reich's interests. The seat of his office is Prague. The Reich Protector, as representative of the Führer and Reich Chancellor and as an agent of the Reich Government, is responsible for ensuring that the political directives of the Führer and Reich Chancellor are observed.⁵¹

The level of Czech autonomy could be modified at any point, as in this decree's articles it was formulated rather nondeterminately.⁵² However, upon closer examination, the Czech authority was limited by the unrestricted authority of the Reich Protector.⁵³ And since

⁴⁸ Sudety or Sudetenland.

⁴⁹ Brandes, Detlef. *Češi pod německým protektorátem: Okupační politika, kolaborace a odboj 1939-1945* (Praha: Prostor, 2019), 36.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 37; Original: "nezbytností nastolit na území zmítaném národnostními boji 'klid a pořádek.'"

⁵¹ Ibid.; Original: Vůdce a říšský kancléř jmenuje říšského protektora v Čechách a na Moravě coby ochránce říšských zájmů. Sídlem jeho úřadu je Praha. Říšský protektor jakožto zástupce Vůdce a říšského kancléře a jako pověřenec říšské vlády má za úkol dbát toho, aby byly dodržovány politické směrnice Vůdce a říšského kancléře.

⁵² Ibid., 38.

⁵³ Moskowitz, "Three Years of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia," 355.

September 1st, 1939, all new laws, ordinances, and regulations proposed by the Protectorate government, must be submitted to the Reich Protector for approval.⁵⁴

With the Occupation the German powers gained valuable economic resources such as work force, industrial buildings, and many others, which were not destroyed by the ongoing war⁵⁵ and were safe from Allied bombing. Furthermore, they gained a functioning agricultural system, and more importantly, the Czech arms industry⁵⁶ along with the now dissolute Czech army's weapons.⁵⁷ This catastrophic situation for the Protectorate was marked by the adjustments of the economy to the German Reich's needs, slowly transforming it into a war economy.⁵⁸ In the first days after the Occupation, the Reichsbank was interested in Czech gold kept in foreign banks, and a year later the gold reserves of the National bank in Prague were transferred to the Reichsbank to be kept safe under the Reichsbank.⁵⁹

After the Autumn of 1941, the situation shifted. Czech people were stunned by the choice of appointing Reinhard Heydrich.⁶⁰ However, German citizens were not opposed to this change: "From the ranks of the Protectorate Germans, without exception, there was the hope that the Czechs would now finally be dealt with using the harshest possible methods...."⁶¹ One of the reasons for this change was undeniably the resistance efforts. Heydrich planned to intimidate Czech people by sentencing offenders to harsher

⁵⁴ Moskowitz, "Three Years of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia," 357.

⁵⁵ Průcha, Václav. *Československé hospodářství za nacistické okupace* (Praha: Dějiny a současnost, 1966), 33-36.

⁵⁶ Brandes, *Češi pod německým protektorátem: Okupační politika, kolaborace a odboj 1939-1945*, 487.

⁵⁷ Novotný, *Státní finanční hospodaření v období protektorátu v letech 1939-1945*, 12-25.

⁵⁸ Brandes, *Češi pod německým protektorátem: Okupační politika, kolaborace a odboj 1939-1945*, 473.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 474; further in: Novotný, *Státní finanční hospodaření v období protektorátu v letech 1939-1945*.

⁶⁰ Brandes, *Češi pod německým protektorátem: Okupační politika, kolaborace a odboj 1939-1945*, 321.

⁶¹ Ibid., 321-322; Original: "Z řad kmenových Němců se bez výjimky ozývala naděje, že vůči Čechům se teď bude konečně postupovat s použitím co nejtvrďších metod..."

punishments.⁶² During the state of emergency between September 27 and November 29, 1941, according to public notices, 404 people were shot, 40% of which were sentenced to be shot because of their participation on the black market.⁶³

When in May the assassination attempt, code-named Operation Anthropoid, was carried out, another wave of terror⁶⁴ began. Mass executions of whole families that were in contact with the assassins, and people who were accused of supporting this attempt.⁶⁵ When on July 4 Heydrich's death was announced, the Czech people could only image the terror that would follow by the order of Heydrich's successor Kurt Daluge. The most horrifying one was the absolute destruction of villages Lidice a Ležáky. The men were killed, the women were sent to concentration camps and the children had various fates in German families where they were re-educated.⁶⁶ Other measures were also undertaken. In total 3188 Czech were imprisoned, out of which 1357 were sentenced to die. They were people of various classes, the only thing connecting them was being in some way connected to the assassination attempt – false accusation, unauthorised gun ownership or support of the assassination.⁶⁷

In 1943, when the war effort accelerated, new German minister Karl Hermann Frank prohibited all non-war-related industry. In 1944 all theatres and circuses were closed, and many newspapers, books and magazine production had to be stopped, all due to the industry transformation to a total war economy.⁶⁸ Still, the situation was different from what people, in this instance, in Poland we accustomed to:

⁶² Brandes, *Češi pod německým protektorátem: Okupační politika, kolaborace a odboj 1939-1945*, 331.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ More in Kyncl, Vojtěch. *Bez výčitek. Genocida Čechů po atentátu na Reinharda Heydricha*. Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR, 2012.

⁶⁵ ⁶⁵ Brandes, *Češi pod německým protektorátem: Okupační politika, kolaborace a odboj 1939-1945*, 406.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 411.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 417.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 431.

The Czechs live in conditions that are so different from ours that they might seem unreal to us, but they are true. This is explained by the fact that the Czechs have not gone through a military catastrophe and have gained their independence peacefully. Living conditions are beyond any doubt difficult and full of sacrifice, yet far removed from the horrors in which we live. The Czechs have not experienced first-hand collective responsibility, arrests, executions and being sent to concentration camps. The Czechs have been left with some semblance of national life, as far as the quantity of newspaper production is still unlimited. The Czech reads his favourite newspapers as he did before the war, but they are as glitch-strewn as all the German press in the Reich. Every Czech has a radio and listens to the Czech radio programme, which broadcasts Czech music, Czech programmes and ... propaganda. But despite this propaganda, they listen to Czech news from London.⁶⁹

As the War was nearing its end and the German Reich was losing territory the requirements and demands were increasing, marking almost total control of the industry. This, along with the ever-increasing political terror against the population, led to the uprising in the Fall of 1944 in Slovakia and also in Prague in the Spring of 1945.⁷⁰ These revolutionary efforts were fought against because, after all, the main purpose of the Protectorate was economic support, for which peace was needed. As the end of the war neared, people gained hope and the resistance group's actions became more prominent. And finally, the war in Europe ended on May 9, 1945.

2.1 Main events from the town of Slaný

In order to gather historical context from Slaný, the *Kronika pro město Slaný pro léta 1938-1947* [Chronicle for the town of Slaný for the years 1938-1947] was used. This

⁶⁹ Brandes, *Češi pod německým protektorátem: Okupační politika, kolaborace a odboj 1939-1945*, 439-440; Original: Češi žijí v poměrech, které se od našich odlišují tak, že by nám mohly při-padat až neskutečné, jsou však pravdivé. Vysvětluje se to tím, že Češi neprošli vojenskou katastrofou a samostatnosti pozbyli pokojnou cestou. Životní podmínky jsou mimo jakoukoli pochybnost těžké a plny odříkání, přesto v šak daleko vzdáleny hrůz, ve kterých žijeme my. Češi nepoznali na vlastní kůži kolektivní zodpovědnost, zatýkání, exekuce a odesílání do koncentračních táborů. Čechům zbylo určité zdání národního života, co do množství dosud ne-omezená je novinová produkce. Čech čte stejně jako před válkou své oblíbené noviny, které jsou ovšem stejně zglajchšaltovány jako všechen německý tisk v Říši. Každý Čech má rádio a poslouchá program českého rozhlasu, v němž se vysílá česká hudba, české programy a ... šíří propaganda. Ale navzdory této propagandě se poslouchají české zprávy z Londýna.

⁷⁰ Wixforth, "The Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia under German Control, 1939-1944," 165.

chronicle was written by Jindřich Henlinský during the Protectorate and was later re-written by Vladimír Slunečko in the year 1952.

The town of Slaný is a small industrial town in the central region of Bohemia. It experienced growth in the latter half of the 19th century when industrial expansions took place. They were focused on the construction of agricultural products. However, this expansion was rapidly stopped by both world wars.

During the Protectorate, it had a population of about 11.000 people, out of which 206 (by May 5) were German. It was a town of culture, where many performances, concerts, sport events, and exhibitions took place. There was a small Jewish community that was at first persecuted and then on February 23, 1942, was forced to leave town and relocate to Terezín. After which, no more mention was found.

In 1938, right before the signing of the Munich agreement, the people went into the streets and even sent a telegram to the government voicing their disagreement with the behaviour of allied nations. Two days later, the men were actively supporting the mobilisation efforts by digging trenches in the vicinity of the town. At the end of September, first refugees from the borderlands were travelling through the city, in total over 3400 people. The year continued without any noteworthy events. Cultural events still happened, and people lived their lives with relative ease: “The balance of 1938 is tragic. The year that should have been a joyful memory of our liberation 20 years ago remains the most painful memory.”⁷¹

The year of the Occupation signified many changes, not just for Slaný, but for the whole Protectorate. When the refugees were fleeing through Slaný, locals were helping them by giving them food, and clothes, and they were able to stay for a night and rest. On

⁷¹ Kronika pro město Slaný pro rok 1938-1947, 32.; Original: “Bilance roku 1938 jest velmi smutná. Rok, který měl být radostnou vzpomínkou na naše osvobození před 20 léty, zůstane vzpomínkou nejbolestnější.”

the morning of March 15, at 7:45 in the morning, the first army vehicles entered the town and decrees in Czech and German were put up. These contained the proclamation of the Occupation and new regulations banning leaving one's house from nine in the evening to six in the morning, the surrender of weapons and the change of driving on the right side.

On March 24, the mayors, and representatives of the public life of Slaný and surrounding villages were called upon to attend a speech of the government emphasising the importance of the Protectorate belonging to the Great German Reich, the pursuit of peace and order, and warning against all sabotage. The rationed system was implemented in Fall, and in November, the precise number of people in Slaný who were registered for rationed stamps was 10.853. All culture events continued without change and there were two weekly magazines "Svělo"⁷² and "Svobodný občan."⁷³

The following three years were rather uneventful in the chronicle. In June 1941 both magazines were merged under a new name "Světlo-Občan." A significant event happened in October at night when the first air raid alarm was sounded, however, there is no note of planes or danger. As mentioned previously, in February 1942, the Jewish community was forced to relocate to Terezin. In June, of that same year, something rather peculiar happened. There was a shortage of beer, forcing people to have an assigned amount of beer consumption per day. Later in September, a course for business owners and their apprentices was held to learn the new German terminology. In July 1943, the local magazine was discontinued after 70 years due to the shortage of paper. At the end of the year, a list of registered animals was included.⁷⁴

The following year, 1944, became more tense. In July, the first American planes were seen flying over the city. They dropped a couple of small bombs, which made a crater

⁷² Light.

⁷³ Free citizen.

⁷⁴ 249 cattle, 537 pigs, 13 sheep, 323 goats, 101 horses, 453 geese, 2.240 chicken, 121 ducks, 150 turkeys, 161 beehives, 10.711 rabbits (28 angora rabbits).

near a railway close to Dřehkov,⁷⁵ fortunately, no-one was hurt. The air-raid sirens became more frequent and cultural life was significantly limited.

As the war neared its end, noteworthy events in Slaný became more frequent. On January 16, bombs fell in the borderland which affected the population in Slaný, “The sky was one flame, the earth shook, the windows and doors rattled.”⁷⁶ The following week a train of wounded soldiers arrived. The teachers were to leave school and work in district offices. In February, the whole school was cleared out for the refugees from German areas. More air-raid sirens were sounded. From February 24, about 1500 people were fleeing though Slaný every day. Prisoners of the war were arriving at Slaný to take trains to Prague. Many locals helped them by providing food, clothes, and cigarettes. The Gestapo officers warned these people against talking to the prisoners of war. Some, that did talk, were imprisoned and interrogated. In March, the situation deteriorated. Thousand prisoners were loaded onto trains and driven away. On March 6, one train broke down. This allowed the locals to give the prisoners food that would last them more than a day, “Many families living around the station did not have lunch that day.”⁷⁷

On March 22, bombs were dropped on the nearby town of Kralupy killing 136 people. A month later, a train coming from Prague to Slaný was attacked in the proximity of the town, killing 5 men and 6 women, injuring 61 others. One woman from Slaný, Vlasta Věchová, died in tis attack.

As soon as the news from Prague on May 4 came to Slaný, the city was adorned by flags of the Allies. Volunteers formed a unit of 280 men. They built barricades in the city and were prepared to defend it. Fortunately, the next 3 days were relatively quiet, the volunteer unit did not quarrel with the German unit. Slaný was declared a hospital town

⁷⁵ Today Dřehkov, a small village near Slaný.

⁷⁶ Kronika pro město Slaný pro rok 1938-1947, p. 234; Original: “Obloha byla jeden plamen, třásla se země, dučela okna i dveře.”

⁷⁷ Ibid., 242; Original: “V mnohých rodinách bydlicích kolem nádraží se toho dne neobědvalo.”

and both sides were forced to clear their barricades to allow transport. The next day, May 8, the war was over. However, German units were chased in the region. In this effort died four men from Slaný.

Overall, the six years of the Protectorate were not particularly tragic in Slaný compared to other towns. Not a single bomb was dropped on the town, and only a small number of people were imprisoned let alone executed.

3. Administration system

With the occupation of the Czech and Moravian Lands, the people were reminded of a situation that occurred during the First World War, when people did not have enough food and there were many hunger strikes and looting of stores.⁷⁸ In order to prevent this situation, the new Protectorate government prepared a transition to a planned economy. Later, when the war efforts needed more production, there was a radical shift to a war economy. Prices, wages, workforce, and materials, were centrally controlled.⁷⁹

In the first years of the Protectorate, prices rose massively because demand exceeded supply. Therefore, the Protectorate government tried freezing prices and in May 1939 the NÚC.⁸⁰ by the government decree 121/1939 Sb. was created. Its task was to regulate and control the prices of foodstuffs and products. The overall transformation⁸¹ to a planned economy followed immediately. In only half a year, many changes were made:

On May 1, 1939, government decree no. 121/1939 Coll. established the Supreme Price Office.

On June 2, 1939, government decree no. 149/1939 Coll. enacted central management of wage policy.

On July 3, 1939, government decree no. 168/1939 Coll. the principles of the new arrangement and changes in the economy were announced.

On August 4, 1939, labour offices were established by government decree no. 193/1939 Coll.

On August 5, 1939, the Central Union of Industry was established, which was in charge of controlling the distribution of raw materials.

On October 6, 1939, the ticket system was introduced.⁸²

⁷⁸ Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, 13.

⁷⁹ Brandes, *Češi pod německým protektorátem: Okupační politika, kolaborace a odboj 1939-1945*; Průcha, *Československé hospodářství za nacistické okupace*, Dějiny a současnost, 243.

⁸⁰ Supreme Pricing Office

⁸¹ Aujezdský, "Válečné řízení hospodářství v protektorátu Čechy a Morava," 9-10.

⁸² Novotný, *Státní finanční hospodaření v období protektorátu v letech 1939-1945*, 15; Original: 1. května 1939 byl vládním nařízením č. 121/1939 Sb. zřízen Nejvyšší úřad cenový.

2. června 1939 bylo vládním nařízením č. 149/1939 Sb. uzákoněno centrální řízení mzdové politiky.

3. července 1939 byly vládním nařízením č. 168/1939 Sb. vyhlášeny zásady nového uspořádání a změnách v hospodářství.

4. srpna 1939 byly zřízeny úřady práce vládním nařízením č. 193/1939 Sb.

5. srpna 1939 vznikl Ústřední svaz průmyslu, který měl na starost kontrolu rozdělování surovin.

6. října 1939 byl zaveden lístkový systém.

In the Fall of 1939, the planned economy came into effect. The population was divided into consumer categories as were all products and foodstuffs, and each person had been assigned ration vouchers.⁸³ These were divided into six basic categories: food vouchers, clothing vouchers, soap vouchers, tobacco vouchers, fuel vouchers, and vouchers for feed for nonfarm animals. Ration vouchers were given out by the district office for a supply period which was usually 4 weeks.⁸⁴

Just as ration stamps were divided into categories, so were people. They were divided into consumer categories based on gender, age, and occupation, based on which they were assigned to different consumer categories. If a person was for example a dairy farmer, they were not given vouchers for dairy.⁸⁵

The Protectorate was divided into regions with Oberlandrats,⁸⁶ or County Councillors, as the lowest administrative organ for German citizens, while also supervising the local Czech authorities.⁸⁷ For Protectorate citizens, the Oberlandrats represented the control organs of their municipal offices.⁸⁸ They were led by, in general, a German officer – Oberlandrat. All had many regional offices underneath them – as is the case with the political region Slaný with a municipal office. All offices, be it Oberlandrats or municipal offices, were under the authority of the Protector.

Since these offices managed various spheres of public life dictated by an ever-increasing number of government decrees, many office clerks had to be employed. To save finances, the original Czech administrative system was kept; however, it was under

⁸³ This rationing system of various stamps was not a substitute for money – money was still used when buying things.

⁸⁴ Government decree no. 215/1939 Coll. about the establishment of vouchers for foodstuffs.

⁸⁵ More in Maršálek, Petr. *Pod ochranou hákového kříže: Nacistický okupační režim v českých zemích 1939-1945*. Praha: Auditorium, 2012.

⁸⁶ More in Kokošková, Zdeňka, et al. *Úřady oberlandrátů v systému okupační správy Protektorátu Čechy a Morava a jejich představitelé*. Praha: Národní archiv, 2019.

⁸⁷ 12 in Bohemia and 8 in Moravia.

⁸⁸ Jirák, P. “Kokošková, Zdeňka – Pažout, Jaroslav – Sedláková, Monika: Úřady oberlandrátů v systému okupační správy Protektorátu Čechy a Morava a jejich představitelé.” *Historica – sborník historických prací* 63 (2019): 291. <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=1011244>.

German jurisdiction. Later, in 1942 with a new administration reform,⁸⁹ to abolish their binary system, the official language was changed to German. All office clerks were then made to attend language courses and pass a language test, if they failed, they could expect their pay to be lowered by 10-20%.⁹⁰ Consequently, the authority of the Protector was greater, however, the work the Oberlandrats did in the past, was now given to the municipal offices making them even more overwhelmed which led to them creating a sophisticated administrative system.

The question of how the office clerks categorised and registered the offences against the war economy remains. At the municipal office in Slaný, the office clerks had alphabetical registration books, and each section was divided into years, for example, a registration book with a number XII⁹¹ which contained the offences against the war economy⁹² containing the first half of the alphabet – letter A to Mb. This was the book used during this research. It started in the year 1942.⁹³ A table separated into three columns titled first in German and then in Czech – serial number,⁹⁴ subject,⁹⁵ and reference number.⁹⁶ In the first column – serial numbers – are numbers starting from one for each letter section. This served as a tool for a later reference to a case, for example, XII-A-1, in which XII is the number of the registration book, “A” represents the position in the alphabet, and the number 1 is the serial number. In the second column – subject – is first the name of the offender, the second is their address, and last is the type of offence, for

⁸⁹ Milotová, Jaroslava. “Výsledky Heydrichovi správní reformy z pohledu okupačního aparátu.” In *Paginae historiae: sborník Státního ústředního archivu v Praze*, 161-174. Praha: Státní ústřední archiv v Praze, 1944.

⁹⁰ Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, 47.

⁹¹ See Appendix Figure 1

⁹² **Kriegswirtschaft, Übertretungen**

⁹³ As mentioned previously, this was because the system of registering offences was established in the fall of 1941.

⁹⁴ Ordnungs-Zahl

⁹⁵ Gegenstand

⁹⁶ Geschäftszahlen

example, nutritional offence.⁹⁷ In the last column are reference numbers of notices or case files. These numbers were assigned to the case upon creation or when the case was transferred a new number was assigned. At the present moment, however, it is incredibly difficult to choose a case from this registration book and find a case based on the serial or reference number, as most of this material is uncategorized and it is not certain that everything was preserved. The cartons themselves are somewhat organised by the office clerks as they filled them away, however, it is only by years and in rare cases by what type of regulation they broke.

Another step in the municipal office's categorization is the criminal record⁹⁸ which is divided into years and filed under three sections: offences against nutritional regulation, offences against supply regulation, and offences against pricing regulations. The office clerks entered the cases as occurred. In this book, the table is divided into fifteen columns pre-printed in Czech that contain cases from 1942 suggesting it was printed before the official language changed. First, there is the item number and name of the office clerk. These two were merged and filed with a case number, for example, A/294. However, this number was not mentioned in the registration book, it was just written on the case file itself and later added to the offender's card in the office's registry. This categorisation was not perfect, as when the office was moved from Nové Strašecí to Slaný, the old reference numbers remained on the case file and a new one was simply added – this created confusion during my research and proved to be an anomaly. The third column is for the name of the offender, their employment, if known, and their address. The fourth column contains the offence described in a few words. Fifth has the date and the number of the offence's discovery, here is written the reference number that could be found in the

⁹⁷ Original: vyživovací přestupek

⁹⁸ Trestní rejstřík; See Appendix Figure 2

registration book. Sixth and seventh are related, they both contain information about a fine – the amount and what institution will get the money. The ninth column is for the date when the offence was declared or delivered, these usually remain empty. The next four columns were merged again. Instead of writing the information in by hand, the office had a stamp which they then filled by hand. The stamp contains the information about the payment of the fine – the amount, date paid, reference number, date entered into the criminal record and the signature of the person filing it. The eleventh column contains information about if the offender was imprisoned – date, if the sentence was postponed and where they were imprisoned, or if the offender submitted an appeal. The final column is for any additional notes. A final improvement in the system was introduced after the office clerks realised that keeping track of these offences was becoming problematic. Therefore, a cabinet of offenders was created. These were organised alphabetically and contained the offender's address, the offence case number, and whether they were imprisoned or paid a fine.

The individual case files remain relatively unorganized. They are just in piles in cartons which were created as the office clerks filed them away. Usually, they consist of a couple of papers bound together with a string. They include the initial report, statements from offenders, appeals they have submitted, and information about their sentence. These are mostly handwritten by the offenders, and sometimes using a typewriter if they are official documents from the municipal office.

4. Offences against the nutritional regulations

The task of the nutritional regulations was not only the work connected with the control of the production of foodstuffs and animal feed, but also its administration – such as the distribution of vouchers.⁹⁹ These regulations set the amounts for products such as: grain, milk, eggs, lard, and many more. Farmers had to surrender a portion of their products, controlling how much the farmers could keep for their use, for new production, and how much they could sell.

4.1 Unregistered domestic slaughter of a pig

Alois Adlta was a railroad employee at Praha-Bubny living in Ruzyně. On June 16, 1942, it was discovered that he carried out an unregistered domestic slaughter of a pig and that this pig was not his property. This investigation was done by two controllers F. Vedral and V. Kubáček from the ministry of agriculture. As this offence happened in the region of Slaný, the case was transferred to the municipal office in Slaný.¹⁰⁰ Adlta's offence was against the regulation of the purchase of a farm animal – in this case, a pig, and how one must have proceeded when they wanted to slaughter it. In the government decree no. 298/1940 Coll. from September 13, 1940, about the change of domestic slaughters of pigs, it is said, “Any domestic slaughter of pigs must be approved by the municipality beforehand. Approval shall be sought in writing. Domestic slaughter must take place within 3 days after approval.”¹⁰¹

The investigation process began in June 1942 after the authorities discovered that he had carried out a domestic slaughter of a pig in the household of his mother Marie

⁹⁹ Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, 64.

¹⁰⁰ Case number XII-A-1, criminal record A/294.

¹⁰¹ Original: “Každá domácí porážka vepře musí být dříve obcí schválena. O schválení budiž žádáno písemně. Domácí porážka se musí státi do 3 dnů po schválení.”

Adltová in Rynholec. This was recorded in the protocol, “He [Alois Adtla] carried out a domestic slaughter of a pig in the household of his mother, Marie Adltová in Rynholec, and did not report the slaughter 3 days in advance to the municipal office. Domestic slaughter must take place within 3 days after approval.”¹⁰² According to the authorities, Adlta did not register this slaughter three days in advance, however, “He [Alois Adtla] registered himself and his family as subsistence farmers, although he was not entitled to do so because he had not kept and fed the pigs for 3 months before slaughter.”¹⁰³

At the municipal office in Ruzyně, he registered his family as subsistence farmers, although he was not entitled to it as he did not raise and feed pigs, and he signed a notice to approve of this slaughter, however, the pig was not his own but his mother’s, as it is said in the protocol, “He [Alois Adlta] signed the notice and petition for approval of the domestic slaughter, although the property to be slaughtered was not his property, it was his mother’s.”¹⁰⁴

Adlta’s circumstances were mentioned in the initial report from June 26, 1942, which included a handwritten protocol no. 344. First, Adlta filled out and signed the ‘Proposal and Notice for Domestic Slaughter’ even though the slaughtered pig was not his own. According to the municipal office, the pig’s owner was Adlta’s mother Mrs Marie Adltová, therefore, the slaughter was unregistered. Second, Mr Adlta was not entitled to self-sufficiently of meat and fat, for which he registered himself and his family, because he does not feed pigs and has not kept them in his holding for more than three months. However, the meat of the slaughtered pig¹⁰⁵ was taken into Mr Adlta’s apartment in

¹⁰² Case file XII-A-1, p.1; Original: “Provedl domácí porážku vepře v domácnosti matky, Marie Adltové v Rynholci, a porážku neohlásil 3 dny předem na obecním úřadě.”

¹⁰³ Case file XII-A-1, p.1; Original: “Přihlásil sebe a svou rodinu jako samozásobitele, ačkoliv neměl na to nárok, jěžto nechoval a nekrmil vepře 3 měsíce před porážkou.”

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.; Original: “Podepsal ohlášku a návrh na schválení domácí porážky, ačkoliv porážený majetek nebyl jeho majetkem, nýbrž matčiným.”

¹⁰⁵ 75 kg of dead weight.

Ruzyně. Simultaneously, the meat and fat calculations were sent to the municipality office in Rynholec, where it was calculated that meat and fat stamps would not be issued for some time. Additionally, a portion of fat was correctly collected at the fat collection point in Nové Strašecí.

This is followed by the statement from the inspected person – Mr Adlta. He says that he was authorized by his mother to deregister the pig because of her short-sightedness. Additionally, he thought that he correctly bought the pig in February and could slaughter it after three months and was not aware that the pig was re-declared by his mother in the census in March. The reason for the purchase was his intention to take an unpaid leave in order to rebuild his house in Rynholec, however, because the reconstruction was officially stopped, this did not happen. Later, when he had a proposed medical vacation which he wanted to spend in Rynholec with his mother, he intended to take care of the pig, however, his plan was changed again, when he got a place of medical leave in a spa in Brandýs nad Orlicí.

I bought the pig from my mother because I was going to take unpaid leave to rebuild my house in Rynholecký Pecínov No. 123. Because the construction and rebuilding were officially stopped, the holiday was cancelled. I had a proposed medical leave of 3 months due to a nervous illness which I wanted to spend with my mother in Rynholc - Pecínov and during that time I wanted to feed the pig I bought myself. Because I was given a spa in Brandýs n. O. instead of medical leave, this leave was cancelled.¹⁰⁶

This offence was against decree no. 206/1939 Coll. of 23.11.1939. His sentence was a fine of K5000 or 14 days imprisonment. Adlta could either pay the fine within 3 days or be imprisoned for two weeks. It was also possible to file an appeal with the Land Office in Prague within 8 days after this document's delivery. Alois Adlta filed an appeal

¹⁰⁶ Case file XII-A-1, protocol no. 344a, p.3; Original: Koupil jsem vepře od mé matky proto, že jsem hodlal nastoupiti dovolenou neplacenou za účelem přestavby mého domku v Rynholeckém Pecínově čp 123. Protože stavby a přestavby byly úředně zastaveny z dovolené sešlo. Měl jsem navrženou zdravotní dovolenou a to 3 měsíce v důsledku nervové choroby kterou jsem chtěl strávit u matky v Rynholci – Pecínově a po tu dobu jsem chtěl koupené prase si sám krmiti. Protože jsem dostal místo zdravotní dovolené lázně v Brandýse n. O. sešlo z této dovolené.

to his sentence in which he tried to explain the situation. He started with the fact that his mother had three pigs, two of which were for the collective she only had for fattening and were already handed over. The last pig, as she was old and had not lived with Adlta's father in one household, she sold to her son. As Adlta was living in a rented apartment in Ruzyně, he had no space to keep this bought pig. Therefore, he left it with his mother in Rynholec. When he went to register the pig, he forgot to mention the fact that the pig is his but is kept in his mother's household due to his anxiety. He mentioned that this was the only misunderstanding, as all other obligations were met – a veterinarian visit, an obligatory portion of lard for collection, and the cancellation of food stamps for meat and fat for a certain period.

My mother, M. Adltová in Rynh-Pecínov No. 102/3 had three pigs for breeding, two of which she had prescribed for fattening for the cooperative, which she also gave away and the third she intended to slaughter for herself in the household. Because she is alone (she does not live in the same household as my father) she sold the pigs to me, her son Alois. I live in Ruzyně in a rental and had absolutely no place to confine the pig and had it for breeding for 3 months. before the intended slaughter. I, therefore, left the pig with my mother and went to the municipal office in Ruzyně to inform them of the matter, but under the influence of my nervous illness and the fact that the officials were overloaded with work in the records. I somehow forgot to report that it was a matter of selling a pig from my mother. I only reported that I could not keep the pig at my place in Ruzyně, as I had neither a pigsty nor any other suitable place and no feed. It was only by this that I was misunderstood when I was told that when the slaughter of the pig at my mother's in Pecínov had been carried out, the prescribed fees for this and the obligatory fat ration would be correctly fulfilled, the pig would be examined by the veterinary surgeon, and then I should sign out to receive the ration cards for meat and fat, which was done immediately.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁷ Case file XII-A-1, pp. 16-17; Original: Moje matka, M. Adltová v Rynh-Pecínově čp 102/3 měla na chov 3 vepře, z nichž 2 měla předepsána na výkrm pro družstvo, které taky odevzdala a třetí mínila porazit pro sebe v domácnosti. Protože je sama (nežije totiž s mým otcem ve společné domácnosti) prodala vepře mně, vlast synovi Aloisovi. Bydlím v Ruzyni v nájmu a neměl jsem naprosto místa, kam bych vepře uzavřel a měl jej na chov 3 měs. před zamýšlenou porážkou. Nechal jsem proto vepře dále u mé matky a šel jsem o věci informovat na obec úřad v Ruzyni, kde však jsem pod vlivem mé nerv choroby a také tím, že byli pp úředníci přetížení pracemi v evid. Polic. přihlášek a obč. legit., jaksi sem spoměl udati, že se jednalo o prodej vepře od své matky. Hlásil jsem jen, že nemohu vepře u sebe v Ruzyni mít, ježto nemám ani chlévec, ani jiné vhodné místo a krmení též ne. Jen tím se prosím stalo, že nastalo u mne nepochopení, když mi bylo řečeno, až se porážka vepře u mé matky v Pecínově provede, předeps poplatky z této, jakož i povinná dávka sádla budou správně splněny, úř zvěrolékařem prase prohlédnutu, pak abych se odhlásil za účelem odebrání potravinových lístků na maso a na tuky, což se také ihned stalo.

Later, when his mother ran out of feed for the pig and thought everything was fine, she had the pig slaughtered. Adlta signed the proper notice of approval. He concludes with a request for reconsidering the fine as he and his wife were ill, and he gets only a small salary.

I may also remark that I am a small railroad official with the office title of "station assistant" with an income of K7360 + K3000¹⁰⁸ per year, and all the years in the former Czechoslovak Republic I served for K520-K640 per month, and that already as a [defin]. In addition, I suffer from a severe nervous disease, and I have a prescribed convalescent home in Brandýs n. Orł. which also burdens me financially. My wife has been ill since 1929 and will never be well again. She was also treated in 1938/39. I could submit documents to prove this. And my parents - I cannot mention them any further, they are both sickly and completely overworked.¹⁰⁹

His request was not granted with a response that this decision was final. As his date of imprisonment began to near, Adlta submitted a request for a postponement of two weeks. As a reason, he stated that his employer needs him at work because many are taking vacations and because of the current heavy transport. This he supports with an official note from his employer. Additionally, he is to start treatment for anxiety in the next two months. In this request, he asks to postpone his sentence to November or December. This request was complied with, and his sentence is moved to 1.11.1942. However, in October Adlta submits another request in which he asks for a postponement to 16.11.1942 due to his ongoing illness and due to a mining company mining shafts on his property. This was complied with also and the call for entry was moved to 16.11.1942 to which he reported and was imprisoned. During his imprisonment, he submitted a last request asking for a single day of leave to arrange the most necessary things for his wife and 12-year-old son. This request was not complied with and Adlta remained imprisoned for the full two weeks.

¹⁰⁸ K [koruna] is the Bohemian and Moravian crown, also known as the Protectorate crown.

¹⁰⁹ Case file XII-A-1, p. 17; Original: Dovoluji si ještě poznamenati, že jsem malý zřízenec drah s úř. titulem „stan. pomocník“ se služ. příjmem K7360 + 3000K ročně, a všechny léta v bývalé čsl republice jsem sloužil za 520-640K měsíčně, a to už jako defin[unrecognizable abbreviation]. Mimo to trpím silnou nervovou chorobou a mám předepsanou ozdravnu v Brandýse n. Orł. což mne též finančně zatíží. Moje žena je nemocná už od r 1929 a zdráva už nebude nikdy. Byla též na léčení v r 1938/39. Doklady o tom mohl bych předložit. A moje rodiče – o těch se nemohu prosím dále zmiňovati, jsou oba churaví a úplně sedřeni.

He is to start in the next few days in the station kitchen in Prague-Bubny (he is a trained cutter and smoker), and he would like to arrange the most necessary things connected with the transfer. Furthermore, his wife is ill at home, and he has no one with him except his 12-year-old boy (son), who goes to school in Ruzyně. He would also arrange the most necessary things at home and would go back immediately to complete his sentence properly and correctly.¹¹⁰

In this case, Alois Adlta carried out a domestic slaughter of a pig that was in the eyes of the system unregistered. Adlta thought he did everything right – he bought the pig, registered in the municipality office, and cancelled food stamps for a certain period. His situation was made difficult by his circumstances as he did not have the space to care for the pig in his own household, a piece of information which he forgot to mention at the municipality office. Later, when his mother registered the pig under her name, which circumstance he did not know about, he was not entitled to slaughter the pig.

In this instance, even when Adlta tried to appeal the municipality's decision he was unsuccessful, as in most of the presented cases. He was, however, able to request for postponement twice, both times the reasons could be said were in the interest of the Protectorate – railway transport and mining of materials. In the end, Alois Adlta chose to be imprisoned instead of paying a fine which he was not able to afford. Due to the complicated bureaucratic system, because the offence happened in Slaný and Adlta lived in Ruzyně, the process began in June 1942 and, after two postponements, he carried out his sentence in November 1942.

¹¹⁰ Case file XII-A-1, p. 29; Original: Jmenovaný má nastoupiti v nejbližších dnech do želez. kuchyně v Praze-Bubnech (je vyučen řez. a uzenář), a prosil by zaříditi si nejnnutnější potřebné věci služeb přeložením spojené. Dále má nemoc ženu doma a nikoho u sebe nemá, kromě 12ti let hochu (syna), který chodí do školy v Ruzyni. Rovněž i doma zařídil by nejnnutnější a ihned by se odebral zpět ku řádnému a správnému dokončení trestu.

4.2 Overpricing and under-the-counter trade of flour

The second presented case of Antonín Král,¹¹¹ who bought flour without the appropriate vouchers, falls also under nutritional regulations, his case was registered as overpricing and under-the-counter trade of flour. His raising the price of flour over the set amount was against the government decree no. 121/1939 Coll. from May 10, 1939, which states:

For an administrative offence, without prejudice to legal prosecution, the punishable person shall be those who violate any of the provisions of this Regulation ... or who engage in intrigues which are capable of raising prices or keeping prices unjustified from an economic point of view. An offence within the meaning of paragraph 1 shall be committed in particular:

1. Whoever demands goods, acts, or causes to be provided or promised price other than the officially determined or admitted price, or a price unjustified in the national economy.¹¹²

Although this first part suggests that this case should be categorized as an offence of the pricing regulation, as this was very unlikely to be proven, the subsequent offence was greater. Král's case, which will be later explored, was opposing the government decree no. 213/1939 Coll. from September 1939, in which it is said that to buy bread or flour the appropriate collection vouchers are needed.

Antonín Král was a small grocery store owner in Slaný. He was accused of overcharging and under-the-counter flour trade. In this case will be statements from Antonín Král, his apprentice Hlavsa and miller Hradecký who sold him flour. During the control on July 7, 1942, it was uncovered by controllers F. Kalous and J. Král that Antonín

¹¹¹ Case number XII-Kr-1, criminal record 1942 no. A/369.

¹¹² Government decree No. 121/1939 coll. containing the establishment of the Supreme Pricing Office; Original: Pro správní přestupek bude – bez újmy soudního stíhání – potrestán, kdo poruší některé z ustanovení tohoto nařízení..., anebo kdo se pouští do pletich, jež jsou způsobitelné zvýšení ceny nebo udržetí ceny národohospodářsky neoprávněné.

Přestupku ve smyslu odstavce 1 se dopouští zejména,

1. Kdo za zboží nebo úkony požaduje nebo sob nebo jinému dává poskytnouti nebo slíbenou cenu jinou, než je cena úředně stanovená nebo připuštěná, nebo cena národohospodářsky neoprávněnou

Král was not only guilty of overcharging his customers for flour, but also because he bought and sold flour without proper food stamps, which he admitted.

In June 1942 Král was accused of several offences. In the first report from the authorities, it was written that Král confessed to having bought in December 1941 5 bags of 00 wheat flour at K20 per 1kg. The miller Hradecký personally brought the flour with other mill products also covered by stamps and vouchers and collected the relevant amount personally.

In the month of December 1941 - only according to his confession - the named Král took over in his trading room in Slaný from the miller Jaroslav Hradecký in Libovec No. 124, district Slaný, without any receipts or other documents, a total of five bags of wheat flour 00 at 20K per 1 kg. Hradecký brought this flour to him personally, together with other mill products, covered by purchase vouchers, and he personally collected the relevant amount.¹¹³

In addition, around Christmas 1941, Král sent his apprentice Václav Hlavsa to Hradecký, from where he always brought around 10kg of flour without vouchers or stamps, this acquired flour Král sold to those customers whom he could trust for K30 per 1kg, however, without the relevant stamps. The price of similar flour according to the relevant decree could not be more than K3.70-4.15 for consumers. Overcharging for acquired flour he earned approximately K5.250.

Král then sold the flour thus acquired around Christmas 1941 only to those of his customers whom he believed he could trust, at K30 per 1 kg, but without the prescribed food stamps and therefore at a discount, - although the price of similar flour according to the relevant decree could have been for consumers at most K3.70-4.15.¹¹⁴

¹¹³ Case file XII-Kr-1, p. 1; Original: Jmenovaný Král v měsíci prosinci 1941 – jen dle vlastního doznání – převzal ve své obchodní místnosti ve Slaném od mlynáře Jaroslava Hradeckého v Libovci č 124, okres Slaný, bez jakýchkoliv odběrných lístů či jiných dokladů v celku 5 pytlů pšeničné mouky 00 po 20K za 1 kg. Tuto mouku dovezl mu Hradecký osobně spolu s jinými mlýnskými výrobky, krytými odběrnými poukazy a příslušný obnos osobně vyinkasoval.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.; Original: Takto nabytou mouku prodal pak Král kolem vánoc 1941 jen těm svým zákazníkům, o kterých se domníval, že jim může důvěřovati, po K30 za 1kg, ovšem bez předepsaných potravinových lístků a tedy pokoutně, -ač cena podobné mouky dle příslušné vyhlášky mohla být pro spotřebitele nejvýše K3,70-4,15.

The accusation was supported by Král's initial statement in which he says he bought in total five bags of flour each 75 kg at the price of K20 per 1 kg. Then in the shop, he sold it to his customers for K30 per 1 kg. Král's statement is followed by a statement from his apprentice, Václav Hlavsa. Hlavsa says that his employer did send him to the miller Hradecký a total of fifteen times, meaning that he brought in 150 kg of flour. He supports the fact they sold this flour to customers for K30 per 1 kg and that this business was done without food stamps.

Following these initial statements, a statement from the miller Jaroslav Hradecký was included. He says that he did not sell but rather exchanged the flour for other goods from Král's shop at the end of 1939. He received goods at a value equal to the price of the supplied flour. He concluded by declaring that he did not overprice this flour.

I sold or, more correctly, I exchanged for other goods with Král from Slaný and at the end of 1939 about 150 kg of coarse flour. I received the goods at a value equal to (somewhat) the price of the delivered flour. Around Christmas in 1941, I sold a total of about 100 kg of flour to Král without documents, which Mr Král's apprentice Hlavsa took away in parts. I exchanged [unintelligible] this flour for other goods. I also declare here that I did not overprice this flour.¹¹⁵

Both Král and Hlavsa then changed their initial statements, declaring that they were disturbed at that time and did not remember the matter clearly. First, Král's changed statement will be presented. He begins by mentioning that the flour he bought at the end of 1939 and the beginning of 1940 was free from stamps. He says that he gave Hradecký goods of the same value as the flour received. Král then again underlines that fat that he did not pay Hradecký, but it was rather an exchange of goods. He cannot prove this statement as he no longer has documents regarding this exchange. He then denies the

¹¹⁵ Case file XII-Kr-1, p. 6; Original: Prodal jsem resp. správněji řečeno vyměnil jsem za jiné zboží obch Královi se Slaného as koncem roku 1939 asi 150kg hrubé mouky. Zboží jsem dostal v takové hodnotě jakou činila (něco) cena dodané mouky. Okolo Vánoc v roce 1941 jsem prodal Královi bez dokladů celkem asi 100kg mouky, kterou po částech odvezl učeň p. Krále Hlavsa. Tuto mouku jsem [nečitelné] vyměnil za jiné zboží. Rovněž zde prohlašuji, že jsem tuto mouku nepředražil.

accusation of his selling this flour to his customers at K30 per 1 kg, but that he used this flour in his household.

At the end of 1939 and the beginning of 1940, Mr Hradecký miller from Libovice left me about 150 kg of flour without a receipt, and for this flour, I gave him some goods such as [unintelligible], bars, also goods for the kitchen and the like. about the goods at that time [unintelligible] free. I gave him the goods at the same value as [unintelligible] the price of flour at that time. He is right that I paid K20 for 1 kg of flour. Later, around Christmas in 1941, he supplied me with p. Hradecký about 1kg of flour, which was brought to me on a bicycle by my former student Mr Hlavsa. I also did not pay K20 per 1kg for this flour, but it was exchanged for [unintelligible] goods of the same value as the [unintelligible] price of flour at the time. It is not true that I would have sold this flour to my trusted customers at 30K per 1 kg, but I used this flour in my household. As a reason, my statement does not match the statement [unintelligible] of the controls to the authorities on 4/7/1941 and on 8/7/1941 I state that I was agitated at the time and had a vague recollection of the matter.¹¹⁶

Král's apprentice Hlavsa support Král's arguments by saying that he did not handle the money exchange between Král and Hradecký, but that he was always instructed to give Hradecký an envelope. In which he thought were relevant stamps. He also does not claim that Král sold flour to his customers for K30 per 1 kg, concluding that he certainly did not do that himself and does not know whether Kral did.

It is true that I was at Mr Hradecký, a miller from Libovice, about fifteen times flour for Mr Král and [unintelligible], I brought back with 5 to 10 kg of flour. I do not know if some of the flour I brought was without receipts, because I always handed in a letter or sometimes a receipt, as I believe, in the envelope that Mr Král gave me for Mr Hradecký. However, I cannot say [unintelligible] what was in those envelopes. I never paid for flour in cash, but always brought Mr Hradecký various goods from the store, which were still available at the time. I cannot claim that Mr Král sold flour in his shop to trusted customers for K30 per 1kg. I did not do that myself and I do not know if Mr Král sold flour that way. As the reason my statement does not match the statement made on July 4, 1942, to the accounting authorities, I

¹¹⁶ Case file XII-Kr-1, p. 7; Original: Pan Hradecký mlynář v Libovici mi přenechal asi koncem roku 1939 a počátkem roku 1940 asi 150kg mouky bez odběrných listů a za tuto mouku jsem mu dal některé zboží jako [nečitelné], bary, dále zboží pro kuchyni a podobně. Jednalo se vesměs o zboží v té době [nečitelné] volné. Zboží jsem mu dal v takové hodnotě jako tehdy [nečitelné] cena mouky. Má pravdu, že jsem za 1kg mouky platil K20. Později a sic okolo Vánoc v roce 1941 mi dodal p. Hradecký asi 1kg mouky, kterou mi vozil na kole můj bývalý učeďník p. Hlavsa. Rovněž za tuto mouku jsem neplatil po K20 za 1kg, nýbrž byla vyměněna za [nečitelné] zboží v takové hodnotě, co činila tehdy [nečitelné] cena mouky. Nemá pravdu, že bych tuto mouku byl prodával svým zákazníkům důvěryhodným po 30K za 1kg, nýbrž tuto mouku jsem spotřeboval v mé domácnosti. Jako důvod, že se má výpověď neshoduje s výpověďmi [nečitelné] kontrol orgánů dne 4.7.1941 a dne 8.7.1941 uvádím, že jsem byl tehdy rozrušen a na věc si nejasno pamatoval.

state that I could not remember the matter and that I believed that it was so in reality.¹¹⁷

Král was given a sentence of a K35,000 fine or 75 days imprisonment. Following this, a request for a reduction in the penalty and for permission to pay a small part of the fine each month was submitted by Král. He first asked for permission to pay in monthly instalments of K2,000 and a reduction in the total amount. He justified his request by saying that his offence was time-barred because the limitation period for the offence of decree No. 206 and 213/39 Coll. was set at 6 months. He concludes his argument by saying that the first offence was no longer punishable. In the end, he added that the imposed sentence was too high, because he earns no more than K16,000 a year and has no real estate, and proposes a reduction of the fine to K10,000, and be allowed to pay in monthly instalments.

However, the district office in Slaný overlooked, as regards the first offence from 1939/40, that if he committed an offence... is time-barred, as the statute of limitations for an offence... is set at 6 months. That is, only the government decree No. 393/41 introduced a statute of limitations of 3 years for all offences. Until that time, i.e., until the issuance of the referenced government regulation, only a 6-month statute of limitations was in force. Since according to the general principle that laws and regulations do not apply retroactively, a longer statute of limitations cannot and could not be introduced retroactively for a crime committed before the issuance of regulation No. 393/41 according to the newly issued government regulation. Finally, this principle is explicitly emphasized by §25 of decree No. 393/41 Coll. For the statute of limitations for criminal acts in the sense of §6 government decree of the last sentence of the regulation, the office must look out of official duty, and therefore no punishment should have been imposed on me for an act already time-barred.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ Case file XII-Kr-1, p. 8; Original: Je pravdou, že jsem byl u p.Hradeckého, mlynáře v Libovici as 15 kráte pro mouku pro p.Krále a [nečitelné], jsem přivezl as 5 až 10kg mouky. Zda některá, mnou přinesené mouka byla bez odběrných listů nevím, poněvadž jsem vždy odevzdával dopis neb někdy odběrný poukaz, jak se o tom domnívám, v obálce, kterou mi p.Král pro p.Hradeckého předával. Nemohu však [nečitelné] tvrdit, co v těch obálkách bylo. Mouku jsem nikdy neplatil hotově nýbrž jsem vždy p.Hradeckému přivezl rozličné zboží z obchodu, které v té době bylo ještě volné. Nemohu tvrdit, že p.Král prodával mouku ve svém obchodě důvěryhodným zákazníkům za K30 za 1kg. Sám jsem tak nečinil a nevím, zda p.Král mouku takto prodával. Jako důvod, proč se má výpověď neshoduje s výpovědí učiněnou dne 4.7.1942 kont orgánům uvádím, že jsem se nemohl na věc pamatovati a že jsem se domníval, že to tak ve skutečnosti bylo.

¹¹⁸ Case file XII-Kr-1, p. 15; Original: Okresní úřad ve Slaném však přehlédli, pokud jde o prvý přestupek z r 1939/40, že dopustil-li se přestupku §4 vyhlášky předsedy vlády č 213/39 Sb. v zimě 1939/40, že tento můj přestupek ... jest promlčen, neboť promlčecí lhůta pro přestupek vl. nař. č. 206 a 213/39 Sb. jest stanovena 6 měsíci. Totiž teprve vl. nař. č 393/41 zavedlo pro všechny přestupky podle cit vl nařízení promlčecí lhůtu 3 let. Do té doby, tedy do vydání cit. vl. nařízení, byla v platnosti pouze promlčecí lhůta 6 měsíční. Jelikož podle všeobecné zásady, že zákony a nařízení nepůsobí nazpět, nemůže a nemohl býti pro trestný čin spáchaný

Although Král tried to appeal his sentence by referring to past decrees, it was not considered. His final addition of not having enough capital was denied as it was found out that his income was much higher. Finally, after a relatively short process, Král paid his fine of K35,000 in September 1942.

Although this case involved three different people, only one of them was, according to the archival sources, fined. Král tried to change his statement and appeal his sentence by citing past decrees, however, this did not work. After a relatively short process lasting only two months, Král chose to pay the fine instead of being imprisoned. The fates of Hradecký or Hlavsa were not included and due to this period being uncategorised, it was not possible to find these case files if they existed in the first place.

před vydáním cit vl nařízení č 393/41 se zpětnou účinnost zaváděna delší promlčecí lhůta podle nového vydaného vládního nařízení. Tuto zásadu konečně výslovně zdůrazňuje ustanovení §25 vl. nař. č 393/41 Sb. K promlčení trestních skutků ve smyslu §6 cit. vl. nařízení poslední věty musí úřad hleděti z úřední povinnosti a proto neměl mně býti za čin již promlčený žádný trest ukládán.

5. Offences against the supply regulations

The main purpose of the supply regulations was to ensure that citizens have access to all products aside from foodstuffs, such as: coal, textiles, soap, and other products which from the Fall of 1939 were only available in exchange for appropriate vouchers.¹¹⁹

During this research, it proved difficult to find cases belonging to this category due to this material being unorganised. The only full case available for analysis was the case of Terezie Štauchová, who owned a coal dealership in Slaný and was charged with consuming charcoal without the appropriate permission. However, the criminal record from 1942 was analysed, and the most common types of offences were presented.

5.1 Unregistered use of charcoal

Terezie Štauchová¹²⁰ was an owner of a coal dealership that managed coal at the train station in Slaný. They were given a set amount of coal, either black or brown, to sell or to use. Then in a revision on July 30, 1942, it was discovered that they received charcoal which they were supposed to sell, but instead used themselves.

The revision's statement said that the company in question spent 8600 kg of charcoal without the proper permit from the Inspectorate at the Ministry of Economy and Labour needed for its use. This condition was not met, because they had used it themselves, and were given a proposed fine of K1000. No compensatory jail sentence was given. Later, this fine was requested to be K300, although this request was not considered.

In the protocol with a statement given by Mr Otakar Katzmannel, a co-worker of Stauchova, it was stated that "The defect happened that a wagon [unintelligible] of charcoal was mistakenly consumed to fuel the trucks [unintelligible] for coal imports, since

¹¹⁹ Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, 115.

¹²⁰ Case file XII-Sta-3, criminal record 1942 no. B/89.

the heat generator could be only fuelled by charcoal and [unintelligible] it was not known that a permit from the supervising office was required for consumption.”¹²¹

The official sentence was set to a fine of K1000 with the reasoning that ‘during the revision on July 30, 1942, it was found that you had consumed 8600 kg of charcoal without the excise permission of the supervisory office of the Ministry of Economy and Labour.

After which, Terezie Stauchova did pay the K1000 fine, however, she submitted an appeal asking for a refund of the already paid fine. She reasoned that it was not their mistake fully, but a miscommunication between various offices, as they, after realising they used charcoal not for its intended use, applied to the supervisory office for a permission change, which was granted to them.

We committed this offence by overlooking the fact that we had received permission for the wagon of charcoal from the supervisory office only for resale and not for consumption, as we thought. The charcoal is needed for our own charcoal-powered Dog generator system, and since we had no other supplies, we used the charcoal we had in stock. As soon as we discovered that we were mistakenly using charcoal for consumption, which we were only allowed to resell, we applied to the supervisory office for permission to consume our stocks, which was also granted to us. We attach this permission from this application.

We have therefore not damaged the tied economy in any way, and we have only committed a formal offence, and the supervisory office at the Ministry of Economy and Labour also acknowledged this when it subsequently permitted us to consume charcoal.¹²²

¹²¹ Case file XII-Sta-3, p. 4; Original: “Závada se stala, že vagon [nečitelné] dřevěného uhlí byl omylem spotřebován pro pohon nákl. auta, [nečitelně] pro dovoz uhlí, poněvadž generátor byl zařízen na vytápění pouze dřev. uhlím a [nečitelné] nebylo známo, že k spotřebě tohoto je zapotřebí povolení dozor. Úřadovny.”

¹²² Case file XII-Sta-3, p. 7; Original: Uvedeného přestupku jsme se dopustili, tímže jsme přehlédli, že na vagon dřevěného uhlí jsme od dozorcí úřadovny dostali povolení jen na další prodej a nikoli k spotřebě, jak jsme se domnívali. Dřevěné uhlí je potřebovali pro vlastní generátor systém Pejšek na pohon dřevěným uhlím, a protože jsme neměli jiných zásob, použili jsme dřevěného uhlí, které jsme měli na skladě. Jakmile jsme zjistili, že omylem k spotřebě používáme dřevěného uhlí, jež nám bylo povoleno jen na další prodej, požádali jsme dozorcí úřadovnu o povolení k spotřebě vlastních zásob, které nám bylo také uděleno. Uvedené povolení přikládáme o této žádosti. Nepoškodili jsme proto nijak vázané hospodářství a dopustili jsme se pouze přestupku rázu formálního a také dozorcí úřadovna při ministerstvu hospodářství a práce to uznala, když nám dodatečně udělila povolení k spotřebě dřevěného uhlí.

She still agreed that using charcoal for their own use was wrong, however, they applied for permission and it was granted. This granted permission was not a part of the case file, therefore, there is no way to analyse it.

In the end, Terezie Štauchová paid the K1000 fine on September 9, 1942. Her later argument that it was more of a formal problem than an offence of the supply regulation, was not considered. Although, the later granted permission was mentioned, it was not included in the case file, except for a mention by Stauchova in her appeal. In the future, when these case files were organized, the missing material could be found.

5.2 Other offences of the supply regulations

As there were no other present cases from this category, except for the case of Terezie Štauchová, a decision was made to provide some examples of records from the criminal records of 1942 of offences against the planned and war economy.

In 1942 there were in total of 1012 cases against the war economy registered in the criminal records. These were divided into 554 offences against nutritional regulation - 113 offences against supply regulations and 345 offences against pricing regulations. Let us focus on the 113 offences of supply regulations. They could be categorised in several ways: location, severity, offence, and if they paid the fine or were imprisoned. In the book of criminal records from 1942, there is no mention of the exact decree the offender acted against. Therefore, the categorisation will be based only on the brief description, in reality, a few words, of the offence.

The overall majority was about not fulfilling the supply of soap (24%) and not having the correct amounts of soap registered in their books (25%). This begs the question, of whether the same situation was in different regions, or if there was a reason these offences were so common. Next, there was not fulfilling the supply of textiles or shoes,

and finally not having the accounting books or supply books in order. Most of the offenders paid a fine, and only four decided to be imprisoned for a brief period of time.

6. Offences against the pricing regulations

As the German occupational units entered the Protectorate, they began to buy products of everyday need. After all, their German marks had a much better course to the Protectorate crown of 6:1.¹²³ This situation prompted people in the Protectorate to accumulate foodstuffs in copious quantities. As the demand rose, so rose the prices. To control the situation the NÚC was founded, which set the prices, and salaries, and made rules for merchants, such as having a book with sales. The following two cases present examples of merchants not following set regulations.

6.1 *An unregistered stock of shoes*

Bedřich Strnadel¹²⁴ was a shop owner in Řevničov. A search of his house was conducted due to his having a larger stock of unregistered shoes. The authorities, namely officers V. Kučera and R. Eisner, conducted a home search on May 30, 1942, and discovered in total fifty-six pairs of shoes. The shoes which he apparently kept with the intention of selling them at a higher price, were confiscated and Strnadel was fined K5000. He tried to appeal his sentence which resulted in a warning of a further punishment.

Similarly, to a case that was already discussed, Strnadel's offence was against the government decree No. 121/1939 Coll. from May 10, 1939. In this case, however, it was only the question of selling products in this case shoes, for prices not set by the NÚC. The government decree applied to this case states that it is an offence when

¹²³ Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*, 115.

¹²⁴ Case number XII-Str-3, criminal records 1942 No. C/122.

“[Anyone] who demands for goods of any kind or gives himself or another to provide or promise the price of goods of a better quality.”¹²⁵

In May 1942 the authorities of the municipality of Slaný were informed that Bedřich Strnadel, a merchant, had a large number of unregistered shoes. They believed that Strnadel kept these shoes with the intention of selling them later for a higher price. As this intention was considered an offence, the discovered shoes were confiscated. In total fifty-six pairs – 39 pairs of several types of children’s shoes and seventeen pairs of women’s shoes – were confiscated.

The undersigned authorities discovered that Bedřich Strnadel from Řevničov 212, Slaný district, is said to have a large stock of various footwear, which he did not declare. For this reason, a house search was carried out at the named person's house, during which thirty-nine pairs of several types of children's shoes, of different numbers and quality, and seventeen pairs of different women's shoes were found stored in the attic. Since the shoes found were not unregistered and were probably kept with the intention of selling them at a later time to obtain a higher price, these shoes were confiscated. The confiscated footwear was handed over to the gendarme station in Řevničov for safekeeping.¹²⁶

Strnadel confessed that these shoes were his property and that he did not register them because he bought them before the war, when they were not tied to collection vouchers, and are no longer saleable as they are subjected to changing fashion. He continued by saying that it cannot be expected for anyone to purchase them, as vouchers are limited, and these shoes were no longer fashionable.

I acknowledge that the found shoes are my property and that I have not claimed them. I left this out because these are shoes bought in the pre-war era, which are subject to fashion and are therefore unsaleable. Especially in the current era, when the sale of footwear is tied to purchase vouchers, it cannot be expected that anyone would buy

¹²⁵ Government decree No. 121/1939 coll. containing the establishment of the Supreme Pricing Office; Original: “Kdo za zboží požaduje nebo sobě nebo jinému dává poskytnouti nebo slíbíti cenu zboží lepší jakosti.”

¹²⁶ Case file XII-Str-3, pp. 1-2; Original: Podepsané orgánové zjistili, že Bedřich Strnadel ze Řevničova 212, okres Slaný, má mít větší zásobu různé obuvi, kterou nepřihlásil. Z tohoto důvodu byla u jmenovaného provedena domovní prohlídka, při které bylo nalezeno na půdě uschováno 39 párů různých druhů dětských botek, různých čísel a jakosti a 17 párů různých dámských polobotek. Ježto nalezená obuv nebyla nepřihlášena a byla uschována patrně a úmyslem aby jejím prodejem v pozdější době byla získána vyšší cena, byla tato obuv zabavena. Zabavená obuv byla předána k uschování četnické stanici v Řevničově.

these types of vouchers. For this reason, I saved the shoes for a later time when they will be available for sale.¹²⁷

Concluding this initial protocol was a decision from the authorities to leave these shoes with Strnadel for now, however, he was instructed not to move them as it could result in an imprisonment of up to six months. The proposed punishment was a fine of at least K5000.

When Strnadel received an official punishment of a fine of K5000 or 20 days imprisonment, which he paid on May 22, and only after the official 8-day period for an appeal, he submitted the following appeal asking for the return of the fine he already paid. As the beginning of his letter is covered by the envelope, we do not have his introductory statement. In this appeal, he stated that the discovered shoes were kept in his attic as they were regarded as discarded and unsalable. Following this, he provided evidence by saying the confiscated shoes were all sold for K200, from which it was evident these shoes were unfashionable and therefore, worthless. He finished by saying that even if he wanted to sell them, he was not able to as most of them were old and not even in a pair. His request for the return of an already paid fine was not granted.

Unsatisfied Strnadel submitted a final appeal in which he attempted to further elaborate on his problem. He, again, stated that the shoes were 18 years old, discarded for several years, and were not able to be worn. Strnadel supported his argument by providing a statement saying the shoes were submitted for an inspection with the district office in Slaný and with the municipal office in Řevničov, both of which recognized these shoes as unnecessary material. The last evidence Strnadel provided, was the fact that all sixty pairs were bought by another company for a total of K200. Concluding this, he said he paid a fine for worthless goods that are sold by the kilogram. Strnadel explained his belated

¹²⁷ Case file XII-Str-3, p. 3; Original: Doznávám, že nalezení obuv jest mým vlastnictvím a že jsem tuto nepřihlásil. Toto opoměl jsem proto, že jedná se o obuv nakoupenou, ještě předválečné době a to o druhy, které podléhají módě a jsou proto neprodejné. Zvláště v nynější době, kdy jest prodej obuvi vázáno na odběrní poukazy nelze očekávat, že by tyto druhy na poukaz někdo kupoval. Z tohoto důvodu uschoval jsem obuv pro pozdější dobu kdy její prodej bude volný.

appeal by saying that his appeal would be considered irrelevant as the office clerks were uninformed about the specifics of the shoes.

For this purpose, I therefore take the liberty of telling you and at the same time describing this shoe, so that it is clear to you and thus you understand why I had to pay the fine mentioned above. It is therefore an 18-year-old shoe, both unfashionable and difficult to wear, which was put aside for several years and was not counted on. This footwear was submitted for inspection and assessment to the District Office in Slaný, by Mr Kamený, by an official at the municipal office in Řevničov, then at the Ministry of Housing and Labour in Prague, and elsewhere, everywhere it was recognized as unnecessary material. The external evidence is perhaps that all the confiscated shoes, numbering sixty pairs, were bought by the company for only K200. From this, you can see what the goods are. I can say that I have paid a fine for worthless goods that others sell by the kilo. I would have appealed immediately within 3 days; I know that my request was considered pointless because you were not sufficiently informed about the type of goods.¹²⁸

However, his final attempt was met with the information that the decision of the authorities was final. This was followed by a warning stating that further submissions would not only be unnecessary but could lead to Strnadel's punishment for unreasonable complaints.

6.2 Overpricing and chain trade with bakery baskets

This final case will illustrate how breaking one regulation, and submitting more appeals could result in discovering other offences. Vladimír Loula was a sales representative in Slaný. His trade was related to bakery products. When the authorities were in March 1942 informed that Loula overpriced bakery baskets which he sold to a company Císařovský pekařství for a substantially higher price, an investigation into this

¹²⁸ Case file XII-Str-3, pp. 16-17; Original: Za tímto účelem, dovoluji si Vám proto sdělit a zároveň tuto obuv popsati, aby bylo Vám jasno a tím pochopili, za co pokuta výše uvedenou musel jsem zaplatit. Jde tudíž o obuv as 18 let starou, jak nemoderní, tak i nesnadno nositelnou, jež byla po několika let takto odložena nebylo s ní sničím počítáno. Tato obuv byla předložena k nahlédnutí a k posouzení Okresnímu úřadu ve Slaném, panem Kameným, úředníkem na obecním úřadě v Řevničově, dále v ministerstvu hosp. a práce v Praze, a jinde, všude uznána byla za nepotřebný materiál. Vnější důkaz snad je, že všechna zabavení obuv čítající 60 párů, byla za pouhých K200 firmou nakoupena. Z toho je vidno a jaké zboží jde. Mohu říci, že platil jsem pokutu za bezcenné zboží, které jiní odprodávají na kilogramy. Byl bych se odvolával ihned do 3 dnů, vím, že moje žádost byla považována za bezpředmětnou poněvadž jste nebyli dostatečně informováni o druhu zboží.

matter was conducted. When Vladimír Loula¹²⁹ admitted to selling bakery baskets for a higher price, his offence was against the government decree No. 175/1939 Coll. from July 27, 1939, about the prohibition of increasing prices: “It is forbidden to increase the prices of goods, goods and actions of any kind...above their status on June 20, 1939.”¹³⁰ Later, during the examination, Loula was sentenced to an additional fine as he participated in the chain trade of bakery baskets, which was directly against the government decree No. 121/1939 Coll. from May 10, 1939, which states “ [anyone] who runs a chain store with goods,”¹³¹ will be sentenced to a fine. Loula received an additional sentence of a fine of K1000 or 10 days imprisonment for chain transactions of bakery baskets.

In March 1942 the municipal office in Slaný was made aware by the ÚCK¹³² that Vladimír Loula was involved in a rather peculiar case of buying and selling bakery baskets. An investigation was conducted by J. Strouhal and K. Václav on March 13, 1942. Loula, according to his own confession, sold fifty pieces of bread baskets and charged K20 a piece, however, he bought them for K15.50 a piece, receiving a commission of 29%. After further questioning, Loula confessed that in 1939 such comparable products he received a commission of 10-15%. Since commissions have not yet been adjusted, the Prime Ministerial Decree No 175/1939 on the prohibition of price increases applied to it. In addition, Loula did not keep any issued bills or a book of trades.

According to the official notice of the ÚCK in Klatovy č. 1226/42 dated 3/3/1942, he sold fifty pieces of bread baskets, size 35 cm in diameter, to the Císařovský pekařství in Čimelence, Písek district, and charged 1 K20 for these, although he pays 1 K15 for these bread baskets. 50, so he as a sales representative earned 29% commission. As the accused admitted, he earned 10 to 15% commission on such goods in 1939. Since the amount of the brokerage commission has not yet been adjusted, the Prime Minister's Order No. 175/1939 on the prohibition of price increases applies to it. In addition, the accused did not issue any invoices, he delivered goods without payment on delivery, he does not keep any books or records,

¹²⁹ Case number XII-Lo-3, criminal record No. C/92.

¹³⁰ Original: “Jest zakázáno zvýšiti ceny zboží, statků a úkonů všeho druhu...nad jejich stav ke dni 20. června 1939.”

¹³¹ Original: “Kdo provozuje řetězový obchod se zbožím,”

¹³² Most probably: úřad cenové kontroly [office of price control].

and it is therefore impossible to find out what goods he trades in and what prices he charges to customers, therefore it is suspected that he trades illegally.¹³³

The initial proposed punishment of a fine of K500, which was later crossed out due to Loula's financial destitution, therefore, a sentence of 3 days imprisonment was given. His imprisonment was carried out from April 9 to 12.

His initial statement stated that the company Jaroslav Muller in Prague sold him these bakery baskets at K15.50 a piece, for this transaction Loula had a bill. He then sent them express to Mr. Císařovský and charged K20 a piece, because the travel to Prague caused him extraordinary expenses. This he included in the price of the baskets as K0.80 a piece, totalling K16.30 a piece, making his profit K3.70 a piece.

I charged that amount because the company asked me to get these somewhere, I had to go to Prague and this created extraordinary expenses for me, and I included them in the price for K0.80. for 1 shoe, i.e., a purchase of K15.50 +80hal total of 16.30, my profit was K3.70 per 1 piece.¹³⁴

Later, Loula submitted an appeal saying she was employed as a sales representative for Hynek Weiskopf in Zbraslav, who produced straw and bakery goods, since 1939. However, the company stopped production due to the straw and other raw materials being confiscated for war for the production of slippers. When in the autumn of 1941, Mr Císařovský asked him to obtain fifty straw baskets which he urgently needed, Strnadel, because he had in the past maintained close business contact with Mr Císařovský, wanted to fulfil his request. Loula was aware that if he managed to obtain these baskets, it would be possible to remain with Mr Císařovský in close contact for future business. When in

¹³³ Case file XII-Lo-3, pp. 1-2; Original: Podle úřední připomínky ÚCK [úřad cenové kontroly] v Klatovech čj 1226/42 ze dne 3.3.1942 prodal řě [firmě] Císařovský pekařství v Čimelencích, okres Písek 50 kusů chlebových ošatek, velikost v průměru 35 cm a účtoval tyto 1 kus K20, ačkoliv sám tyto ošatky platí 1 kus K15.50, tudíž sám jako obchodní zástupce získával 29% provize. Jak obviněný doznal vydělával na takovém zboží v roce 1939 10 až 15% provize. Jelikož výše zprostředkovatelské provize nebyla dosud upravena, platí pro ní nařízení předsedy vlády č 175/1939 o zákazu zvýšení cen. Mimo to obviněný nevystavoval žádné účty, zboží dodával nevyplaceně dobírkou, nevede žádných knih ani záznamů a nelze proto zjistit s jakým zbožím obchoduje a jaké ceny odběratelům účtuje, je proto podezření, že obchoduje na černo.

¹³⁴ Case file XII-Lo-3, p. 3; Original: Tu částku jsem účtoval proto, jelikož pana firma žádala, abych ji tyto někde opatřil, musil jsem jeti do Prahy a tím pro mě vznikly mimořádné výlohy a tyto jsem si do ceny započítal a to za 80 hal na 1 ošatku, tj nákup K15.50+80hal celkem 16.30, můj zisk činil na 1 kusu K3.70.

January of 1942 he indeed managed to obtain the bakery baskets, he purchased them from the company Muller Praha – Karlín for K15.50 apiece. To this price travel expenses and meal expenses were added, based upon the previous agreement with Mr Císařovský, these total about 29% of the price.

As mentioned above, I am employed as a sales representative of Hynek Weiskopf and my brother in Zbraslav, producing straw and basketry goods since 1939. The mentioned company stopped the production of straw goods in 1941 because all kinds of straw and raw materials were confiscated for the wartime production of slippers. In the fall of 1941, Mr Císařovský, the owner of a bakery in Čimelice, with whom I had maintained constant business relations in earlier times, asked me to use my influence to provide him with fifty pieces of straw bags, which I need. To satisfy the aforementioned, as an old customer whom I count on for the future as well, I promised to provide him with these if he pays for my travel and travel expenses. In January of this year, I also actually managed to purchase the desired number of slats from the company Muller Praha - Karlín for the named person at the price of K 15.50 per piece, which I left to the named person also at the stated price, with the addition of ready expenses for travel and food, which in total amounted to the above-listed prices around 29%.¹³⁵

He decisively stated that he was not aware of committing any offence against the government of Decree No. 175/39 and the Government of Decree No. 121/1939 Coll.

However, his appeal was not heard and instead, his guilty verdict was amended – a fine of K1000 or 10 days imprisonment.

Following this amendment, Loula asked for a postponement of sentence by three months, because of his ongoing treatment of breathing issues, which he said must not be interrupted. A postponement was granted; however, he was not imprisoned as he paid the fine on November 17, 1942, a day after he was supposed to enter the prison.

¹³⁵ Case file XII-Lo-3, p. 11; Original: Jsem jak shora uvedeno zaměstnán jako obchodní zástupce Hynek Weiskopf a bratr ve Zbraslavi, výroba slaměného a košíkářského zboží od r 1939. Uvedená firma zastavila výrobu slaměného zboží v r 1941 a to proto, že veškeré druhy slámy a surovin byly zabaveny pro válečnou výrobu papučí. Na podzim v r 1941 požádal mne pan Císařovský majitel pekařství v Čimelicích, s kterým jsem v dřívějších dobách udržoval stálý obchodní styk, abych mu svým vlivem opatřil 50 kusů slaměných ošatek kterých nutně potřebuji. Já abych uvedenému, jako starému zákazníkovi, s kterým počítám i pro budoucnost vyhověl, přislíbil jsem, že mu tyto opatřím, když mi bude hradit cestovné a výlohy s cestou spojené. V lednu letošního roku podařilo se mi taktéž skutečně od firmy Muller Praha – Karlín zakoupiti pro jmenovaného žádaný počet ošatek za cenu 1 kusu K 15.50, které jsem jmenovanému také za uvedenou cenu přenechal s připočtením hotových výloh na cestovním a stravném, což úhrnem činilo ze shora uvedené ceny kolem 29%.

7. Conclusion

This thesis had the goal to answer the question of how the rationing system impacted the everyday population of the political district of Slaný. During this research, the offences which were investigated in the year 1942 in the municipality of Slaný were analysed.

Starting a brief historical background in the Protectorate was provided with a focus on the events consequential for the war economy. The overview of the history of Slaný showed that the years of the Protectorate were peaceful and there were no tragic events such as in Lidice.

The second part of the thesis focused on the administration system of the political district of Slaný. The research showed that the system in Slaný differed from the system explored by past research.¹³⁶ In contrast with the political region of Kladno, which was intensely analysed in the last years, this thesis showed that the office clerks in district of Slaný reacted differently to the challenges of the implementation of the rationed economy. They created registration books, criminal records, and a filing cabinet to simplify their work. The reaction of the office clerks in Slaný verifies Ellwein's idea of *lernende Verwaltung*.¹³⁷ It is possible to conclude that each office or region had a different system, and there was no official system for registering offences.

7.1 Results

Nutritional offences were the most common with 554 recorded cases in 1942. This was due to foodstuffs being heavily regulated, such as: grain, flour, meat, eggs, and milk. The case of Alois Adlta and the unregistered slaughter of a pig was explored. His case was

¹³⁶ Vondráček, *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*.

¹³⁷ The local office clerks reacted to their situation and created their own unique system.

investigated in June 1942 after which he submitted three appeals, trying to explain his situation and to delay his sentence. This case was closed in December 1942, when Adlta after much delay finished his 14-day sentence. The next case was analysing the investigation of Antonín Král and his selling overpriced flour under the counter. This case was dealt with fairly quickly. Král was investigated in July 1942 and in September, after changing the initial statements and submitting one appeal, the K35.000 fine was paid and the case was closed. Both of these cases were diverse, one contained three statements from one person with some clever reasons and a long delay of a sentence, while the second included statements from three people and a quick payment of the fine.

Supply offences proved to be a challenge. Out of the 113 recorded cases, only one was available in full, the other were only registered in the criminal record. However, the case of Terezie Štauchová, owner of a coal dealership, and an unappropriated use of charcoal was explored. The investigation was carried out in July 1942, after which Štauchová submitted an appeal with a document changing the use of the charcoal in question. However, the sentence was not changed, and a K1000 fine was paid in September 1942. The rest of the cases were only categorised. Most paid a fine and four went to prison. The most common offences were in some way about unregistered soap.

From the 345 recorded pricing offences, two were analysed. Bedřich Strnadel was a shop owner who was investigated for a supposed large stock of unregistered shoes. These sixty pair of shoes were confiscated in May 1942, and he was to pay a fine of K5000. This fine was paid in full at the end of May, after which Strnadel submitted two appeals asking for the return of the paid money. Both appeals were denied, and in October 1942 Strnadel received a warning to stop submitting any more statements. The final analysed case was of Vladmír Loula, who was accused of selling overpriced bakery baskets. He confessed, and in April 1942 was imprisoned for three days. However, he submitted an additional

statement that led to him receiving an additional sentence of K1000 or 10-day imprisonment. Loula submitted two additional appeals through which his sentence was delayed to November 16, 1942. In the end, Loula paid the fine a day after he was supposed to be imprisoned.

From the 1012 cases recorded in the criminal records in 1942, five were explored in detail. These provided more knowledge of the everyday life of people in the political district Slaný. These people were attempting to live fulfilling lives and not be limited by new decrees. In these cases, they were unsuccessful. It was further proved, that Czech office clerks operated a bureaucratic system.

7.2 Questions for future research

From this research, many other questions arise. First, a more in-depth analysis of the planned economy in Slaný would provide a more detailed view of the everyday lives of people. Subsequently, a comparative analysis with other towns in the Protectorate could answer the question of how the administrative systems differed. The question of differences between towns in the types of offences could be explored. Finally, the rationed economy after the war until the monetary reform in 1953, and its everyday life presents further questions for analysis and comparison.

Bibliography

- Aujezdský, Jiří. "Válečné řízené hospodářství v protektorátu Čechy a Morava." Bachelor's thesis, Technická univerzita Ostrava, 2012.
- Boulding, K.E. "A Note on the Theory of the Black Market." *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 13, no. 1 (1947): 115-118.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/137604?origin=JSTOR-pdf>.
- Brandes, Detlef. *Češi pod německým protektorátem: Okupační politika, kolaborace a odboj 1939-1945*. Praha: Prostor, 2019.
- Bryant, Chad. "Making the Czechs German: Nationality and Nazi rule in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, 1939-1945." PhD dissertation, University of California, 2002.
- Bryant, Chad. *Prague in Black: Nazi Rule and Czech Nationalism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Ellwein, Thomas. *Der Staat als Zufall und als Notwendigkeit: Die jüngere Verwaltungsentwicklung in Deutschland am Beispiel Ostwestfalen-Lippe*. Opladen: Springer, 1993.
- Fránek, Adam. "Vznik Protektorátu Čechy a Morava a reakce společnosti." Bachelor's thesis, CEVRO Institut, 2015.
- Galbraith, James K. "The Meaning of a War Economy." *Challenge* 44, no. 6 (2001): 5-12.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40722105>.
- Gebhart, Jan and Jan Kulík. *Dramatické všední dny Protektorátu*. Praha: Themis, 1996.
- Hédlová, Luba and Radka Šustrová. *Česká paměť: Národ, dějny a místa paměti*. Praha: Academia, 2015.
- Hubble, Nick. *Mass-Observation and Everyday Life: Culture, History, Theory*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.

- Hrůzová, Klára. "Protektorát Čechy a Morava." Bachelor's thesis, Masarykova universita, 2010.
- Jirák, P. "Kokošková, Zdeňka – Pažout, Jaroslav – Sedláková, Monika: Úřady oberlandrátů v systému okupační správy Protektorátu Čechy a Morava a jejich představitelé." *Historica – sborník historických prací* 63 (2019): 291-293.
<https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=1011244>.
- Klemann, A.M. Hein, and Sergei Kudryashov. *Occupied Economies: An Economic History of Nazi-Occupied Europe, 1939-1945*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2013.
- Kokoška, Stanislav. "Resistance, Collaboration, Adaptation... (Some Notes on Research of the Czech Society in the Protectorate)." *Czech Journal of Contemporary History* 1, no. 1 (2013): 54-76.
- Kokošková, Zdeňka, et al. *Úřady oberlandrátů v systému okupační správy Protektorátu Čechy a Morava a jejich představitelé*. Praha: Národní archiv, 2019.
- Král, Václav. *Otázky hospodářského a sociálního vývoje v českých zemích v letech 1938-1945*. Praha: ČSAV, 1959.
- Kučera, Rudolf. *Život na příděl. Válečná každodennost a politiky dělnické třídy v českých zemích 1914-1918*. Praha: NLN, 2013.
- Kyncl, Vojtěch. *Bez výčitek. Genocida Čechů po atentátu na Reinharda Heydricha*. Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR, 2012.
- Ludlová, Nikola. "Scientific Management of Labour and Production in the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, 1939-1945." Master's thesis, Central European University, 2016.
- Lüdtke, Alf. *The History of Everyday Life*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Lüdke, Alf. "Alltagsgeschichte – ein Bericht von unterwegs." *Historische Anthropologie* 11, no. 2 (2003): 278-295. <https://doi.org/10.7788/ha.2003.11.2.278>.

- Maršálek, Petr. *Pod ochranou hákového kříže: Nacistický okupační režim v českých zemích 1939-1945*. Praha: Auditorium, 2012.
- Mainuš, František. "V protektorátě po 15. březnu 1939." *Totální nasazení: Češi na pracích v Německu 1939-1945*. Brno: Universita J.E. Purkyně, 1970.
- McDonald, C. and Jan Kaplan. *Praha ve stínu hákového kříže: pravda o německé okupaci 1939-1945*. Praha: Melantrich, 1995.
- Milotová, Jaroslava. "Výsledky Heydrichovi správní reformy z pohledu okupačního aparátu." In *Paginae historiae: sborník Státního ústředního archivu v Praze*, 161-174. Praha: Státní ústřední archiv v Praze, 1944.
- Moskowitz, Moses. "Three Years of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia." *Political Science Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (1942): 353-375. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2144345>.
- Musilová, Dana. "Zásobování a výživa českého obyvatelstva v podmínkách válečného řízeného hospodářství (1939-1945)." In *Slezský sborník* 4 (1991): 255-266.
- Novotný, Jiří. *Státní finanční hospodaření v období protektorátu v letech 1939–1945*. Praha: Národohospodářský ústav Josefa Hlávky, 2006.
- Průcha, Václav. *Československé hospodářství za nacistické okupace*. Praha: Dějiny a současnost, 1966.
- Schelle, Karel, et al. *Protektorát Čechy a Morava: Jedna z nejtragičtějších kapitol českých novodobých dějin*. Ostrava: KEY Publishing s.r.o., 2010.
- Ševcová, Dana. Sociální politika nacistů v takzvaném protektorátu v letech 1939-1945. *Dějiny socialistického Československa* 7 (1985): 167-208.
- Šisler, Stanislav. "Příspěvek ve vývoji a organizaci okupační správy v českých zemích v letech 1939-1945." *Sborník archivních prací* 13 (1963): 46-95.
- Štěpek, Jiří. *Přídělové doklady z období tzv. Protektorátu*. Praha: Odbor archivní správy a spisové služby MV ČR, 2010.

- Štolleová, Barbora. *Pod kuratelou Německé říše: Zemědělství Protektorátu Čechy a Morava*. Praha: Charles University, 2015.
- Šustrová, Radka. “A Dilemma of Change and Co-Operation: Labour and Social Policy in Bohemia and Moravia in the 1930s and 1940s.” In *Nazism Across Borders: The Social Policies of the Third Reich and their Global Appeal*, edited by Sandrine Kott and Kiran K. Patel, 105-140. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Šustrová, Radka. “‘It Will Not Work without a Social Policy!’ Research on Social Policy Practice on the Territory of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia.” *Czech Journal of Contemporary History* 2, no. 1 (2014): 31-56.
<https://doi.org/10.51134/sod.2013.003>.
- Šustrová, Radka. *War Employment and Social Policies in the Protectorate Bohemia and Moravia 1939-1945*. Prague: Charles University, 2018.
- Šustrová, Radka. *Zastřené počátky sociálního státu: Nacionalismus a sociální politika v protektorátu Čechy a Morava*. Praha: Argo, 2020.
- Tauchen, Jaromír. “Vývoj Obchodního Práva v Období Protektorátu Čechy a Morava (1939–1945).” In *Vývoj Soukromého Práva Na Území Českých Zemí*, 704-719. Brno: Masarykova Univerzita, 2012.
- Taylor, Lynne. “The Black Market in Occupied Northern France, 1940-4.” *Contemporary European History* 6, no. 2 (1997): 153–176. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20081623>.
- Tönsmeier, Tanja, Peter Haslinger and Agnes Laba. *Coping with Hunger and Shortage under German Occupation in World War II*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- Vajskebr, Jan, and Radka Šustrová. “Německá bezpečnostní opatření v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava na začátku války.” In *Paměť a dějiny* 3(2009): 90-107.

Vondráček, Jan. *Státní moc, politická správa a každodennost: Prosazování řízeného hospodářství v politickém okrese Kladno v Protektorátu Čechy a Morava 1939-1945*. Praha: Academia, 2021.

Vondráček, Jan. "War Economy, Local Administration and Everyday Life under German Occupation in Bohemia and Moravia: New Approaches for Digital Humanities through Digitization, Databases and Digital Analysis." *Journal of East Central European Studies* 70, no. 3 (2021): 439-465.
<https://doi.org/10.25627/202170311019>.

Wixforth, Harald. "The Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia under German Control, 1939-1944." In *Economies under Occupation: The hegemony of Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan in World War II*, edited by Marcel Boldorf and Tetsuji Okazaki, 161-177. London: Routledge, 2015.

Government Decrees

Stejnopis sbírky zákonů a nařízení republiky Česko-Slovenské, ročník 1939

Vládní nařízení č. 75/1939 Sb., *O Protektorátu Čechy a Morava* [On the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia].

Vládní nařízení č.121/1939 Sb. *O zřízení nejvyššího ústavu cenového* [On the establishment of a Supreme Pricing Institute].

Vládní nařízení č.175/1939 Sb. *Zákaz zvýšení cen* [Ban on price increases].

Stejnopis sbírky zákonů a nařízení Protektorátu Čechy a Morava, ročník 1939

Vládní nařízení č. 215/1939 Sb. *Zavedení odběrných lístků na potraviny* [Establishment of food vouchers].

Vládní nařízení č. 206/1939 Sb. *Úprava hospodaření s potravinami a krmivý*
[regulation of food and feed management].

Vládní nařízení č. 211/1939 Sb. *O úpravě hospodaření s jatečným dobyt看, mase,*
a masnými výrobky [On the regulation of the management of slaughter cattle, meat,
and meat products].

Vládní nařízení č. 213/1939 Sb. *Úprava hospodaření s obilím, rýží, mlýnskými*
výrobky a výrobky z mouky, luštěninami, olejnatými plodinami, olejnatými semeny
a krmivý [Management of cereals, rice, milling and flour products, pulses, oilseeds,
oilseed crops and fodder].

Stejnopis sbírky zákonů a nařízení Protektorátu Čechy a Morava, ročník 1940

Vládní nařízení č. 20/1940 Sb. *Rozšíření zmocnění ministerstva zemědělství*
k úpravě hospodaření některými potravinami a krmivý na ovoce, zeleninu, zvěř,
drůbež a ryby [Extension of the power of the Ministry of Agriculture to regulate the
management of certain food and feedstuffs to fruit, vegetables, game, poultry and
fish].

Vládní nařízení č. 189/1940 Sb. *Změna a doplnění některých ustanoveních vládního*
nařízení ze dne 10. května 1939, č.121 Sb., o zřízení nejvyššího úřadu cenového
[Amendment and supplementation of certain provisions of the Government Decree
of 10 May 1939, No. 121 Coll., on the establishment of the Supreme Price Office].

Vládní nařízení č. 298/1940 Sb. *Úprava domácích porážek vepřů* [Amendment to
domestic pig slaughters].

Stejnopis sbírky zákonů a nařízení Protektorátu Čechy a Morava, ročník 1941

Vládní nařízení č. 393/1941 Sb. *O správním trestním právu a řízení v oboru*
vyživovacím, zásobovacím a cenovém [On administrative criminal law and
procedure in the field of maintenance, supply and pricing].

Archival sources

OÚ Slaný Elench XII 1942-1948 A-Mb Přestupky

OÚ Slaný Elench XII 1942-1948 Mi-Ž Přestupky

1942 Trestní Rejstřík

Manipulace 1942 (uncategorised cartons

XII-Sta-3 Štauchová Terezie

XII-Lo-3 Loula Vladmír

XII-Kr-1 Král Antonín

XII-A-1 Adlta Alois

XII-Str-3 Strnadel Bedřich

Slaný: Kronika města 1938-1945.

Appendix

Figure 1 Elench XII; A-1 Alois Adlta

Ordnungs-Zahl Radové číslo	Gegenstand - Věc	Geschäftszahlen - Císla jednací
1942	1 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout.	3760, 31.079, 16, 1928, 2137, 2336, 2730, 1089,
	2 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	1348, 1936,
	3 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	1571,
	4 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	1667,
	5 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	222,
1943	6 Augr. Wenzl, Praha N. 209 - Em. Abt. (bin)	416,
	7 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	1842, 2026, 2465, 2779,
	8 Augr. Wenzl, Praha N. 209 - Em. Abt. (bin)	2485, 2659, 2827,
	9 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	3149,
	10 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	3439,
	11 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	3503,
	12 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	3803,
	13 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	3807, 4208, 4207, 4362, 4772, 4812, 5716, 5238, 5308, 5490, 5707,
	14 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	4167,
	15 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	766,
	16 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	5767, 5787, 4222, 423,
1944	17 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	286, 1454, 322, 1206, 3440, 4054, 4420, 4522, 462,
	18 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	1920,
	19 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	2188,
	20 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	3995, 4577,
	21 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	5595,
	22 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	4216, 4239, 4440, 4637, 5454, 5704, 5769, 5703, 6204, 6203,
	23 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	4212, 4395, 4611, 4986, 5787,
	24 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	4218, 4547, 4698, 4929, 5464,
	25 Adlt Alois, Ruzyně čp. 244 - výpis pout. ^{arabiz. radová}	6224,

Bab
Bas
Bea
Ben
Bi
Bo
B-
Bs
C
C
Da
Do
Dr
Ds
Jv
E
a
f
lb
am
as
b
b

