Late Stalinist Antisemitism

An Approach to the 1952 Slánský Trial in Prague

Jan Gerber

Prologue

On 27 June 1957, public interest in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) was focused on Weimar.[1] The Central Committee of the ruling Socialist Unity Party of Germany (Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands, SED) dispatched its Secretary for Culture and Education, the former Minister for Public Education Paul Wandel to Weimar, and Johannes R. Becher, Anna Seghers and other writers traveled to this city of German Classical Literature. All the larger newspapers sent correspondents. The reason for all this attention was the funeral of the writer Louis Fürnberg, who authors such as Christa Wolf, Rainer Kirsch, and Hanns Cibulka soon considered their literary teacher. Fürnberg had suddenly succumbed to a heart attack four days earlier, at the age of 48. The memorial service organized by the GDR government began in the White Hall of the Weimar City Palace where the coffin of the poet lay in state (ND 1957; Bundesarchiv 1957a, 1957b, 1957c, 1957d). Officers of the newly founded Nationale Volksarmee (National People's Army) performed the guard of honor. They also led the funeral procession, which progressed from the City Palace to the Historical Cemetery, and they laid a huge wreath that Wilhelm Pieck, President of the GDR, had sent. Behind the guard of honor were six more soldiers, carrying the coffin of Fürnberg. Hundreds of people joined the funeral procession and paid the poet their last respects. The SED main organ, *Neues Deutschland*, which carried a report on its front page on the funeral the following day, spoke of a "funeral procession almost inestimable in size" (ibid.). In the Historical Cemetery of the City of Weimar, the coffin was finally lowered into the ground in a representative location. Fürnberg, who had served in Weimar as deputy director of the National Research Institutes

1 This essay summarizes some of the central theses of my book and a longer essay on the Slánský trial in a necessarily abbreviated and pointed form (Gerber 2017; Gerber 2020).

and Memorial Places of German Classical Literature, was laid to rest only a few paces behind the final resting place of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe.

The funeral of Fürnberg, who is today almost only known as the author of the non-official hymn of the SED – "Die Partei, die Partei, die hat immer recht" (The Party, the Party is always right) (Gerber 2012) –, was unusual in every respect. Thus, the author, honored in death by an act of state, had only been granted citizenship in the GDR in August 1954, less than three years before his early demise. Up until that point he had had a Czechoslovak passport and his principal place of residence was Prague. Already in 1945, it had been suggested to Fürnberg, born in 1909 in Iglau in Moravia, that he relocate to Germany. In connection with the resettlement of the Germans from Czechoslovakia after the war, the 50,000 German-speaking members of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (Komunistická strana Československa, KSČ) had been told to leave the country. But Fürnberg and his wife Lotte had refused to go to Germany (Fürnberg/Zweig 1946: 143; AdK 1953). The reason, which they did not mention publicly but only hinted at cautiously in private (Fürnberg/Zweig 1945: 140), was that 28 of their relatives had been murdered in the National Socialist concentration camps. Many Jewish KSČ members, who belonged to the German-speaking minority in the country, made a similar decision. Egon Erwin Kisch, whose brothers had been murdered in the Theresienstadt and Łódź ghettos, Otto Katz, the editor of the two Brown Books about the Reichstag fire (Braunbuch 1933; Braunbuch II 1934), and others, unlike the majority of their German-speaking communist comrades, did not relocate in 1945/46 to the Soviet Occupation Zone of Germany but rather to Prague. Fürnberg commented on his decision: "It wasn't for reasons of caution, but because first a person wants to let some grass grow over their feelings." (Ibid.)

But why then did Fürnberg change his decision not to go to Germany and in 1954 chose to relocate from Prague to Weimar, where twelve years earlier his brother had been murdered in the nearby Buchenwald concentration camp?

A first clue is provided by an extraordinary message of condolence that Lotte Fürnberg received shortly after the death of her husband (AdK 1957). It was sent by Grete Weiskopf, the widow of the writer F. C. (Franz Carl) Weiskopf, who, like Fürnberg, had grown up in the Bohemian Lands, stemmed from a German-speaking Jewish family and had joined the KSČ already as a young man. Like his writer colleague, he too only decided to go to the GDR in the 1950s. In September 1955 he died there of a heart attack.

Not least it was these parallels that Weiskopf's wife alluded to when she wrote in her letter of condolence that there was probably no-one who could understand Lotte Fürnberg as well as she did. But there was another shared common element. In reference to the early death of the two writers, Grete Weiskopf spoke of "mistakes and errors" that were not paid for by "those who made them, but rather by their victims". Both Fürnberg and Weiskopf appeared to her as if they had "died in war". And she added: "Only, what kind of a war was that?!" (Ibid.) This question and the biographies of Fürnberg and Weiskopf provide a new perspective on the late Stalinist campaign against "cosmopolitanism and Zionism" that affected the states of the Soviet sphere of influence from the early 1950s onwards, particularly Czechoslovakia.

A Trial in the Cold War

The confrontation for which Grete Weiskopf found no name was ostensibly the Cold War that began in 1947/48. Only shortly after the breakup of the anti-Hitler coalition, the world was on the brink of a new, this time nuclear, world war. The US monopoly on atomic weapons had been broken already in 1949; work began in 1950 on the Soviet hydrogen bomb. When the Korean War erupted that same year, representatives of the two camps assumed that a new military confrontation was on the horizon in Europe. The fear of this last war, which would be atomic, gained validity on both sides of the Iron Curtain, manifest in a virtual hysteria over spying and infiltration. It was no accident that the career of the British agent 007 began at this juncture. *Casino Royale*, Ian Fleming's first James Bond novel, appeared in 1953, becoming a bestseller in near-record time.

On the one hand, this hysteria about agents was promoted by the actual activities of the security services, which took on an extent previously unknown; on the other, it was spurred by the particularities of the deepening Cold War. Thus, the East-West conflict permeated the world not only vertically, along national borders, but also horizontally right across the blocs. Influential communist parties existed in the West, some of which, as in France and Italy, at times garnered almost a third of the votes. In the Central and Eastern European countries that now belonged to the Soviet sphere of influence, by contrast, the Red Army in its advance from 1942 on had certainly not been welcomed everywhere as a liberator. In addition, in

1948, the Yugoslav head of state and party chief Josip Tito, previously one of the most faithful supporters of Stalin, broke with Moscow.

Yet this hysteria over war and infiltration on both sides of the Iron Curtain was most centrally expressed in a series of spectacular court proceedings, where (despite all the significant differences) the ideological questions of the Cold War were dealt with. Just recall the case against László Rajk in 1949 in Budapest, in which the former Hungarian interior and foreign minister and seven of his comrades were denounced as Western agents (Shiels 2006). In the Kravchenko trial that same year, at issue was the credibility of a Soviet diplomat who had fled to the West (Kern 2007). In New York in 1951, Ethel and Julius Rosenberg were found guilty, despite the deficient state of the evidence, of being Soviet atomic spies. Sentenced to death, they were executed two years later in the electric chair (Schneir 2010).

Yet probably the most spectacular trial in those years was the tribunal in November 1952 in Prague against Rudolf Slánský, the former General Secretary of the Czech Communist Party, along with 13 other high-ranking KSČ functionaries. Eleven of them were sentenced to death, three were given life imprisonment. In five large-scale and a whole series of smaller secondary trials, dozens more former members of the state bureaucracy and Communist Party apparatus in Czechoslovakia received lengthy prison sentences, in some cases life imprisonment (Gerber 2017).

However, the Slánský trial differed from other political trials at the beginning of the Cold War not only in its magnitude but also because of its openly antisemitic character. Many of the defendants were not only reproached for having spent the time of the anti-fascist exile, at least in part, in the West, where they had supposedly been in contact with British and American offices. Rather, the Czechoslovak press also regularly repeated the fact that twelve of the fourteen main defendants were Jews. This Jewish background, it was claimed, made them unreliable in national matters. The pervasive tenor of the indictment, judgment and concomitant press coverage construed them as persons untrustworthy in a national sense: cosmopolitans, conspirators, agents of imperialism and, not to be forgotten, "Zionists". In the trial protocol, ultimately the old antisemitic stereotype of a link between Judaism and Freemasonry was employed: the state prosecutor argued that with the assistance of Freemasonry lodges and Zionist organizations, the accused had tried to undermine the people's democratic order (Urválek 1952: 17). In parallel with the trials, Jews, viewed without ex-

ception as Zionist agents, were banned from mid-level and higher positions in the national government and Communist Party machinery.[2]

Among these victims of the Slánský trial were also Louis Fürnberg and F. C. Weiskopf. After the Coup de Prague, the communists took over power in 1948 and the two writers joined the diplomatic service of Czechoslovakia: Weiskopf became an embassy counselor in Washington, envoy of Czechoslovakia in Sweden in 1949 and shortly after ambassador in the newly declared People's Republic of China. In 1949, Louis Fürnberg was appointed cultural attaché in the Czechoslovak embassy in the GDR. In the context of the Slánský trial, the two were called back from their posts and ordered to return to Prague. Both of them were in a panic, because behind the charges against the defendants in the trials, Fürnberg and Weiskopf also saw attacks against themselves as individuals (AdK 1953b; Fürnberg 1996: 86). Like Otto Katz, Ludvík Frejka or Artur London, they were widely travelled intellectuals, had spent the period of anti-fascist exile in the West and stemmed from Jewish families.

It was at this point that they decided to apply for resettlement in the GDR. Fürnberg and Weiskopf were certainly aware that an analogous trial was also being prepared in East Berlin. The international press reported extensively on arrests in the GDR (Friedmann 2007: 230; Brandt 1985: 407; ZK der SED 1952); moreover, remigrants from the West like Anna Seghers, Willi Bredel, Bodo Uhse and other friends of Fürnberg and Weiskopf had been systematically vetted. Nevertheless, the GDR still appeared to them to be a reasonably safe place of refuge.

They were quite right in their assessment. While Fürnberg and Weiskopf had become personae non grata in Czechoslovakia, their books became bestsellers in the GDR. The wave of purges within the SED also bypassed them. The campaign against "cosmopolitanism and Zionism", which provided the framework for the persecutions across the Eastern bloc in those years, never took on the same proportions in the GDR as in Czechoslovakia. The proceedings against Paul Merker, Bruno Goldhammer, Paul Baender, Fritz Sperling and other remigrants from the West did not take place in 1954/55 as show trials but rather as secret trials (Graf 2024: 213–258; Herf 1997: 106–161). The accused were not executed but rather sentenced to imprisonment. Even if late Stalinism in the GDR evinced clear antisemitic undertones (ibid.; Haury 2002; Meng 2005), the SED

2 On the reactions of the Jewish population in Czechoslovakia to the Slánský trial: Čapková (2020).

apparently was hesitant when it came to making Jews the principal figures in their trials, openly attacking them on basis of their Jewish origins.

Weapons for Israel

The fact that the Prague investigators concentrated on the Jewish party members was not least a product of the Soviet reorientation in the Middle East. Moscow initially had supported the establishment of the State of Israel to weaken the British position in this geo-strategically important area (Bialer 1990; Krammer 1974). When in 1947 an agreement on an arms deal between the Hagana, the Yishuv's defense forces, and Prague began to emerge, Stalin voiced no objections. On the contrary: he supported the development of financial and political relations. Thus, Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union were among the first states to formally recognize Israel internationally in 1948.

The first arms deal agreement was soon followed by others. When Prague and Tel Aviv concluded an agreement on the supply of fighter planes, military support was expanded to include the training of pilots. In Planá and Olomouc in Czechoslovakia, members of the Hagana, among them the future Israeli president Ezer Weizmann, were trained in operating the planes. During the War of Independence, Czechoslovakia additionally assembled a volunteer brigade of some thousand Jews from the People's Republic who had submitted applications to immigrate to Israel, along with numerous non-Jewish officers (Krammer 1974: 111; Timm 1997: 83). But it was especially the airlift between Prague and Lod, by which the Israeli military was kept supplied with weapons during the War of Independence, that proved to be a boon. According to David Ben Gurion, it made a decisive contribution to the Israeli victory over the forces of the Arab League. In his words: "They rescued the state." (Q. f. Schiff 1985: 37)

But the weak showing by the Israeli Communist Party in the first election to the Knesset in February 1949 already served to worsen relations between Moscow and Tel Aviv: the party garnered only 3.5 percent of the vote. This was interpreted by the Kremlin as a clear decision by the Israeli electorate against the "Soviet Way of Life". When in 1949 Israel accepted a loan of 100 million US dollars from Washington and moved cautiously towards the US during the Korean War, relations worsened even further. Moscow began to distance itself from Israel and sought to forge closer links with the Arab states.

This change of policy was expedited by a change in Soviet domestic policy. During World War II, the rulers in the Kremlin had made numerous concessions to the various nationalities in the Soviet Union regarding national and cultural autonomy. They had assumed (probably correctly) that the appeal to patriotic sentiment could better motivate citizens for the struggle against Germany than the idea of the classless society. The latter had already been heavily discredited by the savage actions by the Bolsheviks in their own sphere of power, including foremost the catastrophe of collectivization, the Great Terror and Gulag. In this context, various organizations came into being, such as the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, the Pan-Slavic Anti-Fascist Committee, and its periodical *Slawjane*.

However, with the beginning of the Cold War, the Soviet state and party leadership again distanced itself from its liberal policy on nationalities in World War II. After the victory over the German occupiers, the extensive promises for national autonomy appeared to endanger the unity of the Soviet Union. When in 1948 Golda Meir (at this time: Meyerson), the first Israeli ambassador to Moscow, was greeted joyfully by thousands of Soviet Jews (some speak of tens of thousands) shouting "Next year in Jerusalem!" (Veidlinger 2003: 13–15) during a visit to the great Moscow Choral Synagogue, the always present distrust among the Kremlin leadership grew. The traditional saying at Passover and Yom Kippur, which up until then had had a sacred meaning, had taken on a political dimension with the establishment of the State of Israel in May 1948. Thus, against the backdrop of the intensifying alienation between Moscow and Tel Aviv, the paranoia regarding agents in the early Cold War combined with the traditional fear of a double loyalty on the part of the local indigenous Jews. This change in direction by the Soviet Union was accompanied throughout the Eastern bloc by the infamous campaign against "cosmopolitanism and Zionism".

However, the "war" Grete Weiskopf had alluded to in 1957 in her message of condolence to Lotte Fürnberg had a further dimension. Even if the Soviet reorientation in the Middle East was the geopolitical reason underlying the Slánský trial, it does not explain (1) why Louis Fürnberg, who had become a persona non grata in Czechoslovakia, was less than three years later honored with a state funeral in the GDR. It also does not explain (2) why the campaign across the Eastern bloc against "cosmopolitanism and Zionism" resulted in such especially bloody consequences in Czechoslovakia. The Prague trials were the "most terrible bloodbath that Stalinism led to in the satellite states" (Hodos 1988: 124). And it does not explain (3) why anti-fascists, which the KSČ leaders doubtlessly were, concocted a

show trial only seven years after the liberation of Auschwitz in which Jews were indicted as Jews and ultimately executed. To be able to answer these question, it is necessary to look back into the interwar period and via those years back into the nineteenth century.

Communism and the National Question

When Louis Fürnberg and F. C. Weiskopf emigrated to the GDR in the early 1950s, they were treading a path they had walked down once already more than twenty years earlier. In 1928, Weiskopf relocated for the first time to Berlin, and Fürnberg did the same in 1929. (While for health reasons Fürnberg stayed only a few months in Germany (AdK 1948–1954), F. C. Weiskopf did not return from Berlin to Prague until after the Reichstag fire.) With their resettlement in Berlin in the 1920s, the two writers were part of a large migration movement to Germany from the Habsburg Empire and its successor states, made up of hundreds of young, revolutionary-minded intellectuals, often speakers of German and from Jewish families. With relocation to the German capital, migrants like Karl Kautsky, Egon Erwin Kisch, Otto Katz (in the Slánský trial sentenced to death), Hanns Eisler, Rudolf Hilferding, Friedrich Stampfer and others were continuing down a path they had set out on when they joined the workers' movement.

With the collapse of the Russian and the Habsburg empires at the end of World War I, nation-states had come into being everywhere in Central and Eastern Europe: Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Austrian Republic, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, etc. But significantly, their population structure differed only little from that of the old empires. In the Cisleithanian part of the Habsburg monarchy, i. e. the area governed from Vienna, there were nine recognized nationalities. And in Czechoslovakia there were still six: along with Czechs and Slovaks, who were counted as Czechoslovaks, there were Germans, Hungarians, Ruthenians, Jews and Poles. This heterogeneity entailed numerous problems. The Russian Empire and Habsburg Monarchy had been already shaken by struggles between nationalities, springing from actual discrimination of minorities, and the national aspirations for independence of the respective population groups. However, in the states that had emerged from the collapse of the two great empires, the situation of the national minorities was often even more unpleasant than in the old empires. Their desire for national independence had also been intensified by the wave of new states born after the end of World War I.

The workers' movement had a special attraction for members of these national minorities. This aura went back precisely to the Marxian concept of social class. It was a conception that lacked unlimited binding validity due to the nationalities question that predominated everything in Central and Eastern Europe. This concept, which paradoxically was most popular where one could speak only in a limited way of the dominance of class struggle and different class status, appeared as a kind of beacon. On the basis of its universalist core, it seemed to hold out the possibility to leave behind any discrimination based on a person's origin. The proletarian organizations promised the creation of a society in which the "Blutsurenge", the "merely local connection resting on blood ties", as Marx had polemically termed it (Marx 1993: 161; Marx 1983: 95), would no longer have any meaning. Louis Fürnberg's and F. C. Weiskopf's friend Paul Reimann (Pavel Reiman), who during the Prague trials was forced to testify against Slánský, explained in exemplary fashion in his memoirs that he had become a communist with an eye to a future society of the free and equal, not least in order to liberate himself from his Jewish origin (Reiman 1966: 29).

In the here and now, the Communist Party took on a similar function. Thus, the national minorities among the members and voters of the KSČ (also of the communist parties in Poland, Rumania, Hungary and elsewhere) were also over-proportionately represented (Burks 1961: 187–202; Kuhn 1962: 435–440). This was because the party was the only political force in the respective countries in which the members of all nationalities officially enjoyed full equality. In the ranks of the workers' movement, the members of the national minorities were transformed not only into comrades, but rather paradoxically for the first time into equal citizens according to a Western democratic paradigm. The workers' movement was thus a de facto substitute for political liberalism, which in the West was already mired in crisis, at a time when it still had not even established itself in Eastern Europe. The concept of class appeared to neutralize that of origin.

However, beneath the universalist surface oriented to class struggle, the nationality conflicts, which called into question the actual potency of the concept of class, also continued to churn within the workers' movement. Thus, in the KSČ, the party of Fürnberg and Weiskopf, there was mistrust especially of Germans and Hungarians. This mistrust was based on a mixture of national misgivings and negative experiences with members of the two former dominant nations (Austria and Hungary) in the Habsburg

Empire. In the old imperial days, they had clearly been privileged; their behavior also regularly reflected that.

Yet the mistrust also targeted the Jewish party members. Like Fürnberg and Weiskopf, they often came from middle-class families and their forebears had, as a result of the Josephine reforms in the eighteenth century, in many cases also largely acculturated, including the adoption of the German language and associated aspects of cultural development.[3] Since the emergence of the Czech national movement in the nineteenth century, the indigenous local Jews were thus perceived as adherents and representatives of Germanization, a process vehemently rejected by many Czechs. In contrast, when they adhered to the imperial principle of multilingualism, they were often accused of undermining the ethnolingual affiliations that the various national movements sought to strengthen. While bilingualism, the co-existence of a transnational language of education and a regional colloquial language, was not uncommon at the beginning of the nineteenth century, at its end it was considered something supposedly Jewish – an expression of national untrustworthiness. Even though many Bohemian and Moravian Jews had turned to the Czech language since the late nineteenth century, Czech antisemitism remained connected with animosity towards the Germans and dislike of their language, which had ousted and in part replaced Czech since the seventeenth century (Kořalka 1999: 20; critical: Frankl 2005). Once generated, interpretive patterns usually change more slowly than reality. They immunize themselves against empiricism above all when, even at the time of their creation, they serve less to structure reality than to satisfy needs: from political mobilization to national self-assurance. Interpretive patterns become worldviews when reflection on the projective moment underlying all perception fails (Horkheimer/Adorno 1988: 196–209).

In contrast to the situation in the Bohemian lands, venturing to Weimar Berlin seemed to promise the option of a final goodbye to one's origin. The modernity of the German metropolis, about which Weiskopf, Kisch or Katz were in agreement (e. g. Weiskopf 1927: 486; Václavek 1965: 14), consisted in the fact that two of the core categories of order in modernity, the concepts 'society' and 'class', here were able to lay claim to virtually unlimited validity. To avoid any misunderstandings: the German workers' movement also

3 On the state of research, the question of languages and the complicated affiliations of the Bohemian Jews: Čapková (2012: 14–25, 56–63); Čapková/Kival (2020); Čapková/Kieval (2021).

regularly pursued a strict national direction. Just recall the support of the SPD socialists for the war credits in 1914 or the various national-German Bolshevik strategies with which an attempt was made to surpass the Nazis in matters of patriotic propaganda (e. g. KPD 1930). Yet differing from the situation in the successor states of the Habsburg Empire, the concept of 'nation' in Western Europe and Germany was used less in the sense of 'ethnic groups' and more in the meaning of the affiliation to "the state as a whole" (Kořalka 1958: 299). In simplified terms: west of the old empires, nationality pointed to citizenship; by contrast, in Eastern Europe it aimed towards ethnic belonging, as Hans Kohn has repeatedly emphasized (Kohn 1965).[4] For this reason as well, the question of 'belonging' did not arise in Berlin in the Weimar period with the same vehemence it sparked at that time in the territory of the former Habsburg Monarchy. In Berlin at this juncture, origin was supplanted by the future, or as the German language neatly put it, 'Herkunft' was replaced by 'Zukunft'.

Return to Prague

The longing for Prague that marks many literary works of Fürnberg and Weiskopf only arose when that future disappeared, namely during the conjuncture of anti-fascist exile. Berlin lost its magnetic power of attraction due to National Socialism, which can stand for the end of the "language of class" (Geoff Eley). But Prague likewise no longer meant much as a point of reference. "Gradually", Lotte Fürnberg recalls, "we became aware of the fact just how many of our friends, whom we inquired about, were no longer among the living. The past became clear to us by dint of their death." (Fürnberg 1996: 60)

But the status of the survivors also became precarious. Thus, the Sudeten German movement of "Back Home to the Reich" ("Heim ins Reich"), the experience of German occupation and the Nazi policy of resettlement, expulsion and genocide had served to crystallize different ideas than in the interwar period within the minds of the exiled Czech politicians for dealing with the question of nationalities. No longer was the aim a process

4 In other words, west of the old empires, due to the largely ethnic homogeneity, there were generally no state citizens who had a nationality other than that of the titular nation. In Eastern Europe, however, the situation was different. In Czechoslovakia, for example, there were countless Czechoslovak citizens of German, Polish, Ruthenian, Jewish, etc. nationality.

of coalescing, growing together into one, as Edvard Beneš had envisaged once (Beneš 1909: 19; Beneš 1935: 8; Beneš 1937: 17). Nor was the national autonomy now envisioned, which for a time had been a demand of the KSČ (KSČ 1923: 15–16; KSČ 1931: 299–302). Now central was the aim of ethnic homogeneity, extending even to the expulsion of a portion of the population to achieve that. Thus, most of the Germans, who constituted approximately twenty-five percent of the population, were resettled from Czechoslovakia in 1945/46, and a portion of the Hungarian minority was expelled, their possessions seized.

The local indigenous Jews were also affected by these policies in many cases. On the basis of their identification with the German language and culture, many survivors of the Holocaust were expelled along with the Germans after 1945 (Wein 2016: 252–255; Wlaschek 1997: 220; Nepalová 1999). Hundreds left the country or stood in exile, because their citizenship was withdrawn (Wein 2016: 252–255; Nepalová 1999: 353–355). Exceptions were made not least in the case of members of the KSČ like Fürnberg and Weiskopf. The traditions of the "long nineteenth century" distorted the view among many Czechs of the fact that the close bond between the German and Jewish cultural development since the Josephine reforms had been rent asunder, dissolved by Auschwitz. The brevity of the period in which this nexus was smashed (from the autumn of 1941 to the winter of 1944) also contributed its share in making it difficult to discard what had been the historical system of coordinates of the previous 150 years (Diner 1995: 126–129). Historical consciousness often changes more slowly than its subject.

Ultimately, the goodwill that the Prague government mustered for the emigration plans of Czechoslovak Jews to the Middle East also belongs in this context: between 1947 and 1949 some twenty thousand of them were permitted to emigrate to the British mandate territory Palestine and the State of Israel (Bialer 1990: 63). This comprised roughly half of the Jewish population then in Czechoslovakia.

This sense of goodwill was quite ambivalent, because it was bound up not only with the geostrategically motivated support granted to Israel by the Soviet Union – but rather also with the transformation of Czechoslovakia into a proverbial 'people's democracy'. With this concept, the masterminds of the world communist movement had initially sought to distance and differentiate themselves from the Western democracies. But quite unwittingly, with the term 'people's democracy' they also found a formula that did ethnographic justice to the new situation in Central and Eastern Europe. In

the interwar period, citizenship and ethnicity had diverged in all the countries that were designated as people's democracies after 1945. As a result of the National Socialist population exchanges, the German mass murders, and the ensuing reactions to these policies after the Second World War – the changing and re-drawing of borders, the expulsions and resettlements – demos and ethnos, state people and nominal nation, became largely identical in Eastern Europe for the first time. Poland, where large Jewish, Ukrainian, Russian and German minorities had always lived, became an ethnically nearly homogeneous Polish state through annihilation of the local indigenous Jews, the expulsion of the ethnic Germans and the shifting westward of the borders. Czechoslovakia – as a result of the resettlement of the Germans, the expulsion of numerous Hungarians and the transfer of Carpathian Ukraine, inhabited principally by Ruthenians, to the Soviet Union – was transformed into the national state of the Czechs and Slovaks.

Not least, the emigration of Jews from Czechoslovakia to the Middle East, seen against this backdrop, was regarded as a contribution to the further reduction in the number of those who were not encompassed under the umbrella of 'peoplehood' in the new ethno-democracy. By lending support to emigration to Israel, the government in Prague sought to rid itself of one of the last population groups that reminded people of the imperial tradition of the country – which after the war had once more totally reconstituted itself in a new way, territorially and in terms of ethnicity. An internal paper of the Czechoslovak interior ministry in 1948 stated accordingly that the resettlement plans of the local Jews should be looked on favorably, since these persons were not very reliable and there were "unproductive elements" among them (Svobodová 1999: 235). The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, principally concerned after the Second World War with assistance for Jewish DPs, spoke in an internal paper in 1948 about a "systematic deportation" of the Czechoslovak Jews by the Prague authorities (ibid.; ABS 1948; ABS 1949a; ABS 1949b).

Which is to say: the good relation that the Czech government fostered toward Israel from 1947 to 1949 was at best based only in a limited way on special sympathies for the Jewish state. For that reason, the Prague government in 1948 did not hesitate to negotiate with Arab countries about arms sales. However, when Israel intervened, the Soviet Union forbade Czechoslovakia from developing any further economic relations with Arab countries (Loebl 1976: 24–26; Brod 1980: 71). A Czech weapons transport, which left the Yugoslav Adriatic coast on 28 March 1948, bound for Beirut – at the same time a ship loaded with Israeli rifles embarked, headed for

Haifa – remained in this period the sole military support from Prague for the Arab League (Krammer 1974: 70).

The Trial

This policy of ethnic homogenization, implemented after 1945 everywhere in Eastern Europe, found an ideologically encoded internal party continuation in the Slánský trial – and in a more attenuated form likewise in the other Eastern European show trials during the early Cold War. The Soviet change of course in the Middle East, and the associated campaign across the entire Eastern bloc against 'cosmopolitanism and Zionism' coincided in Czechoslovakia with the lingering aftershocks of the ethnic conflicts in the interwar period and the nineteenth century. Thus, at the end of the 1940s, the Prague state and party leadership had initially refused to arbitrarily produce defendants for a show trial (NA 1949d), demanded by Budapest, Warsaw and Moscow (in that order) (NA 1949a; NA 1949b; NA 1949c). In the beginning, the Czech investigators searched for actual conspirators inside the party bureaucracy; however, none were to be found among the suspects (NA 1949d).

Only when the fraternal parties in Hungary, Poland and the Soviet Union adamantly insisted on a trial (e. g. NA 1951a) did the Czechoslovak investigators and numerous middle and senior party functionaries concentrate on persons who – because of their proficiency in German or their command of several languages – were always viewed with a modicum of mistrust (NA 1951b; NA 1951c). The personnel structure in the middle-range and higher party apparatus and state bureaucracy was revamped, adapting it to the population makeup of the country as it had changed in 1945/46. Without the party leadership becoming fully aware of what was happening, the KSČ in this manner was, in the framework of the campaign against 'cosmopolitanism and Zionism', 'cleansed' of its last imperial or Habsburg vestiges in the new national state of the Czechs and the Slovaks.

Thus, the defendants in the Slánský trial found themselves thrust once again into that multiple position of minority which they had actually opined to leave behind by joining the Communist Party. Fürnberg's and Weiskopf's friend Paul Reimann was compelled to testify in court that the joint element of the accused was "their shared Jewish bourgeois origin" (Reiman 1952: 139). The Czechoslovak press stressed that the names at

birth given to the defendants stemmed largely from the German-Jewish tradition. Fürnberg's friend Ludvík Frejka had been born as Ludwig Freund, Bedřich Reicin as Friedrich Reinzinger, Bedřich Geminder as Friedrich Geminder. Where no German name could be found, one was invented, as in the case of Rudolf Slánský. Since that time there has in fact been a stubborn and persistent rumor that the 'actual name' of the General Secretary of the party had been Rudolf Salzmann[5] (Kolder Commission 1968: 95). Around 1945, the KSČ had often still recommended such name changes to its Jewish members (Goldstücker/Schreiber 2009: 108). Now suddenly the acceptance of this advice was no longer considered proper subordination to the new 'Slavic line' propagated in Czechoslovak politics, which had been a topic of discussion since 1943 (the classic: Kohn 1952). No: rather such name changes were deemed an attempt to infiltrate the party under false pretense, employing fictitious devices (Goldstücker 1952: 94). Thus, the court proceedings against Slánský and comrades were not simply, as is sometimes stated, a 'Moscow' trial, but rather also very much a 'Prague' trial, with a distinctive Czechoslovak element of its own.[6]

In the GDR, the situation differed from that in the successor states of the old empires. Despite the ostensibly identical character, the Slánský trial and the trials held in East Berlin took their choreography from different inventories. While ethnic questions and ideological issues converged in Prague, the trials in the GDR were principally motivated by ideology. Even though the SED continued and reproduced the 'class struggle' jargon of the Weimar German Communist Party (KPD), the concept of class had also lost its historical-philosophical implications there as well, due to National Socialism and the merging of mob and elite into the murder collective of the Holocaust. But in a sociological respect, as an instrument to describe differences in mentality, income and habitus, the notion of class retained in Germany, now as before, its validity. The nationality question – whose aftershocks reverberating in Prague made sure that the KSČ leadership did not even realize the signal effect of an antisemitic show trial only seven years after the liberation of Auschwitz – did not exist in the GDR.

5 Igor Lukes pointed out that the General Secretary's 'actual' or 'former' name was not Salzmann (Lukes 2008: 4). See further the death certificate of Slánský's father from the Theresienstadt ghetto: His father's name was Simon Slánský, his grandfather's name Bernhard Slánský (Ältestenrat 1943).

6 This has recently been emphasized by Chad Bryant, Kateřina Čapková and Diana Dumitru, who have worked out some of the 'local' dynamics with the help of numerous sources (Bryant/Čapková/Dumitru 2023).

Undoubtedly, the SED also ignored the Holocaust (Graf 2024: 185–257; Herf 1997: 13–39). Yet because the social semantics of class were not a code for ethnic issues (but rather, if at all, a cipher for the nation), it shrank back, all its antisemitic rhetoric notwithstanding, from staging Jews as the principal figures in its campaign of political 'cleansing'. The court proceedings against Paul Merker, Bruno Goldhammer and others did not take place as show trials but rather as secret trials (Herf 1997: 106–161).

Epilogue

When in June 1957, two years after F. C. Weiskopf's funeral, the coffin of Louis Fürnberg was placed on the ground only a few paces behind the final resting place of Goethe, this quite unintentionally bore a symbolic meaning. Because with Fürnberg's move to settle in the GDR, a tradition had reached its end. This was a tradition also represented by the work of Goethe. Fürnberg and Weiskopf had always seen German as a cosmopolitan cultural language. Belonging for them, like for Goethe, was not national but rather was conveyed through common shared values. However, as a result of the collapse of the empires after World War I, and National Socialism and its myriad consequences, the German language had forfeited its cosmopolitan character. It had become nationalized.

Ironically, those political parties that in the interwar period had advocated a suspension of a person's origin in the name of equality, later became the central agents of ethnic homogenization, with which the process of nationalization in Eastern Europe was concluded at the beginning of the Cold War. In so doing, the communist parties of Eastern Europe implemented the very goals enshrined in the nationality policy of their former greatest adversaries: of the national right-wing camp around Miklós Horthy in Hungary, Roman Dmowski in Poland and Karel Kramář in Czechoslovakia. At the beginning of the Cold War, the nationalities question was incorporated into the programmatic and organizational principles of the Communist parties of Eastern Europe in a coded ideological form. After 1989, when the categories of the East-West conflict became obsolete overnight, they re-emerged undisguised almost everywhere in the former Eastern bloc – in Yugoslavia as well as in Czechoslovakia and the former Soviet Union.

At the beginning of the 1950s, the last representatives of the Jewish German-speaking traditions of Eastern Europe found themselves necessitated

to relocate to the GDR, the Federal Republic of Germany or Austria – or resign themselves to a shadowy bleak existence in their countries of origin. As a product of the tectonic dislocations of the time, the field of vision of Louis Fürnberg, whose early creativity had been oriented to the future, shifted into the past: from the "goal that beckons before me" ("Du hast ja ein Ziel vor den Augen / Damit du in der Welt dich nicht irrst"), of which he sang in a poem in 1937 (Fürnberg 1937: 163), to the administration of the legacy of Goethe and Schiller, for which he was professionally responsible working in the memorial site of the authors of the Classical Era.

At the same time, the Slánský trial, whose victims, in Grete Weiskopf's words, included Louis Fürnberg and F. C. Weiskopf, also consolidated a new, albeit terrible, tradition. Left-wing anti-Zionism had emerged at the beginning of the twentieth century in the factional struggles of Social Democracy in the Russian Empire. It was not least the result of the difficult triangular relationship between the Bolsheviks, the anti-Zionist General Jewish Labour Bund (the Bund) and Ber Borochov's Marxist Zionists of Poale Zion. The arguments of these debates continued into the interwar period.

Many communists and socialists, such as Fürnberg and Weiskopf, assumed that the coming revolution would eliminate both the exploitation of the proletariat and the dis-crimination against Jews. In the light of these expectations, Zionism appeared to be a step backwards, or at least a detour in the fight against antisemitism. The central addressee of left-wing anti-Zionism in the interwar period was therefore initially the Jewish population. They were to be dissuaded from national Jewish ideas and converted to socialism. Where left-wing anti-Zionism was intended to address a broader audience, it usually had a regional focus. Although it always had antisemitic undertones, unlike traditional antisemitism it was not a model for explaining the world, but an equally simplistic and inadequate aid to interpreting the political developments in British Mandate Palestine. Leftist anti-Zionism was territorially limited.

This changed with the late Stalinist campaign against 'cosmopolitanism and Zionism', of which the Slánský trial became a central symbol. The changes had already begun earlier. The actor Solomon Mikhoels, one of the most prominent members of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee of the Soviet Union, had already been murdered in Minsk on Stalin's orders in January 1948. In the so-called 'Night of the Murdered Poets' in August 1952, other representatives of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, including some of the most important Soviet Yiddish poets, were sentenced to death

and executed (Grüner 2008; Rubenstein/Naumov 2001). However, all these murders were kept secret; Mikhoel's death was disguised as a car accident, and he was even given a state funeral in 1948.

It was not until the Slánský trial, which was followed in December by the accusation of a conspiracy of mainly Jewish Kremlin doctors against the Soviet state and party leadership (the so-called doctors' plot), that Jews were openly accused of being Jews and executed as such. Anti-Zionism became territorially unlimited. Although the Czechoslovak Minister of Culture Zdeněk Nejedlý was one of the first to announce in a radio address shortly after the Slánský trial that "anti-Zionism is not antisemitism" ("Antisionismus není antisemitismus") (Nejedlý 1952: 11), anti-Zionism became the representative of antisemitism in the communist labour movement. The antisemitic undertones became the main tone. Traditional antisemitic ideas were incorporated into party-communist anti-Zionism and it became, at least in tendency, a model for explaining the world. For the first time, domestic challenges and problems were widely linked to the situation in the Middle East and attributed to the insidious actions of 'Zionists'. The term 'Zionism' was also expanded. During the Slánský trial, strict opponents of Zionism such as Otto Fischl were accused and executed as members of a Zionist 'conspirator group', along with people such as Rudolf Margolius, who had sympathized with the founding of the Jewish state due to his own experience in Auschwitz. Louis Fürnberg, who remained sceptical of Zionism until the end of his life, was also considered a Zionist due to his exile in British Mandate Palestine. Unlike in the interwar period, the term 'Zionist' had become synonymous with 'Jew'. The Slánský trial thus also played an important role in the transformation of the 'old' antisemitism, which seemed to have been delegitimized by Auschwitz, into a new, post-45 antisemitism.

Bibliography

ABS – Archiv bezpečnostních složek/Archive of the Security Forces, Prague (1948): MNB 425, 212, 3, l. 159–238 f., American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and Refugee Aid (Joint) in Czechoslovakia, Report for Czechoslovakia, 1 July through 30 September 1948, submitted by Henry Levy.

ABS – Archiv bezpečnostních složek/Archive of the Security Forces, Prague (1949a): MNB 425, 212, 3, l. 159–238 f., American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and Refugee Aid (Joint) in Czechoslovakia, Report for Czechoslovakia, 1 January through 30 June 1949, submitted by Henry Levy.

ABS – Archiv bezpečnostních složek/Archive of the Security Forces, Prague (1949b): MNB 425, 212, l. 1–126, American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and Refugee Aid (Joint) in Czechoslovakia, Report for Czechoslovakia, 1 July through 31 December 1949, submitted by Henry Levy.

AdK – Akademie der Künste/Academy of Arts, Berlin (1948–1954, probably): Louis Fürnberg Archives, no. 1806–1810, Lebensläufe.

AdK – Akademie der Künste/Academy of Arts, Berlin (1953a): F. C. Weiskopf Archives, no. 502, Tagebuch XIII, Prag – Dobříš – Karlsbad, 24 January 1953 – 10 July 1953, 31 May 1953, fol. 67.

AdK – Akademie der Künste/Academy of Arts, Berlin (1953b): F. C. Weiskopf Archives, no. 503, Tagebuch XIV, 11 July 1953 – 7 December 1953, Prag – Berlin.

AdK – Akademie der Künste/Academy of Arts, Berlin (1957): Louis Fürnberg Archives, no. 1744, Grete Weiskopf to Lotte Fürnberg, 25 June 1957.

Ältestenrat (1943): Ghetto Theresienstadt, Der Ältestenrat, Todesfallanzeige [Simon Slánský], 6 March 1943, www.holocaust.cz/databaze-dokumentu/dokument/96228-slansky-simon-oznameni-o-umrti-ghetto-terezin.

Beneš, Edvard (1909): Otázka národností, Prague: Tisková komise české strany pokrokové.

Beneš, Edvard (1935): Masarykovo pojetí ideje národní a problém jednoty československé, Bratislava: Nákladem Učení společnosti Šafaříkovy.

Beneš, Edvard (1937): Kundgebung des Präsidenten der Republik in Reichenberg am 19. August 1936, in: Probleme der Tschechoslowakischen Republik. Kundgebungen des Präsidenten der Republik Dr. Edvard Beneš in Nordböhmen, Prague: Orbis.

Bialer, Uri (1990): Between East and West. Israel's Foreign Policy Orientation 1948–1956, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Brandt, Heinz (1985): Ein Traum, der nicht entführbar ist. Mein Leben zwischen Ost und West, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

Braunbuch (1933): Braunbuch über Reichstagsbrand und Hitlerterror, Paris: Éditions du Carrefour.

Braunbuch II (1934): Braunbuch II. Dimitroff contra Göring. Enthüllungen über die wahren Brandstifter, Paris: Éditions du Carrefour.

Brod, Petr (1980): Die Antizionismus- und Israelpolitik der UdSSR. Voraussetzungen und Entwicklung bis 1956, Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Bryant, Chad/Čapková, Kateřina/Dumitru, Diana (2023): Undone from Within. The Downfall of Rudolf Slánský and Czechoslovak-Soviet Dynamics under Stalin, in: Journal of Modern History, 95(4), 847–886.

Bundesarchiv (Federal Archives) (1957a): Bildarchiv, image 183–48137–0001.

Bundesarchiv (Federal Archives) (1957b): Bildarchiv, image 183–48137–0003.

Bundesarchiv (Federal Archives) (1957c): Bildarchiv, image 183–48137–0004.

Bundesarchiv (Federal Archives) (1957d): Bildarchiv, image 183–48137–0005.

Burks, R. V. (1961): The Dynamics of Communism in Eastern Europe, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Čapková, Kateřina (2012): Czechs, Germans, Jews? National Identity and the Jews of Bohemia, New York/Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Čapková, Kateřina (2020): Jüdinnen und Juden in der Tschechoslowakei und der Slánský-Prozess, in: Ganzenmüller, Jörg (ed.): Jüdisches Leben in Deutschland und Europa nach der Shoah. Neubeginn – Konsolidierung – Ausgrenzung, Köln et al.: Böhlau, 127–136.

Čapková, Kateřina/Kival, Hillel J. (eds.) (2020): Zwischen Prag und Nikolsburg. Jüdisches Leben in den böhmischen Ländern, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Čapková, Kateřina/Kival, Hillel J. (eds.) (2021): Prague and Beyond. Jews in the Bohemian Lands, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Diner, Dan (1995): Gestaute Zeit. Massenvernichtung und jüdische Erzählstruktur, in: Diner, Dan: Kreisläufe. Nationalsozialismus und Gedächtnis, Berlin: Berlin-Verlag, 123–139.

Frankl, Michal (2005): "Sonderweg" of Czech Antisemitism? Nationalism, National Conflict and Antisemitism in Czech Society, in: Bohemia, 46, 120–134.

Friedmann, Ronald (2007): Ulbrichts Rundfunkmann. Eine Gerhart-Eisler-Biografie, Berlin: Edition Ost.

Fürnberg, Lotte (1996): "Ohne Utopie kann ich nicht leben", in: Edschmid, Ulrike (ed.): Verletzte Grenzen. Zwei Frauen, zwei Lebensgeschichten, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 9–91.

Fürnberg, Louis (1937): Du hast ja ein Ziel vor den Augen, in: Fürnberg, Louis (1977): Werke: Gedichte, 1927–1946, vol. 1, ed. by the Akademie der Künste der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, Berlin/Weimar: Aufbau, 163.

Fürnberg, Louis/Zweig, Arnold (1945): Louis Fürnberg to Arnold Zweig, 11. November 1945, in: Poschmann, Rosemarie/Wolf, Gerhard (eds.) (1978): Der Briefwechsel zwischen Louis Fürnberg und Arnold Zweig. Dokumente einer Freundschaft, Berlin/Weimar: Aufbau, 140.

Fürnberg, Louis/Zweig, Arnold(1946): Louis Fürnberg to Arnold Zweig, February/March 1946, in: Poschmann, Rosemarie/Wolf, Gerhard (eds.) (1978): Der Briefwechsel zwischen Louis Fürnberg und Arnold Zweig. Dokumente einer Freundschaft, Berlin/Weimar: Aufbau, 143.

Gerber, Jan (2012): Lied der Partei, in: Enzyklopädie jüdischer Geschichte und Kultur: He–Lu, vol. 3, ed. by Dan Diner, Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler, 515–520.

Gerber, Jan (2017): Ein Prozess in Prag. Das Volk gegen Rudolf Slánský und Genossen, Göttingen/Bristol: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Gerber, Jan (2020): Von Polna nach Prag. Der Weg zum Slánský-Prozess, in: Bohemia, 60, 1–30.

Goldstücker, Eduard (1952): Výpověď svědka Eduarda Goldstückera, in: Ministerstvo spravedlnosti (ed.) (1953): Proces s vedením protistátního spikleneckého centra v čele s Rudolfem Slánským, Prague: Orbis, 94–97.

Goldstücker, Eduard/Schreiber, Eduard (2009): Von der Stunde der Hoffnung zur Stunde des Nichts. Gespräche, Wuppertal: Arco.

Graf, Philipp (2024): Zweierlei Zugehörigkeit. Der jüdische Kommunist Leo Zuckermann und der Holocaust, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Grüner, Frank (2008): Patrioten und Kosmopoliten. Juden im Sowjetstaat 1941–1953, Köln et al.: Böhlau.

Haury, Thomas (2002): Antisemitismus von links. Kommunistische Ideologie, Nationalismus und Antizionismus in der frühen DDR, Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.

Herf, Jeffrey (1997): Divided Memory. The Nazi Past in the two Germanys, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hodos, Georg Hermann (1988): Schauprozesse. Stalinistische Säuberungen in Osteuropa 1948–54, Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Horkheimer, Max/Adorno, Theodor W. (1988): Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

Kaplan, Karel (1986): Die politischen Prozesse in der Tschechoslowakei 1948–1954, München: Oldenbourg.

Kaplan, Karel (1990): Report on the Murder of the General Secretary, London/Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Kern, Gary (2007): The Kravchenko Case. One Man's War on Stalin, New York: Enigma Books.

Kohn, Hans (1952): Pan-Slavism and World War II, in: The American Political Science Review, 46, 699–722.

Kohn, Hans (1965): Nationalism, its Meaning and History, Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.

Kolder Commission (1968): Bericht der Kommission für die Überprüfung der politischen Prozesse in der Zeit von 1949 bis 1954, in: Pelikán, Jiři (ed.): Pervertierte Justiz. Bericht der Kommission des ZK der KPTsch über die politischen Morde und Verbrechen in der Tschechoslowakei 1949–1963, Wien: Europaverlag.

Kořalka, Jiři (1958): Über die Anfänge der Zusammenarbeit zwischen der Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland und in den böhmischen Ländern, in: Obermann, Karl/Polišenský, Josef: Aus 500 Jahren deutsch-tschechoslowakischer Geschichte, Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 299–330.

Kořalka, Jiři (1999): Národní identita Židů v českých zemích 1848–1918 mezi němectvím, češstvím a sionismem, in: Tomaszewski, Jerzy/Valenta, Jaroslav (eds.): Židé v české a polské občanské společnosti. Sborník přednášek, Prague: Univerzita Karlova Filozofická fakulta, 9–25.

KPD (1930): Programmerklärung [der Kommunistischen Partei Deutschlands] zur nationalen und sozialen Befreiung des deutschen Volkes, in: Berthold, Lothar/Diehl, Ernst: Revolutionäre deutsche Parteiprogramme, Berlin: Dietz, 119–128.

Krammer, Arnold (1974): The Forgotten Friendship. Israel and the Soviet Bloc, 1947–53, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

KSČ (1923): Protokol I. řádného sjezdu Komunistické Strany Československa (Sekce III. Komunistické Internacionály), konaného ve dnech 2., 3., 4. a 5. Ùnora 1923 v sále „Domoviny" v Praze VII, Prague: Nakladatelství Svoboda.

KSČ (1931): Protokol VI. řádného sjezdu Komunistické Strany Československa, konaného v Praze ve dnech 7 až 11. března 1931, Prague: J. Haken.

Kuhn, Heinrich (1962): Zur Sozialstruktur der Kommunistischen Partei der Tschechoslowakei. Ein Forschungsbericht, in: Bohemia. Jahrbuch des Collegium Carolinum, 3, 426–467.

Loebl, Eugen (1976): My Mind on Trial, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Lukes, Igor (2008): Rudolf Slansky: His Trials and Trial, Working Paper #50 of the CWIHP Working Paper Series, https://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/publication/WP50IL.pdf.

Marx, Karl (1983): Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie. in: Marx, Karl/Engels, Friedrich: Werke, vol. 42, ed. by Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus beim ZK der SED, Berlin: Dietz.

Marx, Karl (1993): Grundrisse. Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Meng, Michael (2005): East Germany's Jewish Question. The Return and Preservation of Jewish Sites in East Berlin and Potsdam, 1945–1989, in: Central European History, 38, 606–636.

NA – Národní archive/National Archives of the Czech Republic, Prague) (1949a): fond KSČ-ÚV-K 1945–1989, sv. 14, ar.j. 383, l. 21 f. (komise II) (Mátyás Rákosi to Klement Gottwald, 3 September 1949).

NA – Národní archive/National Archives of the Czech Republic, Prague) (1949b), fond KSČ-ÚV-K 1945–1989, sv. 14, ar.j. 383, l. 24 f. (komise II) (report about Karel Švab's meeting with representatives of the Hungarian state and party leadership and General Bjelkin, 7/8 September 1949).

NA – Národní archive/National Archives of the Czech Republic, Prague) (1949c): fond KSČ-ÚV-K 1945–1989, sv. 14, ar.j. 383, l. 25 f. (komise II) (report about Jindřich Veselý's meeting with representatives of the Polish state and party leadership, 13 September 1949).

NA – Národní archive/National Archives of the Czech Republic, Prague) (1949d): fond KSČ-ÚV-K 1945–1989, sv. 14, ar.j. 383, l. 19 (komise II) (Klement Gottwald about the Hungarian and Czechoslovakian situation).

NA – Národní archive/National Archives of the Czech Republic, Prague) (1951a): fond KSČ-ÚV 1945–1989, sv. 2A, ar.j. 13, l. 14 f. (komise II) (Josef Stalin to Klement Gottwald, 24 July 1951).

NA – Národní archive/National Archives of the Czech Republic, Prague) (1951b): fond 01, sv. 16, ar.j. 28, l. 4 (presentation, Klement Gottwald, meeting of the central committee, 6 September 1951).

NA – Národní archive/National Archives of the Czech Republic, Prague) (1951c): fond 01, sv. 16, ar.j. 28, l. 10 (presentation, Václav Kopecký, meeting of the central committee, 6 September 1951).

ND – Neues Deutschland (1957): Louis Fürnberg feierlich beigesetzt, in: Neues Deutschland, 28 June 1957, l.

Nejedlý, Zdeněk (1952): Antisionismus není antisemitismus (Rozlahs 07.12.1952), in: Nejedlý, Zdeněk (1953): K procesu s protistátním spikleneckým centrem. Čtyři projevy v Československém rozhlase, Prague: Československý spisovatel, 11–17.

Nepalová, Šárka (1999): Die jüdische Minderheit in Böhmen und Mähren in den Jahren 1945–1948, in: Theresienstädter Studien und Dokumente, 6, 332–362.

Reiman, Pavel (1952): Výpověď svědka Pavla Reimana, in: Ministerstvo spravedlnosti (ed.) (1953): Proces s vedením protistátního spikleneckého centra v čele s Rudolfem Slánským, Prague: Orbis, 137–139.

Reiman, Pavel (1966): Ve dvacátých letech. Vzpomínky, Prague: Nakladatelství politické literatury.

Rubenstein, Joshua/Naumov, Vladimir P. (eds.) (2001): Stalin's secret pogrom. The postwar inquisition of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Schiff, Zeev (1985): A History of the Israeli Army. 1874 to the Present, New York: Macmillan.

Schneir, Walter (2010): Final Verdict. What Really Happened in the Rosenberg Case, New York: Melville House.

Shiels, Duncan (2006): Les Frères Rajk, Paris: Buchet Chastel.

Svobodová, Jana (1999): Erscheinungsformen des Antisemitismus in den böhmischen Ländern 1948–1992, in: Hoensch, Jörg K./Biman, Stanislav/Lipták, Lubomír (eds.): Judenemanzipation – Antisemitismus – Verfolgung in Deutschland, Österreich-Ungarn, den Böhmischen Ländern und in der Slowakei, Essen: Klartext, 229–248.

Timm, Angelika (1997): Hammer, Zirkel, Davidstern. Das gestörte Verhältnis der DDR zu Zionismus und zum Staat Israel, Bonn: Bouvier.

Urválek, Josef (1952): Státní prokurátor: v z. JUDr. J. Urválek: Předsedovi státního soudu v Praze. Žaloba, in: Ministerstvo spravedlnosti (ed.) (1953): Proces s vedením protistátního spikleneckého centra v čele s Rudolfem Slánským, Prague: Orbis, 7–46.

Václavek, Ludvík (1965): F. C. Weiskopf und die Tschechoslowakei, Prague: Statni Pedagogicke Nakladatelstvi.

Veidlinger, Jeffrey (2003): Soviet Jewry as a Diaspora Nationality. The "Black Years" Reconsidered, in: East European Jewish Affairs, 1, 4–29.

Wein, Martin J. (2016): History of the Jews in the Bohemian Lands, Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Weiskopf, Franz Carl (1927): Mumientreffen am Kurfürstendamm, in: Ibid. (1960): Werke: Reportagen, vol. 7, Berlin: Dietz, 485–489.

Wlaschek, Rudolf M. (1997): Juden in Böhmen. Beiträge zur Geschichte des europäischen Judentums im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, München: Oldenbourg.

ZK der SED (1952): Lehren aus dem Prozess gegen das Verschwörerzentrum Slansky. Beschluss des Zentralkomitees vom 20. Dezember 1952, in: Zentralkomitee der SED (ed.) (1954): vol. 4, Dokumente der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands. Beschlüsse und Erklärungen des Zentralkomitees sowie seines Politbüros und Sekretariats, Berlin: Dietz, 199–220.