

“AS A PUNISHMENT, TO ÚSTÍ NAD LABEM!” THE SPANISH COMMUNIST EXILE IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND COLLABORATION WITH THE STATE SECURITY AS A FORM OF RESISTANCE¹

MAROŠ TIMKO

Institute of History of the Czech Academy of Sciences

timkomaros@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: This study focuses on the issue of the Spanish communist exile in state socialist Czechoslovakia. It analyzes everyday resistance of a heterodox Spanish emigrant, Pilar Gómez, carried out through her collaboration with the Czechoslovak State Security (StB). This insubordination was oriented against the disciplining at the behest of the leadership of the Spanish Communist Party (PCE) in Prague, which expelled Gómez from the party and ordered her transfer to Ústí nad Labem. Through the analysis of Gómez's knowledge (re) creation and the reversal of the discourse on Spanish exiles in Czechoslovakia, the author examines existing power relations between a heterodox exile, the direction of the PCE in Czechoslovakia and the Czechoslovak StB. With a focus on the constructive/productive character of Gómez's resistance, this article underlines the dichotomy within the Spanish communist exile in the Eastern Bloc as well as the everyday problems of political emigrants living under state socialism.

KEY WORDS: Everyday resistance – Czechoslovakia – Spanish exile – Communism – State Security – PCE – Ústí nad Labem

Maroš Timko. Doctor por la Charles University de Praga en 2022, actualmente es Investigador Postdoctoral en el Instituto de Historia de la Academia Checa de las Ciencias. Su tesis Relaciones hispano-checoslovacas (1918-1977) se centra en el exilio comunista español en la Checoslovaquia de posguerra y los exiliados checos y eslovacos en la España de Franco. Su área de estudio son los contactos entre España y Checoslovaquia en el siglo XX, la historia contemporánea de España e Hispanoamérica y la política exterior checoslovaca en la Guerra Fría.

¹ The present study forms part of the chapter entitled “As a punishment, to Ústí nad Labem!” Everyday resistance of Spanish communist exiles in Czechoslovakia” of the PhD dissertation “Czechoslovak-Spanish relations (1918-1977)” defended at the Centre for Ibero-American Studies at Charles University in 2022.

“¡DE CASTIGO, A ÚSTÍ NAD LABEM!” EL EXILIO COMUNISTA ESPAÑOL EN CHECOSLOVAQUIA Y LA COLABORACIÓN CON LA SEGURIDAD DEL ESTADO COMO FORMA DE RESISTENCIA

RESUMEN: Este trabajo se dedica a la cuestión del exilio comunista español en Checoslovaquia del socialismo de Estado. Analiza la resistencia cotidiana de una emigrante española heterodoxa, Pilar Gómez, llevada a cabo a través de su colaboración con la Seguridad del Estado checoslovaca (StB). Esta insubordinación se orientó contra la disciplina a instancias de la dirección del PCE en Praga, que expulsó a Gómez del partido y ordenó su traslado a Ústí nad Labem. A través del análisis de la (re)creación del conocimiento por Gómez y de la reversión del discurso sobre los exiliados españoles en Checoslovaquia, el autor examina las relaciones de poder existentes entre una exiliada heterodoxa, la dirección del PCE en Checoslovaquia y la StB. Con un enfoque en el carácter constructivo/productivo de la resistencia de Gómez, este artículo subraya la dicotomía dentro del exilio comunista español en el Bloque del Este, así como los problemas cotidianos de los emigrantes políticos que vivían bajo el socialismo de Estado.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Resistencia cotidiana – Checoslovaquia – Exilio español – comunismo – Seguridad del Estado – PCE – Ústí nad Labem

INTRODUCTION

The first intensive contacts between Czechoslovak and Spanish communists could be traced back to the Spanish Civil War (1936-39), when out of more than 2,100 Czechoslovak volunteers who fought on the side of the Republic, there were 1,112 communists.² Despite this, Spanish “comrades” did not start to seek refuge in Czechoslovakia sooner than 1946. It was only after WWII

2 Hana BORTLOVÁ, “Los españolotes checoslovacos, intento de reconstrucción de algunos denominadores comunes de sus vidas” in Josef OPATRŇÝ (ed.), *Las relaciones checo-españolas (=Ibero-Americana Pragensia, Supplementum 20)*, Praga: Carolinum, 2007, p. 256-257; Jiří NEDVĚD, *Českoslovenští dobrovolníci, mezinárodní brigády a občanská válka ve Španělsku v letech 1936-1939*, MA thesis, Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 2008, p. 120. The literature on the subject of Czechoslovak (and not exclusively communist) participation in the Spanish Civil War is extensive, see e.g., Manuel REQUENA GALLEGO and Matilde EIROA (ed.), *Al lado del gobierno republicano: los brigadistas de Europa del Este en la guerra de España*, Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, 2009; Zdenko MARŠÁLEK and Emil VORÁČEK et al., *Interbrigadisté, Československo a španělská občanská válka. Neznámé kapitoly z historie československé účasti v občanské válce ve Španělsku 1936-1939*, Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR, 2017 or Maroš TIMKO, “Los voluntarios checoslovacos en el bando sublevado durante la Guerra Civil en España” in Josef OPATRŇÝ (ed.), *Checoslovaquia, Europa Central y América Latina: el periodo de entreguerras (=Ibero-Americana Pragensia, Supplementum 51)*, Praga: Carolinum, 2019, p. 93-108. On the topic of the Spanish Civil War and its metamorphosis within Czech historiography, see Martin KINDL, “«En Madrid se lucha por Praga». La Guerra Civil española en la memoria cultural checa”, *Ayer*, 127 (3/2022), p. 307-333.

when the members of the Communist Party of Spain (Partido Comunista de España – PCE) began establishing the first Spanish exile collective residing in Prague. Undoubtedly, their arrival was influenced by the fact that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (Komunistická strana Československa – KSČ) became the strongest political party in the country with the Prime Minister and 9 members in the cabinet after the general elections of May 1946, controlling the crucial offices (Ministry of the Interior – MOI, Ministry of Information). Thus, as soon as 1946, Czechoslovak communists were able to offer shelter, as a gesture of fraternal solidarity, to various exiles and left-wingers persecuted or fleeing their homeland for their political orientation³ –the Spanish communists were only one of several groups of these leftist emigrants.⁴

The communist regime established in Czechoslovakia after “Victorious February” of 1948 was a fundamental precondition for the transformation of the Czechoslovak metropole into one of the PCE centers. Furthermore, an important role also played the country’s strategic position –in between other centers of PCE (Paris and Moscow), while still maintaining connections with Western Europe.⁵ With the intensification of the Cold War at the turn of the 1940s and 1950s (formation of NATO, the outbreak of the Korean War), tensions within the Eastern Bloc (the Tito-Stalin split) and the problems Spanish communists had to face in post-war France,⁶ the PCE decided to convert

3 Kathleen B. GEANEY, “Špatná strana hranice? Anglicky mluvící levicová komunita v Československu na počátku studené války”, *Střed: časopis pro mezioborová studia střední Evropy 19. a 20. století*, 5 (1/2013), p. 44.

4 Apart from Spaniards, the largest group of political emigration in Czechoslovakia in the 1950s consisted of Greeks, amounting in December 1950 to 12,095 migrants. The number of Yugoslav political exiles has oscillated between 160 and 180 adults since the late 1940s, while Italian emigration included approximately 300 adults. Numerically more limited in Czechoslovakia were the Portuguese exiles, amounting in the 1950s and 1960s only to around 10 members. Furthermore, there were also some English-Speaking (at least 120 British, American, Canadian, Australian and New Zealander) long-term living or working emigrants and a few French political exiles in Czechoslovakia. However, these last two categories could hardly be described as unified exile groups with comprehensive political organization, see Konstantinos TSIVOS, *Řecká emigrace v Československu (1948-1968). Od jednoho rozštěpení k druhému*, PhD Dissertation, Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 2011, p. 55; Ondřej VOJTĚCHOVSKÝ, “Soudruzi nebo vetřelci? O životě cizinců v ČSR na příkladu jugoslávské emigrace”, *Paměť a dějiny*, XI (3/2017), p. 28; Pavel SZOBI, “Portugalci v „komunistické Ženevě“: Praha jako středisko antisalazaristické opozice (1948-1974)”, *Soudobé dějiny*, 21 (4/2014), p. 613; Kathleen B. GEANEY, “Špatná...”, *op. cit.*, p. 41; Doubravka OLŠÁKOVÁ, “V krajině za zrcadlem. Političtí emigranti v poúnorovém Československu a případ Aymonin”, *Soudobé dějiny*, 14 (4/2007), p. 728.

5 Matilde EIROA, “Republicanos en el Centro-Este de Europa: los intentos de normalización institucional” in Ángele EGIDO LEÓN and Matilde EIROA (ed.), *Los grandes olvidados: los republicanos de izquierda en el exilio*, Madrid: CIERE, 2004, p. 313-314.

6 Many Spanish communists fought during WWII in the French *Résistance* and France played a key role as a haven for the PCE in exile even after 1945 –in 1947, the entire leadership of the party was situated in France, see Vladimír NÁLEVKA, “Partyzánská válka ve Španělsku”, *Pocta profesoru Janu Kuklíkovi (=Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philosophica et Historica. Studia Historica XLVIII)*, Praha: Karolinum, 2000, p.

Prague into one of the party's headquarters; while the Czechoslovak metropole in this role substituted for Belgrade.⁷ The situation in France got especially complicated for Spanish communists due to the absence of the French Communist Party from the government (since 1947), plus an intensifying anti-communist campaign epitomized by the operation of the French police called "Boléro-Paprika" (September 1950). This resulted in the arrest or expulsion of 395 (mostly Spanish) communists from France to Corsica, Algeria or Eastern Germany and the subsequent outlawing of the PCE.⁸ Considering that, with the forthcoming French legislative election in June 1951, there was an existing threat of the extradition of Spanish communists to Franco, the request from the General Secretary of the PCE Dolores Ibárruri regarding asylum for these Spaniards, sent in September 1950, was fulfilled by Prague, Budapest and Warsaw already in 1951.⁹ Thus, the number of Spanish communists in Czechoslovakia rose to almost 200 at the beginning of 1952.¹⁰ All this in spite of the complex socio-political situation in the country, infamous for the wave of political trials (1948-54), in which were also accused former Czechoslovak volunteers from the Spanish Civil War, who maintained contacts with Spanish communists also in their new Eastern European haven.¹¹ In total, the number of Spanish communist exiles in Eastern Bloc countries (Czechoslovakia, GDR, Hungary and Poland) and Austria amounted to 550 in 1954.¹²

Therefore, the division of Europe into the capitalist West and the communist East –one of the many consequences of the nascent Cold War– enabled

135-141; Szilvia PETHŐ, *El exilio de comunistas españoles en los países socialistas de Europa centro-oriental (1946-1955)*, PhD Dissertation, Szeged: Universidad de Szeged, 2008, p. 37-39.

7 Vladimír NÁLEVKA, "Španělé v poválečném Československu", *Dvacáté století*, 2005, p. 88.

8 Michele D'ANGELO, "El Partido Comunista Español en Francia, ¿Partido de la protesta u organización para emigrados? 1950-1975", *Aportes. Revista de Historia Contemporánea*, 92 (3/2016), p. 180; José M. FARALDO, "Entangled Eurocommunism: Santiago Carrillo, the Spanish Communist Party and the Eastern Bloc during the Spanish Transition to Democracy, 1968-1982", *Contemporary European History*, 26 (4/2017), p. 651.

9 Matilde EIROA, "Sobrevivir en el socialismo. Organización y medios de comunicación de los exiliados comunistas en las democracias populares", *Historia Social*, 69 (2011), p. 75; Filip VURM, *Československo-španělské vztahy v letech 1945-1975*, MA thesis, Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 2007, p. 42-43.

10 Národní archiv (National Archives Prague, hereinafter NA), fund (f.) Mezinárodní oddělení ÚV KSČ (International Department of the ÚV KSČ, hereinafter MOÚV KSČ), volume (svazek, hereinafter sv.) 187, archive unit number (archivní jednotka, hereinafter a. j.) 652, page (list, hereinafter l.) 96. Rozmístění španělských polit. emigrantů v ČSR (Location of Spanish political emigrants in Czechoslovakia), 1.2.1952.

11 Vladimír NÁLEVKA, "Španělé...", *op. cit.*, p. 89-90, 93-94; NA, f. KSČ – ÚV 1945-89, Praha – Sekretariát (Secretariat) 1962-66, sv. 53, a. j. 102, point (bod, hereinafter b.) 14. Annex III: Zpráva o splnění usnesení sekretariátu ÚV KSČ ze dne 17. února 1965 k prošetření sociálně politického postavení bývalých příslušníků mezinárodní brigády ve Španělsku (Report on the implementation of the resolution of the Secretariat of the ÚV KSČ of February 17, 1965, on the investigation of the social and political status of former members of the International Brigades in Spain), 17.3.1966.

12 Szilvia PETHŐ, *El exilio...*, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

Spanish communists to seek refuge and financial support, not only in Czechoslovakia, but also in many other Eastern European countries ruled by a fraternal communist party, before returning to Spain to fight against Franco's regime.¹³ Still, the Spanish communist exile in these state socialist countries was neither socially nor politically homogeneous. From 1950, in Czechoslovakia, the Spanish emigration was formed by two, in many respects different collectives –the first one in Prague, consisting of the party leadership and loyal, obedient cadres, exercising white-collar work. The other one was established in the North Bohemian city of Ústí nad Labem and was formed mainly by manual workers as well as politically heterodox exiles, i.e., those who got into conflict with the direction of the PCE.¹⁴

The Spanish historian Matilde Eiroa claims that autocriticism became a habitual procedure within the Spanish communist exile in Czechoslovakia, with the objective of removing disobedient members and leading to expulsion from the party and manifold fictitious accusations.¹⁵ On the other hand, in a report elaborated in 1965 by the Central Committee (ÚV) of the KSČ regarding the Spanish emigration in Czechoslovakia, it was stated that “the characteristic feature of the Spanish political emigration is its high political morale and discipline. Despite the long-term stance abroad, the deconstructive elements are not present, nor is vacillation manifested between its members (not counting some exceptions) (...)”.¹⁶ As a consequence of this discrepancy in the interpretation of Spanish emigration in Czechoslovakia, the present study focuses on one of these “exceptions” within the Spanish exile –Pilar Gómez. Her case is an example of disciplining at the behest of the PCE, leading to her expulsion from the party, loss of employment in Prague, forced relocation to Ústí nad Labem

13 In Czechoslovakia, the local communist party financially supported Spanish political emigrants (even providing social assistance when needed), and the PCE's leaders received salaries and various allowances from the KSČ. Furthermore, Czechoslovakia was the country where the PCE published some of its official periodicals (*Boletín de Información, Ejército Nacional Democrático*); from Prague operated the Spanish Redaction of the Foreign Broadcast of the Czechoslovak Radio (*Radio Praga*). The KSČ also enabled and supported the organization of various congresses and plenary sessions of the PCE in Czechoslovakia, see Matilde EIROA, “Sobrevivir...”, *op. cit.*, p. 75-76, 82-87; NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 657, l. 49. Španělská polit. emigrace: Finanční náklady na rok 1951 – Vedení strany (Spanish political emigration: Financial expenses for 1951 – Leadership of the party), n.d. (1951); NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 191, a. j. 666, l. 144. Dodatek k vyúčtování Akce Š-1957 za měsíc září-listopad 1957 (Annex to the account of the Action Š-1957 for September-November 1957), 29.10.1957.

14 The main aim of the division of the exile into two groups was to streamline their control and avoid the formation of a larger center and the potential conspiracy of the Spanish communist emigration, see Enrique LÍSTER LÓPEZ, “Vorgeschichte und Voraussetzungen der Ansiedlung der spanischen kommunistischen Emigranten in Osteuropa”, *Totalitarismus und Demokratie*, 2 (2/2005), p. 312.

15 Matilde EIROA, “Republicanos en...”, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

16 NA, f. KSČ ÚV – Kancelář 1. tajemníka ÚV KSČ A. Novotného – zahraniční záležitosti (Office of the First Secretary A. Novotný – foreign issues), c. 221 - Spain, file 3. Vztahy (Relations) PCE – KSČ. Španělská politická emigrace v ČSSR (Spanish political emigration in Czechoslovakia), n.d. (1965).

and subsequent everyday resistance –resistance directed against the leadership of the PCE and carried out through collaboration with the Czechoslovak State Security (StB).

METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

This study shows, with the case of Pilar Gómez analyzed below, how the opposition of some of these nonconformist Spaniards living predominantly in Ústí nad Labem against the decisions of the PCE and Czechoslovak authorities could be, considering its long-lasting and mundane character, studied as an example of “everyday resistance” –an analytical concept introduced in the 1980s by the North American anthropologist James C. Scott. As “everyday resistance” is understood by Scott, the pattern of oppositional acts carried out by subalterns against diverse forms of dominance; i.e., informal and hidden resistance, which is oriented towards immediate and actual gains (e.g., rumors, gossip, gestures, jokes, poaching, foot-dragging, dissimulation or theft).¹⁷ This contention can be defined by “its pervasive use of disguise”¹⁸ –concealment or anonymity of the agent (practitioner) of resistance or the concealment of the act of resistance itself.¹⁹ Furthermore, the goal of this form of resistance is not the overthrow of the system of domination but persistence and survival.²⁰ However, Scott’s theses were subjected to criticism, in recent years even from their author.²¹ Taking into account the number of flaws criticized within Scott’s concept of “everyday resistance”,²² in the following analysis, this study will not proceed exclusively with the application of his concept to the case of resistance of a Spanish exile in Czechoslovakia but instead will try to go beyond it. Therefore, this paper works with the framework of “dispersed resistance”,

17 James C. SCOTT, *Weapons of the Weak. Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985, p. 33; James C. SCOTT, “Everyday Forms of Resistance”, *Copenhagen Papers in East and Southeast Asian Studies*, 4 (1989), p. 35-36, 52-53; James C. SCOTT, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*, New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1990, p. XIII.

18 James C. SCOTT, “Everyday...”, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

19 *Ibidem*, p. 54-56.

20 James C. SCOTT, *Weapons...*, *op. cit.*, p. 301.

21 See e.g., Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, *Conceptualizing ‘Everyday Resistance’: A Transdisciplinary Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2020, p. IX-XI, 34-39; Mikael BAAZ and Mona LILJA and Michael SCHULZ et al., “Defining and Analyzing «Resistance»: Possible Entrances to the Study of Subversive Practices”, *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 41 (3/2016), p. 139-141.

22 For example, in the case of state socialist countries, Scott applies his theories only in the context of collective resistance and also in a different period. In this respect, Helena Flam questions the possibility of applying Scott’s “politics of disguise and concealment” to the cases of state socialist Czechoslovakia or the Polish People’s Republic, mentioning the examples of *KOR* in Poland and *Charta 77* in Czechoslovakia and claiming that Scott “ignores the importance of the historical evolution of discourses about protest and the forms it takes”, in Helena FLAM, “Anger in Repressive Regimes. A Footnote to *Domination and the Arts of Resistance* by James Scott”, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 7 (2/2004), p. 178-179.

introduced by Swedish scholars Stellan Vinthagen and Mona Lilja. “Dispersed resistance” is a collected concept which stems from Scott’s notion, however, it compiles various forms of everyday resistance,²³ while it emanates from the Foucauldian interpretation of power as entangled with resistance.²⁴ Vinthagen and Lilja present this concept in its two variants: the first being “counter-repressive resistance”; the second form of dispersed resistance is “productive/constructive resistance”.²⁵

This latter variant represents resistance as originating from the understanding of power, in which domination is exercised by means of “creating truths, ways of life and subjectivities, rather than limiting people’s options” and while this form of dispersed resistance takes place within dominant discourses and systems, it is simultaneously oriented against domination.²⁶ Besides, constructive resistance “focuses on creating, building, carrying out and experimenting with what is considered desirable”.²⁷ Thus, this variant of dispersed resistance emanates from a different understanding of power than Scott’s –instead of being repressive, power in this case also works via “the production of truths, subject positions and subjectivities”.²⁸ By being productive/constructive, this resistance can (re)form institutions, communities or knowledge in a manner that undermines domination (although without full liberation), while answering to discursive truths and disciplinary measures.²⁹ Also, this form of dispersed resistance is usually based on negotiating and (re)creating alternative discourses and deals with different rhetorical re-

23 Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, *Conceptualizing...*, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

24 From the Foucauldian perspective, power is omnipresent, multifocal, dynamic, it stems from below and “makes people act and speak”, while power relations are “dispersed and heterogenous (...) (and) as productive as they are repressive (...)”, in Roger DEACON, “Strategies of Governance. Michel Foucault on Power”, *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, 92 (1998), p. 119; Michel FOUCAULT, *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1978, p. 93-95; Michel FOUCAULT and James D. FAUBION (ed.), *Power. Essential Works of Foucault 1954-84*, New York: New Press, 2000, p. 172.

25 Mona LILJA and Stellan VINTHAGEN, “Dispersed resistance: unpacking the spectrum and properties of glaring and everyday resistance”, *Journal of Political Power*, 11 (2/2018), p. 212, 217-222. In addition to the term “productive resistance”, Lilja, Vinthagen or Sørensen also use the notion “constructive resistance”; however, this denominational permutation does not mean any semantical, analytical or theoretical change. Thus, both terms function in this study as synonyms.

26 *Ibidem*, p. 219-221.

27 Majken Jul SØRENSEN, “Constructive Resistance: Conceptualising and Mapping the Terrain”, *Journal of Resistance Studies*, 2 (1/2016), p. 57.

28 Mona LILJA, *Constructive Resistance: Repetitions, Emotions, and Time*, London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2021, p. 2.

29 Mona LILJA and Stellan VINTHAGEN, “Dispersed...”, *op. cit.*, p. 221-222; Mikael BAAZ and Mona LILJA and Michael SCHULZ et al., “The ABC of resistance: towards a new analytical framework”, *Journal of Political Power*, 16 (1/2023), p. 70-72.

petitions or discourse that stems from another position, while using language for the discursive change and the (re)production of knowledge.³⁰

Considering the above, in the analysis of resistance of Pilar Gómez, carried out through collaboration with the Czechoslovak StB, this study applies the concept of dispersed constructive/productive resistance, which can be regarded as a suitable analytical instrument for the research of a heterodox female Spanish emigrant due to its novelty and definitional accuracy. Considering that the everyday resistance of Spanish exiles was carried out against the disciplining from the side of the PCE leadership, in order to impose homogeneity and thus normalize its (ex)members and their actions, the analysis below will be working with the Foucauldian concept of disciplinary power.³¹ Besides, the focus will be given on three crucial analytical dimensions in resistance research, as proposed by Vinthagen and Johansson: the “relationships of agents of resistance” (with other actors), the “repertoires of everyday resistance” (in relation to configurations of power) and the “spatialization of resistance”.³² Through a diachronic approach and a progressive research method, this case study analyzes the constructive character of everyday resistance of a female Spanish exile in a state socialist country in the 1950s.

The issue of the Spanish communist exile in state socialist Czechoslovakia has been, for many years, out of the spotlight of the Czech, Slovak, Spanish, as well as foreign researchers,³³ while the resistance of these exiles remains a topic with almost no research carried out to date.³⁴ Considering the absence of

30 Mona LILJA and Stellan VINTHAGEN, “Dispersed...”, *op. cit.*, p. 212, 219-222; Mona LILJA, *Constructive...*, *op. cit.*, p. 87-88.

31 For more on his notion of disciplinary power, see Michel FOUCAULT, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, New York: Vintage Books, 1995, p. 170-194 or Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, “Dimensions of Everyday Resistance: An Analytical Framework”, *Critical Sociology*, 42 (3/2016), p. 432.

32 Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, “Dimensions...”, *op. cit.*, p. 419-427.

33 Nevertheless, the research on the issue of the Spanish communist exile in the Eastern Bloc has been broadened in the last two decades. Matilde Eiroa is the most productive author researching this topic in a systematic and long-term manner (see Matilde EIROA, *Espanoles tras el Telón de Acero. El exilio republicano y comunista en la Europa socialista*, Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2018; Matilde EIROA, “Republicanos en...”, *op. cit.*, p. 301-322; Matilde EIROA, “Sobrevivir...”, *op. cit.*, p. 71-90). Important contributions within the study of the Spanish exile in Czechoslovakia have been made by the Hungarian researcher Sz. Pethő (Szilvia PETHŐ, *El exilio...*, *op. cit.*, p. 83-130) or Czech historians V. Nálevka (Vladimír NÁLEVKA, “Španělé...”, *op. cit.*, p. 77-95) and F. Vurm (Filip VURM, *Československo-španělské...*, *op. cit.*). For more on Spanish exiles in other Eastern Bloc countries, see also Glennys YOUNG, “To Russia with «Spain». Spanish Exiles in the USSR and the *Longue Durée* of Soviet History”, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 15 (2/2014), p. 395-419; Karl D. QUALLS, *Stalin's Niños: educating Spanish Civil War refugee children in the Soviet Union, 1937-1951*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2020 or Axel KREIENBRINK, “Der Umgang mit Flüchtlingen in der DDR am Beispiel der spanischen „politischen Emigranten““, *Totalitarismus und Demokratie*, 2 (2/2005), p. 317-344.

34 Recent investigation demonstrates that the anti-regime resistance in state socialist Czechoslovakia took various forms and was not as rare as could be expected in a communist authoritarian regime;

secondary literature dealing with the issue of everyday resistance of (Spanish) communist exiles in the Eastern Bloc, the present study is mainly based on unpublished archival materials from Czechia and Spain (National Archives Prague, Security Services Archive, Archive of the PCE), as well as other primary sources (memoirs and interviews of Spanish exiles). As has already been mentioned, Pilar Gómez was not the only Spanish emigrant living in Czechoslovakia who resisted the decisions of the PCE or Czechoslovak authorities. Apart from visible acts of public resistance,³⁵ such as not attending PCE meetings, not participating in partisan activities or requesting changes of job or place of residence carried out by some of the exiles, there were more examples of everyday (hidden) resistance of Spaniards, especially of those from Ústí nad Labem. For example, through petitions to the Czechoslovak state organs against the decisions of the PCE leaders. These were the cases of José A. Valledor or Ramón Rubio Miranda, whose activities were also investigated and criticized at the PCE meetings, while these exiles were eventually expelled from the party.³⁶ Nevertheless, due to the limited scope of this study, the scarce available archival materials and the ingeniousness of Gómez's resistance, this study focuses exclusively on her constructive everyday resistance—a specific and under-researched form of resistance of a political emigrant in people's democracy.

Using the case of her resistance as an example, this article works with the thesis that the dichotomy (different life and work conditions between the heterodox Spanish exiles and the direction of the PCE) within the Spanish exile in Czechoslovakia exemplifies the complexity and multiplicity of power (relations) and its entanglement with resistance. Especially provided that power relations, as well as the relationship between power and resistance, are, in the Foucauldian understanding, dynamic and constantly shifting.³⁷ Moreover, this

still, it was only seldom openly critical of it. However, the concept of everyday resistance as well as the resistance of political emigrants in Czechoslovakia remain, until now, almost unexplored, see Tomáš VILÍMEK and Oldřich TŮMA and Jaroslav CUHRA et al., *Projevy a podoby protirežimní rezistence v komunistickém Československu 1948-1989*, Praha: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR, 2018; Tomáš VILÍMEK and Václav RAMEŠ, “Pohyblivé hranice diktatury ve světle stížností občanů”, *Soudobé dějiny*, 29 (1/2022), p. 17-42; Maroš TIMKO, “The Spanish communist exile and consentful contention in state socialist Czechoslovakia”, *Ibero-Americana Pragensia*, 49 (1/2021), p. 81-99 (in print). The case of Pilar Gómez is already briefly described in Maroš TIMKO, “„Všude na španělské soudruhy dívaly se jako na příživníky.“ Španielsky komunistický exil v povojnovom Československu”, in Monika KABEŠOVÁ and Kateřina HRUŠKOVÁ (ed.), *České, slovenské a československé dějiny 20. století XV.*, Hradec Králové: UHK Filozofická fakulta, 2022, p. 173-196.

35 For more on public resistance, see James C. SCOTT, *Domination...*, *op. cit.*, p. 198-201 or Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, *Conceptualizing...*, *op. cit.*, p. 27-28, 90-91.

36 See Maroš TIMKO, “„Všude na španělské...””, *op. cit.*, p. 173-196 or Maroš TIMKO, “The Spanish communist...”, *op. cit.*, p. 81-99 (in print).

37 Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, “Dimensions...”, *op. cit.*, p. 424; Mikael BAAZ and Mona LILJA and Michael SCHULZ et al., “Defining...”, *op. cit.*, p. 148-149.

study examines the hypothesis that it was the constructive aspect of Gómez's resistance, that led on the discursive level to the (re)creation of knowledge (new and critical discursive "truths") on Spanish exiles and was capable of disrupting the existing complex relations and power structures between a heterodox Spanish communist exile, the PCE and Czechoslovak authorities. Also, apart from underlining the dualism of the Spanish emigration in Czechoslovakia and the internal conflicts within the PCE in exile, this paper illustrates how Ústí nad Labem played within the Spanish exile a double role, not only as a material geographic location but also as a social space, a symbolic place of correction and the "purgatory" of Spanish emigration.³⁸ Lastly, the present study intends to offer a new insight into the subject of the everydayness of political emigrants living under Czechoslovak state socialism.

FROM NAVARRA TO PRAGUE, FROM PRAGUE TO ÚSTÍ NAD LABEM

Pilar Gómez was born on November 1, 1921, in the Navarrese village of Cintruénigo. In 1936, she joined the General Union of Workers (Unión General de Trabajadores) and in March 1938 joined the PCE.³⁹ During the Civil War, she organized women within the Association of Spanish Anti-Fascist Women (Asociación de Mujeres Antifascistas Españolas), acted as a secretary of the PCE for work among women in Almansa and worked in the provincial committee of the International Red Aid (Socorro Rojo Internacional) in Jaén.⁴⁰ After fleeing into exile in France in February 1939, she spent almost a year in the internment camp in Angoulême. During the Nazi occupation of France, Gómez functioned as a liaison between the communist party and partisan organizations and after the war, she acted as the Secretary General of the Unified Socialist Youth (Juventudes Socialistas Unificadas) and of the Association of Anti-Fascist Women in Bordeaux.⁴¹ Gómez came to Czechoslovakia from Paris on July 4, 1950, as an unmarried and childless political refugee, based on instructions from the CC PCE, in order to settle permanently in the Czechoslovak Republic.⁴² Initially, Pilar Gómez was accommodated with other

38 Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, *Conceptualizing...*, *op. cit.*, p. 121-122.

39 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 197, a. j. 689, file: G. Cuestionario (Questionnaire): Villar Gómez Marín, 26.6.1953.

40 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 197, a. j. 689, file: G – Gomez Pilar (197). Autobiografía de (Autobiography of) Pilar (Villar) Gómez Marín, 20.2.1951.

41 *Ibidem*.

42 Archiv bezpečnostních složek (Security Services Archive, hereinafter ABS), f. Objektové svazky – centrála a Praha (Subject Files Group – Headquarters and Prague, hereinafter OB/MV), a. č. OB – 1718 MV "Španělská emigrace" ("Spanish emigration"), sv. 1/3, l. 80. Krajské velitelství StB, Ústí n. Labem (Regional Headquarters of the StB, Ústí n. Labem). Issue: Gomezová Villar – šetření (investigation), 20.3.1951.

Spaniards in a hotel in Prague, the expenses of the Czechoslovak party for her stay amounted to 11,500 CZK (hotel and food) and 1,000 CZK as allowance.⁴³ However, at the end of August 1950, she was transferred with the first group of Spanish exiles to Ústí nad Labem, where a new center of the Spanish communist exile in Czechoslovakia was being formed. In Ústí nad Labem Gómez, as well as other Spaniards, received accommodation, food allowance and clothes.⁴⁴ Subsequently, she was employed from September 1950 in the Cosmetics Department of the North Bohemian Fat Works (*Severočeské tukové závody* – STZ) until December, when she was transferred to Prague again.⁴⁵

The initiative to transfer part of the Spanish exiles from Prague to Ústí came from the KSČ. Antonio Cordon (leader of the Prague collective between 1949-55) claimed that the reasons for this step, instigated by the Czechoslovak side, were the “desirability and necessity”⁴⁶ of this move, caused not only by the post-war housing crisis in the capital but also by the already mentioned need to improve control over the exiles. This is confirmed by Cordon’s letter to the ÚV KSČ, in which he listed Spaniards willing to move to Ústí,⁴⁷ although the “voluntariness” of their transfer can be questioned. The son of Gerónimo Casado, who was with his family on the list of exiles allegedly willing to move there, recalled in hindsight this move: “Probably because he (father – M. T.) did not like some things, they later transferred us to Ústí (...)”.⁴⁸

The first request to conduct a police investigation on Villar (Pilar) Gómez, preserved in the Security Services Archive, dates back to the beginning of 1951, shortly after she was transferred back to Prague (December 1950), where she started working on a milling machine in Tesla Karlín.⁴⁹ During this investigation, nothing suspicious was found on Gómez. The report only stated that she did not have any criminal record in the Czechoslovak Republic, that she

43 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 657, l. 30. Španělská emigrace (Spanish emigration), 21.8.1950. For comparison, in December 1948, the official price for 1 kg of bread in Czechoslovakia was 5 CZK (illegally on the black market, it was 12.40 CZK), 1 kg of butter was 80 CZK (483 CZK), 1 kg of rice was 10 CZK (302 CZK), and 55 CZK (772 CZK) for cocoa, in Václav PRŮCHA et al., *Hospodářské a sociální dějiny Československa 1918-1992. 2. Díl: Období 1945-1992*, Brno: Doplněk, 2009, p. 207.

44 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 654, l. 2-3. Nový španělský kolektiv v Ústí n/ Labem (The new Spanish collective in Ústí nad Labem), 4.9.1950.

45 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV “Spanish emigration”, sv. 1/3, l. 59-65. Seznam cizinců zaměstnaných v STZ v Ústí nad Labem (List of foreigners employed at the STZ in Ústí nad Labem), n.d.

46 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 654, l. 12. Antonio Cordon to the ÚV KSČ, 19.4.1951.

47 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 654, l. 9-11. Relación de los camaradas españoles dispuestos a trasladarse a Ústí nad Labem (List of Spanish comrades willing to move to Ústí nad Labem), 19.4.1951.

48 Karel VRÁNA, “Česká španělská vesnice” [online], *Tyden* 3, 2006, https://www.tyden.cz/tema/ceska-spanelska-vesnice_61.html, [23 March 2023].

49 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV “Spanish emigration”, sv. 1/3, l. 79. Provedení PŠ III. stupně (Conducting a level III Police Investigation) Gomezová V., 27.2.1951; ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV „Spanish emigration”, sv. 1/3, l. 59-65. List of foreigners employed at the STZ in Ústí nad Labem, n.d.

had come to the country as a political refugee and planned to return to Spain after the fall of Franco's regime.⁵⁰ In the summer of 1951, Gómez took up a position in the bureau of the World Peace Council (WPC) in Prague, where she was employed as a political collaborator and French-Spanish interpreter.⁵¹ Compared to her income in the STZ (2,300 CZK in the spring of 1951), her wage in the WPC increased at the end of 1951 to more than the above-average 7,329 CZK.⁵²

Nevertheless, on February 7, 1953, Cordon informed the MOÚV KSČ on behalf of the PCE leadership in Czechoslovakia, that Gómez was recalled by the PCE from the WPC.⁵³ He added that disciplinary proceedings at the level of the PCE direction had been initiated against her, stating as the main reason, "the moral delinquency –homosexual relations with another female employee in the WPC, evidenced by confessions from both sides".⁵⁴ In this regard, it is necessary to add that consensual adult homosexuality was in state socialist Czechoslovakia decriminalized only in 1961. And according to the Criminal Law from July 12, 1950, homosexuality was still punishable in the 1950s by up to one year of imprisonment.⁵⁵ However, as Sokolová continues, although discriminated against and without legal protection, "queer people living their lives during State socialism indeed maneuvered quite skillfully around the limits of the criminal law formally prohibiting homosexual behavior". Also, there is no indication that the communist regime in Czechoslovakia would systematically hunt down or campaign against homosexuals –instead of imprisonment, the State Security used homosexuality as leverage to blackmail political competition (to gain more interesting anti-state information) or to force the person in question into collaboration with the StB.⁵⁶ Put simply, in state socialist

50 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV "Spanish emigration", sv. 1/3, l. 80. Regional Headquarters of the StB, Ústí n. Labem, Issue: Gomezová Villar – investigation, 20.3.1951.

51 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV "Spanish emigration", sv. 1/3, l. 59-65. List of foreigners employed at the STZ in Ústí nad Labem, n.d.

52 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 187, a. j. 652. Liste nominale des camarades qui forment le Collectif des communistes espagnoles a Prague (Nominal list of comrades who form the collective of Spanish communists in Prague), 22.11.1951. Based on this list, the salaries of Spanish communists in Czechoslovakia ranged in 1951 between 4,000 and 14,000 CZK.

53 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 653, l. 57. Španělská polit. emigrace (Spanish political emigration), 7.2.1953.

54 *Ibidem*.

55 Věra SOKOLOVÁ, *Queer Encounters with Communist Power. Non-Heterosexual Lives and the State in Czechoslovakia, 1948-1989*, Prague: Karolinum, 2022, p. 61-63; Franz SCHINDLER, "Život homosexuálních mužů za socialismu" in Pavel HIML and Jan SEIDL and Franz SCHINDLER (ed.), *"Miluji tvory svého pohlaví": homosexualita v dějinách a společnosti českých zemí*, Praha: Argo, 2013, p. 275-282.

56 Věra SOKOLOVÁ, *Queer Encounters...*, *op. cit.*, p. 20, 63, 182-183.

Czechoslovakia, “(p)eople’s sexuality mattered only when it could be used for political purposes”.⁵⁷

Also for this reason, the case of Gómez’s “disciplinary misdemeanor” was further investigated by Cordón (instead of Czechoslovak state authorities) and discussed at a meeting of the PCE leadership, which in this regard proposed and demanded help from the KSČ –to punish Gómez by transferring her to the Spanish collective in Ústí as soon as possible and to find her a job in a factory and suitable accommodation in this North Bohemian city. She ought to stay there until her matter would be solved within the PCE direction.⁵⁸ The following month, Pilar Gómez was expelled from the PCE (officially for her homosexual orientation)⁵⁹ and she started working again in Ústí at the STZ with a significantly lower salary than in the WPC; meanwhile, her work ethic was described as “good”.⁶⁰ However, soon after, in the summer of 1953, she was labeled by the Czechoslovak StB as “a suspicious person who maintains contacts with unreliable elements and also due to her contacts with the (French – M. T.) embassy”.⁶¹ This labeling was most probably influenced by a negative reference from the Czechoslovak WPC employee, Jan Křížek, who claimed that Gómez was still in contact with “shady elements from the World Peace Council” –as an example, he mentioned an English citizeness, Grunberger.⁶² In this report, it was also stated that Gómez, despite her departure from Prague, was still returning to the capital and was repeatedly seen in front of the French embassy.⁶³

Gómez was therefore punished by the PCE leadership by moving from an office job in Prague to manual work in Ústí, paradoxically to a similar job to the one she had been already exercising before her “moral delinquency”. Thus, her example confirms the above-mentioned thesis that the transfer to Ústí was for many Spanish exiles in Czechoslovakia (or at least for those transferred there directly from Prague) a form of punishment, just as claimed, aside from the above-mentioned Casado, also another Spanish heterodox exile from Ústí nad Labem, José Montorio: “(T)hey sent me to Ústí (...) because it’s like when the

57 *Ibidem*, p. 215.

58 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 653, l. 57. Spanish political emigration, 7.2.1953.

59 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 190, a. j. 664, l. 89. Antonio Cordón to the ÚV KSČ, 25.3.1953.

60 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV “Spanish emigration”, sv. 1/3, l. 59-65. List of foreigners employed at the STZ in Ústí nad Labem, n.d.

61 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV “Spanish emigration”, sv. 1/3, l. 45-58. Krajská správa StB, Ústí n. Labem pro Ministerstvo národní bezpečnosti (Regional Directorate of the StB in Ústí n. Labem to the Ministry of National Defence). Issue: Španělská politická emigrace – souhrnná zpráva (Spanish political emigration – Summary report), 25.6.1953.

62 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 197, a. j. 689, file: G – Gomez Pilar (197). Záznam ze dne (Report from) 2.6.1953.

63 *Ibidem*.

Soviets sent to (...) Siberia. As a punishment, to Ústí nad Labem!”⁶⁴ In 1955, another “problematic” Spanish exile sent from Prague to Ústí, José Antonio Valledor, even described this North Bohemian city as a “concentration camp without barbed wire”.⁶⁵ The thesis that the move to Ústí nad Labem served as a punishment is further confirmed by the fact that at the beginning of the 1950s, the housing conditions in Ústí nad Labem were far from ideal, and the Spanish exiles were residing in the houses of the expelled Sudeten Germans, which, after being abandoned for some time, were in bad condition and often even rat-infested. Thus, and as another former member of the collective in Ústí, Pedro García Iglesias further remembers, after WWII and in the first half of the 1950s, Ústí nad Labem was “a kind of Czechoslovak Far West”.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, it was in Ústí nad Labem, where Pilar Gómez decided to resist the disciplining at the behest of the PCE –in this case, her resistance was carried out through collaboration with the StB.

COLLABORATION AS A FORM OF RESISTANCE

In June 1954, an agency report about an interview between two Spanish exiles was submitted at the StB in Ústí nad Labem. Its author, the StB agent “Eman” (Manuel Perez Lopez), reported that during his talk with Juan Bravo Perez, the latter claimed that “we expelled Gómez (from the PCE – M. T.) because she made one mistake, and we must not talk about this in front of anyone, otherwise we would also be expelled from the party”.⁶⁷ Subsequently, the State Security assigned “Eman” to get in touch with Gómez and to engage in a conversation with her, at first only on general matters to find out her political orientation, and later also regarding her position on the issue of Spanish exiles.⁶⁸ In this respect, it should be mentioned that a hostile approach towards the subject of attention of the State Security, as well as social marginalization and the possibility of material gains, were frequent preconditions for the se-

⁶⁴ Diego FANDOS, *Dos tonalidades diferentes de rojo* [online], www.youtube.com, 2002, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QhN3Iw3pHz0&t=84s&ab_channel=DiegoFandos [23 March 2023], 4:55-5:07.

⁶⁵ NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 198, a. j. 689, file: V. Resoluce skupiny č. I stranické organizace KSČ Ústí nad Labem o vyloučení José Antonio Valledora z KSČ (Resolution of the group no. I of the organization of the PCE in Ústí nad Labem about the expulsion of José Antonio Valledor from the PCE), 8.6.1955.

⁶⁶ However, during the 1950s, the housing and living situation of Spaniards in Ústí slowly improved, see Pedro GARCÍA IGLESIAS, *Memorias de un niño de la guerra: Desde Praga, memorias, apuntes y reflexiones de un niño de la guerra civil española de 87 años*, Almería: Círculo Rojo, 2019, p. 85, 194.

⁶⁷ ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV “Spanish emigration”, sv. 3/3, podsv. 5: Perez Juan Bravo, l. 11. Agenturní zpráva (Agency report), “Eman”. Issue: Bravo Perez Juan, španělský politický emigrant (Spanish political emigrant) – report, 17.6.1954.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*.

lection of collaborators by the StB.⁶⁹ Pilar Gómez, a Spanish emigrant expelled from the PCE, socially ostracized and in economic need, transferred from Prague back to Ústí, was thus an unsurprising adept for collaboration with the StB, effectuated in her case as a tactic of everyday resistance.

The attempt of the StB to recruit Gómez as a collaborator through the agent “Eman” was a quick success –her first report, dedicated to Antonio Cerdón, dates back to the end of 1954. In this report, Gómez claimed that many Spanish emigrants in Czechoslovakia began to hate Cerdón, while Gómez herself, after arriving in the Czechoslovak Republic and meeting with him, found out that he is “a cold and indifferent person who has no connection with people, he appeared to her as a big gun who needs servants and not as a man with a connection with comrades”.⁷⁰ Gómez continued in her report with the criticism of Cerdón, claiming that the political life of Spanish exiles was chaotic. Cerdón told Spaniards that their job in the Czechoslovak Republic was only constant study, whereas unlike many Spaniards living in difficult housing and financial conditions, he lived in luxury and with a lot of money.⁷¹ Gómez claimed that when it was being decided in 1951 which Spaniards would be sent to Ústí nad Labem, the list ought to include all those who had some disputes with Cerdón. Initially, before her employment in the WPC, it was planned that Gómez would be transferred in the summer of 1951 to Ústí nad Labem as well. At that time, she asked Cerdón about the reason for her transfer and about the identity of the person responsible for the selection of Spaniards that should have been displaced. Cerdón explained this transfer as a decision of the KSČ caused by the lack of flats in Prague, while the selection of Spaniards that were sent to Ústí nad Labem was to be decided according to the direction of PCE.⁷² Her report ended with a brief description of Cerdón, who, “acts dictatorially and not democratically (...). The Spaniards looked at him mistrustfully and did not confide in him. They were afraid to say what they thought for fear that one of his favorites would inform him against them (...).”⁷³

Regarding the veracity of Gómez’s report, it is necessary to add that Cerdón’s income in Czechoslovakia exceeded the average wage –in the second half of 1953, the average income of workers in the socialist sector in the Czechoslovak Republic amounted to 1,097 CZK.⁷⁴ At the end of 1953, Cerdón was earning 2,200 CZK, as a professor at Charles University, and was living in a two-room

69 Pavel ŽÁČEK, “‘Ostrá zbraň’ Štátnej bezpečnosti. Spolupracovníci politickej polície v smerniciach pre agentúrno-operatívnu prácu, 1947-1989”, *Pamäť národa*, October 2004, p. 5, 8, 12.

70 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV “Spanish emigration“, sv. 1/3, l. 119-120. Issue: General Antonio Cerdón – zpráva (report), n.d. (December 1954).

71 *Ibidem*.

72 *Ibidem*.

73 *Ibidem*.

74 Václav PRŮCHA et al., *Hospodářské...*, *op. cit.*, p. 638.

apartment in the center of Prague.⁷⁵ His daughter, Teresa Cerdón Vilas, in her testimony does not remember quarrels between her father and the other Spanish exiles, nor their luxurious lives and claims that the Cerdón family lived in Prague only modestly and always surrounded by Spanish friends: “(M)y parents went to work, I went to school, and later we have been living at home the Spanish way (...) (o)n weekends our Spanish friends came to our house to eat, to chat (...) (m)y home has always been full of Spanish friends (...)”.⁷⁶ On the other hand, another heterodox Spanish exile, Manuel Tagüeña, also criticized Cerdón in his memoirs, especially for his role in the anti-Tito campaign; during which Cerdón designated his former host⁷⁷ as Hitler’s agent and misused the information obtained during his stay in Belgrade resulting in his book, “I saw Tito’s betrayal: The Betrayal of Tito’s gang during the war”.⁷⁸ Moreover, Tagüeña in his memoirs further claimed that Cerdón’s lack of scruples, cowardliness and servility brought him into a position where even though he “became the leader of Spaniards, (H)e did not show much nobility in this position (...) He interfered according to his liking (...)”.⁷⁹ The existence of these criticisms was most probably also based on the fact that Cerdón was one of those members of the PCE leadership, who were allowed to travel abroad (mostly to other Eastern Bloc countries) in order to attend congresses or to spend holidays; in Czechoslovakia, he was also a frequent vacationer in recreational facilities such as Chateau Dobříš (at the expense of the KSČ).⁸⁰

The answer to the question of whether Cerdón really acted in relation to other Spanish comrades “dictatorially” and “undemocratically”, just as Gómez claimed, remains unclear. Nonetheless, his response to Gómez in the case of her transfer to Ústí corresponds to the official report of Cerdón for the ÚV KSČ, in which he informed the Czechoslovak party about the elaboration of a list of a group of Spaniards willing to move from Prague to Ústí nad Labem, as had been requested by the KSČ.⁸¹ However, in his report, Cerdón also asked

⁷⁵ NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 191, a. j. 666, l. 50-54. Přehled pracovního zařazení a materiálního zajištění španělské polit. emigrace v ČSR (Overview of the employment and material security of the Spanish political emigration in Czechoslovakia). Annex, 21.12.1953 (29.12.1953).

⁷⁶ Matilde EIROA, *Espanoles...*, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

⁷⁷ Cerdón spent the end of WWII and one year after it in Yugoslavia as an officer and military advisor in the Yugoslav army.

⁷⁸ Antonio CORDÓN and Karel MAREK, *Viděl jsem Titovu zradu: zrada Titovy bandy za války*, Praha: Mír, 1951.

⁷⁹ Manuel TAGÜEÑA LACORTE, *Testimonio De Dos Guerras*, Barcelona: Planeta, 1978, p. 370.

⁸⁰ NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 196, a. j. 689, file: C – Cerdón Antonio (9). Záznam pro s. (Record for c.) Müller, 28.7.1953; NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 198, a. j. 689, file: V – Vilas Rosa / Cerdón (32). Rosa Vilas. Biografía (Biography), n.d. (1953).

⁸¹ NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 654, l. 9-11. List of Spanish comrades willing to move to Ústí nad Labem, 19.4.1951; NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 654, l. 13. Antonio Cerdón to the ÚV KSČ, 19.4.1951.

the Czechoslovak authorities to provide adequate employment and accommodation for the Spanish emigrants leaving for Ústí.⁸² Still, it must be noted that the above-mentioned criticisms of Córdón and his activity as the leader of the Spanish collective came from heterodox Spanish emigrants in conflict with the party (Gómez, Tagüeña), therefore, their objectivity can be questioned. Hence, these testimonies against Córdón most probably served as a “payback” against one of the leaders of the PCE in Prague for the loss of privileged positions by these “problematic” Spanish exiles.

Another of Gómez’s agency reports dating back to January 1955 was dedicated to another Spanish emigrant, Francisco Bosch. Gómez claimed that she had first met Bosch in France in 1945 at the Spanish refugee convalescent hospital in Lourdes, where Bosch occupied the position of director. To her, Bosch seemed “hard, cold, unsympathetic, acting unfriendly and ungraciously toward comrades”.⁸³ Gómez had the opportunity to learn the details of Bosch’s private life while working with his wife in Ústí nad Labem. In this agency report, her critique continued with the statement that Bosch had retained his “petty-bourgeois customs” – a bottle of cognac and 30–40 cigarettes a day, regardless of the family budget and provision for his children.⁸⁴ Spanish comrades allegedly knew about these circumstances, and they did not like Bosch, but he was allowed to move from Ústí to Prague thanks to his good relations with the leadership of the Spanish emigration in Czechoslovakia. In the conclusion of her report, Gómez added that Bosch’s wife is rather “a servant to him than a friend, who has suffered all her life due to his love affairs (...)”.⁸⁵

Nonetheless, in contrast with Gómez’s affirmations about Bosch’s conflicts with Spanish comrades, in his official CV, elaborated by the PCE for the KSČ, it was stated that in February 1953, Bosch was enjoying, “the full support of the leadership of the PCE”.⁸⁶ Furthermore, after the death of his 12-year-old son in 1952, Bosch was, apart from being devastated, “very intensively working in the sanatorium in Ústí-Bukov as a doctor”. Therefore, he was recommended for a two-week holiday in Prague with his family for the following year.⁸⁷ And eventually, on the request from Enrique Lister (leader of the Spanish exile in Czechoslovakia since 1951), Bosch was indeed transferred with his family from

82 *Ibidem*.

83 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV “Spanish emigration”, sv. 1/3, l. 136. Agency report, “Alvarez” 1248. Issue: dr. Francisco Bosch – report, 6.1.1955.

84 *Ibidem*.

85 *Ibidem*.

86 NA, f. KSČ – ÚV 1945–89, Praha – Politický sekretariát (Political Secretariat) 1951–54, sv. 54, a. j. 141, b. 15. Vyslání španělských soudruhů Moixe a Bosche do Vídně (Sending of Spanish comrades Moix and Bosch to Vienna), 18.2.1953.

87 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 17, a. j. 62/1. Různé pro schůzi komise (Miscellaneous for the commission meeting), 4.12.1952.

Ústí to Prague, where he started working from August 1953 in the hospital in Praha-Krč, after attending a six-month Czech language course, while also having a part-time job as an external physician.⁸⁸ On the other hand, in March 1955, Bosch was criticized by the director of his department for his lack of knowledge of Czech and his disinterest in learning it, which led to situations when Bosch was designated as an underperforming employee.⁸⁹ Still, the above-cited archival sources confirm his activities in France as a doctor in various hospitals, including the famous Varsovia Hospital,⁹⁰ where he occupied the position of director, and also his employment in Ústí as a doctor until 1953, just as Gómez stated in her report. In the consulted sources, his marital status is also confirmed – nevertheless, without any mention of alleged love affairs or economic problems in his family, while Bosch’s wife, in June 1953, claimed in her CV that “we have comfortable financial means and we live in a good understanding as a family”.⁹¹

However, even before Gómez submitted her agency report in January 1955, another report on Bosch had been elaborated in March 1954 by the Public Security in Ústí nad Labem and subsequently sent to the Ministry of the Interior (MOI) in Prague.⁹² In contrast to Gómez’s report, within this police investigation, no comments regarding Bosch’s unfriendliness to comrades, nor his mistreatment of his family and his love affairs were present, even though his “petty-bourgeois customs” (visiting cafés) also appeared in this report. On the contrary, it was stated that Bosch was meeting with other Spaniards in his place of stay on a daily basis.⁹³ Taking into account Bosch’s journey to Spain with his wife in the summer of 1960, for a visit of their daughters and in order to investigate the possibility of their permanent return,⁹⁴ Gómez’s allegations about his dysfunctional marriage and family life seem to be far from the truth. Especially considering that the Czechoslovak Red Cross (Československý červený kříž – ČSČK), responsible for the social welfare of Spanish exiles,⁹⁵ usually

88 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 196, a. j. 689, file: B – Bosch Francisco (61). Spanish political emigration, 9.2.1953 (12.2.1953); NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 196, a. j. 689, file: B – Bosch Francisco (61). Sociální odbor (Social Department) of the ČSČK, c. Morávek, 12.2.1953.

89 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 196, a. j. 689, file: B – Bosch Francisco (61). V. Heral to the Social Department of the ČSČK, 8.3.1955.

90 For more on the Varsovia Hospital, see e.g., Pablo MOLANES PÉREZ, “El Hospital Varsovia de Toulouse, un proyecto del exilio español”, *Cultura de los Cuidados* 35, vol. XVII (2013), p. 63-75.

91 NA, f. KSČ – ÚV 1945-89, Praha – Political Secretariat 1951-54, sv. 54, a. j. 141, b. 15. Sending of Spanish comrades Moix and Bosch to Vienna, 18.2.1953; NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 196, a. j. 689, file: B – Bosch Francisco (61). Biografía de (Biography of) Dolores Bosch, 28.6.1953.

92 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV “Spanish emigration”, sv. 1/3, l. 99. Městská správa VB Ústí n. Labem pro Ministerstvo vnitra (Municipal Directorate of the Public Security in Ústí n. Labem to the MOI), 31.3.1954 (1.4.1954).

93 *Ibidem*.

94 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 192, a. j. 681, l. 100. Record for c. Hendrych, 21.6.1960.

95 Doubravka OLŠÁKOVÁ, “V krajině...”, *op. cit.*, p. 724-725.

informed the MOÚV KSČ about the marital problems of these émigrés. Furthermore, as Bosch’s travel was at that time also recommended by the PCE,⁹⁶ his quarrels with other Spanish exiles could also be easily disapproved. Thus, as well as in the case of Cordón, Gómez’s agency report on Bosch contained a lot of information that was most probably false or at least imprecise. One could even describe it as rumor or gossip –both tactics of Scott’s concept of everyday resistance.

On the same day as the report on Bosch, Gómez also submitted an agency report dedicated to Ángel Celada. Gómez stated that she had met Celada for the first time in Toulouse in 1946, when he was working in the structures of the party and was respected among the cadres.⁹⁷ After arriving in Czechoslovakia in July 1951, he was assigned to work in the WPC by Enrique Líster. Knowing him from France, Celada seemed (to Gómez) as “good for the party, but full of conceit and self-satisfaction. Collaborator (Gómez – M. T.) had only little sympathy for him.”⁹⁸ After Gómez’s arrival in the WPC, Celada behaved coldly and arrogantly also in relation to another Spaniard who was working as a translator; meanwhile, Celada was constantly emphasizing Líster’s trust in him. For these reasons, Gómez had little affection for him, even though, shortly after his arrival in the WPC, Celada was appointed as the Head of the Organization and Documentation Department and Gómez was to be his deputy in the Latin American Section –a fact that presupposed their cooperation.⁹⁹ According to her report, Celada’s behavior at that time changed– he became more pleasing; however, Gómez did not understand the change in his conduct. Still, the most interesting aspect of this report is his supposed scandalous intimate relationship with “a young Frenchwoman Jacky Cailloux”¹⁰⁰ (correctly Caillot – M. T.). Even though the scandal broke out at the time of the arrival of Celada’s wife and children from France, and despite the public criticism, he did not end his relationship with Caillot. Far from this –according to Gómez, after several unfortunate months with his wife, he decided to leave her for good and to stay with Caillot; at the time of the elaboration of this agency report, the two were to live together in Vienna. At the end of her report, Gómez stated that Celada is “ambitious, dishonest, very conceited and able to win the love of responsible comrades”.¹⁰¹

Available archival materials confirm Celada’s arrival in Czechoslovakia in July 1951. Similarly, they confirm his subsequent employment in the WPC

96 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 192, a. j. 681, l. 101. Sebastian Zapirain to the ÚV KSČ, 21.6.1960.

97 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV “Spanish emigration”, sv. 1/3, l. 135. Agency report, “Alvarez” 1248. Issue: Angel Celada – report, 6.1.1955.

98 *Ibidem*.

99 *Ibidem*.

100 *Ibidem*.

101 *Ibidem*.

as the Head of the Organization and Documentation Department with an above-average salary of 11,036 CZK at the end of 1951,¹⁰² as well as the arrival of his wife, Sardina Merino Trinidad (b. 1928), with their two children and her mother.¹⁰³ In a report from February 1952, Ángel Celada and Sardina still appear as a couple living together in Prague with their two children.¹⁰⁴ However, they split in December of that year, and as of July 1953, Celada was living together with a member of the French Communist Party, Jackie Caillot (b. 1929) –employed also in the WPC. Furthermore, in his biography, Celada also claimed, in contrast to the agency report of Gómez, that his “relations with his ex-wife are cordial”.¹⁰⁵ In March of the following year, Celada was still working in the WPC and living in Prague with his French wife (Caillot) and their newborn child, away from Sardina.¹⁰⁶

Therefore, the information from Gómez about the separation of Celada and Merino Trinidad and about his stay with Caillot in Vienna, where the WPC’s headquarters moved in 1954,¹⁰⁷ was correct. Hence, when Celada and his French wife eventually left Czechoslovakia for Berlin in August 1959,¹⁰⁸ his spouse was, at that time, without any doubt, Jackie Caillot. However, Gómez’s agency report regarding Celada’s private life, even though based on truthful information, was still imprecise (she did not mention Celada’s and Caillot’s child) and her gossip had the aim of defaming, while omitting relevant information. Gómez, who was in her agency report underlining the age gap between Celada and the “young Frenchwoman” Caillot (who was 12 years younger than him), did not mention that his ex-wife Sardina was only one year older than Jackie. Furthermore, consulted archival documents illustrate that the Czechoslovak authorities already possessed more accurate information about Celada’s life

102 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 187, a. j. 652. Nominal list of comrades who form the collective of Spanish communists in Prague, 22.11.1951; NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 196, a. j. 689, file: C – Celada Angel (7). Biography (Angel Celada), 15.7.1953.

103 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 187, a. j. 652, l. 24-25. Seznam rodin španělských politických emigrantů v ČSR, které mají přijet z Francie do ČSR (List of families of Spanish political emigrants in Czechoslovakia, who should arrive from France to Czechoslovakia), n.d. (1951).

104 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 187, a. j. 652, l. 97-98. Španělská emigrace – středisko Praha – abecední seznam (Spanish emigration – centre Prague – alphabetical list), 1.2.1952.

105 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 196, a. j. 689, file: C – Celada Angel (7). Biography (Angel Celada), 15.7.1953.

106 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 187, a. j. 652, l. 76-77. Seznam Španělů žijících v Praze, jejich bydliště a zaměstnání (List of Spaniards living in Prague, their accommodation and occupation), 15.3.1954; NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 191, a. j. 666, l. 50-54. Overview of the employment and material security of the Spanish political emigration in Czechoslovakia. Annex, 21.12.1953 (29.12.1953).

107 Karel BARTOŠEK, *Zpráva o putování v komunistických archivech. Praha - Paříž (1948-1968)*, Praha: Paseka, 2000, p. 111.

108 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 656, l. 118. Sebastián Zapirain to the ÚV KSČ, 24.8.1959.

than those submitted by Gómez –the intelligence offered by her could thus be characterized as uninteresting to the StB.

FROM A SECRET COLLABORATOR TO THE SUBJECT OF INVESTIGATION

Still, Gómez did not appear in documents from the Security Services Archive only as an StB collaborator. In the agency report from “Eman”, dedicated to the Spaniard Eduardo Quevedo, it was stated that Quevedo is applying for a state loan to buy furniture, as he is planning to marry Gómez, who is expecting a baby with him.¹⁰⁹ Quevedo visited the Regional Directorate of the Public Security in Ústí in March 1955 regarding his marriage –even though the woman who appeared in his passport as his wife (Eusebia) had come to Czechoslovakia from France, Quevedo stated that they were not married. Despite his relationship with Eusebia (employed as well as Gómez at the STZ) with whom he had a daughter, Quevedo claimed that their appearance as a married couple was to serve only as a cover maneuver for getting into Czechoslovakia.¹¹⁰ Moreover, he planned to marry Gómez and asked the authorities to be recognized as unmarried. At the Foreigners’ Department of the Regional Directorate of the Public Security in Ústí, Quevedo was told that his case did not fall within their cognizance and was advised to address his request to the court; he received a similar answer from the direction of the PCE –he ought to solve his matters by himself. In this case, the StB tasked “Eman” with visiting the court with Quevedo to help him.¹¹¹ Taking into account the information provided by Quevedo and Eusebia in their questionnaires in July 1953, the issue of the legal validity of their marriage seemed clear: both indicated their civil status as married and both stated that they got married in 1936.¹¹² On the other hand, Quevedo’s claim that their marriage was only a maneuver allowing them to travel to Czechoslovakia, supports the fact that despite the deportation of Quevedo to Corsica in September 1950, he managed to enter Czechoslovakia in July 1951, followed in December by Eusebia and their daughter.¹¹³

Given Gómez’s alleged homosexuality, the information about her life together with Quevedo is rather surprising –therefore, it is worth raising the question of whether the true reasons for her disciplinary punishment were, in reality, not based on personal issues with the leadership of the PCE, possibly

109 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV “Spanish emigration”, sv. 1/3, podsv. 1: Quevedo Eduardo, l. 159. Agency report “Eman”. Issue: Quevedo – španělský státní příslušník – poznatky (Spanish citizen – information), 22.3.1955.

110 *Ibidem*.

111 *Ibidem*.

112 NA, f. MOÚV KSCČ, sv. 198, a. j. 689, file: Q. Questionnaire: Quevedo Eduardo, 1.7.1953; NA, f. MOÚV KSCČ, sv. 198, a. j. 689, file: Q. Questionnaire: Quevedo Eusebia b. Asarta, n.d. (1953).

113 *Ibidem*.

manifested even before her forced departure from the WPC. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that her homosexual orientation is not even mentioned in any of the archival documents proceeding from the State Security after her forced transfer to Ústí, despite the fact that the StB used one's homosexuality as leverage *par excellence* when forcing him or her to collaborate.¹¹⁴ Gómez's agency reports critical towards Spaniards, which might be understood as revenge against the leadership of Spanish communists, play also in favor of this hypothesis. Unfortunately, due to the lack of information regarding Gómez's activities in the WPC and her relations with other Spanish comrades, the genuine causes behind her expulsion from the PCE and her disciplinary punishment remain unclear.

In contrast, her common life with Quevedo can be confirmed by another agency report from "Eman" on Quevedo from April 23, 1955.¹¹⁵ This report described Quevedo's dissatisfaction with his job, related to his low salary and, once again, his application for a state loan in order to buy furniture was being mentioned. It also included Quevedo's statement that he "cannot understand that after the V Congress (of the PCE – M. T.) some Spanish comrades have opinions that do not correspond with the resolutions of the V Congress".¹¹⁶ Quevedo mentioned the examples of those Spaniards who had been expelled from the party and no one was allowed to speak to them, which, in his opinion, could lead to the falling of these comrades into the hands of the enemy in the future. He added that the party should not isolate itself from the people who had been expelled from it. Quevedo was referring especially to the case of the already expelled Gómez, with whom he was living in a common household and planned to marry, but with whom no other Spanish communist was allowed to communicate. Understandably, due to his relationship with Gómez, Quevedo was also criticized at the PCE meetings.¹¹⁷

Czechoslovak State Security decided to use the above-stated intelligence to its benefit: one of the tasks mentioned during the instruction at the Regional Directorate of the MOI in Ústí nad Labem on May 6, 1955, was the processing of Eduardo Quevedo with the aim of recruiting him for collaboration with the State Security.¹¹⁸ Quevedo was chosen as a prospective collaborator since he got into a conflict with the leadership of the Spanish collective in Ústí –at least according to the aforementioned agency report from "Eman".

114 Věra SOKOLOVÁ, *Queer Encounters...*, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

115 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV "Spanish emigration", sv. 1/3, podsv. 1: Quevedo Eduardo, l. 157. Agency report "Eman". Issue: Quevedo – Spanish emigrant – information, 23.4.1955.

116 *Ibidem*.

117 *Ibidem*.

118 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV "Spanish emigration", sv. 1/3, l. 148. Regional Directorate of the MOI in Ústí nad Labem. Issue: Zápis o instruktáži v referátě 253 na KS MV Ústí (Memo about the instruction at the Department 253 at the Regional Directorate of the MOI in Ústí), 6.5.1955.

Another task was to focus on the collaborator “Alvarez” (Pilar Gómez), in order to obtain information on the Spanish emigrants José Esquerre and Artemio Precioso (leader of the Prague Spanish collective since 1955). However, the acquisition of these reports should have taken place only after Gómez’s return from maternity leave.¹¹⁹ Still, archival materials do not prove that the obtaining of information on these exiles from Gómez took place; also, the concrete level of Gómez’s collaboration remains unknown. In the documents from the Security Services Archive, instead of a clear denomination (resident, agent, informer, owner of conspiracy flat or confidant),¹²⁰ “Alvarez” obtained only the general designation of “collaborator”.

Another agency report from “Eman” on Quevedo from late May 1955 once again confirms Quevedo’s relationship with Gómez and her pregnancy.¹²¹ In this regard, it was stated that Quevedo was denied a state loan that he requested for the purchase of supplies for their child –the rejection of his application made him upset. “Eman” in this report further described Quevedo’s financial problems –he needed to borrow some money to buy equipment for their newborn child. When asked why he did not turn to the Spanish comrades or the PCE for help, Quevedo replied that he came into conflict with them over his relationship with Gómez and because he had left his wife; therefore, they were not willing to lend him any money.¹²² The final evaluation of this report included a statement that the need for financial provision on the part of Quevedo could be used in favor of the Czechoslovak authorities, considering that Quevedo got into conflict with his PCE group in Ústí and is also exasperated at the establishment due to the refusal of the loan. It was suggested that his situation could be exploited by the StB in two ways: either lend him 500 CZK directly –in this manner, the StB would gain his trust and the loan could also function as compromising material. The second option was to help him acquire the loan– the State Security would thus gain his trust and, after the initial establishment of contact (providing information on his colleagues at work), and after evaluating his attitude toward cooperation, he would be given intelligence tasks within the Spanish emigration. Lastly, this agency report included a recommendation for a financial reward for the collaborator “Alvarez” (Gómez), given her preg-

119 *Ibidem*.

120 Libor BÍLEK, “Zavazují se dobrovolně... Rezidenti, agenti, informátoři a další. Tajní spolupracovníci Státní bezpečnosti v letech 1945-1989”, *Paměť a dějiny*, IX (4/2015), p. 9.

121 ABS, f. OB/MV, a. č. OB – 1718 MV “Spanish emigration”, sv. 1/3, podsv. 1: Quevedo Eduardo, l. 158. Record (at the Regional Directorate of the MOI in Ústí), “Eman”. Issue: Ústí, zpráva agent. Eman o španělském emigrantu Quevedovi (Ústí, report from the agent “Eman” about the Spanish emigrant Quevedo), 20.5.1955.

122 *Ibidem*.

nancy and unflattering economic situation, whereas a financial gift would strengthen her trust and sympathies towards the StB.¹²³

As has already been mentioned, financial problems and material benefits were some of the issues on which the StB was trying to capitalize to recruit new collaborators.¹²⁴ Still, due to the non-existence of archival documents proving Quevedo's further contacts with State Security, it can be presumed that he was eventually not recruited for collaboration by the StB. On the other hand, his position within the Spanish emigration must have eventually improved, as in July 1957 he was among the few Spaniards nominated by the PCE as translators for the VI World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow.¹²⁵ Still, the scarce archival materials do not clarify the reasons behind the change of his position in the Spanish exile in Czechoslovakia.

BACK TO SPAIN

As a consequence of the PCE's new strategy, the Policy of National Reconciliation, the CC PCE decided in the summer of 1956 to support the voluntary return of Spanish exiles from the Eastern Bloc to Spain.¹²⁶ Communist resistance against Franco's regime should now have been conducted with pacifist methods: nationwide strike movement and the infiltration of the Francoist syndical organization, *Sindicato Vertical* (OSE).¹²⁷ To achieve this goal, the PCE needed to increase the number of communists in Spain; however, economic assistance from the Eastern European countries for the departure of Spaniards was necessary. Thus, by January 1959, almost 50 Spanish communists (23 from Czechoslovakia, 21 from Hungary and 4 from the GDR) were repatriated from the Eastern Bloc,¹²⁸ apart from around 1,900 Spaniards (Spanish Republican soldiers and children evacuated to the USSR during the Spanish Civil War) who returned to Spain from the USSR only between 1956-59.¹²⁹ In the case of Czechoslovakia, the ÚV KSČ approved the financial support for the return of Spanish communists to their fatherland at the beginning of 1957.¹³⁰

123 *Ibidem*.

124 Pavel ŽÁČEK, "Ostrá...", *op. cit.*, p. 5, 12.

125 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 191, a. j. 670, l. 122. Antonio Cordón to the ÚV KSČ, 20.7.1957.

126 Szilvia PETHŐ, *El exilio...*, *op. cit.*, p. 67-68; NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 192, a. j. 681, l. 143-144. Record for c. Koucký, n.d. (1960). For more on the Policy of National Reconciliation, see Gregorio MORÁN, *Miseria, grandeza y agonía del PCE: 1939-1985*, Madrid: Akal, 2017, p. 339-375.

127 Filip VURM, *Československo-španělské...*, *op. cit.*, p. 50; Carmen MOLINERO and Pere YSÁS, "El Partido del antifranquismo (1956-1977)" in Manuel BUENO and José HINOJOSA and Carmen GARCÍA (ed.), *Historia del PCE. I Congreso 1920-1977, vol. II*, Oviedo: Fundación de Investigaciones Marxistas, 2007, p. 14-16.

128 Szilvia PETHŐ, *El exilio...*, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

129 Glennys YOUNG, "To Russia...", *op. cit.*, p. 414; Karl D. QUALLS, *Stalin's...*, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

130 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 192, a. j. 681, l. 143-144. Record for c. Koucký, n.d. (1960).

Both Pilar Gómez and Eduardo Quevedo chose to leave for their homeland with their children –an understandable step considering their long-term social ostracism as well as their unsatisfactory economic situation in Ústí. In July 1957, Gómez had applied at the Czechoslovak Red Cross for assistance with obtaining travel documents necessary to visit her parents in Spain; she had also asked the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the emission of these documents a few months earlier.¹³¹ The subject of her application was the authorization of her journey to Spain, as Gómez, pregnant at that time, already had her Spanish passport ready in Vienna. This visit to Spain was intended as a probe of the possibility of a safe return to her homeland, and although she was willing to pay for the journey herself, in the summer of 1957 she was not allowed to travel to Spain.¹³² Towards the end of September 1957, when Gómez had already received the foreign currency needed for traveling to Spain, she was still waiting for her Czechoslovak travel documents to be issued.¹³³ It is not clear whether this trip to Spain took place –in a letter from the ČSČK to the MOÚV KSČ from October 1958 it was stated, that Gómez and her three children would return to their home country, even though her husband (Quevedo) was to remain in Ústí.¹³⁴ In this letter, the Czechoslovak Red Cross also asked for the reimbursement of tickets to Madrid and the payout of 125,000 francs, which was meant to cover their living expenses for the first weeks abroad.¹³⁵

Although the PCE decided to support the voluntary return of Spanish exiles to their homeland, the characteristic feature of the collective in Ústí –a center of manual workers as well as those “politically heterodox” emigrants– influenced the possibility of their mobility outside of the country. Thus, during an interview at the ÚV KSČ regarding the return of Spanish exiles back to Spain, Enrique Líster stated that only those Spanish communists living in Ústí nad Labem, whose loyalty to the PCE is clear, would be taken into consideration for return. Emigrants with discovered “uncertainties” would not yet be allowed to return to their homeland.¹³⁶ Therefore, both Quevedo’s, as well as Gómez’s

131 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 192, a. j. 681, l. 26-27. ČSČK Social Department to the MOÚV KSČ. Issue: Urgence cest. průkazů (Reminder of travel documents), 22.7.1957; NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 192, a. j. 681, l. 7-8. Přehled o vyřizovaných žádostech pro odjezdy Španělů (Overview regarding processed applications for the departure of Spaniards), n.d. (1957).

132 *Ibidem*.

133 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 192, a. j. 681, l. 54-55. ČSČK Social Department to the MOÚV KSČ. Issue: Odjezdy Španělů (Departures of Spaniards), 25.9.1957.

134 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 192, a. j. 681, l. 77. ČSČK Social Department to the MOÚV KSČ. Issue: Departures of Spaniards, 14.10.1958.

135 *Ibidem*.

136 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 656, l. 47-49. Záznam o rozhovoru se s. Lísterem, členem politického byra ÚV KS Španělska (Record about an interview with c. Líster, member of the Politburo of the CC PCE), 13.11.1956.

relationship towards the leadership of the PCE must have changed in order for their journey to have been allowed. Thus, just before she departed for Spain at the end of 1958, Gómez applied for re-admission into the PCE. Eventually, she was allowed to join the party anew, based on improving her behavior since her expulsion, as well as due to the change of her relationship with the PCE and the correction of the cause that had originally been the reason for her expulsion (homosexual relations with a Frenchwoman from the WPC).¹³⁷ Nevertheless, Gómez received a positive response from the PCE to her request only at the time of her return to Spain –this decision was based on reports about Gómez from the Spanish collective in Ústí nad Labem, which welcomed her re-admission into the party “with a storm of applause”.¹³⁸ At the beginning of 1959, she was living with her children in the Spanish capital,¹³⁹ where they were joined shortly after by Quevedo, who also decided to definitively return to Spain. A record at the MOÚV KSČ from March 1959 reiterated the request from the ČSČK for his travel documents, 50,000 French francs, 500 Austrian shillings, as well as the purchase of tickets for Quevedo, who was returning to Spain permanently.¹⁴⁰

Further reports submitted by Gómez, after the State Security planned to use her to obtain information on the Spanish emigrants Esquerre and Precioso in May 1955 (after her maternity leave), are missing. One possible explanation is that Gómez voluntarily ceased her collaboration with the StB in order to not run the risk of being exposed by the leadership of the PCE, as she needed its approval for her return to Spain. This seems probable in view of her newborn child –her resistance in the form of secret collaboration, which, albeit secured “immediate, de facto gains”¹⁴¹ (purchase of furniture), eventually did not lead to a long-term and desired improvement in her material security. Moreover, if the hypothesis about personal vengeance is correct, nor was she able to deteriorate the situation of those Spanish exiles whom she had criticized in her reports. Another possible explanation stems from an executive order from the Czechoslovak MOI regarding the revision of the StB agency network and the elimination of non-prospective collaborators issued in 1955.¹⁴² This way, Gómez, with her imprecise intelligence (uninteresting and out-of-date information or even just gossip) on Spanish exiles,

137 Archivo del PCE (Archive of the PCE, hereinafter APCE), f. Emigration, c. 96/3 Czechoslovakia, file: 96/3.1.4 – Czechoslovakia, PCE – Informes (Reports). Confidencial (Confidential), n.d., 1960(?).

138 *Ibidem*.

139 APCE, f. Emigration (Microfilms). Países socialistas (Socialist countries), jacq. 1082. Lista de nuevos camaradas regresados al país definitivamente (List of new comrades that returned to the country definitively), 21.1.1959.

140 NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 192, a. j. 681, l. 84. Record from March 29, 1959.

141 James C. SCOTT, *Weapons...*, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

142 Libor BÍLEK, “Zavazují...”, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

would be one of those unreliable sources who were no longer of interest for the StB in the second half of the 1950s.

KNOWLEDGE IS POWER

Still, Gómez's case is not just an example of disciplining by the Spanish communist party on the grounds of her homosexuality, which can be, given her relationship with Quevedo and their three children, as well as the absence of this information in archival materials from the State Security, easily questioned. In addition, her collaboration with the StB can be understood as everyday resistance –her activities were a pattern of acts carried out from a subordinated position with the aim of disrupting the system of dominance. This resistance towards the leadership of the PCE counted both with the anonymity of the agent of resistance, as well as the concealment of the act of resistance –open and public resistance against the PCE would be too dangerous for Gómez.¹⁴³ Her motivations and aims were clear and unquestionable –after repression in the form of forced transfer from office work in Prague to manual, lower salary work in Ústí, as well as her expulsion from the PCE (directly linked to her ostracism, loss of party privileges and deterioration of her economic situation), she started to carry out everyday resistance (via collaboration with the StB) in order to improve her material conditions and to seek revenge on the target of her resistance (leadership of the PCE). Intending to undermine the position of the direction of the party, Gómez used the tactics of resistance available to her (submitting agency reports), which were based on the rearticulation and/or reversion of the dominant discourse concerning Spanish exiles, existing in Czechoslovakia.

Taking into account the entanglement between power and knowledge on a discursive level in situations where resistance is carried out,¹⁴⁴ it can be well argued that with her resistance against the leadership of the PCE, Gómez intended to reverse existing power relations by offering in her reports to the Czechoslovak authorities a critical, (re)created and reversed knowledge (critical “truths”) about prominent members of the Spanish exile. Her (ex)comrades appear in these reports as undemocratic, dictatorial and living in luxury (Cordón); a petty-bourgeois alcoholic, mistreating his wife (Bosch); or an arrogant adulterer who left his family (Celada). Altogether, Gómez characterized her former comrades negatively, in opposition to the existing discourse in Czechoslovak society regarding Spanish exiles as fighters against fascism and heroes

143 Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, *Conceptualizing...*, *op. cit.*, p. 9, 28; James C. SCOTT, “Everyday...”, *op. cit.*, p. 54-56.

144 Mona LILJA, *Constructive...*, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

of the French *Résistance*.¹⁴⁵ Even if the information that Gómez passed to the StB on the Spaniards was not always correct –it was rather imprecise, out-of-date and consisting often of rumors and gossip, Gómez still created new critical discursive “truths” on Spanish emigrants in her reports, which she offered to the Czechoslovak authorities in control of the Spanish exile. Hence, from the conceptual point of view, Gómez’s contention should be classified as dispersed resistance, more precisely as the productive/constructive variant of this resistance. Considering that this model of everyday resistance is based on negotiating and/or (re)creating alternative discourses and knowledge,¹⁴⁶ Gómez’s knowledge-making could be considered the tactic of her constructive resistance. Meanwhile, it was this discursive level, where Gómez’s resistance and its constructiveness took place, thus, “both a starting point for, and an instrument of, resisting practices” was the above-mentioned discourse.¹⁴⁷

Gómez’s everyday resistance, carried out as a discursive (re)construction or reversal of knowledge, might also be understood as her vengeance for the repression effectuated against her in order to subject her to party discipline. This disciplinary repression, officially presented as a punishment for her “moral delinquency”, had the long-term objective of coercing her behavior according to the norm demarcated by the leadership of the PCE. However, the motivation behind this aim was to strengthen party discipline also within the Spanish political emigration as a whole, by means of the exemplary punishment of Gómez. In this relationship, Gómez emerged as an agent of resistance located in a subordinate position, as she publicly and formally submitted herself to the official decision of the PCE leadership in Czechoslovakia –she broke off her (alleged) homosexual relationship, moved from Prague to Ústí and transferred from office to manual work. However, she coped with her social ostracism and deteriorating material security only for the sake of appearances –in this regard, she decided to resort to resisting the decisions of the party leadership through her collaboration with the StB.

The role Gómez played within the relationship between the Czechoslovak authorities (represented by the StB) and the leadership of the PCE is also interesting. The State Security decided to recruit Gómez, a heterodox and marginalized émigré, in order to obtain information on certain Spanish exiles. In this sense, the StB capitalized on the bad economic situation and ostracism of Gómez with the aim of receiving her agency reports on her former comrades,

145 For example, contrary to information from Gómez, Cordón was in the introduction of his already-mentioned book, characterized as a “hero of the Spanish anti-fascist war”, in Antonio CORDÓN and Karel MAREK, *Viděl... , op. cit.*, p. 5.

146 Mona LILJA and Stellan VINTHAGEN, “Dispersed...”, *op. cit.*, p. 219-222; Mikael BAAZ and Mona LILJA and Michael SCHULZ et al., “The ABC...”, *op. cit.*, p. 70-72.

147 Mona LILJA, *Constructive... , op. cit.*, p. 87, 142.

even against the leaders of the Spanish emigration in Czechoslovakia (Cordón, Precioso). Meanwhile, via collaboration with Gómez, the StB also pursued its own safety-related agenda, since it was permanently monitoring all activities of the Spanish exile, especially the group of Spanish officers that came from Yugoslavia after the Tito-Stalin split.¹⁴⁸ Still, the PCE leadership in Czechoslovakia did not know about the existing contacts between Gómez and the StB, nor had any awareness (or archival materials do not prove it) of the focus of the State Security on the members of the PCE leadership.

Besides, Gómez's resistance stemmed from a symbolic space of correction and resistance and, at the same time, a geographical location and a center of the Spanish exile –Ústí nad Labem. In this sense, the spatialization of resistance comes across as an important analytical category in her case. The city of Ústí nad Labem (material space) also formed a social space with the role of a “purgatory” of Spanish communist exiles, thus confirming the thesis that the frontiers between material and symbolic spaces are fluid and unclear.¹⁴⁹ Still, even though the control of space is a key aspect of (disciplinary) power,¹⁵⁰ based on Gómez's case, it appears that the leadership of the PCE was not aware that resistance and indiscipline are carried out as a response to power.¹⁵¹ What's more, the PCE willingly created a “mycelium” in Ústí for resistance against its leadership and against partisan discipline enforced by them, simply by transferring to this city many heterodox Spaniards from Prague as a form of punishment in order to normalize their behavior. Gómez's constructive resistance, entangled with Ústí and oriented against the leadership of the PCE, although eventually not liberating her from her subordination to the target of resistance,¹⁵² still led to a change in power relations as it strengthened the superior position of the Czechoslovak authorities over the leadership of the PCE, based on the secretly obtained damaging (although imprecise and outdated) intelligence on Spanish exiles. Still, everyday resistance does not necessarily have to succeed, nor does productive/constructive resistance have to overthrow the system of domination, nor achieve complete liberation of the resister. Its position is more complex –it is located “within-against-and-beyond domination”.¹⁵³

CONCLUSION

The son of General Lister, Enrique Lister López, mentions in his memoirs dedicated to the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia the peculiarity of the Spanish

148 Vladimír NÁLEVKA, “Španělé...”, *op. cit.*, p. 93-94.

149 Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, *Conceptualizing...*, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

150 Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, “Dimensions...”, *op. cit.*, p. 427.

151 Mona LILJA, *Constructive...*, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

152 Mona LILJA and Stellan VINTHAGEN, “Dispersed...”, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

153 *Ibidem*.

collective in Ústí nad Labem, considering their positive attitude towards the occupation (unlike the Prague collective). He claims that this group from Ústí, consisting mainly of manual workers, was almost unanimously in favor of the intervention, while it formed, “the proletarian branch of this (Spanish – M. T.) emigration (...) (A)nd the proletarians (...) have nothing to lose in the fight, only their chains”.¹⁵⁴ Líster was wrong twice in this respect –not only did the position of the Ústí collective towards invasion change very quickly and already in 1970, the party organization in Ústí nad Labem expressed its support for the PCE’s policies under the leadership of Ibárruri and Carrillo (critical towards the occupation).¹⁵⁵ Also, for the “proletarians” in state socialist Czechoslovakia (even for communist emigrants from fraternal parties, seeking asylum in the country) there was always something to lose –skilled jobs, educational opportunities for their children, the possibility to travel or, in some rare cases, even their own lives. There were very few who could travel regularly and without the lengthy process of recommendations and authorizations behind the Iron Curtain, as Enrique Líster López did (unlike Pilar Gómez).

Thus, the different life and work conditions between nonconformist Spanish exiles and the direction of the PCE in Czechoslovakia, as well as the above-analyzed case of everyday resistance, prove the complexity and multiplicity of power (relations) and its entanglement with resistance. The relationship between the Czechoslovak authorities and the Spanish emigration in Czechoslovakia is another example of this complexity. Especially taking into account the ambivalent approach to supporting the PCE from the Czechoslovak side, recruitment of heterodox Spaniards as collaborators by the StB, resentment of Spanish exiles from a part of Czechoslovak society,¹⁵⁶ and (mostly after 1968), ideological discrepancies between the two “fraternal” parties. It seems clear that this partnership had its limits, especially once the PCE condemned the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia and criticized the Czechoslovak normalization regime and its repression of dissidents.¹⁵⁷

Finally, the story of Gómez and her bittersweet experience with Czechoslovak state socialism proves that even in a regime as oppressive as Czechoslovakia was

¹⁵⁴ Enrique LÍSTER LÓPEZ, *Praga, Agosto 1968. Páginas de un diario personal*, Guadalajara: Silente, 2008, p. 232-233.

¹⁵⁵ APCE, f. Emigration (Microfilms). Socialist countries, jacq. 1149. Resolution (The organization of the PCE in Ústí nad Labem), 22.11.1970.

¹⁵⁶ In her summary report evaluating the relocation, employment, financial support, and social welfare of Spanish emigrants in Ústí nad Labem, Anna Alešová, responsible at the Ministry of Manpower for the relocation of Spanish exiles to Ústí, stated in June of 1952: “I did not find understanding for this action from anyone in the Region of Ústí nad Labem. Everywhere they looked at Spanish comrades as parasites”, in NA, f. MOÚV KSČ, sv. 188, a. j. 654, l. 52-53. Celková zpráva španělské akce Ústí n/L. (Overview report of the Spanish action Ústí nad Labem), 1.8.1951-19.6.1952, 20.6.1952.

¹⁵⁷ José M. FARALDO, “Entangled...”, *op. cit.*, p. 656-658.

under the dictatorship of the communist party, there were various possibilities of (everyday) resistance. In the case of Pilar Gómez, it was the constructive aspect of her resistance that led on the discursive level to the (re)creation of knowledge on Spanish exiles and was capable of disrupting the existing relations and power structures between a heterodox Spanish communist exile, the PCE and Czechoslovak authorities. It is difficult to determine whether her resistance, carried out against the leadership of the PCE and via collaboration with the StB, can be eventually considered successful; in any case, her story is another contribution to the history of everyday life of political immigrants in state socialism.

SOURCES

ARCHIVES

- Archiv bezpečnostních složek (Security Services Archive – ABS), Fund (f.): Objektové svazky – centrála a Praha (Subject Files Group – Headquarters and Prague – OB/MV)
- Archivo del PCE (Archive of the PCE – APCE), Funds:
Emigración (Emigration)
Emigration (Microfilms)
- Národní archiv Praha (National Archives Prague – NA), Funds:
KSČ – Ústřední výbor (Central Committee) – Kancelář 1. tajemníka ÚV KSČ A. Novotného – zahraniční záležitosti (Office of the First Secretary A. Novotný – foreign issues)
KSČ – ÚV 1945-89, Praha – Sekretariát (Prague – Secretariat) 1962-66
KSČ – ÚV 1945-89, Praha – Politický sekretariát (Political Secretariat) 1951-54
Mezinárodní oddělení ÚV KSČ (International Department of the CC KSČ – MOÚV KSČ)

WEB

Diego FANDOS, *Dos tonalidades diferentes de rojo* [online], www.youtube.com, 2002, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QhN3Iw3pHz0&t=84s&ab_channel=DiegoFandos [23 March 2023].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mikael BAAZ and Mona LILJA and Michael SCHULZ et al., “Defining and Analyzing «Resistance»: Possible Entrances to the Study of Subversive Practices”, *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 41 (3/2016), p. 137-153.

- Mikael BAAZ and Mona LILJA and Michael SCHULZ et al., “The ABC of resistance: towards a new analytical framework”, *Journal of Political Power*, 16 (1/2023), p. 59-80.
- Karel BARTOŠEK, *Zpráva o putování v komunistických archivech. Praha - Paříž (1948-1968)*, Praha: Paseka, 2000.
- Libor BÍLEK, “Zavazuji se dobrovolně... Rezidenti, agenti, informátoři a další. Tajní spolupracovníci Státní bezpečnosti v letech 1945-1989”, *Paměť a dějiny*, IX (4/2015), p. 4-19.
- Hana BORTLOVÁ, “Los españolotes checoslovacos, intento de reconstrucción de algunos denominadores comunes de sus vidas” in Josef OPATRŇÝ (ed.), *Las relaciones checo-españolas (=Ibero-Americana Pragensia, Supplementum 20)*, Praga: Carolinum, 2007, p. 253-270.
- Antonio CORDÓN and Karel MAREK, *Viděl jsem Titovu zradu: zrada Titovy bandy za války*, Praha: Mír, 1951.
- Roger DEACON, “Strategies of Governance. Michel Foucault on Power”, *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, 92 (1998), p. 113-148.
- Michele D'ANGELO, “El Partido Comunista Español en Francia, ¿Partido de la protesta u organización para emigrados? 1950-1975”, *Aportes. Revista de Historia Contemporánea*, 92 (3/2016), p. 177-211.
- Matilde EIROA, *Españoles tras el Telón de Acero. El exilio republicano y comunista en la Europa socialista*, Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2018.
- Matilde EIROA, “Republicanos en el Centro-Este de Europa: los intentos de normalización institucional” in Ángeles EGIDO LEÓN and Matilde EIROA (ed.), *Los grandes olvidados: los republicanos de izquierda en el exilio*, Madrid: CIERE, 2004, p. 301-322.
- Matilde EIROA, “Sobrevivir en el socialismo. Organización y medios de comunicación de los exiliados comunistas en las democracias populares”, *Historia Social*, 69 (2011), p. 71-90.
- José M. FARALDO, “Entangled Eurocommunism: Santiago Carrillo, the Spanish Communist Party and the Eastern Bloc during the Spanish Transition to Democracy, 1968-1982”, *Contemporary European History*, 26 (4/2017), p. 647-668.
- Helena FLAM, “Anger in Repressive Regimes. A Footnote to *Domination and the Arts of Resistance* by James Scott”, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 7 (2/2004), p. 171-188.
- Michel FOUCAULT, *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*, New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Michel FOUCAULT, *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*, New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Michel FOUCAULT and James D. FAUBION (ed.), *Power. Essential Works of Foucault 1954-84*, New York: New Press, 2000.

- Pedro GARCÍA IGLESIAS, *Memorias de un niño de la guerra: Desde Praga, memorias, apuntes y reflexiones de un niño de la guerra civil española de 87 años*, Almería: Círculo Rojo, 2019.
- Kathleen B. GEANEY, “Špatná strana hranice? Anglicky mluvící levicová komunita v Československu na počátku studené války”, *Střed: časopis pro mezioborová studia střední Evropy 19. a 20. století*, 5 (1/2013), p. 40-62.
- Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, *Conceptualizing ‘Everyday Resistance’: A Transdisciplinary Approach*, New York: Routledge, 2020.
- Anna JOHANSSON and Stellan VINTHAGEN, “Dimensions of Everyday Resistance: An Analytical Framework”, *Critical Sociology*, 42 (3/2016), p. 417-435.
- Martin KINDL, “«En Madrid se lucha por Praga». La Guerra Civil española en la memoria cultural checa”, *Ayer*, 127 (3/2022), p. 307-333.
- Axel KREIENBRINK, “Der Umgang mit Flüchtlingen in der DDR am Beispiel der spanischen „politischen Emigranten“”, *Totalitarismus und Demokratie*, 2 (2/2005), p. 317-344.
- Mona LILJA, *Constructive Resistance: Repetitions, Emotions, and Time*, London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2021.
- Mona LILJA and Stellan VINTHAGEN, “Dispersed resistance: unpacking the spectrum and properties of glaring and everyday resistance”, *Journal of Political Power*, 11 (2/2018), p. 211-229.
- Enrique LÍSTER LÓPEZ, *Praga, Agosto 1968. Páginas de un diario personal*, Guadalajara: Silente, 2008.
- Enrique LÍSTER LÓPEZ, “Vorgeschichte und Voraussetzungen der Ansiedlung der spanischen kommunistischen Emigranten in Osteuropa”, *Totalitarismus und Demokratie*, 2 (2/2005), p. 289-316.
- Zdenko MARŠÁLEK and Emil VORÁČEK et al., *Interbrigadisté, Československo a španělská občanská válka. Neznámé kapitoly z historie československé účasti v občanské válce ve Španělsku 1936-1939*, Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR, 2017.
- Pablo MOLANES PÉREZ, “El Hospital Varsovia de Toulouse, un proyecto del exilio español”, *Cultura de los Cuidados* 35, vol. XVII (2013), p. 63-75.
- Carmen MOLINERO and Pere YSÁS, “El Partido del antifranquismo (1956-1977)” in Manuel BUENO and José HINOJOSA and Carmen GARCÍA (ed.), *Historia del PCE. I Congreso 1920-1977, vol. II*, Oviedo: Fundación de Investigaciones Marxistas, 2007, p. 13-32.
- Gregorio MORÁN, *Miseria, grandeza y agonía del PCE: 1939-1985*, Madrid: Akal, 2017.
- Vladimír NÁLEVKA, “Partyzánská válka ve Španělsku”, *Pocta profesoru Janu Kuklíkovi (=Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philosophica et Historica. Studia Historica XLVIII)*, Praha: Karolinum, 2000, p. 135-141.

- Vladimír NÁLEVKA, “Španělé v poválečném Československu”, *Dvacáté století*, 2005, p. 77-95.
- Jiří NEDVĚD, *Českoslovenští dobrovolníci, mezinárodní brigády a občanská válka ve Španělsku v letech 1936-1939*, MA thesis, Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 2008.
- Doubravka OLŠÁKOVÁ, “V krajině za zrcadlem. Političtí emigranti v pounořovém Československu a případ Aymonin”, *Soudobé dějiny*, 14 (4/2007), p. 719-743.
- Szylvia PETHŐ, *El exilio de comunistas españoles en los países socialistas de Europa centro-oriental (1946-1955)*, PhD Dissertation, Szeged: Universidad de Szeged, 2008.
- Václav PRŮCHA et al., *Hospodářské a sociální dějiny Československa 1918-1992. 2. Díl: Období 1945-1992*, Brno: Doplněk, 2009.
- Karl D. QUALLS, *Stalin's Niños: educating Spanish Civil War refugee children in the Soviet Union, 1937-1951*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2020.
- Manuel REQUENA GALLEGO and Matilde EIROA (ed.), *Al lado del gobierno republicano: los brigadistas de Europa del Este en la guerra de España*, Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, 2009.
- Franz SCHINDLER, “Život homosexuálních mužů za socialismu” in Pavel HIML and Jan SEIDL and Franz SCHINDLER (ed.), *Miluji tvory svého pohlaví: homosexualita v dějinách a společnosti českých zemí*, Praha: Argo, 2013, p. 271-386.
- James C. SCOTT, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*, New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1990.
- James C. SCOTT, “Everyday Forms of Resistance”, *Copenhagen Papers in East and Southeast Asian Studies*, 4 (1989), p. 33-62.
- James C. SCOTT, *Weapons of the Weak. Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Věra SOKOLOVÁ, *Queer Encounters with Communist Power. Non-Heterosexual Lives and the State in Czechoslovakia, 1948-1989*, Prague: Karolinum, 2022.
- Majken Jul SØRENSEN, “Constructive Resistance: Conceptualising and Mapping the Terrain”, *Journal of Resistance Studies*, 2 (1/2016), p. 49-78.
- Pavel SZOBI, “Portugalci v „komunistické Ženevě“: Praha jako středisko antisalazaristické opozice (1948-1974)”, *Soudobé dějiny*, 21 (4/2014), p. 609-634.
- Manuel TAGÜEÑA LACORTE, *Testimonio De Dos Guerras*, Barcelona: Planeta, 1978.
- Maroš TIMKO, “Los voluntarios checoslovacos en el bando sublevado durante la Guerra Civil en España” in Josef OPATRŇÝ (ed.), *Českoslovaquia, Europa Central y América Latina: el periodo de entreguerras (=Ibero-Americana Pragensia, Supplementum 51)*, Praha: Carolinum, 2019, p. 93-108.

- Maroš TIMKO, “The Spanish communist exile and consentful contention in state socialist Czechoslovakia”, *Ibero-Americana Pragensia*, 49 (1/2021), p. 81-99 (in print).
- Maroš TIMKO, “„Všude na španělské soudruhy dívaly se jako na příživníky.“ Španielsky komunistický exil v povojnovom Československu”, in Monika KABEŠOVÁ and Kateřina HRUŠKOVÁ (ed.), *České, slovenské a československé dějiny 20. století XV.*, Hradec Králové: UHK Filozofická fakulta, 2022, p. 173-196.
- Konstantinos TSIVOS, *Řecká emigrace v Československu (1948-1968). Od jednoho rozštěpení k druhému*, PhD Dissertation, Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 2011.
- Tomáš VILÍMEK and Václav RAMEŠ, “Pohyblivé hranice diktatury ve světle stížností občanů”, *Soudobé dějiny*, 29 (1/2022), p. 17-42.
- Tomáš VILÍMEK and Oldřich TŮMA and Jaroslav CUHRA et al., *Projevy a podoby protirežimní rezistence v komunistickém Československu 1948-1989*, Praha: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR, 2018.
- Ondřej VOJTĚCHOVSKÝ, “Soudruzi nebo vetřelci? O životě cizinců v ČSR na příkladu jugoslávské emigrace”, *Paměť a dějiny*, XI (3/2017), p. 24-32.
- Karel VRÁNA, “Česká španělská vesnice” [online], *Tyden* 3, 2006, https://www.tyden.cz/tema/ceska-spanelska-vesnice_61.html [23 March 2023].
- Filip VURM, *Československo-španělské vztahy v letech 1945-1975*, MA thesis, Praha: Univerzita Karlova, 2007.
- Glennys YOUNG, “To Russia with «Spain». Spanish Exiles in the USSR and the *Longue Durée* of Soviet History”, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 15 (2/2014), p. 395-419.
- Pavel ŽÁČEK, “‘Ostrá zbraň’ Štátnej bezpečnosti. Spolupracovníci politickej polície v smerniciach pre agentúrno-operatívnu prácu, 1947-1989”, *Pamäť národa*, October 2004, p. 4-27.

ARTÍCULO RECIBIDO: 03-10-2023, ACEPTADO: 31-01-2024

