Abstract

The objective of this thesis is to answer the question why is the Munich complex so essential for samizdat and tamizdat authors, how important was its influence on moral decline of the Czech nation, what was its role in the inability to avoid communist plot in 1948 or in the fail of the Prague spring. . The methodological approach of the presented historical-critical analysis of Munich complex in political thinking of dissent and democratic opposition in exile stems from the interpretation of history of ideas by Aloysius P. Martinich, and the conception of symbolic center by Miloš Havelka. In the introductory part, I analyze the Munich agreement in its historical context and the interpretation of events leading to Munich in the official Communist historiography during the sixties and seventies. It is important for better orientation in individual approaches of analyzed authors. The main focus of the thesis is the analysis of publications relating to Munich events from chosen authors. I confront their conclusions with interpretation of Jan Tesař, whose work is the culmination of samizdat discussion about this topic. There is no unified definition of the Munich complex. It is mostly associated with president Edvard Beneš and moral decline of the Czech nation. Almost all authors mention the need to find a leader, who would lead the nation from political and cultural passivity. Munich primarily represents the mentioned symbolic center, which is a cluster of recurring problems. In this case, it is a syndrome of a small nation in the haul of great history.