

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Institute of International Studies

Masters thesis

2015

Elisabeth Anna Hobl

CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Institute of International Studies

Elisabeth Anna Hobl

**Changing the interpretation of monuments
for the purpose of influencing the
Czechoslovak collective identity through
Rudé Právo and presidential speeches
(1948-1957)**

Masters thesis

Prague 2015

Author: B.A. Elisabeth Anna Hobl

Supervisor: doc. PhDr. Jiří Vykoukal, CSc.

Academic Year: 2014/2015

Bibliographic note

HOBL, Elisabeth Anna. *Changing the interpretation of monuments for the purpose of influencing the Czechoslovak collective identity through Rudé Právo and presidential speeches (1948-1957)*. 139 p. Master thesis. Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institut of International Studies. Supervisor doc. PhDr. Jiří Vykoukal, CSc.

Abstract

The Communist Party of Czechoslovak (KSČ) tried self-servingly to shape the interpretation of Czechoslovak history. National identity can theoretically change over time by adapting amongst others collective memory. As collective memory also consists of several components the thesis focuses on early attempts to influence Czechoslovak national identity by altering the meaning of certain historical events represented by specific monuments in the period 1948-1957. A monument's meaning derives from discourse and traditions. The analysis shows that *Rudé Právo* articles and Presidential speeches were part of a discourse used to influence the meaning of monuments. The case studies: Bethlehem Chapel was to symbolize the historical Hussite legacy continued by the KSČ; the Monument of National Liberation was to commemorate World War Two soldiers and important communists; the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers was to commemorate the Red Army as Czechoslovakia's sole liberator. These interpretations were meant to generate legitimization, justification and credibility for the KSČ's claim to power and help over time to facilitate a national collective identity supportive of socialism. The analysis shows that for this purpose certain tools were employed for instance first-person-plural narration, black-and-white depiction of issues, exclusion and falsification of facts, credibility through academic authors and seemingly genuine accounts by ordinary citizens.

Abstract

Komunistická Strana Československa (KSČ) se snažila ovlivnit výklad československé národní historie v její vlastní prospěch. Kolektivní pamět je jedna součást národní identity. Změna ve kolektivní paměti může teoreticky časem působit na národní identitu. Práce zkoumá rané pokusy měnit kolektivní pamět v období 1948-1957. Protože se kolektivní pamět skládá se vícero součástí se tenhle výskum zaměřuje na změnu významu některých historických událostí, které jsou symbolizované konkrétními památkami. Význam památek vyplývá z diskurzu a tradic. Analýza dobových textů ukázala, že články Rudého Práva a prezidentské projevy byly použity ke změně významu památek vybraných jako případové studie: Betlémská kaple a Jan Hus měly symbolizovat historický husitský odkaz k jehož naplnění se hlasila KSČ; památník národního osvobození měl připomínat pádlé vojáky Druhé Světové války a významné komunisty; Památník sovětských tankistů representoval tvrzení Rudé armády že je jediným osvoboditelem Československa. Tyto památky, symbolizující historické události, měly representovat legitimovat nárok KSČ na moc a usnadnit vznik národní kolektivní identity podporující socialismus. Z analýzy dobových textů vyplynulo, že k manipulaci veřejného mínění bylo použito těchto jazykových nástrojů, například: použití první osoby množného čísla v naraci; černobíle zobrazení světa a faktů, vyloučení a falšování faktů, generování důvěryhodnosti prostřednictvím akademických autorů a zdánlivě skutečných údajů obyčejných občanů.

Klíčová slova

Československo, KSČ, Betlémska kaple, památka národního osvobození, pomník sovětským tankistům, kolektivní pamnět, kolektiví identita, kvalitativní analýza diskurzu, vynalez tradic, lieux de mémoire

Keywords

Czechoslovakia, KSČ, Bethlehem Chapel, Monument of National Liberation, Monument of Soviet tank drivers, collective memory, collective identity, qualitative discourse analysis, invention of tradition, lieux de mémoire

Range of thesis:

296.427 characters with spaces and footnotes

139 p.

Declaration of Authorship

1. The author hereby declares that he compiled this thesis independently, using only the listed resources and literature.
2. The author hereby declares that all the sources and literature used have been properly cited.
3. The author hereby declares that the thesis has not been used to obtain a different or the same degree.

Prague 14.01.2015

Elisabeth Anna Hobl

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful especially for the support of her family and friends.

Institute of International Studies
Master thesis proposal

M. A. THESIS – PROJECT

Name:

Elisabeth Anna Hobl

E-mail:

e.hobl@alumni.maastrichtuniversity.nl

Date:

14.01.2015

Title (preliminary):

Changing the interpretation of monuments for the purpose of influencing the Czechoslovak collective identity through Rudé Právo and presidential speeches (1948-1957)

Expected term of defence (semester, academic year):

Winter Semester 2014/2015

Instructor of the M. A. Thesis Seminar:

doc. PhDr. Jiří Vykoukal, CSc.

Supervisor:

doc. PhDr. Jiří Vykoukal, CSc.

Substantiation (5 lines):

Monuments are only a small aspect of a nation's collective memory, but are often emotionally charged. They symbolize a nation's significant historical events or people. National history in turn is a component of national identity. The meaning of a monument and with it the interpretation of the represented historical event can be altered through discourse and traditions in the long-run. If such changes are adopted into the collective memory over time, then also a nation's collective identity can gradually change. Hence, it is important to know how the meaning of a monument is changed.

Expected outcome (5 lines):

The expected outcome is to find tools and stylistic devices used in a discourse in order to change the perception and interpretation of a monument and the represented historical event. The examination of traditions and rituals can supply information on how such new interpretations presented in the discourse are reinforced and disseminated among the public.

Key concept (10 lines):

Collective memory is the overarching concept. Monuments constitute only a small aspect of collective memory, but they focus the commemoration of the represented events, invoke rituals and symbolize a certain interpretation of the past. Monuments are like a tangible crystallized memory. A monument's meaning and significance can change for numerous reasons. During the communist period history and with it monuments were often politicized and used for justification or legitimization. For this purpose certain memories were suppressed and others were falsified.

Preliminary structure (10 lines):

After an introduction into the topic, short definitions of the used theoretical concepts (lieux de mémoire, invention of tradition, collective memory, national identity, national day) are provided; afterwards, why and how quantitative discourse analysis is utilized for the analysis of the discourse of Rudé Právo and the discourse of presidential speeches. The case studies focus on monuments and the corresponding national days, which commemorates the historical event represented by the monument. Each case study provides background information to the examined monument and a separate chronological analysis of the discourse published on the corresponding national day. Bethlehem Chapel and 6th July, Monument of National Liberation 28th October, Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers 9th May. The findings are presented in the conclusion.

Sources (preliminary selection):

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. (revised edition). Verso, London

Assmann, A. (2008, Spring). Transformations between History and Memory. *Social Research*, Volume 75, Issue 1, pp.49-72

Čornej, P. & Pokorný, J. (2000). *A brief History of the Czech lands to 2000*. (Trans.) A. Bryson. Praha

David, J., Čech, R., Davidova-Glogrová, J., Radková, L., Sústková, H. (2013). *Slovo a text v historickém kontextu – Perspektivy historickosémantické analýzy jazyka*. Ostravská univerzita v Ostravě

Eder, F. X. (2006). *Historische Diskurse und ihre Analyse – eine Einleitung*. In F. X. Eder (ed.). *Historische Diskursanalysen: Genealogie, Theorie, Anwendung*. (1st Ed.). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften

Eley, G. (2010). *Marxist historiography*. In S. Berger, H. Feldner & K. Passmore (eds.). *Writing History- Theory and Practise* (2nd ed.). Blumsbury Academic, London
Galandauer, J., Mály, I., Kortus, O. (2012). *Narodní památník na Vítkově*. Narodni Museum, Praha

Gellner, E. (1987). *Culture, Identity, and Politics*. University of Cambridge

Gerovitch, S. (2007). "New Soviet Man" Inside Machine: Human Engineering, Spacecraft Design, and the Construction of Communism. *Osiris*, Volume 22, Issue 1, pp.135-157

Hájková, D. & Wingfield, N. M. (2010). Czech-(oslovak) national commemorations during the interwar period: Tomáš, G. Masaryk and the Battle of White Mountain avenged. *Acta Histriae*, Volume 18, Issue 3, pp. 425-452

Hobsbawm, E. (1983). *Introduction: Inventing Tradition*. In E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger (eds.). *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press

Hojda, Z. & Pokorný, J. (1996). Pomníky a (za)pomníky. Paseka

Končelík, J., Večeřa, P., Orság, P. (2010). Dějiny českých médií 20. Století. Portál, Prague

Krejčí, J. (1990). Czechoslovakia at the crossroads of European History. I B Tauris. London

Landwehr, A. (2008). Historische Diskursanalyse. Campus historische Einführung. Campus Verlag, Frankfurt

Lebow, R. N. (2006). The Memory of Politics in Postwar Europe. In R. N. Lebow, W. Kansteiner, C. Fogu (eds.). The Memory of Politics in Postwar Europe. Duke University Press, Durham and London

Malý, I. (2013). Památník na Vítkově v proměnách vládní ideologie a propagandy v letech 1938-1950. In Společnost a kultura v Českých zemích 1939-1949. Národní muzeum, Praha

Maršálek, Z. (2013). Místo husitské tradice v moderní české společnosti: základní kámen národní identity. In B. Soukupová, H. Nosková & P. Bednařík (eds.). Paměť – Národ – Menšiny-Marginalizace-Identity I. Urbánní studie. Sv. 6. Praha

Mayer, F. (2009). Češi a jejich komunismus – Paměť a politická identita. M. Nodl (ed.). H. Beguivinová (trans). Argo, Praha

McCrone, D. & McPherson, G. (2009). National Days Constructing and Mobilising National Identity. D. McCrone, D. & G. McPherson (eds.). Palgrave Macmillan

Michl, J. (2009). Legionáři a Československo. Naše vojsko, s.r.o., Praha

Mitchell, K. (2003). Monuments, Memorials, and the Politics of Memory. Urban Geography, Volume 24, Issue 5, pp.442-459

Nora, P. (1989, Spring). Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire. Representations, Volume 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory, pp.7-24, University of California Press

Paces, C. (2009). Prague Panoramas – National memory and sacred spaces in the twentieth century. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, USA

Pichlík, K., Klípa, B. & Zabloudilová, J. (1996). Českoslovenští legionáři 1914-1920. Mladá Fronta, Praha

Randák, J. (2008). Betlémská kaple, revoluční tradice a vstup marx-leninské historiografie do prostoru. In Proměny diskursu české marxistické historiografie – Kapitoly z historiografie 20. století. Historia Culturae XV. Studia 10. Jihočeská univerzita v Českých Budějovicích, Philosophical Faculty

Randák, J. (2014). Paměť v prostoru a proctor v paměti – příklad modern české společnosti. In M. Poliaková, J. Raška, V. Smyčka (eds.). Uzel na kapesníku: vzpomínka a narativní konstrukce dějín. (1st ed.). Charles University Prague, Philosophical Faculty

Said, E.W. (1995). Orientalism. Western Conceptions of the Orient. Modern Classics Penguin

Said, E. W. (2000, Winter). Invention, Memory, and Place. Critical Inquiry, Volume 26, Issue 2, pp. 175-192. The University of Chicago Press

Smith, A. D. (1991). National Identity. Penguin Group, London

Soukupová, B. (2013). Místo husitské tradice v moderní české společnosti: základní kámen národní identity. In B. Soukupová, H. Nosková & P. Bednařík (eds.). Paměť – Národ –Menšiny-Marginalizace-Identity I. Urbánní studie. Sv. 6. Praha

Vella, C. (2013). European Resistance in the Second World War. P. Cooke & B. H. Shepherd (eds.). Pen & Sword Praetorian Press, UK

Wingfield, N. M. (2000). The Politics of Memory: Constructing National Identity in the Czech Lands, 1945 to 1948. East European Politics and Societies. Volume 14, Issue 2, pp.246-267

Signature

Approved

Date

Signature

Supervisor

Instructor of the M.A Thesis Seminar

BECES Guarantor

TABLE OF CONTENT

INTRODUCTION.....	2
1. THEORY	8
1.1. <i>Monuments.....</i>	8
1.1. <i>Collective Memory.....</i>	12
1.2. <i>National Identity.....</i>	15
2. METHODOLOGY – DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.....	21
2.1. <i>Discourse Analysis.....</i>	21
2.1. <i>Applying Discourse Analysis to Rudé Právo.....</i>	25
2.2. <i>Applying Discourse Analysis to Presidential Speeches.....</i>	28
3. CASE STUDY: BETHLEHEM CHAPEL	30
3.1. <i>Background information on Hussite Movement and Bethlehem Chapel.....</i>	30
3.2. <i>Depiction of Hussite Movement and Jan Hus in Rudé Právo on national day 6th July.....</i>	34
3.3. <i>Depiction of Hussite Movement and Jan Hus in Presidential speeches on national day 6th July.....</i>	47
4. CASE STUDY: MONUMENT OF NATIONAL LIBERATION.....	51
4.1. <i>Background information on the Monument of National Liberation.....</i>	51
4.2. <i>Depiction of Czechoslovak legionnaires and Monument of National Liberation in Rudé Právo on national day 28th October.....</i>	57
4.3. <i>Depiction of Czechoslovak legionnaires and Monument of National Liberation in Presidential speeches on national day 28th October.....</i>	70
5. CASE STUDY: MONUMENT OF THE SOVIET TANK DRIVERS.....	73
5.1. <i>Background information Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers.....</i>	73
5.2. <i>Depiction of the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers in Rudé Právo on national day 9th May.....</i>	77
5.3. <i>Depiction of the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers in Presidential speeches on national day 9th May.....</i>	99
CONCLUSION	102
SUMMERY	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	112

“Who controls the past [...] controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.”

(George Orwell, 1984)

Introduction

The aim of the thesis is to examine how certain historic events, symbolized by certain monuments, were presented and re-interpreted and what tools were used in the examined discourses to shape the meaning of these monuments and the interpretation of the historical events represented by them. The underlying assumption is that the examined monuments were presented in the investigated discourses in a certain pro-communist way. The aim was to influence how the historical events represented by the examined monuments would be remembered in the Czechoslovak collective memory. One of the underlying motivations for this endeavour of manipulating Czechoslovak collective memory is assumed to be intentional alteration of Czechoslovak national identity in the long-run. However, no broad claims can be made in regard to real changes in Czechoslovak national identity, because the thesis focuses only on one component of national identity – national history. Moreover, the thesis is further limited, because national history is also based on several elements and only the aspect of national monuments is examined here.

After the end of the Second World War (WW II) in May 1945, the Communist Party of Czechoslovak (KSČ) tried to gain a stronger foothold in the Czechoslovak post-war government. In the first post-war elections of 1946 the KSČ managed to get about 40% of the votes and it became the biggest party in the Czech lands and Klement Gottwald became Prime Minister (Krejčí, 1990, p.176 & Holy, 1996, p.18). In order to strengthen the KSČ's position the other political parties were discredited and the influence over the security apparatus, the media, information and polling institutions was expanded. The KSČ used a moment of governmental instability to stage the decisive coup d'état of February 1948 and to take full political control (Krejčí, 1990, pp.179-181). Soon new elections were held to solidify the KSČ's position (ibid.), setting Czechoslovakia on a path towards deeper integration with the Soviet Union (SU) and socialism (Čornej & Pokorný, 2000, pp.70ff).

The KSČ had now the chance to alter and shape the post-war identity of the Czechoslovaks according to its needs and thus consolidate its grip on power in the long-

run. Ideally this would have resulted in the establishment of a socialist society¹ in the long-run, because a society identifying with the regime would be easier to govern and less likely to protest its policies (Gerovitsch, 2007).

Numerous influences² exist to facilitate such a socialist collective identity, a *homo sovieticus* as it would be called later by Alexander Sinowjew (1984), and not all can be discussed in this thesis. In general nations need common points of identification to determine inclusion or exclusion from their community and the level of national unity. Such common signifiers are a common language, culture, values, territory, religion, history and its commemoration (Assmann, 2008, p.67). The latter can influence a nation quite considerably, because national history affects how a state interacts with its neighbours, what relation it has for example to its territory, language, religion, ethnicity, how it treats minorities (Smith, 1991) and it influences individual and collective identity. Changes in the interpretation of significant historical events can potentially impact a nation's identity when the collective memory embraces these changes. Interpretation of historical events can be changed by for example modifying history education, new academic findings, new public discourse, changing the meaning of national monuments and promoting different national heroes (Randák, 2014, pp.113ff).

In order to change the interpretation of the past and thus potentially facilitate a communist national identity in the long-run, the KSČ began gradually to disseminate a historical narrative based on Marxist-Leninist historiography³ (Wingfield, 2000, pp.246ff & Barša, 2014, p.39). The KSČ chose to use certain prominent historic events to shape national collective identity to its advantage (Wingfield, 2000, p.247 & Randák, 2014, pp.113ff). Such as a basis for a close alignment with the SU (Holy, 1996, p.138), as justification and legitimization of communist rule (Wingfield, 2000, pp.246ff & Barša, 2014, p.39) and as a mean to marginalize potential rivals to the communist sole claim to Czechoslovakia's heart and mind (Wingfield, 2000, p.262 & Holy, 1996, pp.58-59).

¹ Characteristics: loyal to the party and SU, united, hard-working, fierce towards enemies of the state, egalitarian, classless society of workers, peasants and intelligentsia (Gerovitsch, 2007).

² Media, socio-economic situation, public discourse, political system, education, national history and its commemoration, ethnicity, religion, territory and so on (Smith, 1991).

³ Marxist-Leninist historiography facilitated a "socially organized and ideologically based amnesia as well as an institutional remembering of a particular Czech national history" (Wingfield, 2000, p.255). History is subordinated to ideology and used to legitimize present policies and laws. Power over the past's interpretation is crucial for any political regime, because a society's norms and values also derive from it (Randák, 2008, pp.225f).

The KSČ searched for usable historical parallels and continuity in order to curb the newness of the recently changed circumstances and to increase its acceptability. Historic continuity gives new regimes potentially more credibility, because the new regime can claim to represent a natural, logical continuation of a nation's history. This often entails the promotion of a new interpretation of the past (Randák, 2014, p.113). One possibility to do so is by erecting new monuments or changing the meaning of existing monuments. The thesis itself focuses on this aspect and examines the following monuments: Bethlehem Chapel - *Betlémská kaple*, Monument of National Liberation - *památník národního osvobození*, Monument of the Soviet Tank Driver - *památník sovětských tankistů*.⁴ The historical events represented by these monuments were adapted in order to propagate the regime's ideals. By doing so the KSČ hoped to facilitate a stronger identification of the people with the communist rule and to generate a historical legitimacy for its rule and credibility (Wingfield, 2000, p.255). However, monuments represent only a small aspect of potential re-interpretation of the national past and the thesis focuses on this factor. This is done because monuments can have a considerable impact, despite being only small components of national collective identity and memory (Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, p.14).

In general, monuments are a statue or a sculptural group located in a public place, but they can also be just a simple cross or an entire building complex. Monuments focus public commemoration. They can be specifically built for remembrance and commemoration or they are a historic building enriched by a special symbolical value (Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, p.14). They symbolize and commemorate certain historical events, achievements or people, which are part of collective memory, which in turn shapes collective identity. Moreover, monuments can also symbolically reflect a specific interpretation of the historical event or person they depict (Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, p.18 & Assmann, 2008, p.55). Monuments are sites of memory or so called *lieux de mémoire* (Nora, 1989, p.19), as they not only carry important meaning, but also often occupy prominent public places. Through their public location they are part of a society's shared presence and space, instead of simple works of art or mere symbols (Wingfield, 2000, p.259).⁵

⁴ They represented originally the following events: Hussite movement and Jan Hus, the legionnaires' role in Czechoslovakia's independence in 1918, the Red Army's liberation of Czechoslovakia.

⁵ Communist monuments and other symbols like hammer and sickle, red star or flags signalled the KSČ's presence (Wingfield, 2000, p.262).

Additionally, *lieux de mémoire* and monuments in general play a role in the commemoration of past events, as they incite a certain behaviour: people gather at them on specific days, lay down flowers, give speeches, sing songs or anthems, salute, organize honorary guards, and so on. Moreover, constructing monuments or removing them symbolizes changes in society, politics or an altered interpretation of past events or deeds of the depicted person⁶. Even today monuments can focus the emotions of a nation and can contribute to reconciliation, but also to resentment, because they can attract oppositional views of past events.

The advantage of the communist government was that the Czechoslovak state was a relatively young country having gained independence only in 1918 (Čornej & Pokorný, 2000). Hence, a national Czechoslovak identity did exist, but it was not yet firmly consolidated, because of the minorities and the existence of purely Czech and Slovak national identities (Holy, 1996, pp.6ff). Moreover, the Czechoslovak legions and the struggle against Nazi-Germany also did not eliminate the differences between the various ethnic groups residing in Czechoslovakia completely, despite them partially fighting side by side (Maršálek, 2013, pp.41-46). After World War II, Czechoslovakia became less multi-ethnic and Czechoslovaks identified more strongly against Germans and Hungarians (Wingfield, 2000, pp.246-247 & Ladislav Holy, 1996, pp.8ff). Germans were increasingly seen as the enemy, the significant other the Czechoslovaks united and identified against (Harle, 1994), pp.28ff), because all guilt and responsibility connected to the war was transferred onto the Germans (Wingfield, 2000, p.247). Therefore, it could be argued that the Czechoslovak identity was already changing (Pabián, 2007) and the communist regime took advantage of this situation in order to steer the national collective identity into a certain direction. Wingfield (2000) argues, that the Czechoslovak elites attempted to connect “the ‘acceptable’ past⁷ with the reconstructed post-war state” (p.246) in order to establish a compelling narrative of resistance and victory and not victimhood. This new communist historical narrative did not focus on the increasing domestic conflict after 1935, the Munich agreement of 1938 or German occupation, events which were seen as shameful. Instead, communists tried to reaffirm Czechoslovakia as a strong nation fulfilling its (communist) destiny after 1945 and focused on glorifying the Red Army and SU (Wingfield, 2000, p.247). To achieve this,

⁶ Examples: Lenin statues toppled in Ukraine 2014 (Barber, 2014). Holocaust Memorial revealed in Berlin (BBC News, 2005). Bronze soldier in Tallinn (Kattago, 2010).

⁷ Exclusion: Nazi-collaboration, expulsion of Sudeten Germans (Wingfield, 2008, p.246), Holocaust.

the KSČ used organized forgetting (suppression, exclusion, repression) and remembering (purposeful highlighting, invention, popularization) towards certain historic events and people (ibid., p.246).

For the purpose of creating an acceptable narrative, some features of the Czechoslovak interwar identity were re-used by the communists, while others were altered to fit the KSČ's objectives: The initial Czechoslovak identity after 1918 was based amongst others on Czech and Slovak language, a long national history with national heroes such as St. Wenceslaus, Jan Hus and the First Czechoslovak President T. G. Masaryk (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010, p.429), and on the struggle for independence during World War One by the Czechoslovak legions⁸ (Holy, 1996, pp.36-40,134-135). This identity also manifested itself in the monuments and memorials built during the interwar period to Masaryk, Jan Hus and the Czechoslovak Legions across Czechoslovakia (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010, pp.429, 439 & Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, pp.164ff). Features of this interwar identity, that were changed by the communists, included the perception of Jan Hus (Krejčí, 1990), Masaryk and the Czechoslovak legions. They were namely gradually disregarded and their significance was downplayed or falsified by the communists (Holy, 1996, pp.58-58). Statues of Masaryk were soon removed and replaced by statues of Marx, Engels, Lenin or Stalin and memorials dedicated to the legionnaires were overshadowed by new Red Army memorials (Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, Wingfield, 2000, p.262). The meaning of these monuments and the corresponding historical events can be altered in several ways. Public discourse is one of them. It includes for instance media, publications and speech acts that discuss the monument's interpretation. Articles and speeches are regarded as tools to influence the public perception of certain historical events and monuments. As not the entire discourse can be examined, two examples were selected for the thesis in order to investigate how the communist party tried to alter the meaning of these monuments. *Rudé Právo* was selected, because it was the official communist newspaper in Czechoslovakia with a nationwide readership amounting to 852 300 copies being sold in 1957, reaching a broad public because of its high availability and the limitation of other media (Končelík et al., 2010, pp.140f,172). Presidential speeches of Klement Gottwald and Antonín Zápotocký were chosen, because they were a valuable

⁸ "Legionnaires, [... were] Czech volunteers who fought with the Allies on three fronts during World War One" (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010 & p.429, Pichlík et al., 1996). The legions' success boosted the

propaganda tool for dispersing communist viewpoints. They were often published in *Rudé Právo* in full length and generally also reached a large audience, due to nationwide broadcasting and publication in book editions.

Hence, this paper examines the question how certain historic events, symbolized by certain monuments, were presented and re-interpreted by the KSČ in *Rudé Právo* and Presidential speeches in order to facilitate a more socialist collective identity. In order to answer this question the thesis examines the above mentioned case studies and what tools were used by the KSČ 1948-1957 to adapted their meaning in the examined discourses.

The research focuses on the corresponding national days commemorating the historical events represented by the examined monuments: the burning of Jan Hus, 6th July; the day of independence, 28th October; Victory Day, 9th May (Holy, 1996, p.58). The articles chosen for this study were published on or around these state holidays in connection to these holidays. The same applies to the chosen speeches, which were delivered by the presidents on or around these state holidays. The speeches delivered and articles published on these days would get more public attention and reach a wider public, thus spreading the propagated interpretation of the past. Additionally, significant official celebrations would often take place in public on these national days and the regular rituals and traditions would induce the monuments with meaning.

The focus of the research is put on the time period that stretches from 1948, when the KSČ seized power in February (Končelík et al., 2010, pp.131ff), until 1957, when the second President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Antonín Zápotocký, died. This time period was chosen, because it comprises the first ten years of communist rule. Hence, it investigates the initial efforts of the KSČ to alter the meaning and the interpretation of the examined monuments and the historic events associated with these monuments through newspaper articles and presidential speeches in order to foster a more socialist identity.

The first chapter of the thesis presents the theoretical background used in the analysis. It discusses various concepts such as ‘invention of tradition’ (Hobsbawm, 1983) and ‘*lieux de mémoire*’ (Nora, 1989), focusing on how monuments are associated with certain meanings. Additionally, the role of national identity and collective memory for a nation is illustrated. The second chapter gives an overview over the methodology

Czechoslovak National Committee for Czechoslovak independence's struggle (Orzoff, 2009, pp.95ff) and legionnaires were later idolized for it (Galandauer et al., 2012, p.48 & Michl, 2009).

employed in the analysis of the case studies. Namely how discourse analysis is applied to the newspaper articles and presidential speeches examined in the thesis. The following three chapters present the case studies: Bethlehem Chapel, Monument of National Liberation, Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers. The thesis concludes with an evaluation and overview of the findings. Due to the limited scope of the thesis and the extensiveness of the topic not all factors could be considered.

1. Theory

1.1. *Monuments*

In general a monument is regarded today as a statue or a sculptural group occupying a public space. It is though first a symbol and then an artefact of a certain time period. It focuses public commemoration and it can be just a simple cross or an entire building complex. Monuments are either specifically built for the purpose of commemoration and remembrance, like the Monument of National Liberation on Vítkov Hill, or are a historic building enriched by a special symbolical value like parliaments, for instance (Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, p.14). A ‘real’ monument is different from other sculptures or buildings, because it is recognized and honoured by the public as a monument without considering aesthetics, according to Hojda and Pokorný (1996, p.15).

Monuments have been already built since antiquity and have mainly focused on rulers and military leaders (Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, pp.15-16). Later on, monuments were often erected by the flourishing, more secularized citizenry and they reflected their often national ideology; instead of depicting saints or military leaders as before. Sometimes the place around these monuments became sacred as well. An example would be St. Wenceslaus Square, which radiates a sense of historical sanctification and of ‘where history is made’. Additionally, these monuments guided people through the national history, reaffirmed old traditions and invited new generations to uphold these traditions (Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, p.16). Hence, 19th century monuments also symbolize the search for national identity, as they depict national heroes, for example. The choice of national heroes illustrates a nation’s collective memory, due their high public recognition and acceptance (ibid., p.17).

However, monuments not always represent the meaning they were initially endowed with. Thus, struggles over the true meaning of a monument originate often from disputes over the true traditions, features and culture of a nation (Mitchell, 2003, pp.446f). Additionally, the political meaning of monuments must not be underestimated, as they represent a certain political act and time (Randák, 2014, pp.117-118). The revealing of a new monument creates opportunity for political manifestations in the public space through speeches; and the amount of visitors might even give an idea about the popularity of the person or event eternalized in the sculpture, but also of the group that sponsored the monument. Moreover, rallies take place, speeches are delivered, parades end or begin, wreaths are laid, and demonstrations take place at monuments. These rituals and traditions can be used by a certain social groups or communities to exert influence over others (Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, p.18).

Only when a monument stops to invoke negative or positive feelings and is forgotten, it ceases to be a monument. Sometimes the physical appearance of monuments was changed to fit a new era or interpretation, but more frequently the changes extended mainly to the monuments meaning, function and its ‘users’ (Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, p.20).

If monuments are not forgotten and their meaning is regularly reaffirmed through rituals and traditions, than they become so called “*lieux de mémoire*”. This concept was developed by Nora (1989) and designates places of memory to which people have an emotional connection to. *Lieux de mémoire* emerge through the interaction of memory and history and the will to remember (ibid., p.19). They are places where memory crystallizes (1989, p.7). These sites of memory can be natural or artificial, they are accessible directly through tangible experiences (p.18.) can be “material, symbolic, and functional”, according to Nora. “Museums, archives, cemeteries, festivals, anniversaries, treaties, depositions, monuments, sanctuaries, fraternal orders - these are the boundary stones of another age, illusions of eternity” and embody a consciousness for commemoration (p.12) by reminding people of the past in a new ever-changing world.

As said above, these places have to be created and maintained through rituals, because no spontaneous memory existed, according to Nora (1989, p.12). Nora argues, that *lieux de mémoire* would soon disappear in the masses of history, if they would not be persistently commemorated, because history tries to alter and transform the memory they represent. Identities are built on such sites, but if there was no danger that the past

events they commemorate would be forgotten such sites would not be set up (ibid., p.12). Further, *lieux de mémoire* arouse living and experiencing memory (ibid., 14). Such common experiences, of memories being recollected, can bind a nation together and foster the people's collective identity, because they provide shared experiences and affirm the nation's shared past.

These rituals and traditions, which keep a monument 'alive' and invest it with meaning, are often invented. The concept 'invention of tradition' constitutes that traditions are constructed, instituted by society or governments for specific reasons. The term describes a collection of practises, regulated by a set of openly or silently accepted rules. These practises are often ritualistic or symbolic and try to engrain specific norm, values and patterns of behaviour through repetition (Hobsbawm, 1983, p.1). Traditions also help to understand the present and to judge the future in terms of the past, if it is a logical continuation of the past (Holy, 1996, p.138). However, new traditions do not need to be always included into a long historic past reaching until the beginning of time. Events like revolutions break with the past. They cut off history in order to launch a new era and introduce new traditions (Hobsbawm, 1983, p.2). Thus, such new traditions "are responses to novel situations, which take the form of reference to old situations or which establish their own past by quasi-obligatory repetition" (ibid.). Furthermore, traditions are usually viewed from a present or future standpoint, which has a certain aim. Thus, the attitudes towards traditions can change, as it happened after the rise of the communist party in 1948. For the KSČ it was particularly useful that traditions can potentially be used to justify certain policies or to mobilize people, for instance (Holy, 1996, p.138); but traditions can also transmit the self-image and cultural rites of a certain group into the past (Assmann, 2008, p.66). This was done with the Hussite movement, which was claimed by the KSČ as their myth of origin almost.

Furthermore, traditions and rituals can also shape collective memory, because invented traditions and rituals in general select and manipulate specific parts of national history by highlighting some and downplaying others. This selection of historic events to be remembered collectively across generations is a fictitious "narrative emplotment or visual encoding". The historic events are constructed to fit certain national narratives. However, this does not mean that memory constructs, fuelling traditions or commemorative procedures, are false, because they are often adapted, due to some pressing need in the present (Assmann, 2008, p.67). Therefore, collective memory is "not necessarily authentic, but rather useful" and functional (Said, 2000, p.179). It

functions as the basis of an “invented memory of the past as a way of creating a new sense of identity for ruler and ruled” (ibid., p.178).

In the case of the KSCĚ new tradition were employed and previous rituals were adapted to infuse monuments with the meaning the KSCĚ needed. By doing so the KSCĚ tried to make these monuments *lieux de mémoire* of the communist cause, so that they present the communist interpretation of history and people would relate to that. The concept of invention of tradition can be a mean to interconnect with large numbers of people in order to govern them. Invention of tradition includes the ‘invention’ of ceremonies and rituals, but it also encompasses the creation of national days (Said, 2000, p.179).

Monuments are often visited on certain national days to commemorate the event or person they represent. On these days the visibility and effect of the monuments is increased, because special ceremonies or celebrations are held during which state officials, civil society representatives, military personal or other groups are present and certain rituals and traditions are adhered to (McCrone & McPherson, 2009, p.8). McCrone and McPherson (2009) state that national days can foster national identity, as they are commemorative tools, which illustrate “how national identity is imagined, shaped and mobilized” (p.8). They can reinforce a nation’s collective identity through celebrations, commemorative acts and ceremonies (ibid., p.1).

Moreover, national days also symbolize the continuity of a state, as annually or regular rituals and traditions are performed often in connection to certain monuments. These rituals and traditions symbolically include the entire society and reaffirm the meaning of the monument. Some holidays are elevated by ensuring paid leave from work and many draw a lot of media attention. As a result national days are also an opportunity “for politicians to make (relatively) unchallenged statements to docile audiences” (McCrone & McPherson, 2009, p.4). As the case studies below show, national days are just like monuments prone to be contested or altered, due to the economic, social or political circumstances, and the way of celebration or their initiation can signal challenges and change (ibid., p.5). Also (non)-celebration can cause disapproval (ibid., p.6).

1.1. Collective Memory

“An understanding of the past not only helps us interpret the present; it tells us who we are. Shared experiences and memories, and the values and commitments they create and sustain, provide distinctive identities to individuals and communities.”

(Lebow, 2006, p.3)

Maurice Halbwachs introduced the term ‘collective memory’ already in 1925 in his book “On Collective Memory”. He “[...] characterized collective memory as plural, showing how shared memories can be effective markers of social differentiation” (Olick, 1999, p.334). Olick (1999) underlined that collective memory often significantly impacts society and politics (p.333). Society also plays a role in acquiring memories, as people “recall, recognize, and localize their memories” in the context of society (Halbwachs, 1992, p.38).⁹ In the case of a nation as a collective group, the individual must adopt and share this nation’s history, although it transcends that persons own lifespan, in order be part of the nation. This is done by taking part in the nations view of its past through “cognitive learning and emotional acts of identification and commemoration” (Assmann, 2008, p.52). Though national history, according to Holy (1996), does not included all past events that have been chronicled, but a selection of events. This selection depended on the perceived implications and significance of these events for the nation in the present (p.117).

In order to understand how the meaning of monuments can change and why their interpretation can be purposefully altered one has to first fathom what shapes memory. In regard to memory Assmann (2008) points out that “two important dimensions of memory [exist]: interaction with other individuals and interaction with external signs and symbols.” Personal memories can be shared with others through language, which makes them part of an “intersubjective symbolic system” (p.50). Hence, these individual memories are not exclusive anymore and language also shapes how memories are

⁹ Halbwachs linked his concept of ‘collective memory’ to what he termed ‘social frames’. “A social frame is an implicit or explicit structure of shared concerns, values, experiences, narratives” (Assmann, 2008, pp.51-52). Memory does not function outside these frames and they are employed by societies and their members in order to determine and recall their memories (Halbwachs 1992, p.43). Through these social frames an individual can join a group and become part of the ‘we’. This ‘we’ can be “[t]he family, the neighbourhood, the peer group, the generation, the nation, the culture” (ibid., p.52). These groups are than included into the individual’s identity. Each group is established through shared discourses and habits that highlight specific limits and the rules of inclusion and exclusion (Assmann, 2008, p.52).

perceived and presented (ibid.). This becomes apparent in personal accounts published in the *Rudé Právo* and allegedly written by ordinary people, who share their personal memories and experiences of the examined historical events. The reader is more inclined to believe and to identify with such personal stories, because they appear to be genuine.

Additionally, memory can be distinguished into “semantic” and “episodic”. The former comprises the storing and learning ability of the mind. This ability is gained by collective instruction, regular learning and gathering and maintaining specialized and general information. It links people with others and their environment. Episodic memory encompasses individual experiences. This individual experience is changed while it is shared with others due to the medium of sharing this experience (Assmann, 2008, p.51). Hence, both semantic and episodic memory offer ways to influence how historic events are remembered, be it through school books or common public commemoration.

Collective memory is a combination of semantic and episodic memory. The nation’s past is first learned by the individual, than internalized and memorized. When social memory, which is based upon autobiographical, experienced and lived events, begins to fade it will become increasingly homogeneous. This is because its recollection is mediated through historians, public narratives, newspapers, speeches, movies, images, demonstrations, celebrations and processions. A certain national history is supported by media, symbols and rites and conveyed to the people. Its level of influence depends upon the people’s ethnic or patriotic ferventness and its dispersion, for instance (p.55). Such national history is represented by images, values and narratives with which the individual identifies (Assmann, 2008, p.65). As a result abstract national history transforms into emotionally charged forms of ‘our’ history, which is then incorporated into the collective identity.¹⁰ In the language use by the communists in *Rudé Právo* and the speeches this is very evident, because the regime is equalized with the nation and the nation’s history equalized with the party’s history.

To foster identification with national history and make it ‘our history’, joint participation in recollections of the national past is often coerced in totalitarian states; either through propaganda or indoctrination as it was the case in Czechoslovakia.

¹⁰ This is possible, because the individual recollection of the past is not fixed, but it is a process of steady reconstruction in an always changing present. Thus, the interpretation of past events can change according to the circumstances or the view point through which they are seen, for example (Assmann, 2008, p.53).

Symbols and rituals are part of the process and intend to foster identification with the presented interpretations of past events (Assmann, 2008, p.65). “Symbols, texts, images, rites, ceremonies, places and monuments” (ibid., p.55) help large social groups, institutions or nations to create a memory for themselves. These means helps exclude and select memories, which are defining for a group’s identity. Additionally, in totalitarian states collective memory is used to mobilize people for the government’s objectives or to demonstrate unity between leadership and the people, which can be observed also in the case studies below (ibid., p.52).

Furthermore, regarding collective memory Said points out that it is not “passive [...], but a field of activity in which past events are selected, reconstructed, maintained, modified, and endowed with political meaning” (2000, p.185). Collective memory derives amongst others from the transition from history into memory. The process of history becoming memory incorporates the described process of framing selected past events into emotionally laden narratives and mobilizing symbols. These events are than recollected according to set rites and traditions and regarded as unifying and defining for the nation (Assmann, 2008, p.67).¹¹

How people think about certain past events can influence their actions in the present and mobilize them. In this context censorship and propaganda were used to remove alternative views and to ensure stability through a uniform interpretation of history. Unwanted personal memories were denied a platform to be shared and desired views were spread. This is visible in the case studies below, where certain historical events go unmentioned and specific views are persistently repeated.

The framework for the interpretation of the nation’s past was Marxist-Leninist historiography, which put the working class now into the centre of historiography and supplied the scientific evidence for the already given answer (Paces, 2009, p.199). It had to comply with the political doctrine and was used as a propaganda tool to indoctrinate people (Randák, 2008, p.228, 230). Marxist-Leninist historiography

¹¹ In order to transfer fleeting social memory into long-lasting collective memory to be passed on from one generation to another, it needs attentive elaboration and structure: employment of events in an affectively charged and mobilizing narrative; visual and verbal signs that serve as aids of memory; institutions of learning and the dissemination of mass media; sites and monuments that present palpable relics; commemoration rites that periodically reactivate the memory and enhance collective participation. These steps potentially make memory and history more homogenous, explicit, institutionalized and top-down; but they can be influenced by ideology and used for political means (Assmann, 2008, pp.55-56) such as unity, mobilization, legitimization or justification. The communists met Assmann’s points in their effort to alter the interpretation of Czechoslovak history (Barša, 2014, p.39).

suggested namely strongly to the public how to perceive, evaluate, interpret and think about certain events (Randák, 2008, p.225). It also encompassed explanation, meaning and aim for human action and existence, drawn from its interpretation of the past. Further, it was to guide values, thinking and the nation's relation to its history, its neighbouring states and its traditions (Randák, 2008, pp.227-228). Moreover, Marxist-Leninist historiography presented itself as the only true view of history, because the centralization of politics and economy also entailed the "centralization of ideas" (ibid., p.227). No disruptive or belittling questions were to be permitted, other interpretations were defamed as false, rivalling opinions were denied any credibility (ibid., p.227). Hence, no debates, critique or discusses could be observed in the examined articles. (ibid., p.229). Historical events were not entirely falsified, but a purposeful emphasis was put on certain historical actors and moments (ibid, p.234). As a result, this historiography entailed the reduction of the world's plurality and variety, so that it would fit the claim that class struggles drive history forward towards communism.

Historiography was meant to actively shape Czechoslovak society after February 1948 and to present the building of communism as inevitable, logical and as 'meant to be' (ibid., p.229). Moreover, it was supposed to deliberately promote loyalty towards socialism and to contrast the communist interpretation of history with 'false' Western views of history, which were allegedly in favour of capitalists and the bourgeoisie (ibid., p.230). In the following chapter the concepts of nation and collective identity are presented and how identity is influenced by monuments.

1.2. National Identity

Nations have been titled by Benedict Anderson (2006) 'imagined communities', because a nations members will not know or meet the majority of the other members. Yet, still they feel a bond of connectivity to these other members (p.6). Moreover, imagined political communities are limited, as each nation has some boundaries, which separate them from other nations (ibid., p.7). A nation has several key features that define it as a nation: a historic territory, a common mass culture, a shared myths and historical memory, shared rights and obligations for all members of the nation, a shared economy and mobility across its territory (Smith, 1991, p.14). Collective identity and a shared memory are key characteristics of a nation, which can be combined with certain

types of identity – class, ethnic or religious. National identity is a form of collective identity. It is more elaborate than that of a group. Additionally, a nation's unique features are illustrated in its "sacred centres', objects of spiritual and historical pilgrimage" (Smith, 1991, p.16). Furthermore, nation use memory and history to transform a heterogeneous population into a distinct collective, sharing a common view of its past. The nation apprehends itself then "as 'a people' with a collective 'autobiography'" (Assmann, 2008, p.64).

National identity is multi-dimensional and cannot be minimized to a single quality. It can also not be generated or changed in a population quickly or with ease through artificial means (Smith, 1991, p.14). That is why the propaganda machinery set in motion by the KSCĚ was also so all-encompassing. It included mass media like radio, television and newspapers, school history books, economic policies and sports events. All were adapted to the communist vision of the past, present and future. People were encouraged to join the numerous communist organizations and associations and the access to alternative lines of thinking and especially Western ideas was limited (ibid.). The following paragraphs detail the features and functions of national identity.

A nation's identity describes the sense of belonging to a community, which includes also a sense of a political community. This in turn involves at least a few common institutions, a defined social space, a demarcated territory to which the community members feel connected and one code of rights and duties applying to all community members (Smith, 1991, p.8). Furthermore, national identity is also shaped by language, geographical region, ethnicity, religion, traditions, culture and a common history (Smith, 1991). The thesis focusses foremost on the latter. A nation's history is often regarded as crucial to the development of that nation. The memories of past events of national significance are transmitted through personal memories, oral histories, school history books, state holidays, traditions and commemoration ceremonies, for instance. Such events shape a nation and can be for instance the memory of the consolidation of a nation's territory, gaining national independence or the achievement of religious unity (ibid.). How these past events of national importance are seen and understood can change over time (Mitchell, 2003, pp.446f). A society's perception of these events and with them collective memory, can be altered through public discourse, media, propaganda, speech acts, different commemorations or new traditions and so on (Assmann, 2008).

Moreover, other factors than history and memory can shape a nation's collective identity as well, according to Smith (1991, pp.3f), but some are more potent than others to animate collective action or consciousness. Such factors are language, ethnicity, religion or geographical region, for example (ibid.). Other factors influencing collective identity, but often not maintaining it in the long run, are gender and social class (Smith, 1991, p.4). These features focus more on economic interest and are more likely to divide a community in the long-run. Additionally, economic situations can change rapidly and thus, a shared identity based on it has a low sustainability (ibid.). In connection to communist countries Smith (1991) states, that class has been employed by Marx's sociology as the key basis for a nation's collective identity, driving a society forward. Within a nation the unity of workers is crucial, as they are subdivided along skill-levels and industries, but are more influential if they stand together. However, social class is not as inclusive towards other parts of society, as the social connections are directed more inwards into the class-based community (ibid., pp.4-6).¹²

Furthermore, national collective identity is expressed in ceremonies and symbols that are often fused into daily life and as a result are taken for granted and not as salient:

“flags, anthems, parades, coinage, capital cities, oaths, folk costumes, museums of folklore, war memorials, ceremonies of remembrance for the national dead, passports, frontiers [...], national recreations, the countryside, popular heroes and heroines, fairy tales, forms of etiquette, styles of architecture, arts and crafts, modes of town planning, legal procedures, educational practices and military codes [...], distinctive customs, mores, styles”

(Smith, 1991, p.77).

Such symbols, ceremonies and customs can facilitate a sense of belonging to a nation, because they are visible, distinct and can illustrate a more abstract ideology and evoke an emotional response (ibid.).¹³ These tools are crucial particularly for new nations that are just asserting themselves and are engaging in nation-building. The latter being state-building joined with mobilization and national integration (Smith, 1991, p.112).¹⁴

¹² Factors like territory, religion or ethnicity are stronger, more inclusive identifiers than a class-based collective identity and can mobilize parts of a society on a larger scale (Smith, 1991, pp.5-6).

¹³ Art can also disperse and present a nation and its ideals through “painting, sculpture, architecture, music, opera, ballet and film, as well in the arts and crafts”. They are tools in constructing an image of the nation (Smith, 1991, p.92). They were employed to promote socialist realism as an art genre and designed monuments that would visually support the communist claim to power and evoke an emotional bond (ibid.).

¹⁴ New nations or regimes need to set themselves apart from their neighbours through the creation of a political identity and a national culture (Smith, 1991, p.112). Czechoslovakia was not a new nation in that

The functions of national identity are economic¹⁵, political¹⁶ and territorial¹⁷. Additionally, national identities are a tool for the socialisation of new members into its community as citizens and nationals. This is accomplished, for instance, by standardized, obligatory, public mass education, giving the state authority the ability to imprint “national devotion and a distinctive, homogeneous culture” (Smith, 1991, p.16). Hence, the nation offers a social lineage between classes and individuals through common norms, values, traditions and symbols. These commemorate the shared heritage and cultural affinity and as a result, foster a feeling of common identity and belonging among the people. This can also help nations to overcome hardship and challenges (Smith, 1991, p.17).

Some components of the interwar Czechoslovak identity, as mentioned above, have been utilized, enhanced and adapted according to the needs of the KSČ (Holy, 1996, pp.134f). The aim was the creation of a class-based socialist society supportive of the regime; a society that identified with the historical struggle of the nation against German occupation, the socialist fight against Western capitalism and embraced socialist values (ibid.).

Gellner (1987) argues that Soviet policy on achieving a common Soviet identity was to make ethnicity cultural, so that it did not mirror structural differences (p.26). This was necessary because numerous diverse ethnicities and religious communities resided within the SU’s sphere of influence.¹⁸ In the case of Czechoslovakia the differences between Czechs and Slovaks was downplayed in order to preserve societal and political stability and preserve the countries territorial integrity. The Slovak strive for more autonomy did not disappear (Nedelsky, 2009, pp.118-123), although they

sense, but as a state it had only existed for 30 years when the communists took power. The communist tried to reshape the collective identity of the Czechoslovak nation in order to secure their power (Randák, 2008).

¹⁵ Nations are a guarantee for the control over a territory’s resources and manpower. They devise division of labour, support the exchange of goods and labour and distribute resources among the nationals in the homeland. National identity offers the reasoning for autonomy by specifying boundaries, membership and resources (Smith, 1991, p.16).

¹⁶ National identity underlines the state and its institutions. National interests are the base for the regulation of political behaviour, selection of political staff, elections, as it mirrors “the national will and national identity of the inclusive population”. The primary political task of national identity is to legitimize shared legal obligations and rights of legal institutions. The latter shape the specific character and values of the nation and mirror the nation’s traditions and customs (Smith, 1991, p.16).

¹⁷ A historic territory of a nation establishes a community in space and time. A nation’s social space defines where the members of the nation live and work (Smith, 1991, p.16).

¹⁸ Hence, the Soviet society needed to feel solidarity, commonality and to ensure that “ethnic-cultural boundaries within it should cease in any way to be structural markers” (Gellner, 1987, p.26). Otherwise ethnically or religiously motivated struggles might pose a threat to the party’s monopoly on power and cause societal or political instability (ibid.).

enjoyed the same rights as Czechs, but the communist regime tried for a considerable time not to give this issue a too large platform. The regime continuously promoted an image of national unity, a united aspiration to build communism and how much better Slovaks were treated under communism (Wingfield, 2000, pp.251-252, 254), which will be also shown in the case studies.

An additional mean to facilitate the unity of the Czechoslovak nation and to justify the communist claim to power, was to create an enemy Czechoslovaks could identify against. Harle's (1994) describes quite fittingly the role of the 'other' and the 'enemy'¹⁹ in regards to identity (p.28). As identifying against someone or something can unite and mobilize a nation and strengthen its leadership, which is seemingly protecting the population from a perceived threat. Such a threat can be a 'significant other', a concept developed by Said (1995). It describes someone or something a nation identifies against and shapes its identity in opposition to this significant other. Harle (1994) argues that an 'enemy' develops, if the 'us' and 'them' groups are considered to differ radically (p.28). When this difference is also further polarized through a perceived struggle of good and evil, than 'them' is quickly regarded as evil, not human and it becomes legitimate to apply strong force against this enemy. The enemy is considered to be excluded from the society and is connected to filth, pests, diseases, disorder, chaos and injustice. This is contrasted with the positive view of the 'us' that is identified with rule of law, justice and morality (ibid., p.29). Such a negative perception and rhetoric has been also observed in the case studies in regards to the West.

An example of using the image of a national enemy and threat would be the anti-German and anti-fascist rhetoric that persisted after May 1945. The purpose of this rhetoric was initially to unite the Czechoslovaks against the German minority and to also justify their expulsion. Afterwards Czechoslovakia's ethnical diversity was lower and an external enemy was found to identify against (Wingfield, 2000, pp.251-252, 254). The West was regarded as standing in opposition to the SU and was depicted as being treacherous, because of the Munich Agreement, imperialist, capitalist and as a threat to Czechoslovakia's territorial integrity, independence and security. Internal threats were people, who supposedly wanted to abolish communism from within or slow down its progress. This so called "reakce" legitimized the regimes persecution of

¹⁹ Harle (1994) defines "enemy images", as the "commonly-held, stereotyped, dehumanized images of the out-group". This concept is a way of defining "them" and can be used for "propaganda and mass

ostensible class enemies within Czechoslovakia (Bednařík et al., 2011, p.248)²⁰. Therefore, the persistent existence of enemies only warded off by the communists, was another justification for the communist regime's existence (Randák, 2008, p.235). In contrast to the enemies, the SU and the KSČ were presented as peaceful, hardworking, concerned for their citizens and fighting a honourable fight against these enemies, as the case studies below show.

Furthermore, in order to create sustainable support for the communist party and to unite the people not only through external and internal threats the concept of the 'New Soviet Man' was devised. The 'New Soviet Man' was seen as crucial for the project of building communism. During the totalitarian period the Soviet man was regarded as "the cog in a wheel", which was a metaphor depicting a "passive individual subsumed under the collective and implied the machinelike operation of the party and state apparatus controlling social life" (Gerovitch, 2007, p.137). There are different views on how the new Soviet man evolved and people were probably not only passive receivers of official ideology. People also made communist norms and values their own by trying actively to adapt and endeavoured to reach the "alluring ideal of the new Soviet man" (Gerovitsch, 2007, p.137). Another reason for such efforts to change ones identity was the wish to better oneself. The Soviet preference for the working class was used by some to forge a proletarian identity and origin for themselves in order to improve their economic and social standing (ibid.). The image of a new Soviet man was propagated, but also ambiguous, because people were supposed to be "good member[s] of the collective" and also have own initiative, for instance (Gerovitch, 2007, p.140). An example of this are the personal accounts examined below, which depict happy model socialist citizens benefiting from the communist regime and the articles, which mentioned a new socialist society being build.

The following chapter describes the methodology used in the analysis of the newspaper articles and presidential speeches, which were part of the KSČ's attempt to spread a certain interpretation of the past and to change with it the collective identity of the Czechoslovaks.

mobilisation in wars and other violent campaigns", for example. The "Other" can be defined as what is "fundamentally different from 'us'" (p.28).

2. Methodology – Discourse Analysis

2.1. *Discourse Analysis*

This section gives an overview of what discourse analysis and discourse is and how it is applied to the case studies chosen for this thesis. Discourse analysis was chosen, because it can show how certain topics were presented orally and in writing and what connotations and meanings were attached. Furthermore, the thesis pursues a qualitative approach, because it is the more suitable method for answering the research question. Through qualitative analysis it can be better judged, how certain historical events and the connected monuments were presented and phrased in *Rudé Právo* and presidential speeches; and what image the chosen wording helped to create of the examined monuments and the historical events they represented.

The thesis also refrains from pursuing quantitative analysis, because two rather recent publications touch upon related topics with quantitative studies. The first one being a dictionary of phrases and words used by Czechoslovak communists titled “*Slovník komunistické totality*” (Cvrček et al., 2010) using *Rudé Právo* amongst others as a case study. The second one is a collection of studies on the historical semantic analysis of language by David, Čech, et al. published in 2013. The book includes a comprehensive quantitative study of presidential New Year’s speeches delivered during the communist era and afterwards.

Discourse analysis itself examines language beyond the sole transfer of information. It is not an attempt to grasp the literal meanings, but to understand what language can accomplish and what cultures and individuals achieve through the use of language. Discourse analysis researches how meaning is constructed. For this purpose it investigates discourse in a methodological and research-practical manner by looking at the use of language, according to Landwehr (2008, p.14). However, Eder (2006) points out that there is no clear definition of discourse analysis and that researchers also do not have a shared opinion on what discourse encompasses (p.9).

In regard to discourse Eder distinguishes two types among the different views on discourse: one that sees discourse as a corpus of written and oral texts, and the other, that defines it as a system of rules, which produces possible statements and prevents

²⁰ This led to the show trials of the 1950s where the KSC and society were purged from ostensible class

impossible ones. Additionally, there is no common opinion on what is included in the discourse, like recipients, institutions, education and so on (Eder 2006, p.11). In general discourse can be concrete communication processes, larger text corpora, visual or acoustic media, written and oral statements (ibid., p.16). It can also encompass dialog, speech, tracts about an object either orally or in writing, communication society, textual unities exceeding a sentence, discussions or debates, complex system to generate knowledge and reality according to Landwehr (2008, p.15).²¹

The concern of discourse analysis is to examine why a difference can be observed throughout time and in all societies between what is grammatically correct to say, what is practically possible to do or what is theoretically feasible to think and what people actually say, do and think. Not everything that can be said, is said, and not everything that is possible, is done, and not everything that is thinkable, is thought (Landwehr, 2008, p.20). Discourse analysis is a tool employed to grasp certain phenomena, which previously could not be put into words through the available conceptual possibilities (ibid.). Michel Foucault is one of the key thinkers on discourse analysis and he calls this the scarcity of statement options. He also points out that discourse also shapes reality and how people perceive it and discourse organizes reality. In regard to this language takes a special position. Language not only influences the configuration of social reality, but is also an act, which creates (ibid., pp.22-23). Speech acts can change actual statuses, but single words also already convey concepts such as place, time, identity or quantity, for instance (ibid., p.24).

In regard to discourse Foucault sets out four rules describing a discourse's features. The aim of these rules is to set the discourse apart from other discourses and to give the subject-matter of the discourse an objective status. This increases the ability to describe and name the subject-matter (Landwehr, 2008, pp.68-69). The first elements of the discourse are the social and institutional correlations, which define the scope of a discourse and organize its parts. The second element is the subject of the discourse uttering the statement and what relation it has to the subject-matter, in what kind of environment is the statement made and what possibilities does the subject have to join the discourse. The third element analysis how the statement is organized – are the words

enemies and counterrevolutionaries (Nedelsky, 2009, p.135).

²¹ Furthermore, discourses structures linguistic practices, through rules which are re-constructible. They are not permanent shells surrounding the actual objects, but discourses produce and shape the perception of this object continuously. Thus, they are potent and able to create and influence reality, according to Landwehr (2008, p.78).

set out according to a certain principle; such as generalization, specification, chronological order, narration and so on. The fourth element describes the strategies that can be found in discourses to improve their coherence and how discourses stand towards each other, for example (ibid.). These features are considered with the help of the analytical tools described below. Foucault also underlines that the place of discourses that is to be examined, should not be searched in the mentality or consciousness of the individuals. The fact that a statement was made and that things have been said, is enough as a base and reason for an analysis. According to Landwehr (2008), Foucault is interested in the fact that a particular statement exists, and why particularly this one and why no another statement appeared at a certain time and place (p.70).

Another important connection is made between discourse and power. Discourse and power are linked and reciprocal, because one can say the truth, but one can only be truthful, when adhering to the rules of the dominant discourse. Thus, the creation of a discourse is subjected to control by rules, which are permanently updated. Outside this rules one has few chances to be heard. As a result, discourses define truth and thus, wield social power. The control over discourse can be external procedures of exclusion, internal control mechanisms or the limitation of the speaking subjects. Furthermore, discourses have an organizational function as they structure accumulated knowledge and allocate meaning to it also in the social sphere. They also separate the true from the false, which generates criteria for differentiation, which enable the drawing of a line between the normal and the deviation (Landwehr, 2008, pp.72-74). This power relation exists within the discourses examined in the case studies, because the KSC had great influence on what and how things were conveyed and censored unwanted publications. Communist phrases and slogans also entered everyday language.²²

²² Regarding the relation between discourses and power (Landwehr, 2008, p.81) Pierre Bourdieu argues, that the core of social or political conflicts is the mode of perception and the enforcement of the legitimate definition of reality. The power to categorize, meaning here the power to do something publicly and explicitly by putting it into words, is seen by Bourdieu as an extraordinary social power (Landwehr, 2008, pp.81-82). The state itself gains power by not only having a monopoly on military power, but also by shaping the mental structures and views of its people, which enables the state to wield symbolical power. Linked to that is the ability to draw lines between things, to differentiate and to classify; because something can only emerge and be regarded as existing, if it is differentiated from something else and is constructed as existent (ibid., p.83). Hence, words, sayings, charts and ritually repeated forms of expression also have a symbolical power, because they create things through words. This symbolical power, acknowledged by society, can establish a certain idea of the social world and structure this world, as it has been attempted by the KSC. Political actors try to enforce linguistically based visions of the social world through this symbolic power in order to influence other actors and their perception of the social world (ibid., pp.83-84). The KSC spread a black-and-white vision of (non)communist countries.

Furthermore, the context of the discourse should not be undervalued during the analysis, because otherwise it might lead to the neglect of the role of power in discourse (Landwehr, 2008, p.106). Hence, background information about the monuments is provided before the analysis of the case studies and information is collected under what circumstances the presidential speeches were delivered. The societal, political and historical power relations cannot be ignored, because they contributed to the emergence of the reality presented in the examined discourse (ibid.). Moreover, the embedment of the discourse into its context allows to draw conclusions regarding the content of statements, tendencies and historical shifts in the discourse (ibid., p.110).

The context analysis of the examined discourses has four levels: a) situational level, describing the people and their actions, rituals, ceremonial clothing at a location involved in the discourse, b) media level, describing the type of medium in which the discourse is presented and how that influences the discourse, c) institutional level, highlighting the circumstances under which a discourse came into being (part of a social, political, etc. institution, political party, company etc.), d) historical context, looking at the whole political, societal, economic and cultural situation in which the discourse emerged (Landwehr, 2008, pp.107-108).

A discourse analysis can be set out much broader in order to include more sources and thus, give a more complete picture of the discourse occurring at a certain time period (Landwehr, 2008, pp.101ff). However, due to the limited scope of this thesis the focus is put on two main sources: *Rudé Právo* and presidential speeches in the time period 1948-1957. The following tools are used to examine discourses and are grouped together into Macroanalysis and Microanalysis.

Macro-analytical tools are the following: a) theme of the text, b) texture, organization and structure of the text, visual appearance of the text, c) sections, division of the text into chapters and paragraphs and their function (introduction, main part, conclusion, transition from one passage to the next), d) author - how is the author present, use of first-person-singular or first-person-plural e) speech and writing - writing down of speech, reading text out loud, f) principles of representation - actualization, humanization, sensualisation²³, e) attitude - adopted towards the content of the text²⁴ g) exclusion (Landwehr, 2008, p.113-114). These macro-analytical tools can show which

²³ Actualisation transports the account into a different time and uses comparisons, humanization tries to trigger empathy or identification with the account, sensualisation, compares and concretizes the account by using metaphors (Landwehr, 2008, pp.113-114).

words, arguments, differentiations etc. are repeated or hold the discourse together. They give an idea about which statements shape the discourse (ibid., pp.114-115) and the most meaningful and suitable have to be chosen for each study.

Microanalysis focuses on argumentation, rhetoric, stylistic devices and the function they are fulfilling in the text (Landwehr, 2008, p.117). Rhetoric focuses on the set up the text – introduction, narration, argumentation and conclusion. Regarding the argumentation and persuasiveness there are two types of argumentation: a) logical argumentation and b) affective stimulation of emotions. The aim of these two types are either the rational discussion of an issue resolving it through persuasion or the opponent is to be ridiculed and defeated, because of social or political motives. This happens through belittlement, exaggeration, denial, defamation, black and white thinking (ibid., pp.117-119).²⁵

In sum, not all tools described above for the sake of completeness are used in the analysis, because some tools are not deemed suitable to generate meaningful information, which would help to answer the research question of this thesis, like for example how each newspaper article is structured and how many paragraphs it has. The following sections show how discourse analysis is applied to the chosen discourses - *Rudé Právo* and presidential speeches.

2.1. Applying Discourse Analysis to *Rudé Právo*

The historic, media, situational and institutional context to *Rudé Právo*:
Historical level: This newspaper was the main mouthpiece of the Czechoslovak communist party and the main national newspaper until 1989. It was first published in

²⁴ committed solicitousness, objective narration, disapproving dismissal

²⁵ For the sake of entirety tools going into more detail are shortly mentioned: At the sentence level there are several elements that can be looked at in a microanalysis: a) length of the sentences, short sentences provide quicker information and are more rememberable, long sentence signal complex issues, b) compound sentence, the arrangement of main and subordinate clause depicts logical, temporal, causal or modal relations, c) sentence type, declarative sentence, exclamatory sentence, rhetorical question, interrogative sentence, etc. show the relation between the author and the described situation (Landwehr, 2008, p.120). Additionally, rhetorical figures can be used to depict a certain view as well: a) repetition of certain words or sentence elements, b) shortening certain passages to highlight them in text, c) positioning words and sentence parts in an unusual manner, d) types of argumentation, which directly support the text's intention (ibid.). The most appropriate and convenient micro-analytical tools have to be chosen according to each research. Another tool can be the statistic of words and how often they appear in the text and what kinds of words are used more often (verbs, adjectives, nouns, etc.). Moreover, the use of

the interwar period on 21. September 1920. This day was later on even celebrated in the other media outlets controlled by the communists such as radio and television (ČT24, 2014). During WW II *Rudé Právo* was forbidden, but rose after May 1945 soon to its pre-war numbers again with 500 000 issues being printed already by 1947 (Bednařík et al., 2011, p.233). Its purpose was to present the official standpoints of the party and state leadership regarding current issues or to officially inform the general public about the policies of the KSČ and the communist government (Válková, 2010).

Other communist newspapers existed as well such as *Nova svoboda*, the main daily newspaper in Ostrava, and *Głos Ludu*, the main Polish language daily newspaper (Končelík et al., 2010, p.145). Additionally, weekly communist magazines were published in the 1950s as well: *Květy*, *Propagandista*, *Nova mysl* and *Funcionář*, for example. Political parties of the National Front also produced their own party print media: The Czechoslovak People's Party published the daily *Lidová demokracie* and the magazine *Důvěrník*; the Czechoslovak Socialist Party published *Svobodné slovo* and two-weekly *Socialistický směr* (ibid., pp.145-147); the People's Democracy published *Svobodné slovo* and *Lidová demokracie* (ČT24, 2014).²⁶ However, even these print media stayed below the high number of *Rudé Právo* issues (Bednařík et al., 2011, p.233). Hence, there was a theoretically a broad choice of print media. However, only media loyal to, approved by the KSČ or published by other left-wing parties or communist organizations were widely accessible (Končelík et al., 2010, pp.145-147).

After February 1948 only political parties, state institutions and societal organizations were permitted to print periodicals and about 570 periodicals disappeared. Fostering the cause of the party and communism was now one of the key missions of the media (Končelík et al., 2010, pp.137-138, 145). Končelík et al. described the print media landscape of the 1950s as dull, uniform, unoriginal and the news coverage as uninteresting. There were almost no ads, interviews or reportages printed. Instead speeches by high ranking communists in full length (ibid., p.149). Quality did not matter to these print media as their expenses were covered by the state budget (ibid., p.169).

loanwords, neologism, dialect, technical language, anachronism and so can also be analysed (Landwehr, 2008, pp.122-124).

²⁶ *Mladá fronta* was also a popular daily newspaper of the *Ústředního výboru Socialistického svazu mládeže*. Regional periodicals, children's magazines and cinema magazines also existed, but were often scarce (ČT24, 2014).

Media level: The press was an important propaganda tool for the communists, involved in shaping and changing society. Censure, media coverage and employment in media were decided centrally (Válková, 2010). Moreover, the influence of *Rudé Právo* was theoretically quite significant as by 1989 over a million issues were printed with up to five issues a day. It was not only bought by the general public, but partially larger factories had to buy it directly (ČT24, 2014).

Furthermore, *Rudé Právo* reflected the specific language, argumentation and phrases employed by the KSČ. A recent study showed just how specific the language used in *Rudé Právo* was and how heavily communist propaganda was present. While current Czech newspapers use the “člověk” (human/person) most often, communist spoke most often about the political party “strana” (Válková, 2010)²⁷. Many of investigated these words have a different meaning or connotation in modern Czech. Examples would be words such as “uderník” – a worker, who overly exceeds his set production targets and because of is regarded as a role model to others (Cvrček, et al., 2010, p.155), and “reakce” – opposition to socialist progress and the attempt to restore the pre-revolutionary status (ibid., p.127). This specific use of language was not only employed by politicians and journalist of the communist era, but also shaped the linguistic habits of the general public. Understanding and interpreting this jargon could potentially advance people’s positions (Válková, 2010). Due to this specific jargon the examined monuments and historic events were also presented and phrased in a certain way in examined *Rudé Právo* articles.

Situational level: In 1948 the KSČ took full control of the press and shaped the media landscape according to the SU’s example. For the party it was vital that information reaching the public was approved and censored beforehand by the party. Employment as a journalist was only possible through membership in the *Svaz českých redaktorů*, that was in place since 1945 (Končelík et al., 2010, p.169). Another means of control was closing down certain periodicals or changing the composition of the editorial staff. The only exception to censure was *Rudé Právo*, whose editorial staff consisted already of loyal communists (ibid., p.140) and whose chief editor took part in the meetings of the Central Committee of the KSČ (ibid, p.169). The chief editors of *Rudé Právo* were only long-run communist-party-members.

²⁷ The most frequently used words such as ‘work’, ‘Soviet’, ‘socialist’, ‘working’, ‘company’, ‘union’, ‘development’ and ‘comrade’ reflect the topical focus and linguistic specificity (Válková, 2010).

The role of the journalists also changed after 1948. Journalists were now asked to interpret events according to their political significance, the economy was always to be portrayed as flourishing and as an example of the common effort to build communism, national news were strictly monitored, and successes from sports or science had to be presented as achievements of the new society. Journalists who did not comply were prevented from following their profession by excluding them from the state-controlled association of journalists (Končelík et al., 2010, p.168).

Institutional level: One of the bodies censoring media was *Hlavní správa tiskového dohledu* – main administrative press supervision that was put into place in April 1953. It was an independent body with links to the Ministry of Interior and State Security and controlled everything from media, exhibitions, theatres, posters, postcards, stickers, obituaries and so on (Končelík et al., 2010, p.139). The press department of the KSČ did not yield its influence over this institution and ensured its party loyalty (Bednařík et al., 2011, p.259). Furthermore, any other potential print media were pushed out of the market through a new distribution law in 1953. This law centralized the distribution of print media directly to subscribers, to newspaper kiosks and specialized shops, according to the Soviet model. If a newspaper was taken out of the distribution network, it struggled even more than it did before with paper quotas or the loss of its registration. This policy had a clear political aim, as *Rudé Právo* got a preferential treatment (ibid., p.149).

2.2. Applying Discourse Analysis to Presidential Speeches

The institutional, situational, media and historic context to presidential speeches: Historical level: Since the foundation of Czechoslovakia great attention has been paid by the public to speeches given by presidents. The most outstanding president was T.G. Masaryk, whose opinion was highly valued and who provided moral and ethical guidance. There is a tradition of marking some special occasions or state holidays such as New Year's or First of May with a presidential speech (Čech, et al, 2013, p.42). Hence, presidential speeches are not limited to election campaigns, for example. This tradition was continued by the communist presidents. Thus, they generated considerable

media attention not only because of their political office and the media's loyalty to the KSČ, but because they also presented themselves as having great national significance.

Media level: The speeches examined were delivered by President Gottwald (1948-1953) and President Zapotocký (1953-1957). Hence, they generated a significant media attention and publicity. Additionally, due to the personal cult surrounding President Gottwald speeches delivered by him stood out even more. The rather extensive speeches were delivered in public and often broadcasted afterwards. The presidential speeches could have shaped the discourse not only because of the considerable media attention, but also because they were points of orientation, giving other speakers a sense of what can, should or cannot be said.

Situational level: The presidential speeches were mostly delivered in public spaces so that the general public could hear them. They were mostly embedded in or part of a larger event or ceremony, which set the theme of the speech's content to a certain extent. Depending on the event, the audience would either consist of large crowds, due to a parade, or of specially invited guests from society and politics, for instance. The location was usually a prominent location like Prague castle, Wenceslas Square, Hussite towns, near a monument, at war graves, Old Town Square in Prague, Lucerna hall in Prague and so on.

Institutional level: The speeches were delivered on national days or to mark a special occasion. They were often published in *Rudé Právo* in order to guarantee their nationwide dispersion (Čech, et al, 2013, p.42). The national days chosen for this study were not always accentuated by a presidential speech, because the president was sometime represented by a deputy or a minister gave a speech instead. This is true for most of the celebrations in honour of Jan Hus, for instance. The state holidays and time period are the same as for the newspaper articles discussed above. Additionally, the speeches reflected very strongly the party line of the KSČ and its standpoints.

3. Case Study: Bethlehem Chapel

3.1. *Background information on Hussite Movement and Bethlehem Chapel*

As examined above, monuments play a role in the formation and sustainment of collective memory. They can also represent changes in the interpretation of historic events and regimes use them to assert their power and presence. The image of the historic event or person a monument represents can shift over time or can be adapted through government policy. Such a policy was applied to the Hussite movement represented by the Bethlehem Chapel, when Marxist-Leninist historiography was made the predominant interpretation of the past. Additionally, central public spaces were used and created in order to express political and national identity. Hence, the chapel became a prime example of Marxist-Leninist historiography taking shape in the public space in the 1950s in Prague (Randák, 2008, p.227). The following chapter provides a short background to the Bethlehem Chapel and an overview of how and why the interpretation of the Hussite movement was changed. This helps to understand the examined discourse better.

The church itself was “founded in 1391 by burgher Jan Kříž and Hanuš of Mulheim”. The aim was to give Prague townspeople the possibility to hear the mass in Czech. It became the largest meeting place in Prague, into which 3000 people could fit. After a short time the church build up connections to the university and it was known to be more radical and „a place for public debate”. Many reform-minded people came to the church. While teaching at Prague University (Paces, 2009, p.192), Jan Hus was among the priests preaching at Bethlehem Chapel. He soon gained popularity after he began giving sermons in 1402 at the chapel and translating the Bible into Czech (Mahoney, 2011, pp.65ff). After Jan Hus death in 1415, the chapel’s Hussite traditions were preserved, until the counterreformation in the 1660s. Then the chapel was given to Jesuits. Due to the suppression of the Jesuits later on the chapel became property of the Austrian state in 1773. Only a few years later the First Technical University was founded and used the building, however, the chapel was in a desolate state. Gradually it was disassembled and multifamily homes were built in its place. As a result only a few traces of the chapel were recovered, when it was rebuild (Paces, 2009, pp.193,195).

The history of the Hussite movement was revived through a growing public interest in the first half of the 19th century (Soukupová, 2013, pp.10f,22ff). It culminated in the first commemoration in modernity of Jan Hus' death in 1868. Thanks to the work of the historian Palacký amongst others the Bethlehem chapel found its way again into the public consciousness of Czechs (Paces, 2009, p.193). The ceremony took place on Bethlehem Square, but the police tried to dissolve the festivity. The site was gradually becoming a *lieux de mémoire*, as people continued to come and install plaques commemorating Jan Hus. It turned into a fix point of the emerging national movement (Paces, 2009, p.194). Hence, a monument was to be built in the honour of Hus, as on the site of the Bethlehem Chapel were now residential buildings. After long debates and consideration the Hus monument was built on Old Town Square, which was considered a more prominent site than Bethlehem Square (Galandaer, 2008). With the monument the focus shifted to Old Town Square, as the main focus point of Prague's Czech and Hussite identity (Paces, 2009, p.194).

Still, the reconstruction of the Bethlehem Chapel was debated through the 1920s and 1930s. However, the idea was abandoned because the remains of the chapel were located below private buildings. For the communists this was not an issue, as they were nationalizing private property already (Paces, 2009, pp.192,194-196). Only after the communists took power the government decided (*ibid.*) on 30th July 1948 to reconstruct the chapel and to complete the previous efforts (Galandaer, 2008). Therefore, the KSČ's efforts were not new or original, but just picked up on previous endeavours (Randák, 2008, p.238 & Paces, 2009, pp.194ff). Randák (2008) presents the discourse of the time regarding the Bethlehem Chapel's meaning and value, as being of national importance and most precious (pp.238-239). The building was to become a cornerstone of the communists attempt to forge a new Czechoslovak collective identity and where the working class and society in general could connect with the historic efforts to establish a fairer and classless society.

In sum, the Bethlehem Chapel was originally a religious symbol, but it also represented a place of knowledge, debate, reform and free speech. Being the place where Jan Hus began his reform of the Catholic Church (Mahoney, 2011, pp.65ff). The KSČ rebuilt it despite its general aversion to religion (Paces, 2009, p.189), also because the Hussite religious symbols were regarded as mere notions of the former *Zeitgeist* (Krejčí, 1990, p.185). The KSČ reframed the building as the place where the first social movement started, the fight against injustice, exploitation and suppression by wealthy

authorities, whose legacy prevailed until the present and was carried by the communists (Randák, 1987, pp.233,237 & Soukupová, 2013, pp.31-34). It was to become a place representing the struggle for democratic values (Soukupová, 2013, pp.13f), which was also carried out in the Czechoslovak regions connected to Hussitism. Those were to be imagined and remembered as parts of a greater proto-communist effort. Each peasant uprising was portrayed as a socialist effort to overthrow the bourgeois ruling class (Randák, 2014, p.118).

The communist used the Hussite movement as a component of their version of Czechoslovak collective identity. By doing so they utilized its prominence, which had already grown during the First Republic (Randák, 2008, p.233 & Soukupová, 2013, pp.10f). The main figures of the Hussite movement Magister Jan Hus and Jan Žižka²⁸ z Trocnova were presented as a socialist revolutionary (Krejčí, 1990, p.185) and as Hus' avenger (Soukupová, 2013, p.13). Hus's conviction transpired from the plight of the people he observed during his sermons in Bethlehem Chapel, located in the poor part of Prague. Due to this, Hus mobilized the disenfranchised to fight against feudalism and fought for the rights of the working class (Randák, 1987, p.237). Allegedly, the aim was to create a new social order, to establish prosperity and a flourishing state, which made the Hussite movement the forerunner of the Czech revolutionary and progressive efforts leading up to February 1948, according to communist propaganda (Randák, 2008, p.233). Randák (2014) describes fittingly the Czechoslovak communist regime's depiction of the Hussite movement as a type of first communism that encompassed the entire nation.

By changing the meaning of the historic narrative about the Hussite movement the communist regime tried to depict itself as a logical and almost obligatory continuation of the Hussite struggle for freedom and self-determination. The Hussite movement was portrayed as a timeless event, which transcended into the present. The communist society was supposed to identify with it and see itself as a collective descending from the Hussites (Randák, 2008, p.234). Moreover, Paces (2009, p.190) argues that the communists tried to limit the cultural influence of the Catholic Church and increase their own. Furthermore, by continuing the discourse on the Hussites from the interwar period (Nedelsky, 2009, pp.54ff), the communists could link themselves to

²⁸ Jan Žižka (1360-1424) was a Hussite leader and Czech general, who joined a section of the Hussite movement – the Taborites. The latter were a puritanical community, based on basic democratic principles,

this national discourse and claim additional legitimacy for their government (Paces, 2009, p.190). Additionally, they could leave a mark through the Bethlehem Chapel on Prague and simultaneously contribute to the capital's renewal. This building could potentially become a new meeting point for the "new society [... the communists] were creating". However, the religious connotation of Hus and the chapel could not be removed entirely by the communists (ibid.) and the Chapel was not used long enough.

The KSČ attempted to cement their views regarding the Hussites in the public perception through instrumentalised celebrations. The latter were part of the invention of tradition that was aimed at steering the national identity into the intended direction. For communism to take root successfully, people needed to identify with the past as it was presented by the regime (Randák, 2008, p.234). The communist regime wanted to offer the people a tangible, existing, public and for all accessible point of identification. Such places were either rediscovered or created for this purpose like Bethlehem Chapel. The latter was meant to be somewhat transpersonal and symbolic (Randák, 2008, p.236). The KSČ wanted to present the seemingly old traditions of the communist movement in a tangible way (Randák, 1987, p.237).

For the chapel's reconstruction the historian and minister of education, science and arts (Paces, 2009, p.196) Zdeňek Nejdly was assigned to chair the committee for the reconstruction of Bethlehem Chapel (Randák, 2008, p.239). Magazines and newspapers such as "Lidová demokracie, Mladá fronta, Svět práce, Obrana lidu" (Randák, 2008, p.240) reported from the construction site and praised ideological significance of the building. In addition, a book was written by Aliose Kubíčka documenting the reconstruction, which was part of the Five-Year-Plan launched in 1948, despite it being a time of scarce building materials and a small work force. The communist regime itself presented the reconstruction of the chapel as a product of the so called 'victorious February' and as a symbol of the implicitness of communist rule, its power and its historical revolutionary tradition. Bethlehem chapel was one of the essential monuments documenting the past spiritual wealth of the Czechoslovaks. Additionally, it was to serve the broader society as a proof of its past greatness and glory, but also a sign of strength for the present and future efforts to establish a socialist society. Hus became the *pars pro toto* for this interpretation of history (Randák, 2008, p.244).

who defended its beliefs against the Catholic Church with the help of Žižka, Hungarian King Sigismund led a crusade against the Hussites in the 1420s (Martin, 2002).

In 1954 the chapel was opened to the public on the 5th July (Randák, 2008, p.240), the 539th anniversary of the death of Jan Hus (Paces, 2009, p.189). On Bethlehem Square a festive people's camp was held and the chapel was ceremonially handed over to the people (Randák, 2008, p.240). "Members of government, party, and public, along with representatives from the Soviet embassy", "representatives from the Protestant Czechoslovak Church and the Church of Czech Brethren" and Prague's mayor Adolf Svoboda came to the opening (Paces, 2009, p.205). Zdeněk Nejedlý was the key note speaker. He was the one, who shaped Czechoslovak historiography the most in the 1950s. Nejedlý pronounced the chapel the most precious monument of the Czechoslovak nation, representing the age-old struggle of the nation for freedom from oppression and the cradle of the national and people's movement. Additionally, he underlined the image of Hus' fight against the Church, the largest capital owner of his time, being a social revolution against the authorities (ibid., pp.242-242). Nejedlý also played on the still prevailing anti-German sentiment and tried to discredit the efforts of the First Republic to rebuild the chapel. He also argued that "the Communist Party was more Hussite than Masaryk's government" (ibid., p.209). The official ceremony ended with the Soviet and Czechoslovak anthem. Afterwards guests and participants visited the new chapel (Randák, 2008, pp.242-242), which attracted many visitors and offered regular tours (ibid., p.244).

The chapel was a monument to remember the communist interpretation of the past and to focus the Czechoslovak memory. Thus, the chapel was meant to preserve and actively pass on the values and interpretation of history it embodied also in future and foster a certain national identity. Society was to see itself as the descendants of the Hussites and thus, identify stronger with the regime presenting itself as the continuation and heir of the Hussite cause (Randák, 2008, p.245). Though, the research shows that chapel was charged only insufficiently with meaning through invention of tradition, because few celebration, ceremonies and rituals took place there.

3.2. *Depiction of Hussite Movement and Jan Hus in Rudé Právo on national day 6th July*

The following keywords were used as markers to designate articles that are included into the analyses: *Jan Hus, Betlémska kaple, husitký, lidový/ revoluční hnutí,*

6th červenec. These keywords were chosen, so that only articles are included into the examined discourse, which are relevant for this case study. Articles published around 6th July were included into the discourse, because Hus' death was sometime commemorated before or after this date.

In connection to *lieux de mémoire* and invention of tradition, information mentioned in the examined articles about rites and customs performed in connection to the commemoration of the national day 6th July is also collected. The Bethlehem Chapel only opened to the public in July 1954, which is why also rituals performed at other commemorative sites across Czechoslovakia are documented. As a result it can be observed what traditions were invented and fostered to further spread the communist interpretation of Czechoslovak history.

Articles or book excerpts, which were published in connection to the national day of Jan Hus' burning, are divided into two groups: a) informative – news articles answering the classic W-questions, b) historical – providing historical background or recapping past events. Each group's analysis is structured chronologically. The most suitable tools applied in the analysis look mainly at the author's background, tone, the article's content, choice of words, stylistic devices, excluded topics and what was mentioned instead, in order to investigate how the Hussite movement, Jan Hus and Bethlehem Chapel were presented over the years in *Rudé Právo*, and how a certain interpretation of the past was meant to shape a more communist Czechoslovak identity.

In July 1948, only two informative articles were published in connection to the national day of Jan Hus' burning in *Rudé Právo*. The matter-of-fact news article *Manifest k Husovým oslavám 1948* (1948, p.1) it announced the ceremony and noted that Jan Hus was celebrated, because he was a “předchůdce a průbojník ... nutící dál ... k odpovědnému pojmání našeho socialismu”. The first-person-plural is also used “dnes se nám jeví”. This stylistic device is employed in order to convey national unity, to engage the reader, to present the author of the text as someone speaking for the entire nation and thus, representing the common opinion of the nation. This stylistic device is used almost always in *Rudé Právo* articles.

The other news article *Národ vzpomněl památky M. J. Husa* (1948, p.1) documented the commemoration taking place on Old Town Square in Prague. Church, political party, societal and university representatives were present. Gottwald laid a wreath at Hus' monument, as did 23 Hussite towns and Prague's mayor Dr. Vacek. The

article also pointed out, that pious ceremonies took place across the country and that Gottwald attended a mass in Prague. The image that is conveyed is one of a united celebration across the country with high profile guests from society and politics (ibid.). Furthermore, in July 1948 *Rudé Právo* also announced the government's decision to rebuild Bethlehem Chapel. The announcement itself was objective, only one sentence long and further only stated, that this national good - the chapel, is now in state-ownership (Rudé Právo, 1948, p.1). It can be only speculated, why no bigger announcement was made; if it was out of fear that the tenants of the to-be-torn-down buildings would protest (Paces, 2009) or if the population would want the government to set a different priority with an economy only slowly getting back on track after the war.

On 7th July 1949 an informative article was illustrated by a large cover picture of the celebrations showing a crowd attending Hus' commemoration. The extensive text described the ceremony and atmosphere as 'powerful', 'loyal' and 'loving'. The second part of this article documented Prime Ministers Zápotocký's visit to Slovakia and did not mention Hus anymore. Again the reader is included through patriotic phrases in first-person-plural such as "všechn náš lid", "naše národní dějiny and "náš národ" (Československý lid manifestoval svou věrnost lidově demokratické republice, 1949, pp.1,3). The other informative article from 7th July is titled *Oslavy mistra Jana Husa* (1949, p.3) and gives an overview about the nationwide celebrations. Again representatives from society and politics are present and Deputy Prime Minister Fierlinger delivered the speech in Husinec in front of "thousands" of people from the region. Again the reader is included through phrases such as "us", "we, who follow the path to socialism today".

In Prague large celebrations were held on Old Town Square with Deputy Mayor Josef Krosnář giving the opening speech after Hussite songs were sung. In the speeches summarized in the article, the Hussite movement was depicted as the predecessor of the communists and Hus was portrayed as a strong critic of the churchly authority and institutional power. Hussitism was described as something ancient uniting the people of today, who loyally defend their state - "ještě rozhodněji se postavíme proti tomu, kdo by vystoupil proti státu, jeho lidu a cestě k socialismu" (ibid.). Moreover, the Hussites were mystified into some sort of national will or legacy driving the Czechoslovaks forward - "Husitství znamená pro nás vznešenou velikost a uchvatnou sílu, zdroj nezlomené sebedůvěry" and "mezinárodní význam husitcké revoluce" (ibid.). Additionally, a new

Soviet society that is being created and gradually coming closer to Hus' ideals, as the people of today fight like Hus against "omezování svobody svědomí a svobody projevu". Bethlehem Chapel was also mentioned, but only as the place where Hus spoke to the poor people of Prague (ibid.).

On 5th July 1950 a news article documented the celebrations in Hus' birthplace Husinec. The manifestation of the working class on this national day was presented as self-evident. Deputy Prime Minister General Svoboda delivered the opening speech, which was partially quoted and summarized (ČTK, 1950a, p.5). The second news article documented another commemoration of the Hussite movement in Sulice and shortly recapitulated partially the opening speech delivered by the Minister of National Security Ladislav Kopřiva (ČTK, 1950b, p.5). Both use the first-person-plural and underline the strength and importance of the Hussite legacy. On 6th July an article (RP, 1950a, p.1) reported on the commemorations taking place close to Tabor in a castle, where Hus used to reside. Tabor was presented as a town of communist pioneers of democracy (Soukupová, 2013, p.20). The participation of the people in these various ceremonies across the nation was interpreted, as the demonstration of the public's will to remember Hus and thus, to uphold world peace and to build socialism. Several guests from the Russian, Rumanian and Bulgarian Orthodox Church participated together with representatives of Czech Churches. The President of the National Assembly Dr. O. John's delivered the opening speech in July 1950, which was partially summarized and reproduced in *Rudé Právo*. Also the Russian metropolitan Dr. Nikolaj mentioned Hus' legacy shortly, as an inspiration for peace (RP, 1950a, p.1). Another short news article from 7th July 1950 documented the celebrations that took place in Prague on the 5th July on Old Town Square. People laid down flowers and Hussite songs were sung. More importantly it was shortly stated that the reconstruction of Bethlehem Chapel was officially commenced by the deputy of the Minister of Finance Dr. B. Spáčil in the presence of the Deputy Minister of Education, Mayor V. Vacek and representatives of Charles University and the Technical Universtiy (ČTK, 1950c, p.3). Hence, the presence of Church representatives, presentative from university and the public speeches by state officials gave these local ceremonies and the propagated communist interpretation of Hus more legitimacy and weight.

On 9th July 1951 a short news article reported on the celebrations that took place in Tabor and Husinec. Representatives of the Czechoslovak Church, Minister of the Building Industry Prof. Dr. Ing. E. Šlechta and the principle of Charles University

delivered speeches. In Tabor 15.000 people participated together with pioneer, youth, military and factory groups. On the hills around Husinec “vzplanuly symbolická hranice” and a parade was held to the house where Jan Hus had been born. A priest and the Minister of the Post Dr. A Neumann held speeches in front of Hus’ house. Unfortunately none of the speeches was reproduced in *Rudé Právo* (ČTK, 1951a, p.1). Again an image was created that showed a united nation commemorating a national communist hero together with political and religious representatives, both legitimizing the events through their presents. Only now also staff of the military and communist associations was included into the ceremonies.

The long informative article from July 7th 1952 documented the commemoration in Trocnov the birthplace of Jan Žižka, Husinec, Kozí Hrádek close to Tábor, and recapitulated partially the speeches given (ČTK, 1952a, p.1). The motto of the celebration in Trocnov is already very telling: “Čerpajice z bojových tradic Jana Žižka z Trocnova postavíme z jižních Čech trvz míru a socialismu”. The commemoration was used as an occasion to propagate socialism and communist ideas about world peace. Large crowds turned out and applauded the speakers. Representatives from the military and the National Front were also present. Military, sport and cultural performances were shown in Kozí Hrádek (ibid.).

In July 1953 the informative article documented the “large manifestations” across Czechoslovakia during the commemorations of Hus and summarized the political speeches. The military organized a parade for the large crowd (ČTK, 1953, p.2). In Trocnov cultural performances by youth and military groups were displaced, a parade was held and the border guard unit was given a battle banner to honour their bravery by a decree of the president. In Husinec in front of Jan Hus birthplace many locals from the region gathered in a “velk[á] mírov[á] manifestac[e]” and proclaimed to fulfil the Five-Year-Plan. The opening of a new power station and of the house of Zdeněk Nejedlý, a house of culture focusing on the Hussite traditions, were also part of the ceremony (ČTK, 1953, p.2).

The news article from 3rd July 1954 announced the nationwide commemoration of Hus and Hussites at locations linked to Hussitism (*Rudé Právo*, 1954, p.1). The motto was “Husitsky a gottwaldovsky pevně a jednotně v Národní frontě za mír a rozkvět naší vlasti”. Like in the previous years the main events took place in Husinec, Tabor and Trocnov. Parades and shows were held by military units and youth groups like the pioneers and a theatre play was performed (ibid.). On 5th July an article documented the

celebrations and how “thousands of people” participated in each location. The opening speech in Trocnov was delivered by the Minister of Justice Dr. Václav Škoda. Representatives from Slovakian regions also highlighted the unity of the Czechoslovak people (*Rudé Právo*, 1954, p.3). On 3rd July a very short notice was printed to announce the opening of Bethlehem Chapel with Nejedlý giving the opening speech (ČTK, 1954a, p.2). The article from 6th July 1954 featured a photograph of the new chapel and documented the celebration in Prague. Hussite songs were sung as during the previous commemorative events, high profile guests were present and Nejedlý delivered a speech. Afterwards the Soviet hymn was played and the crowd visited the chapel (*Betlemská kaple slavnostně předána našemu lidu*, 1954, p.1).

The news article from 7th July 1955 reported on the celebration held at Bethlehem Chapel. President Zápotocký participated in the commemoration of the 540th anniversary of Hus’ death. Other high-ranking politicians were present and of course Nejedlý. A large audience gathered and listened to the opening speech of the Minister of culture Prof. L. Štoll (ČTK, 1955a, p.1). A plaque thanking Nejedlý for his work on the chapel was also installed (*ibid.*). The last article from 7th July (*Rudé Právo*, 1955, p.1) documented the ceremony held in Tábor. The army performed a re-enactment of the Hussite army being attacked by crusaders and a practise performance of tanks and airplanes had been also organized. Additionally, works from the regional People’s Art Groups were exhibited and the theatre play “Jan Žižka” was performed in Tabor. These documents show how the Hus commemorations developed from a pious ceremony, with the president attending mass, to a display of military strength.

In July 1956 and 1957 no articles were published in connection to Jan Hus or the Hussite movement in *Rudé Právo*, as the emphasis was put on the *Spartakiada*, various foreign delegations visiting Czechoslovakia, coal supplies and the need of a timely harvest. It is possible to think that other media published more articles about the topic at hand. The same goes for the other case studies.

On 4th July a historical article written by historian Zdeněk Nejedlý (1948, p.1) was published. The text caught the reader’s eye through a highlighted title. The first paragraph shortly described Hus’ work and the second paragraph gave arguments, why Hus’ legacy still mattered for the present society. Nejedlý spoke directly to the reader, used first-person-plural and did not discuss Hus’ work objectively. Instead, he portrayed Hus not as a reformer of the Catholic Church, but as a vigorous spokesman of the

disenfranchised lower class. This claim was depicted as a historical and logical fact that could not be denied. Nejedlý's attitude towards the topic was enthusiastic, describing Hus as an inspiration to the current socialism building society. Hus fought for a socialist revolution and Nejedlý and the reader were doing the same - "co děláme dnes my, kteří bojujeme za vítězství socialismu" (Nejedlý, 1948, p.1). Hus' thinking was presented as topical, applicable to current questions, a basis for current socialism and as fighting old and allegedly inadequate social structures (ibid.). The second historical article was written on 4th July by the editor of *Rudé Právo* Vojtěch Dolejší (1948, p.1). The text had a highlighted title and was framed to increase its visibility. The general theme is the Hussite movement and how it transcended until the present. Dolejší used direct speech and first-person-plural to include the reader into his argumentation with patriotic phrases like "náš národ". His tone was enthusiastic and fierce at the same time – underlining the glory of the past, but committing the reader to overcome future challenges. Moreover, Dolejší used metaphors in order to illustrate the interconnectedness of the Hussite and socialist movement and depicted both as righteous, 'good', truthful and peaceful. Additionally, short repetitive sentences simplistically divided the world into 'good and evil': "Strana pokroku proti straně reakce. Strana světla proti straně tmy. Strana míru proti straně války. Strana spravedlnosti proti straně útlaku. Strana pravdy proti strane lži". Dolejší used this to illustrate how the Hussite principles formed the basis of Socialism and the national moral foundation. Simultaneously, Dolejší noted that the Czechoslovak legionnaires and the patriotic sports association *Sokol* also followed the ideals of the Hussites. Hence, the KSČ was juxtaposed with legionnaires and *Sokol* and the party was presented as an all-encompassing societal movement (1948, p.1). Thus, an image was created that the KSČ had broad public support also in other public associations and continued the bequeathed struggle for good, started by the Hussites, alongside the Soviet Union and other Slavic states.

On 3rd July 1949 five historical articles were published on the occasion of Hus' death 534th anniversary. The theme was Jan Hus' and the Hussite movements' meaning for the current society. The first article *Velké tradice našich dějin* (1949, p.1) included the reader already in the first sentence by using first-person-plural - "tyto dny připomínáme si [...] jednoho z největších synů českého národa mistra Jana Husa", phrases such as "náš národ" and rhetorical questions (ibid.). The representation of the content was solemn, engaging and serious. Military type phrases were used: "v staletých

bojích”, “zač bojuvali naši předkové a zač bojujeme dnes my”, “vyvrcholilo v bojích”, “s bojem za sociální pokrok” (ibid.). Also the falseness of Western traditions and historiography was noted and Czechoslovaks were urged to learn from the Hussite ideals in order to master future challenges. The Hussite movement was described with phrases such as “husitcká tradice byla mocnou ideovou zbraní”, “naší narodní minulost, tradice husitcké”, “velké sociálně-revoluční hnutí husitské”, “všechno velké, silné a slavné, co přišlo v době pohusitské [...] navazovalo na velké ideje husitckého revolučního hnutí”, “husitská tradice dodávala [...] sílu a odhodlanost” (ibid.). Furthermore, the Hussite movement was presented as a proto-socialist revolution inspiring a historically continuous struggle and materializing as peasant uprisings, struggle for independence in 1848 and the communist workers movement, for instance. Hence, the article claimed that the current socialist revolution and struggle were logical, justified and picking up a long national, historical and honourable tradition. The aim was to mobilize the reader and to adjust his understanding of the national past according to Marxist-Leninist historiography (Velké tradice našich dějin, 1949, p.1) through alleged scientific and academic proof.

The other four articles provided additional credibility, because they were excerpts from books written by known national thinkers and historians František Palacký's (Palacký, 1949, p.3) “Mistr Jan Hus” and Aloise Jirásek's (Jirasek, 1949, p.3) “Protí všem”. Additionally, quotes from Jan Hus own writing were published (Z listů Mistra Jana Husi, 1949, p.3) alongside an excerpt from Kurt Konrad's (Konrad, 1949, p.3) book “Svoboda a zbraně”. The articles illustrated the life of Hus and the Hussite movement vividly, so that the reader would identify more with it and thus, with the communist party, which was presented as the alleged heir of Hus' legacy.

On 6th July 1950 four historical book excerpts were published in commemoration of Jan Hus, but no presidential speech. The articles filled again the whole page and provided seemingly academic and historical proof to the communist interpretation of Hus. The excerpt from Hus' letter described Hus' cruel and unjust imprisonment in Konstanz (Z listu Jana Husa všem věrným Čechům, 1950, p.3). Another excerpt from Alois Jirásek's book “Protí všem” (Jirásek, 1950, p.3) described a heroic battle scene involving Žižka. Like Jirásek fellow historian Dr. Josef Macek provided credibility to the claims of the KSC about the Hussite past through his article (Macek, 1950, p.3). Macek's article accused the past bourgeois society of depicting Hus as only a Church reformer and not the social revolutionary he was as well. Macek

illustrated Hus as learned man, fighting for the disenfranchised and against the authorities. Bethlehem Chapel is presented as Hus' tribune from which he spoke to all layers of society. Moreover, Macek claimed that Hus was opposed to the Church, because it was exploiting the working class and Hus' understood their plight, coming himself from a poor family. Macek also stated that only under the current communist government can the revolutionary work of Hus unfold. Žižka was presented as a loyal fighter for Hus' ideas, and was used as a metaphor for the tireless, continuous, communist struggle to build socialism (ibid.). The third historian in this issue was Nejedlý (1950, p.3). In the excerpts from his book "Hus a naše doba" he portrayed Hus as a born leader, a great leader, smart, self-confident, helpful, generous, brave, heroic, not shy to say his opinion, as learning from the working class about their misery and as expressing what many have felt, but could not put into words. Nejedlý called Hus also a "první již novověký revolucionář" with international influence. Hus fought against the Church and was driven by an inner strength, according to Nejedlý, who told Hus's story with pathos and solemnity. Bethlehem Chapel was depicted as the greatest people's tribune and as the first place from which Hus preached to the poor (1951, p.1).

In July 1951 no presidential speech was published. The long historical article by the *Rudé Právo* editor František Nečásek (1951, pp.1,7) was filled with repetitive Marxist-Leninist historiographical imagery and examples of how the collective memory of the Hussite movement was altered in order to suit KSC's means in adapting the collective memory of the Czechoslovak and to shape a new more communist the Czechoslovak national identity in the long run.

The people were supposed to adopt the view that communism was in the Czechoslovak nature and that communism was, since the Hussite movement, a defining feature of Czechoslovak history, which now finally flourished and its legacy was now being fulfilled. Nečásek (1951, pp.1,7) described Hus as a great ancestor, commemorated nationwide and the Hussite traditions as being still topical, an inspiration and role model for the current society. He spoke of "naše časy", "naš prezident" and "naš lid" keeping the memory alive and protecting it against the "žoldáckým vojskům světové reakce" (ibid.), comparing here the West and anti-communists to the crusaders that fought the Hussites. Nečásek also quoted Gottwald and used rhetorical questions to engage the reader into the argumentation. Communism is presented as the era, when the ideals of Hus and the Taborite army are finally fulfilled. In contrast to that Nečásek called the attitude and celebration of Hus in the

interwar period hypocritical. The interwar governments were not the successors of Hus, but the successors of the oppressive authorities that had ruled the Czech lands since the Battle at White Mountain. A clear proof for this claim is the interwar government's capitulation after the Munich Agreement, according to Nečásek (1951, p.1). The tone was also harsher, when Nečásek spoke about the Church, the nobility and wealthy townspeople, who he presented as the cruel oppressors of the working class. The latter was allegedly driven, as a part of the Hussite movement, by the wish to abolish suppression and to improve living conditions. Bethlehem Chapel is presented as the place where Hus spoke to the simple workers, peasants and the poor (ibid.). Tábor is depicted as the first attempt to establish a democratic community, which was now being completed by the communist society. Further, Nečásek drew parallels between Hussite ideals and communist policies in order to underline the KSČ's claim of being the successor of Hus: The Hussites were depicted as unyielding towards the Catholic armies, and communists are equally unfaltering towards the American Marshall-Plan; the KSČ opened schools and universities to the working class, as Hus envisioned it.

Moreover, a strong element of anti-German and anti-Church rhetoric was used by Nečásek (1951, p.1). The Church was indirectly accused of being abused as a safe harbour for 'enemies of the state' and their weapons. He also argued that the enemies of the Hussite movement are almost the same enemies that the communist countries are facing today, as they descend from those enemies of Hussitism (1951, p.1). As current internal enemies Nečásek presented some victims of communist show trials - Horáková, Šlinga, Švermové and Clementis. The Hussite era was a direct metaphor for the struggle between the communist and Western, imperialistic and exploitative countries, according to Nečásek (1951, p.1). The Soviet Union was presented repeatedly as peaceful, but powerful and the only guarantee against a new 'crusade' against the Hussite countries and an ally against state enemies. Besides, the Battle of White Mountain and the Munich Agreement were juxtaposed to show the continuity of history and the continuous external threat endangering Czechoslovakia. This argumentation provided seemingly legitimacy to the communist, because KSČ allegedly tried to prevent the loss of independence from happening again. Thus, Nečásek called upon the people to stand loyally united "jak to žádal Hus" against state enemies in order to be as invincible as "vojska Žižkova" (1951, p.7).

The second historical article from 6th July 1951 was half a page long, included an etching of Hus and was written by communist professor of history František Graus.

He used quotes and spoke in first-person-plural to the reader. Graus also employed military type phrases and images - “k boji proti mocným” or “symbol jeho vlastního boje”. He depicted the Hussite movement as a broad national movement composed of the disenfranchised, suffering under feudalism and the exploitation by the Church. Hus was the spokesperson of this movement, a fighter, a symbol of law and justice and a leader, according to Graus (1951, p.3). Like Nečásek he attacked the interwar understanding of Hus as being a university scholar, who broke with the Church, due to disagreements about certain Church practises. Graus (1951) called this view false and underlined the ‘truth’ propagated in his article, namely that Hus was the leader of the first socialist revolution (p.3). Moreover, Graus argued that Hus was presented as a national anti-German fanatic and was used as a symbol for bourgeois egoistic nationalism. Bethlehem Chapel was mentioned as the place where Hus preached, which defined him as a thinker and leader, and from where Hus had to flee after an armed attack by his adversaries (1951, p.3). Furthermore, Graus argued that Hus spurred the people on not to fulfil the commands of the authorities when they were being oppressed, because it was their right and duty (1951, p.3). Moreover, Graus tried to explain Hus’ religious language as given due to the *Zeitgeist*. The Czechoslovaks stayed allegedly loyal to Hus’ ideals even after his death, rising in a socialist revolution against the authorities and protecting Hus’ true image against the bourgeoisie. Graus called Hussites “boží bojovníci” and Hussitism one of the mightiest movements of the feudal era, which only failed because of betrayal. It was not possible for the adversaries to “vyhladit odkaz Mistra Jana z českých dějin”. The “revolutionary Hussite tradition” stayed an integral part that was “věčně živ[í] v našem národě” (Graus, 1951, p.3) and became part of the traditions of the people with the workers movement referring to Hussitism all along.

On 6th July 1952 two historical articles were printed written by historians giving the communist vision of Jan Hus credibility, weight and legitimacy. These articles occupied two thirds of the page and included a drawing of Jan Hus. The first article was written by František Kavka, who studied the Hussite period and ran the History institute of the Charles University until he was discredited by the communist regime (Čornej, 2005). Kavka followed in his description of Jan Hus and the Hussite movement the Marxist-Leninist historiography evident in the already discussed articles. He also included the reader by writing in first-person-plural and appealed with phrases like “že máme v naší národní minulosti”, “naš lid”, “naši vlasti”, “našich dějin” to the reader’s

patriotic sentiment (1952, p.3). Kavka quoted also Hus and Engels to give his article a greater underpinning and make it more vivid. Like Nečásek and Graus, Kavka (1952, p.3) attacked the ‘false’ depiction of Hus by the bourgeoisie and accused it of erasing the memory of Hus out the people’s minds by separating Hus from the revolutionary movement. The ‘bourgeois’ image saw Hus as a martyr, a mythical saint, only a theologian, a historical figure of the Middle Ages inspired by the Englishman John Wyclif and with little significance for the present. “The people” were not fooled, according to Kavka (1952, p.3), but preserved an image of Hus, as a fighter, brave spokesman of the people in their struggle against exploitation and for freedom and independence. Hus was again illustrated as a man of the people, supported by the people, learning from them and being one of them; and going further in his thinking than Wyclif, according to Kavka (1952, p.3). The working class was presented as continuously loyal to Hus and the Church was portrayed as the main exploiter and oppressor of the people trying to limit Hus’ influence. This claim can be understood as criticism of the Church in line with the communist attempt to diminish the influence of the Church on society and to discredit it. Furthermore, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin were depicted as the ones realizing the age-old Hussite ideals of the working class. The KSČ was allegorized as the leader fulfilling the Hussite struggle (Kavka, 1952, p.3). Furthermore, the Hussite wars were described as a patriotic war against external enemies – the foreign crusaders, which were used again as symbol for the new enemies threatening the SU and the Slavic unity. The Hussite wars are also described as righteous, and thus, the communist’s efforts are also righteous and justified. Another parallel was drawn between the achievement of the Hussites and communists: both foster education among the populace; Czechoslovak army is based on the Hussite army’s tradition of being invincible (Kavka, 1952, p.3).

The second historical article published 6th July 1952 was an excerpt from the book “Husitcké revoluční hnutí” written by historian Josef Macek (1952, p.3). The reader was again directly approached through rhetorical questions, use of first-person-plural, patriotic phrases like “naše lidově demokratická republika” and naší vlasti” and military imagery like “k novým a ještě krásnějším vítězstvím” was employed to mobilize the reader. The themes of the previous years are repeated in the article. The adversaries of Hussite movement are demonized as “nejtemnější[...] síl[y] reakce” and the path of the working class towards a better life was illustrated as “cesta ke slunci”.

Additionally, Hussites were titled again “boží bojovníci” fighting to end the oppression and exploitation through the authorities (Macek, 1952, p.3).

In July 1953 only one informative article was published in connection to Hus, that has been discussed above. The historical article from 4th July 1954 recapped the history of Bethlehem Chapel and included an etching of the chapel (Urban, 1954, p.4). Urban engaged the reader with rhetorical questions and by describing the atmosphere of the chapel: Hus’ greatness could be felt as well as the pride that Hus’ last wish - to preserve Bethlehem Chapel, was fulfilled (ibid.). Urban also quoted the new plaque on the chapel, which carried Nejedlý’s words on the completion of the chapel. Additionally, the former demolition of the chapel by engineer Herget in 1786 under the Habsburgs is harshly criticised (ibid.). Alois Kubiček is described as the one person pushing for the reconstruction of the chapel after 1918, when he discovered the remains of the chapel within the buildings that stood in the chapel’s place. The writer Iason Urban also illustrated quite objectively the initiation of the reconstruction by Nejedlý. However, the people, who lost their homes due to it, are not mentioned (ibid.). The workers rebuild the chapel with “love” and “care” and some parts of the original chapel were found. With pathos and details Urban described how the chapel was returned into its original state (ibid.).

On 6th July 1955 one historical article by writer and historian Miloš Václav Kratochvíl, who wrote some popular historical novels about the Hussite period, was published. The article was illustrated with a drawing of Hussite warriors. The article depicted Hus again as the fighter and spokesman of the disenfranchised, who was unjustly killed in Konstanz. Kratochvíl included the reader through military style phrases in first-person-plural like “za to bojujeme i my”. The metaphor of prey and predator was used to illustrate the past exploitation of the working class by the authorities and particularly by the church (Kratochvíl, 1955, p.3). Historical details about life in the 13th century and the controversial letters of indulgence gave the text more credibility, as they were historical facts provided by an academic author. Additionally, Kratochvíl detailed Hus’ accusations against the church, used rhetorical question, called upon the reader with pathos to remember the Hussite traditions and ideals. He also quoted a Hussite song to make the narration more vivid and engaging. He also described and linked the unyielding heroism of the Hussite warriors, Žižka defeating superior armies and the Hussite’s longing for peace, to the communist regime. The author also emphasised that the Hussite ideals spread to other countries and were

preserved over time by the people. Especially the Czechoslovak people's army continued the heroic Hussite tradition, according to Kratochvíl, because the Hussite army was also a people's army (1955, p.3). With this Kratochvíl tried to underpin the universality, timelessness and current applicability of the Hussite legacy.

Moreover, the book excerpts and articles published in *Rudé Právo* insinuated authority and credibility on the subject of history, because they were often written by professors or known historians. However, these authors followed the Marxist-Leninist historiography and distorted history for the communist cause. The number and length of articles decreased visibly over the years, but the rhetoric and communist interpretation of Hus and the Hussite movement stayed basically the same.

3.3. Depiction of Hussite Movement and Jan Hus in Presidential speeches on national day 6th July

The same keywords as for the newspaper articles have been chosen for the presidential speeches i: *Jan Hus, Betlémska kaple, husitcký, lidový/ revoluční hnutí, 6th červenec*. The suitable micro- and macro-analytical tools are applied to the presidential speeches. The analysis is structured chronologically. Speeches delivered by ministers are included into the discourse of this case study, because so few presidential or prime ministerial speeches were delivered in connection to the anniversary of Jan Hus' death. However, it has to be considered that these ministerial speeches probably did not generate so much media and public attention as speeches by Gottwald or Zápotocký would have. Additionally, the context in which the speeches were delivered and the dimension of these ceremonies is also presented. It shows how the circumstances under which the speeches were delivered, the speakers themselves and the extent of the ceremonies changed in correlation with the altering importance of 6th July.

In July 1948 the opening speech at the 533th anniversary of Jan Hus' death was not delivered by President Gottwald, who just laid down a wreath and attended a mass held in honour of Jan Hus at St.Nickolaus. Instead Prague's mayor Mr. Vacek delivered the opening speech, followed by the Prime Minister's deputy Fierlinger who gave a speech in the name of the government (*Národ vzpomněl památky M. J. Husa, 1948*). The speeches were not printed completely and the only line from Fierlinger's speech

was the importance of “že již nikdy nepřipustíme rozkol v lidu a v národě” and that “Lipany s Bíla hora” must not be repeated.

In July 1949 Prime Minister Zápotocký delivered the speech during the festivities on honour of Hus’ 534th year of death. The speech was held in Devín on the occasion of the 5th Slavonic day. The general theme was the progress of the first Five-Year-Plan, Cyril and Methodius, Slavic cooperation and the threat coming from outside the SU. Cyril and Methodius were used as an argument for close cooperation between Slavic nations and for membership in the SU. Moreover, Zápotocký appealed to the Czechs and Slovaks to stand united (Projev předsedy vlády A. Zápotockého, 1949, p.1). Unfortunately, he did not mention Jan Hus or the Hussite movement directly, but focused on the peace efforts of the communist government and the SU by drawing a black and white picture of the current situation in Europe.

On 5th July 1950 Deputy Prime Minister General Svododa delivered the opening speech during the ceremony in Husinec. He spoke directly to the people including them through phrases in first-person-plural (ČTK, 1950a, p.5) and argued that the Catholic Church, anti-national and anti-communist reactionaries tried persistently to taint Hus’ memory. Moreover, he presented the Soviet Union as the reason, why Czechoslovaks are free to remember Hus as he ‘really’ was. The peacefulness of all Soviet people was underlined – „síla tohoto obrovského tábora míru [... je] v jeho naprosté jednotě [...] a spravedlivějšího socialistického zřízení“. Additionally, phrases relating to military were used like „boj za mír” and he warned against external and internal threats (ibid.).

Moreover, a second news article from July 1950 documented another commemoration of the Hussite movement and partially the opening speech of the Minister of National Security Ladislav Kopřiva. He also spoke to the audience directly and engaged it with patriotic phrases in first-person-plural like “nás lid”. Additionally, he called the Hussite period revolutionary and linked Hus’ thinking on truth to the communist regime by saying “naše pravda zvítězí”. He employed military rhetoric that was also apparent in the previously discussed speeches and depicted the West as the enemy: “fronta práce, fronta budování socialismu”, “Úspěšné žně budou vyhranou bitvou, novou ranou, kterou zasadíme našim nepřítelům”, “Anglo-američtí imperialisté a jejich agenti” (ČTK, 1950b, p.5).

Additionally, in Tabor the President of the National Assembly Dr. O. John’s delivered the opening speech on 6th July 1950, which was partially summarized and reproduced in *Rudé Právo*. He included the audience directly through formulations in

first-person-plural like “sovetský svaz je nám nejlepším přítelem” and “poneseme hrde husitský odkaz” (RP, 1950a, p.1). Hus was pictured here as a “velk[ý] bojovník[...]” and as a socialist revolutionary, who “kázal svou revoluční pravdu” (ibid.). Further, to link the Hussite legacy to communism also metaphorically a parallel was drawn between the “rudá barva husitské krve” and the communists’ symbolic colour. Besides, military metaphors were used in this article like “bojovat na pracovištích a bojovat na polích”, “za mír je nutno bojovat”, “vítězství socialismu” (RP, 1950a, p.1) in order to highlight the continuous struggle of the Hussite movement and the working class.

On 9th July 1951 only a short news article reported on the ceremonies. In Tabor Minister of the Building Industry Prof. Dr. Ing. E. Šlechta and the principle of Charles University delivered speeches. In Husinec a priest and the Minister of the Post Dr. A. Neumann gave speeches in front of Hus’ house. Unfortunately none of the speeches was reproduced in *Rudé Právo* (ČTK, 1951a, p.1).

On 7th July 1952 an article documented the regional ceremonies. The Minister of State Control Jan Harus spoke in Trocnov, in Husinec the Minister of the Workforce Dr. J. J. Havelka spoke and in Kozí Hrádek the Company General František Janda delivered a speech (ČTK, 1952a, p.1). Harus emphasized in his speech the revolutionary ideals of the Hussites and that the KSČ was now openly claiming allegiance to these noble views – “můžeme [se] plným právem hlásit k husitské tradici”. Further, Harus compared the efforts of the émigré bourgeoisie and President Truman to the crusades of the Catholic popes against the Hussites, thus, fuelling a distinct enemy image. Additionally, Harus used phrases in first-person-plural like “naše vlast” and “jsem pevní a jednotni ve svém boji” to suggest consensus and unity. Harus also emphasized the main task of the people today - the successful harvest of crops (ČTK, 1952a, p.1). In Husinec Havelko stated that the locals were rightfully proud, because here began the “nejslavnější[...] hnutí našich dějin – slavných vítězných bojů husitských bojovníků”. Like Harus, he emphasized that the struggle for peace and socialism was based on Hussite traditions. Both speeches were accompanied by applause from the huge crowd, according ČTK (1952a, p.1). In Kozí Hrádek Janda followed this line of argument and added that now also a new type of man was emerging “člověk socialistické společnosti”. He also used the metaphor “strengthening the socialist dam against capitalist exploitation - the dam of peace against war” (ibid.) to illustrate the external danger threatening Czechoslovakia.

In July 1953 only one informative article was published in connection to Hus and it unfortunately summarized the speeches only partially. Hus was referred to “jeden z největších synů našeho národa”. At Kozi Hrádek the Deputy Minister of Education Václav Hendrych delivered the opening speech (ČTK, 1953a, p.2). The only statement by Hendrych documented, was that the former exploitative authorities tried in vain to erase the memory of Hus in Czechoslovakia. In Trocnov the Deputy Minister of National Defence Major General Oskar Jeleň gave the opening speech instead of the Minister of National Defence Karol Bacílka. The only thing published of this speech was that Jeleň recalled the “most significant time in national history, the era of the Hussite revolution”. Deputy Prime Minister Olřich Beran delivered the opening speech in Husinec and the only quote reproduced was that “našemu lidu imponovalo husitství” in its fight against the oppressive authorities (ČTK, 1953a, p.2).

On 5th July 1954 an article documented the celebrations and partially the opening speech delivered by the Minister of Justice Dr. Václav Škoda in Trocnov. He emphasized the importance of national unity and the people’s loyalty to the party, Hussite traditions, the government and the fight for freedom. Škoda also argued that a socialist society being built (Rudé Právo, 1954, p.3). The article from 6th July 1954 documented the opening ceremony of Bethlehem Chapel with Zdeněk Nejedlý delivering a speech about the role of Bethlehem Chapel as a meeting point between the working class and Jan Hus. Nejedlý also boasted of the readiness of the communists to make the reconstruction of the chapel possible, so that the Hussite tradition could live on (Betlemská kaple slavnostně předána našemu lidu, 1954, p.1)

The news article from 7th July 1955 reported that President Zápotocký participated in the commemoration of the 540th anniversary of Hus’ death at Bethlehem Chapel. However, no speech was printed in connection to it. The opening speech was delivered by the Minister of culture Prof. L. Štoll in which he described Bethlehem Chapel as a place of memory for the entire nation (ČTK, 1955a, p.1). Hus was portrayed as a symbol that sparks democratic national pride and loyalty towards the common efforts of the people.

However, no other presidential, prime ministerial or ministerial speech was found in connection to 6th July and the commemoration of Hus after 1955. According to the examined *Rudé Právo* articles Gottwald was occasionally present at Jan Hus commemorations, but other party representatives delivered the speeches. When Zápotocký became president no other speeches were found in connection to the national

day 6th July. Additionally, other events collided with the commemoration of Hus, so maybe priorities laid else were. President Zápotocký destalinization efforts gradually taking shape after 1953, might have also contributed to a lower profile of the commemorations of Hus and a lesser emphasis on the alleged historic origin of the KSČ.

4. Case Study: Monument of National Liberation

4.1. Background information on the Monument of National Liberation

The following chapter gives an overview of how the Monument of National Liberation on Vítkov Hill came into being and how it was changed to serve the needs of the communist regime. It also shortly presents its connection to Czechoslovak legionnaires and their connection to Czechoslovak identity.

Like the Hussites (Nedelsky, 2009, pp.54-55), the legions were part of the official Czechoslovak national identity in the interwar period and they had considerable political pull and influenced on the organization and formation of the Czechoslovak army (Galandaauer et al., 2012, p.34). The Czechoslovak legionnaires were namely credited with successfully fighting for Czechoslovakia's independence from the Austro-Hungarian Empire. This made them a symbol of Czechoslovak independence. Additionally, the existence of a Czechoslovak army was one of reasons why Czechoslovakia was recognized as an independent state. The legionnaires were also visible through the numerous monuments set up in their honour in the interwar period in public places (Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, pp.164ff). However, after 1945 the number of legionnaires had sunk by about half and their average age was between 50-60 years (Galandaauer et al., 2012, p.34). This significantly reduced their influence and the WW I and II battles of the legions were commemorated on a grand scale for a last time in 1947, according to Galandaauer et al. (2012, pp.36-37). Afterwards, they were incorporated into communist associations and they lost further significance.

Vítkov Hill itself was a place already infused with historical meaning, as it was the site where Hussite general Jan Žižka triumphed in battle over the Catholic crusaders in 1420. Hence, the hill was discussed as a symbolically suitable place for a statue of

Žižka or a national monument in general already in the late 19th century, as a symbol for the nation's struggle for self-determination (Paces, 2009, p.171).²⁹ As shown in the case study above, the communists also saw themselves as the Hussite movement's sole heirs fulfilling its legacy. According to the communists, Žižka's monument was supposed to represent the seemingly age-old Czech revolutionary tradition, which was discussed in the case study above (Paces, 2009, p.189).

After long debates a design for the monument drafted by Jan Zázvorka was approved in 1925. The foundation stone was laid by Masaryk in 1928 on the country's 10th anniversary of independence (Malý, 2013, pp.209f). Prime Minister Beneš delivered the key note speech at Vítkov Hill that day. The celebrations included also numerous publications in honour of this day, parades with legionnaires, *Sokol*, and firefighter groups participating, commemorative celebrations were held, memorials were unveiled in other parts of the country and wreaths were laid at legionnaire's graves (Galandauer et al., 2012, p.9). Therefore, the site was infused with meaning through these rituals and the historical location – the starting points of the monument's potential development into a *lieux de mémoire* in the long-run, as a symbol of Czechoslovakia's independence and of the nation itself³⁰.

With only few finishing touches remaining it was originally planned to open the monument to the public on the 28th October in combination with the country's 20th anniversary in 1938 (Paces, 2009, p.171). However, after the Munich Agreement and the secession of the Sudetenland the opening ceremony was not held, as it did not seem appropriate anymore, because the monument was also recalling the country's military tradition and Czechoslovakia's independence (Galandauer et al., 2012, p.18)³¹.

²⁹ Czech patriots wanted to create a memorial to general Žižka already during the Habsburg Empire. However, the Austrian authorities never allowed it (Galandauer et al., 2012, pp.47ff). After 1918 mostly Czechoslovak legionnaires facilitated and pushed for the establishment of a memorial for the country's struggle for independence on Vítkov Hill (Malý, 2013, p.209). The legionnaires had previously chosen Žižka as a symbol, because they saw themselves as heirs to his and the Hussite's struggle for national self-determination (Paces, 2009, p. 189). According to Paces (2009) Žižka, was a convenient symbol for the communists, due to his fight against the emperor and the pope and the "communal lifestyle of Žižka's Taborites suited the communist economic and social message" (p.189).

³⁰ Beneš set out the intended commemorative focus of the future monument: the rise of the compatriots in 1914; the work of Milan Štefánik, T.G. Masaryk and himself to have independent Czechoslovakia international recognized; the deeds of the Czechoslovak legions. These memories were to be preserved for future generation also through a museum and archive attached to the actual monument. Moreover, he underlined that it was to become a national monument also honouring important countrymen like Hus, Žižka and Palacký, and embodying the Czech spirit (Galandauer et al., 2012, p.11).

³¹ The final works had to be interrupted, due to the Nazi-invasion in March 1939 (Paces, 2009, p.171). During WW II the monument suffered considerable damage, because the Wehrmacht had used it as a storage facility and later dismantled parts of it, due to Hitler's 'total war' decree (Galandauer et al., 2012, pp.27-28,32). Bohumil Kafka finished Žižka's statue despite the war in 1941 with the firm hope that the

The Monument of National Liberation also became the last resting place of an Unknown Soldier (Národní Muzeum, n.d.), a memorial to the Czechoslovak legionnaires and a symbol of national independence. Anderson (2006) regards memorials and monuments to unknown soldiers as compelling symbols of “the modern culture of nationalism”. These memorials evoke in people deference, as before such monuments were not erected. Additionally, the tombs were still infused with “national imaginings”, even if there were no mortal remains in them (p.9).³² The tomb was initially supposed to be also the burial place of the First Czechoslovak President³³ (Paces, 2009, p.171). It was built underneath the statue of Žižka (Galandauer et al., 2012, p.14) originally in honour of the Czechoslovak legionnaires fighting in World War One (Národní Muzeum, n.d.) and national independence after 1918 (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010). However, after 1945 a discussion arose about how WW II should be generally commemorated and incorporated into the monument. Thus, it could be argued, that the need and will to adapt the national monument’s meaning was already crystallizing, because the circumstances had changed so much since the construction began (Galandauer et al., 2012, p.40 & Wingfield, 2003, p.674). As a result, in 1949 an Unknown Soldier from the battlefield of Dukla Pass 1944 was buried on Vítkov Hill and not one from the Zborov Battlefield of 1917, as originally intended (Galandauer, 2012, p.52). This was done because of a general need to commemorate WW II soldiers as well (Národní Muzeum, n.d.), but it gradually overshadowed the memory of the legionnaires.

Especially, after May 1945, the communist party became very influential and could shape how this monument would be adjusted to suit the current commemorative needs. Most importantly the attitude of the now ruling KSČ towards the legions was volatile and selective. In the interwar period the legions were to be regarded as part of the imperialistic army according to the party line directed from Moscow, because some units had fought in Russia against Bolshevik troops in World War One. Later on the

occupation would end soon (ibid., p.31). By 1950 the monument was completed and Žižka’s statue was finally installed (Michl, 2009, pp.173f & Paces, 2009, p.189).

³² Initially an unknown soldier was taken from the Zborov battlefield and buried in the chapel of the old city hall at Prague’s Old Town Square in 1922. Mainly Czechs and Slovaks could connect to this symbol and the Old Town Square was often used for assemblies to reaffirm the Czech nation (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010, p.441), also because of the Jan Hus statue located there (Galandauer, 2008). This made the Unknown Soldier more of a Czech national symbol, than a Czechoslovak one (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010, p.441).

³³ This would have given it potentially even more significance and symbolic value. However, Masaryk refused the offer, but still took over the patronage over the construction project, which gave the project considerable prestige and public attention, making it known across the nation (Paces, 2009, p.171).

communist attitude changed and the legions were to be regarded as Slavic brothers fighting alongside the SU in WW II. Though, only the battles on the Eastern front – Dukla Pass, Kiev and Sokolov, for instance, were recalled. Other battles, where the Czechoslovak legions had been involved, were ignored by the KSČ and the role of Russia was magnified.

In 1947 earth from these Eastern battlefields was symbolically brought to the Monument of National Liberation by communist general and Minister of Defence Svoboda. During this occasion Svoboda highlighted that the legions had also fought side by side with the Soviet Red Army against the mutual German enemy and thus, incorporated them more into the propagated Marxist-Leninist historiography. It was a sign of the gradually reframing of the monument away from the sole commemoration of the legions towards a greater emphasis on the Red Army and the communist party (Galandauer et al., 2012, p.38).³⁴

The meaning of the monument was later on further changed, when it became the final resting place of four Czechoslovak communists - activists and founders of the KSČ in 1951 (Malý, 2013, pp.214-216). Hence, the initial purpose of the monument, as the final resting place of the elites of the First Republic and legionnaires, was hijacked by the communists (Galandauer et al., 2012, p.52). The probably most significant change was the designation of the Monument of National Liberation as the mausoleum for the first communist President Gottwald in 1953³⁵ (Galandauer et al., 2012, pp.53-55). Furthermore, in 1955 an additional chamber was built by Jan Zázvorka – the hall of the Red Army (ibid., p.55). With this expansion of the building itself the communists left a strong mark on it and absorbed it into their propaganda. As a result, the Monument of National Liberation turned into a place of pious communism and its initial meaning was buried underneath communist symbols, Gottwald and the glorious memory of the heroic Red Army. Because of this the national monument gradually lost its original significance for many people and fell into oblivion.

Only after 1989 were the remains of the deceased communists removed. However, the nation struggled for some years to give the monument new meaning and

³⁴ The KSČ wanted to present Czechoslovak independence as a direct result of the Russian October Revolution and generally foster the standing of the KSČ and the SU in Czechoslovakia (Holy, 1996, p.58). Hence, it stressed the importance of the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 for Czechoslovak independence in 1918 with slogans such as “Without the 7th November there would be no 28th October” (p.39). Additionally, the Soviet anthem was played more frequently during commemorative occasions (Galandauer et al., 2012, p.39).

³⁵ Gottwald’s corpse was mummified and preserved there too (Galandauer et al., 2012, pp.53-55).

to diminish the stain the communist era had left on it (Národní Muzeum, n.d.). In 2001 the monument was included into the government's decree on revitalizing and reconstructing some national monuments of the 20th century. Since then it became part of the Czech National Museum and was reopened in the 29th October 2009 to the public (Národní Muzeum, n.d.).

As already discussed above, national days have an impact on how prominent and influential monuments are and how they are perceived and presented³⁶. For the new Monument of National Liberation on Vítkov Hill the national day 28th October became the most important day. The day commemorated Czechoslovak independence, but also the deeds of the legions (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010, p.429). The 28th October was already one of the main interwar national days and the first state holiday being introduced as early as 1919. It was celebrated each year and its decennial commemoration was one of the largest festivities of the Czechoslovak interwar period. National and historic symbols and speeches delivered on this national day mirrored the popular view of Czech identity, rather than a more neutral and inclusive state identity (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010, p.446). Thus, the 28th October was seen during the interwar period by the minorities as a rather Czech holiday and they did not feel quite included in the celebrations. The holiday commemorated namely also the victory over the Habsburg Empire in which many Germans and Hungarians had served (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010, p.427). Over time the festivities expanded and Czechs were animated “to celebrate their independence by recalling the deeds of great men [(primarily Czechs)] in their history” (ibid.) such as Hus, Žižka, J.A. Komenský and Palacký, for instance (Mayer, 2009, p.33). Another part of these celebrations were parades, decorating buildings in the national colours, lectures about historic figures, World War

³⁶ Legionnaires were already commemorated on the 2nd July in the interwar period. This holiday was dedicated to the Czechoslovak army and the legionnaires, who had fought alongside the Russian soldiers against the Central Powers on the Eastern Front in the battle of Zborov, today's Ukraine, in 1917 (Wingfield, 2003, pp.655ff). However, the communists did not support or celebrate this national holiday, as they despised some legionnaires for partially fighting against the Bolsheviks while making their way across Siberia back to Czechoslovakia (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010, p.438). The communist saw this national day as a state-sponsored demonstration of patriotism and regarded legionnaires as part of the ‘imperialistic’ armies (Wingfield, 2000, p.249), which tried to create a counterrevolution against the Bolsheviks. Thus, there were no praising articles published in the communist daily newspaper *Rudé Právo*, when Zborov was commemorated (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010, p.438). Instead, demonstrations were staged by the communists to protest this holiday in the 1920s. The communists claimed that workers and peasants could not yet celebrate, because communism had not yet been achieved and the revolutionary struggle was not over yet (ibid., p.433).

One and other historic events significant for the Czechoslovak national collective memory (Hájková & Wingfield, 2010, p.429).

The large-scale 10th anniversary of the 28th October in 1928, as mentioned above, was celebrated in an era, when the economy was still growing and Europe was politically stable. The government organized the several weeks-long celebrations together with national organizations such as *Sokol*. There were military parades, meetings between President Masaryk and soldiers, school children and diplomats, theatre performances and a wreath was also laid at the Palacký memorial, for instance. President Masaryk was emphasising with this gesture the national identity of the Czechoslovaks, according to Hájková and Wingfield (2010, p.430). Masaryk was consciously highlighting certain elements of Czechoslovak history to anchor them in the minds of the people and shape the national identity of the young state. The festivities also included honouring the “the heroism of the Legionnaires who fought for the freedom of the nation” (ibid., p.432) by processions of school children to local World War One monuments and memorials in order to lay down wreaths. The celebrations were also an occasion to setup monuments dedicated to the legions across the Czech lands (ibid., p.439). The overarching aim was to consolidate the legions as a crucial feature of Czechoslovak collective memory and national identity and to also link Czechoslovak identity to Jan Hus (ibid., p.432).

After February 1948 these celebrations ceased relatively quickly, as the communist regime wanted the memory of the legions and of the ‘bourgeois’ First Republic to fade. The memories were to be replaced by a more Marxist-Leninist interpretation of history, which emphasized the October Revolution and liberation of Czechoslovakia by the Red Army more. Thus, the 28th October gradually changed from the ‘day of independence’ into the ‘day of nationalisation’. The latter recalled the nationalisation of banks, insurance companies and mines, which had begun 28.10.1945 (Holy, 1996, p.58). As a result, the 28th October gradually lost its significance and meaning as also the traditions of commemoration changed – from lavish celebrations to a minor holiday. It was replaced as the largest state holiday by the new state holiday on 9th May, which recalled Czechoslovakia’s liberation by the Red Army in 1945 (ibid.).

Moreover, another blow to the memory of the legionnaires was their re-interpretation by the communists and the change of their day of commemoration³⁷. As

³⁷ Additionally, the 6th October became the central holiday for the legions, being celebrated together with the Czechoslovak Army Day from 1950 onwards (Wingfield, 2000, p.245). The switch to the 6th October

mentioned above, only in 1947 was the legion's participation in the battle of Zborov re-framed as being part of the overall Slavic battle against German occupation and suppression, fighting alongside brotherly Russia. Hájková and Wingfield (2010) argue that the communists tried to harness the memory of the battle of Zborov later on for their own means, by claiming that the legionnaires at Zborov were mostly workers, who wanted a socialist classless society and fought for it already in World War One. Further, the KSČ stated that the 'bourgeois' government had not "fulfilled the »promise of Zborov«" namely a socialist revolution to improve the lot of the working class, who had fought in the war for a better free life (p.438). This was done in order to discredit the interwar governments with hindsight. The following section examines how *Rudé Právo* presented the communist attitude towards the Red Army, Czechoslovak legionnaires, nationalisation and 28th October.

4.2. Depiction of Czechoslovak legionnaires and Monument of National Liberation in *Rudé Právo* on national day 28th October

The following keywords were used to select articles that are suitable for the discourse of this case study: *Rudá Armáda, legionáři, samostatnost, Vítkov* or *Památník národního osvobození, znárodnění* and *28 říjen*. Then suitable micro- and macro-analytical tools are applied in order to determine how legionnaires, the Red Army, the Monument of National Liberation, 28th October and nationalisation were presented and how their image was shaped in the newspaper articles on the national day 28th October.

Monuments are infused with meaning through regularly repeated rituals and traditions that are connected to them and make them *lieux de mémoire*. Such commemorative site can have meaning for national identity, as they represent certain interpretations of the past, a past that is part of the nation's identity. Therefore, information mentioned in articles about rites and customs performed in connection to the commemoration of 28th October published around that date was also collected. As a result it can be observed what traditions were invented and fostered in order to spread a

is also apparent in the analysis below, because after 1950 more and more articles were published about

certain interpretation of the past. Though, the focus lies on articles published 28th October.

Initially many articles were published relating to the 28th October national day – in October 1948 more than 50 articles, in October 1949 alone more than 80 articles, for instance. The numbers decreased gradually in the 1950s. Due to the high amount, the articles were grouped according to type in order to simplify the analysis and make general patterns more visible: a) informative news articles, b) historical articles giving background information, c) personal accounts of events.³⁸

The following sections are within themselves ordered chronologically, so that the development and change of the content could be observed better. Once the articles were chosen and categorized, the suitable discourse analysis tools were applied. The most suitable tools applied look mainly at the author's background, tone, the article's content, choice of words, stylistic devices, excluded topics and what was mentioned instead.

The informative articles from the period 1948-1957 announced and documented the celebrations taking place. The 28th October under Masaryk had a touch of an open inclusive folk festival, reaffirming Czech national identity and commemorating the dead from World War One. The communists used these rituals – public festivities, parades, commemoration, laying down wreaths, etc. – to propagate their own message; namely military strength as a protection against potential aggressors and putting the spotlight on communist resistance and communist fighters from WW II.

The nationwide celebrations of 28th October 1948 were documented by several articles (Oslavy 28.října v našem kraji, 1948, p.4 & Po slavném 28. říjnu k dalším budovatelským úspěchům, 1948, p.1 & Nad letošními oslavanmi 28. října, 1948, p.1 & Mohutné oslavy v celé republice, 1948, p.3). The national day's agenda included also a military parade (Přehlídka armády, SNB a lidových milicí, 1948, p.3), however, the emphasis lay with the launch of the Five-Year-Plan and honouring “úderníky” (28.října podepíše president republiky zákon o pětiletém plánu, 1948, p.1 & Slavné 30. Výročí

nationalisation in regard to 28th October.

³⁸ Additionally, articles were also published regarding sports events, economic policies and congratulatory telegrams in connection to 28th October. However, they had to be excluded from the analysis, due to the limited scope of the paper and because they say something about how the regime wanted to present itself – as international, open, with many allies. However, these articles say little about how the regime wanted to present and commemorate the examined historical events and monuments in order to influence national memory and in the long-run collective identity.

republiky ve znamení pětiletky a nástupu k socialismu, 1948, p.1 & Odměny rolníkům za splnění výkonného plánu, 1948, p.1). The atmosphere at the signing ceremony in the parliament was described as festive, joyful and all political representatives present applauded the launch of this milestone towards socialism (Sněmovna slavnostně schválila osnovu zákona o pětiletce, 1948, p.2). The articles *President republiky převzal záštitu nad oslavami vzniku republiky* (1948, p.1) and *Presidentu republiky byly odevzdány československé řády* (1948, p.2) depicted the high profile of the ceremony in honour of the day of independence and linked it to the festivities of the interwar period, where the president and his patronage played a prominent role in the commemoration of the day of independence.

Additionally, articles described the celebrations taking place in the “brotherly nations” USSR, Poland and elsewhere in honour of Czechoslovakia’s national day in 1948 and 1949 (Oslavy 30.výročí Československé republiky v SSSR a v Polsku, 1948, p.2 & Oslavy československého státního svátku v zahraničí, 1949, p.2 & Oslavy čs. státního svátku v zahraničí, 1949, p.6). The aim was to depict the loyal socialist allies of Czechoslovakia and thus, demonstrate the strength of socialism and make it more appealing.

In October 1949 the Five-Year-Plan was again the dominant theme in the articles relating to the national day (Oslavy 28.října v Žandově, 1949, p.6 & Kraj Liberecký, 1949, p.8 & Kraj Pražský, 1949, p.6) and large nationwide celebrations reaching every part of society were reported once again to suggest national unity, consensus and legitimacy (Celá republika oslavila 28.říjen, 1949, p.5 & Všechen náš lid slaví 31.výročí vzniku ČSR, 1949, p.1). The rituals and the agenda of the ceremony in honour of the national day were documented in articles published prior to 28th October 1949. Rituals and traditions were altered to fit the regime – streets were decorated like in previous celebrations, but now with Czechoslovak and Soviet flags and pictures of Gottwald and Stalin. Critics of the government, the “reakce” and previous governments were excoriated and defamed: “Letos 28. října, to nebyly studené oficiální oslavy, na kterých se lid necítil doma, jak to při oslavách 28. října bývalo dříve.” and “jednota československého lidu již předem v zárodku zmařila jakékoliv pomyšlení reakce na zneužití 28. října”. The extent of the festivities is also visible in the amount of festive meetings, speeches, concerts, theatre performances and panel discussions, which were held. Moreover, greeting sheets could be signed in Rudolf Gallery in Prague castle, public buildings were decorated with national and soviet flags and military parades were

held (Oslavy 28. října ve všech závodech, 1949, p.1). Furthermore, theatre premiers, celebrations at schools and youth manifestations were organized as well (Naše země před 28.říjnem, 1949, p.1).

By creating new events and reframing others the KSČ distracted from the original meaning of the national day. One distinct example was the growing emphasis on economic issues and workers themselves: On the 28th October 1949 the distinction and honouring of the so called “úderníky” was documented (ČTK, 1949a, p.2 & V údernickém hnutí se rodí nový socialistický člověk, 1949, p.1 & Čest a láva těm, kteří jsou v čele, 1949, p.1 & 118 vyznamenaných úderníků a údernic, 1949, p.4). The articles used extensive quotes from the participants’ speeches to make the account more vivid and give the reader the feeling, that he was present as well. The high profile event was organized to praise the working class and to present “úderníky” as role models for socialist society. This event was used to cement new traditions and rituals suiting the new political and societal regime: handing out medals and diplomas to highly productive workers, and singing workers hymns and patriotic songs (ibid.). Hence, the focus of the national day was shifted from a patriotic day of celebrating independence towards a deadline for achieving economic targets and honouring productive workers.

On 23rd October 1949 a short informative article documented the remembrance ceremony that took place at the Monument of National Liberation on Vítkov Hill. During this ceremony 51 urns with the remains of political prisoners killed by the Nazis were given to the bereaved. Additionally, army general Svoboda received earth from the concentration camp, where members of his family died (Pietní slavnost v Památníku osvobození, 1949, p.1). The ceremony can be seen as another step towards the alteration of the monument’s meaning towards a great emphasis on WW II.

On 28th October 1950 a short article documented the ceremony in honour of the 32nd anniversary of the republic and the 5th anniversary of nationalisation that took place in Lucerna Hall in Prague (RP, 1950c, p.1). Like previously the reports of the event were very positive and illustrated the audience’s support. Chairman of the National Assembly dr. O. John Minister of Industry, Minister-Chairman of the State Planning Office dr. J. Dolansky and Gustav Kliment delivered speeches during this ceremony. Other high political officials like Prime Minister Zápotocký, party officials, representatives of factories, peasants, the military and the youth were present. The Czechoslovak and Soviet anthems were played. Building peace and socialism and glorification of the SU as a protector and supporter of the Czechoslovaks were key

themes (ibid.). One of the reasons why legionnaires were not mentioned anymore on 28th October was that the 6th October had become the central holiday for the legions from 1950 onwards, being celebrated together with the Czechoslovak Army Day (Wingfield, 2000, p.245).

On 28th October 1951 a ceremony was again held in Lucerna hall in Prague this time only in honour of the 6th anniversary of nationalisation. It was called a “manifestační schůze” and was opened with the Czechoslovak and Soviet hymn. Nationalisation was depicted as a successful tool to strengthen peace and build socialism. The event of this day was smaller in scale than the ones organized before (RP, 1951, p.1). The ceremony also included the opening speech by the chairmen of the Central Trade Union František Zupka (Ze zahajovacího projevu předsedy ÚRO Františka Zupky, 1951, p.1), the speeches of the Minister of Heavy Industry Gustav Kliment (Projev ministra těžkého strojírenství Gustava Klimenta, 1951, pp.1,7) and of the chairman of the National Assembly Dr. O John (Závěrečný projev předsedy Národního shromáždění dr. O. John, 1951, p.7). The audience consisted of “úderníky” and political officials like Deputy Prime Minister Dr. J. Ševčík, several ministers and party officials. The event was ended with the workers song “písně práce” (RP, 1951, pp.1,7).³⁹

On 29th October 1952 the first page was dominated by an extensive article on the upcoming anniversary of the October Revolution. Two informative articles appeared on the second page documenting the ceremony that took place in honour of the 7th anniversary of nationalisation in Lucerna Hall in Prague. Politicians, party representatives, foreign ambassadors and dignitaries and the best workers from across the nation attended the ceremony. The Soviet and Czechoslovak anthems were played and cultural performances displayed. The chairman of the National Assembly dr. O. John delivered the opening speech and was followed by a speech from the head of the Central Council of Trade Unions, Gustav Kliment (RP, 1952, p.2). On 30th October two short news articles created the image of nationwide celebrations by describing the ceremonies in the countryside. The ceremonies consisted mostly of KSČ representatives delivering speeches, workers’ meetings at factories and praising the Red Army as liberator and the allegedly prosperous nationalized economy (ČTK, 1952d, p.1 &

³⁹ On 30th October articles reported about celebrations of the 6th day of nationalisation held at the Czechoslovak embassy in Moscow and Beijing with distinguished guests (ČTK, 1951b, p.1 & ČTK,

Vyznamenání nejlepších pracovníků v závodě V. I. Lenina v Plzni, 1952, p.2 & Svoboda, 1952, p.2).

In October 1953 the only article directly relating to 28th October as the day of nationalisation was a historical article, which is discussed below (Základní kámen naší socialistické výstavby, 1953, p.2). Nationalisation was less prominent, because greater emphasis was put on the commemoration of the October Revolution (Hesla ústředního výboru KSSS k 36.výročí Velké říjnové socialistické revoluce, 1953, p.3).

In October 1954 no article was published in direct connection to nationalisation except some economically themed articles that are excluded from the discourse. Only on 29th October a debate was held by the Central Trade Union in honour of the pledges of 13 large industrial and agricultural factories to increase their production outputs in honour of the 37th anniversary of the October Revolution (ČTK, 1954c, p.1).

In October 1955 an entire page was dedicated to the 10th anniversary of nationalisation. One matter-of-fact informative article provided facts and figures in order to give credibility to the claim that nationalisation and with it a planned economy were successful (Fakta a cifry mluví jasnou řečí, 1955, p.3). No reports about a ceremony were found, but it is possible that other print media wrote about it.

In October 1956 one informative article highlighted the current benefits that nationalisation had brought compared to the interwar period and the shortcomings of Western economies (Šulc, 1956, p.2). In October 1957 no news article was printed in connection to nationalisation or the day of independence (Rudé Právo, 1957, pp.1-4).

The historical articles from the period 1948-1957 included pieces like the one from 28th October 1948 *Jak jsme naplnili odkaz 28.X.* (1948, p.3), which was highlighted with a large title, the text was divided through several crossheadings and occasional bold print. The article recapped emergence of the KSČ's political program after WW II and its positive achievements and changes. The article claimed that only the working class demanded independence in 1918, who was also "jediný skuteční nositel národně osvobozenického boje za první války". Moreover, it stated that the October Revolution of 1917 significantly inspired and supported Czechoslovakia's independence and the introduction of socialism. Masaryk's government was presented as brutal, bourgeois and preventing a socialist revolution already in 1918, whereas the

1951c, p.2). This potentially symbolized the closeness and support of Czechoslovakia's foreign socialist allies.

SU was portrayed as Czechoslovakia's strong protector and liberator. Further, the KSČ was praised as having achieved the most for the people after 1945, especially through the Two-Year-Plan. The article also warned of enemies, "naše reakce" and other political parties threatening the building of a successful socialist economy. Furthermore, the first Five-Year-Plan was described as a milestone (ibid.). Hence, this article used the national day more as an opportunity to promote the KSČ, the SU and its economic plans; rather than to commemorate the original meaning of the day.

The article from 28th October by Volavka (1948, p.3), a communist representative in the Czechoslovak National Assembly, recapped the last 30 years. It described the current situation in the country's periphery and compared it to the interwar period to point out the positive changes enforced by the Two-Year-Plan, the latter easing the alleged plight of the previous "vláda kapitalistů a velkostatkářů". 28th October was here merely a deadline until when the set economic targets had to be achieved, not as a national day of independence. The exile government in London was defamed by accusing it of "táhnout zpět naše zemědělcce do kalných vod bídy a rozvratu první republiky".

Another long historical article from 28th October, titled *Marxismus a boj za národní samostatnost* (1948, p.5), was written by Pavel Raiman, a communist and employee of the Agitprop of the Central Committee, who also wrote about the KSČ's history. Raiman claimed that Czechoslovakia's independence had been already propagated and demanded by the communists before, only hindered by the bourgeoisie. He repeated the arguments presented in previous articles. The legionnaires and their involvement in making Czechoslovakia an independent country were not mentioned, but the emergence of a new socialist society. Raiman praised namely the "dělnická třída [...která] získala si svým odporem proti Rakousku největší zásluhu o národní samostatnost Československa" and which is the "jedin[a] spolehliv[a] strážkyně národní svobody" (ibid.).

Another historical article from 28th October (Sládek, 1948, p.5) recapped how Czechoslovakia gained independence and accused the bourgeoisie and interwar government of ignoring historical truth and falsifying the past. For example, the 'false' historical recollection of Czechoslovakia independence during the interwar period was denounced: The impact of foreign resistance through legionnaires and the diplomatic efforts were highly exaggerated according to Sládek. Instead the domestic resistance and the working class's endeavours were more decisive and were inspired and

supported greatly by the socialist October Revolution. “28. říjen 1918 je jedním z výsledků Veliké říjnové socialistické revoluce” and Czechoslovakia could only survive alongside the SU, “jediným spolehlivým přítelem československého lidu” (Sládek, 1948, p.5). The article aimed to discredit the interwar government, blaming it for preventing the establishment of socialism before, and to glorify KSČ’s and the SU.

Another article gave a short overview of the KSČ’s development during the past 30 years on each 28th October (Kvasnička, 1948, p.5). Kvasnička repeated the arguments and claims mentioned in previous articles. He presented the working class as the true driving force of statehood and that “po třiceti letech se tedy uskutečňuje to, zač bojovala dělnická třída vříjnu 1918” (ibid.). Additionally, he depicted the interwar governments as violent, brutal towards strikers, uncaring for the unemployed and underpaid, and as paving the way for Nazi occupation and the loss of Sudetenland. The nationalisation, the Two-Year-Plan and Five-Year-Plan were praised and commemorated as great achievements also in the article by *Rudé Právo* editor Cekotová (1948, p.1). Czechoslovakia’s independence was pushed into the background.

In October 1949 an article by journalist Čestmír Suchý was published on the 28th October (Suchý, 1949, p.3). It followed the line of Marxist-Leninist historiography in its historical account of how the 28.10. became a national day. The article was illustrated with two photographs of people rallying in Prague. Allegedly, the national day was celebrated, because of the fulfilment of the Two-Year-Plan and the launch of the Five-Year-Plan. It appealed to the reader’s patriotism with phrases in first-person-plural like “naší mílované a krásné vlasti”. The First Republic was presented again as untruthful and Western allies were portrayed as the key to Czechoslovak independence in 1918, although the Western countries wanted to renew Habsburg Empire, according to Suchý. This was only prevented by the October Revolution which supported national self-determination. Further, Suchý stated that during the interwar period people were supposed to forget that the 28.10. was actually “svátek[...] bojujícího a vítězného pracujícího lidu” (1949, p.3). Moreover, the KSČ was presented as the immediate leader of the resistance against Nazi-occupation and the previous governments were blamed for the latter. Suchý’s account of WW II and Czechoslovakia’s liberation by only the Red Army was underpinned and made more credible with extensive quotes from flyers that were produced and dispersed by the resistance movement of the KSČ. The sacrifices and persecution of the KSČ were also emphasized. Under the communist regime the true symbolism of 28.10. was allegedly revealed – “symbol[...] boje a

vítězství” and “velkými manifestacemi lásky a věrnosti k Sovětskému svazu” (Suchý, 1949, p.3). Gottwald was quoted extensively also in regard to the positive effects of nationalisation on 28.10.1945, on the expulsion of Germans and the Two-Year-Plan (ibid.).

The article *28.Říjen* (1949, pp.1,5) used first-personal-plural to trigger identification with the text within the reader. The day of independence had been allegedly falsified by the interwar government. Seemingly, the latter wanted the people to forget about the great impact of the October Revolution of 1917. The article discredited the interwar government further by accusing it of indifference towards the people’s needs. In contrast, the SU and Red Army were praised for Czechoslovakia’s liberation. Other actors were not mentioned. Nationalisation, Two-Year-Plan and Five-Year-Plan were also lauded as great successful achievements of the KSČ (ibid.).

The historian and university lecturer Klíma (1949, p.3) repeated the previous arguments and described in detail the strikes of 1918, which he depicted as a nationwide united front of workers protesting against the Habsburg Empire and for independence. The social-democratic parties were depicted as opportunistic, claiming the achievements of the working class for themselves (ibid.).

The journalist Bedřich Rohan (1949, p.3) repeated the previous arguments in his extensive description of the interwar period and the Second World War. His account was made more vivid through rhetorical questions, present tense and direct quotes from contemporary witnesses. Rohan argued that the SU was the only guarantee for and protector of Czechoslovakia’s independence and deserved together with the Red liberator Army continuous gratitude. Britain and France were defamed as indifferent to the fate of Czechoslovakia because of the Munich Agreement.

Miroslav Kárný (1949, p.3) repeated the arguments of Klíma and Rohan to underpin his claim that the soviet October Revolution and the Czechoslovak workers movement were the true reason why independence was gained in 1918. Legionnaires and the exile government’s involvement were not mentioned. Additionally, Kárný presented some things as common knowledge, such as Britain’s apparent initial unwillingness to support Czechoslovakia’s plea for independence, for instance. With this Kárný tried to discredit Western countries and facilitate greater support for the SU, which was presented as the continuous patron of Czechoslovak independence (Kárný, 1949, p.3).

The article *Historické 28.říjny* (1949, p.3) repeated these arguments and described the interwar period as a bleak time for the working class, who was suppressed by the bourgeois government, who violently tried to force people to participate in the official celebrations of 28.10., according to the article - “stávky, demonstrace, krvavý teror, to všechno nemohlo získat lid k účasti na oficiálních oslavách”. Moreover, it presented the KSČ as a victim of Nazi persecution, but also the natural and glorious leader of the resistance and the working class, uniting and fighting for the workers’ rights, “do čela národa stavěla se komunistická strana” (ibid.).

In October 1950 long historical articles were published, which followed the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the past and repeated the arguments mentioned above. The historian Prof. dr. Oldřich Řiha (1950, p.4) repeated the Marxist-Leninist depiction of Czechoslovak independence, how allegedly the interwar governments falsified history and inflated their role in the recognition of Czechoslovakia as an independent state. Řiha defamed Western countries by quoting from the memoirs British Prime Minister Lloyd George, who wrote that the Western allies initially did not wish to dissolve Austria-Hungary. Additionally, Řiha discredited Masaryk by claiming that he had only the interests of the bourgeoisie in mind. The “zahraníční odboj” of World War One was presented as ineffective (ibid.).

On the same page the article of the *Rudé Právo* editor Drahomir Barta (1950, p.4) was published. Barta argued that the Marxist-Leninist ideology and Stalin supported national self-determination, and thus Czechoslovak independence, much more and more continuously than Western politicians. The Czechoslovak pre-1914 government supposedly protected its own class interests and hence, did not demand Czechoslovakia’s independence from the Habsburg Empire sooner (ibid.).

Another reoccurring theme in an article about nationalisation was the naming and shaming of specific people, who were regarded as capitalist, shareholders, landowners or generally opposed to nationalisation (Cekotová, 1950, p.5). These people were singled out as sources of irritation to the great national revolutionary movement. The rest of society was portrayed as happily welcoming nationalisation. Also a very illustrative metaphor defamed capitalism and private ownership as evil, exploitive and violent – “to byl kapitalismus. Měl tisíc tlam s vlčími zuby, které trhaly život a zdraví pracujícího člověka i jeho štěstí. Měl tisíc drápů a ty mu byly 24.října 1945 přistřiženy” (ibid.).

Slavík's (1950, p.5) extensive article employed similar arguments as the other historical articles published in October 1950 in connection to nationalisation and recaps how nationalization came about. He described the interwar governments metaphorically as “temné síly světových imperialistů” walking on the ground soaked with “krví statečných rudoarmějců”. Further, he presented nationalisation as a defence against the bourgeois threat. Slavík also employed patriotic phrases in first-person-plural like “naší vlastí” to engage the reader and to stirring patriotic feelings. The nation was presented as certain and supportive of nationalisation (Slávik, 1950, p.5).

In October 1951 articles used the same rhetoric and arguments in regard to nationalisation as in the previous years. Independence was pushed further into the background and not mentioned. The article *Slavné vítězství pracujících* also blamed the First Republic for unemployment and the Munich Agreement, for instance (1951, p.1). The Head of National Economy Department Ludík Frejka called “28.říjen 1945, den se kterým spojujeme znárodnění našeho průmyslu, našich bank a pojišťoven” (Frejka, 1951, p.3). *Rudé Právo* editor Ludmila Cekotová described the case of a factory benefiting greatly from nationalisation, being stronghold of communism and the former owner being a “peněžní[...] drav[ec] (Cekotová, 1951, p.3). Additionally, the interwar government and Western countries were continuously portrayed as opposed to nationalisation and blamed for the Munich Agreement (O intrikách amerických imperialistů, 1951, p.4 & Vrchlická, 1951, p.4).

In October 1952 rhetoric about nationalisation and praising the SU and the Red Army continued and the original meaning of the 28.10. was further overshadowed and excluded from *Rudé Právo* save for short mentions, that the 28.10. was also not only the day of nationalisation: The historical article *Den znárodnění* (1952, p.1) praised nationalisation as successful and any criticism was dismissed. Additionally, some former businessman and entrepreneurs were defamed as national traitors and enemies of the people, which are limiting general prosperity (ibid.).

In October 1953 the only article directly relating to 28th October as the day of nationalisation was a historical article recollecting the origin of nationalisation, praising it as the basis for Czechoslovak-Soviet brotherly friendship, as a first step towards socialism, as limiting unemployment and increasing living standards (*Základní naší socialistické výstavby*, 1953, p.2).

In October 1954 no historical article was published in connection to nationalisation or the day of independence (*Rudé Právo*, 1954, pp.1-4). On 29th October

1955 an extensive historical article written by the economics expert Doc. Vladimír Kaigl was published on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of nationalisation (1955, p.3). Kaigl presented nationalisation as a necessary step to establish socialism, gave an overview how nationalisation was implemented and how modernization and development of industries overcame challenges. Previous non-communist governments were accused again of hindering economic progress and the country's reconstruction (Kaigl, 1955, p.3). On 28th October 1956 a historical article praised the nationalised economy's accomplishments since 1945 and emphasised the necessity to cooperate with the SU (Správná vesta, 1956, p.1). In October 1957 another historical article recapped how nationalisation came about twelve years ago. It portrayed the day of independence as a bourgeois celebration and argued that commemorating nationalisation was more appropriate (Dvanáct let svobodné práce, 1957, p.1).

In connection to the national day 28th October also personal accounts were published in order to give more credibility to the communist rule and to create the impression that many people supported and identified with the communist cause. Only two personal accounts were published on 30th October 1948. *Rudé Právo* editor Cekotová (1948, p.3) described the impressions of a young communist who visited an exhibition about communist resistance in 1946. The language was simple, emotional, awe-stricken and compassionate towards the sacrifices that the KSČ made during WW II. The first-person narrator illustrated this through short accounts of fallen or wounded communist familiar to him. This piece was meant to trigger a compassionate and grateful view towards communists and the SU within in the reader, as they were presented as the heroes sacrificing their lives for the nation.

The other account (Den nejslavnější, 1948, p.3) was narrated by an unknown male first-person-narrator, describing positively the preparations for the national day and his experiences of this day. Details about the narrator's personal background and the quite emotional, touching description helped the reader to identify with him. The 28.10. was portrayed as the day of the workers, who proudly fulfilled the Two-Year-Plan and excitedly continue with the Five-Year-Plan; but also as the republic's 30th anniversary. The communists are praised for ending the misery of Nazi-occupation to build a 'brighter future' and of introducing a new socialist society, where the individual should find fulfilment in the collective and follow the party line. Legionnaires were only mentioned as participants in the parade held that day (ibid.).

In 1949 again only on 30th October did a personal account with the title *Nad hroby hrdinů* (AH, 1949, p.1) describe the honouring of Red Army soldiers. The unknown narrator lauded the fallen Red Army soldiers and portrayed them as honourable, brave heroes, who liberated the country. The tone was solemn, sad, devotional and was probably aimed to trigger compassion, empathy and gratitude in the reader for the fallen (ibid.).

On 28th October 1950 four personal accounts were published titled “Svobodní a šťastní lidé pracují ve znárodněných závodech” (Kubiš, 1950, p.3 & Pernt, 1950, p.3 & Kovář, 1950, p.3). The fourth personal account was written by factory worker and “underice” Zdeňka Hnídková. In it she praised her workplace and how it had improved since nationalization (Hnídková, 1950, p.6). The other three accounts were similar to this one in tone and style, written by common people lauding nationalisation. On the same page was also a longer text about the Baťa factory by writer and painter Svatopluk Turek. He portrayed this factory as a place of exploitation before nationalisation (Turek, 1950, p.3).

On 30th October 1951 the miner Jaroslav Miska praised nationalisation and the advantages it brought to miners. He also highlighted the gratitude for Czechoslovakia’s liberation by the Red Army in 1945 and the introduction of socialism (Miska, 1951, p.3). Both articles were written in a manner so that the reader identified with the narrators and their stories. The purpose was to generate sympathy and support for communist policies, which were endorsed by these narrators.

However, personal accounts of the national day celebrations or nationalisation gradually disappeared from *Rudé Právo*. In the years 1952, 1953 and 1954 no personal accounts in connection to nationalisation or the day of independence were found. Only in connection to the 10th anniversary in 1955 *Rudé Právo* published three. One was an interview where an engineer had been asked to describe the changes at his workplace since nationalisation and yearly plans. He praised the technological modernization and production output increase (Na Prahu druhé pětiletky, 1955, p.3). The ironworker Hřivňák was also full of praise, also for his work collective (1955, p.3). Hašková described the reconstruction of a factory destroyed during WW II, the improvements and the pride of the workers (1955, p.3). In October 1956 a commentary by a *Rudé Právo* journalist mentioned the 28.10. as the day of independence and nationalisation. To the latter far more importance was attached, as the first-person-narrator criticised the low food consumption and high unemployment during the First Republic (1956, p.2). In

October 1957 (*Rudé Právo*, 1957, pp.1-4) no personal accounts were published in connection to nationalisation or the day of independence.

4.3. Depiction of Czechoslovak legionnaires and Monument of National Liberation in Presidential speeches on national day 28th October

The presidential speeches were analysed to determine if and how the legionnaires, the Red Army, the Monument of National Liberation, 28th October and nationalisation were presented in the presidential speeches between 1948-1957. Most of the speeches were found in issues of *Rudé Právo*, as the books with collected speeches of Czechoslovak presidents often did not include the needed presidential or prime ministerial speeches delivered on this national day. The context in which the speeches were delivered and the dimension of these ceremonies is also presented. It shows how the circumstances under which the speeches were delivered, the speakers themselves and the extent of the ceremonies changed in correlation with the altering importance of 28th October.

President Gottwald delivered a speech in honour of 28th October 1948 on Wenceslas Square in Prague. The speech was directed at the general public and it was published 30th October on the first page within an article (*Slavné 30. Výročí republiky ve znamení pětiletky a nástupu k socialismu*, 1948, p.1). President Gottwald stirred patriotic feelings, included the audience through phrases like “*naš lid*” and “*všem našim lidem*” in first-person-plural and rhetorical questions. Further, some words were highlighted in the text through bold print to emphasise the conveyed message. He described the 28th October as the day, when Czechoslovakia emerged as a result of the people’s movement abroad and at home under the leadership of “*Osvoboditele T. G. Masaryka*” (*ibid*, 1948, p.1). This is interesting, as the previous articles gave little credit to Masaryk. However, Gottwald was quick to also highlight the alleged positive influence of the October Revolution and its promotion of national self-determination on Czechoslovak independence. Moreover, the Czechoslovak people were encouraged by the October Revolution to demand an independent, socialist republic. Legionnaires were not mentioned. Still, Gottwald claimed that the parties and politicians in power during

the interwar period were to be blamed for the Munich Agreement and had tried to gain power again in February 1948. The KSČ averted a “druh[ý] Mníchov [...]” and a new rise of imperialistic Germany. Gottwald presented the communist economic reforms as logical consequences of WW II. The launch of the Five-Year-Plan showed the nation’s beneficial development (ibid.).

On 28th October 1949 Gottwald’s speech from the 27.10. was published (Projev presidenta republiky, 1949, p.1). It was directed at the “úderníky” and only indirectly at the general public, who was encouraged to take them as role models. The distinction of these workers took place in the Prague castle, which is a very prominent place highlighting the importance attached to these workers and their role in communist propaganda. The speech focused only on the “úderníky” and their importance for the building of socialism and increasing living standards nationwide. Moreover, Gottwald argued that “v údernickém hnutí se rodí nový socialistický člověk, člověk sebevědomý, člověk, pro kterého zítřek je včerejškem, člověk, pro kterého obtíže jsou zde proto, aby je překonával, člověk-hospodař, člověk-vlastenec” (ibid.). He describes this new socialist man as the guarantee for deploying the nation’s provided resources to build a better life for the people. Hence, he called upon the people to strive for becoming also an “úderník” in order to achieve the set goals sooner. Gottwald also warned of external and internal enemies blocking Czechoslovakia’s path to socialism (ibid.).

In October 1950 a ceremony was held in Lucerna hall in Prague in commemoration of the 32nd anniversary of the republic and the 5th anniversary of nationalisation. During this event the main speeches were delivered by the Minister of Industry Gustav Kliment’s speech (Slavné výročí, 1950, p.1), which was published in *Rudé Pravo* on the 28th October. Additionally, the opening speech of chairman of the National Assembly dr. O. John was also partially reproduced (Projev předsedy NS dr. O. Johna, 1950, p.1) together with the speech of the Minister-Chairman of the State Planning Office dr. J. Dolansky (RP, 1950c, p.1). These speeches are excluded from the analyses as they are not presidential or prime ministerial speeches and do not fit the discourse criteria. Prime Minister Zápotocký did deliver a speech, but at the enterprise ČKD-Sokolovo and not at the main event and it was published only on the last page of the newspaper issue (1950, p.8), hence it was excluded too.

On 28th October 1951 speeches were delivered in connection to nationalisation in Lucerna hall in Prague during a “manifestační schůze” and published in *Rudé Právo* (RP, 1951, p.1). The main speakers were the chairman of the Central Council of Trade

Unions František Zupka (*Ze zahajovacího projevu předsedy ÚRO Františka Zupky*, 1951, p.1), the Minister of Heavy Industry Gustav Kliment (*Projev ministra těžkého strojírenství Gustava Klimenta*, 1951, pp.1,7) and the chairman of the National Assembly dr. O. John (*Závěrečný projev předsedy Národního shromáždění dr. O. John*, 1951, p.7). These speeches were, however, excluded from the analyses as they are not presidential or prime ministerial speeches and do not fit the discourse criteria. Zápotocký did hold a speech on the 28th October, however, at a building site of a new ironworks and it was directed more specifically at the present workers than at the nation at large (Cekotová, 1951, p.3) thus, it was excluded.

On 29th October 1952 a ceremony was held at Lucerna Hall in Prague in honour of the 7th anniversary of nationalisation (RP, 1952, p.2). The speech of the chairman of the Central Council of Trade Unions Gustav Kliment was read out by Assemblyman J. Kolář (*Z projevu předsedy Národního shromáždění dr. O. John*, 1952, p.2), and the chairman of the National Assembly Dr. O. John (*Z projevu předsedy ÚRO poslance G. Klimenta*, 1952, p.2). These speeches were published on the 29th October 1952, but are excluded from the analyses as they are not presidential or prime ministerial speeches and do not fit the discourse criteria. No speech was delivered by Zápotocký or Gottwald in connection to the day of nationalisation.

On 28th October 1953 no speech by the president or Prime Minister or some other state official was published in *Rudé Právo* in connection to the day of independence or nationalisation.

On 28th October 1954 itself no speech by the president or prime minister was published. Instead extensive reports on the elections to the National Assembly covered most of the issue (*Rudé Právo*, 1954, pp.1-4). On 29th October 1954 a speech delivered by Prime Minister Viliam Širkory (*Projev předsedy vlády Viliama Širokého*, 1954, pp.1,2) was published, but the theme was not nationalisation or the day of independence. Instead, Širkory gave a speech at a debate held on the occasion of the pledge of several factories to increase their production targets in honour of the 37th anniversary of the October Revolution. He spoke about the need to exceed the planned targets in honour of the upcoming 10th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation by the Red Army and to raise living standards, competitiveness and product quality. First-person-plural and patriotic phrases were used like “rozvoj naší vlastí” and Širkory called upon the audience with phrases like “závazky, které vaše podniky vyhlásily” and “vaše výzva”. Širkory's tone was dunning, postulating and urging (ibid.).

On 28th October 1955 no presidential or prime ministerial speech was published on connection to the day of independence or nationalization (Rudé Právo, 1955). A speech by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party Antonín Novotný was published on 28th October, however, in connection to a national technical conference of construction workers (Z projevu prvního tajemníka ÚV KSČ soudruha Antonína Novotného, 1955, pp.1,2). The focus was entirely on the 38th anniversary of the October Revolution (Hesla Ústředního výboru Kommunistické strany Československa u ÚN Národní fronty, 1955, p.1).

In October 1956 no speech by the president or prime minister was published, only in October 1957 a speech was published by President Zápotocký. However, it did not relate to nationalisation or independence, but to economic innovation and modernization (Projev Prezidenta republiky Antonína Zápotockého, 1957, p.1).

5. Case Study: Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers

5.1. *Background information Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers*

The monuments that emerged in post-war Czechoslovakia in 1945 were often statues, monuments and place names dedicated to Czech war heroes. Czech resistance members, but also participants in the May revolution and Soviet liberators were honoured and new commemoration sites developed until the 1970s (Wingfield, 2000, p.262).⁴⁰ “Monuments were an immediate and apparently unmediated way of communicating political values to people whose political loyalties might be wavering” (ibid.). Furthermore, the festivities and ceremonies held in honour of the unveiling of the new monument, included more and more often groups of pioneers – the youth organization of the communists. The pioneers would sing workers anthems, the Soviet anthem and play some traditional national music. As a result the monuments were

⁴⁰ These monuments were not always established top-down, although the communist regime did map many historic sites across Czechoslovakia in order to give the communist historical narrative a credible base, but some monuments were also built by local groups. Local heroes or Soviet brothers were frequently commemorated in these bottom-up memorials. The communists in these groups tried of course to influence the design of the statues (Wingfield, 2000, p.262).

infused with a certain meaning and supported the purposeful construction of state socialism, as they reinforced a specific interpretation of history (ibid.).

One of the most prominent monuments commemorating the liberation by the Red Army was the somewhat untraditional Monument to the Soviet Tank Drivers on today's Kinsky Square in Smíchov, Prague. Initially the communists were quite supported, compared to other political groupings, because they promoted and credited themselves with significant and patriotic resistance work during WW II (Holy, 1996, p.132). They depicted themselves as part of the international coalition “dominated by the SU, whose army was being honoured for liberating much of Czechoslovakia” (Wingfield, 2000, p.262). The considerable support of the Red Army provided in the liberation of Czechoslovakia was to be commemorated in the Monument to the Soviet Tank Drivers.

The monument itself was a Soviet tank with the number 23 standing on a high pedestal since 29th July 1945 (Koldinská & Šedivý, 2005). When the monument was revealed to the public by Prague's mayor Vačka, the tank was induced by the communists with initial, purposeful meaning: recalling the deeds of the first Soviet tank drivers liberating Prague, and by freeing the capital city symbolically also rescuing the entire country. The myth surrounding the monument claimed that this tank was the first tank to arrive in Prague and to liberate it from Nazi-occupation in May 1945 during the Prague Uprising. Many people, who had fought in the resistance or abroad, or had to go into exile, were probably grateful to the SU for driving the Germans out of Czechoslovakia and approved of the monument. Moreover, the monument fitted the mood of the time, as many monuments like this one were erected across Europe's cities during the initial post-war euphoria, according to Koldinská and Šedivý (2005).

However, the chosen location of the monument was peculiar, because most of the Western part of Prague, and with it Smíchov, had been liberated by Russian Liberation Army of General A. A. Vlasov. Hence, the monument overshadowed the achievements of General Vlasov and the Red Army symbolically claimed the liberation of the entire city for itself. The regime wanted the Red Army to be known as the only liberator of Prague and Czechoslovakia. The political reasoning behind choosing this location is evident, but it shows that in comparison to the other case studies discussed here, this location lacks a ‘historical or mythical ground’ (Koldinská & Šedivý, 2005). Bethlehem Chapel was rebuilt in its former place and the Monument of National Liberations stands, where Žižka defeated the crusaders; but no battle or skirmish was

fought by the Red Army where the tank stood. This makes the location seem quite artificial and arbitrary. One can argue that this fact also limited the extent of the emotional bond people could establish to this monument (ibid.).

Another peculiarity of this monument is the tank itself. The Russian Army Generals did not want to put the true first tank, which was damaged by fire, onto the pedestal. Instead they chose a different type of tank, but passed it on as the original ‘first tank’ (Koldinská & Šedivý, 2005). Military historians can prove today, that it is in fact “the wrong tank, the wrong type of tank with the wrong number on its turret” (Horaková, 2005). The tanks that were deployed to Prague were fast T34 tanks. However, on the monument stood a different type - an IS-2 infantry tank. The number on the turret also did not correspond to the numbers of the tanks actually reaching Prague in May 1945 (ibid.). The confusion over the number on the turret appeared because the first tank to enter Prague on 9th May 1945, commanded by the lieutenant I. G. Goncharenko, who died in the fights, carried the number 24. However, the tank on the monument carried the number 23. This fact was explained in a book published in 1966 in commemoration of the 20th anniversary of Prague’s liberation by the Red Army. The book recollected the events of May 1945 and the celebrations of May 1965 (Růžička & Vobořil, 1966, p.60).⁴¹

This book tried to accommodate some of the ambiguity connected to the myth of the first tank: Lieutenant Goncharenko did command the tank number 24, belonged to 1st battalion 63rd tank brigade under lieutenant general Lejushenko and entered Prague on 9th May. The tank Nr. 24 came under fire by German soldiers, Goncharenko was mortally wounded and the tank burned out, which entailed it being sorted out. The other members of the tank crew were also wounded. These are the historical facts, according to Růžička and Vobořil (1966, pp.51-52). Further, Růžička and Vobořil claim that much later the monument and tank in Smíchov were linked to Goncharenko and his crew in the public perception and that it was not the regime, which fostered this perception (ibid., p.52). They also admit that the type of tank on the monument (a heavy IS-2 tank) did not correspond to the medium-sized tank, type T-34, commanded by Goncharenko. The Soviet army headquarters were responsible for this choice, because they wanted a

⁴¹ There were even two photos published in the book documenting both tanks: one photo showing a tank with the number I-24 and the caption “Legerndární tank poručíka Gončarenka, který svedl na Klárově svůj poslední boj” and another one showing presumably “mrtvé tělo proučíka Gončarenka, velitele tanku č. I-24” (ibid., p.54). The a third photograph depicted a tank with the number 23 and the caption reads “tank s číslem 23 na Václavském náměstí” (ibid., p.56).

more representable tank on top of the pedestal, according to Růžička and Vobořil, which is why they chose the IS-2, which had the number 23 (ibid., p.53). This could be regarded as an attempt to straighten out some of the ambiguities surrounding the tank, but the articles of the 1940s and 1950s did speak purposefully of the famous ‘first tank to liberate Prague’. Still, this endeavour to straighten out the facts about the monument in 1966 documents most of all how the monument’s meaning was contested over time.

Initially, the tank was meant to symbolize the Red Army’s heroic liberation of Prague. However, Hojda and Pokorný (1996) argue that the monument – the wrong type of tank, the wrong number, in the wrong location - turned into a symbol of the falsification of history by the communist regime (p.224) and became gradually for large parts of the populace also a symbol of Russian occupation in the end (Horaková, 2005, Koldinská & Šedivý, 2005). Especially, with Prague Spring in 1968 the perception of this monument changed in the public eye. Even the festive May celebrations and the commemorative ceremonies could not entirely disguise that the monument was an artificial site of memory. The efforts of the KSČ to induce the monument with a broader appeal to the general public⁴² and not being only appealing to a few veterans and officials, was not achieved in the long-run as history has shown.⁴³

Connected to the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers the KSČ tried to spread its vision of the end of WW II, which stood in contrast to reality: In early May 1945 Czechoslovakia’s Western parts were liberated by the American troops, but they stopped at the agreed demarcation line. Thus, Pilsen was the only major city liberated by the Americans (Jalk & Junek, 2010). The remaining parts of Czechoslovakia were liberated by Soviet troops. This fact was inflated by communist propaganda and the American contribution was first played down and later denied (Jalk & Junek, 2010). Additionally, the contribution of Czechoslovak resistance fighters and Czechoslovaks fighting in

⁴² For instance, in 1976 the tank was eternalized by Otakar Vavra, a movie maker cooperating with the regime, in the movie ‘The Liberation of Prague’ (Koldinská & Šedivý, 2005). More strikingly is a children’s story published in a primer published in 1986. It tells the story of the first tank from the tanks perspective. The title is “Tank Number 23” and it was written by Zdeněk Adl and Věra Adl. It described the allegedly heroic and selfless journey of a tank and his commander Goncharenko, a simple Komsomol worker (Communist Youth Organization), to Prague and the destruction of the tank and how its crew came under fire during the liberation of the city – “I am an odd monument and I know it. People like me. They bring flowers to my heroes [...] peace [is flourishing], which also I brought to Prague, Ural tank number 23” (Adl & Adl, 1996, pp.104-106). This story, although not part of the examined discourse of this thesis, does show the version of Prague’s liberation, which the KSČ wanted to become part of the public consciousness and national memory.

⁴³ The monument is probably part of the national memory of the Czech Republic, at least with the younger generation, but not as a symbol of the Red Army’s liberation of Prague, but as the ‘Pink Tank’.

armies of the allied forces was also quickly underplayed. The memory of the American liberators and Czechoslovak non-communist resistance was suppressed and not given a chance to be expressed or passed on openly (ibid.). Instead, the emphasis was put on the deeds of the Red Army that was honoured in numerous war monuments displaying the Soviet hammer and sickle. These symbols represented the ‘indebtedness of Czechoslovakia to the SU’. They fostered the claim of the KSČ to power, as they argued that because of their achievements the SU was holding its protective hand over Czechoslovakia. Without the SU Germany would remain an imminent threat, also due to the expelled Sudeten Germans (Wingfield, 2000, p.262).

After 1989 the commemoration of the end of WW II was adapted to other European countries and it is now celebrated on 8th May as the Day of Victory. Beforehand the regime had celebrated the Red Army, the liberation of Czechoslovakia and the Prague Uprising extensively. Often for several days in early May until the 9th May, the actual official liberation day. The 9th May became over time one of the main state holidays, larger than the national day of independence (Holy, 1996, p.58). The next sections examine how the Red Army, the liberation of Prague and Czechoslovakia and the tank were presented in *Rudé Právo* and presidential speeches.

5.2. Depiction of the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers in *Rudé Právo* on national day 9th May

This chapter examines how the monument of the Soviet tank drivers, the Red Army and the liberation of Czechoslovakia were presented in *Rudé Právo*. The interpretation of the events of May 1945 and how they were portrayed is important, because the communist regime drew from it legitimation for its rule and also for the close alignment with the SU. Additionally, a negative depiction of American soldiers, for example, could influenced potentially the enemy image the KSČ was cultivating in order to unite the nation against the ‘treacherous’ capitalist countries and to mobilize people in support of the SU.

The keywords, which designate if an article is included into the discourse, are *Rudá Armáda*, *Památník sovětských tankistů*, *osvobození Československa* and *9 květen*.

The tank was painted pink by art student David Černý in 1991 and later removed to a military museum

Articles from other days than 9th May (except if no issue was published on 9.5. than 8.5. is used for the analysis) are excluded in this analysis, because the discourse would become too extensive. This becomes apparent, when looking at early May 1950 alone, when over 140 articles were published in connection to 5th anniversary of the liberalisation of Czechoslovakia, the Prague Uprising and the end of WW II. Additionally, Labour Day and the Prague Uprising were also celebrated in early May and many articles published during this time overlapped thematically. Additionally, the 9th May stayed one the most important communist holidays for a long time and considerable media attention was devoted to this national day - in contrast to the day of independence or the day of Jan Hus' death, which both gradually lost their initial significance.

In regard to the monument of Soviet tank drivers rituals and rites are also documented. Monuments are, as discussed above, infused with meaning through repeated rituals and traditions, which are connected to these sites making them *lieux de mémoire*. Hence, information mentioned in the articles about rites and customs performed in connection to the commemoration of the national day 9th May is also collected. As a result it can be observed what traditions were used to spread a certain interpretation of the past and how this national day was celebrated.

Like in the previous chapters the articles were grouped according to type in order to ease the analysis and make general patterns more visible: a) informative articles, b) historical articles, c) personal accounts.⁴⁴ The following sections are within themselves ordered chronologically, so that the development and changes can be observed better. Once the articles were chosen and categorized, the suitable discourse analysis tools were applied. The most suitable tools applied in the analysis look mainly at the author's background, tone, the article's content, choice of words, stylistic devices, excluded topics and what was mentioned instead.

The informative articles from the period 1948-1957 documented the announcement and agenda of the celebrations and also how the festivities and commemorations took place. In May 1948 a short news article announced that a new constitution would be signed that day. President Gottwald delivered the closing speech

outside of Prague (Hojda & Pokorný, 1996, pp.224-228).

⁴⁴ As in the case study before, articles reporting on sports events held in connection to 9th May and congratulatory telegrams are excluded from the analysis for the reasons already mentioned.

during the signing ceremony on Prague castle (Dnes bude slavnostně přijata nova ústava, 1948, p.1). On the occasion of the 3rd anniversary of liberation it was also shortly announced that the communist party reached a membership of 2,000.048 (Kommunistická strana Československa dosáhla 2,000.048 členů, 1948, p.1 & Kommunistická strana dosáhla dvou million členů, 1948, p.2). Another article reported on the alleged nationwide support for the KSČ and the SU and thanked the people for the successful commemoration of 9th May 1950 (ČTK, 1950d, p.1). Both articles were meant to generate an image of a united nation supporting the KSČ.

On 10th May 1949 an article shortly reported on the commemorative ceremony that took place at Olšansky cemetery, where a wreath was laid in the name of President Gottwald, Soviet dignitaries and foreign delegations also participated. At the Monument of Soviet Tank Drivers a wreath was laid down by the Soviet ambassador, mayor of Prague Vacek, the Prague garrison commander Division General Eja and others (Směnou míru oslavili jsme Den vítězství, 1949, p.1). Vítkov was not mentioned, instead, ceremonies that took place elsewhere in Czechoslovakia were described. “Všechnen náš pracující lid” celebrated the 4th Day of Victory and the heroic liberator, the Red Army.

Another news article documented the ceremony on Vítkov Hill in honour of 9th May 1950. Greek fires were lit in front of the tomb of the Unknown Soldier, the Czechoslovak flags and the Soviet flag were flown, wreaths with red ribbons were laid by politicians, foreign dignitaries during and in the name of President Gottwald by Prime Minister Zápotocký, a pious ceremony held and the Soviet and Czechoslovak hymn were played (RP, 1950b, p.1). These adapted rituals symbolized the close alignment with the SU.

The agenda of the communist government officials for the 9th May also included quite regular visits to the opera or theatre (ČTK, 1950e, p.1), which had been also part of the program in the interwar period. The article *Svátek v ulicích Prahy* (1950, p.3) documented the public May celebrations. The tone was excited, awestruck and emotional and the public allegedly expressed its gratitude, joy and loyalty to the SU. The present tense created a more vivid image of the ceremony and first-person-plural and rhetorical questions engaged the reader. First-person-plural indicated that the author spoke for the whole united nation, which agreed, supported and experienced the ceremony in the same way. Hence, the reader could sympathize more with the said.

Additionally, several articles described the parade that was held. Representatives from different Czechoslovak regions as well as military personnel, tanks, factory representatives, pioneers, people in folk costumes participated in it. Soviet and Czechoslovak songs and dances allegedly created a relaxed joyous atmosphere, underlining again the communist's claim to popular support. This claim was to generate legitimization and justification for the communist rule based on broad, genuine, joyful support for the KSČ (Svátek v ulicích Prahy, 1950, p.3 & Sajnerová, 1950, p.4 & Pionýři pochodovali před presidentem republiky, 1950, p.3). The articles showed how the communist regime introduced new traditions and rituals in order to demonstrate its (military) power, influence the identity of especially young citizens participating in these parades as a collective and to propagate the emphasis the regime put on certain historical events.

On May 8th 1951 an article documented the ceremony honouring the fallen Soviet soldiers (Pocta sovětským hrdinům, kteří padli za svobod naší vlasti, 1951, p.1). At Olšanský cemetery President Zápotocký and other national, foreign, military dignitaries laid down a wreaths, accompanied by funeral music and an honorary guard. The Red Army is described as the heroic sole liberator of Czechoslovakia. At Vítkov Hill the fallen fighters against fascism were honoured by a honorary guard and Chairmen of the National Assembly O. dr. John laid a wreath in the name of the President and Zápotocký laid one in the name of the Czechoslovakian government. The pious act ended with the Soviet and Czechoslovak anthems and a visit inside the monument (ibid.).

On 9th May 1952 the celebrations of the 7th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation were held in Smetanova síň in Prague. High party and state officials, military representatives and foreign delegations were present. The Czechoslovak and Soviet hymns were played and several speeches were delivered (ČTK, 1952b, p.2) by party functionaries and were published together with the speech of Prime Minister Zápotocký (Rudé Právo, 1952, p.3). Another part of this national day was the distinction of "vynikající pracovníky", who were rewarded by the mayor of Prague in Slovanský dům (Udělení vyznamenání vynikajícím pracovníkům, 1952, p.6). This was a tradition invented to not only focus on the fallen soldiers, but to also celebrate the communist system. Additionally, a ceremony took place the day before at Olšanský cemetery at the grave of Soviet heroes and on Vítkov Hill at the Monument of National Liberation (ČTK, 1952c, p.6). Wreaths were laid at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier on Vítkov

Hill by Gottwald, Zápotocký, party representatives, government representatives and other officials. Greek fires burned adjacent to it, an honour guard stood at the tomb, a funeral march was played and military representatives were present. Additionally, delegations from allied countries participated and laid wreaths – SU, Mongolia, China, Albania, Romania and Bulgaria. Various associations were also present and laid wreaths like the Czechoslovak Union of Youth. The ceremony ended with the Soviet and Czechoslovak anthem (ČTK, 1952c, p.6). This designated the high-profile character of this national day, but also that the seemingly international honorary guests were only from other communist countries and that this national day was actually celebrating not only Czechoslovakia, but also the Soviet Union. This international commemoration of the Red Army's victory was also documented in an article reporting about the ceremony taking place in Berlin. The latter was held to demonstrate the Czechoslovak-German friendship and their mutual peace effort against imperialistic enemies (AND, 1952, p.6) and it was meant to enhance the impression, that all allied socialist countries were celebrating the 7th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation. This in return created the impression that the KSČ was successfully aligning itself with strong partners.

Furthermore, after Vítkov Hill the Soviet political and military representatives, together with Zápotocký, went to the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers in Smíchov. Flowers were laid and “tichou vzpomínkou uctili památku hrdiných tankistu armády generála Leljušenka, kteří padli v boji” (ČTK, 1952c, p.6). The general public, pioneers, pupils and workers also brought flowers and wreaths to this monument – “při pietní slavnosti byl pomník obklopen čestnou stráží”. Throughout the city small monuments and memorials erected by the public commemorated the fallen Red Army soldiers and fighter from the barricades from May 1945 (ibid.). This article depicted the ‘people’ character of the commemoration – genuine, pure and simple. The Red Army soldiers were described as heroic, selfless, willing to sacrifice their lives, brave and honourable (ČTK, 1952c, p.6). The Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers was depicted as the site where genuine large-scale public commemoration and mourning took place. The monument was further induced with meaning through the official visit by political representatives and the customs described above, supporting its development into a site of memory.

In May 1953 (ČTK, 1953b, p.2) a news article documented the ceremony in honour of the 8th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation by the Red Army. On this occasion formal meetings of the Action Committees of the National Front were held

nationwide. In the Smetanovo theatre the National Front's Central Action Committee organized a gala evening in which President Zápotocký and many party and government officials participated. Delegations from other socialist countries like China and Mongolia were also present. The people were described as expressing "nesmírnou věrnost a lásku.[...] a horoucí vděčností ...nepřemožitelné armádě" and towards the SU. The Czechoslovak and Soviet anthem were played and the opening speech was delivered by Prime Minister Viliam Široký. The International was played before the cultural program began (ČTK, 1953b, p.2). A pattern can be seen in these ceremonies, which focus very much on the communist politicians and the glorification of the SU. Instead of commemorating the victims and fallen soldiers of WW II communist workers, politicians and the Red Army are honoured. The atmosphere described is highly supportive with plenty of applause and communist slogans being shouted by the audience, according to the article (ČTK, 1953b, p.2).

Army General Dr. Alexej Čepička (1953, p.3) commented on the 8th anniversary of Liberation Day. According to Čepička, the interwar governments were as exploitative and suppressive as Austro-Hungary before 1918 and were wrong to hand the country to Hitler without a struggle. The fight against Nazi-occupation culminated in "květnovou revoluci 1945" (1953, p.3) and thanks to the SU full freedom was gained, when the working class took power. In contrast to that, the American army's advance into Šumava is portrayed as "důkazem, že na straně zahraničního kapitalismu nechybělo chutě zardousit mladou svobodu našeho lidu". Further, Čepička argued that it is necessary to remove the old social order and to establish "vyšší společenskou soustavu, vybudovat socialistický společenský řád" (1953, p.3). This can be seen as sign of the new Soviet society that the communists wanted to introduced in order to generate greater support for their regime and to clearly break with the 'old bourgeois order' of past governments. In the case studies above the new socialist society was also mentioned a couple of times as an ideal the Czechoslovak nation should strive for. Furthermore, by propagating the Marxist-Leninist view of history, namely that the Americans were not a part of Czechoslovakia's liberation from Nazi-occupation, but were in fact enemies of the Czechoslovaks; the latter were pushed to identify stronger with the communist cause. The use of phrases like "naš lid" and "naše dejiny" suggest consensus between the reader and the author, stirred patriotic feelings and demonstrated national unity in regard to national history and current politics. Another argument to draw the reader onto the side of the KSČ and repeated by Čepička, warned against

imperialistic, bourgeois, capitalist internal and external enemies wanting to harm Czechoslovakia (Čepička, 1953, p.3). This enemy image was continuously reinforced also during other national days, as shown in the case studies above. It was aimed to rally people behind the communist cause and to mobilize them in defence of their country. Connected to that was the use of military type phrases in connection to non-military topics, as it has been shown also above. Additionally, the individual in the audience was called upon to participate and to contribute personally to the building of socialism. The reader was supposed to feel, that by supporting socialism he was part of something bigger, a greater cause - peaceful, fair, just, honourable and victorious. Čepička also argued that the KSČ was the only true leader prepared to fulfil “tuto vedoucí úlohu a veliké dějinné poslání” and “svou historickou úlohu” (Čepička, 1953, p.3). This links to the above discussed alleged historical legacy of the KSČ to rule and to achieve what the Hussite movement did not achieve in the past.

Another article from May 1953 was illustrated with a picture of Soviet tank drivers being greeted by people on Old Town Square in Prague in 1945. This article glorified the Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship and the SU as the role model to be emulated (Klement Gottwald, 1953, p.3). Moreover, it affirmed and strengthened a positive image of the SU, so that the reader would sympathize with it. Quotes from Gottwald show how the good relationship developed thanks to KSČ and make the narration more vivid (ibid.). Furthermore, a news article documented the pious ceremony at the monument to Soviet soldiers at Olšanský cemetery in honour of the 8th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation. President Zápotocký, Prime Minister Široký, other state, party, ministerial and military officials, foreign dignitaries, representations of various associations laid down wreaths, an honorary guard was present and a funeral march was played. Afterwards a pious ceremony took place also on Vítkov Hill at the monument of the WWII soldiers, and Prime Minister Široký laid a wreath in the name of Zápotocký together with other state, party, government, military and foreign officials. Additionally, flowers were laid the grave of Gottwald (ČTK, 1953c, p.6). The Monument of the Soviet Tank Driver was not mentioned. Additionally, another article recapped the ceremonies of the 8th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation in Rumania, Poland and Albania (ČTK, 1953d, p.6). Like in the years before this article was supposed to demonstrate the unity of the Soviet Bloc and that the propagated interpretation of the past was accepted also abroad.

The ceremony of 9th May 1954 followed a similar pattern with wreaths being laid by state officials, SU representatives and others during a pious act and people, pioneers, students flocking to the graves and monument to lay down flowers. Zápotocký's wreath was laid by Prime Minister Široký at Olšany cemetery, which was visited first and decorated with the Czechoslovak and Soviet flags. Then Vítkov Hill was visited by government, party, foreign and military delegations and red flowers and wreaths were laid there. Besides, short paragraphs report on the ceremonies at monuments in Slavín, Slovakia, and Pilsen (ČTK, 1954b, p.2) and signal that the commemoration took place nationwide and the article even states "Památku padlých hrdinů [...] uctívají v těchto dnech pracující v celé republice". Further, the monument to the Bulgarian fighters, who died in Prague, was honoured as well but the Monument to the Soviet Tank Drivers was not mentioned. The article repeatedly described the Red Army as the heroic liberator of Czechoslovakia and other actors like the Americans were not mentioned (ČTK, 1954b, p.2). Another part of the ceremony was a festive cultural evening in Prague, which was attended by Zápotocký and Široký and opened with the Soviet and Czechoslovak anthem (Slavnostní umělecký večer v Praze na počest 9.výročí osvobození naší republiky, 1954, p.2). The high profile participation was meant to demonstrate a broad agreement with the ceremony, the close alignment with the SU and general consensus about the presented interpretation of history.

In honour of the 10th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation a ceremonial session of the Central Committee of the KSČ, the Czechoslovak government and the Central Committee of the National Front was held on Prague castle. The main speech was delivered by Prime Minister Široký and the atmosphere was described as festive and supportive. The article was illustrated with three pictures of joyous soldiers on tanks liberating Prague and a tank monument (ČTK, 1955b, p.1). Once again the tank serves as a symbol of freedom and of Czechoslovakia's liberation. In honour of the 10th anniversary of liberation a festive theatre performance took place in the national theatre in Prague and was visited by many state officials (Slavnostné představení na počest 10.výročí osvobození v Národním divadle v Praze, 1955, p.8) as in the years before. Articles also documented the celebrations taking place in Moscow and Berlin and the speeches of Russian and German communist leaders were also published in the newspaper (Rudé Právo, 1955, pp.7-8). Additionally, a new memorial in honour of the liberation by the Red Army was revealed in the Slovak spa town Luhače (Odhalení Pámatníku osvobození v Luhačovicích, 1955, p.8). This demonstrated the overall

gratefulness of the liberated nations and how highly honoured the Red Army was not only in Czechoslovakia. It is worthwhile noting that on 7th May 1955 the hall dedicated solely to the Red Army was opened on Vítkov Hill as part of the monument (Uctění památky bokovníků za svobodný život Československa, 1955, p.2). The ceremony was opened by the Soviet and Czechoslovak anthems, Alexej Čepička delivered a speech to mark the opening of the Red Army hall. The purpose of the hall is to remind the Czechoslovaks of “slávu a hrdinství nepřemožitelné Sovětské armády –naši osvoboditelky” (ibid.). After the International was played, the state officials laid wreath at Gottwald’s mausoleum and visited the new hall, which was then opened to the public. The public was described as silent, stricken with awe and respect towards the liberators while walking through the hall. At Olšanský cemetery a pious act took place, with lying down wreaths, a funeral march, an honorary guard and visits from political and party officials and representatives of the general public (ibid.). The Monument of Soviet Tank Drivers is not mentioned. It becomes apparent that the monument to the Soviet soldiers at Olšanský cemetery was accredited with greater significance, despite the famous myth about the important role played by the first tank arriving in the liberation of Prague. Moreover, the monument on Vítkov Hill was also always only visited after Olšanský cemetery and in the reports it played a minor role.

On 9th May 1956 an article documented the official celebrations taking place in honour of the 11th anniversary of liberation. A festive concert was held in the national theatre. High state and party officials, foreign dignitaries and representatives from the broad society were present. The Czechoslovak and Soviet anthem were played and speeches were delivered (ČTK, 1956a, p.2). Further, a short article reported on the commemorative ceremony organized in Olšanský cemetery at the monument and graves of Red Army soldiers. Honourable guards were present, a funeral march and the Soviet and Czechoslovak anthems were played, and wreaths and flowers were laid on. The wreaths were laid by representatives of the Central Committee of KSČ and of the government and not Zápotocký himself. Afterwards the delegation also visited Vítkov Hill and wreath were laid down at the grave of the Unknown Soldier (Vzpomínáme padlých sovětských hrdinů, 1956, p.2). Czechoslovak soldiers or other victims, who perished in WW II were not mentioned. Part of the day’s agenda was also the awarding of state prizes to accomplished citizens in Prague castle (Udělení státních cen Klementa Gottwalda, 1956, p.2 & ČTK, 1956b, p.2) and across the country (Slavnostní udělení vyznamenání nejlepším pracovníkům, 1956, p.5).

On 9th May 1957 an article reported on the distinction of excellent workers and several collectives from Prague in honour of the 12th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation (Vyznamenání nejlepším, 1957, p.1). Another part of the national day's ceremonial agenda was a visit to the two memorial sites. A short article described matter-of-fact the pious ceremony at Olšanský cemetery. A honorary guard greeted the high state officials, military representatives, members of the National Assembly and National Front, who laid down wreaths and flowers at the monument of Red Army soldiers; so that they "uctili nesmrtelnou památku těch, kteří obětovali své životy při osvobození naší vlasti" (Pocta padlým sovětským hrdinům, 1957, pp.1,7). Zápotocký was not mentioned explicitly as present. As in the years before the funeral march of Russian revolutionaries was played. Other associations also honoured the graves by laying red wreaths on each grave. After the Czechoslovak and Soviet anthem the participants went "na vrch Vítkov, kde pokládají věnce k hrobu Neznámého bojovníka" (ibid.). Wreaths and flowers were also laid "k tanku na náměstí Sovětských tankistů na Smíchově" by representatives of the pioneers, factories, the KSČ and others. Additionally, across Prague at different plaques and other memorials flowers were laid and pioneers organized honorary guards there too (ibid.). Furthermore, a military parade was held in Prague and it was linked to the Závod vítězství in honour of the 12th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation (Dnes vojenská přehlídka na letenské pláni, 1957, p.7). In the national theatre there was once again a special performance with high political state officials in the audience (Slavnostní představení v předvečer 9.května, 1957, p.7.). An article also mentioned that a region was now entirely part of a collective farm in honour of the 12th anniversary of liberation (Celá obec v družstvu, 1957, p.7). Another short news article reported that Czechoslovakia's national day was also celebrated by compatriots in Leningrad, Warsaw and Budapest (Oslavy našeho státního svátku v zahraničí, 1957, p.8).

In sum the Red Army is presented as the heroic, selfless, sole liberator of Czechoslovakia, pictures of tanks symbolize this visually in the newspaper and the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers was included into the 9th May commemorative ceremony. It is though mainly only described as a site where public commemorative acts occur. The myth about the first tank is not mentioned. Americans are depicted as the enemy, who never actually wanted to liberate Czechoslovakia.

On 9th May 1948 the historical article titled *Den vítězství* (1948, p.2) accused the allied forces of falsifying history in regard to WW II. The SU was presented as the patriotic and heroic force that defeated fascism through the battle of Stalingrad and conquering Berlin – “skutečná svoboda a demokratvie byla [...] zachráněna především sovětským svazem”. The article’s wording was patriotic and proud – “pro nás a naše slovanské bratry” (ibid.).

On 9th October on the cover page of *Rudé Právo* was a picture of a Red Army soldier being greeted by a joyous crowd in Prague. The caption recollected the heroic liberation of Czechoslovakia three years ago and the anniversary was to spur people on to strengthen the friendship between Czechoslovakia and “naší největší záštitou, s naším osvoboditelem, s mohutným Sovětským svazem” (*Rudé Právo* – picture, 1948, p.1). Another very telling description of the Red Army was a photograph in the children’s section of the newspaper of a smiling Red Army soldier with the caption “Three years ago this young, Soviet tank driver liberated Prague. He is a hero, don’t you think children?” (*Rudé Právo*, 1948, p.5). On 8th May a picture of tank and its crew waving a Soviet flag was published on the first page (*Rudé Právo*, 1949, p.1). The photograph was taken on Wenceslas Square in Prague and the crowd is happily celebrating the Red Army soldiers for liberating the city from German occupation. Again images Soviet tanks are used as symbols of Czechoslovakia’s liberation.

Another historical article recapped the liberation of Czechoslovakia and was illustrated with a map showing Soviet troop-movements around Prague. The language was matter-of-fact while retelling the technical details of Czechoslovakia’s liberation. However, the tone and wording was accusatory and dismissive towards the Americans, but proud, heroic and self-evident towards the Red Army. The *Rudé Právo* journalist and later director of Czechoslovak Television Adolf Hradecký claimed namely, how American Army entered Czechoslovakia a day later than the Red Army, after bombarding the Škoda factory in Pilsen. Further, the advance of the American Army was particularly easy, often without combat, because German troops were surrendering to them en masse, according to Hradecký (1948, p.3). In contrast, the Soviet Army was involved in hard battles along its front. Hradecký also quoted an American presidential order regarding troop movements, to add credibility to his claim, and argued that the Americans could have liberated Prague, but did not do so. Besides, the Czechoslovak resistance fighters and people of the Prague Uprising did not get the weapons they were requesting from the British or Americans. Additionally, Hradecký (1948, p.3) argued

that the Czechoslovak RAF pilots were not permitted to join the battle around Prague, because the British army did not fight in Czechoslovakia, but the American army did. The Americans were also portrayed as opportunistically supporting the “zkrachovan[y...] buržoasn[í...] politik[y...]”, which tried to “strhnout na sebe moc a vpadnout lidu do zad” (Hradecký, 1948, p.3). This was again underpinned by a quote from an interview with President Truman in the New York Times about the exile government. Hradecký added another argument to further cloud the image of the American army – the people of Pilsen were also not given weapons though they wanted to go and aid Prague (1948, p.3). Hence, the Americans were scolded for staying at the agreed demarcation line and leaving Prague for the Soviets to liberate (Jalk & Junek, 2010). The next paragraph was quite tellingly titled “Pro Rudou armádu byla pomoc samozřejmostí” and contrasted the Soviets and Americans. Stalin gave allegedly immediately the order to aid Prague and the Red Army had to fight its way through fierce German resistance. While the situation in Prague was described as “desperate”, the tanks sent to liberate the city arrived in time. Hence, the Red Army was credited with saving Prague from destruction by the Nazis “za veselého oslavování míru americkými vojsky, vzdálenými 88km” (Hradecký, 1948, p.3). As a result Hradecký granted only the Red Army the sole honour of having liberated the Czechoslovaks. Furthermore, “historie ukazuje” that the communist party was the leading organizer of Czechoslovak resistance, heroically and mercilessly fighting Nazis, and uniting and calling upon the people to rise against the enemy.

This claim stands in contrast to reality, because Czechoslovak resistance occurred only on a small scale, was scattered and only in the later years of the war paramilitary action and sabotage was organized more frequently, according to Vella (2013, pp.52ff). The main work of the Czech resistance was gathering intelligence. The exception was of course the assassination of the Deputy-Reich-Protector Reinhard Heydrich. However, the mission was organized abroad. Only as the Germans were retreating popular uprisings broke out across the country (Vella, 2013, p.52). Moreover, the controversial Hitler-Stalin-Pact was also not mentioned in any account of WW II published in the examined time period (Vella, 2013, p.56).

Another historical article linked the struggle for national self-determination of 1848 to the struggle for freedom of 1945. Barricades were erected both times by “vzbouřeného lidu” and had a “rozhodující úlohu v povstání” (Barikády na pražských ulicích r.1848 a 1945, 1948, p.4).

In May 1949 the article *Vítězství a mír* (1949, p.1) recapped the end of WW II. It described the Red Army as “nepřemožitelnou”, “nadšeně vitanou pražským lidem” “poslední[...] úder[...], který ukončil [...]válku” and “největší a rozhodující vítězství výbojuvala armáda Sovětského svazu”. The British and American Armies allegedly were inspired and found new valour due to the heroic example of the Red Army. Additionally, the Red Army supposedly “tři léta držela [...] sama frontu proti Německu”. Also the war was, when the British and American forces landed in Western Europe, “jíž podstatatě rozhodnuta” by the Red Army and its many victories. The Soviet people are credited with “největší břemeno nesl lid sovětséjp svazu” and that “jiskra síly a odhodlání zvítězit [...] přeskočila ze Sovětského svazu na lid všech zemi Německem obsazených”. Further, the Red Army is “nepřemožitelná a že není síly, která by se jí mohla rovnat” (*Vítězství a mír*, 1949, p.1). The metaphor of a clear flame was used to illustrate the Soviet determination to defeat Nazi-German and bring peace to Europe. Moreover, the SU was depicted as the guarantor of future peace and freedom also after 1945; and as “ještě silnější a mohutnější” than before. Socialism was presented as superior to capitalism and most of all - as peaceful (*Vítězství a mír*, 1949, p.1). An entire page was dedicated to the commemoration of 9th May 1949 and again a picture of a tank in Prague liberating Prague on 9th May 1945.

Slavík (1949, p.3) blamed in his article the interwar governments for the Munich Agreement and their media outlets are soon terminated by the KSC. The article was illustrated with a picture of a smiling Red Army soldier being handed flowers by a grateful crowd. Moreover, he stated that the communist party was at the forefront of anti-German resistance “šestiletý, nepřetržitý boj komunistické strany, bojující v čele všeho lidu za osvobození”. Allegedly the KSC became more and more powerful through its partisan work and by “stemlov[ání...] širší a širší národní frontu”, “vedla zemi do rozhodného boje proti okupantům”. Slavík still mentioned other non-communist resistance fighters - “illegální[...] národní[...] výbory” with whom the communist resistance, supplied from the east, cooperated in its partisan work. The persecution of the KSC by the Nazis was presented as if the communist resistance was the gravest danger to German war effort – “hitlerovci viděli pro sebe hlavní nebezpečí v činnosti naší strany”. The communist victims were portrayed almost as martyrs dying for a greater cause – “za svobodu národa”. This was meant to invoke sympathy, gratefulness and awe in the reader for the deeds of the KSC. Furthermore, Slavík accused the non-communists of cooperating with the Nazis and argued “zrátc[e...]

doma a londýnská buržoasní emigrace stupňovala své intriky proti boji československého lidu za skutečnou svobodu”. Slavík used the metaphor of good vs. evil, while he described the adversaries of the KSČ as “reakce se však [...] nevzdala svých temných plánů”, “která chtěla vpadnout do zad lidu”. In order to make the text more engaging, vivid and to increase the identification of the reader with the story, Slavík switched in some passages from past tense into present tense. In relation to the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers it is interesting to note that the part of the city where it was erected was liberated by General Vlasov’s army. Slavík discredits Vlasov’s army by stating that they were “hitkerovksky[...] vrahy”. Like Hradecký (1948, p.3), Slavík accused the Western forces of purposefully not aiding Prague, although “jehož vojska stojí 80km od Prahy”. In contrast, Soviet tanks were on their way to liberate Prague all the way from Berlin and saving it from destruction (1949, p.3).

Another article (Janů, 1949, p.3) drew a negative image of the West and seemingly underpinned it with seemingly historical events and facts. The British and American governments and companies were accused of opportunistic cooperation and interdependence with Hitler’s Germany in the interwar period and afterwards. The governments of France, Britain and America were, according to Janů, led by incompetent, deranged politicians, who lost the support of their nations. Other Western-minded governments were equally discredited by Janů (1949, p.3). The later managing editor of the TV-news Kamil Winter (1949, p.3) followed this line of argumentation in his article. He claimed that the other allied forces contributed little the victory over Germany, that they destroyed the “legend o svém ‘podilu’ na vítězství nad fašismem” and that their nations did not believe them. The allied forces effort to end the war through negotiations was presented as weak and accommodating Hitler and his supporters, in contrast to the SU’s heroic fight (Winter, 1949, p.3). Winter also accused Britain and America of not mobilizing as many men as the SU did, of having the ‘easier’ battle at the Western front and that their air raids were ineffective. Furthermore, Winter argued that the Two-Front-War was a lie and that Hitler just wanted to destroy the SU. The SU is presented as the true victor and defeater of Germany, bringing truth and peace to other nations (1949, p.3).

In May 1950 an article commemorated the 5th anniversary of the end of WW II, but focused only on creating a negative image of the former Western allies. The article continued to praise the Red Army and the SU as the protector and liberator, who

“zachránily tak svou zem I všechny země světa před nepředstavitelnou hrůzou fašistického barbarství” (Odkaz 9.května zvítězí na celém světě, 1950, p.1). With pathos eternal gratefulness was expressed towards the SU. The former Western allies were presented as treacherous and accused of wanting to focus the war entirely on the SU – “Je známa historie nedoržených anglo-amerických slibů s otevřením druhé fronty v západní Evropě”, and of trying to erase the memory of the Red Army’s heroism. In May 1950 an extensive historical article (Petřina, 1950, p.2) recapped the end of WW II, praised the SU and described how the SU successfully recovered socially and economically. The SU was presented as an attractive ally, economically strong, peaceful, victorious and technologically advanced. Nationalisation was increasing the living standards of the working class and capitalism is inferior (ibid.).

In May 1951 the chief secretary of the KSČ Rudolf Slánský (1951, p.3) picked up on the previously mentioned arguments and argued that Czechoslovakia had been socially and economically improving since liberation. The SU was credited with the success and that socialism would not be possible without it in Czechoslovakia. Slánský also warned against external and internal enemies and underlines the need to fight for peace (ibid.).

In the issue of 9th May 1953 the chief of the general staff Václav Kratochvíl (1953, p.4) glorified in his article the Red Army. The article was illustrated with a picture of the military parade in Moscow. Kratochvíl calls 9th May the “na věčné časy nejpamátnější[...] den” in the Czechoslovak history and “největším a nejkrásnějším celonárodním svátkem”. The national day was an occasion to proclaim Czechoslovakia’s love, gratitude and loyalty to the SU. Kratochvíl (1953, p.4) described the battle against the German forces and how the victorious and “slávní tankisté [...] a vojska generalplukovníka Lejlušenka proníkla již 9. května ráno k Praze”. The journey from Berlin was done in only three days, despite the resistance of the Germans. The South of Prague was liberated by Colonel General A. K. Kravchenko, according to Kratochvíl, who does not mention Vlasov’s army. Further, the Red Army was praised as the ‘liberation army’ (ibid.).

In May 1954 another article by Kratochvíl (1954, p.4) is published in honour of the 9th anniversary of Czechoslovak liberation and it was illustrated again with a photograph of a military parade in Moscow. Building socialism was for him a new epoch and he used similar arguments as the year before. Kratochvíl did focus though more on the October Revolution and its influence on Czechoslovakia (ibid.). Moreover,

the 9th May was called in 1954 the biggest national holiday of Czechoslovakia (Největší svátek naší vlasti, 1954, pp.1,2). The Red Army soldiers were described as joyfully carrying flowers given to them by the people of Prague. The Red Army monuments standing from Dukla pass to Prague reminded Czechoslovaks that “náš národní život, naše republika, naše svoboda a statní svrchovanost, to vše je nerozlučně spjato se Sovětským svazem”. The narrator used phrases like “přišli k nám naši osvoboditelé”, “s námi v tábore míru” and “naší draze vykoupené svobody”. The sacrifices made by the communist party during the occupation are emphasized and the SU is glorified (ibid.). Furthermore, T. Svatopluk (Turek, 1954, p.3) recollected the unemployment and insecurity of the 1920s and pointed out the advantages of the new communist system.

In May 1956 the article *S pohledem dopředu* (1956, p.1) used phrases like “našeho lidu” and “každém z nás” while commemorating the 11th anniversary of Czechoslovakia’s liberation and evaluating the achievements made since then. Socialism and the KSCĚ have brought peace, prosperity and security to Czechoslovakia. However, the efforts to improve the social and economic situation must not cease, because the enemies of the people are just waiting “aby vpadli lidu do zad” should the revolutionary efforts abate, according to the article (ibid.). Polejov (1956, p.2) described from the perspective of a visitor the May celebrations taking place in Prague as the lavish, huge and joyful. He commemorated that eleven years ago there were tanks in Prague and now the damages have been well repaired.

On 9th May 1957 a historical article recapped the events of May 1945 and how it influenced the development of Czechoslovakia until now (Vítězí život!, 1957, p.1). The defeat of fascism by the Red Army was glorified and a possible return of former fascists through European integration, America or NATO was warned against in the article. The tanks employed in the liberation of Prague were depicted as vessels of peace and prosperity (ibid.). The same arguments were used in the article written by the member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the KSCĚ Rudolf Barák (1957, p.2). He also underlined the importance of national unity for the progress and development of Czechoslovakia, because elections to the national committees were soon to be held. Further, February 1948 was described as a moment where “náš lid [vystoupil] pod vedením Komunistické strany Československa jednotně na obranu lidově demokratického řadu”. The anti-communist “reakce” was presented as threat to national unity and freedom. Another historical, but emotional account narrated by František Kubka (1957, p.2) described how live changed for the better for a family after socialism

was introduced. Another historical article recapped chronologically the most important events since 1945. It emphasized the positive economic developments from nationalization to increasing living standards. The article also called upon the people to get involved in order to achieve socialism, peace and prosperity (Dvanáct let..., 1957, p.3). Koněv's article also repeated, like in the articles before, the Marxist-Leninist interpretation on May 1945. Once more the tanks were mentioned as machines evoking awe and demonstrating force. The West was also discredited, accused of aggressiveness towards the SU and still depicted as a threat. He also underlined the importance of national unity of "jednoty zemí socialistického tábora" (1957, p.3). Moreover, another article described how regions were affected by WW II: how Germans left landmines behind, inhabitants left to build a better life elsewhere abroad, but also how the communists rebuild the village, modernized it and how people returned because of that from abroad. Now the people honour the Red Army soldiers, who perished in this region to liberate it and to introduce this "šťatsný dnešek" (Stano, 1957, p.7).

On 9th October 1948 a short collection of personal accounts was published written by common people from a first-person-perspective and recollected emotionally their first-hand experience of Prague's liberation in May 1945. The Red Army was depicted as heroically fighting the Germans and selflessly helping Czechoslovaks (Vzpomínáme na 9.květen, 1948, p.2). Another personal account of May 1945 was written by *Rudé Právo* journalist Josef Rybák (1948, p.4). Rybák remembered the liberation of Prague by the "slavn[a...] Rud[á...] armád[a...]" and linked it to February 1948: "Byla zhnána strašidla" and "byly odstraněny překážky", which were blocking the introduction of socialism, peace and people's democracy – the ghosts being the German occupiers and post-war non-communist political parties. Rybák also argued that a "nový člověk" was developing – great selflessness, a new relationship with work, valuing arts, active love of the free homeland, those were the sign of this new emerging culture. This new culture built upon great Czech thinkers such as Jan Hus and Jan Amos Komensky (1948, p.4). Another personal account underpinned the myth about the first tank to arrive and to liberate Prague (Kubernatová, 1948, p.3). Illustrated with a picture of a tank with soldiers the article was written from the first-person-perspective narrating the experience of a young woman and the memories of Czechoslovak Major Kolanda of 9th May in Prague. The details of the story were supposed to give it more credibility and truth: the precise time of the meeting with the first Russian soldiers at 4am on the 9th

May, that the battalion belonged to General Lejushenko, the detailed description of the uniforms of the Russian soldiers. The people on the Prague barricades themselves were described as speechless, touched, relieved, happy, helpful, welcoming towards the Red Army soldiers and calling each other comrade (ibid.). The Red Army soldiers were described as friendly, keen to fight, brave, simple fellow workers, easy to talk to and fraternizing with the Czechoslovaks. The relation of Czechoslovaks and the SU was also symbolically depicted in one of the described scenes: A Czechoslovak wanted to climb a Russian tank in order to get a ride to the next barricade and a Russian soldiers helped him up onto the tank “usmál se na mne tak nějak nezapomenutelně a pomáhal mi s převakou staršího bratra nahoru” (ibid.).

Further, a quite graphic personal account written by T. Svatopluk (Turek, 1949, p.3) described the liberation of Prague with great pathos and emotion, speaking often about ‘us’ and ‘we’ to suggest unity among the people, who all share the same memory of these events. The atmosphere created was that of fear, due to the fierce battle with the Germans, and hope, due to rumours that help was on its way. The American Army was mentioned shortly, as having reached Pilsen, and in connection with rumours that Americans and allied airplanes have reached Prague already. However, the allied forces were accused of not coming to aid Prague, because “nelíbila se jim Praha příliš revoluční, váhali a stokrát raději by se byli dohodli nějak s Němci, ne s nějakými revolucionáři komunisty”. In contrast, the Red Army was reaching Prague “se všech stran” in tanks, being described as almost the product of legends – “ti, jichž slávu odbíjeli kremelské zvony a salvy děl”. Turek, described scenes where, people greeted and embraced the liberators frantically, thanking them for coming. The Tanks themselves were described as “obrovité”, not seen before and as “balvany železa, oceli”. “To nám oni [the Red Army soldiers] na svatých svých zbraních svobody přinesli” and gave their lives for Prague. For this the Red Army deserved eternal gratitude (Turek, 1949, p.3).

Another extensive supposedly personal account written from a first-person-perspective, read like an adventure story and documented the experience of a Red Army soldier participating in the liberation of Prague with his tank crew (Lazarov, 1949, p.4). The heroisms, sacrifice and simple workers background of the tank drivers and the helpfulness and gratitude of the Czechoslovak were underlined. The tank mentioned was made in a factory in the Ural Mountains, which were also referred to in the children

story “tank číslo 23” mentioned above. The article was meant to confirm the myth of the first tank and make it seem more real to the reader (ibid.).

The personal account by the Russian writer and journalist Boris Polejov (1950, p.2) was told from the first-person-perspective and recalled the liberation of Prague. Phrases like “naš lid”, “jsme viděli” and the scenes described suggest national unity with complete trust in the communist party. The described scenes were meant to underpin, that Czechoslovakia and SU should cooperate closely, that the coup d’état in February 1948 was in fact wanted and supported by the nation and that the post-war non-communist government tried to destroy the link between SU and Czechoslovakia. The personal account of the writer and journalist Karel Nový (1950, p.3) also described the liberation of Prague. Nový accused the Anglo-American forces of letting the Czechoslovaks down, who were expecting military support. The Germans fled “na idyllicky tichy americký západ [...] do jejich bezpečné náruče” and Red Army was credited with preventing the air raid on Prague. The first tank was also mentioned – “viděli jsem ten první slavný tank na Václavském náměstí” and the Red Army soldiers were greeted as heroes by the public. The tank drivers were described as common people, through hardened in battle still empathetic - “a staří i mladí tankisté, prošli ohněm sta bitev, zhnědlí počasím a požary, nestyděli se stírat slzy dojetí” (ibid.).

On 9th May 1953 three personal accounts Czechoslovak soldiers were published under the title *Vojáci naší armády střeží odkaz května* (p.4). They had patriotic undertones, loyally supporting the communist regime. The first one mainly praised communist soldiers as being role models to others and depicted the army as a guarantee of peace (Jirák, 1953, p.4). Šedivý described his experience of May 1945, anxiously waiting for the Soviet tanks to arrive in Tabor. He lauded the political education provided to soldiers and the exemplary heroism of Red Army soldiers. What was interesting here was that he clearly stated his dislike towards state enemies – “nenávidím imperialisty, válečné štváče a vrahy” (1953, p.4). What is usually underpinned with (often false) historic facts – that the West is the enemy, is now emotionally declared, as part of someone’s identity. Additionally, the soldier proclaimed how much he likes “naší vlast”, “všechny, kdož chtějí mír” and saluted other workers for their efforts. In another article Karásek explained with pathos the honourable legacy of 9th May (building peace and socialism) and how it led to a happier, better life for all (1953, p.4).

The Soviet perspective was presented by mechanic Victor Najdis, who participated as a Red Army soldier in the liberation of Prague. He promoted Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship, building socialism together and how successful planned economy was (1953, p.5). The Soviet artist Michail Ciaureli (1953, p.5) wrote in the tone of an older experienced brother while commenting on Czechoslovakia's development since May 1945. The KSCĚ was presented as the main driver of Czechoslovak resistance. The German troops were demonized as “po zuby vyzbrojený[...] německofašistický[...] hordy” (ibid.). The Soviet tank crews were portrayed as heroes “překonávající odpor hitlerovských armádních skupin, podnikly v dějinách bezpříkladný pochod, aby přišly včas”. The Soviet musician Anatolij Novikov (1953, p.5) argued that Soviet and Czechoslovak cultures were close and both were now in the service of building socialism. Culture was bringing the two brotherly nations closer together. The Belorussian K. Dlužoščevskij applauded the progress made by Czechoslovakia in building socialism and described how Minsk was rebuilt after it was destroyed by the Nazis. The reconstruction was presented as something that strengthened peace (Dlužoščevskij, 1953, p.5). These personal accounts were completed by four stories and experiences of common Czechoslovak: Palouš (1953, p.5), Bohinc (1953, p.5), Piš (1953, p.5) and Roleček (1953, p.5) lauded the Red Army's heroic liberation of Prague and all praised the SU's achievements as progressive, modern, efficient and as examples that should be studied closely. Mining techniques were more effective, the art and theatre is a “kultura světlá, zdravá, kultura vysokého uměleckého mistrovství, přitom všemu lidu blízka, srozumitelná” and the agriculture were more productive. Also Czechoslovak schools need to learn how to improve in order to “lépe vychovávat nového socialistického člověka” (ibid.). These accounts present identities that are grounded in a deep loyalty and gratitude towards the SU, and commitment to socialism and progress. They depicted the ideal ‘new socialist man’, who the reader was encouraged to identify with.

Another personal account recalled the simple village life, the heroism of Red Army soldiers, the Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship and keeping the memory of May 1945 alive (Marek, 1953, p.5). Two other personal accounts of positive experiences of Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship and how both nations could learn from each other, inspire each other and cooperate, were written by the collective farm worker Malinova (1953, p.5) and writer Hončar (1953, p.5). These personal accounts also presented ideal

identities, which were based in friendship towards the SU and love for the socialist system.

In May 1954 the personal accounts of the ironworker L. Kotala (1954, p.5) and ironworker K. Trunecka (1954, p.5) went into a similar direction. Both praised the modernity of the SU, both were happily learning from it, admired the SU and recollected the Red Army's victory over fascism. Another one focused on how good the Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship was among people since 1954 (Provazník, 1954, p.5), how efficient planned economy is and how ready people were to cooperate and help each other in order to increase or improve production (Sojka, 1954, p.5) like in the SU. The builder F. Mráz also compared the working conditions of the interwar period with the circumstances after 1945. He applauded the changes and improvements introduced by the communist government (1954, p.3). On 9th May the main heading of a page reads "Po boku soviětské armády na stráži nezávislosti naší vlasti" and three personal accounts of Czechoslovak soldiers were published underneath. They were not directly linked to the national day, but do touch upon the concept of the enemy, who is allegedly threatening Czechoslovakia. It created the image that the border does need protection and that Czechoslovakia was in danger (Paul, 1954, p.4). However, thanks to the KSČ tank divisions (Codr, 1954, p.4) and fighter pilots were prepared (Šedivý 1954, p.4). These accounts were meant to proof that all strata of society supported socialism.

On 9th May 1955 the author Jan Drda recollected how he had experienced the liberation of Czechoslovakia and how happy he was to see the first Red Army soldiers. A drawing of Red Army soldiers on tanks and happy civilians illustrated this claim. The former were allegedly the only one's able to defeat the Nazis. The Red Army was anxiously expected by the people and was the "jediná neotřesitelná jistota", strong and certain to win "proti jeho temné brutalitě [of fascism...] nesrovnatelnou mravní převahou". The Red Army was presented as the heroic, selfless, brotherly saviour of Prague and Czechoslovakia. After liberation the nation wanted to strive to become more like the Soviet people, who had rescued them, according to Drda (1955, p.5). Along the same lines ran the account of Jan Mareš, who described with pathos the liberation from the perspective of a young man who participated in the fighting (1955, p.5). The article was illustrated with a photograph of a children playing with two Red Army soldiers. Glazarova (1955, p.5) recollected in her personal account of May 1945 the battles on the barricades, the happy liberation, the repairing the damages in Prague and how socialism was victorious also in other countries over the past ten years.

On 9th May 1956 a narrative told from the first-person-perspective by a young mother recollected how her family experienced the liberation of Czechoslovakia. The battles were described as fierce, with tanks rolling outside on the street engaging heroically the Nazis in combat (Řezáč, 1956, p.4). Another personal account of May 1945 described the joy and friendship between a young Red Army soldier and the Czechoslovaks, who admired him and thanked him for liberating them (Trojanová, 1956, p.4). Moreover, Kopecký (1956, p.4) wrote from a first person perspective and described on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of liberation, how the enemies of the people were behind the borders and fuelled the critics within Czechoslovakia. Kopecký argued that the critics of planned economy have little bases for their complaints and praised nationalisation as the motor of modernization and progress. Examples of how popular Czechoslovak products were across the world were used as proof for the overall success of Czechoslovak economy. Czechoslovakia benefited from this good reputation, according to Kopecký (1956, p.4).

The former Red Army soldier Levčenko (1956, p.5) applauded the Czechoslovak-Soviet friendship that had thrived since May 1945. With phrases like “celý náš socialistický tábor” and “náš společný úkol” he suggested national unity and consensus. From the first-person-perspective he narrated his experience as a Red Army soldier and how accomplished the heroic, fearless and selfless the Soviet army was, so that “historie válek neznala takového hrdinství a odvahy”. People supported him and his unit, joined the tanks and soldiers in battle and the liberated towns and villages were today “plná spokojených lidí“.

On 9th May 1957 an article urged the reader to remember May 1945 and the heroic Red Army soldiers, but to prevent war in future (Ve jménu života, 1957, p.3). The article was illustrated with a photo of marching Soviet soldiers. Another article by J.A. Goržibovskij, a former Red Army soldier, recollected how he and his unit reached Czechoslovakia and fought for its freedom in 1945. He urged people to remember the glorious days on the occasion of the 12th anniversary of liberalization. The article was illustrated with a photo of a Soviet tank being greeted by a happy crowd and a picture of dancing and music playing Red Army soldiers in a crowd of civilians (1957, p.3). Further, another article repeated the previously used points and argument regarding liberation, the Red Army and the SU (Sluka, 1957, p.3).

5.3. Depiction of the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers in Presidential speeches on national day 9th May

Only some of the presidential and prime ministerial speeches, delivered on the occasion of the day of liberalization, were published in *Rudé Právo*. The speeches found and included into the discourse are analysed with the suitable micro- and macro-analytical tools in order to examine how and if the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers, the Red Army and the liberation of Czechoslovakia were presented in *Rudé Právo* in the period 1948-1957. The context in which the speeches were delivered and the dimension of these ceremonies is also presented. It documents possible changes of the circumstances under which the speeches were delivered, the speakers themselves and the extent of the ceremonies.

In May 1948 a speech was delivered by President Gottwald on the occasion of the 3rd anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation and the adoption of a new constitution. The short speech was printed on 11th May (Národ si dal novou ústavu, 1948, p.1). Gottwald focused on the positive effect the constitution would have on building socialism. He argued that the new constitution was endangered from the beginning by "temné síly domácí a cizí reakce" and "nepřátelá lidu", who wanted to prevent the socialist revolution. The new constitution was strengthened by February 1948, because "jasnou a nedvojsmyslnou řečí promluvil náš lid". Further, "slavná sovětská armáda [...] osvobodila Prahu" and made the new constitution possible. Hence, Czechoslovakia is united and loyal to the SU (ibid.).

On 8th May the speeches *Projev generálního tajemníka KSČ posl. Rudolfa Slánského v parlamentě v rozpravě o ústavě* (1949, p.3), *Projev gen. zpravodaje ústředního výboru ÚNS poslance univ. prof. dr. Vladimira Procházky* (1948, p.4) and a speech by Antonín Novotný, on the occasion of the 5th conference of the Prague region (Hrdá balance práce komunistů Pražského kraje, 1949, p.7), were published. However, they are excluded from the discourse, because they are not presidential or Prime ministerial speeches.

On 8th May 1950 a speech by President Gottwald, delivered on the occasion of the 5th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation on Wenceslas Square in Prague, was published in full in *Rudé Právo* (Projev presidenta republiky Klementa Gottwalda, 1950, p.1). 9th May is titled the "náš největší národní svátek" and an occasion to express

the eternal gratitude towards the SU. The Red Army is praised as wise, famous, decisive, brotherly, invincible and brave. Gottwald claimed that without the SU Czechoslovakia would be still not free and independent. The SU was glorified as respecting “svobodné vůle národů”, protecting the country from “zdrádcí a kapitalistickými pijavicemi lidu” and strong in its peace efforts. Czechoslovakia could learn from the SU’s experiences in building socialism and running a planned economy. The West was portrayed as the enemy – imperialistic, capitalists, exploitative, warmongering. Its economic system was described as inferior compared to the communist economic system with Five-Year-Plans and nationalisation. To stand loyally with the SU was key for Czechoslovakia’s future, according to Gottwald.

On 6th May 1951 only a speech by Prime Minister Zápotocký was printed (Projev předsedy vlády Antonína Zápotockého, 1951, p.3). Zápotocký used the phrases like “our nation” and “we and our children” in order to speak as one of the people and to represent unity between party and the nation. In the speech Zápotocký also highlights the strong gratitude felt for the liberation by the Red Army – the “rozhodným[...] a definitivním[...] vítěz[em]”. The SU is further praised for its strength, friendship, will to sacrifice their troops for the Czechoslovaks and its “strategická prozíravost našeho osvoboditele” that prevented the destruction of Prague. He also emphasised the relationship between Czechoslovakia and the SU – “učíme se a budeme se ještě usilovněji učit od sovětské vědy, kultury, techniky i od praktických příkladů sovětských stachanovců, jak ovládat techniku, zdvíhat produktivitu práce” (ibid.). This links to the personal accounts discussed above, which also described an ideal identity based on loyalty towards the SU, socialism and dedicated, hard work.

On 9th May 1952 only Prime Minister Zápotocký’s speech was published (Projev předsedy vlády A. Zápotockého, 1952, p.2). In this speech Zápotocký recalled the liberation by the heroic Red Army and stated the first tanks inspired hope, joy, love and gratefulness in the people. The interwar period is portrayed as a harsh time, which the nation had to overcome in order to build now a brighter future. He also dwelled on the unity of the people, the indebtedness to the SU and the progress made since 1945. Additionally, the friendship between other Slavic nations was invoked and that old rivalries have been settled, so that the Slavic countries stand now united with the SU against the enemies - America and the West. Both are in general presented negatively: as imperialistic, exploitative, anti-democratic, warmongering and wanting to damage

Czechoslovakia. Zápotocký spoke in first-person-plural to include the audience more into his argumentation.

On 9th May 1953 an article written by President Zápotocký was published on the first page and the speech by Prime Minister Viliam Široký was also included in that issue of *Rudé Právo*. Zápotocký wrote that the working class fought for the rights of the people, because it was inspired and encouraged by the Soviets. The SU was presented as the perfect role model, superior in every way. According to Zápotocký “sovětský svaz zůstal důsledně věren slibu, který dal již v roce 1941 soudruh Stalin, že Sovětský svaz nebude po osvobození vnucovat svoji vůli ani svůj režim osvobozeným zemím”. This sentence was supposed to underpin the claim that the Czechoslovaks chose the communist system themselves voluntarily. Further, the socialist revolution had not already occurred in 1918, because the working class had not been yet fully organized and because the other political parties and actors had prevented it. Nationalisation of the economy was praised as a great success and stepping stone towards socialism. Zápotocký also pointed out the economic achievements of the last eight years and how much better the situation was now than in the interwar period (Osm let budování republiky, 1953, p.1). Široký he used the phrases like “naší republiky” and “naší vlasti”. The first-person-plural made it seem as if he spoke not to the nation, but for the nation. He only mentioned the Red Army as the liberator of Czechoslovakia from Nazi-occupation, brave, brotherly, heroic, selfless, and as bringing peace and freedom to the Czechoslovaks. No other actors were mentioned. Široký also called the 9th May “velký státní svátek” and said only positive things about Soviet policies, its reliability and its peace efforts. About state enemies Široký stated “aby naše vlast byla co nejrychleji očištěna od nepřatel a aby osvobozování území naší republiky bylo uskutečněno s nejmenšími škodami” (Projev předsedy vlády Viliama Širokého, 1953, p.2).

On 10th May 1954 President Zápotocký’s speech was published completely in *Rudé Právo*. Zápotocký used again phrases like “naší lidové demokratické republice” to suggest unity and consensus. He praised the military parade as a demonstration of solidarity, peace and loyalty to socialism and the SU. The heroic Red Army was glorified for its victory over Nazi-Germany. The SU was a great role model and example for Czechoslovakia, according to Zápotocký and he underlined the need for national and political unity, exemplary building of socialism and strengthening national security, peace and independence. The KSČ was the natural leader of the Czechoslovaks and of “mírového tábora” in Zápotocký mind. Further, the party removed all remnants

of the capitalist bourgeois past and was not responsible for the Cold War and did not engage in any provocative or aggressive policies towards the West (Projev presidenta republiky soudruha Antonína Zápotockého, 1954, p.1).

On 9th May 1955 on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of Czechoslovakia's liberation Prime Minister Široký delivered a very extensive speech published in *Rudé Právo* (Projev předsedy vlády soudruha Viliama Širokého, 1955, pp.2,4). Again patriotic phrases in first-person-plural like “náš lid” and “naše armáda” were used. In the speech Široký credited the Red Army with bringing peace to many European and Asian countries, but also it did “zachránila světovou civilizaci, celé lidstvo od fašistické tyranie a barbarství”. The Red Army fought a “bezpříkladný hrinný boj” selflessly fighting also for other nations and although the “zapadní mocnosti sabotovaly s průhledným záměrem zřízení druhý fronty”. The KSČ was presented as the central force of democracy and was lauded for rebuilding and modernizing the military and the economy and for having loyal socialist allies as neighbouring countries. Czechoslovakia tried to have good relations with any ‘anti-Western’ country, according to Široký, and developments in other communist countries are keenly observed. “Všechnen náš lid s největší pozorností sledoval průběh nedávné conference asijských a afrických zemi v Bandungu a upřímně se těšil ze všech jejích pozitivních výsledků”, for instance (ibid.).

In May 1956 only the speech of the Minister of defence, delivered on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of liberation, was published on 10th May (Projev ministra národní obrany soudruha B. Lomského, 1956, p.1). Also in May 1957 only the speech of the Minister of defence, given in honour of the 12th anniversary of liberation, was published (Projev ministra národní obrany generálplukovníka Bohumíra Lomského, 1957, p.1). Both speeches cannot be part of the discourse, because they are not a presidential or prime ministerial speech.

Conclusion

This thesis endeavoured to answer the question how certain historic events, symbolized by certain monuments, were presented and re-interpreted by the KSČ in *Rudé Právo* and Presidential speeches in the time period 1948-1957 in order to facilitate a more socialist identity. The study showed how historic events were presented in the public discourses and what tools were used to foster the acceptance of the communist

interpretation of the past. The motivation behind it was not only to facilitate a socialist collective identity, but also to generate legitimacy and credibility for the communist regime.

By adapting the meaning of certain monuments, historical events and figures and altering and replacing rites through new invented traditions, the KSČ tried to gradually alter the collective memory of the people. New national days were set up celebrating communist achievements such as 9th May, and others were adapted to fit communist propaganda, but were later pushed into oblivion like 28th October and 6th July. Additionally, through new traditions and rituals the examined monuments could have become *lieux de mémoire* with a deliberately communist meaning, but the dimension and elaboration of the ceremonies varied in the examined time period quite considerably. Which is why, it is questionable if the intended communist meaning was successfully disseminated.

In the case of Bethlehem Chapel and Jan Hus, the ceremonies took place at Tabor, Husinec, Trocnov or Prague's Old Town Square, because the chapel itself was not reconstructed until 1954. These towns were historically connected to the Hussite movement and were to some extent already *lieux de mémoire* for the Czechoslovaks, because the Hussite legacy had already been a prominent topic during the interwar period and before. The communists made use of these places, but also picked up the previous endeavour to rebuild the chapel. Prior to the Bethlehem Chapel's reconstruction, a myth was partially fostered about the chapel in articles relating to Hus. The chapel was mentioned often only shortly as the place, which influenced Hus the most and shaped his work and thinking; the tribune, where Hus preached and encountered the plight of the working class; though the chapel was usually not overly glorified.

The reconstructed chapel was initially intended to invite and foster pro-communist traditions, national unity and symbolize the overcoming of historic enemies. Such pro-communist traditions might have been potentially adopted by Czechoslovak society over time, as ways to reaffirm national self-understanding. Additionally, in the long-run, regular rituals and traditions might have facilitated the chapel becoming a *lieux de mémoire*, symbolizing the communist interpretation of history. However, the chapel's usage was too short for new traditions or rituals to infuse it with national meaning or for people to develop or adopt new specifically communist traditions or rituals in connection to the chapel. Gradually the chapel fell into oblivion, because it

was not employed as intensively as previously intended. It was later on shunned as a communist propaganda symbol and an attempt to create solid prove for the communist interpretation of the past.

In the speeches, Bethlehem Chapel was only mentioned in connection to its opening and the ceremony in honour of the 540th anniversary of Hus' death, as the place of Hus' preaching. The speeches and *Rudé Právo* focused more on Hus and the Hussite movement presenting both in a similar fashion. Following tools were used in the articles to describe Hus and the Hussites: rhetorical questions, patriotic wording, military phrases, narration in first-person-plural, comparisons, exaggerations, exclusion and metaphors, for instance. Their purpose was to engage the reader, to make him identify with and believe the presented narrative: that the entire nation commemorated Hus in a specific way, that Hus was the first socialist revolutionary, and that the KSČ was the heir to Hus' legacy and the Hussite movement being a part of the current Czechoslovak self-understanding.

Hus and the Hussite movement were presented as the predecessors of the communist party and both were portrayed very positively - peaceful, determined, strong, bravely fighting a stronger enemy, unyielding, attentive to the working class' plight, leading the nation, fighting for good. Representing the poor and disenfranchised, being examples to the people of today. There was also no discussion about Hussitism or Hus and nothing negative was mentioned in connection to both. Only one vision was presented of Hus, and any other interpretations were discredited as false. Additionally, Hus and the Hussites were frequently linked to Soviet peace efforts and images were invoked of external and internal threats from anti-communists and the imperialist West that menaced the peaceful Czechoslovakia and SU; just like the crusaders threatened the peaceful Hussites. State enemies served, as the significant other to identify against, as in the other case studies.

As far as traditions go, the described rituals were meant to involve the whole nation, to represent national unity and to link Hussitism and the present: Military parades, mass manifestations, cultural performances, singing of Hussite songs, pilgrimages to places of the Hussite movement and so on: The reports about the ceremonies often focused often on the opening speeches of communist politicians, which described Hus in their speech acts as a socialist revolutionary.

The speeches only added to the depiction of Hus that he, as a socialist revolutionary, facilitated a nationwide uprising against the oppressive authorities and

that he was a fighter, a natural leader, standing by the side of the working class. Hus' ideals were presented as the ideals of communism, which were promoted for the establishment of a new socialist society. The Hussite struggle was presented as a role model for the communist Czechoslovak society and the most significant time period in Czechoslovak history. Stylistically, the speeches employed first-person-plural extensively to symbolically depict the unity between the people and the party and to incite identification with the said by the audience. Military type metaphors illustrated the continuous struggle of communist cause. Repeatedly the KSČ and the SU were presented and glorified as the only guarantors of peace, prosperity and progress.

In regard to the second case study, the significance of 28th October was not only put on Czechoslovakia's independence, but also on nationalisation and the October Revolution. Over time Czechoslovak independence was pushed into the background and nationalisation became the predominant signifier from 1950 onwards, but was celebrated on a smaller scale than the day of independence before. From 1953 onwards, a greater emphasis was put on honouring and commemorating the October Revolution. The national day was reshaped from an initially large public celebration and commemoration of independence to nationwide celebrations focusing on achieving economic targets, rewarding "úderníky" and holding military parades, to just another day celebrating the October Revolution.

The Monument of National Liberation was mentioned in the examined articles and speeches but only as the place, where deceased political prisoners from WW II were given their last honour during a ceremony. Hence, no descriptions of other rituals or traditions performed were found. The monument was mentioned more often in connection to the third case study, as a place of commemorating Red Army soldiers and Gottwald.

In the articles the legionnaires' role in Czechoslovakia's independence was often played down and overshadowed by the Red Army – the alleged sole liberator. The working class was depicted as the true force behind Czechoslovak independence and the interwar governments was defamed and discredited. The accusations ranged from causing unemployment, suppressing the working class, preventing socialist revolution to causing the Munich Agreement and Nazi-occupation. The public was incited to break with the memory of the First Republic and to embrace the present, more glorious communist vision. Connected to that, the SU and Red Army were always depicted very

positively as the loyal, constant and peaceful protector and liberator of Czechoslovakia. The Red Army was the heroic, brave invincible actor that brought prosperity to Czechoslovakia through socialism. Communist economic policy like nationalisation was also praised as bringing about higher living standards, prosperity, modernity, progress and being one of the pillars of socialism. The working class was described as greatly benefitting and doubtlessly supporting nationalisation. Exclusion, black-and-white depiction of issues, metaphors, comparisons and exaggeration were common tools.

In regard to the speeches examined legionnaires and the Monument of National Liberation were not mentioned. It is likely though that the Monument of National Liberation was mentioned in other speeches delivered on different occasions not examined here. The interwar governments were mentioned positively only once. Mostly they were blamed for the Munich Agreement and accused of exploiting the working class. The interwar governments were also portrayed as external and internal enemies threatening Czechoslovakia. The tools used were narration in first-person-plural, military phrases, exclusion, topical refocus and a biased depiction of issues. For instance, although 28th October commemorated Czechoslovakia's independence gained in 1918, the liberation by the Red Army and the October Revolution's impact were emphasized and mentioned more often in the speeches. Nationalisation, other economic policies and honouring workers were discussed more frequently. The public profile of the ceremonies and the chosen speaker's rank also decreased with the changed interpretation of this national day. The October Revolution gained greater prominence in communist propaganda around 1953 and overshadowed the day entirely.

In regard to the third case study, the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers was mentioned a few times and with it the myth about the first tank. Though, quite frequently pictures of Soviet tanks being welcomed by a joyous crowd in Prague were published. They served as proof for the given interpretation of Czechoslovakia's liberation. Moreover, the tanks were depicted as symbols of hope which inspired joy, love and gratefulness in the Czechoslovaks. The Soviet tank drivers themselves were glorified as brave heroes, selflessly aiding the Czechoslovaks and liberating Prague. Several personal accounts told from the first-person-singular perspective were meant to influence the collective memory of the events of May 1945. By having common people tell their story, the stories gained a certain credibility, because they are presented as

genuine and people were incited to identify with the narrators. However, often the propagandistic overtones were quite noticeable. These publicised memories were supposed to become part of the general collective memory of Prague's liberation and provide details about 'how it all happened'. Additionally, an image was created that everyone was out on the barricades, saw the first tank arrive and fought the German soldiers. This gave the myth of the glorified first tank genuineness and authenticity, because these personal accounts seem to depict untainted, not tampered with, first-hand experiences.

The image of the Red Army created in *Rudé Právo* was extremely positive and most detail was provided by personal accounts. They encouraged the public to adopt and preserve a positive attitude towards the values the Red Army represented. Red Army soldiers were depicted friendly, good hearted, helpful, brotherly, brave, heroic, selfless, honourable, determined, ready to give their life for the cause and invincible. They were named the liberators, protectors, role models and guarantors of peace. Most of all, they were credited with defeating fascism. The efforts of the other allied forces were downplayed and belittled. The attitude of Czechoslovaks towards Red Army soldiers was described as friendly, welcoming, loving, helpful, grateful, brotherly and loyal. The liberation of Prague was usually presented as a tough battle, but not too difficult for the Soviet tank drivers and soldiers, who quickly defeated the German troops. Neither were negative traits of Red Army soldiers mentioned, nor was the issue of the horrors of war broached. Negatives sides of war were occasionally touched upon only in connection to Nazi war crimes. Further, the commemoration of Red Army soldiers at their memorials was described as if the entire nation mourned those who gave their lives for Czechoslovakia's freedom, flowers and wreaths were laid, honour guards organized and funeral marches played. High ranking state officials gave the commemorative occasions a high profile.

Other non-communist resistance fighters and other actors were barely mentioned, because the KSČ claimed the bulk of the credit. The interwar governments were persistently discredited and blamed for the Munich Agreement as in the case studies before. With this the KSČ tried to taint the memory of the First Republic. It was supposed to be remembered not as the true 'first' republic, but as a continuation of external exploitation and suppression like under the Habsburg Empire and another obstacle the nation had to overcome before it could fulfil the Hussite legacy. This plays into the first case study.

The collective identity of Czechoslovaks was also supposed to be shaped by the ‘us’ versus ‘them’ thinking the communist propaganda persistently repeated. Like in the other case studies the SU was the positively connoted, peaceful, good partner with which the people were supposed to identify, and the West was the enemy against who the people were urged to identify. The West was presented as treacherous, deceiving, warmongering, dangerous, exploitative, undemocratic, anti-communist and treating its working class poorly.

Additionally, at the Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers certain rituals and traditions were performed, as it was designated as a place of memory, though an artificial one. Flowers and wreaths were laid down, a guard of honour stood by the monument, pioneers, military representatives, politicians, foreign dignitaries and the general public visited the monument. However, the monument took a minor position in the coverage of *Rudé Právo*. Other monuments like the one dedicated to fallen Red Army soldiers in Olšanský cemetery or the tomb of the Unknown Soldier on Vítkov hill in the Monument of National Liberation were mentioned more frequently. The latter was also a site where honorary guards stood, anthems were played, wreaths laid and high functionaries would pay tribute to the fallen soldiers. The Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers was persistently described as the symbol of Prague’s liberation and the myth about the first tank was continuously repeated, particularly in personal accounts. The historical articles gave more credibility to the claims of the KSČ. The monument was meant to symbolize the communist interpretation of history, but looking at the above mentioned controversy surrounding the tank’s type and the location of the monument this monument stayed an artificial site of memory, as the Russian liberators never left, but demanded continuous adoration and loyalty.

The speeches used similar arguments as the articles in regard to state enemies, the SU and the Red Army. First-person-plural was used to suggest a common understanding and consensus, the KSČ being the true representative of the nation’s will. The speakers did of course represent the nation through their office, but speaking ‘on behalf of the nation’ was taken to a new presumptuous level, because no discussion, doubt or critique of socialism, the Red Army or the SU was ever voiced in the examined speeches. The Presidents and Prime Ministers were occasionally not present at all of the commemorative ceremonies taking place in Prague, but would visit only Olšanský cemetery, for instance.

Like in the other case studies, the speeches described Czechoslovakia as feeling allegedly deep loyalty, indebtedness and gratitude towards the heroic, invincible, protective, selfless, brave, strong, powerful and skilled Red Army and towards the modern, peaceful, progressive and exemplary SU. Further, the liberation of Czechoslovakia and the close alignment with the SU were presented as the basis for Czechoslovakia's economic prosperity and security.

In how far the Czechoslovaks accepted the presented communist interpretation of the discussed historic events and to what extent national collective identity was changed in the long-run, has to be judged by further research. Especially, because a monument's meaning alters gradually over time and in the examined time period changes were enforced quite quickly and some interpretations ceased to be enforced all together. This would have made the monuments and the communist interpretation of the past events appear more artificial. Thus, people still remembered interwar interpretation of the Hussite movement, or had personal experiences and memories of World War One and Two, which stood in contrast to historical narrative propagated by the communists. Due to limited scope of the thesis not all factors could be taken into consideration and further research needs to be conducted, also into possible other motivations to change the interpretation of significant historical moments in Czechoslovak history.

Summery

The aim of the thesis was to examine how certain historic events, symbolized by certain monuments, were presented and re-interpreted and what tools were used in the examined discourses to shape the meaning of these monuments and the interpretation of the historical events represented by them.

The outcome of the study can be summarized as the following: The Bethlehem Chapel was reinterpreted as the birthplace and of the first proto-communist social revolutionary movement. The chapel was meant to symbolize the Hussite legacy that was continued and fulfilled by the communists. Hus' connection to the working class was overemphasized and he was presented mainly as a socialist revolutionary fighting for national self-determination and freedom from the oppression by the authorities. Hus being a reformer of the Catholic Church was either omitted or belittled. Hence, the new meaning of this monument was quite clearly presented in the discourses. The tools used

in *Rudé Právo* to describe and increase the appeal, identification with and acceptance of this new interpretation of this historic event – the Hussite movement, were the following: rhetorical questions, military phrases, narration in first-person-plural, patriotic wording, positive description of Hussites and Hussite values, comparisons, exaggerations, exclusion of facts, no alternative interpretations presented as credible, metaphors and academic authors giving the claims more credibility.

The rituals and traditions used to spread the communist interpretation and engrave it into the nation's collective memory were the following: mass manifestations and parades, military and cultural performances, speeches by political representatives, singing Hussite songs and pilgrimages to places of the Hussite movement. They were to symbolize Hussite values, which were equated with communist values: national unity, bravery and willingness to defend ones values and norms, sense of community, solidarity, peacefulness, equality.

The speeches in this case study were mostly ministerial speeches. They used the same tools as the articles: narration in first-person-plural was probably the most striking one, because it presumptuously symbolized the unity between the audience, the speaker and indirectly the party. Like other tools it was used to incite the audience to identify with the said. Regarding traditions and rituals, the speeches were always part of an official ceremony.

The Monument of National Liberation was re-interpreted as a burial place of significant communists and fallen Czechoslovak and Russian WW II soldiers. The tools to change the interpretation of this monument used in the articles were the following: topical refocus to economic policies and October Revolution, exclusion of facts, accusation and blame towards the interwar governments, positive depiction of SU and nationalisation, narrative in first-person-plural, emotional first-hand-accounts, metaphors, comparisons.

In regard to traditions and rituals: vanishing importance of the day of independence deducible from the decreasing dimension of the ceremonies and media coverage, official visits mainly on 9th May instead of 28th October, lying down of wreath and flowers, honour guards, many foreign and domestic representatives, playing Soviet anthem, burial of communist elite not general or pre-war elite, honouring workers, shifting commemorative focus.

Regarding the speeches legionnaires or the Monument of National Liberation were not mentioned. The focus lay with other topics like October Revolution and

nationlisation and the tools were the same. In regard to traditions and rituals, the ceremonies of that national day changed completely. From a public festivity to a small ceremony to honour dedicated workers.

The Monument of the Soviet Tank Drivers was a new and artificial monument that was infused with purely pro-communist meaning. The tools in the discourses to foster the intended meaning were the following: positive description of Czechoslovakia's liberation and Red Army soldiers, personal accounts glorify both and praise the SU, repetition of the myth about the first tank, exclusion of facts, narration in first-person-plural, academic author give credibility, no alternative interpretations presented, metaphors, black-and-white depiction.

In regard to traditions and speeches, the monument was visited regularly during the national day, but was not the main commemorative site. Wreaths and flowers were laid, honour guards held, Soviet anthem was played and occasionally speeches were held there.

As discussed above the 'significant other' plays a crucial role in individual and collective identity. Descriptions of external and internal threats deriving from anti-communists and the imperialist West were frequent and state enemies were compared to Catholic crusaders. Each case study mentioned the threat of state enemies and how good, protective, helpful and loyal the SU was. False statements about American deployments in Czechoslovakia were also frequent. Stark contrasts and exaggeration were persistent tools to stimulate positive identification with socialism and the SU.

Bibliography

Adl, Z. & Adl, V. (1986). Tank Číslo 23. In *Čítanka pro třetí ročník*. Státní pedagogické nakladatelství. Gebhartová, V. & Vykopal, Z. (eds). Svoboda, Praha

AND (1952, May 9). Oslavy 7.výročí osvobození ČSR Sovětskou armádou v Berlíně. *Rudé Právo*. Number 116, Volume 32, p.6

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. (revised edition). Verso, London

AH (1949, October 30). Nad hroby hrdinů. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 30, p.1

Assmann, A. (2008, Spring). Transformations between History and Memory. *Social Research*, Volume 75, Issue 1, pp.49-72

Barák, R. (1957, May 9). Jednotou k vítězství. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.2

Barber, E. (Last up-date: 29.9.2014). Ukrainian protesters topple massive Lenin statue. *Time*. Retrieved November 22, 2014, from <http://time.com/3443342/ukraine-protestors-topple-massive-lenin-statue-kharkiv/>

Barikády na pražských ulicích r.1848 a 1945 (1948, May 9). Nový člověk – nositel nové kultury. *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.4

Barša, P. (2014). Paměť národa a vědění historie. In M. Poliaková, J. Raška, V. Smyčka (eds.), *Uzel na kapesníku: vzpomínka a narativní konstrukce dějín*. (1st ed.). Charles University Prague, Philosophical Fakulty

Barta, D. (1950, October 28). Sovětský svaz – opora naší svobody. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.4

BBC News (Last up-date: 10.4.2005). Berlin opens Holocaust memorial. BBC News. Retrieved November 22, 2014, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4531669.stm>

Bednařík, P., Jirák, J., Köpplová, B. (2011). *Dějiny českých médií – od počátku do současnosti*. Grada Publishing a.s., Praha

Betlemská kaple slavnostně předána našemu lidu (1954, July 6). *Rudé Právo*. Number 185, Volume 34, p.1

Bohinc, J. (1953, May 9). Za příkladem sovětských horníků. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.5

Cekotová, L. (1948, October 23). Pokračujeme, kde oni přestali. *Rudé Právo*. Number 249, Volume 28, p.3

Cekotová, L. (1948, October 28). Zazní písní vznešená.... *Rudé Právo*. Number 253, Volume 28, p.1

Cekotová, L. (1950, October 28). Historické dny. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.5

Cekotová, L. (1951, October 28). Z revoluční historie ČKD-Stalingrad. *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 31, p.3

Celá obec v družstvu - na počest 12.výročí osvobození (1957, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.7

Celá republika oslavila 28.říjen (1949, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 30, p.5

Ciaureli, M. (1953, May 9). Radujeme se z vašich úspěchů. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.5

Codr, M. (1954, May 9). Por příkladu nejlepších. *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.4

Cvrček, V., Čermák, F. & Schmiedtová, V. (eds). (2010). *Slovník komunistické totality*. Praha NLN, Nakladatelství Lidové noviny : Ústav Českého národního korpusu

Čech, R., Davidová Glogarová, J., David, J. (2013). Kvantitativnělingvistické metody a jejich využití v historické sémantice. In: *Slovo a text c historickém kontextu – perspektivy historickosémantické analýzy jazyka*. J. David, R. Čech, J. Davidová Glogarová, L. Radková, H. Šústokvá. (eds.). Host, Ostravská Univerzita

Čepička, A. (1953, May 9). Vítězný pochod svobody, socialism a míru. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.3

Československý lid manifestoval svou věrnost lidově demokratické republice –Živé traduce slavných období našich dějin (1949, July 7). *Rudé Právo*. Number 157, Volume 29, pp.1,3

Čest a láva těm, kteří jsou v čele (1949, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 30, p.1

Čornej, P. (2005). Zemřel František Kavka, historik doby Karla IV (“Ona se to stejně lépe nenaučí!”). *Dějiny a současnost*, Issue 12. Retrieved December 7, 2014, from <http://dejinyasoucasnost.cz/archiv/2005/12/zemrel-frantisek-kavka-historik-doby-karla-iv/>

Čornej, P. & Pokorný, J. (2000). *A brief History of the Czech lands to 2000*. (Trans.) A. Bryson. Praha

ČTK (1950a, July 5). Národní pouť v Husinci na paměť Mistra Jana Husi. *Rudé Právo*. Number 157, Volume 30, p.5

ČTK (1950b, July 5). Národní pouť u památníku shromáždění husitského lidu. *Rudé Právo*. Number 157, Volume 30, p.5

ČTK (1950c, July 7). Uctění památky Mistra Jana Husa. *Rudé Právo*. Number 159, Volume 30, p.3

ČTK (1950d, May 9). Po slavných dnech ještě radostněji a směleji do práce. *Rudé Právo*. Number 110, Volume 30, p.1

ČTK (1950e, May 9). Slavnostní představení Prodané nevěsty k 5.výročí osvobození. *Rudé Právo*. Number 110, Volume 30, p.1

ČTK (1951a, July 9). Mírové oslavy k uctění památky Mistra Jana Husa. *Rudé Právo*. Number 159, Volume 31, p.1

ČTK (1951b, October 30). Oslava Dne znárodnění na čs. velvylsanectví v Moskvě. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.1

ČTK (1951c, October 30). Oslava čs. Dne znárodnění v Pekinu. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.2

ČTK (1952a, July 7). V duchu husitských tradic vybudujeme z naší země trvz míru a socialismu. Velké husitské slavnosti v jižních Čechách. *Rudé Právo*. Number 175, Volume 32, p.1

ČTK (1952b, May 9). Slavnostní večer na počest 7.výročí osvobození republiky. *Rudé Právo*. Number 116, Volume 32, p.2

ČTK (1952c, May 9). Položení věncu u pomníku hrdinů Sovětské armády v Národním památníku na vrchu Vítkově. *Rudé Právo*. Number 116, Volume 32, p.6

ČTK (1952d, October 30). Oslavy 7.výročí znárodnění v krajích. *Rudé Právo*. Number 289, Volume 33, p.1

ČTK (1953a, July 6). Husitské oslavy v jižních Čechách. *Rudé Právo*. Number 186, Volume 33, p.2

ČTK (1953b, May 9). Slavnostní večer na počest 8.výročí osvobození Československa Sovětskou armádou. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.2

ČTK (1953c, May 9). Položení věncu k památníku sovětských vojáků a k Národnímu památníku v Praze. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.6

ČTK (1953d, May 9). Lid bratrských zemi slaví 8.výročí osvobození Československa. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.6

ČTK (1954a, July 3). Slavnostní otevření Betlemské kaple. *Rudé Právo*. Number 183, Volume 34, p.2

ČTK (1954b, May 9). Položení věncu k památníku sovětských vojáků a k Národnímu památníku v Praze. *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.2

ČTK (1954c, October 29). Přátelská beseda představitelů strany a vlády které vyhlásily vzorne socialistické závazky. *Rudé Právo*. Number 300, volume 35, p.1

ČTK (1955a, July 7). Vzpomínková slavnost k výročí upálení mistra Jana Husa. *Rudé Právo*. Number 186, Volume 35, p.1

ČTK (1955b, May 9). Slavnostní zasedání Ústředního výborů KSČ, vlády Československé republiky a ÚV Národní fronty k desátému výročí osvobození. *Rudé Právo*, Number 127, Volume 35, p.1

ČTK (1956a, May 9). Na počest 11.výročí osvobození. *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 36, p.2

ČTK (1956b, May 9). Slavnostní udělení stáních cen Klementa Gottwalda v roce 1956. *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 36, p.2

ČT24 (last up-date: 22. 9.2014). Rudé právo před 25 lety: Zdání změn přehlušily přípravy na sjezd v roce 1990. Česká Televize. Retrieved November 23, 2014, from

<http://www.ceskatelevize.cz/ct24/domaci/286864-rude-pravo-pred-25-lety-zdani-zmen-prehlusily-pripravy-na-sjezd-v-roce-1990/>

David, J., Čech, R., Davidova-Glogrová, J., Radková, L., Sústková, H. (2013). *Slovo a text v historickém kontextu – Perspektivy historickosémantické analýzy jazyka*. Ostravská univerzita v Ostravě

Den nejslavnější (1948, October 30). *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 28, p.3

Dlugoščevskij, K. (1953, May 9). Pozdrav přátelům. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.5

Dnes bude slavnostně přijata nova ústava – ve Vladislavském sale pražského hradu – Promluví předseda vlády Klem. Gottwald (1948, October 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.1

Den vítězství (1948, October 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.2

Den znárodnění (1952, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 287, Volume 31, p.1

Dolejší, V. (1948, July 4). Pravda vítězí. *Rudé Právo*. Number 156, Volume 28, p.1

Drda, J. (1955, May 9). Veliká jistota. *Rudé Právo*, Number 127, Volume 35, p.5

Dvanáct let... (1957, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.3

Dvanáct let svobodné práce (1957, October 27). *Rudé Právo*. Number 299, Volume 38, p.1

Eder, F. X. (2006). Historische Diskurse und ihre Analyse – eine Einleitung. In F. X. Eder (ed.). *Historische Diskursanalysen: Genealogie, Theorie, Anwendung*. (1st Ed.). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften

Eley, G. (2010). Marxist historiography. In S. Berger, H. Feldner & K. Passmore (eds.). *Writing History- Theory and Practise* (2nd ed.). Blumsbury Academic, London

Fakta a cifry mluví jasnou řečí, (1955, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 300, Volume 36, p.3

Frejka, L. (1951, October 28). Znárodnění – základ rozmachu naší vlasti. *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 31, p.3

Galandauer, J. (2008). *6.7.1915 Pomník Mistral Jana Husa – Český symbol ze žuly a bronzu*. Havran, s.r.o., Praha

Galandauer, J., Mály, I., Kortus, O. (2012). *Narodní památník na Vítkově*. Narodni Museum, Praha

Gellner, E. (1987). *Culture, Identity, and Politics*. University of Cambridge

Gerovitch, S. (2007). “New Soviet Man” Inside Machine: Human Engineering, Spacecraft Design, and the Construction of Communism. *Osiris*, Volume 22, Issue 1, pp.135-157

Glazarová, J. (1955, May 9). Nová krása tě ověncí. *Rudé Právo*, Number 127, Volume 35, p.5

Goržibovskij, J.A. (1957, May 9). Dopisy ze Sovětského svazu. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.3

Graus, F. Doc. Dr. (1951, July 6). Mistr Jan Hus – Bojovník za pravdu lidu. *Rudé Právo*. Number 158, Volume 31, p.3

Hájková, D. & Wingfield, N. M. (2010). Czech-(oslovak) national commemorations during the interwar period: Tomáš, G. Masaryk and the Battle of White Mountain avenged. *Acta Histriae*, Volume 18, Issue 3, pp. 425-452

Hašková, L. (1955, October 29). Hospodáři v Závodech V. I. Lenina. *Rudé Právo*. Number 300, Volume 36, p.3

Hesla Ústředního výboru Kommunistické strany Československa u ÚN Národní fronty (1955, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 300, Volume 36, p.1

Hesla ústředního výboru KSSS k 36.výročí Velké říjnové socialistické revoluce (1953, October 26). *Rudé Právo*. Number 298, Volume 34, p.3

Historické 28.říjny (1949, October 30). *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 30, p.3

Hnídková, Z. (1950, October 28). Máme tě rádi, naše továrno. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.6

Hobsbawm, E. (1983). Introduction: Inventing Tradition. In E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger (eds.). *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press

Hojda, Z. & Pokorný, J. (1996). *Pomníky a (za)pomníky*. Paseka

Hončar, O. (1953, May 9). Ať sílí a vzkvétá přátelství našich národů. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.5

Horáková, P. (Last update: 08.05.2005). Current Affairs - The complicated history of Prague's Tank No. 23. Czech Radio 7, Radio Prague. Retrieved October 14, 2014, from <http://www.radio.cz/en/article/66274>

Hradecký, A. (1948, October 9). Volali jste a my přišli. *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.3

Hrdá balance práce komunistů Pražského kraje – z pojevu krajského politického tajemníka poslance Ant. Novotného (1949, May 8). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 29, p.7

Hřivňak, G. (1955, October 29). Tavíme ocel pro blahobyt naší vlasti. *Rudé Právo*. Number 300, Volume 36, p.3

Jak jsme naplnili odkaz 28.X. (1948, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 253, Volume 28, p.3

Jalk, T. & Junek, M. (2010). *České národní povstání 1945. Katalog k výstavě konané na Staroměstské radnici v květnu roku 2010*. Národní Muzeum

Janů, J. (1949, May 8). Poučení a výstraha. *Rudé Právo*. Number 108, Volume 28, p.3

Jiráček, J. (1953, May 9). S odznakem vzorného vojáka. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.4

Jiráček, A. (1949, July 3). Obraz z české epopie. *Rudé Právo*. Number 156, Volume 29, p.3

Jiráček, A. (1950, July 6). V předvečer bitvy. *Rudé Právo*. Number 158, Volume 30, p.3.

Kaigl, V. Doc. (1955, October 29). Znárodnění průmyslu – ekonomická základna budování socialismu. *Rudé Právo*. Number 300, Volume 36, p.3

Karáček, B. (1953, May 9). Písně ostří naše zbraně. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.4

Kárný, M. (1949, October 28). Bez 7.listopadu 1918 by nebylo 28.října 1918. *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 30, p.3

Kattago, S. (2010). Memory, Pluralism and the Agony of Politics, *Journal of Baltic Studies*, Volume 41, Issue 3, pp.383-394

Kavka, F. (1952, July 6). Zářivý vzor neohroženého bojovníka proti útisku – za pravdu lidu. *Rudé Právo*. Number 174, Volume 32, p.3.

Klement Gottwald – tvůrce nerozborného československo-sovětského přátelství (1953, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.3

Klíma, A. Dr. dr. (1949, October 28). Dělnická třída a 28. říjen 1918. *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 30, p.3

Koldinská, M. & Šedivý, I. (2005). Smíchovský tank Jsem zvláštní pomník, a já to vím. *Dějiny a současnost* 2005/01. Retrieved October 14, 2014, from <http://dejinyasoucasnost.cz/archiv/2005/1/smichovsky-tank-jsem-zvlastni-pomnik-a-ja-to-vim/>

Kommunistická strana Československa dosáhla 2,000.048 členů – Ve dnech 3.výročí osvobození republiky (1948, October 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.1

Kommunistická strana dosáhla dvou million členů (1948, October 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.2

Končelík, J., Večeřa, P., Orság, P. (2010). *Dějiny českých médií 20. Století*. Portál, Prague

Koněv, I.S. (1957, May 9). Slavné výročí osvobození Prahy. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.3

Konrad, K. (1949, July 3). Síly husitské revoluce. *Rudé Právo*. Number 156, Volume 29, p.3

Kopecký, J. (1956, May 9). Pro slavné jméno naší země. *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 36, p.4

Kotala, L (1954, May 9). Po vzoru nejlepších přátel. *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.5

Kovař, L.(1950, October 28). Z dělníka ředitelem výroby. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.6

Kraj Liberecký (1949, October 30). *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 30, p.8

Kraj Pražský (1949, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 30, p.6

Kratochvíl, M. V. (1955, July 6). Neuhasínající plamen – 540 let od upálení Mistra Jana Husa. *Rudé Právo*. Number 185, Volume 35, p.3

Kratochvíl, V. (1953, May 9). Sovětská armáda – armáda míru, armáda osvoboditelka. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.4

Kratochvíl, V. (1954, May 9). Sovětská armáda – spolehlivá záštita míru. *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.4

Krejčí, J. (1990). *Czechoslovakia at the crossroads of European History*. I B Tauris. London

Kubernatová, M. (1948, May 9). První v Praze. *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.3

Kubiš, J. (1950, October 28). Havířina tenkrát a dnes. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.6

Kubka, F. (1957, May 9). 9.května, 9 hodin ráno. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.2

Kvasnička, B. (1948, October 28). Třicet 28. Říjnů. *Rudé Právo*. Number 253, Volume 28, p.5

Lamplotová, B. (1951, October 25). Sokolstvo v Měsíci čs.-sovětského přátelství. *Rudé Právo*. Number 252, Volume 31, p.6

Landwehr, A. (2008). *Historische Diskursanalyse. Campus historische Einführung*. Campus Verlag, Frankfurt

Lazarov, N. (1949, May 8). Nejkrásnější setkání. *Rudé Pravé*. Number 108, Volume 28, p.4

Lebow, R. N. (2006). The Memory of Politics in Postwar Europe. In R. N. Lebow, W. Kansteiner, C. Fogu (eds.). *The Memory of Politics in Postwar Europe*. Duke University Press, Durham and London

Levčenko, V. (1956, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 36, p.5

Macek, J. Dr. (1950, July 6). Odkaz Mistra Jana Husa. *Rudé Právo*. Number 158, Volume 30, p.3

Macek, J. Doc. Dr. (1952, July 6). Ve znamení husitských revolučních tradic budujeme socialismus. *Rudé Právo*. Number 174, Volume 32, p.3.

Mahoney, W. M. (2011). *The history of the Czech Republic and Slovakia*. The Greenwood Histories of the Modern Nations. F. W. Thakeray & J. E. Findling (eds.). ABC-Clio, LLC, Santa Barbara

Malininova, P. (1953, May 9). Českoslovenkým družstevníkům. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.5

Malý, I. (2013). Památník na Vítkově v proměnách vládní ideologie a propagandy v letech 1938-1950. In *Společnost a kultura v Českých zemích 1939-1949*. Národní muzeum, Praha

Manifest k Husovým oslavám 1948 (1948, July 4). *Rudé Právo*, Number 156, Volume 28, p.1

Marek, J. (1953, May 9). Nezapomenutelná setkání. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.5

- Mareš, J. (1955, May 9). Směr Praha. *Rudé Právo*, Number 127, Volume 35, p.5
- Maršálek, Z. (2013). Místo husitské tradice v moderní české společnosti: základní kámen národní identity. In B. Soukupová, H. Nosková & P. Bednařík (eds.). *Paměť – Národ – Menšiny – Marginalizace – Identity I. Urbánní studie*. Sv. 6. Praha
- Martin, L. (last up-date: 16.03.2002). Tábor. Czech Radio 7, Radio Prague. Retrieved December 30, 2014, from <http://www.radio.cz/de/rubrik/tourist/tabor>
- Martin, L. (Last up-date: 30.07.2014). Tagesecho - Ausstellung am Prager Jan-Hus-Denkmal informiert über Historie und Sanierung des Monuments. Czech Radio 7, Radio Prague. Retrieved October 22, 2014, from <http://www.radio.cz/de/artikel/414306>
- Mayer, F. (2009). *Češi a jejich komunismus – Paměť a politická identita*. M. Nodl (ed.). H. Beguivinová (trans). Argo, Praha
- McCrone, D. & McPherson, G. (2009). *National Days Constructing and Mobilising National Identity*. D. McCrone, D. & G. McPherson (eds.). Palgrave Macmillan
- Michl, J. (2009). *Legionáři a Československo. Naše vojsko, s.r.o.*, Praha
- Miska, J. (1951, October 30). Dobyté vítězství svou prací upevníme. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.3
- Mitchell, K. (2003). Monuments, Memorials, and the Politics of Memory. *Urban Geography*, Volume 24, Issue 5, pp.442-459
- Mohutbé oslavy v celé republice (1948, October 30). *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 28, p.3
- Mráz, F. (1954, May 9). Můj pracovní rok dříve a nyní. *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.3

Nad letošními oslavanmi 28. Října (1948, October 31). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 28, p.1

Najdis, V. (1953, May 9). Pracujeme pro mír. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.5

Na Prahu druhé pětiletky – Rozhovor s hlavním Inženýrem ČKD Stalingrad soudruhem J. Baierem (1955, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 300, Volume 36, p.3

Národ si dal novou ústavu - V den třetího výročí osvobození Prahy Rudou armádou (1948, May 11). *Rudé Právo*. Number 110, Volume 28, p.1

Národ vzpomněl památky M. J. Husa – President Republiky na oslavě na Staroměstském náměstí v Praze (1948, July 8). *Rudé Právo*, Number 157, Volume 28, p.1

Národní Muzeum (n.d.). Národní památník na Vítkově. Retrieved November 16, 2014, from <http://www.nm.cz/Hlavni-strana/Navstivte-nas/Narodni-pamatnik-na-Vitkove.html>

Naše země před 28.říjnem – den národního svátku ve znamení úsilí za vybudování socialismu (1949, October 27). *Rudé Právo*. Number 253, Volume 30, p.1

Nečásek, F. (1951, July 6). V tradicích Husa, Žižky a táboritů. *Rudé Právo*. Number 158, Volume 31, pp.1, 7

Nedelsky, N. (2009). Defining the sovereign community. The Czech and Slovak Republic. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia

Nejedlý, Z. (1948, July 4). Hus a naše doba. *Rudé Právo*, Number 156, Volume 28, p.1

Nejedlý, Z. (1950, July 6). Mistr Jan Hus a husitcká revoluce. *Rudé Právo*. Number 158, Volume 30, p.3.

Největší svátek naší vlastí (1954, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, pp.1,2

- Není výročí jako výročí (1956, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 302, Volume 37, p.2
- Nora, P. (1989, Spring). Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire. *Representations*, Volume 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory, pp.7-24, University of California Press
- Novikov, A. (1953, May 9). Necht' sílí kulturní styky našich národů!. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.5
- Nový, K. (1950, May 9). Vzpomínka na hořící dny. *Rudé Právo*. Number 110, Volume 30, p.3
- Odhalení Pámatníku osvobození v Luhačovicích (1955, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 35, p.8
- Odkaz 9.května z vítězů na celém světě (1950, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 110, Volume 30, p.1
- Odměny rolníkům za splnění výkonného plánu (1948, October 30). *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 28, p.1
- O intrikách amerických imperialistů proti znárodnění v Československu (1951, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 31, p.4
- Olick, J. K. (1999, November). Collective Memory: The Two Cultures. *Sociological Theory*, Volume 17, Issue 3, pp.333-348
- Orwell, G. (1983). *1984*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt
- Orzoff, A. (2009). *Battle for the Castle. The Myth of Czechoslovakia in Europe 1914-1948*. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Oslavy československého státního svátku v zahraničí (1949, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 30, p.2

Oslavy čs. Státního svátku v zahraničí (1949, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 30, p.2

Oslavy mistra Jana Husa (1949, July 7). *Rudé Právo*. Number 157, Volume 29, p.3

Oslavy našeho státního svátku v zahraničí (1957, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.8

Oslavy 28. října ve všech závodech (1949, October 26). *Rudé Právo*. Number 252, Volume 30, p.1

Oslavy 28. října v našem kraji – ve znamení dvouletky a vyhlášení pětiletky (1948, October 22). *Rudé Právo*. Number 248, Volume 28, p.4

Oslavy 28. Října v Žandově (1949, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 30, p.6

Oslavy 30.výročí Československé republiky v SSSR a v Polsku (1948, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 253, Volume 28, p.2

Osm let budování republiky (1953, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.1

Pabián, P. (2007). *Inventing the Hussite Nation: Liberals, Catholics, and Protestants in Conflict over Czech National Identity*. Z. R. David & D. R. Holton (eds.) *The Bohemian Reformation and Religious Practice*. Prague: Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, pp.275-282

Paces, C. (2009). *Prague Panoramas – National memory and sacred spaces in the twentieth century*. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, USA

Palacký, F. (1949, July 3). Mistr Jan Hus. *Rudé Právo*. Number 156, Volume 29, p.3

Palouš, K. (1953, May 9). Veliký příklad pro naše umění. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.5

Paul, Z. (1954, May 9). Setkání s pohraničníky. *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.4

Pernt, J. (1950, October 28). Jiny život mají dnes učňové. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.6

Petřina, A. (1950, May 9). Pět let vítězné cesty míru. *Rudé Právo*. Number 110, Volume 30, p.2

Pietní slavnost v Památníku osvobození (1949, October 23). *Rudé Právo*. Number 250, Volume 30, p.1

Pichlík, K., Klípa, B. & Zabloudilová, J. (1996). *Českoslovenští legionáři 1914-1920*. Mladá Fronta, Praha

Pionýři pochodovali před prezidentem republiky (1950, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 110, Volume 30, p.3

Piš, J. (1953, May 9). I my tak budeme hospodařit. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.5

Pocta padlým sovětským hrdinům (1957, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, pp.1,7

Pocta sovětským hrdinům, kteří padli za svobod naší vlasti (1951, May 8). *Rudé Právo*. Number 108, Volume 31, p.1

Polejov, B. (1950, May 9). Naše přátelství je nerozborné. *Rudé Právo*. Number 110, Volume 30, p.2

Polejov, B. (1956, May 9). Jedenáctý Máj. *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 36, p.2

Po slavném 28. říjnu k dalším budovatelským úspěchům – Plněním a překročením úkolů dvouletky připravujeme úspěšný nástup do pětiletky – Dále zvyšovat průmyslovou výrobu a produktivitu pracen-neprovolit v tempu výkupu obilí a zvyšovat doávky ostatních zemědělských produktů (1948, October 31). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 28, p.1

President republiky převzal záštitu nad oslavami vzniku republiky (1948, October 26). *Rudé Právo*. Number 251, Volume 28, p.1

Presidentu republiky byly odevzdány československé řády – Zahájení oslav 30. Výročí republiky – Vysoká vyznamenání bojovníkům za svobodu (1948, October 30). *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 28, p.2

Projev generálního tajemníka KSČ posl. Rudolfa Slánského v parlamentě v rozpravě o ústavě (1948, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.3

Projev gen. zpravodaje ústředního výboru ÚNS poslance univ. prof. dr. Vladimíra Procházky. (1948, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.4

Projev ministra národní obrany soudruha B. Lomského (1956, May 10). *Rudé Právo*. Number 130, Volume 36, p.1

Projev ministra národní obrany generálplukovníka Bohumíra Lomského (1957, May 10). *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 37, p.1

Projev ministra těžkého strojírenství Gustava Klimenta (1951, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 31, pp.1,7

Projev presidenta republiky (1949, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 30, p.1

Projev presidenta republiky Klementa Gottwalda (1950, May 8). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 30, p.1

Projev presidenta republiky soudruha Antonína Zápotockého (1954, May 10). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 34, p.1

Projev předsedy NS dr. O. Johna (1950, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.1

Projev předsedy vlády Antonína Zápotockého (1951, May 6). *Rudé Právo*. Number 106, Volume 31, p.3

Projev předsedy vlády Antonína Zápotockého v ČKD-Sokolovo (1950, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.8

Projev předsedy vlády A. Zápotockého (1949, July 7). *Rudé Právo*. Number 157, Volume 29, p.1

Projev předsedy vlády A. Zápotockého (1952, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 116, Volume 32, p.2

Projev předsedy vlády soudruha Viliama Širokého (1955, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 35, pp.2,4

Projev předsedy vlády Viliama Širokého (1953, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.2

Projev předsedy vlády Viliama Širokého (1954, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 300, Volume 35, pp.1,2

Provazník, Zd. (1954, May 9). Ukázali správnou cestu. *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.5

Přehlídka armády, SNB a lidových milicí (1948, October 30). *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 28, p.3

Randák, J. (2008). Betlémská kaple, revoluční tradice a vstup marx-leninské historiografie do prostoru. In *Proměny diskursu české marxistické historiografie – Kapitoly z historiografie 20. století*. Historia Culturae XV. Studia 10. Jihočeská univerzita v Českých Budějovicích, Philosophical Faculty

Randák, J. (2014). Paměť v prostoru a prostor v paměti – příklad modern české společnosti. In M. Poliaková, J. Raška, V. Smyčka (eds.). *Uzel na kapesníku: vzpomínka a narativní konstrukce dějin*. (1st ed.). Charles University Prague, Philosophical Faculty

Reiman, P. (1948, October 28). Marxismus a boj za národní samostatnost. *Rudé Právo*. Number 253, Volume 28, p.5

Rohan, B. (1949, October 28). Sovětský svaz – záruka naší samostatnosti. *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 30, p.3

Roleček, O. (1953, May 9). Po vzoru sovětské školy. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.5

RP (1950a, July 6). Mírové shromáždění na Kozím Hrádku na paměť Mistra Jana Husa. *Rudé Právo*. Number 158, Volume 30, p.1

RP (1950b, May 9). Položení věnců u hrobu Neznámého bojovníka. *Rudé Právo*. Number 110, Volume 30, p.1

RP (1950c, October 28). Slavnostní zasedání na počest 32.výročí vzniku republiky a 5.výročí znárodnění. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.1

RP (1951, October 28). Znárodnění průmyslu je mezníkem našich dějin, zárukou svobody, šťastného a radostného zítřka – Manifestační oslava šestého výročí znárodnění v Praze. *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 31, p.1

RP (1952, October 29). Za další rozmach našeho znárodněného průmyslu – oslava výročí znárodnění v pražské Lucerně. *Rudé Právo*. Number 288, Volume 33, p.2

Rudé Právo (1948, July 31). *Rudé Právo*. Number 177, Volume 29, p.1

Rudé Právo (1948, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.5

Rudé Právo (1949, May 8). *Rudé Právo*. Number 108, Volume 29, p.1

Rudé Právo (1952, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 116, Volume 32, p.3

Rudé Právo (1954, July 3). Husitské oslavy v jižních Čechách. *Rudé Právo*. Number 183, Volume 34, p.2

Rudé Právo (1954, July 5). Husitské oslavy v jižních Čechách. *Rudé Právo*. Number 184, Volume 34, p.3

Rudé Právo (1954, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 299, Volume 35, pp.1-4

Rudé Právo (1955, July 7). Před celostátními husitskými oslavami na Kozím Hrádku u Tábora. *Rudé Právo*. Number 186, Volume 35, p.1

Rudé Právo (1955, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 35, pp.7-8

Rudé Právo (1955, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 299, Volume 36, pp.1-4

Rudé Právo (1956, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 301, Volume 37 pp.1-6

Rudé Právo (1957, October 27). *Rudé Právo*. Number 299, Volume 38, pp.1-4

Rudé Právo – picture (1948, October 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.1

Růžička, O. & Vobořil, S. (1966). *Prážský květen 1945 1965*. Orbis, Praha

Rybák, J. (1948, May 9). Nový člověk – nositel nové kultury. *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.4

Řezáč, V. (1956, May 9). Sedm Tanku. *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 36, p.4

Řiha, O. Prof. Dr. (1950, October 28). Velká říjnová revoluce a 28.říjen. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.4

Said, E.W. (1995). *Orientalism. Western Conceptions of the Orient*. Modern Classics Penguin

Said, E. W. (2000, Winter). Invention, Memory, and Place. *Critical Inquiry*, Volume 26, Issue 2, pp. 175-192. The University of Chicago Press

Sěmovna slavnostně schválila osnovu zákona o pětiletce (1948, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 253, Volume 28, p.2

Sajnerová, H. (1950, May 9). Žijeme šťastný život. *Rudé Právo*. Number 110, Volume 30, p.3

Sinowjew, A. (1984). *Homo Sovieticus*. Diogenes Verlag, AG Zürich

Sládek, J. (1948, October 28). Za vznik Československa děkujeme Říjnové revoluci. *Rudé Právo*. Number 253, Volume 28, p.5

Slánský, R. (1951, May 9). Slavné Výročí. *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 31, p.3

Slavík, V. (1949, May 8). V čele lidu do slavných dnů května. *Rudé Právo*. Number 108, Volume 28, p.3

Slavík, V. (1950, October 28). Vítezný boj o znárodnění. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.5

Slavné vítězství pracujících (1951, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 31, p.1

Slavné výročí (1950, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.1

Slavné 30. Výročí republiky ve znamení pětiletky a nástupu k socialismu – Československý lid nadšeně pozdravil 28. říjen – President republiky Klement Gottwald podepsal zákon o pětiletém plánu (1948, October 30). *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 28, p.1

Slavnostní koncert České filharmonie k 30. Výročí ČSR (1948, October 30). *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 28, p.1

Slavnostné představení na počest 10. výročí osvobození v Národním divadle v Praze (1955, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 35, p.8

Slavnostní představení v předvečer 9. května (1957, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.7

Slavnostní udělení vyznamenání nejlepším pracovníkům (1956, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 36, p.5

Slavnostní umělecký večer v Praze na počest 9. výročí osvobození naší republiky (1954, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.2

Sluka, J. (1957, May 9). V čem byla a je naše síla. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.3

Směnou míru oslavili jsme Den vítězství (1949, May 10). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 29, p.1

Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity*. Penguin Group, London

Sojka, E. (1954, May 9). Plným krokem cestou sovětských lidí. *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.5

Soukupová, B. (2013). Místo husitské tradice v moderní české společnosti: základní kámen národní identity. In B. Soukupová, H. Nosková & P. Bednařík (eds.). *Paměť – Národ – Menšiny-Marginalizace-Identity I. Urbánní studie*. Sv. 6. Praha

Správná vesta (1956, October 26). *Rudé Právo*. Number 301, Volume 37, p.1

Stano, J. (1957, May 9). Na východ od Slanského pohoří. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.7

Suchý, Č. (1949, October 27). 28. říjen – svátek bojujícího a vítězného lidu. *Rudé Právo*. Number 253, Volume 30, p.3

Svátek v ulicích Prahy (1950, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 110, Volume 30, p.3

Svoboda, J. (1952, October 30). Splnit úkoly čtvrtého roku pětiletého plánu. *Rudé Právo*. Number 289, Volume 33, p.2

Šedivý, A. (1953, May 9). Chráníme nedotknutelnost hranice republiky. *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 33, p.4

Šedivý, M. (1954, May 9). Letový den proudových stíhačů. *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.4

S pohledem dopředu (1956, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 36, p.1

Trojanová, J. (1956, May 9). Na věrné přátelství. *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 36, p.4

Trunecka, K. (1954, May 9). Za všechno nám děkujeme, drazí přátelé. *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.5

Turek, S. (1949, May 8). Jak jsme je vítali. *Rudé Právo*. Number 108, Volume 28, p.3

Turek, S. (1950, October 28). Bez šéfa. *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, p.6

Turek, S. (1954, May 9). Upřímné slovo o životě. *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 34, p.3

Uctění památky bokovníků za svobodný život Československa (1955, May 8). *Rudé Právo*. Number 126, Volume 35, p.2

Udělení státních cen Klementa Gottwalda – s čestným titulem ‘Laureát státní ceny Klementa Gottwalda’ v roce 1956 (1956, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 36, p.2

Udělení vyznamenání vynikajícím pracovníkům (1952, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 116, Volume 32, p.6

Urban, I. (1954, July 4). „Abyste na Betlem laskavi bylo...“. *Rudé Právo*. Number 183, Volume 34, p.4

Válková, H. (last up-date: 5.6.2010). Soudruh, strana, práce. Vědci rozebrali Rudé právo, připravují slovník totality. Zprávy iDNES.cz. Retrieved November 23, 2014, from http://zpravy.idnes.cz/soudruh-strana-prace-vedci-rozebrali-rude-pravo-pripravuji-slovník-totality-1x2-/domaci.aspx?c=A100604_193408_domaci_hv

Ve jménu života (1957, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.3

Velké tradice našich dějin (1949, July 3). *Rudé Právo*. Number 156, Volume 29, p.1

Vella, C. (2013). *European Resistance in the Second World War*. P. Cooke & B. H. Shepherd (eds.). Pen & Sword Praetorian Press, UK

Vítězí život! (1957, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.1

Vítězství a mír (1949, May 8). *Rudé Právo*. Number 108, Volume 28, p.1

Volavka, A. (1948, October 28). Třicet let naší vesnice. *Rudé Právo*. Number 253, Volume 28, p.3

Vrchlická, E. (1951, October 28). Dny hněvu a bolesti. *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 31, p.4

Všechen náš lid slaví 31.výročí vzniku ČSR (1949, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 30, p.1

V údernickém hnutí se rodí nový socialistický člověk (1949, October 30). *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 30, p.1

Vyznamenání nejlepším (1957, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 128, Volume 37, p.1

Vyznamenání nejlepších pracovníků v závodě V. I. Lenina v Plzni (1952, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 287, Volume 33, p.2

Vzpomínáme na 9.květen (1948, October 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 109, Volume 28, p.2

Vzpomínáme padlých sovětských hrdinů (1956, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 129, Volume 36, p.2

Wingfield, N. M. (2000). The Politics of Memory: Constructing National Identity in the Czech Lands, 1945 to 1948. *East European Politics and Societies*. Volume 14, Issue 2, pp.246-267

Wingfield, N. M. (2003, November). The Battle of Zborov and the Politics of Commemoration in Czechoslovakia. *East European Politics and Societies*. Volume 17, pp. 654-681

Winter, K. (1949, May 8). Legenda a pravda o 9.květnu. *Rudé Právo*. Number 108, Volume 28, p.3

Základní kámen naší socialistické výstavby – K Dní znárodnění (1953, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 300, Volume 31, p.2

Závod míru (1955, May 9). *Rudé Právo*. Number 127, Volume 35, p.8

Závěrečný projev předsedy Národního shromáždění dr. O. John (1951, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 31, p.7

Ze zahajovacího projevu předsedy ÚRO Františka Zupky (1951, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 255, Volume 31, p.1

Z listů Mistra Jana Husi (1949, July 3). *Rudé Právo*. Number 156, Volume 29, p.3

Z listu Jana Husa všem věrným Čechům (1950, July 6). *Rudé Právo*. Number 158, Volume 30, p.3

Znárodnění vytvořilo předpoklad hospodářského rozvoje, jakého dosud naše historie nepoznala. Projev ministra-předsedy Státního úřadu plánovacího dr. J. Dolenského na slavnostním zasedání ÚAV NF a ÚRO k 32.výročí vzniku ČSR a k 15.výročí znárodnění (1950, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 256, Volume 31, pp.1,5

Z projevu předsedy Národního shromáždění dr. O. John (1952, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 288, Volume 33, p.2

Z projevu předsedy ÚRO poslance G. Klimenta (1952, October 29). *Rudé Právo*. Number 288, Volume 33, p.2

Z projevu prvního tajemníka ÚV KSČ soudruha Antonína Novotného (1955, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 299, Volume 36, pp.1,2

118 vyznamenaných úderníků a údernic (1949, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 30, p.4

28.Říjen (1949, October 28). *Rudé Právo*. Number 254, Volume 30, pp.1,5

28.října podepíše president republiky zákon o pětiletém plánu (1948, October 26). *Rudé Právo*. Number 251, Volume 28, p.1