

## **Abstract**

The Prague uprising signified the end of the Second World War in Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. As the Soviet and American armies progressed through the country towards Prague and the war was apparently soon to come to an end, Czechoslovaks themselves wanted to take part in the resistance against the Nazi oppression. The uprising was also a turning point for the succesful liberation of Prague. After the Czechoslovak communist party seized power in February 1948, the way the public perceived the uprising had to be changed to fit the party's interpretation, purposely overlooking the contribution of any non-communist resistance.

This ideologically suitable interpretation had to be accepted even by the main leader of the uprising. The aforementioned interpretation can still be seen in historiographic books, even those published after the Velvet Revolution. Interpretation of the same event with the targeted use of words and phrases allows for different sounds and thus influences the reader. Targeted use of historical events can achieve the long-term prevalence of rumors, the refutation of which is a necessity and the work of historians.

On the example of key moments of the uprising, such as its spontaneous beginning, the involvement of The Russian Liberation Army or the surrender of German troops in Prague, it is possible to compare interpretations and describe the differences of narratives. Communist authors called opponents by many of vulgar words, non-communist ones then neutrally.

This thesis focuses on Critical Path Method used on books about the Prague uprising published during the communist era, comparing them with the explanation accepted in the later years after the Velvet Revolution.

This thesis is also a contribution to historiography of the Prague uprising as it brings different interpretations of this event.

## **Key words**

communist, resistance, Prague Uprising, The Second World War, Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, historiography, comparison