

# CHANGES IN THE PICTURE OF 'OCTOBER 28' IN CZECH HISTORY TEXTBOOKS

**BLAŽENA GRÁCOVÁ**

Pedagogical Faculty of Ostrava University in Ostrava

## ABSTRACT

The study follows the changes in the picture of the circumstances surrounding the origin of the Czechoslovak Republic and the course of the day Oct 28, 1918 in Czech history textbooks from 1920-2013. The changes between the texts from the interwar years and those published after February 1948 are clear in the degree of attention paid to the activities of the foreign resistance, the actions of its main representatives, deployment of the Czechoslovak legions, and the personalities of the domestic resistance. While in the older "Eurozone" works these themes were given widespread coverage, in the textbooks from the Socialist period certain facts were reduced to a minimum. Readers were deprived of the names of those who came to the head of the newly created 'bourgeois' state, since the 'working people' were identified as the creators of independence. The textbooks of the last twenty-five years are marked by the objectivity and balance of the information and themes covered in them; in addition they adopt a multi-perspective approach. The empirical research confirms that since Oct 28, 1918 was the beginning of the evaluated period of Czech history, so the most significant of the creators of our independence hold a dominant place in the Czech national memory. The significance of the national holiday by which we commemorate the birth of the independent state is not given the importance it had in the first twenty years of the existence of the CSR. However, we see as encouraging the finding that many young people emphasize the need to remember the democratic tradition of our past, as well as the personalities who belong to it.

## KEYWORDS:

Czech history; history textbooks; Oct 28, 1918

## INTRODUCTION

The Czech attitude to the Habsburg monarchy in the final decades of its existence could be described as ‘a marriage of convenience’. The negative stereotype of the Habsburgs, one of the many enemies of the Czech national struggle, was only reinforced by the disappointment with the dualism, the frustrated attempt at Austrian-Czech equality, and the unfulfilled promises of the emperor. Essentially, the Czech national relation to the monarchy and the dynasty – with the exception of the person of the Emperor – was irredeemably hostile<sup>1</sup>. The Austro-Hungarian and German alliance in the First World War was perceived by Czech eyes as almost identical to Austrian allegiance to the German Empire, thus disturbing the positive conception of coexistence in a common state among its previous supporters<sup>2</sup>. The main motives and decisive reasons for the formation of an independent state were created by the war, its course and its condemnation<sup>3</sup>. On the creation of Czechoslovakia, these national stereotypes grew in significance as a means towards a beginning national political self-definition<sup>4</sup>. The overthrow was publicized as the ‘The Battle of White Mountain Reparations’, public demonstrations were packed with phrases like the Three-Hundred Year Subjugation, the Jail of the Nations, the Black-Yellow Hydra, and the like<sup>5</sup>. We will concern ourselves with which of the indicated stereotypes contributed to the picture of key events in history textbooks and which can even today influence the viewpoint of the young generation.

October 28, as the origin of an independent Czechoslovakia became the symbol of the pinnacle of the ongoing emancipation struggles of the Czech society and at the same time the beginning of its new-era democratic existence<sup>6</sup>. Ferdinand Peroutka, in his *Building a State*, admits that it is controversial ‘from which day date the legal existence of the Czechoslovak state dates from, whether from the recognition of the Paris temporary government or from October 28, therefore from the admittance of the Czechoslovak delegation to the peace conference’. He advocates October 28, “since

<sup>1</sup> J. Rak, *Bývalí Čechové. České historické mýty a stereotypy*, Praha 1994, p. 138-139.

<sup>2</sup> J. Galandauer, “Čeští vojáci ve velké válce a vzájemný obraz Čechů a českých Němců”, in: *Obraz Němců, Rakouska a Německa v české společnosti 19. a 20. století*, red. J. Křen, E. Broklová, Praha 1998, p. 78.

<sup>3</sup> The Czech perspective in the war objectives of the Central Powers – the creation of Mitteleuropa – caused problems, then disappeared. R. Kvaček, “Ke vzniku Československa”, *Český časopis historický*, 1998, 96, 4, p. 717-735.

<sup>4</sup> D. Labischová, *Čech závistivec Rakušan byrokrat? Proměny obrazu Čechů, Rakušanů a jejich minulosti ve vědomí studující mládeže*, Ostrava 2005, p. 17.

<sup>5</sup> J. Rak, *Bývalí Čechové. České historické mýty a stereotypy*, Praha 1994, p. 139-140

<sup>6</sup> J. Randák, *Říjen mezi dvěma epochami: ke konstrukci a podobě historického faktu*, [in:] *České křižovatky evropských dějin*, red. I. Šedivý, J. Němeček, J. Kocian, O. Tůma, Praha 2010, p. 233-242.

that is the date when the state began to exist materially.<sup>7</sup> Zdeněk Kárník points out the fact that not only the Czechs, but also the Slovaks and the Germans, possibly also the Hungarians, participated in the uprising. But in his opinion the Czech uprising above all the others led to the victory<sup>8</sup>.

## METHODOICAL APPROACH

The goal of the following section however will be to show the change of the interpretations of the events which led to the origin of the CSR in the pages of Czech history textbooks over the course of almost one hundred years. The introductory considerations were simply to indicate that an analysis of the basic educational medium cannot be limited to the date of the declaration of independence but also to the other processes which led to it, as well as the days immediately following. We had to establish a concrete outline which will direct the analysis<sup>9</sup>. Accordingly, we will follow the following sub-themes:

- A clarification of the reasons for which it was not possible to remain within the Habsburg monarchy.
- The activities of the representatives of the foreign resistance and its most significant personalities.
- The significance of the deployment of military supporting the Allies as an agent for the facilitation of the recognition of the CNR as the representative of the emerging state.
- The significance of the activities of the domestic resistance.
- The share of the expressions of dissatisfaction of the inhabitants of the Czech lands and the military insurrection in the achievement of the independence.
- The proclamation of independence abroad – the Washington Declaration of 18. 10. 1918.
- The 14th the 28th and the 30th of October 1918, November 14, 1918 – the appointment of the first government and the election of the President of the Republic.
- Reflections on the correctness of the decision to form an independent state.

<sup>7</sup> [Je sporné,] „od kterého dne datovat právní existenci československého státu, zda od uznání pařížské zatímní vlády, nebo od 28. října či teprve od připuštění československé delegace na mírovou konferenci“. [Přimlouvá se za 28. říjen,] „protože je to den, kdy stát počal existovat hmotně.“ F. Peroutka, *Budování státu I. 1918-1919*, Praha 1991, p. 101.

<sup>8</sup> Z. Kárník, *České země v éře první republiky (1918-1938)*. Part 1, *Vznik, budování a zlatá léta republiky (1918-1929)*. Praha 2000, p. 48.

<sup>9</sup> A content analysis of the basic education media indeed monitor the quantity of the searched information, but primarily it has as its goal to present the way of interpreting the information; therefore it involves a quality analysis. The contribution by D. Labischová - B. Gracová in this publication is closely related to this.

The textbook passages differ from each other according to the year of their publication. History was and is a political tool, and each political system controls this area of education and instruction. In the case of an authoritarian or totalitarian system, this means direct control over and manipulation of the facts. In democratic systems too there appear justifications for the positions taken and of the opinions, even though their criticism is tolerated<sup>10</sup>. The slice of the past monitored by us has been the subject of a great deal of manipulation, as the following text will indicate. In order to examine the effect of the textbook interpretations of these events on the Czech population, we will also look at the results of the empirical research executed by official institutions. The findings from the research of young students relate directly to our theme.

### CLARIFICATION OF THE REASONS FOR THE NECESSITY TO SEPARATE FROM AUSTRIA

The clarification of the reasons for the necessity for the Czech lands to break away from Austro-Hungary receives the most attention in those textbooks published just after the founding of the republic. Materials determined for younger pupils displayed markedly emotional but more general interpretations, both in the titles of the relevant passages (“How Czech trust in Austria ended”, “How the nation is helplessly suffocating”), and in the content of the texts themselves (“the evil Austria does not deserve to live longer, for its yoke has strangled free nations”, “States of the 20th century cannot be based on injustice and violence but on justice of independence”)<sup>11</sup>. Also in later years there are found similar descriptions of the persecution of the Czech political representation and the suppression of human rights underlining the threatened existence of the Czech nation in the case of the victory of the Central Powers, reminders of the fate of the Polabian Slavs, and at the same time their unwillingness to fight against their ‘Slav brothers’ in the interest of the suppressors<sup>12</sup>. The lessons for students in their high school graduating year were accompanied with a smaller dose of emotion but with a listing of specific causes. In a paragraph designated marginalia ‘Mental and Emotional State of the Czechs,’ Jozef Pekař claims bombastically: “The

<sup>10</sup> Z. Beneš, “Učebnice dějepisu jako edukační médium a jako didakticko-historický text”, in: *Vzájemný obraz souseda v polských a českých školních učebnicích*, red. B. Gracová, D. Labischová, J. Szymeczek, Ostrava 2014, p. 15-16.

<sup>11</sup> L. Horák, *Počátkové dějepisu návodného na škole národní, s částí theoretickou a praktickou*. IV. (pro 7. - 8. ročník), Praha 1920, p. 106-107; L. Horák, „*Naše škola*“. *Knihovna pokrokové práce učitelstva československého*, III. díl, Praha 1923, p. 225.

<sup>12</sup> Jiráek, Reitler, *Dějepis pro roční kursy (IV. ročník) při měšťanských školách*, Praha 1935, p. 151; L. Horák, *Dějepis pro třetí třídu měšťanských škol*, Praha 1936, p. 137; Gebauerová, Jiráek, Reitler, *Dějepis pro měšťanské školy*, III. Díl, Praha 1937, p. 93.

thought that with their blood and property they must provide help to strengthen the domination of Germany-Hungary over them was as unbearable as the duty to kill their friends – Russian, Serb and French.”<sup>13</sup> The author does not have in mind only the Czech territory, but also Slovakia. Experiences of Nazi occupation in the Second World War were again presented with an increase in emotionality in texts following the end of the war (“Free after three hundred years of slavery!”)<sup>14</sup>.

In textbooks published after 1948 however we encounter a totally different thematic conception. The sufferings of war are limited only to the ‘working people’; the ‘bourgeoisie’ is presented as the group of the Czech population who are parasites on human misery. Tomáš Baťa for example is named as a war profiteer. The persecution of the Czech political elite is also skipped over<sup>15</sup>. The unwillingness of Czechs and Slovaks, ‘suppressed for hundreds of years by the Germans and the Hungarians,’ to fight in the interests of the Austro-Hungarian ‘bourgeoisie’<sup>16</sup> is given mention, while sympathy for the Slav nations and specific expressions of the anti-Austrian thinking of the Czech ‘people’ and the types of their persecution are emphasized<sup>17</sup>.

In textbooks published after the Velvet Revolution, this negative attitude of the Czechs is documented by the tune, ‘Red frocks, turn around them, we’re going against Russia, and we don’t know why’<sup>18</sup>. The differing reactions of the Czech and German populations to war were identified as the reason for the growth of nationalism and, on the German side, increasing aggression towards Czechs. “There deepened such nationalist dissension that left no hope for the future balancing of the relations between the decisive nations living in the Czech lands.” Or in other words: “The attitude of the government, the aggressive approach of nationalist streams in the ranks of the German population, and not least the strengthening of the dependence on the policies of Wilhelminian Germany all brought about with new urgency the question

<sup>13</sup> “Myšlenka, že mají krev i statkem svým přispěti k utužení nadvlády německo-maďarské nad sebou, byla jim nesnesitelnou, stejně jako povinnost zabíjeti své přátele, Rusy, Srby a Francouze.” J. Pekař, *Dějiny československé. Pro nejvyšší třídy škol středních*, Praha 1921, p. 168.

<sup>14</sup> J. S. Touc, *Stručné československé dějiny*, Praha 1946, p. 71; E. Štorch, K. Čondl, *Pracovní učebnice dějepisu*, part 3, for the 3rd class of lower secondary schools, Praha 1946, p. 174-175.

<sup>15</sup> *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější*. Učební text dějepisu pro osmý postupný ročník všeobecně vzdělávacích škol, Praha 1954, p. 75-76; K. Bartošek, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1987, p. 27-29.

<sup>16</sup> *Dějiny ČSR. II. díl*. Učební text pro 10. postupný ročník všeobecně vzdělávacích škol a školy pedagogické, Praha 1956, p. 81; J. Joza, A. Ort, *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější* pro 8. ročník základní devítileté školy, Praha 1962, p. 56.

<sup>17</sup> M. Trapl, V. Čapek, *Dějepis pro devátý ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 115-116; V. Husa, *Československé dějiny*. Učebnice pro střední školu, Praha 1966, p. 200-201; M. Dohnal, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1980, p. 25-26.

<sup>18</sup> “Červený šátečku, kolem se toč, my jdeme na Rusa (případně půjdeme nebo táhneme na Rusa, Srba), nevíme proč”. M. Hájek, J. Ryšánková, *Svět a Československo ve 20. století*, Praha 1990, p. 17; Coll., *Dějepis 8, učebnice pro základní školy a víceletá gymnázia*, Plzeň 2010, p. 136; F. Čapka, L. Vykoupil, *Dějepis – novověk*. Pro 8. ročník základní školy a tercie víceletých gymnázií, Brno 2009, p. 106; V. Olivová, *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995, p. 37.

of the relationship of the Czech nation with Austro-Hungary.<sup>19</sup> Robert Kvaček adds to this that certain Czech politicians, of whom there were not many, saw in the war changing the contemporary world “a historical opportunity for a significant change to the constitutional position of the Czech lands”<sup>20</sup>. But we also encounter a generalizing explanation for the outbreak of the war as an impulse for the developing emancipation struggles of minority nations in multi-national states and nationally-mixed territories, in the case of Austro-Hungary with reference to the “prewar inability of the state to effectively resolve nationalist squabbles”<sup>21</sup>.

## FOREIGN RESISTANCE

The differences between interwar textbooks and the themes that were published after February 1948 are visible in the degree of attention paid to the activities of the foreign resistance and the actions of its main representatives, as well as to the significance of the deployment of the Czechoslovak legions. While extensive passages are given them in the older books, certain facts are reduced to a minimum in socialist texts. Their authors, shortly after the formation of the CSR, inform younger pupils that Masaryk understood that in the case of the victory of the Central Powers “the Czech nation could expect nothing from them apart from complete legal and national downfall.” This was to explain his attempt to persuade the Allies of the necessity to liberate the Czechoslovak nation from the Habsburg Empire<sup>22</sup>. The nobility of the efforts of the representatives of the foreign resistance, capable of understanding the need for their own nation in its wider context, receives emphasis. “They did not come to plead, but rather to demand the right for an educated nation in the center of Europe to have its own country. They did not come with just a map of their land but with a plan for a new, fairly divided Europe in which all the subjugated nations would gain their independence.”<sup>23</sup>. Pekár limited the discussion on the foreign resistance and the Czechoslovak legions to a few pages of text in chapters eloquently entitled

<sup>19</sup> „Prohloubil se tak národnostní rozkol, který do budoucna nedával naději na urovnání vztahů mezi oběma rozhodujícími národy žijícími v českých zemích.“ *České a československé dějiny II, od roku 1790 do současnosti*, Praha 1991, p. 59. „Postoj vlády, agresivní nástup nacionalistických proudů v řadách německého obyvatelstva a v neposlední řadě posílení závislosti na politice vilémovského Německa, to vše kladlo s novou naléhavostí otázku vztahu českého národa k Rakousko-Uhersku.“ J. Harna, R. Fišer, *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998, p. 126.

<sup>20</sup> R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 89.

<sup>21</sup> *Moderní dějiny pro střední školy*. Učebnice. Světové a české dějiny 20. století a prvního desetiletí 21. století, Praha 2014, p. 24.

<sup>22</sup> „Český národ od nich [R-U] ničeho nesmí čekat, než úplné právní a národní zkázy.“ L. Horák, *Dějepis pro třetí třídu měšťanských škol*, Praha 1936, p. 106-107.

<sup>23</sup> Jirák, Reitler, *Dějepis pro roční kursy (IV. ročník) při měšťanských školách*, Praha 1935, p. 151.

“the resistance of foreign Czechs, Masaryk and his collaborators, Czech resistance in Russia, Czech army in Russia, the arrangement of the Czech army in France and Italy, the Czech military uprising against the Bolshevik Russians, the significance of the Czech victory in Siberia”<sup>24</sup>. He evaluated Masaryk’s role with the words: “from those Czechs acting politically and scientifically abroad he is the most significant, knowing well foreign countries and languages, in particular the Anglo-Saxon world (and also Russian), and is especially capable of the grand task he committed to.” He mentions the Paris Manifesto of the Czech foreign committee of 14 Nov 1915 as the first official manifestation of foreign Czechs advocating independence. He states that the idea “of the complete dismemberment of Austria and the establishment of an independent, Czechoslovak state” was first formulated by Arnošt Denis in the work *War* published in 1915, therefore at a time when this option was not acceptable to the majority of the Allies<sup>25</sup>. He sees the “Czech domination of Siberia, when for the three months the name of our nation filled the press of the entire world” as of decisive importance for the fulfillment of the foreign resistance’s program. He added that this was followed by the recognition by all the Allies at the Paris Council of the future Czechoslovak government and the Czechoslovak nation as an Allied country<sup>26</sup>. The theme of the Legions was not missing from any textbook during the interwar period. Its content was offered to elementary school children in a rather emotional form. They made reference to “the spirit of the Hussite forebears” and to the heroism of the Legions who “filled the world with wonder for there was no example in history that an army thousands of kilometers from home could manage without resources to defend themselves in an enemy country”. The lesson ends with the claim that the participation of the Czech legionnaires in battles on the side of the Allied countries had, along with Masaryk, the greatest credit for our freedom and independence<sup>27</sup>. Horák’s text is even more impressive, depicting Masaryk as a white-haired old man leaving behind family and homeland to swear to our martyr, in the name of the whole nation on July 6, 1915 at the memorial to Jan Hus in Kostnica, “a break from the cursed Austria and its dynasty”<sup>28</sup>. From the prisoners in Russia he created an army “which, like once the brave Hussites,

<sup>24</sup> J. Pekař, *Dějiny československé. Pro nejvyšší třídy škol středních*, Praha 1921. p. 172-174, 176, 179, 182.

<sup>25</sup> “Jsa z Čechů působících politicky a vědecky v cizině neznámějším, znaje dobře cizinu a zejména svět a jazyk anglosaský (ale i ruský), byl zvláště způsobilým k veliké úloze, již se podjal.” J. Pekař, *Dějiny československé. Pro nejvyšší třídy škol středních*, Praha 1921., p. 172-173.

<sup>26</sup> “[Č]eskému opanování Sibíře, kdy jméno našeho národa po tři měsíce plnilo tisk celého světa”, J. Pekař, *Dějiny československé. Pro nejvyšší třídy škol středních*, Praha 1921, p. 181-182.

<sup>27</sup> [Hrdinství legionářů] “naplňovalo svět úžasem, neboť není příkladů v dějinách, aby vojsko vzdálené tisíce kilometrů od vlasti a bez prostředků dovedlo se v nepřátelské zemi tak dlouho brániti.” J. Horčíčka, J. Nešpor, *Dějepis pro školy měšťanské*, díl třetí, Praha 1922, p. 77-78.

<sup>28</sup> L. Horák, „*Naše škola*“ ..., p. 226.



had a Žižka platoon, a Prokop platoon and a Hus platoon who gave themselves in heroic battle on Russian and French battlefields”<sup>29</sup>. We find references to the glory of the Hussites in most interwar textbooks: “The spirit of the Hussite forefathers came back to life in the Legions, Unafraid of death in their enthusiasm for the liberation of the homeland, they overran the trenches, invaded the German defence lines and by their example stirred the timid Russian divisions. Then all nations spoke the name of the Czechoslovaks with wonder.<sup>30</sup>”. The students were reminded of the names of the legionnaire fighters who were celebrated on various fronts and who gave down their lives in the struggle for liberty, as well as the names of illustrious commanders. They were together offered the titles of books on the theme of the Legions, or the authors even included quotations from them<sup>31</sup>. In the textbooks published in 1946 there were already clear efforts to downplay the Legions’ conflicts with the Bolsheviks. Rather the successes at Zborov were emphasized, along with Masaryk’s order for the Legions to return to Europe and their relocation to French battlefields to fight the Central Powers. The Siberian adventure was reduced to a few sentences. “Since there occurred misunderstandings with the Soviets, the Legionnaires decided to keep fighting to Vladivostok. They occupied the Siberian main line and, protected by armed trains, finally reached the Pacific Ocean after many difficulties.<sup>32</sup>”

A significant change in the teaching of the theme in textbooks was brought about by ideological manipulation, rooted of course in the newly-published works of Czechoslovak historiography. The main credit for the independent state could no longer be given to the foreign resistance and the Legion’s military activities, but rather to the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It was written that Masaryk’s move abroad – with the consent of the Czech bourgeoisie – was dictated by one goal: to secure a position for the bourgeoisie, in the case of a victory by the Allies, in the winners’ camp. The activities of the resistance leaders were belittled by the assertion that “Although Masaryk and Beneš publicly demanded the liberation of the Czech and Slovak nations, in actuality they were willing to subordinate them-

---

<sup>29</sup> [Vytváří armádu,] „která jako kdysi stateční husité měla rotu Žižkovu, Prokopovu, Husovu a na bojišti ruském i francouzském se dala v hrdinský boj”. L. Horák, „*Naše škola*“..., p. 199.

<sup>30</sup> “Duch husitských předků ožil v legionářích. Nelekajíce se smrti, v nadšení pro osvobození vlasti dobyli zákopů, prorvali německé obranné linie a strhli svým příkladem i vlašné ruské oddíly. Tehdy bylo vyslovováno jméno Českoslováků všemi národy s obdivem.” J. Mlčoch, *Učebnice dějepisu pro měšťanské školy*. III. Novověk, Praha 1935, p. 109.

<sup>31</sup> J. Mlčoch, *Učebnice dějepisu pro měšťanské školy*. III. Novověk, Praha 1935, p. 110; Gebauerová, Jirák, Reitler, *Dějepis pro roční kursy (IV. ročník) při měšťanských školách*, Praha 1935, p. 94-96; J. S. Touc, *Stručné československé dějiny*, Praha 1946, p. 69.

<sup>32</sup> “Když však došlo k nedorozumění se sověty, rozhodli se legionáři, že se probijí až do Vladivostoku. Obsadili sibiřskou magistrálu a chránění obrněnými vlaky dosáhli po mnoha svízelných konečně Tichého oceánu.” E. Štorch, K. Čondl, *Pracovní učebnice dějepisu*, part 3, for the 3rd class of lower secondary schools, Praha 1946, p. 172.



selves to the interests and the wishes of the Allied powers.”<sup>33</sup>. Since for all textbook authors the October Revolution was for almost four decades the decisive act behind the emergence of the CSR, quotations of Gottwald’s words are found which expanded further this idea. “It will be forever recoded in the history of the Czech and Slovak nation that Stalin, as spokesman for the Russian Bolsheviks, was the first, even before Czech politicians, to highlight the right of our people to freedom and national independence outside the framework of the Habsburg monarchy.”<sup>34</sup>. The share of the Czechoslovak legions in the victory of the Allies was undermined by the claim that it suited the imperialists that the Czechs and the Slovaks were fighting for them<sup>35</sup>. Almost no textbook from the 1949-1989 period lacked various lengthy passages on “the abuse of the Czechoslovak military in Russia for the imperialist intervention”. In texts from the 1950s the explanation of these facts are given the greatest space. In one of these we come across an absurd explanation for Masaryk’s stay in Russia. “Masaryk was passionately engaged against the Bolsheviks. He was willing to support anyone fighting against them. He avoided encounters with the representatives of the Soviet government while negotiating with the anti-revolutionary bourgeoisie, and supported the terrorists who were plotting the assassination of significant Soviet activists.”<sup>36</sup>. The authors again supported their words with quotations, in this instance with Lenin’s words that “by the day of secession, the leaders of the Czech national council received approximately 15 million, for which money the Czechoslovak army was sold to the French and English imperialists.”<sup>37</sup>. The whole story of the conflict between the Legionnaires and the Bolsheviks was deliberately misrepresented, for example by the affirmation that Masaryk “during his stay in America bragged that he was the ruler of Siberia and of half of Russia” and that he advised the Americans to expand he intervention, which is later balanced out by a detailed discussion of Czechoslovaks in the Red Army in Russia<sup>38</sup>. Elsewhere it is claimed that the goal of

<sup>33</sup> “Masaryk a Beneš se sice veřejně dožadovali osvobození českého a slovenského národa, ale ve skutečnosti byli ochotni podřídit se zájmům a přání dohodových velmocí.” *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější*, p. 76-78.

<sup>34</sup> “Zůstane navždy zapsáno v dějinách českého a slovenského národa, že Stalin jako mluvčí ruských bolševiků vyzvedl první, ještě dříve než čeští politikové, právo našeho lidu na svobodu a státní samostatnost mimo rámec habsburské monarchie.” *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější*, p. 77.

<sup>35</sup> *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější*, p. 78.

<sup>36</sup> “Masaryk byl vášnivě zaujat proti bolševikům. Byl ochoten podporovat každého, kdo proti nim bojoval. Vyhýbal se setkání s představiteli sovětské vlády, zato však jednal s protirevoluční šlechtou a buržoasií a podporoval teroristy, kteří chystali vraždy významných sovětských činitelů.” *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější*, p. 82.

<sup>37</sup> “Do dne vystoupení obdrželi vůdcové České národní rady od francouzské a anglické vlády přibližně 15 milionů a za tyto peníze byla československá armáda prodána francouzským a anglickým imperialistům.” *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější*, p. 83.

<sup>38</sup> [Masaryk se] „za svého pobytu v Americe chlubil, že je pánem Sibíře a poloviny Ruska.” *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější*, p. 84-85.

the Czechoslovak Legions was the occupation of Moscow<sup>39</sup>. In textbooks published in the 1960s, the blame for the actions of the Legions against Soviet Russia was placed on their 'Bourgeois commanders', enemies of the October Revolution, who outright lied to the Legionnaires in order to convince them that the Bolsheviks wished to turn them over to the Germans and so they must fight. They emphasized the contacts between the Legion commanders and Czarist generals and added "this action by the Czechoslovak Legions, decided in advance by the representatives of our bourgeois resistance with the Allied powers, was part of the intervention war of the capitalist countries against Soviet Russia."<sup>40</sup> More information on the foreign resistance and its leaders can be found in a text from 1970. The significance for their activities abroad, are detailed along with the connection to the domestic resistance and the purposes of the creation of the Czechoslovak legions. Their organization in the individual countries and the battle at Zborov are described in detail. In contrast to the preceding textbooks, there are no margin notes emphasizing information on the armed encounters of the legions with the Bolsheviks, which the authors limited to one sentence: "While in the period of the events of the revolution the leadership of the legions stood on the side of the Counterrevolution, part of the Czech and Slovak prisoners were gained by the revolutionary ideas to fight at the side of the Russian proletariat."<sup>41</sup> A similar approach was taken by the authors of texts from the 1980s<sup>42</sup>.

The importance of the foreign resistance and the military activities on the side of the Allies are again accented in text materials published after 1989. They present profiles of a trio of the most significant resistance representatives and define the beginning of the declaration of war on Austria-Hungary 'to the death' (6 July 1915) and mention the proclamation of the Czech Foreign Committee (14 Nov 1915). In one textbook it is emphasized that "the success of the political negotiations often depended on individuals. Therefore the Czechoslovak exile movement also needed a significant personality. This was Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk [...], who enjoyed a certain prestige

---

<sup>39</sup> *Dějiny ČSR. II. Díl*, p. 86.

<sup>40</sup> "Toto vystoupení československých legií bylo předem dohodnuto představiteli našeho buržoazního odboje s dohodovými velmocemi a bylo součástí intervenční války kapitalistických států proti sovětskému Rusku." J. Joza, A. Ort, *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější pro 8. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 59; M. Trapl, V. Čapek, *Dějepis pro devátý ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 118; V. Husa, *Československé dějiny. Učebnice pro střední školu*, Praha 1966, p. 200-201; M. Dohnal, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1980 p. 203.

<sup>41</sup> "Zatímco vedení legií se v době revolučních událostí postavilo na stranu kontrarevoluce, část českých a slovenských zajatců a legionářů byla revolučními myšlenkami získána k boji po boku ruského proletariátu." M. Dohnal, L. Stolařík, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1970, p. 26-29.

<sup>42</sup> M. Dohnal, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1980, p. 26-27; *Dějepis II. pro 2. ročník gymnázia*, Praha 1986, p. 326-327; *Dějepis pro 3. ročník gymnázia*, Praha 1987, p. 46.

abroad which helped him gain political support for his exile action.<sup>43</sup> In other materials the authors mention the complexity of Masaryk's attempt to convince the Allied states of the need for the destruction of Austro-Hungary and on the other hand they point out the financial and moral support of the Countrymen's Association (2 million Czechs and Slovaks living abroad), which made the formation of the Legions easier. Their significance is documented not only by the specific military successes but also by the number of legionnaires (France 10,000, Italy, 20,000, Russia 60-70,000). Kvaček explains that joining the legion "was for the most part an expression of deep national feeling nurtured even before the war." He added that the Legionnaires "became the army of a state that did not yet exist and did not have its beginning solidly assured, but who believed in it and tied their fates to it."<sup>44</sup> Elsewhere it is stated that "the Czechoslovak army joined the fighting on the western and the eastern fronts, and its existence meant above all significant political support for foreign actions towards implementing the idea of a Czechoslovak state. Its international significance grew on Russian soil after 1917."<sup>45</sup> The so-called Chelyabinsk incident and its consequences, the occupation of the Siberian railway, are explained briefly but objectively. Younger pupils too receive the lesson that "the Legion's successes in the fight against the Soviets gained the admiration of the whole world" and quickened the diplomatic recognition of the Czechoslovak National Council<sup>46</sup>. V In one textbook the students read of a downplaying of the conflict of the Legionnaires with the Bolsheviks after 1948, and Válková claims that then they were not allowed to teach anything about the Czechoslovak legions<sup>47</sup>.

The idea of uniting the Czechs and Slovaks in a single state is described as "too daring a proposal" because "the program of the national union of Czechs and Slovaks

<sup>43</sup> "Úspěch politických jednání často závisí na jednotlivcích. Proto i československé exilové hnutí potřebovalo výraznou osobnost. Tou se stal Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk [...], těšící se v cizině jistému renomé, které mu pomohlo získat politickou podporu pro jeho exilovou akci." *Moderní dějiny pro střední školy*. Učebnice. Světové a české dějiny 20. století a prvního desetiletí 21. století, Praha 2014, p. 24.

<sup>44</sup> [Vstup do legií] "byl většinou výrazem hlubokého národního citění vypěstovaného již před válkou." [Legionáři se] "stali vojskem státu, který ještě neexistoval ani neměl zrod pevněji zajištěn, ale uvěřili v něj a spojili s ním svůj další osud". R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 94.

<sup>45</sup> "Československé vojsko zasáhlo do bojů na západní i východní frontě, jeho existence však především znamenala významnou politickou podporu zahraniční akce při prosazování myšlenky československého státu. Svého mezinárodního významu nabylo na ruské půdě po roce 1917." *České a československé dějiny II*, p. 60-61; M. Hájek, J. Ryšánková, *Svět a Československo ve 20. století*, Praha 1990, p. 18-19; M. Hlavačka, *Dějepis pro gymnázia a střední školy*, Praha 2001, p. 166-167; V. Olivová, *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995, p. 39-41; R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 90-91, 93-95; J. Harna, R. Fišer, *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998, p. 127-128, 133; V. Válková, *Dějepis 8 – novověk pro základní školy*, Praha 2008, p. 136-137.

<sup>46</sup> V. Olivová, *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995, p. 40; *České a československé dějiny II*, p. 62; R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 94; J. Harna, R. Fišer, *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998, p. 133; *Moderní dějiny pro střední školy*, p. 29.

<sup>47</sup> V. Válková, *Dějepis 8 – novověk pro základní školy*, Praha 2008, p. 136.

departed from the current Czech conception of historical state rights.”<sup>48</sup> The genesis of this project, its support by Czech and Slovak countrymen’s associations, the reasons for and the undoubted positives of this union are observed. Kvaček however pointed out the negatives which were brought along by the Czech ‘paternalism’ “in which was conflictingly present a self-sacrificing, a superiority and an underestimation of the partner [...], which the entire Czech society shared concerning Slovakia and the Slovaks, and then brought into the common state.”<sup>49</sup>

## DOMESTIC RESISTANCE

The fact that in history textbooks the Czechoslovak domestic resistance has been granted substantially less attention than the activities of the foreign resistance is a proof of the perception of the latter as a more significant agent in the emergence of the independent state. Information on events in the Czech lands is concentrated on the persecutions in the first months of the war and in particular the names of some of those executed, S. Kratochvíl, E. Matějka and the publisher J. Kotka, for distributing the manifesto of the supreme Russian commander. More often there appear the arrests of leading politicians and well-known writers: V. Klofáč, J.S. Machara, V. Dyk, and especially K. Kramár and A. Rašína, sentenced to death as the persons responsible for the anti-Austrian thinking of the Czechs and for causing Czech platoons to change sides<sup>50</sup>. The theme is made clearer for younger students through the concrete story of Kramár. They are informed that “the Archduke Bedřich announced that there is no more dangerous enemy than the *vile* Masaryk – that he must be captured – removed! And so this man, who tried for 25 years to combine the good of the nation with the good of the empire and against whom not the least fault could be proved, after a year in prison as a ‘traitor’ was condemned to death by hanging.” He adds that the carrying out of the sentence was suspended due to the realisation that this would be an injustice<sup>51</sup>. We can find a reference to the Mafia, a secret society maintaining contact

<sup>48</sup> R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 90; M. Hlavačka, *Dějepis pro gymnázia a střední školy*, Praha 2001, p. 166; *Moderní dějiny pro střední školy*, p. 30.

<sup>49</sup> “V němž [v českém paternalismu] byla rozporně přítomna obětavost i nadřazenost a podceňování partnera [...], který sdílela vůči Slovensku a Slovákům celá česká společnost a přenesla si ho pak i do společného státu.” R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 90.

<sup>50</sup> L. Horák, “*Naše škola*”, p. 226; J. Mlčoch, *Učebnice dějepisu pro měšťanské školy. III. Novověk*, Praha 1935, p. 110; L. Horák, *Dějepis pro třetí třídu měšťanských škol*, Praha 1936, p. 137-138; Gebauerová, Jirák, Reitler, *Dějepis pro roční kursy (IV. ročník) při měšťanských školách*, Praha 1935, p. 93.

<sup>51</sup> “Arcivévoda Bedřich prohlásil, že jest nejnebezpečnějším nepřítelem jako ‘bídny’ Masaryk. Že musí být zatčen a – odstraněn! A tak tento muž, který po 25 let snažil se spojití dobro národa s dobrem říše a jemuž ani nejmenšího provinění nebylo lze dokázati, po roce žalářování jakožto ‘velezrádce’ odsouzen byl k smrti provazem.” L. Horák, *Počátkové dějepisu ...*, p. 107.

with the foreign resistance, with a list of the names of its members<sup>52</sup>. The authors then return to the domestic setting, somewhere in the section entitled 'Domestic Resistance,' with a discourse on significant events from the final years of the war<sup>53</sup>. It is stated that fear of the Russian (February) Revolution led to a revival of political life. The declaration of Czech writers from May 1917, the constitutional declaration of Czech members of parliament, the so-called Epiphany Declaration, the national oath, occasionally theatre celebrations, then meetings in Liptovský Mikuláš and the formation of the National Committee are all mentioned<sup>54</sup>.

In the textbooks from the socialist era, the persecution of Czech politicians does not appear as a theme. The wartime problems of the inhabitants and the demonstrations of resistance to the difficult situation in the form of strikes and protest meetings are stressed, and the numbers of victims are stated. The Russian revolution, primarily the response to the October revolution, is identified as the inspiration for these, among the other results of which is mentioned the massive May Day demonstrations of 1918. The activities of Czech politicians and writers from 1917-1918 are indeed mentioned, but the greatest attention is devoted to detailed descriptions of military mutinies, again with references to the numbers of victims and sometimes also to the specific participants. Significant space is reserved for a critique of the policies of social democracy. The formation of the National Committee is interpreted as an attempt by the bourgeoisie to secure their influence on the course of events, to influence the leaders of the worker parties, and to make of them collaborators. The individual names of the protagonists have been left out since there was no need to mention the leading representatives of a slice of our history which should best be forgotten<sup>55</sup>. "The Men of October 28" are mentioned in the text of J. Pátek alone, while in other places we

<sup>52</sup> J. Mlčoch, *Učebnice dějepisu pro měšťanské školy. III. Novověk*, Praha 1935, p. 111; L. Horák, *Dějepis...*, p. 143; Gebauerová, J. Jiráček, Reitler, *Dějepis pro roční kursy (IV. ročník) při měšťanských školách*, Praha 1935, p. 94; J. S. Touc, *Stručně československé dějiny*, Praha 1946, p. 69; E. Štorch, K. Čondl, *Pracovní učebnice dějepisu*, part 3, for the 3rd class of lower secondary schools, Praha 1946, p. 170; V. Husa, *Československé dějiny. Učebnice pro střední školu*, Praha 1966, p. 200-201; M. Dohnal, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1980 p. 201.

<sup>53</sup> Jiráček, Reitler, *Dějepis pro roční kursy (IV. ročník) při měšťanských školách*, Praha 1935, p. 152.

<sup>54</sup> Jiráček, Reitler, *Dějepis pro roční kursy (IV. ročník) při měšťanských školách*, Praha 1935, p. 152; J. Horáček, J. Ledr, *Dějepis pro měšťanské školy. Díl čtvrtý*, Praha 1935, p. 124; L. Horák, *Dějepis...*, p. 148-149; Gebauerová, Jiráček, Reitler, *Dějepis pro roční kursy (IV. ročník) při měšťanských školách*, Praha 1935, p. 97-98; J. S. Touc, *Stručně československé dějiny*, Praha 1946, p. 70; E. Štorch, K. Čondl, *Pracovní učebnice dějepisu, part 3, for the 3rd class of lower secondary schools*, Praha 1946, p. 177; J. Mlčoch, *Učebnice dějepisu pro měšťanské školy. III. Novověk*, Praha 1935, p. 112.

<sup>55</sup> *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější...*, p. 79-82, 85-86; *Dějiny ČSR. II. díl...*, p. 81-86; J. Joza, A. Ort, *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější pro 8. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 56-58; M. Trapl, V. Čapek, *Dějepis pro devátý ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 115-117; V. Husa, *Československé dějiny. Učebnice pro střední školu*, Praha 1966, p. 200-201; M. Dohnal, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1980 p. 200-202; M. Dohnal, L. Stolářik, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1970, p. 25, 30-32; M. Dohnal, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1980, p. 26, 29, 32.

occasionally meet with a reference to V. Šrobár<sup>56</sup>. The name of the “factory owner” or “reactionary bourgeois politician” Kramár is mentioned in the context of negotiations for the first government, which he headed<sup>57</sup>.

An essential change in the teaching of the share of the domestic resistance in the emergence of the republic is noted in all the textbooks published after 1989. Characteristic is the attempt to increase knowledge of the period of liberty preceding the two totalitarianisms, the Nazi and the Communist. In some texts it is possible to read of the persecutions of individual persons after the forming of a military/bureaucratic dictatorship in Cisleithania, on their party allegiance, membership in national organizations or the “Secret Committee – the Mafia”, on the activities that led to their capture, the political trials, the convictions, in some cases the carrying out of capital punishment sentences. In the listings we find the names Klofáč, Kramár, the head of the Sokol movement J. Scheiner, Rasina, and also Kratochvíl and Kotka. The organizers of the Mafia, especially E. Beneš and P. Šámal, but also those who participated to a significant degree in its intelligence activities, are mentioned. In one textbook the author, making use of professional publications, attempts to evaluate the significance of the Mafia association. “Today we cannot overstate the intelligence value of the information that the Mafia passed abroad. Probably more significant was the two-way mediation of knowledge on the Czech (Czechoslovak) anti-Austrian resistance abroad and on the domestic political situation as a whole.”<sup>58</sup>

In textbooks from the past 25 years the shift in Czech domestic policy in the final years of the war is demonstrated by a number of proclamations from 1917. A passage rejecting the concept of an independent Czechoslovakia state by the Czech Association (from 24 Jan 1917) states that “the Czech nation, as always in the past also in the present and in the coming period, sees its future and the conditions of its development only under the Habsburg scepter”<sup>59</sup>. and the contemporary protest of Czech writers against this too, calling on parliamentarians “to care for the interests of the nation

<sup>56</sup> J. Pátek, *Československé dějiny (1918-1939)*, SPN, Praha 1975, s. 12.

<sup>57</sup> J. Joza, A. Ort, *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější pro 8. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 61; *Dějiny ČSR. III. díl. Učební text pro 11. postupný ročník všeobecné vzdělávacích škol a školy pedagogické*, Praha 1956, p. 3.

<sup>58</sup> “Nemůžeme dnes přeceňovat zpravodajskou hodnotu informací, jež Maffie předávala do zahraničí. Závažnější pravděpodobně bylo dvoucestné zprostředkování vědomostí o českém (československém) protirakouském odboji v zahraničí a o celkové politické situaci doma.” M. Hlavačka, *Dějepis pro gymnázia a střední školy*, Praha 2001, p. 166; V. Olivová, *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995, p. 37, 39; *České a československé dějiny II...*, p. 59-60; R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 88; J. Harna, R. Fišer, *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998, p. 127; F. Parkan, T. Mikeška, M. Parkanová, *Dějepis 9 – učebnice pro základní školy a víceletá gymnázia*, Plzeň 2011, p. 136; *Moderní dějiny pro střední školy...*, p. 29.

<sup>59</sup> “Národ český jako vždy v minulosti, tak také v přítomnosti a v době příští jen pod žezlem habsburským vidí svoji budoucnost a podmínky svého vývoje.” V. Olivová, *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995, p. 42; *České a československé dějiny II*, p. 61; *Moderní dějiny pro střední školy...*, p. 29.



and to work for a Europe of free nations,” with the explanation that “as has been the custom in Czech conditions, where politics failed or were excluded, the cultural sphere stepped forward.”<sup>60</sup> It is claimed that the Manifest of Czech Writers (17 May) bullied the deputies into a proclamation calling for the change of the monarchy into a common state, and for the union of Czech lands with Slovakia<sup>61</sup>. Harna and Fišer consider that “in relation to the flow of quickly-changing events, there exists a row of partial milestones which accompanied the concluding phase of the struggle for a change of the constitutional status of the Czech lands and the bringing about of the long-term goals of Czech politics.”<sup>62</sup> In other books it is made clear that the so-called Epiphany declaration openly demanded “an independent, sovereign, social-democratic state.” The national oath by the representatives of Czech politics, culture and science of April 13 reacted against the arrogant condemnation of Czech emancipation attempts by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Czernin, speaking of the activities of the “miserable and pitiful Masaryk” at home and abroad and that the most effective public demonstration were the National Theatre celebrations (16-17 May) with the participation of representatives of the Slovaks<sup>63</sup>. In the majority of textbooks, the breakup of Austro-Hungary is also accompanied by military uprisings and desertions and the unhelpful stoking of the situation by strikes and demonstrations influenced by reports on the Russian Revolutions. The preparations for a state overthrow are then documented by the formation of the National Committee in July 1918 and especially by the October Days. The balance of the information provided is characteristic of textbooks of the last quarter-century.

## IMAGE OF OCTOBER 28, 1918 AND OTHER DATES CONNECTED WITH THE ACHIEVEMENT OF INDEPENDENCE

Which dates are emphasized in textbooks as key for the establishment of the state? Pekár gives dates to all the significant events directly preceding the birth of the CSR – first the recognition of the Czechoslovak state by the Allied countries,

<sup>60</sup> J. Harna, R. Fišer, *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998, p. 129.

<sup>61</sup> V. Olivová, *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995, p. 42; *České a československé dějiny II...*, p. 61; R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 93; J. Harna, R. Fišer, *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998, p. 129; M. Hlavačka, *Dějepis pro gymnázia a střední školy*, Praha 2001, p. 167.

<sup>62</sup> “V souvislém proudu překotně se ženoucích událostí existuje řada dílčích mezníků, které doprovázely závěrečnou fázi boje o změnu státoprávního postavení českých zemí a uskutečnění dlouholetých cílů české politiky.” J. Harna, R. Fišer, *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998, p. 131.

<sup>63</sup> *České a československé dějiny II...*, p. 62; V. Olivová, *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995, p. 42; J. Harna, R. Fišer, *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998, p. 132; R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 95; M. Hlavačka, *Dějepis pro gymnázia a střední školy*, Praha 2001, p. 168



specifically mentioning June 29 (France), July 2 (USA), less specifically August and September, 1918. In addition he mentions October 14, when Beneš announced the formation of a new government in Paris, and its dedication to steering the destiny of the ‘Czechoslovak Land’, and October 18 as the date of the ceremonial proclamation of Czech independence by Masaryk – the Washington Declaration. October 14 however is mentioned in connection with the attempt by the socialist parties to declare a republic. October 28 was unambiguously designated the Day of Czech Liberation. He adds that by the Martin Declaration of October 30, Slovakia joined the common state. Also mentioned are the Geneva meeting with Beneš, attended by leading Czech political figures. The list is topped off by the ‘Great Day’ of November 14, when the Habsburg-Lorraine dynasty was deprived of its right to the Czech throne, the republic was proclaimed, and its president and government elected. Also specified was the day the President arrived in the country (December 21)<sup>64</sup>. In those textbooks determined for elementary schools, the authors restricted themselves to listing the dates 28 October, 30 October, and 14 November. They do not forget to mention the date of Masaryk’s return from abroad, and occasionally October 18<sup>65</sup>. But significant space is reserved for the picture of October 28. Its description contrasts with Pekař’s factuality. “Due to the prudent leaders, on that beautiful day not one shot was fired during those intoxicating moments when the nation shook off almost 400 years of Habsburg rule. In joy over the unbelievable news, the Czechs cried, embraced, exalted. Prague rang out with national songs, and two-headed eagles, the symbol of 300 years of subjugation, were torn down from official buildings. Czechs in other cities enjoyed similar joyous moments listening to the speeches of their leaders. They took to the streets to the sounds of music and the chiming of the bells, packed together and ignoring grudges and social differences. After so much suffering they were witnesses to that blessed day for which generations had waited in vain. The fairy-tale moment spread throughout the entire homeland.”<sup>66</sup> Elsewhere we read that “early in the day delighted crowds of people flooded into Prague. Everywhere was joy, music, singing, tears of happiness.

<sup>64</sup> J. Pekař, *Dějiny československé. Pro nejvyšší třídy škol středních*, Praha 1921, p. 182, 184-187.

<sup>65</sup> J. Mlčoch, *Učebnice dějepisu pro měšťanské školy. III. Novověk*, Praha 1935, p. 116; Gebauerová, Jirák, Reitler, *Dějepis pro roční kursy (IV. ročník) při měšťanských školách*, Praha 1935, p. 97-99; E. Štorch, K. Čondl, *Pracovní učebnice dějepisu*, part 3, for the 3rd class of lower secondary schools, Praha 1946, p. 179, 181; J. S. Touc, *Stručně československé dějiny*, Praha 1946, p. 71.

<sup>66</sup> “Zásluhou prozíravých vůdců nepadla v překrásný den ani jedna rána v opojných okamžicích, kdy se národ zbavil téměř 400letého panství Habsburků. Z radosti nad neuvěřitelnou zprávou Čechové slzeli, objímali se, jásali. Prahou zněly vlastenecké písně, z úředních budov byli shazováni dvouhlaví orlové, znaky třistaleté poroby. Stejně radostné chvíle prožívali Čechové v ostatních městech, naslouchající řečem předáků. Ubírali se za zvuků hudby a hlaholu zvonů ulicemi, svorně vedle sebe, necítíce společenských rozdílů ani zloby. Po tolika útrapách byli svědky blaženého dne, na nějž marně čekaly generace. Pohádková chvíle se rozlila po celé vlasti.” J. Mlčoch, *Učebnice dějepisu pro měšťanské školy. III. Novověk*, Praha 1935, p. 114.

The great day of our nation! After three hundred years of slavery, once again freedom! Extreme delight, emotion – and such discipline and order; not one drop of blood was spilled.”<sup>67</sup> Of course the picture of October 28 is not presented so emotionally in all textbooks. But it is always emphasized that the National Committee performed the overthrow smoothly and without bloodshed, that the military garrisons gave up without much resistance, and that volunteers, Sokol movement members and scouts replaced them. “Never had Prague seen such delight as on that day. The liberated nation rejoiced.”<sup>68</sup> Some authors included quotations from the proclamation of the National Committee on October 28, and even from the Martin Declaration<sup>69</sup>.

Authors of textbooks from the times of socialism place a different accent on the dates connected with the formation of an independent state. The milestone that influenced European developments becomes the October Revolution, and everything that happened in our land was under its influence. For this reason all the mass demonstrations by ‘the working people’ are highlighted. The most crucial moment leading to the declaration of the CSR was not the 28th, but the 14th of October 1918: “the culmination of the revolutionary movement of the Czech and Slovak peoples.” The formation of the Socialist Council and its call for demonstrations and strikes against the export of food are mentioned. One of the authors includes the text of a poster which called for these actions<sup>70</sup> and another quotes the manifesto of the action committee of the Socialist Council to prove that the republic was declared on that date. “The time has come about. We have thrown down the shackles of slavery. With our own unbroken will and in face of the sanctions of the whole democratic world we proclaim that here we stand as creators of a new state independence as citizens of the free republic of Czechoslovakia.”<sup>71</sup> There follows an explanation that the bourgeoisie, who first reportedly wished the preservation of the monarchy, were upset that the people declared themselves in favour of a republic and therefore the National Committee apologized to the Emperor that “it did not intend to prepare a coup.” It emphasised the exceptional

<sup>67</sup> “Už v poledne nadšené davy lidu zaplavy Prahu. Všude jásoť, hudba, zpěv a radostný pláč. Veliký den našeho národa! Po třiřtásetém otroctví opět svoboda! Nesmírné nadšení, dojetí – a také kázeň a pořádek; nebyloť prolito jedině kapky krve.“ Gebauerová, Jiráek, Reitler, *Dějepis pro roční kursy (IV. ročník) při měřtanských školách*, Praha 1935, p. 98-99

<sup>68</sup> “Nikdy jeřtě Praha neviděla takového nadšení jako tento den. Osvobozený národ jása.” E. Štorch, K. Čondl, *Pracovní učebnice dějepisu*, part 3, for the 3rd class of lower secondary schools, Praha 1946, p. 180; L. Horák, *Dějepis...*, p. 151

<sup>69</sup> J. S. Touc, *Stručně československé dějiny*, Praha 1946, p. 71.

<sup>70</sup> K. Bartošek, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1987, p. 32.

<sup>71</sup> “Doba se naplnila. Shodili jsme okovy rabů. Z nezloinné vůle vlastní a za sankce všeho demokratického světa prohlářujeme, že tu stojíme jako vykonavatelé nové státní samostatnosti, jako občané svobodné republiky Československé.” *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovejší*. Učební text dějepisu pro osmý postupný ročník všeobecně vzdělávacích škol. Praha 1954, p. 86. M. Trapl, V. Čapek, *Dějepis pro devátý ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 119.

significance of that day when the Czech working people led by the working class declared the independence of Czechoslovakia and declared that the new state will be a republic and contribute to the consequent capitulation of Austro-Hungary<sup>72</sup>. We read on that “the immense power of the workers caused the bourgeois’ fear,” that the actions of the proletariat frightened it and accordingly the National Committee decided “to act decisively”<sup>73</sup>. This was their explanation as to why the general strike did not grow into a proletarian revolution. “At the head of the struggle for a Czechoslovak state during the war there stood bourgeois politicians whose leader, T. G. Masaryk, was abroad. They claimed to be the greatest fighters for the liberty of our nation and thus gained the trust of most of the population.”<sup>74</sup> The news of the capitulation is given as the impulse for the overthrow of October 28. The role of the ‘bourgeoisie’ and their leaders abroad is downplayed and ‘the people’ are designated as the agents of the event. “The people went into the streets. Crowds of people marched through the capital and proclaimed the glory of the Czechoslovak republic. Everywhere there were troops in red and white. The soldiers tore Austrian badges from their caps and replaced them with tri-colours. Everywhere people began removing the Austrian symbol – the two-headed eagle.” Further it is stated that: “When the members of the National Committee saw what was happening, they feared that the same would happen to the bourgeoisie. So they tried to calm down the revolutionary fever of the people’s actions and sent brass bands into the streets. They also had announcements pasted on street-corners calling *Citizens, remain calm!*”<sup>75</sup> There followed information on events in the country and on the Declaration of the National Council in Martin and on a common state. The image of events concluded with the summarization that the working class, inspired by the successes of the Soviet proletariat, weakened and then

---

<sup>72</sup> *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovejší...*, p. 86-87; M. Trapl, V. Čapek, *Dějepis pro devátý ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 120.

<sup>73</sup> *Dějiny ČSR. II. díl ...*, p. 87; J. Joza, A. Ort, *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovejší pro 8. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 61; *Dějiny ČSR. III. díl. Učební text pro 11. postupný ročník všeobecně vzdělávacích škol a školy pedagogické*, Praha 1956, p. 60; V. Husa, *Československé dějiny. Učebnice pro střední školu*, Praha 1966, p. 200-201; M. Dohnal, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1980 p. 203-204.

<sup>74</sup> “Do čela boje za československý stát se totiž během války dostali buržoazní politikové, jejichž vůdcem byl v zahraničí T. G. Masaryk. Vydávali se za největší bojovníky za svobodu našich národů, a získali důvěru většiny lidí.” K. Bartošek, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1987, p. 34.

<sup>75</sup> “Ten [lid] vyšel do ulic. Davy lidí procházely hlavním městem a provolávaly slávu Československé republice. Všude bylo plno červenobílých praporů. Vojáci strhávali z čapek rakouské odznaky a nahrazovali je trikolorami. Lid začal všude odstraňovat rakouské znaky – dvojhavé orly. Když členové Národního výboru viděli, co se děje, měli obavy, aby nedošlo také na buržoazii. Snažili se proto ztlumit revoluční ráz lidových projevů a vyslali do ulic dechové kapely. Zároveň dali vylepovat na nárožích vyhlášky s výzvou *Občané, zachovejte klid!*.” *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovejší...*, p. 87; J. Joza, A. Ort, *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovejší pro 8. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 61.

overthrew the Habsburg monarchy, but then the bourgeoisie “again seized power.”<sup>76</sup> Only exceptionally were Beneš’ negotiations with the representatives of the National Committee in Geneva mentioned<sup>77</sup>. Another fact that is found in the textbooks is November 14, the date of the meeting of the so-called Revolutionary National Assembly, where Masaryk was elected President and the ‘factory-owner’ Karl Kramář as the Chairman of the Government. In texts from the 1980s the emotionalism of the interpretation has lessened, the facts are presented more factually, but the premises of Marxist interpretation remain<sup>78</sup>. In all the textbooks from the socialist era the theme is concluded with a section on the significance of October 28. The formation of the independent state, in which the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution was decisive, is praised, along with the rescinding of aristocratic privileges. But it is nonetheless emphasized that the government of the new state was not held by the people, who fought for national liberation, but by the bourgeoisie. Given as the reason why power remained in the hands of the bourgeoisie is the lack of a revolutionary party “armed with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism” and the betrayal on the part of the leaders of the social-democratic party<sup>79</sup>.

A considerable number of dates related to the complicated road to Czechoslovak independence are found in high school textbooks published after 1989, especially in textbooks dealing with Czech history. One group of these consists of data related to the activities of the foreign resistance from its beginning (6 July, 14 Nov 1915) through to the recognition of the Czechoslovak National Council by the Allied powers (29 June, 9 Aug, 2 Sep, 9 Mar, 3 Oct 1918), the proclamation of independence abroad (14 Oct, 18 Oct) and the negotiations of the representatives of domestic politics with the representatives of the foreign resistance in Geneva. In some texts this list is completed with precise data, in others the authors themselves collected exemplary dates or content determining the appropriate month and year of the given event<sup>80</sup>. In this context, there also appear significant milestones of the project of the

<sup>76</sup> *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější...*, p. 88; M. Trapl, V. Čapek, *Dějepis pro devátý ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 121.

<sup>77</sup> M. Dohnal, L. Stolařík, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1970, p. 35.

<sup>78</sup> M. Dohnal, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1980, p. 32-36.

<sup>79</sup> M. Dohnal, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1980, p. 88-89; *Dějiny ČSR. II. díl...*, p. 87-88; J. Joza, A. Ort, *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější pro 8. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 61; M. Trapl, V. Čapek, *Dějepis pro devátý ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962, p. 122; M. Dohnal, *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1980, p. 36; *Dějepis pro 3. ročník gymnázia...*, p. 51.

<sup>80</sup> J. Harna, R. Fišer, *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998, p. 128, 133-135; M. Hlavačka, *Dějepis pro gymnázia a střední školy*, Praha 2001, p. 166, 168; R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 91, 96-98; V. Olivová, *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995, p. 39, 44-45, 48

joint state of Czechs and Slovaks negotiated in the United States (the Cleveland and Pittsburgh Agreements)<sup>81</sup>.

The picture of the events of October 28, 1918 in textbooks from the last quarter-century is presented either with the author's own characterization of the atmosphere on the day or by using quotations from popular educational literature, or directly from proclamations of the time. In material designed for younger students, Olivová in her introduction chose passages from the first variant and described the situation as follows: "On October 28 tri-colour and red and white troops appeared in Prague. Soldiers tore Austrian badges from their caps. Singing and rejoicing people removed banners with the Austrian two-headed eagle and threw them into the Vltava. Glory to the independent Czechoslovak state was chanted". Then she quotes the words of one of the 'Men of October 28', František Soukup, who spoke on Wenceslas Square on that day. "Maintain order and calm everywhere! Let not even one Czechoslovak hand be raised for an act of violence. Let us praise the moment when the nation, after 300 years, again proceeds towards freedom not be stained by even one manifestation of human passion, retribution or anger. The truth has prevailed over the lie, freedom over tyranny, democracy over absolutism – from truth, freedom and democracy we will build our own Czechoslovak state."<sup>82</sup> We should comment that the authors of texts from the era of socialism took the introductory sentence out of context and interpreted it as an attempt by the 'bourgeoisie' to prevent the socialist revolution. The mentioned author closes with a quotation by the National Committee: "Czechoslovak people! Your ancient dream has become a fact. The Czechoslovak state on today's date has entered the ranks of the cultured states of the world."<sup>83</sup> Similarly she documents the union of the Czechs and the Slovaks with two points from the Martin Declaration and the explanation that "it was spread by the press, was read in the churches, in front of local offices, on the squares. The Slovak people had sworn to it."<sup>84</sup> The author of the

---

<sup>81</sup> J. Harna, R. Fišer, *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998, p. 128, 134. - R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 99. - *Moderní dějiny pro střední školy ...*, p. 29.

<sup>82</sup> "28. října zavlály v Praze trikolóry a červenobílé prapory. Vojáci strhávali ze svých čepic rakouské odznaky. Zpívající a jásající lidé odstraňovali štíty s rakouským dvojhavým orlem a házeli je do Vltavy. Byla provolávána sláva samostatnému československému státu. [...] Zachovejte všude pořádek a klid! Nechť se nezvedne ani jediná ruka československá k nijakému aktu násilí. Nechť velebnost chvíle, kdy národ po 300 letech znovu povstává k svobodě, není poskrvněna ani jediným projevem lidské vášně, odplaty a zloby. Pravda zvítězila nad klamem, svoboda nad tyraní, demokracie nad absolutismem – z pravdy, svobody a demokracie vybudujeme také svůj stát československý." V. Olivová, *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995, p. 48, 50.

<sup>83</sup> "Lide československý! Tvůj odvčký sen se stal skutkem. Stát československý vstoupil dnešního dne v řadu samostatných kulturních států světa." V. Olivová, *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995, p. 50; Obdobně F. Čapka, L. Vykoupil, *Dějepis – novověk*. Pro 8. ročník základní školy a tercie víceletých gymnázií, Brno 2009, p. 107.

<sup>84</sup> "Byla rozšiřována tiskem, byla předčítána v kostelích, před obecními domy, na náměstích. Slovenský lid na ni přisahal." V. Olivová, *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995, p. 50.

high-school books underlines that the Prague Proclamation of a joint Czechoslovakia state from October 28 “was confirmed by the Martin Declaration as the unmistakable expression of Slovak national political will.”<sup>85</sup> In another textbook, in order to give a more concrete picture to younger pupils, the memory of the writer’s own experience was chosen: “On the way to school I saw gentlemen tearing down the two-headed eagle, the symbol of the Austrian monarchy. In the evening, my father got dressed in his tuxedo and took us with our mother to the Variété theatre, where he was a director, and before the show he got onto the podium with a red and white flag and gave the gala speech.”<sup>86</sup> An excerpt from the book by A. Branald adds another passage from the National Committee declaration, similarly concretizing the atmosphere of that exceptional day with the usage of a popular educational publication was used by Milan Hlavačka. “Czechoslovak people! The whole world is following your steps into a new life, your entry into the Promised Land. At the beginning of this great day the National Committee, from today your government, imposes on you that your conduct and your joy be dignified on today’s great moment. Thus began the first ordinary day in the new state.”<sup>87</sup>

In all the texts, the ‘Men of October 28’ are mentioned, sometimes even drawn or celebrated. “These individuals’ readiness for action was admirable. After a series of weeks of waiting, they managed to organize, without great excesses, a principled state revolution. They kept order over the celebratory mood of the people, and right on the next day, they abolished, in negotiations at the land command headquarters, the right of the army to the events, and immediately established their authority beyond the centre into other regions.”<sup>88</sup> The five names of the ‘Men of October 28’, the executors of the state revolution, are found only seldom in the textbooks from the interwar period, and always with the clarification that they were representatives of the National

<sup>85</sup> [Prohlášení společného státu] “bylo Martinskou deklarací potvrzeno jako nezpochybnitelný výraz slovenské národně politické vůle.” R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 101.

<sup>86</sup> “Cestou do školy jsem viděl, jak páni strhávají dvojhavlého orlíčka, symbol rakouské monarchie. Večer se tatínek oblékl do fraku, vzal nás s maminkou do divadla Variété, kde byl režisér, a před představením vystoupil na pódium s červenobílým praporem a měl slavnostní proslov.” F. Parkan, T. Mikeska, M. Parkanová, *Dějepis 9 – učebnice pro základní školy a víceletá gymnázia*, Plzeň 2011, p.142.

<sup>87</sup> “Lidu československý. Celý svět sleduje tvé kroky do nového života, tvůj vstup do země zaslíbené. Na počátku velikého díla ukládá ti Národní výbor, ode dneška tvoje vláda, aby tvé chování a tvá radost byly důstojny velké chvíle dnešní. Tak začal první obyčejný den nového státu.” M. Hlavačka, *Dějepis pro gymnázia a střední školy*, Praha 2001, p. 169; R. Kvaček, *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002, p. 99.

<sup>88</sup> “Akceschopnost těchto jednotlivců byla obdivuhodná. Po řadě týdnů vyčkávání dokázali zorganizovat bez velkých výstřelků zásadní státoprávní převrat. Udrželi pořádek, slavnostní náladu lidí, hned následujícího dne jednáním na zemském velitelství vyloučili zásad armády do událostí a okamžitě prosazovali svou autoritu mimo centrum do dalších region.” J. Harna, R. Fišer, *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998, p. 136-137.



Committee<sup>89</sup>. Although the number of reported participants in the domestic struggle for an independent state in some textbooks exceeds ten, and members of the Mafia are counted among them, along with the persecuted and other leaders of political parties. Similarly the participants in the fight abroad are here given undoubted prominence, including foreign supporters of their struggles (E. Denis, R. Seton-Watson, W. Steed). In the analyzed textbook materials emphasizing the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution on the creation of the CSR, 'Men of October 28', were not given much space. Their listing as representatives of the domestic 'bourgeoisie' was discovered in only one<sup>90</sup>. While the names of the three most significant representatives of the 'bourgeois' foreign resistance were included, in textbooks from this period it was regularly with a critical commentary. Secondary school textbooks published after 1989 matched the texts from the interwar period with respect to the number of historical personalities responsible for the emergence of the independent state. A reduction of the number of names in texts written for younger students is understandable, but the names Masaryk, Beneš and Štefánik were never left out.

## WAS BUILDING AN INDEPENDENT STATE THE RIGHT DECISION?

We find such a consideration in one of the most recent textbooks. The authors called the relevant section "Open Question: the Collapse of Austro-Hungary". By listing the positives of the cohabitation until that time, they pose the question if it would not have been sufficient just to reform this state. "The monarchy provided the nations living under its protection against external threats, in a democratic society was essentially created the Cisleithania part, the Czech part was offered the opportunity for significant economic growth and participation in a large duty-free market, and it was not such a cruel 'jail of nations' as has been claimed until recently." They add that precisely for these reasons influential Czech politicians considered Austro-Hungary as a feasible state arrangement. But they immediately add that the situation developed otherwise after the First World War, when the Viennese government fell under the influence of the German Empire and its pan-Germanic tendencies. It planned to divide the lands of the Czech crown so that its distinctive form would disappear. "That was unacceptable for the Czech nation and for Czech politics. Accordingly they gradually identified with the idea of creating their own national state, which

<sup>89</sup> J. Pekař, *Dějiny československé. Pro nejvyšší třídy škol středních*, Praha 1921, p. 185; E. Štorch, K. Čondl, *Pracovní učebnice dějepisu, part 3, for the 3rd class of lower secondary schools*, Praha 1946, p. 180; L. Horák, *Dějepis...*, p. 151.

<sup>90</sup> J. Pátek, *Československé dějiny (1918-1939)*, SPN, Praha 1975, s. 12.



would continue the historical traditions of the lands of the Czech crown”, is how the authors conclude their idea<sup>91</sup>. In another text the problematic fulfillment of historic and natural right is pointed out – “Self-determination in theory and in practice.”<sup>92</sup> It is possible to conclude that the correctness of the decision to build an independent state is not put into doubt in the history textbooks, the prehistory of the historical section, considered an exceptional period of the Czechoslovak past, occupies a significant place on their pages.

## STUDYING YOUTH'S HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS OF OCTOBER 28

In an appendix of the cultural-historical review, *History and the Present* entitled “Celebrations, Feasts and Jubilees in the Changes of Time” the authors of one of the contributions stated their conviction that “October 28, spontaneously celebrated by our First Republic leaders (and by Čapek’s dog and cat), does not say very much to us anymore. For many this picture of a celebration based on a no more existing state is completely absurd.”<sup>93</sup> Is it possible to agree with the opinion of these authors? We need to search out the answer in findings from empirical research. Most recently we attempted to discover the contemporary relation of the young generation to the date October 28 by polling young students<sup>94</sup>.

All those polled associated the date October 28 with the foundation of Czechoslovakia. The most complete response was provided by a Czech studies student who first of all “came up with October 28 as the date of foundation of the CSR”, and then mentioned the holiday and the day off connected with it, the presentation of awards by the President of the Republic in the Wenceslaus Room at Prague Castle, and the Open Doors Day at the New City Hall in Moravian Ostrava. Another polled student with this same major came out with the names of the personalities who were responsible for the establishment of the independent state, therefore Masaryk, Beneš and the

<sup>91</sup> “Monarchie totiž poskytovala národům, které v ní žily, ochranu před vnějším ohrožením, v předlitavské části vytvořila v zásadě demokratickou společnost, nabídla českým zemím možnost pozoruhodného hospodářského rozvoje a uplatnění na velkém bezcelním trhu a nebyla také tak krutým „žalářem národů“, jak se donedávna tvrdilo. [...] To bylo pro český národ a českou politiku nepřijatelné. Proto se postupně ztotožnila s ideou vytvořit vlastní národní stát, který by navazoval na dějinnou tradici země Koruny české.” J. Kuklík, J. Kuklík, *Dějepis pro gymnázia a střední školy 4. Nejnovější dějiny*, Praha 2002, p. 15.

<sup>92</sup> *Moderní dějiny pro střední školy* ..., p. 32.

<sup>93</sup> “28. říjen, spontánně slavený našimi prvorepublikovými předky (i Čapkovým pejskem a kočičkou), nám již mnoho neříká. Pro mnohé je představa oslavy založení již neexistujícího státu přímo absurdní.” J. Pokorný, J. Rak, “Patroni, svátky a výročí. Slavnosti českého národa”, *Dějiny a současnost*, 2008, 8, p. 30.

<sup>94</sup> 56 students of history, Czech language and literature, and civic studies from the Ostrava University and Silesia University in Opava answered five questions in a questionnaire.

'Men of October 28' and also the change of the state arrangement and the concepts of independence and democracy. Students of history also associate the date with the end of the First World War, the role of the Czechoslovak legions, but above all they consider this day a significant milestone of our past; for some it is the most important marker in our new-era history. Many complained that the ordinary people today have no idea what actually happened on October 28, that its significance is not even sufficiently dealt with in schools, apart from in history lessons, and that people often see it as just another state holiday since they take liberty and democracy for granted and do not realize that they are not automatic, that they must be 'nurtured,' as one future civics teacher expressed it. Noteworthy was the reaction of one respondent, who stated that he cannot take seriously 'a day which celebrates an event almost one hundred years old.'

The reaction to the issue as to whether the establishment of the CSR was a significant anniversary for them personally was not completely unilateral, although the affirmatives did prevail. We also met with the opinion that it is 'a rather strange holiday that celebrates something that de facto no longer exists.' Some students compared the significance of three anniversaries: October 28, the foundation of the Czech Republic, and the Velvet Revolution. Only exceptionally was the date 1 January 1993 identified as more significant than or as significant as November 17. A certain segment of the young people, most frequently studying the teaching of civics, doubted the significance of the anniversary, or at least its exceptionality, in today's times, which corresponded with the reported ignoring of its importance, along with that of celebrated church feasts, in other social/humanities subjects, where the opportunity to do so is obvious. On the other hand, many pointed out the need to also remember in this context the personalities connected with the beginnings of independence as an inspiration for the present. Also emphasized was the opportunity to stand as an equal partner with other European nations which the formation of an independent state gave us. One of the respondents was of the opinion that thanks to October 28, we have our 'own roots' which we should defend within the Eurozone.

On the question as to whether separating from the monarchy was the right move, a majority of the respondents answered positively, with a reference to the long-term inability of that state to resolve ethnic issues. Some did not feel competent for an adequate judgment, and students of history listed both the positives and the negatives of this solution. The Czech studies student considered that by remaining within Austro-Hungary "we would have lost a piece of our *own* Czech nature but that she would not change for anything else despite the fact that 'today we curse what

we cannot control.” The foundation of the independent state is perceived not only from the economic aspect, but as such a moment of significant strengthening of the national pride, “the self-confidence of Czechs and Slovaks” necessary in the difficult situations with which our nations would later be confronted. The future civics teacher emotionally expressed her convictions: “We preserved the Czechness and showed the world that a small country too can achieve great things, and that there are exceptional people living there”; her colleague considered that otherwise a loss of our national identity would threaten.

The union with Slovakia was evaluated pragmatically by the young people as the only possible solution of the situation at that time, and only occasionally with emotion: “I don’t know with whom we could have better united.” The economic and personnel burdening of the more developed Czech country, the conviction of greater advantages in the union for Slovakia and even a belief of “saving the Slovaks from inevitable Hungarization” were emphasized. Negative or uncertain standpoints arose from the knowledge of the continual expressions of dissatisfaction in the Slovak part of the first CSR, ‘the betrayal’ of 1939, and also the fact of the country’s dissolution in 1993.

We got the fewest unilateral answers in the questionnaire on justification of the state form chosen in 1918, although the conviction prevailed that a democratic republic was a good choice, that it created a certain tradition which it was possible to tie into, that it reflected the trends of the times, and that it satisfied the demands for change. A non-negligible part of the respondents perceived positively both possibilities, i.e., a constitutional monarchy in their opinions is distinguished by a greater respect for tradition, and is less volatile. One history student stated that more important than the form of the government are the specific people who rule. The stated views are likely to be influenced by contemporary experience with the present-day political scene and with their confidence in the problem-free operating of European constitutional monarchies.

Within the extensive research of the project “Multicultural aspects of education in social-humanitarian subjects and their reflection in the historical awareness of studying youth” carried out in 2011-2012, those teaching history and those studying the teaching of this subject were invited in the focus groups method to choose ten key dates from our past. From the 19 selected options, only two were not called into question: the date of the formation of the CSR and the beginning of the so-called Velvet Revolution<sup>95</sup>. The viewpoint of the Czech population as a whole may differ in many points. We do not have up-to-date findings of the reactions to national holidays,

<sup>95</sup> D.D. Labischová, *Co si uchováme v paměti? Empirický výzkum historického vědomí*, Ostrava 2013, p. 154-156.

but all sorts of things may be derived from other sociological research based on the opinions of a representative set of respondents. Part of the recently completed “Research of the historical consciousness of the population of the Czech Republic” was a battery of questions regarding an assessment of Czech history. Those questioned gave preference to older parts of our past, in particular the era of Charles IV, but the period most close to the present, the era of the first Czechoslovak Republic, was nonetheless evaluated first and seen as a time of flourishing<sup>96</sup>. A retrospective look at the results of the empirical research shows that from 1968 this period of our past is evaluated positively, with the year 1968 in fact the most celebrated period of Czech history (39%). In the IVVM research from 1992, as in later research carried out by CVVM (2001, 2005, 2008), the period of the First Republic received 23% (eventually 16-19%), perceived with increasing margins as the second most highly regarded after the period of the rule of Charles IV (29 to 41%), therefore always belonging among the dominant periods in the Czech national memory. Similarly, the founder of the Czechoslovak state TG Masaryk permanently remains among those figures from our past most highly appraised (sharing first place with Charles IV)<sup>97</sup>. In the evaluation of the individual periods of the new-era Czech history, the First Republic unambiguously comes out the best (70%). The declaration of independence in October 1918 then took fourth place (11%) among the periods of the past or decisive moments in which the Czechs acted most bravely<sup>98</sup>. However, we do not have at our disposal current data from research investigating the need of the whole Czech population to celebrate state holidays recalling significant historical events, so not even October 28.

## FINAL THOUGHTS

The analysis of Czech history textbooks confirmed that those produced at present offer the students at both levels of studying history sufficient information on the reasons for independence in 1918 and on the activities which significantly contributed to it. With generous usage of written and iconographic resources they also provide a picture of the course of the ‘glorious’ October 28, 1918. Both in the area of quality and quantity of facts they rival the texts from the interwar period, and logically enough, surpass it in terms of didactic facilities. But this reality itself cannot influence the relations of today’s studying youth to the day which is our most important state holiday.

<sup>96</sup> J. Šubrt, J. Vinopal et al., *Historické vědomí obyvatel České republiky perspektivou sociologického výzkumu*, Praha 2013, p. 108.

<sup>97</sup> Š. Pfeiferová, J. Šubrt, “Veřejné mínění o problematice českých dějin”, *Naše společnost*, 7, 2009, 2, p. 16-23.

<sup>98</sup> S. Hampel, J. Vinopal, J. Šubrt, “Reflexe novodobých českých dějin, sametové revoluce a současného vývoje v názorech veřejnosti”, *Česká společnost*, 9, 2011, 1, p. 19-30.

The need to celebrate the foundation of the independent state in the first twenty years of its existence was essentially greater than it is today. Apart from other facts, this is documented by the fact that even the youngest generation was led to respect for this date, as illustrates the quoted work by Čapek designed for children who could not yet be taught in detail in their homeland studies courses. This fact was also realized by our respondents, who repeatedly mentioned that today this holiday has lost some of its significance and that its celebration is not perceived like in the times of the First Republic. The question is if this did not in part contribute to the depreciation of its significance first in the years of the Nazi occupation and for a much longer period during the era of socialism, the dissolution of the common state, or taking today's Czech Republic being for granted, which manifests a link to the message of October 28, the declaration of the First Czechoslovak Republic. The conviction of at least a part of the respondents that it is imperative to continue to remember the efforts of our ancestors, who accomplished the 'fulfillment of the ancient dream,' is encouraging.

TRANSLATION: Eva SCIRANKOVÁ

---

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- Bartošek K., *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1987.
- Beneš Z., "Učebnice dějepisu jako edukační médium a jako didakticko-historický text", in: *Vzájemný obraz souseda v polských a českých školních učebnicích*, red. B. Gracová, D. Labischová, J. Szymeczek, Ostrava 2014, p. 15-16.
- Čapka F., Vykoupil L., *Dějepis – novověk. Pro 8. ročník základní školy a tercie víceletých gymnázií*, Brno 2009, p. 106;
- České a československé dějiny II, od roku 1790 do současnosti, Praha 1991.
- Dějiny ČSR. II. díl. Učební text pro 10. postupný ročník všeobecně vzdělávacích škol a školy pedagogické*, Praha 1956, p. 81;
- Dohnal M., *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1980, p. 25-26.
- Dohnal M., Stolařík L., *Dějepis pro 9. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1970, p. 26-29.
- Galandauer J., "Čeští vojáci ve velké válce a vzájemný obraz Čechů a českých Němců", in: *Obraz Němců, Rakouska a Německo v české společnosti 19. a 20. století*, red. J. Křen, E. Broklová, Praha 1998.
- Gebauerová, Jiráček, Reitler, *Dějepis pro měšťanské školy*, III. Díl, Praha 1937.
- Hájek M., J. Ryšánková, *Svět a Československo ve 20. století*, Praha 1990.
- Hámpl S., J. Vinopal, J. Šubrt, "Reflexe novodobých českých dějin, sametové revoluce a současného vývoje v názorech veřejnosti", *Česká společnost*, 9, 2011, 1, p. 19-30.
- Harna J., Fišer R., *Dějiny českých zemí II. Od poloviny 18. století do vzniku České republiky*, Praha 1998.
- Hlavačka M., *Dějepis pro gymnázia a střední školy*, Praha 2001.
- Horák L., *Počátkové dějepisu návodného na škole národní, s částí theoretickou a praktickou. IV. (pro 7. - 8. ročník)*, Praha 1920.
- Horák L., *„Naše škola“*. *Knihovna pokrokové práce učitelstva československého*, III. díl, Praha 1923.
- Horák L., *Dějepis pro třetí třídu měšťanských škol*, Praha 1936.
- Horčíčka J., Nešpor J., *Dějepis pro školy měšťanské, díl třetí*, Praha 1922.

- Husa V., *Československé dějiny. Učebnice pro střední školu*, Praha 1966.
- Jiráak, Reitler, *Dějepis pro roční kursy (IV. ročník) při měšťanských školách*, Praha 1935.
- Joza J., Ort A., *Dějiny doby nové a nejnovější pro 8. ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962.
- Kárník Z., *České země v éře první republiky (1918-1938). Part 1, Vznik, budování a zlatá léta republiky (1918-1929)*. Praha 2000.
- Kvaček R., "Ke vzniku Československa", *Český časopis historický*, 1998, 96, 4, p. 717-735.
- Kvaček R., *České dějiny II*, Praha 2002.
- Labischová D., *Čech závistivec Rakušan byrokrat? Proměny obrazu Čechů, Rakušanů a jejich minulosti ve vědomí studující mládeže*, Ostrava 2005.
- Labischová D., *Co si uchováme v paměti? Empirický výzkum historického vědomí*, Ostrava 2013.
- Mlčoch J., *Učebnice dějepisu pro měšťanské školy. III. Novověk*, Praha 1935.
- Moderní dějiny pro střední školy. Učebnice. Světové a české dějiny 20. století a prvního desetiletí 21. století*, Praha 2014.
- Olivová V., *Dějiny nové doby 1850-1993*, Praha 1995.
- J. Pátek, *Československé dějiny (1918-1939)*, SPN, Praha 1975.
- F. Parkan, T. Mikeska, M. Parkanová, *Dějepis 9 – učebnice pro základní školy a víceletá gymnázia*, Plzeň 2011.
- Pekař J., *Dějiny československé. Pro nejvyšší třídy škol středních*, Praha 1921.
- Peroutka F., *Budování státu I. 1918-1919*, Praha 1991.
- Pfeiferová Š., Šubrt J., "Veřejné mínění o problematice českých dějin", *Naše společnost*, 7, 2009, 2, p. 16-23.
- Rak J., Bývali Čechové. *České historické mýty a stereotypy*, Praha 1994.
- Rak J., "Patroni, svátky a výročí. Slavnosti českého národa", *Dějiny a současnost*, 2008.
- Randák J., *Říjen mezi dvěma epochami: ke konstrukci a podobě historického faktu*, [in:] *České křížovatky evropských dějin*, red. I. Šedivý, J. Němeček, J. Kocian, O. Tůma, Praha 2010.
- Štorch E., Čondl K. *Pracovní učebnice dějepisu*, part 3, for the 3rd class of lower secondary schools, Praha 1946.
- J. Šubrt, Vinopal J., et al., *Historické vědomí obyvatel České republiky perspektivou sociologického výzkumu*, Praha 2013.
- Touc J. S., *Stručné československé dějiny*, Praha 1946.
- Trapl M. Čapek V., *Dějepis pro devátý ročník základní devítileté školy*, Praha 1962.
- V. Válková, *Dějepis 8 – novověk pro základní školy*, Praha 2008.