

Alexander Kolisko (1857–1918), A Pathologist in Nineteenth Century Vienna

Štefan Kaleta

The aim of this study is to introduce the life and work of Alexander Kolisko, a noteworthy pathologist of nineteenth century Vienna, into literature. While his contribution to medical science (and particularly obstetrics)¹ is recognised in medical circles, with Kolisko often appearing in works dedicated to the history of the Viennese Faculty of Medicine, particularly its department of Forensic Medicine, he has thus far been mostly overlooked in historical literature, often reduced to a single mention. To date, not a single study has been written about this influential and accomplished pathologist (he was chair of forensic medicine and later chair of pathological anatomy at the University of Vienna, chief prosecutor of Vienna, and also the author of a number of articles and books, of which several were already considered essential reading in his lifetime) or his family, which will be discussed in future articles.

The primary sources for this study were German-language newspapers and medical journals published mostly during Kolisko's lifetime – 1857–1918. Although they often depict Kolisko as a member of several non-medical Viennese societies, this aspect of his life lies out outside the scope of this study and will not be discussed. Kolisko's family life, well-documented in Viennese church books which will serve as the primary source for a future study, will also not be examined. The study will instead focus solely on Kolisko's career as a physician and his work.

Kolisko appears in several biographical dictionaries. A comprehensive entry, which apart from basic biographical data also discusses his contributions to medical science and includes a list of his works, can be found in the fourth volume of the *Österreichisches biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950*.² Helmut Wiklicky's entry for Kolisko in the *Neue Deutsche Biographie* is of

¹ A recent Czech textbook on modern obstetrics mentions Kolisko within the context of his book *Pathologische Beckenformen*, calling it an “unsurpassed work”. Aleš Roztočil et al., *Moderní porodnictví* (Prague: Grada, 2017), 26.

² “Kolisko Alexander, Anatom,” in *Österreichisches biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950. Band 4* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1969), 83.

similar scope.³ Kolisko's entry in the *Historisches Lexikon Wien*, while more concise, contains much of the same information.⁴

Alexander Kolisko was born in Vienna on 6 November 1857⁵ as the oldest of four brothers.⁶ His father, Eugen Kolisko, was an obstetrician, while his mother, Luise Bach, was the sister of the Minister of the Interior of the time Alexander von Bach.⁷ The young Alexander followed in his father's footsteps, enrolling at the Viennese Faculty of Medicine after graduating from Schottengymnasium in 1875.⁸ He entered an environment strongly influenced by, among others, the pathologist Karl Rokitansky, the internist Josef Skoda, and the surgeon Johann Dumreicher⁹ – the so-called Second (or New) Viennese School of Medicine which introduced a new paradigm of evidence-based medicine interested in the underlying causes of external symptoms.¹⁰ Rokitansky and Skoda's student Hans Kundrat proved to be the greatest influence on Kolisko. A professor of pathology, he became Kolisko's mentor upon graduation in 1881,¹¹ with Kolisko acting as his assistant.¹²

³ Helmut Wiklicky, "Kolisko Alexander," in *Neue Deutsche Biographie. Band 12* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1980), 461.

⁴ Gabriela Schmidt, "Kolisko Alexander," in *Historisches Lexikon Wien. Band 3: Ha-La* (Vienna: Kreymer & Scherlau, 1994), 554–55.

⁵ *Book of Baptisms 1856–1857*, fol. 403. Alservorstadt pfarre. 01-27. Wien/Niederösterreich (Osten): Rk. Erzdiözese Wien. Available online at: <https://data.matricula-online.eu/cs/oesterreich/wien/08-alservorstadt pfarre/01-27/?pg=407>.

⁶ Alexander's brothers Rudolf, August, and Hans will be discussed in a future article.

⁷ Bach was Kolisko's godfather. Of note is the fact that an article from 1896 mentions Kolisko as "the nephew of former Minister of the Interior Alexander von Bach." See "Kränze und Condolenzen," *Wiener Salonblatt*, 24 May 1896, 5. Since Bach was ennobled with the title of *Freiherr* on 22 April 1854, it can be said that Kolisko was connected to nobility by birth. See, for example, "Amtliches," *Abendblatt der Presse*, 25 April 1854, 2.

⁸ "Von der Universität," *Neues Wiener Journal*, 13 June 1898, 1.

⁹ Interestingly, Dumreicher's niece Amalie von Eschenburg would go on to become Kolisko's wife. See *Book of Marriages 1874–1889*, fol. 70. St. Augustin. 02-14, 15. Wien/Niederösterreich (Osten): Rk. Erzdiözese Wien. Available online at: <https://data.matricula-online.eu/cs/oesterreich/wien/01-st-augustin/02-14%252C15/?pg=291>.

¹⁰ See, for example, Alfred Vogl, "Six Hundred Years of Medicine in Vienna: A History of the Vienna School of Medicine," *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 43, no. 4 (1967): 282–99.

¹¹ "Kolisko Alexander, Anatom," 83. Kolisko stood by Kundrat's deathbed on 25 April 1893. "Professor Hans Kundrat," *Local-Anzeiger der „Presse“*, 26 April 1893, 10.

¹² Earliest recorded mention in "Oeffentliche Vorlesungen an der k. k. Universität zu Wien im Winter-Semester 1885/6," *Amtsblatt zur Wiener Zeitung*, 18 August 1885, 287.

Establishing himself as a researcher with the 1884 article “Zur Kenntniss des Carcinoma psammosum ovarii,”¹³ Kolisko, along with fellow student Richard Paltauf,¹⁴ acted as a demonstrator in Kundrat’s exercises in pathological histology from 1885 to 1891, leading his own pathologic-histological exercises in 1890.¹⁵ Beginning with 1888, when he was named *Privatdozent* of pathological anatomy,¹⁶ he also established himself as a lecturer, giving lectures on the histology of tumors.¹⁷

Tumors seemed to be of particular interest to Kolisko. His first article, the aforementioned “Zur Kenntniss des Carcinoma psammosum ovarii” published in the *Medizinische Jahrbücher* for 1884, concerned itself with malignant tumors of the ovaries. His paper “Über congenitale Herzmyome” was published in the 1887 edition of the same yearbook.¹⁸ The weekly medical journal *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* published his paper “Das polypöse Sarkom der Vagina im Kindesalter” – a case study exploring vaginal tumors in 14 deceased girls¹⁹ – between 7 February and 14 March 1889.²⁰ Following up on a demonstration which Kolisko, along with the pediatrician Josef Weinlechner,²¹ had given at a meeting of the Austrian Medical Society on 25 May 1888,²² he examined cases previously described in literature, while also describing two autopsies he had performed himself. In his six-part paper, Kolisko not only provides thorough physical descriptions of the sarcoma cases, but also presents his

¹³ Alexander Kolisko, “Zur Kenntniss des Carcinoma psammosum ovarii,” in *Medizinische Jahrbücher* (Vienna: K. k. Gesellschaft der Ärzte, 1884), 173–206.

¹⁴ He, like Kolisko, would later be named Professor of Pathological Anatomy and have a successful medical career of his own.

¹⁵ “Oeffentliche Vorlesungen an der k. k. Universität zu Wien im Sommer-Semester 1890,” *Amtsblatt zur Wiener Zeitung*, 17 April 1890, 558.

¹⁶ “Kolisko Alexander, Anatom,” 83.

¹⁷ “Kundmachungen,” *Amtsblatt zur Wiener Zeitung*, 26 September 1888, 437.

¹⁸ Alexander Kolisko, “Über congenitale Herzmyome,” in *Medizinische Jahrbücher* (Vienna: K. k. Gesellschaft der Ärzte, 1887), 135–58.

¹⁹ Two were examined by Kolisko himself, one had already been briefly described by the anatomist Theodor Billroth, and the rest were previously described in medical literature. See “Journal-Revue. Gynäkologie und Geburtshilfe. 19. Das polypöse Sarkom der Vagina im Kindesalter,” *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift*, 22 November 1890, 2035.

²⁰ Alexander Kolisko, “Das polypöse Sarkom der Vagina im Kindesalter,” *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, February 7, 1889, 110–11; 14 February 1889, 130–32; 21 February 1889, 159–61; 28 February 1889, 182–85; 7 March 1889, 202–04; 14 March 1889, 222–25.

²¹ A doctor at the St. Anna Children’s Hospital in Vienna where the autopsies of two of the girls took place.

²² Alexander Kolisko, “Das polypöse Sarkom der Vagina im Kindesalter,” *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*. 7 February 1889, 110.

own microscopic findings. Included are detailed drawings of the vagina and surrounding tissue.

Kolisko's studies and articles published from 1889 on seem to indicate a shift in interest. "Ein Beitrag zur pathologischen Anatomie der Ureteren," published in *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* on 28 November 1889,²³ examines previously reported cases to describe duplication of the ureter in newborns. Along with "Zur Kenntniss des Carcinoma psammosum ovarii" and "Das polypöse Sarkom der Vagina im Kindesalter," the article forms a triptych of works focused on the genitourinary system.²⁴ "Zum Wesen des Croups und der Diphtherie" from 21 February of the same year²⁵ is a summary of the state of research on croup, a respiratory infection common in children, and diphtheria, a viral illness that commonly causes it.²⁶

After his habilitation, Kolisko's standing rose rapidly. In 1890, he was named assistant prosector – or performer of autopsies –, at the Allgemeine Krankenhaus in Vienna.²⁷ Throughout his career, he performed countless autopsies, with several being particularly high profile. Among Kolisko's autopsied were opera singer Maria Wilt,²⁸ politician Franz Schuhmeier²⁹ and three cholera victims.³⁰ Kolisko was also an apt conservationist, overseeing the conservation of Archduke Charles Louis in 1896³¹ and of Emperor Francis Joseph I in 1916.³²

²³ Alexander Kolisko, "Ein Beitrag zur pathologischen Anatomie der Ureteren," *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, 28 November 1889, 917–19.

²⁴ A blanket term for the genital and urinary organs.

²⁵ Alexander Kolisko, "Zum Wesen des Croups und der Diphtherie," *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, 21 February 1889, 147–49.

²⁶ This seems to be Kolisko's only foray into the realm of microbiology, which – or rather its subfield of bacteriology – had gained a foothold among his colleagues (e.g., fellow students of Hans Kundrat's, Richard Paltauf and Richard Kretz) in the years leading up to the article's publication. Although influenced by bacteriology, their research was firmly anchored in Rokitsky's pathologico-anatomical tradition. See Erna Lesky, *The Vienna Medical School of the 19th Century* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), 516–17.

²⁷ "Alexander Kolisko," *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift*, 2 March 1918, 397.

²⁸ "Maria Wilt †," *Deutsches Volksblatt*, 27 September 1891, 4.

²⁹ "Das Ergebnis der Obduktion," *Die Zeit. Abendblatt*, 13 February 1913, 3.

³⁰ "Ein eingeschleppter Cholerafall," *Erlafthal-Bote*, 13 November 1892, 3; "Ein Cholerafall in Wien," *Neues Wiener Abendblatt*, 29 August 1893, 3; "Die Cholera," *Neue Freie Presse*, 3 September 1893, 8.

³¹ "Kränze und Condolenz," *Wiener Salonblatt*, 24 May 1896, 5.

³² As reported by newspapers published on 25 November. See, for example, "Die Aufbahrung in Schönbrunn," *Neuigkeits-Welt-Blatt*, 25 November 1916, 6.

On 15 June 1892, Kolisko, along with his colleague Richard Paltauf, was named extraordinary professor of pathological anatomy.³³ He taught a course of pathologic-anatomical demonstrations³⁴ while also continuing to publish scientific works and give lectures at meetings of the Austrian Medical Society,³⁵ of which he had been a member since 1887.³⁶ It was at this time that his research first began to be published in book form. The 1891 *Über die Beziehung der Arteria choroidea anterior zum hinteren Schenkel der inneren Kapsel des Gehirnes* aimed to examine Otto Heubner's claim that the anterior choroidal artery supplies the posterior limb (or rather, its inferior half) of the internal capsule of the brain.³⁷ As Kolisko explains in the foreword, the idea was suggested to him two years earlier by neuropathologist Theodor Meynert. In his own words, his research "essentially confirmed Heubner's statement," although he was able to supplement and "partially correct" Heubner's findings.³⁸

Shortly after being named extraordinary professor, Kolisko saw another career advancement. The chair of pathology at the University of Vienna was left vacant upon Hans Kundrat's death on 25 April 1893. The position was eventually filled by Kolisko.³⁹ Though only temporarily, with Anton Weichselbaum taking over in July of the same year,⁴⁰ he found himself presiding over a university body for the first time in his career – a clear sign of the respect he held within the Viennese medical community.⁴¹

After his brief tenure as chair of the pathology department, Kolisko returned to lecturing and publishing. The following years saw the publication

³³ "Hof- und Personal-Nachrichten," *Die Presse. Abendblatt*, 15 June 1892, 3.

³⁴ "Oeffentliche Vorlesungen an der k. k. Universität zu Wien im Winter-Semester 1892/3," *Amtsblatt zur Wiener Zeitung*, 15 September 1892, 1.

³⁵ "Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Blutversorgung der Grosshirnganglien," published in the 16 March 1893, issue of the *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, was "based on a lecture given in the k. k. Medical Society on 15 January 1892." See Alexander Kolisko, "Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Blutversorgung der Grosshirnganglien," *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, 16 March 1893, 192–95.

³⁶ "Gesellschaft der Aerzte," *Die Presse*, 20 March 1887, 15.

³⁷ Interestingly, the artery that supplies the inferior half of the anterior limb now carries Heubner's name.

³⁸ Alexander Kolisko, *Über die Beziehung der Arteria choroidea anterior zum hinteren Schenkel der inneren Kapsel des Gehirnes* (Wien: Alfred Hölder, 1891), 3.

³⁹ "Hochschulnachrichten," *Deutsches Volksblatt*, 17 May 1893, 6.

⁴⁰ "Der Nachfolger des Hofrathes Kundrat," *Deutsches Volksblatt. Abend-Ausgabe*, 22 July 1893, 2.

⁴¹ Another sign can be found in the results of the 1894 Medical Chamber of Vienna elections. Kolisko was elected a member with 900 votes out of 976. "Das Ergebnis der Aerztekammerwahlen," *Deutsches Volksblatt*, 27 May 1894, 6.

of two collaborative efforts. The first publication, the 1895 *Schemata zum Einzeichnen von Gehirnbefunden*, written with Emil Redlich, was another in a series of works concerned with the pathological anatomy of the brain.⁴² The second, the 1896 *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Osteomyelitis*, written with Eduard Albert,⁴³ signaled Kolisko's new interest in the pathology of bones. Both works were met with an immediate positive reception. A review in the *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift* calls the former "an altogether practical book worthy of the reputable names of its authors" and praises its selection of images,⁴⁴ while the latter was "a rich source for surgeon and pathological anatomist alike."⁴⁵

Kolisko's career would soon take another turn. On 27 August 1897, Eduard von Hofmann, the chair of forensic medicine at the University of Vienna, died. Once again, a vacant spot needed to be filled. The collegium of professors at the Faculty of Medicine brought forth three candidates⁴⁶ – Hans Dittrich, then professor of forensic medicine at the University of Prague,⁴⁷ Albin Haberda, who had only recently become *Privatdozent* for forensic medicine,⁴⁸ and Alexander Kolisko. Haberda ended up being named the temporary chair, serving until June 1898, when Kolisko replaced him as the definitive chair, being named ordinary professor of forensic medicine in the process.⁴⁹

Kolisko's inaugural lecture took place on 7 November 1898. Reflecting his background in pathological anatomy, he chose to discuss the relationship between pathological anatomy and forensic medicine.⁵⁰ The lecture was

⁴² Kolisko had already followed up on the aforementioned *Über die Beziehung der Arteria choroidea anterior* with an article on the blood circulation of the basal ganglia. See Kolisko, "Grosshirnganglien," 192–95.

⁴³ According to Helena Kokešová, Kolisko was among Albert's closest associates at the University of Vienna. See Helena Kokešová, *Eduard Albert* (Prague: Vyšehrad, 2014), 126. Albert mentions Kolisko and their combined effort in his memorial book.

⁴⁴ "Schemata zum Einzeichnen von Gehirnbefunden," *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift*, 7 December 1895, 2116.

⁴⁵ Julius Schnitzler, "Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Osteomyelitis," *Wiener klinische Rundschau*, 31 May 1896, 390. Schnitzler notes the book's dedication to the late Hans Kundrat which "will help to further increase the fame of three Viennese researchers."

⁴⁶ "Hochschulnachrichten," *Deutsches Volksblatt*, 5 March 1898, 8.

⁴⁷ He would continue to teach at said university until retirement.

⁴⁸ "Haberda, Albin (1868–1933), Gerichtsmediziner," in *Österreichisches biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950. Band 2* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1958), 122.

⁴⁹ "Die Professur für gerichtliche Medicin," *Neues Wiener Abendblatt*, 13 June 1898, 3. Upon his joining, the college of professors consisted of twenty men. See the header of *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, 30 June 1898, for a full list.

⁵⁰ "Notizen," *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, 10 November 1898, 1034.

published in *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift* later that month in the form of a feuilleton.⁵¹ Apart from being a concise history of the Viennese department of forensic medicine,⁵² the article also offers a unique look into Kolisko's plans for the future and reveals that, though he had conducted his research in a different area for the past 17 years, he held the field of forensic medicine in high regard, and entered his new position with a great sense of duty.⁵³

Throughout 1898 and 1899, the newspapers almost exclusively record Kolisko as a prosecutor, particularly of murder victims. The very first such article demonstrates the gravity of Kolisko's new role.⁵⁴ As reported by *Neues Wiener Abendblatt*, he performed the autopsy of 10-year-old Anna Kutschera, the daughter of a post office worker. It was originally believed that Anna died by suffocation when her brother covered her mouth with his hands. Kolisko's autopsy determined, however, that suffocation was in fact not the cause of death. Instead, the prosecutor found countless fresh injuries all over the girl's body, including a wrist fracture. This suggested that Anna's death was of a more violent nature, perhaps the result of mistreatment by Anna's stepmother.⁵⁵

Even in his new role as head of the department of forensic medicine, Kolisko did not hesitate to honor his roots in pathological anatomy. The year 1900 saw the publication of the first part of the first volume of *Die pathologischen Beckenformen*, a textbook on deformities of the pelvis written together with obstetrician Carl Breus. This first part alone spans 366 pages and contains 116 illustrations. A contemporary review notes "the creation of an epochal literary product which far surpasses anything that has been published so far

⁵¹ Alexander Kolisko, "Das Verhältniss der pathologischen Anatomie zur gerichtlichen Medicin," *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, 17 November 1898, 1050–55.

⁵² Kolisko begins with the department's founding in 1805 and ends with von Hofmann's death, mentioning among others Rokitsansky, Skoda, and Kundrat along the way. It is evident that he held not just the department, but also its heads and von Hoffmann in particular, in high regard.

⁵³ Another indicator is, perhaps, the fact that he oversaw the publication of the two-volume *Beiträge zur gerichtlichen Medizin* in 1911 and 1912, a work composed of studies by the various members of the department of forensic medicine.

⁵⁴ It can be assumed that Kolisko's naming as the chief Viennese prosecutor in 1900 made the burden of his work all that heavier. Of note is the fact that Albin Haberda was named his first deputy. See *Wiener Kommunal-Kalender und städtisches Jahrbuch* (Vienna: Paul Gerin, 1900), 500.

⁵⁵ "Das Marthyrium eines Kindes," *Neues Wiener Abendblatt*, 14 December 1898, 3. Anna's stepmother was initially sentenced to death, but her sentence was altered to eight years heavy jail upon the Emperor's intervention. Anna's father was also tried but was eventually freed of the charges. See, for example, "Die Kindesmörderin Kutschera begnadigt," *Ischler Wochenblatt*, 28 January 1900, 4.

in terms of the abundance of what is offered.”⁵⁶ The work continued to be published in separate parts (eventually compiled into full volumes) until 1912, when the second part of the third volume was published. It would go on to acquire the reputation of Kolisko’s most significant and accomplished work, useful not just for pathological anatomists, but also for obstetricians.⁵⁷

Only a year after the last part of *Die pathologischen Beckenformen* was published, Kolisko authored another textbook of similar proportions. The work, entitled “Plötzlicher Tod aus natürlicher Ursache,” was published as part of Hans Dittrich’s *Handbuch der ärztlichen Sachverständigentätigkeit* and spanned almost 800 pages. In a review published in the 9 May 1914 issue of *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift*, Albin Haberda praises the work, calling it “a textbook in which the physician will find almost everything he needs for his work at the dissection table” and pointing out that such an amount of detail is “available nowhere else.”⁵⁸

While chair of forensic medicine, Kolisko found himself in even higher positions on several occasions. The first such occasion was in 1901, when he was elected a member of the academic senate of the University of Vienna.⁵⁹ He was reelected the following year.⁶⁰ Of particular significance is his election as the Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, also in 1901.⁶¹ Though elected for only one term – the 1901–1902 school year –, he was later elected Dean for a second time.⁶² This can be seen as a sign of respect from his fellow professors, and also as recognition for his continuing contributions to medical science.

In 1916, Kolisko’s long tenure as head of the department of forensic medicine came to an end. Just like almost 20 years earlier, a vacant seat facilitated his move to another department. Anton Weichselbaum, the head of the department of pathological anatomy, had reached the age limit for his position, and was to retire. It was decided that his successor would be Alexander

⁵⁶ “Die pathologischen Beckenformen,” *Wiener klinische Wochenschrift*, 4 October 1900, 912. The reviewer also calls the work “an honorable monument set to the memory of [Hans] Kundrat.”

⁵⁷ As evidenced by, for example, “Die pathologischen Beckenformen,” *Wiener klinische Rundschau*, 9 June 1912, 359. One of Carl Breus’ obituaries calls it a “foundational work.” See “Karl Breus †,” *Medizinische Klinik*, 21 June 1914, 1084.

⁵⁸ Albin Haberda, “Plötzlicher Tod aus natürlicher Ursache,” *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift*, 9 May 1914, 1037–38.

⁵⁹ “Der neue akademische Senat,” *Das Vaterland*, 18 July 1901, 6.

⁶⁰ “Der neue akademische Senat der Wiener Universität,” *Illustriertes Wiener Extrablatt*, 2 July 1902, 6.

⁶¹ “Von der Universität,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 16 June 1901, 7.

⁶² “Von der Universität,” *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, 17 June 1909, 12.

Kolisko.⁶³ His naming as chair of pathological anatomy was followed with his naming as ordinary professor of pathological anatomy.⁶⁴ The chair of forensic medicine, now too left vacant, would be filled by Albin Haberda.⁶⁵

Kolisko was only able to enjoy his new position for a little over a year. On February 23, 1918, he passed away in a Viennese sanatorium due to a long-lasting illness.⁶⁶ His funeral took place at the Schottenkirche and was attended by members of the government, several of his medicinal colleagues, high-ranking military representatives, and “a large circle of his friends.”⁶⁷ An obituary published in the 2 March issue of the *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift* describes him as “a superb anatomist, a brilliant teacher, and an amiable colleague.”⁶⁸ Ten years later, a street in the Viennese district Favoriten was given his name – *Koliskogasse*.⁶⁹

As evidenced, Alexander Kolisko was very much a product of the Second Viennese School of Medicine. He not only learned from and worked with some of its most accomplished members, but also carried on their legacy through his words and work. Though largely overlooked now, he was well-respected in his own time. His contributions to the Viennese medical school, and medicine as a whole, were such that he most definitely deserves to be remembered. Hopefully, this study has ensured that he will receive proper attention in the future. His family, whether his siblings, ancestors, blood relatives, or in-laws, also deserves to be recognised, and will be examined in future articles.

Abstract

Alexander Kolisko was born in Vienna in 1857, the son of obstetrician Eugen Kolisko and Luise Bach, and sister of former Minister of the Interior Alexander von Bach. After graduating from the Viennese Faculty of Medicine in 1881, he was an assistant to his mentor, Hans Kundrat, while also conducting research in pathological anatomy. He published his research in 1884 with the article *Zur Kenntniss der Carcinoma psammosum ovarii*. He published

⁶³ “Abschied zweier medizinischen Gelehrten von der Wiener Universität,” *Neues Wiener Abendblatt*, 21 September 1916, 3.

⁶⁴ “Von den Hochschulen,” *Fremden-Blatt*, 2 October 1916, 4.

⁶⁵ “Hofrat Kolisko als Nachfolger des Hofrates Weichselbaum,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 2 October 1916, 7.

⁶⁶ “Hofrat Professor Dr. Alexander Kolisko gestorben,” *Der Morgen*, 25 February 1918, 3.

⁶⁷ “Hofrat Professor Dr. Alexander Kolisko,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 27 February 1918, 8.

⁶⁸ “Alexander Kolisko,” *Wiener medizinische Wochenschrift*, 2 March 1918, 397.

⁶⁹ “Neue Wiener Straßennamen,” *Neues Wiener Journal*, 24 March 1929, 25.

articles concerned with several distinct areas of his field, but his most important works focused on deformations of the pelvis (*Die pathologischen Beckenformen*) and sudden death from natural causes (*Plötzlicher Tod aus natürlicher Ursachen*). He was named extraordinary professor of pathological anatomy in 1892, leading his department for a short time after Hans Kundrat's death in 1893. He remained a lecturer and researcher. In 1897, after the death of the chair of forensic medicine Eduard von Hofmann, Kolisko replaced him in his position, also being named ordinary professor of forensic medicine. While being an apt prosecutor (he was even named chief prosecutor of Vienna in 1890), he also tried to honor the legacy of his predecessors. He led the department until 1916, when he was named chair (and ordinary professor) of pathological anatomy. He was also voted Dean of the Faculty of Medicine on two separate occasions. He died in 1918 as a respected pathologist.

Keywords: Alexander Kolisko; Kolisko family; Pathology; History of medicine; Forensic medicine; Nineteenth century Vienna; Second Viennese School of Medicine

Štefan Kaleta

Štefan Kaleta is a Bachelor student at the Department of History of the Palacký University in Olomouc. He is mainly interested in Early Modern patrimonial officials and distinguished families in nineteenth century Vienna, also conducting research into the Moravian and Viennese Kolisko family.

Department of History
Faculty of Arts
Palacký University Olomouc
e-mail: stefan.kaleta01@upol.cz

Commemorating War in Public Space: The Case of the Ostrava Battlefield¹

Ondřej Kolář

Introduction

The so-called Ostrava Offensive or Moravian-Ostrava Offensive, lasting from 10 March to 5 May 1945, was one of the hardest combat operations in the territory of the present Czech Republic. The course of military operations had been thoroughly studied and described elsewhere.² Significantly less scholarly attention has been paid, however, to the forms of commemoration and remembrance, as well as to the role of the dramatic war events for creating and maintaining local identity and collective memory in the heavily industrialised and ethnically mixed region of the Czech-Polish borderland, in the area of the historical provinces of Silesia and Northern Moravia.³

For the purposes of this paper, some forms of remembrance (such as historiography or both fiction and non-fiction books and films) are neglected.⁴ My aim is to describe and analyse the commemorative practise in public space, represented mainly by war monuments and memorials, museum exhibitions and toponymical terms. These symbols are understood in the context of development of the political and demographic situation, propaganda, and collective identity in the examined region. For comparison and for understanding

¹ This study is a result of research funded by the Czech Science Foundation as the project GA ČR P410 22–05263S “Transformation of Silesia 1945–1948”.

² See Jaroslav Hrbek, ed., *Draze zaplacená svoboda: osvobození Československa 1944–1945. Vol. 2* [The High Cost of Freedom: The Liberation of Czechoslovakia 1944–1945] (Prague: Paseka, 2009); Ondřej Kolář, *Boj o Ostravsko 1945* [Battle of the Ostrava Region 1945] (Ostrava: Magistrát města Ostravy, 2021); Břetislav Tvarůžek, *Operační cíl Ostrava* [Target Ostrava] (Ostrava: Profil, 1973); Emil Vávrovský, *Svoboda šla Ostravskem: kronika osvobození* [Freedom Came to Ostrava: A Chronicle of Liberation] (Ostrava: Krajské nakladatelství, 1965).

³ For further reading about ethnic structure and identities in Silesia, see Brendan Karch, *Nation and Loyalty in a German-Polish Borderland: Upper Silesia 1848–1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018); Johana Musálková, “Silesian Identity: the Interplay of Memory, History and Borders” (PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2018); Timothy Wilson, *Frontiers of Violence: Conflict and Identity in Ulster and Upper Silesia 1918–1922* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

⁴ These aspects were briefly depicted by Ondřej Kolář, “Different Stories of One Battle: The Moravian-Ostrava Offensive in Historiography and Collective Memory,” *Pogranicze Polish Borderlands Studies* 8, no. 2 (2020): 61–79.

the wider circumstances, I use both case studies on similar topics, as well as theoretical studies about war remembrance.⁵ Although the main object of the research is the memory of the Ostrava Offensive, for understanding the context, it is necessary to briefly depict some of the broader aspects of war remembrance and collective identity in the region.

The Battle of Ostrava

In order to understand the subsequent forms of commemoration and narratives of the offensive, it is essential to briefly depict the course of the combat operations. Around 155 thousand troops were involved on the Soviet side, including the Czechoslovak tank crews and airmen. The offensive was originally carried out by two armies of the 4th Ukrainian Front. In later stages of the operation during April and May, the attacking forces were also supported by the 60th Army of the 1st Ukrainian Front. Their opponents were some 250 thousand German and Hungarian soldiers of the Wehrmacht and SS, supported by Volkssturm and other irregular armed formations. During the first stage of the operation, the Axis forces were commanded by the legendary mastermind of defensive strategy Gotthard Heinrici. The German defence used parts of the pre-war Czechoslovak fortification line from the 1930s. The troops also often created heavily fortified strongholds in towns and villages, which led to many civilian victims and heavy damage in built-up areas.

One of the main goals of the offensive was to retain the German Army Group 'Mitte' under the infamous Ferdinand Schörner in Czech territory and prevent this force from becoming involved in the defence of the German capital. The Soviet primary goal was to take Berlin as soon as possible and thus Moscow deployed most of its manpower and material to attain this objective.⁶ As a result, the troops of the 4th Ukrainian front in the Ostrava region lacked the necessary superiority in manpower, fuel and weapons for a successful offensive. The attack was also supposed to relieve the Soviet units in Austria and Eastern Moravia from the pressure of the enemy and, if possible, conquer and preserve the industrial area and railway junction around Ostrava. The Soviet

⁵ See Peter Donaldson, *Remembering the South African War: Britain and the Memory of the Anglo-Boer War, from 1899 to the Present* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2014); Jay Winter, *Remembering War: the Great War between Memory and History in the 20th Century* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2008).

⁶ Peter Antill, *Berlin 1945: End of the Thousand Year Reich* (Oxford: Osprey, 2005); Tomáš Jakl, *Květen 1945 v českých zemích: pozemní operace vojsk Osy a Spojenců* [May 1945 in the Czech Lands: Land Operations of Axis and Allied Forces] (Prague: Miroslav Bílý, 2004).

advance was then supposed to continue to the city of Olomouc to meet the troops, proceeding from Eastern Moravia.

On 10 March, two armies of the 4th Ukrainian Front attacked from the North-East in the Strumień area in nowadays Poland and tried to reach the Ostrava coal mining district through a flat area around Těšín and Karviná. The offensive soon stuck due to muddy terrain, lack of superiority in firepower and Heinrici's well-prepared defence. The commander of the 4th Ukrainian Front, General Ivan Petrov, decided to join the 60th Army of the 1st Ukrainian Front, which performed an effective offensive on the western flank of his 38th Army. At the end of March, the Soviets managed to cross the Odra River and advanced to the pre-war Czechoslovak-German border. Petrov's new plan was to take Ostrava by encirclement from the North-West. During this operation, Petrov was replaced by Andrei Jeremenko (Yeryomenko) at the end of March. The new commander continued in the efforts of his predecessor.

In mid-April, Jeremenko reached the pre-war Czechoslovak border and divided his forces into two groups. The first one was supposed to conquer heavily fortified Opava to prevent German troops in western Silesia from attacking the Soviet army proceeding eastwards to Ostrava. The second group advanced directly to Ostrava. Both groups of Jeremenko's forces experienced heavy fighting, including house-to-house combat in towns and villages. On 22 April, the Soviets pushed the remains of the German elite mountain division from Opava.⁷ Ostrava was conquered during the last day of the month. At that moment, most of the Axis forces were already retreating to avoid enclosing. Over the following days, Jeremenko advanced through the mountainous terrain of Northern Moravia to take Olomouc. The goal was reached during the very last days of the war on the European continent. The final operations of the 4th Ukrainian Front in Olomouc area were part, however, of the Prague Offensive, while the Ostrava offensive was officially ended on 5 May.⁸

⁷ František Švábenický, ed., *Troppau 1945: Opava v roce nula* [Troppau 1945: Opava in Year Zero] (Opava: Statutární město Opava, 2017).

⁸ Jakl, *Květen 1945*; Ondřej Kolář, "K vnímání 'nepřítele' a 'osvoboditele' v bojích jara 1945 v paměti českého obyvatelstva Slezska a Ostravska" [On the Reception of "the Enemy" and "the Liberator" in the Memory of Civilians in Silesia and Ostrava], *Historica: Revue pro historii a příbuzné vědy* 8, no. 2 (2017): 183–96.

Phases of Commemoration

Throughout the offensive, most of the fighting took place on the territory of what is now Poland. Despite this fact, the combat operations of 1945 were never viewed as an important topic in regional Polish historiography and identity, as it has been in the Czech case. The area of fighting in today's Poland lied alongside the pre-war Polish-German border and the Western part of the territory was mainly German-inhabited. After the forced displacement of the vast majority of the German population, the region was repopulated by new settlers who came predominantly from nowadays Ukraine. The new-settlers did not directly witness the Ostrava Offensive and consequently it did not become part of their family or regional memory. The events of 1945 were seen just as a prelude to the 'Polonisation' of the territory or as a significant step on the 'path to socialism'. For the memory and identity of the Eastern part of the region, which was inhabited mainly by the Polish population during the war, the previous experience of Nazi terror and anti-Nazi resistance during the era of the occupation became more significant than the events of 1945.⁹

After the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989, Polish historians as well as most of the public denied the concept of 'liberation' by the Red Army (which is in contrast still influential in the Czech milieu) and often stressed the negative impacts of the Soviet presence in the region (mainly the cases of mass rape, political and ethnic purges, deportations of the local population to Siberia, Soviet support for the newly established Communist regime, etc.). For the Polish minority in the eastern part of Czech Silesia, which was not significantly affected by the Ostrava Offensive, the memory of home resistance during the Nazi occupation became more important.¹⁰

The remembrance of the last weeks of the war became crucial, however, for the Czechs. Even before the fighting was over, the very first memorials were erected. Unlike the commemoration of the Great War in the examined region,¹¹ the commemorative practise after 1945 was not based primarily on

⁹ Kazimierz Popiołek, *Silesia in German Eyes 1939–1945* (Katowice: Śląsk, 1964).

¹⁰ Mečislav Borák, *Na příkaz gestapa: nacistické válečné zločiny na Těšínsku* [By Order of the Gestapo: Nazi War Crimes in the Těšín region] (Ostrava: Profil, 1990); Fanciszek Hawranek, ed., *Wypisy do Dziejów Raciborskiego* [Notes on the History of Ratibor] (Opole: Instytut Śląski w Opolu, 1975); Kazimierz Popiołek, *Polskie dzieje Śląska* [The Polish History of Silesia] (Opole: Instytut Śląski w Opolu, 1986).

¹¹ Ondřej Kolář, "K typologii, symbolice a identitotvorné roli pomníků a památníků obětí první světové války v českém Slezsku 1918–1938" [On the Typology, Symbolism and Identity-making Role of War Memorials in Czech Silesia 1918–1938], *Marginalia Historica: Časopis pro dějiny vzdělanosti a kultury* 9, no. 2 (2018): 53–74.

remembering 'own' victims. Locals, murdered in Nazi camps or killed during air raids, were not of course supposed to be forgotten, but the crucial aim of the commemorative effort was to celebrate and immortalise the Allied and Soviet soldiers, the 'liberators, who died for our country'. While the names of civilian victims (including locals murdered during the Holocaust) were often simply 'added' onto the lists of fallen compatriots on communal Great War memorials or commemorated by simple plaques, local and regional officials through all the political parties worked to create highly presentable monuments dedicated to Soviet soldiers. In Opava, a statue of a Soviet soldier was erected already in 1945, financed by the district administration.¹² During the 1940s and early 1950s, notable sculptors were often involved, such as Vincenc Havel, the author of the sculptural group of 'liberators' in the provincial town of Bílovec, erected in 1952.

Another significant difference between the forms of remembrance of the two world wars can be seen – while local communities were crucial for the commemorative practise after the Great War, after 1945 the remembrance in the public space was 'monopolized' by official bodies, mainly district and regional administration and Communist party organisations, as well as organisations of ex-servicemen. Grass-root memorials erected by individuals or through public collections became very rare. Compared to the remembrance of the previous Great War, the victims of 1945 were often anonymous. Apart from a few distinguished heroes, the Red Army was most often remembered as a 'collective entity', partly due to lack of information about the thousands of individual soldiers, partly due to the collectivist narrative of Communist propaganda.

In general, the commemorative practise can be divided into several phases. The first one started already in the last weeks of the war and the practise did not significantly change after the Communist putsch in February 1948. An important transformation, however, came in the late 1950s. This initial stage of Ostrava Offensive's commemoration symbolically ended with the new Czechoslovak 'socialist' Constitution of 1960, which provoked more liberal policies in society. The first phase was characterised by spontaneity and some level of improvisation, but mainly by uncritical lionization of the Soviet soldiers. It also stressed the symbolical continuity of 'liberation' and the following era of 'building a socialist country', as well as the idea of 'Slavic mutuality'. During the first years, attempts were made by local administrations to commemorate concrete Soviet soldiers, although the majority of memorials and

¹² Státní okresní archiv Opava [State District Archives in Opava], Okresní národní výbor Opava-venkov [District National Committee Opava], cart. 244.

monuments remained anonymous, dedicated simply to ‘liberators’, ‘heroes’ or ‘Slavic brothers’.

In the 1960s, the second phase of commemoration of the Offensive emerged. At the time, the impact of partial liberation and ‘westernization’ became evident in Czechoslovakia. Another significant factor was the ‘generation gap’. The traditional narrative of Slavic and German antagonism and ‘liberation from Nazism as the first step on the path to socialism’ was not sufficient any longer for young people, who did not themselves experience the war and the enthusiasm of the first post-war years. Although the previous narrative was not entirely disclaimed, it was heavily scrutinised, especially face to face debates about the collaboration or cowardice of a part of the Czechoslovak population, as well as mistakes or excesses by Soviet soldiers. Such debates did not directly influence the commemoration through memorials, monuments, and wrath-lying ceremonies, but the reflection in historiography, media, films and mainly books of fiction¹³ significantly changed the way the general public was *thinking* about the war.¹⁴ Although the commemorative practise did not modify its ideas or ideologies, it adopted new visual forms and technologies, including modern art styles.

The occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact armies in August 1968 commenced another, neo-Stalinist, phase of commemoration, although using modern means of museum presentation. During this third phase, the authorities attempted to revive the concept of the 1950s and eliminate any debates about controversies of 1945. This ‘conservation of memory’ lasted until the fall of the regime in 1989.

The fourth, post-communist phase, did not lead to denial of the narrative of ‘liberation’ and the role of the Red Army in defeating Nazism remained appreciated. The decentralization of public life after the fall of Communism enabled, however, a great number of institutions, groups, and individuals to become involved in the commemorative practise. The ‘non-Soviet’ war experience of Czechoslovak and German soldiers and civilians began to attract more attention.

During the last decade, a tendency to reject the concept of ‘liberation’ became prominent within part of Czech society, describing the Soviet presence in Czechoslovakia in 1945 as ‘an occupation.’ This idea has been mainly motivated

¹³ Mainly semi-autobiographic novels *Zbabělci* [Cowards] by Josef Škvorecký and *Smrt si říká Engelchen* [Death is Called Engelchen] by Ladislav Mňačko became extremely influential.

¹⁴ See Jan Randák and Petr Koura, eds., *Hrdinství a zbabělost v české politické kultuře 19. a 20. století* [Heroism and Cowardice in Czech Political Culture of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries] (Prague: Dokořán, 2008).

by current relations with Russia, rather than by historical research.¹⁵ At the moment it is hard to say whether this is the beginning of a next phase of commemoration. Despite, however, the nation-wide debates of the last years, the overwhelming viewpoint of the Ostrava population seems to be unchanged. Thus, the importance of the war memory for local identity has proved to be stronger than in many other Czech regions, which did not experience such heavy fighting in 1945.

In recent years, commemorative activities have been restrained due to anti-pandemic measures in 2020 and 2021 and due to the spontaneous reaction to the war in Ukraine in 2022. It is too early, however, to comprehensively analyse the potential impact of this recent development.

Tombstones and Memorials

The tombs and memorials of dead soldiers are naturally the most ‘visible’ means of commemoration. The first monuments appeared in the area of the hardest fighting between Opava and Ostrava. A significant part of this territory lied in the Hlučín district, inhabited mainly by a Czech speaking population, but with traditionally strong pro-German sentiments. The region was part of Prussia and Germany in 1742–1920 and 1938–1945, therefore local men served in the Axis armed forces during World War II.¹⁶ Unlike in surrounding Czech areas, the official narrative of ‘liberation’ was seen as controversial in the Hlučín district, although it could not be openly questioned in the early post-war years.

Immediately after the fighting was over, fallen soldiers and civilians had to be buried. While the German tombs usually lacked any inscriptions, provisional wooden memorials were built for the dead Soviets by the Red Army or by locals. The first burial places were often in front of town halls or other public buildings. Unlike the victims of the Great War a generation ago, the Soviets were usually not buried in local Catholic cemeteries, partly due to the disapproval of burying Orthodox and Muslim soldiers within an overwhelm-

¹⁵ Jakub Huška, “Anketa revue KROK: První a druhá světová válka – proměny a konstanty historické paměti” [Revue KROK Survey: The First and Second World War – Changes and Invariables of Historical Memory], *Krok: Kulturní revue Olomouckého kraje* 12, no. 2 (2015): 3–6.

¹⁶ Nina Pavelčíková, “Postoje obyvatel Hlučínska v letech politických zvrátů (1930–1945)” [Attitudes of Hlučín Region Inhabitants in an Era of Political Twists, 1930–1945], *Slezský sborník* 88, no. 4 (1990): 280–95; Vilém Plaček, *Prajzáci aneb k osudům Hlučínska 1742–1960* [Prussians or on the Fate of the Hlučín Region 1742–1960] (Háj ve Slezsku: František Maj, 2007).

ingly Catholic population, partly as a symptom of continuing secularisation of the war remembrance.¹⁷

In 1946, central cemeteries of Soviet soldiers were founded in Opava, Ostrava and Hlučín due to the efforts of the Moravian-Silesian National Committee.¹⁸ In Ostrava, the urns of Czech and Soviet victims were buried together in a mausoleum to highlight 'Slavic mutuality'. The memorial in Opava cemetery deserves attention due to the inscription, celebrating the role of the Red Army as a 'liberator of Slavic nations'. The nationalist rhetoric, neglecting the international character of Communist ideology and multiethnicity of the Red Army, was typical for Czechoslovak Communist propaganda at the time. The symbolic importance of this aspect also needs to be understood in the context of post-war 'czechisation' of overwhelmingly German-populated Opava.¹⁹

A specific form of commemoration occurred soon after the war, when wrecks of military vehicles began to be used as provisional memorials. Damaged and abandoned tanks or guns served as a symbol of the heroism of Czechoslovak and Soviet troops. The most significant case appeared in Ostrava, where a vehicle of the Czechoslovak Tank Brigade was spontaneously placed in front of the town hall. Later, at the end of the 1950s and afterwards till the mid-1970s, this form of commemorative practise re-appeared and military vehicles and airplanes became an integral part of some monuments, such as the memorial of airmen in Ostrava or monuments of tank crews in the villages of Sudice and Smolkov. While in 1945, this practise was seen as only a provisional measure before dignified memorials could be erected, during the second phase this form of commemoration was motivated by the effort to make war remembrance more attractive visually for young generation. Displayed vehicles or airplanes, often constructed after the war, were supposed to symbolise the continuity of wartime and post-war Czechoslovak armed forces and encourage young men to become soldiers in the socialist army.

An extraordinary case could be witnessed in the Hlučín region, where several cemeteries of fallen German soldiers were constructed already in 1945 by locals, who shared the 'German' experience of the war. Naturally, state authorities tried to suppress such tendencies. Over the following decades, commemorative plaques of local 'German' war victims were placed in several

¹⁷ See Kolář, "K typologii".

¹⁸ Zemský archiv v Opavě [Provincial Archive in Opava], Moravskoslezský Zemský národní výbor – expozitura v Ostravě [Moravian-Silesian National Committee – Branch Ostrava], cart. 744, sign. 693.

¹⁹ Ondřej Kolář, ed., *Slezsko znovuzrozené: k 70. výročí návštěvy prezidenta ČSR dr. Edvarda Beneše v Hrabyni* [Silesia Reborn: On the 70th Anniversary of the Visit of the Czechoslovak President Dr. Edvard Beneš in Hrabyně] (Hrabyně: Obec Hrabyně, 2016); Švábenický, *Troppau*.

churches. Since the buildings were owned by the Catholic Church, officials and police could not remove or destroy such sites of memory. The special case of 'German' commemorative practise in early post-war Hlučín area was the burial of Adolf Theuer in April 1947.²⁰ A former SS guard from the Auschwitz concentration camp, Theuer was convicted and executed as a war criminal and his family decided to bury him in his native village of Bolatice. The ceremony was interrupted by police officers, who took the body and buried it in an unmarked tomb in Opava. Although the planned burial in Bolatice did not take place, the readiness of locals (including clergymen) to attend the ceremony demonstrated that Theuer's wartime service was not seen as a controversy in his birthplace. Although the burial itself could not be understood as an act of war remembrance, it illustrated the widespread viewpoint of Hlučín region inhabitants, opposing the 'official' narrative.

During the 1950s and mainly the 1960s many simple war memorials in towns and villages were built by local administrations or local branches of the Communist party. Only in larger towns and cities, usually centres of administrative districts, more elaborate sculptures appeared, often depicting Soviet soldiers, sometimes together with civilians celebrating the liberation, symbolizing 'Slavic friendship'.

Many more monuments and memorials were erected during the celebrations of anniversaries of liberation in 1970, 1975 and 1980, which most often materialised in a very simple form without any sophisticated symbolism. During the first two post-war decades, memorials were erected mostly in Ostrava, Opava and the Hlučín regions; in areas, where the people inflicted by the events of 1945 still lived. In the case of the Hlučín territory, the war monuments were also projected as a symbol of the Czech character of the former part of Prussia.²¹ In this area, one can witness a unique case in the nation-wide context of commemorative practise. Several memorials in the region, usually dated to the 1960s, are lacking Czech inscriptions, the whole text is in Russian. This was in all probability decided by the district administration and intended as a symbol of 'the superiority' of the ruling regime over the local population with a 'different' experience and a 'German' identity.

Another new aspect of the 1960s was a shift of interest from an anonymous mass of heroic soldiers to individual personalities. This tendency can be best illustrated by the case of Miloš Sýkora, a young Communist resistance

²⁰ Ondřej Kolář and Hana Dostálová, "Obyvatelé Hlučínska před Mimořádným lidovým soudem v Opavě 1945–1948" [Inhabitants of the Hlučín Region Prosecuted by the Extraordinary People's Court in Opava 1945–1948], *Historica Olomucensia* 52 (2017): 163–88.

²¹ Plaček, *Prajzáci*.

fighter, killed on the 30 April 1945. Soon after the war, Sýkora was labelled as the probable saviour of a bridge in the centre of Ostrava, which without him would have been blown up by the Germans. Despite some doubts about his role,²² Sýkora belonged to the most popular and important symbols of the liberation of Ostrava. In 1965, a statue of Sýkora, created by a respected sculptor Konrád Babraj, was erected at the place of his death. The statue was obviously inspired by works by the British artist Henry Moore and it is significant for depicting Sýkora not in a heroic pose but lying wounded on the ground. The adoption of a modern Western art style was typical for the decade, but was not destined to last for long.

Together with Sýkora, the fallen Czechoslovak soldier Jan Kubinec belonged to significant symbols. While Sýkora personalised the home resistance, Kubinec belonged to the most celebrated heroes of the Czechoslovak army in the Ostrava Offensive. Unlike Sýkora, however, Kubinec was worshipped not due to a heroic deed, but due to a martyr death (allegedly captured and tortured by German soldiers in Štítina). His grave in Štítina served as an important site of memory for decades. The cult of Kubinec was partly misused by the Communist regime to suppress the popularity of General Heliodor Píka, who was born in Štítina and executed by the Communists in 1949.²³

Later during the 1970s and 1980s, new memorials also came about in former German villages of the former battlefield of the Ostrava Offensive (mainly in the North-Western part of the Opava region and in the Nový Jičín district). Sometimes older Great War memorials were adapted for the purpose or just simple commemorative plaques were created. This common practice indicates quite the low level of need for these memory sites amongst the local population (consisting mainly of new settlers, who came after 1945), unlike in the territories closer to Ostrava, where the war experience played a significant role in the shared memory. Those later erected sculptures and plaques usually did not appear as a response to actual social demand, but rather served as a means of ongoing 'normalisation' after 1968 and a means of redefining Soviet ideology in 1970s, when the traditional narrative of 'progress to socialism' proved to be untenable and was gradually replaced by a historical narrative, stressing the 'previous victories' of the Soviet Union.²⁴

²² Pavel Hamza, "30. duben 1945 u Říšského mostu v centru Ostravy aneb Opravdu Miloš Sýkora?" [30 April 1945 at the Imperial Bridge in Ostrava or Actually Miloš Sýkora?], *Ostrava: příspěvky k dějinám a současnosti Ostravy a Ostravska* 22 (2005): 250–71.

²³ Zdeněk Vališ, *Divizní generál Heliodor Píka* [Division General Heliodor Píka] (Prague: Vojenský historický archiv, 1991).

²⁴ Timothy Snyder, *Cesta k nesvobodě* [The Road to Unfreedom], trans. Martin Pokorný (Prague: Paseka – Prostor, 2019).

Most of the memorials were funded by municipalities or associations of veterans. Nevertheless, a significant exception deserves to be mentioned. In the late 1960s, the North Moravian Regional Council of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia decided to create a central memorial of the Ostrava Offensive. The village of Hrabyně was chosen as a site of memory. There were several reasons for this decision. The village was an important, but not the only, symbol of the combat operations of 1945. Its location on a hill half-way between Opava and Ostrava, with a good view of the Hlučín region, made Hrabyně universal, a 'shared', and accessible symbol. The location did not favour or neglect any part of the 'wider Ostrava region', as the territory was informally called.

Hrabyně was also a significant site of another, non-communist, memory that was supposed to be destroyed and replaced. The local pilgrimage church built by the legendary Czech patriotic priest of the nineteenth Century Jan Böhm, as well as the hill of Ostrá Hůrka a few kilometres from Hrabyně, were iconic places of Czech struggle for ethnic and cultural self-determination during the Habsburg and interwar periods.²⁵ In 1969, a commemorative meeting at Ostrá Hůrka turned into a massive protest demonstration against the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact armies that took place a year before. Regional Communist authorities hoped to undermine the symbolic role of the place by constructing a new site of memory, which presented and celebrated Czech-Soviet cooperation against both fascism and 'imperialism'.²⁶ The authors of the concept also followed other aims in a wider national context. The regional Communist leader Miroslav Mamula wanted to stress the importance of the Ostrava Offensive and put it on the same level in the remembrance practise as the military operations in Dukla Pass in 1944, which were celebrated as an official feastholiday of the Czechoslovak Army.

The realisation of the project in Hrabyně slowed down due to a series of administrative and technical problems. Finally, the memorial was opened for public in April 1980, 35 years after the liberation of Ostrava. The concrete building, called Ostrava Offensive Memorial (*Památník ostravské operace*), consisted of two parts, symbolising the two allied armies (Soviet and Czechoslovak). To make the message even more obvious, a sculptural group of a Czech and Soviet soldier was erected in front of the building. The memorial was used for temporary exhibitions, as well as ceremonial oaths of soldiers

²⁵ Jáchym Blechta, *Ostrá hůrka: zpěv slezské svobody* [Ostrá hůrka: Song of Silesian Freedom] (Hrabyně, 1933); Petr Jordán, ed., *Hrabyně* (Hrabyně: Obec Hrabyně, 2007).

²⁶ Petr Berger and Alfons Březina, *Památník Ostravské operace* [Ostrava Offensive Memorial] (Ostrava: Profil, 1985); Slezské zemské muzeum, Opava [Silesian Museum, Opava], *Novodobé dějiny* [Contemporary History], sign. IV B 670–673.

and 'Pioneers' (a Communist youth organisation inspired by the Boy Scouts) or meetings of war veterans. A symbolic cemetery of war victims from the region was also part of the area.

The impact of the Hrabyně memorial on collective memory could be described as partly contra-productive. Locals were forced to make contributions to the construction of the monument or to participate as 'volunteer' workers during weekends. This was why the building soon became quite unpopular with the regional population, commonly nicknamed CUC, standing for "*Cypovina u cesty*" ("*Nonsense by the Roadway*"). The unique architecture of the place, symbolising the unity of the Czechoslovak and Soviet armies, was highly prized, however, by architects. The younger generation of visitors, in particular, also appreciated another remarkable aspect of the memorial – a cinema hall, where a short documentary about Ostrava during WWII was projected on a special three-dimensional screen.²⁷

Although the fall of Communism in 1989 opened the debate about formerly tabooed topics, such as the role of the non-communist anti-Nazi resistance and the fate of Czechoslovak citizens from Hlučín and other regions serving in the German forces, the commemorative practise did not change distinctively. Most of the memorials and street names were preserved with several exceptions. The memorial of airmen in Ostrava from 1960 was removed as a 'symbol of Communism' in the euphoric era of the early 1990s. Some memorial plaques in urban areas were destroyed by metal thieves. Very few new monuments appeared, some of them dedicated to fallen soldiers, whose stories were newly documented by researchers. The rise of interest in Holocaust victims can be also witnessed after 1989.

The post-communist era also re-opened the question of war victims on the Axis side. A cemetery of German soldiers in Opava came about through reconstruction. Many skeletal remains were transferred to the central cemetery in Cheb, Western Bohemia, operated by the German association Volksbundes Deutscher Kriegsgräberfürsorge (National Union for Care of Military Graves). Some municipalities of the Hlučín region refused, however, to allow the relocation of bodies. This fact documents the lasting pro-German sentiment and the role of the 'German' war experience in the territory.²⁸

The most important post-1989 change, in all probability, was the 'revival' of a traditional site of memory at Ostrá Hůrka. The hill had become a well-

²⁷ The remarks on reception of the memorial were collected from my interviews with visitors of the sight during my working experience as a guide and custodian in Hrabyně in 2012–2015.

²⁸ Anežka Brožová, "Pomníky padlým na Hlučínsku" [War Memorials in the Hlučín Region,] in *Hlučínsko 1920–2020*, ed. Jiří Neminář (Hlučín: Muzeum Hlučínska, 2020), 106–15.

known meeting place of Czech patriots already in the nineteenth century. In 1929, a sculpture was erected here to commemorate the self-determination of the Czechs after the Great War. This original monument did not survive the Nazi occupation and the post-war attempts to renew it were stopped by the new Communist regime. In the 1960s, a simple column dedicated to “the Czech people of Silesia” replaced the old monument. After 1989, a memorial plaque was added, commemorating the leaders of the local home resistance, executed by the Nazis in April 1943. Although the site of memory at Ostrá Hůrka was not directly associated to the Ostrava Offensive, the commemorative ceremonies in April were usually connected to wreath-lying in nearby Hrabyně, so the victims of the home resistance and the fallen ‘liberators’ of 1945 were remembered and celebrated together, as integral symbols of the ‘shared’ narrative of anti-Nazi struggle and liberation.

Local Names

Another form of commemoration was the usage of local names. This included particular personalities, as well as more abstract names. Naming a street or square was usually based on a decision of a local or district administration, while other institutions and associations had very little chance to influence the procedure.

General Petrov, despite his undisputable credit in planning the offensive, was almost forgotten; at least he was not formally commemorated. His successor Jeremenko became, however, an important symbol for the local collective memory and identity. A street and a coal mine in Ostrava were named after him. The mine name was changed to “Marshal Jeremenko” in 1970, during the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the liberation of Ostrava. The old Marshal himself took part in the celebration.

The case of Jeremenko street in Ostrava was quite peculiar. This not particularly important street in the centre of the industrial Vítkovice district seemed too ‘ordinary’ to bear the name of an iconic war hero. It also had no significant wartime history, which could be associated with the ‘Liberator of Ostrava’. Before the war, the street bore the name of Jerome of Prague (Jeroným in Czech), the fifteenth century religious reformer.²⁹ While the street names that related to German history and traditions were often changed in the post-war years, there was no obvious reason for removing Jeroným, whose legacy was still relatively respected by the Czech population, from the public space.

²⁹ František Šmahel, *Jeroným Pražský* [Hieronymus of Prague] (Prague: Svobodné slovo, 1966).

One of motives for renaming the street might have been related to the effort to weaken the traditional ‘German’ character of Vítkovice district. (Before 1945, a strong German minority lived in the area and local architecture was also significantly influenced by the German style).³⁰ Even the resemblance of the names Jeroným and Jeremenko may have played some role. Another reason lies in the proximity of Jeremenko street and Ruská (‘Russian’) street (former Hermann Göring street), which was significant due to the symbolism of the ‘Slavic’ name itself, but also as one of the access routes, used by Soviet and Czechoslovak troops to invade the centre of Ostrava in April 1945. Later in 1960, a small group of workers’ houses close to Jeremenko Coal Mine was also named after the Marshal.

Several attempts were later made to remove the name of Andrei Jeremenko. In 1968, the local administration considered naming ‘his’ street in Vítkovice after the Communist reformist Čestmír Císař.³¹ In the early 1990s, names such as “Church Street” or “Market Street” were suggested by several city councillors, inspired by the surrounding localities. Despite the above-mentioned initiatives, Jeremenko’s name remained.

Other streets bore the names of Czechoslovak soldiers killed during combat operations. While Josef Gregor, shot dead by a German sniper, was commemorated already in 1945, his comrade Ivan Ahepjuk gained his ‘own’ street as late as 1970. The difference seems surprising because Ahepjuk and Gregor were the only two members of the Czechoslovak exile army killed in the city of Ostrava itself.

This differing commemorative practise in both cases might be partly explained by some uncertainty about the circumstances of Ahepjuk’s death and the fact that Ahepjuk was ‘only’ a driver compared to Gregor as a non-commissioned officer and a distinguished tank commander with four confirmed ‘kills’ of enemy vehicles. The primary reason was, however, in all probability related to the dissimilar approach of Czechoslovak politics and propaganda to two categories of (ex-)servicemen soon after the war. Gregor belonged to Czechs from Volhynia in current-day Ukraine. The Czech community settled in the region during the nineteenth century and kept their language and traditions. Many Volhynian Czechs served in the Czechoslovak exile army during the war. When Czechoslovakia was renewed in 1945, many Volhynian Czechs were

³⁰ Karel Jiřík, “Vítkovice – nejvíce germanizovaná obec v Předlitavsku” [Vítkovice – The Most Germanised Village in Cisleithania], *Ostrava: příspěvky k dějinám a současnosti Ostravy a Ostravska* 21 (2003): 162–96.

³¹ Čestmír Císař, *Paměti: nejen o zákulisí Pražského jara* [Memoirs: Not Just About the Background of the Prague Spring] (Prague: SinCon, 2005).

welcomed to settle in the borderland in order to replace the expelled Germans. Propaganda depicted ‘Volhynians’ as patriots, who distinguished themselves in the combat against Nazism and who ‘came back to their homeland to build up a new socialist country’. (In fact, for many Czechs the real motivation for remigration from Volynhia was the endeavour to escape Soviet oppression). The name Gregor, as a Volynhian Czech and meritorious soldier, represented a perfect hero for the official ideology of the first post-war years.

Ahepjuk was, in contrast, probably not viewed as a ‘suitable’ subject of commemoration for the authorities because of his Carpathian Ruthenian origin. After Stalin annexed the territory in 1945, Czechoslovak officials kept trying to preserve a good relationship with Moscow, thus the fate of Ruthenians, including distinguished anti-Nazi fighters, became a taboo subject.³² In 1970, when the old ties between most of Czechoslovak society and Carpathian Ruthenia were already broken, there were no obstacles to naming a street after Ahepjuk. In the context of post-1968 ‘normalisation’, a Czechoslovak soldier, born in ‘Soviet’ territory looked like a convenient symbol of declared ‘Slavic friendship’ between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union. Together with the visit of Marshal Jeremenko to Ostrava and laying the cornerstone of the Ostrava Offensive Memorial in Hrabyně the naming of a street after Ahepjuk accompanied the celebrations of the 25th anniversary of the liberation. Simultaneously, the commemoration of a ‘common’ Czechoslovak soldier could serve as a counterbalance to the lionization of the anonymous ‘Soviet army’ and its commanders, which was supposed ‘to humanize’ the remembrance of the war.

War-related street names also appeared in other towns and villages of the examined regions, but usually in very impersonal and collective forms. The places were dedicated to ‘the Red Army’, ‘Liberators’, ‘the Resistance’ or ‘Freedom’. These names were often used to replace old ‘German’ or ‘Anti-socialist’ toponymic terms, such as the names of pre-war politicians, or to name newly built streets in industrial towns of the Ostrava coal-mining district.

The “Red Army Streets” in many towns and villages were characterised by a linguistic oddity which had to be explained. After the Communist putsch of 1948, the wartime Red Army was often referred to as the ‘Soviet Army’ with a ‘capital S’, which, in Czech, suggested the term as an official name. In fact, the term ‘Soviet Army’ was formally introduced in 1946 to replace the official title of Red Army, thus relating it to the war events was ahistorical. Nevertheless, the ruling regime preferred the new name ‘Soviet Army’ to strengthen the rhetoric of Czech-Soviet friendship and emphasise the gratefulness for libera-

³² Bohdan Zilynskyj, *Ukrajinci v českých zemích v letech 1945–1948* [Ukrainians in the Czech Lands 1945–1948] (Prague: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR, 2000).

tion to the Soviet Union. This rhetoric was typical mainly for street names and war memorials, erected in the 1970s. Occasionally the name Red Army was used for streets and squares in untranslated Russian form ('Krasnoarmějců' instead of 'Rudoarmějců') to emphasise 'Slavic mutuality'.

In the 1960s and 1970s, many places were named or re-named after the Czechoslovak General Ludvík Svoboda, the wartime military commander and Defence Minister. Although Svoboda was not personally involved in the fighting in the Ostrava region, he was highly respected by both ex-servicemen and the public and he occasionally attended commemorative acts in Ostrava. The cult of Svoboda (whose name meant 'Liberty' in Czech) appeared soon after the war. In the case of Ostrava, the cult was underlined by the General's repeated visits in the region in 1945–1948.³³ In the 1950s, the war hero was removed from public life and even imprisoned. Over the following decade, Svoboda experienced a fascinating comeback, which led to his success in the presidential election in Czechoslovakia in 1968. Although the ageing President was continuously losing real power in favour of the conservative wing of 'normalisers' in the Communist party, his reputation prevented his adversaries from any direct action against him. Even if some post-1989 historians questioned Svoboda's merits and moral integrity,³⁴ no measures were ever taken to remove his name from the public space by post-communist authorities. In Ostrava and many other towns and villages, we can still find many streets and squares named after Svoboda.

The role of the home resistance in the Ostrava Offensive was neglected for a long time. As late as 1980, a street in Ostrava was given a name Josef Brabec, a worker killed when trying to prevent the Germans from blowing up a railway bridge. Up until the present, the mausoleum in Ostrava, where Soviet and Czech combatants are buried together, is referred to as "the Red Army Memorial" in official documents and tourist guides.

Quite surprisingly, local names related to the Ostrava Offensive did not become common outside the city of Ostrava. In the surrounding towns and villages, the names of Czechoslovak and Soviet commanders and war heroes were not widespread. Paradoxically, names inspired by other wartime military operations of the Czechoslovak army, such as the battles of Dukla and Jaslo occurred more often. In some villages, streets bore names after the days of the liberation of the place, such as "Street of 27 April" in Háj ve Slezsku or "Street of 30 April" in Ostrava.

³³ Lukáš Bártl et al., *Viktor Kolář st. 1898–1971* (Brno: Books and Pipes, 2022), 35, 64–65.

³⁴ Jan Irving et al., "Českoslovenští vojáci a konec války 1945" [Czechoslovak Soldiers and the End of the War 1945], *Historie a vojenství* 44, no. 2 (1995): 118–48.

Remarkably, the names of ‘newly discovered’ non-communist war heroes after 1989 were used to name streets and squares only in a few cases, usually not connected to the battle of Ostrava. This fact can be partly explained by the declining interest of society due to increasing intervals from the war events, partly by social demand to also commemorate the heroes and veterans from other battlefields, previously neglected by Communist historiography and propaganda, although many of those people had no pre-war and wartime connection to the region. A significant example was naming a school in Ostrava after the former Royal Air Force fighter pilot Zdeněk Škarvada in 2013. The remembrance of the Ostrava Offensive was therefore partly replaced by the remembrance of the Czechoslovak anti-Nazi resistance.

Museums and Exhibitions

In the first post-war decade, museums in the Ostrava region (and all Czechoslovakia) went through many significant changes. At first, custodians and other staff had to deal with the destruction, vandalism, and cases of robbery, caused by the turbulent political and military situation. Even before things could be consolidated, a series of structural reforms begun in order to centralise the network of museums after the Communist putsch in 1948. This complicated period ended with new legislation in the late 1950s.³⁵ Unlike in the interwar era, the new ‘Communist’ museums were supposed to pay much more attention to contemporary history. Thus, the documentation of war events was strongly supported.

In 1963, the Museum of Revolutionary Combats (Muzeum revolučních bojů, MRB) was founded in Ostrava as a detached part of the Silesian Museum in Opava.³⁶ It followed the effort of the Documentary Commission of the Communist Party Regional Council, which had collected testimonies about ‘the revolutionary traditions’ of the region since the 1950s. The employees of MRB carried out hundreds of interviews with veterans of home resistance and the exile army, often held as group sessions. The museum also collected militaria, written and printed documents and photographs. In 1980, the museum was transformed into an independent body under the new name Museum of Revolutionary Combats and Liberation (Muzeum revolučních bojů

³⁵ Pavel Šopák, *Město muzeí: Opava 1814–1989* [City of Museums: Opava 1814–1989] (Opava: Slezské zemské muzeum, 2016).

³⁶ Alfons Březina, *Muzeum ostravské operace Kravaře* [Museum of the Ostrava Offensive in Kravaře] (Ostrava: Profil, 1976).

a osvobození, MRBO). The museum ran a long-term exhibition dedicated to the Ostrava Offensive in the château in Kravaře and organised smaller short-term exhibitions in Ostrava and Hrabyně. The main problem of MRB/MRBO was a lack of systematic usage of collected materials, which served mainly for temporary exhibitions and were not utilised for systematic research.

Despite the general easing in Czechoslovak society during the 1960s, the second Berlin Crisis and the threat of a nuclear war led to the renewal of escalated anti-German rhetoric, based on the concept of so-called ‘German revanchism’. The official propaganda argued that Western Germany was *de facto* ruled by former Nazis seeking revenge. The idea of revanchism did not find expression in commemorative ceremonies, which were already well-established and ritualised, but it became an important topic for museums. MRB intensively collected – and subsequently presented to the public – hundreds of photographs and documents, related to meetings and other activities of German war veterans and expelled Czechoslovak Germans in Western Germany, which were supposed ‘prove’ the conspiracy of ex-Nazis plotting against socialist countries.³⁷ This propagandistic effort even included a fabricated story about *Operation Teutonic Sword* (*Unternehmen Teutonenschwert*), suggesting that the assassination of the French Foreign Minister Louis Barthou and the Yugoslav King Alexander in 1934 was orchestrated by German intelligence. The intention was to blame Hans Speidel, then dispatched in Paris and later Supreme Commander of NATO in 1957–1963, for the attack. The efforts of MRBO were therefore focused mainly on ‘anti-Western’ propaganda, than on regional research and museum presentation of local history. Over the following decades, the propagandistic role of MRB partly weakened. The museum adopted a more professional approach and focused mainly on the history of Czech Silesia and Northern Moravia in the twentieth century.

I have already mentioned the usage of military equipment as parts of memorials. In the 1970s and 1980s, discarded military vehicles and planes also began to be used for open-air exhibitions. The first initiatives were carried out by enthusiasts, who sought for support of institutions. MRB recognised the educational and promotional potential of the idea and co-funded several such events. The co-operation of local enthusiasts and an official museum institution also led to attempts to make some fortification objects accessible to public. The 1930s Czechoslovak fortification line naturally attracted the attention of military history enthusiasts, but the exploration and utilisation of the bunkers was strictly limited for several reasons. Most of the pillboxes

³⁷ Heinz Sander, *Presídlenecký revanšismus v západním Německu* [Revanchism of Displaced Persons in Western Germany] (Prague: Svoboda, 1972).

and forts, although unused, were still owned by the army, which still considered plans to use them in case of war.³⁸ From the ideological viewpoint, the fortifications were associated with the memory of the 'bourgeois' interwar Czechoslovak regime. People who were interested in the bunkers were therefore seen as potential 'enemies of the working class'. Moreover, many of the first amateur researchers focusing on the fortification line in the 1960s and 1970s were members of the so-called 'tramping' movement – an informal group of young people dedicated to the outdoors and inspired by the American Wild West. Their interest in pre-war Czechoslovak army could be partly explained as a form of 'mental resistance' against the communist regime.

Later during the 1980s, research and commemoration related to the 1930s army became tolerated by the ruling Communist party due to increasing social demand caused by the upcoming 50th anniversary of the Munich agreement, as well as the idea of 'Perestroika', declared by the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. Due to these circumstances, several objects of the fortification line were adopted for museum purposes near Hlučín, thanks to the complicated alliance of MRB (as an official pro-regime body) and local enthusiasts, including former interwar Czechoslovak army officers, such as the engineer and architect Jindřich Czeniek, who was also the author of several war memorials.³⁹ People like Czeniek and the journalist Jan Polášek acted as mediators between MRB and the young generation of 'tramps', some of whom became involved in the project. The new fortification museum, which opened in 1984, was supposed to remember not just the era of the 1930s, but also the role of the fortifications during combat operations in 1945.

Speaking about the 'museologisation' of the war before 1989, it is important to reflect on the 'geography of memory'. The MRBO exhibition in Kravaře, as well as the exhibition of Czechoslovak fortifications, created by MRBO in the 1980s, were in the Hlučín area. Unfortunately, MRBO papers are still not accessible for researchers. It therefore remained unclear, whether the localisation of exhibitions could be understood as part of the efforts to 'import' the official Slavic and socialist narrative of 'liberation' to a region with a different identity and memory, or whether the exhibition buildings were selected just due to technical and administrative reasons.

The fall of the Communist regime led to higher diversity in the activities of museums. The memorial in Hrabyně became part of the Silesian Museum

³⁸ Josef Durčák and Oldřich Gregar, *Pohraniční opevnění na Opavsku a Bruntálsku* [Border Fortifications in the Opava and Bruntál Regions] (Opava: AVE, 1998).

³⁹ Oldřich Hrachovec, "Architekt Jindřich Czeniek devadesátiletý" [The Architect Jindřich Czeniek Celebrates 90], *Vlastivědné listy Slezska a Severní Moravy* 27, no. 1 (2001): 43.

in the early 1990s and was later reconstructed and reconceptualised as the National World War II Memorial. It became an exhibition venue, commemorating the war as whole, with no primary connection to the Ostrava Offensive. Over the last decade, the municipal museum in Hlučín created a new long-term exhibition focusing on 'the other story' of the local population. For the first time, the war participation of Czechoslovak citizens from the region in WW II Axis forces became a subject of museum presentation. In 2016, the museum was awarded "the Museum of the Year" of the Czech Republic. This example provides evidence of the partial 'rehabilitation' of pre-1945 regional identity, which can also be witnessed in some parts of Polish Silesia.⁴⁰ Furthermore, several private military museums have appeared in the region since 1990s, but none of them systematically focus on the Ostrava Offensive. Amongst them, the museum in Chuchelná, focusing primarily on the German armed forces, gained some level of popularity. Consequently, the case of the Hlučín area and their commemorative practice represents the only significant counterbalance to the traditional narrative of 'liberation'.

Attempts at Revision

After the collapse of the Communist regime in 1989, the commemorative practice in the Ostrava region did not change distinctively. Simple wreath-laying ceremonies were still held in towns and villages and attended by representatives of the administration and military. Re-enactment appeared as a new 'pop-cultural' and overwhelmingly apolitical form of remembrance.

The narrative of 'liberation' by the Red Army remained highly respected and the fallen Soviet soldiers were still celebrated as heroes, although the 'language of remembrance' was partly 'purified' of socialist rhetoric and the idea of 'hereditary Czech-Soviet friendship' was repudiated. Any social demand to reconsider the concept of 'liberation' did not fundamentally appear, however, until recent years. The 70th anniversary of Victory Day in 2015 opened a debate within Czech society. The events in Ukraine a year before led to a radical anti-Russian attitude, widespread mainly amongst the young and middle generations. An understandable concern after the annexation of Crimea caused a tendency to search for simplified and often ahistorical parallels between the

⁴⁰ See Rafał Riedel, "Silesia – Oblivion: Territory and its Past in Contemporary Lower Silesians' Identity Constructions," *Sleský sborník* 116, no. 2 (2018): 97–112.

events of 1945 and 2014 and comparing contemporary Russia to the Soviet Union.⁴¹

The debate was renewed yet again in 2019 after repeated demands of right-winged municipal politicians and their supporters to remove the statue of Soviet Marshal Konev in Prague. The proponents stressed the fact that Konev's army reached the Czech capital hours after the capitulation of German forces, so the Soviet did not actually 'liberate' Prague. Konev's role in the suppression of the Hungarian uprising in 1956 was also often stressed. The conflict escalated in the autumn of 2019 through several cases of vandalism. One of the damaged war memorials was the mausoleum in Ostrava, built in 1946 for both Czech and Soviet fallen soldiers. A radical nationalist group justified the vandalism of the monument as an act of spontaneous commemoration of the victims of 1956. The deed was strongly criticised by almost all political groups in the country. Municipal and regional authorities, together with historians, also pointed out the difference between Konev as a significant military and political leader, and common soldiers buried in Ostrava, who had had no responsibility for political decisions, as well as at the ahistoricity of connecting people killed in 1945 to the events of 1956.

It is important to note that, while the statue of Marshal Konev in Prague was removed in 2020, no attempts were made to re-name streets named after other Soviet military commanders, such as Jeremenko, who remained well respected in the Ostrava region. Even after Russian aggression against Ukraine in February 2022, occasional attempts to remove remaining 'Soviet' or 'Communist' street names were not backed up by any political party or important local association. Compared to the general tendencies in Czech society, the Ostrava region still demonstrates a high level of continuity in commemorative practises and memory of the war. The difference becomes obvious mainly in comparison with the 'revisionist' tendencies in Prague or the lower level of interest in war remembrance in South and Central Moravia or Eastern Bohemia as well as other regions, also significantly affected by the operations of the Red Army. A strong regional-patriotic narrative of 'liberation', that is similar to the one of the Ostrava Offensive, can be found in the territories of Western Bohemia, which were liberated by the US Army. In this case, of course, the regional narrative opposes the traditional pre-1989 pro-Soviet interpretation, which dominates in the Ostrava region.

⁴¹ Ondřej Kolář, "Neslavná bilance neoslaveného výročí: 75 let od konce druhé světové války v Evropě a 'repolitizace' kolektivní paměti" [Inglorious Evaluation of a Not-Celebrated Anniversary: 75 Years After the End of Second World War in Europe and 'the Re-Politicization' of Collective Memory], *Časopis Slezského zemského muzea: série B - vědy historické* 69, no. 1 (2020): 73–75.

This attitude of the Ostrava population can be partly explained by the traditionally strong position of left-wing parties in the industrial region. Nevertheless, it would be misleading to understand the continuity of the 'liberation narrative' just as a form of pro-communist sentiment. Even regional civic associations or re-enactment groups, which are based on the ideas and heritage of interwar Czechoslovak democracy, often oppose the – allegedly 'Prague-based' – anti-Russian narrative of recent years.

To highlight the main reasons for this fact, several aspects should be pointed out. First of all, there are family stories (and also urban legends) about the events of 1945. Despite all the undisputable controversies, the defeat of Nazism was always remembered in a positive way – if not as a 'victory' or 'liberation', at least as a 'lesser evil'. Frustrating or tragic experiences with Soviet soldiers were often not told to family members and so it did not become part of the shared memory.⁴² It is important to note that cases of 'misbehaviour' of Soviets, resulting in violence committed on civilians, are very poorly documented in written sources, so it cannot be described and presented by historians in detail. Many representatives of the older and middle generations, regardless to their political preferences, never felt any need to reconsider the simple and understandable narrative, they had learnt in school or by visiting MRBO exhibitions in their youth. Simultaneously, the story of heavy fighting in the industrial region in 1945 perfectly fits into the 'regional-patriotic working-class narrative', stressing the importance of Ostrava as the 'industrial heart' of the country.⁴³

Conclusion

In general, after the initial and spontaneous stage of commemorative acts that took place immediately after the war, the late 1940s and 1950s were strongly affected by existing political and administrative problems, as well as the rhetoric of 'the building of socialism', which left little space for looking back in the past. The 'golden age' of war remembrance came in the 1960s, due to loosening of political and ideological pressure, which led to nation-wide debates about the legacy of the war, as well as to institutional support for re-

⁴² Kolář, "K vnímání".

⁴³ Ol'ga Šrajerová, *Historické a aktuálne otázky vývoja národnostných vzťahov, kultúr a identít v národnostne zmiešanej oblasti Sliezska a severnej Moravy* [Historical and Current Problems of Inter-Ethnic Relations and Identities in the Culturally-Mixed Area of Silesia and Northern Moravia] (Opava: Sliezske zemské muzeum, 2015).

search and the adoption of modern art styles. The era of ‘normalisation’ after 1968 was characterised by attempts to petrify the narrative of liberation by the Soviet army and eliminate all dissenting narratives. This situation began to change as late as the second half of the 1980s and mainly in the following decades, after the fall of the Communist regime.

The restoration of democracy did not lead, however, to a significant shift in the view of the war. The Soviet role in defeating Nazism remained highly respected, despite some problematization and well as minor displays of radical anti-Soviet and anti-Russian attitudes. The above-mentioned tendency re-appeared after 2014 as a reaction to the conflict in Ukraine, but did not influence the commemorative practice in public space in any significant way.

The post-1989 situation enabled the detabooisation of previously neglected controversies. In recent years, the ‘alternative story’ of the Hlučín region inhabitants, who had fought on the Axis side, was presented by a successful museum exhibition. Nevertheless, the traditional narrative of ‘liberation’ remains strong in the area of the former battlefield, especially in comparison with other regions of the Czech Republic affected by the military operations of 1945.

Abstract

Combat operations of 1945 in the Ostrava region ranked among the largest and most important military encounters of World War II in the Czech Lands. Immediately after the war, the first sites of memory appeared spontaneously. During the 1950s and 1960s, ‘institutionalisation of memory’ can be witnessed, based on the narrative of ‘liberation’ and ‘Slavic brotherhood’ of the Czech and Soviet population. The discussion of historians and writers about wartime controversies, which started in the era of ‘destalinisation’, had no important impact on the commemorative practise. After the invasion of the Warsaw Pact armies in 1968, authorities attempted to use the narrative of ‘liberation’ to improve the public opinion of the Soviet Union. Museums were expected to play a leading role in this process. After the fall of the Communist regime in 1989, attempts to reconsider the narrative of ‘liberation’ appeared. A strong counter-narrative developed amongst the population of the Hlučín region, whose ancestors served in German armed forces. Nevertheless, the traditional post-communist narrative of ‘liberation’ remains quite strong in the region.

Keywords: Moravian-Ostrava Offensive; Narrative; Liberation; Collective Memory; Commemoration

Mgr. Ondřej Kolář, Ph.D.

Ondřej Kolář (born 1983) completed his doctoral degree in History at Palacký University in 2012. He is currently employed as Head of the Department of Historical Research and custodian in Silesian Museum in Opava, Czech Republic. He focuses on the military and police history of the twentieth century and the contemporary history of Silesia.

Silesian Museum
Opava
e-mail: kolar@szm.cz

The Path to the Unexpected Partnership of Nixon and Kissinger in 1969¹

David Mareček

Introduction

Richard Nixon's triumph in the presidential elections in the autumn of 1968 opened a new era in the sphere of U.S. foreign policy formation. The newly-elected president took office with a clear idea of what role the United States should play in the world and what institutions should participate the most in achieving the goal. This vision manifested itself soon after Nixon's election when he started taking his initial steps towards efforts to shift powers concerning major foreign policy decisions from the U.S. Department of State to the White House.

Within the plan, the National Security Council² was to become the principal executive body of U.S. diplomacy. The main reason for such a decision was that the actual power of its members was more dependent on how the President himself interpreted them; in contrast, the U.S. Department of State could act as a more autonomous body when creating its policy. To make his visions come true, Nixon needed to improve the NCS's credit and extend its authority. The selection of the new National Security Advisor,³ who would lead the council, therefore became one of the main tasks to perform shortly after his election.⁴

Nixon's idea of new opportunities to establish U.S. foreign policy unequivocally contributed to enhancing the council's prestige. This led to the supposition that the President would try to appoint a highly regarded politician with long-term experience in the highest government offices or a person from Nixon's close colleagues whom he could fully trust to lead the office. Because of the new President's broad ambitions to create his own foreign policy, the

¹ This paper is the result of a project of specific research *US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and his NATO Policy in his First Year in Office (1973–1974)* supported by the Faculty of Arts of the University of Hradec Králové in 2021.

² Hereinafter NSC (National Security Council).

³ Hereinafter NSA (National Security Advisor).

⁴ According to Nixon, NSC should provide "a focus at the highest level of government for full and frank discussions of national security issues." "National Security Memoranda," accessed 2 July 2022, <https://www.nixonlibrary.gov/national-security-memoranda>.

selection criterion was not limited only to the candidate's expertise but also to his supposed absolute future loyalty.

Given such requirements, it came as a complete surprise to many people that the President-Elect decided to offer the position to Henry Kissinger. The Harvard professor, who used to work as an advisor and diplomat in democratic administrations under the presidency of Kennedy and Johnson, and, simultaneously, an advisor to a lifelong enemy of Nixon within the Grand Old Party,⁵ Nelson Rockefeller, met neither of the requirements.⁶ Kissinger also considered himself a representative of the "mainstream of those who had either been hostile to Nixon or disdained him", which made his appointment even more confusing.⁷

This study therefore has two main goals that derive directly from that surprising appointment. The first one is an analysis of the reasons that made Richard Nixon have his colleagues called to the New York Museum at the end of November 1968, where Kissinger could be found at that time, and offer him a significant position in the newly-developing administration. Kissinger, being somewhat shocked, accepted the offer to work for the NSC. The second aim of the paper is to analyse under what conditions Nixon's administration came to office and what attitudes both the protagonists had towards the U.S. role in the world. The study is based on two assumptions: 1. Kissinger's appointment to lead the NSC and the men's views on foreign policy at that moment were linked with their rich experience in high political and academic positions 2. Nixon and Kissinger's attitudes reflected long-term trends in their thinking and, at the same time, reacted to the geopolitical circumstances associated with the ongoing Cold War.

In relation to the stated objectives, the study is based on research of several different types of archival materials. These materials include records of U.S. government meetings released by the U.S. State Department, recordings of the interviews that show the views of the observed protagonists, or Kissinger's personal papers released by the Yale University Library. For a proper understanding of how both politicians were perceived by society at that time, the

⁵ Hereinafter also GOP (Grand Old Party).

⁶ Later in his autobiography, Kissinger remembered how Nixon's offer surprised him. He admitted there were two main obstacles to his potential appointment. His "unpromising background" – being part of Kennedy's administration and the fact that until then, he "did not know the president elect". Henry Kissinger, *Roky v Bílém domě*, trans. Václav Viták (Prague: BB/art, 2006), 18. He spoke about his attitude towards Nixon as "ambivalent...Compounded of aloofness and respect, of distrust and admiration." Henry Kissinger, *Bouřlivé roky*, trans. Václav Viták (Prague: BB/art, 2004), 103.

⁷ Kissinger, *Roky v Bílém domě*, 28.

paper is based on an archive of political newspaper articles published primarily in the period either shortly before Nixon's inauguration or in the early months of his presidency. The articles were deliberately chosen to include prominent authors who often published in the most influential newspapers or journals.⁸

In the field of secondary literature, the study is derived from the works of political scientists or other academics from the period of Nixon's presidency, as well as from the books that were written several years later and are thus mainly the work of historians. In both cases, the study is based on contributions by the most prominent authors and experts on American politics as well as issues related to the Cold War and US-Soviet relations. Among them is Niall Ferguson, author of the authorised biography of Kissinger,⁹ or some of the most prominent journalists of the 1970s, for example, the Kalb brothers, whose reputations brought them into direct contact with Nixon and Kissinger as their policies were being implemented.¹⁰ The work also draws from the memoirs of the objects of the analysis themselves, namely Nixon¹¹ and Kissinger.¹² These

⁸ Among these authors may be mentioned Joseph Kraft, New York Times columnist and speech-writer for President Kennedy, James Reston who was one of the most respected columnists in the United States and long-time editor of the New York Times, and Theodor Shabad, a recognized expert on U.S.-Soviet relations and recipient of an award from the Association of American Geographers for his contributions to the field.

⁹ See Niall Ferguson, *Kissinger: 1923–1968: the Idealist* (London: Allen Lane, an imprint of Penguin Books, 2015).

¹⁰ Marvin Kalb worked as chief diplomatic correspondent for NBC News and is the recipient of six Overseas Press Club awards. His brother Bernard served as a political commentator and television correspondent, accompanying President Nixon on his historic trip to China in 1972. Robert Dallek described their book on Kissinger, more than 30 years later, as a “well-regarded biography”. Robert Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2007), 614. Another example of a book from which the paper derives from is the book *The Diplomacy of Detente: the Kissinger Era* by Coral Bell. Bell was one of the most important figures in the field of international relations in the 1970s, when Nixon was in power. After her death, Henry Kissinger himself declared that “no other commentator had been as perceptive on United States policies” as her. See “Coral Bell: The ‘Accidental Academic’ Who Wanted to Stop Armageddon,” ABC, accessed 10 July 2022, <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-07-31/coral-bell-the-accidental-academic-wanted-stop-armageddon/100334542>.

¹¹ See Richard M Nixon, *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1978).

¹² See Kissinger, *Roky v Bílém domě*; Idem, *Bouřlivé roky* or Winston Lord, *Kissinger on Kissinger: Reflections on Diplomacy, Grand Strategy, and Leadership* (New York: All Points Books, 2019). The potential bias in favour of Kissinger's policies needs to be taken into account especially in the latter book. In this book, the foreign policy of the Nixon administration is discussed, nearly fifty years later, by two figures who co-created that policy – Henry Kissinger and his advisor Winston Lord. The approach of both authors can be reflected in their descriptions of their dealings with the Chinese when they claim that: “The outcome met the classic precondition for a successful negotiation — victory for both sides.” Lord, *Kissinger*, 40.

memoirs are, of course, the most complicated part of the sources and need to be approached critically. Despite the possible intentional distortions in these sources, it is important to include them in this study because they reflect the perception of the events from the leaders themselves.

Nixon and Kissinger before 1969

To explain the politicians' later mutual relationship and their political beliefs, the authors dealing with Nixon and Kissinger's policies often refer to their background and experience when they were children.¹³ According to this view, their childhood and youth experience and traumas played the chief role in forming their later political attitudes. Paying too much attention to their early life often led to overrating the impact of this experience. Both Nixon and Kissinger were reluctant to speak about this period of their lives in public and if they did, they tried to diminish the importance and extent of suffering some authors attributed to them. An analysis of their political interconnection, later cooperation and views on the world would not be possible, however, without at least a brief outline of the conditions and circumstances that had affected them before they entered office. When we look more closely at their life journeys, a few unifying factors, that later determined their political careers to a great extent, can be recognised.

The most prominent features they shared were being suspicious of elites all their lives and feeling insecure. Nixon's grudge had its roots in the fact that despite all his achievements, he did not feel accepted by members of the "higher society", significant liberals and intellectuals. In his memoirs, Kissinger described the relationship of the Harvard elites towards the future President

¹³ Ferguson claims, for example, that Kissinger's youth experience made him considerably strong, which he used later when achieving his political goals. Ferguson, *Kissinger*, 867. Del Pero emphasises the influence of Kissinger's Jewish origin, especially his experience in the army and, consequently, his view of the world. Mario Del Pero, *The Eccentric Realist: Henry Kissinger and the Shaping of American Foreign Policy* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2013), 45. The impact of his Jewish origin and his experience of the liberation of concentration camps are also described in a letter written by Kissinger shortly after the war finished. This letter is a reaction to the cruelty he witnessed in Germany. When being involved in the disposal of corpses, he arrives at a sad conclusion "That Is Humanity in the Twentieth Century". "The Eternal Jew," 1966, A. Kissinger papers, part II, Series I, Early Career and Harvard University, Yale University library, accessed 16 August 2022, https://findit.library.yale.edu/images_layout/view?parentoid=11786942&increment=0. Black analyses the impact of Nixon's coming of age on his character; he states that his Quaker upbringing and modest background strongly stimulated his renowned ambition. Conrad Black, *Richard M. Nixon: A Life in Full* (New York: Public Affairs, 2008), 43.

as follows, “I had taught for over ten years at Harvard, where, among the faculty, disdain for Richard Nixon was established orthodoxy”.¹⁴ Kissinger had a similar experience: while studying at Harvard, he did not have access to the elite clubs because of his origin, and the local elites continuously kept him at a distance.¹⁵ As Coral Bell stated, neither of them belonged to “the Liberal intellectual foreign-policy elite”, and that fact connected them.¹⁶

Despite the disadvantages, the 1950s meant a period of fast career advancement for both Nixon and Kissinger. For the former, the growth was associated with his political activities that led to the position of Vice-president and, subsequently, to his Republican presidential nomination in 1960. Kissinger’s rise was more linked to the academic sphere in that period; he first worked as a professor in the Government Department at Harvard University, and later, after publishing his bestseller entitled “Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy”, he became a highly accomplished expert in national security issues.¹⁷ While President Eisenhower recommended his staff members read Kissinger’s book, its author – a Harvard professor at that time – began to speak out against the American foreign-policy strategy in the 1950s and thus, for the first time, indirectly set himself against Nixon as well.¹⁸ As Vice-president, Nixon tried to actively participate in the creation process of Eisenhower’s diplomatic strategies.¹⁹

¹⁴ Kissinger, *Roky v Bílém domě*, 13.

¹⁵ Jeremi Suri, *Henry Kissinger and the American Century* (Cambridge: Belknap Press: An Imprint of Harvard University Press, 2009), 11.

¹⁶ Coral Bell, *The Diplomacy of Detente: the Kissinger Era* (London: Martin Robertson, 1977), 44.

¹⁷ Henry Kissinger, *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957). Although this book from 1957 was probably Kissinger’s most outstanding contribution to the U.S. foreign policy role of the “nuclear times”, the future Secretary of State continued to write essays and thus contributed to the national debate on the U.S. strategy over the following years. His paper from 1966, for instance, urgently warned against the serious threat associated with the development of the Soviet nuclear arsenal and a lack of U.S. defence policy, see “American Strategic Doctrine and Diplomacy, The Theory and Practice of War,” 1966, Henry A. Kissinger papers, part II, Series I, Early Career and Harvard University, accessed 10 July 2022, https://findit.library.yale.edu/images_layout/view?parentoid=11786912&increment=0.

¹⁸ Steven Wagner, *Pursuing the “Middle Way,”* [lecture] History 410: Eisenhower and the 1950s. Joplin: MSSU, September 7, 2021. Kissinger blamed the then administration that the U.S. foreign policy in their hands “is based on the doctrine of massive retaliation... we base our policy on the threat that will involve the destruction of all mankind ...” Mike Wallace, “Interview with Henry Kissinger,” Interview by Henry Kissinger, Harry Ransom Center, 13 July 1958, video, 29:16. <https://hrc.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/p15878coll90/id/67/>.

¹⁹ The records of the NSC negotiations about the options of conducting U.S. foreign policy during the “Eisenhower era” confirm the fact; Nixon often acted in a very distinctive way. On Nixon’s role in the negotiations on foreign policy within Eisenhower’s administration, see, for example,

After a series of outstanding career achievements in the 1950s, however, they both experienced a fierce encounter with reality at the beginning of the new decade. The failure in the presidential election against Kennedy in 1960 prevented Nixon from having the position to make major political decisions for the next eight years. For Kissinger, Kennedy's arrival at the White House meant the first opportunity to exercise executive power in foreign policy; he was invited to join the advisory board, but was disappointed with his position within the administration, and gradually resigned to pursue his own political ambitions.²⁰

Even if he returned to Harvard, Kissinger soon appeared to be again at the centre of crucial diplomatic negotiations, unlike Nixon. In 1967, Kissinger was asked to join Johnson's advisory team, whose mission was to find new options in the ongoing war in Vietnam.²¹ This was a pivotal moment for Kissinger's future: owing to the position, he became one of the most recognised experts in issues of U.S. activities in Vietnam; later, which helped him obtain a post in Nixon's team after the 1969 elections.²²

In the meantime, while there were secret negotiations between Kissinger and the Vietnamese, the first Kissinger and Nixon encounter occurred; they shortly met in December 1967 at Claire Boothe Luce's party.²³ Their meeting was not long, however, and did not suggest much about their future cooperation. A much more significant event for their future professional connection

Memorandum of Discussion at the 303d Meeting of the National Security Council, Washington, 8 November 1956, FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1955–1957, EASTERN EUROPE, VOLUME XXV, Office of the Historian, accessed 15 February 2022, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1955-57v25/d175> or Memorandum of a Conference with the President, White House, Washington, 5 November 1956, FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1955–1957, EASTERN EUROPE, VOLUME XXV, Office of the Historian, accessed 14 February 2022, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1955-57v25/d168>.

²⁰ Marvin Kalb and Bernard Kalb, *Kissinger* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1974), 64.

²¹ Kissinger participated in long-term secret negotiations in Paris with the North Vietnamese under the auspices of Johnson's government that were supposed to find a solution to end the conflict between the two parties. On Kissinger's negotiations in Paris, see Editorial Note, 1967, 263, FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1964–1968, VOLUME V, VIETNAM, Office of the Historian, accessed 11 February 2022, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1964-68v05/d263>.

²² Later, he called the Vietnam War “the most significant political experience of an entire American generation.” See Henry Kissinger, “Lesson of Vietnam,” accessed 3 July 2022, <https://www.henrykissinger.com/articles/lesson-of-vietnam/>.

²³ See Bruce Mazlish, *Kissinger: The European Mind in American Policy* (New York: Basic Books, 1976), 213 or *Salt Lake Tribune*, 3 December 1968, 3, Salt Lake City, Utah, US, <https://newspaperarchive.com/salt-lake-tribune-dec-03-1968-p-3>. Clare Booth Luce was a significant Conservative politician, journalist and Nixon's long-time supporter.

had occurred a few months before the party, when Nixon published one of his most influential articles of his career with the title *Asia After Vietnam* in the October issue of *Foreign Affairs* magazine.²⁴

The article's contents strongly suggested why its author, later in the role of the President, chose to appoint Kissinger as the NSA. His article indicated that it was vital for U.S. foreign policy that American diplomacy concentrate on more complex issues than just the ongoing war with Vietnam. Indirectly, it urged the government to start showing an interest in the options of developing mutual relationships with China. Such a view was much the same as Kissinger's understanding of the world; it was based on his conviction that U.S. diplomacy should focus more on the relations with the principal world powers previously neglected by Johnson's administration – chiefly because of the Vietnam War. In addition, both Nixon and Kissinger had an interest in creating foreign policy based on the idea of “the grand strategy”, a broad global vision for the future of U.S. diplomacy that would not invest all its energy in the specific problems of the countries of minor importance.²⁵

Searching for a National Security Advisor

Despite similar opinions on the fundamentals of the U.S. geopolitical strategy, the selection to appoint Kissinger as the NSA might have encountered many obstacles. Each of them could have prevented him from being appointed and could have diverted the U.S. foreign policy of the 1970s in a different direction. Concerning Kissinger's earlier critical attitude to the new President and his connections with Nixon's major political opponents, the most obvious issue to question was the above-mentioned trustworthiness.²⁶

Considering this criterion, it was a paradox that Kissinger's reputation of being a “Rockefeller's man”²⁷ posed a more serious threat to his appointment

²⁴ See Richard Nixon, “Asia after Vietnam,” *Foreign Affairs* 46, No. 1 (October 1967): 111–125.

²⁵ Winston Lord, Kissinger's long-time advisor, states the shared attitude that the long-term strategy created a strong connection between Nixon and Kissinger. Lord, *Kissinger*, 130.

²⁶ Kissinger was linked with both of the largest American parties over a long period. In the 1960 presidential elections, when he was to choose between two candidates, Nixon and Kennedy, he voted for the Democratic one, Heather Lehr Wagner, *Henry Kissinger: Ending the Vietnam War* (New York: Chelsea House, 2007), 44.

²⁷ The close bond between the two politicians can be proved by the fact that Rockefeller sent 50 thousand dollars to Kissinger's account in 1974 with a commentary that the gift should express his “gratitude for his long-time service” Robert McFadden, “D. ROCKEFELLER GAVE KISSINGER \$50,000, HELPED 2 OTHERS,” *New York Times*, 6 October 1974, <https://www.>

than his political activities in advisory positions for governments of Democratic presidents. As a matter of fact, Kissinger worked for Rockefeller, a perennial candidate for the Republican presidential nomination and a favourite of the GOP Liberal wing, as a key advisor for many years. He held this position even at the time when Rockefeller stood up against Nixon in the battle for the 1968 nomination.

The tension between Rockefeller and the Conservative wing of the Republican Party was a long-time phenomenon that necessarily affected one of the most distinctive members of his advisory board. The conservatives' hatred of Kissinger became a widely known fact. As an example of the antipathy, we could quote a threatening message that Kissinger received from Goldwater's²⁸ Conservative supporters during the Republican convention in 1964 saying, "Kissinger – don't think we'll forget your name".²⁹ Due to this tension, no one could have predicted that he would become a leading figure of the administration, supported by the Conservative Republican wing.

Thus, for Nixon, Kissinger's appointment as the NSA necessarily represented an obstacle on the path towards better relationships with the Conservative wing of the party, whose influence was constantly on the rise and whose support was desperately needed for the President. Another item on the list of perils of Kissinger's appointment that needs to be mentioned was his background, which cannot have been "a hearty recommendation for membership in the inner circle of Richard Nixon, where anti-Semitic commentaries could be heard on a regular basis."³⁰ Given the number of these reasons, his appointment to such a high advisory position did not seem like a reasonable move.

[nytimes.com/1974/10/06/archives/rockefeller-gave-kissinger-50000-helped-2-others-he-denies-any.html](https://www.nytimes.com/1974/10/06/archives/rockefeller-gave-kissinger-50000-helped-2-others-he-denies-any.html).

²⁸ Barry Goldwater was a Republican presidential candidate in the 1964 election. Later in an interview, Kissinger described that Goldwater's movement inside the GOP manifested itself by "a kind of intolerance toward opposition. It then became characteristic of both the extreme Right and the extreme Left, and they changed sides occasionally." Jacob Heilbrunn, "The Interview: Henry Kissinger," interview by Henry Kissinger, *National Interest*, 14 May 1969, <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-interview-henry-kissinger-13615>.

²⁹ Ferguson, *Kissinger*, 605.

³⁰ Jussi M. Hanhimäki, *The Flawed Architect: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 2.

Transformation of the National Security Council

All these arguments against Kissinger's appointment were outweighed by both Nixon's clear vision of the NSC transformation and a perfect choice in his mind as to who should carry out the transformation. He was convinced of the need for a new strategy in conducting foreign policy because of his long-time experience during Eisenhower's administration years; he also made careful observations of how American diplomacy was executed throughout the presidency years of Kennedy and Johnson.

Nixon was an eyewitness to the limits the NSA had to experience at the time of Eisenhower's administration – its function was diminished to merely a manager's position; moreover, he could follow the further depreciation of the role from a distance during Johnson's presidency.³¹ Affected by his unpleasant experience from the times when he worked for advisory boards of Democratic administrations, Kissinger unequivocally agreed with Nixon, as is apparent from his claim that "President Johnson's attempt at reform (of the NSC)... failed to do the job, since the main decision-making body ... had no formal agenda ..."³²

Kissinger later reflected on his experience and views while working within a group called "Harvard Study Group on Presidential Transition", which was supposed to create a plan for how Nixon should act in his office if elected.³³ Placing an emphasis on the importance of the NSC in their reports and, therefore, downplaying the role of the U.S. Department of State, was exactly what Nixon required. In his considerations, which were subsequently transformed into the articulation of the plans, Kissinger favoured the idea of "a strong NSC serving an assertive president".³⁴ Simultaneously, such a constellation would necessarily mean reducing the decision-making powers of the U.S. Department of State.

³¹ Asaf, Siniver, *Nixon, Kissinger, and U.S. Foreign Policy Making: the Machinery of Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 51. Johnson tended to rely more on personal connections with a few of his advisors than on general decisions made by the council.

³² *Ibid*, 57.

³³ Ferguson, *Kissinger*, 845. For more details on Kissinger's publishing activities in 1968, see Joseph Kraft, "Major Gain on Foreign Policy," *Eureka Times Standard*, 15 December 1968, 4, Eureka, California, US, <https://newspaperarchive.com/eureka-times-standard-dec-15-1968-p-4/> or Theodore Shabad, "Soviet Hopes U.S. to Cut Foreign Role," *Mason City Globe Gazette*, 24 January 1969, 9, Mason City, Iowa, US, <https://newspaperarchive.com/mason-city-globe-gazette-jan-24-1969-p-9/>.

³⁴ Elizabeth Borgwardt, Christopher McKnight Nichols and Andrew Preston, *Rethinking American Grand Strategy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2021), 281.

Nixon was well aware of the significance of Kissinger's role within the group in terms of the published proposals; this made him believe that he would be the right person capable of completing the institutional transformation of the U.S. foreign policy implementation in favour of the NSC. It is true that their agreement about the issues of the internal organisation of the U.S. institutions involved in foreign policy was critical. The fact that both politicians had the same views, however, on the particular goals to achieve by the institutions on the international scene was even more important for their mutual professional collaboration.

With regard to the geopolitical situation, Nixon and Kissinger agreed especially on the need for tactics change in the Vietnam War and, at the same time, in the transformation of the American attitudes towards the two major communist world powers – the Soviet Union and China. Essentially, they both believed in the need to negotiate with the North Vietnamese representatives, gradual withdrawal of the U.S. Army from the area of former Indochina, which would not result in degradation of the U.S. reputation and providing material and military support to the South Vietnamese army.³⁵

Kissinger, influenced by many travels to Vietnam during Johnson's presidency, came to these conclusions in his letters and articles written as early as before the 1968 election.³⁶ The impression they made was yet additional proof of the new President's right choice; Kissinger's vision later became one of the foundations of Nixon's policy of 'Vietnamization'. All the points listed above led Nixon to ask Kissinger to join his administration.

Unlike the complex motivations behind Nixon's choice, it is much easier to answer why Kissinger decided to accept Nixon's offer and work as the National Security Advisor – his motivation was rooted in his ambition and desire for

³⁵ On the plan and process of Vietnamization, see Guy J. Pauker, "An Essay on Vietnamization: A Report Prepared for Advanced Research Projects Agency," 1971, 107, accessed 11 July 2022, <https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/reports/2008/R604.pdf>. The emphasis on the need for 'Vietnamization' of the conflict was evident in the following memoranda that Kissinger, in the role of the NSA, sent to the President. See Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon, Washington, 10 September 1969, 117, FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1969–1976, VOLUME VI, VIETNAM, JANUARY 1969–JULY 1970, Office of the Historian, accessed 7 July 2022, <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v06/d117>.

³⁶ For example, in June 1966, Kissinger wrote in *Look* magazine that from the American point of view, "The war in Vietnam is dominated by two factors: withdrawal would be disastrous, and negotiations are inevitable. American policy must take both of these realities into account." see "Vietnam Statement for *Look*," Image 15, 8 June 1966, Henry A. Kissinger papers, part II, Series I, Early Career and Harvard University, accessed 10 July 2022, https://findit.library.yale.edu/images_layout/view?parentoid=11787055&increment=2.

power.³⁷ The president's original vision of foreign policy execution, in which the NSC was supposed to play a significant role, enabled the new advisor to have almost unlimited access to the Oval Office and a direct influence on the U.S. foreign policy execution.

Kissinger's Appointment and the Subsequent Direction of U.S. Foreign Policy

Kissinger accepted Nixon's offer, and the new President could stand in front of the press in January 1969 and announce the new NSA to the public. Kissinger took over the office at a time when the lack of U.S. foreign policy success in the 1960s created high hopes for changes associated with the new pair in the White House. The expectations were described, for example, in an article published by *Time* magazine after Kissinger's appointment; the front page stated that with Kissinger at the helm, there would be "new approaches to friend and foe".³⁸

These hopes were encouraged by two factors: the first was a mutual agreement between the two politicians on what was later called "the grand strategy". The strategy was based on the new U.S. opportunities to open a series of negotiations with China and on the improvement of bilateral relations with the Soviet Union. These almost 'revolutionary' plans were based on the shared feeling of scepticism regarding the development of America's role in the world

³⁷ Kissinger's drive "to stand out as the best secretary of state in the country's history" while in office, according to Dallek, even "matched Nixon's reach for historical greatness" and it was thus the personality trait that united the two politicians. Dallek, *Nixon*, 614.

³⁸ "Presidential Adviser Kissinger: New Approaches to Friend and Foe," *Time*, 14 February 1969. After the announcement of Kissinger's appointment, high expectations could be observed even across the American regional newspapers. A regional California newspaper *The Press Telegram*, for instance, published a piece by James Reston, who wrote about the newly appointed NSA, that: "He is an intelligent, articulate, and remarkably industrious scholar, who also has had the experience of being a consultant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson on many of the critical problems of the last decade — from Berlin to arms control." James Reston, "New Man in the Basement," *Press Telegram*, 4 December 1968, 36, Long Beach, California, <https://newspaperarchive.com/press-telegram-dec-04-1968-p-36/>. Other authors referred to Kissinger, for example, as 'Brisk, Demanding'. "Professor Kissinger 'Brisk, Demanding,'" *Columbia Missourian Newspaper*, 4 December 1968, 20, Columbia, Missouri, US, <https://newspaperarchive.com/columbia-missourian-newspaper-dec-04-1968-p-20/>. His reputation as a supporter of a hard line in foreign policy was often mentioned, however, at the same time, which caused some concerns among American journalists. See Glen, Elsassner, "Nixon Names Kissinger to Security Post," *Chicago Tribune*, 3 December 1968, 12, Chicago, Illinois, US, <https://newspaperarchive.com/chicago-tribune-dec-03-1968-p-12/> or "Kissinger Named To Security Post," *Abilene Reporter News*, 3 December 1968, 44, Abilene, Texas, US, <https://newspaperarchive.com/abilene-reporter-news-dec-03-1968-p-44/>.

and the current inability to solve the issues associated with the world-power rivalry during the Cold War.

While working as the NSA, Kissinger wrote in his diary that the core principle to follow when forming the U.S. foreign policy is that “Everything depends, therefore, on some conception of the future”. Nevertheless, when Nixon came to office, such a vision did not seem very promising.³⁹ To change the direction, there was a need for the new President, despite his conservative nature, to enter “uncharted waters” and establish a new foreign policy strategy. His unorthodox selection of the person to fill the post of the NSA implied that he was ready to carry out such a new policy.

The other factor to justify why the hopes were not far-fetched was that both politicians were fully prepared to make the critical diplomatic steps on the world scene. In fact, Nixon took office as probably the best-informed incoming President of all times regarding foreign relations, while Kissinger started his work when he had the position of one of the top experts specializing in the history of diplomacy and the field of Security and Strategy Studies.⁴⁰

Their in-depth expertise in the foreign-policy sphere emerged from very different backgrounds: Nixon’s erudition was gained through his vice-presidency experience in the 1950s when he was thoroughly engaged in negotiations with world leaders. Kissinger’s expertise had its roots in more of a theoretical background associated with his long-term activities as a Harvard professor who, until then, had not experienced directly holding the highest government posts.

Their different sources of knowledge and their personal insecurities became evident in the way they performed their functions. Because of the difference in their knowledge, they had to share their experience and collaborate closely; they were able to doubt themselves and question the purposes of those around them, which led to an effort to centralize the political power to the White House as much as possible. This resulted in a deepening distrust of bureaucratic apparatus, especially the U.S. Department of State, and an attempt to execute principal diplomatic tasks autonomously.

Nixon officially confirmed his trust in the abilities of the new NSA in May 1969; in a face-to-face meeting, he told the then Soviet ambassador to the USA, Anatoly Dobrynin, that issues of great importance should be dealt with

³⁹ Kissinger and Lord, *Kissinger on Kissinger*, 29.

⁴⁰ Before the 1960 election, for example, Eisenhower stated about Nixon that “There is no man in the history of America who has had such a careful preparation as has Vice President Nixon for carrying out the duties of the presidency, if that duty should ever fall upon him.” Nixon, *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, 177.

through Kissinger. He added how much he appreciated the effective operation of the “secret channel” between the Soviet embassy and the NSC.⁴¹ The Soviet Union responded favourably to the fact, and Dobrynin stated that from “the observations of Nixon and his main foreign policy advisors, it can be confidently declared that the dominant opinion influencing the President comes from Kissinger.”⁴² This decision, in fact, excluded the Department of State headed by Minister Rogers from the key negotiations within the Cold War. The President left the initiative mostly to the NSC, which had later far-reaching consequences for American-Soviet relations throughout Nixon’s presidency.

Conclusion

Nixon’s election as President at the end of 1968 and Kissinger’s subsequent appointment as the National Security Advisor began a period of highly significant political collaboration that, for the following five years, determined the changes in global international relations to a great extent. The then President paired up with his NSA; the partnership connected extensive practical and theoretical experience from the international environment, which they applied to real politics. The first half of the 1970s was consequently characterized by their efforts to reduce the tension between the rival world powers; that was most apparent in 1972 when Nixon participated in the Beijing summit with Chinese leader Mao in February and the Moscow summit with Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev in May.⁴³

The negotiations in those summits later led to unprecedented agreements between Americans and the two major Communist powers. The agreements based on the negotiations in Beijing initiated a process that later proved to be essential in economic collaboration between China and the West. Furthermore, the agreements made in Moscow turned out to be key elements of

⁴¹ Memorandum of Conversation (USSR), 14 May 1969, 4, Meeting Between Nixon and Dobrynin, accessed 16 August 2022, <https://nsarchive2.gwu.edu/NSAEBB/NSAEBB233/5-14-69.pdf>.

⁴² Raymond Garthoff, *Detente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1994), 80.

⁴³ Although Nixon’s role was crucial to the development of US-Soviet and US-Chinese relations, Kissinger also played a very important role in the development of US foreign policy strategy during this period. It is because of Henry Kissinger’s importance to the development of American policy that Robert Dallek, in his book, named this period “The Nixon-Kissinger Presidency”. Dallek, *Nixon*, 534.

world security that reduced the fatal threat of using nuclear weapons.⁴⁴ Shortly afterwards, the Americans managed to reach agreements to end American military involvement in Vietnam.⁴⁵

The new administration reached all the agreements despite the fact – in Kissinger’s words – that it entered office at a time when “the intellectual capital of U.S. post-war policy had been used up”.⁴⁶ In reality, the events of the 1960s associated with the Vietnam War and internal unrest pointed to the fact that U.S. power was on the decline, and there were no new ideas that would rectify its position on the world scene. After his election victory, Nixon was well-aware of the situation. He wanted to find a person suitable to head the NSC and capable of coming up with a new concept of foreign policy execution. Kissinger’s ideas of “the grand strategy” that had occurred in his early texts from the 1960s must have therefore impressed him.⁴⁷

Kissinger’s approach to international policy issues from a philosophical perspective made the newly-elected President appoint him to such a prominent position in spite of many contradictions: Kissinger had an unusual background and no prior experience in high government positions; in addition, he often criticized Nixon’s abilities and, at the same time, was linked with Nixon’s arch-enemy from the Republican party during his career.

Despite all these negatives, Nixon perceived as the key point that they both believed in the same institutional vision of foreign policy execution and

⁴⁴ The Shanghai Communique was signed by representatives of the USA and China, see Joint Communique between the United States and China, 27 February 1972, Box 73, President’s Personal Files (PPF), Staff Member Office Files (SMOF), Nixon Presidential Library and Museum, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, accessed 15 August 2022, <https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/121325>. On the SALT agreement between the USA and the USSR, see Strategic Arms Limitations Talks/Treaty (SALT) I and II, Milestones 1969–1976, Office of the Historian, accessed 12 August 2022, <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1969-1976/salt>.

⁴⁵ See “Paris Peace Accords,” 1973, accessed 16 August 2022, <https://www.docsteach.org/documents/document/paris-peace-accords>.

⁴⁶ Suri, *Henry*, 199.

⁴⁷ Kissinger wrote about the issue of the “grand strategy”, for example, in his celebrated article for *Foreign Affairs* magazine published in 1963, where he urged the need to create a new Euro-Atlantic Partnership that would transcend in importance “the crises which form the headlines of the day”, and, that future historians will perceive as the distinctive feature of the decade. “Strains on the Alliance. Foreign Affairs,” Image 3, January 1963, Henry A. Kissinger papers, part II, Series I, Early Career and Harvard University, accessed 10 July 2022, In: https://findit.library.yale.edu/images_layout/view?parentoid=11787055&increment=2. His papers of that time suggest that the future Secretary of State was not going to come to terms with the fact that the USA should react only to the impulses from the outer world; on the contrary, he believed that it was necessary to create a comprehensive foreign policy strategy that would be strongly pro-active.

simultaneously, they identified the same goals that the restructured diplomatic apparatus should strive to reach.⁴⁸ Their subsequent cooperation, ended by Nixon's resignation in 1974, had an influence not only on the American internal organizational setting of the decision-making process in foreign policy, but also on the actual direction of U.S. foreign policy in the following decades.

Abstract

The presented study examines the origins of cooperation between the US President Richard Nixon and his National Security Advisor and later Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The aim of the paper is to analyse under what conditions Nixon's administration came to office in 1969, the causes that led the new President to approach Kissinger with the offer of a key foreign policy position and what attitudes both the protagonists had towards the U.S. role in the world. Despite being an unlikely partnership, their subsequent coopera-

⁴⁸ The debate among theorists in the field of international relations theory concerning the classification of Nixon and Kissinger as idealists or realists has long been a complex one. This is evidenced by insight into the literature on these two politicians. Del Pero, for example, entitled his book on Kissinger *The Eccentric Realist: Henry Kissinger and the Shaping of American Foreign Policy*, Thomas Schwartz also claims in his book that Kissinger "played a central role in the maneuvering and articulation of the realist revolution in American foreign policy" and, according to Suri, it was the "American Century" associated with the rise of Henry Kissinger that reflected a move away from democratic idealism and towards the realism of strong, authoritarian leaders. Thomas Alan Schwartz, *Henry Kissinger and American Power: A Political Biography* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2020), 162; Suri, *Henry*, 9. Niall Ferguson, on the other hand, entitled his authorised biography of Kissinger as *Kissinger: 1923–1968: the Idealist*, thus partially opposing the mainstream view, see Ferguson, *Kissinger*. Like Kissinger, however, Nixon was also a political figure whose realist or idealist leanings are not entirely agreed upon by historians. Hanhimäki, for example, noted that Nixon, although often considered a realist, used idealistic phrases in his speeches that resembled those of Woodrow Wilson. This combination of idealism and realism was already evident, for instance, in his inaugural address, where, while he idealistically promised that all the countries could join the United States in an effort "to reduce the burden of arms, to strengthen the structure of peace, to lift up the poor and the hungry", he also uttered the realist addendum that "All those who would be tempted by weakness, let us leave no doubt that we will be as strong as we need to be". Jussi M. Hanhimäki, *The Rise and Fall of Détente: American Foreign Policy and the Transformation of the Cold War* (Dulles: Potomac Books, 2012), 43. This mix of idealism and realism subsequently became typical of the Nixon administration on foreign policy. According to some, realism tended to dominate, while idealism dominated according to others. New York Times journalist Tom Wicker, for instance, argued that Nixon represented the "realistic side of the nation". Melvin Small, *A Companion to Richard M. Nixon* (New Jersey: Wiley Blackwell, 2011), 16. Nixon, on the other hand, portrayed himself as an idealist intent on doing what was best for his country. Ibid.

tion, which operated until Nixon's resignation in August 1974, significantly changed the course of the Cold War. During Nixon's administration, the crucial summits between Americans and representatives of the then Communist powers took place in Beijing and Moscow in 1972, becoming the most prominent diplomatic legacy of their efforts to reduce international tensions. Up to that time, in contrast, similar attempts to negotiate with China and the USSR were unprecedented due to the then tense geopolitical situation associated with the ongoing Cold War. The study concludes that the fundamental reason for this unexpected connection between two different politicians was a shared vision of transforming the decision-making process within the American administration and the idea of a grand strategy in international politics that would get the United States out of the crises of the 1960s.

Keywords: Richard Nixon; Henry Kissinger; Cold War; Republican Party; U. S. Foreign Policy; Détente; National Security Council

Mgr. et Mgr. David Mareček

David Mareček is a PhD student at the Institute of History, Faculty of Arts, University of Hradec Králové. His research focuses on American foreign policy during the Republican administrations of Presidents Dwight Eisenhower and Richard Nixon. As part of his studies, he has participated in research and study projects in the United States, Belgium or Germany. He is currently researching the question of how the change in the approach of American diplomacy towards the Communist powers, the Soviet Union and China, was conceptualized in the media and public sphere in the United States in the first half of the 1970s. This process was linked to the so-called détente policy pursued by National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger, which resulted in two major summits attended by the US President in Beijing and Moscow in 1972.

Institute of History
Philosophical Faculty
University of Hradec Králové
e-mail: david.marecek@uhk.cz

The Moravian Pact of 1905: A Model Solution to Ethnic Conflict, or a Way to Deepen Ethnic Conflict in Multi-Ethnic Towns? A Case Study of Olomouc¹

Andrea Pokludová

In our² research, we have been dealing with Czech–German interactions and confrontations in modernizing Moravia for a long time. Whether we examined the formation of the intelligentsia,³ the role of municipal government,⁴ national statistics in the Bohemian Lands between 1880 and 1930,⁵ or the transformation of the countryside,⁶ a national partitioning of society was always evident in the sources. At the turn of the twentieth century, the vocational organisations of the intelligentsia split into Czech and German parts; in 1905, the Moravian Medical Chamber was divided into Czech and German sections.⁷ In the municipal government, clashes between political parties were overshadowed by a struggle between Czechs and Germans. From 1880, the decennial census polled “the language of daily use,” which national activists interpreted as synonymous with nationality, and thus as an indicator of each nation’s size.

¹ This study has been financially supported by the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR) grant reg. no GA20-00420S – Moravský pakt jako laboratoř etnizace politiky a práva: národnostní rozdělení moravských měst v letech 1905–1914 [The Moravian Compromise as a Laboratory for the Nationalization of Politics and Law: The National Partitioning of Moravia’s Towns, 1905–1914].

² Andrea Pokludová together with Pavel Kladiwa. Faculty of Arts. University of Ostrava.

³ Andrea Pokludová, *Formování inteligence na Moravě a ve Slezsku 1857–1910* (Opava: Slezské zemské muzeum, 2008).

⁴ Pavel Kladiwa, Andrea Pokludová and Renata Kafková, *Lesk a bída obecních samospráv Moravy a Slezska 1850–1914. II. díl, 1. svazek, Muži z radnice* (Ostrava: Filozofická fakulta Ostravské univerzity, 2008).

⁵ Pavel Kladiwa et al., *Národnostní statistika v českých zemích 1880–1930: mechanismy, problémy a důsledky národnostní klasifikace. I and II volume* (Ostrava: Ostravská univerzita, 2016).

⁶ Pavel Kladiwa et al., *Čas změny: Moravský a slezský venkov od zrušení poddanství po Velkou válku* (Prague: Masarykův ústav a Archiv AV ČR, 2021).

⁷ *Moravská Orlice*, 8 September 1905, 2.

Our interest in the Moravian Pact⁸ stemmed primarily from the above-mentioned surveyed topics, which we had always dealt with using comparative approaches of historical sciences. The Moravian Pact is not a so-called research gap in historical sciences, but its implementation in the social practice of Moravian cities has not yet been investigated. We carried out the research on the six most populous municipalities in Moravia with a linguistic minority of at least 10% (based on census data concerning the language of daily use), i.e. Brno/Brünn (the land capital – South Moravia), Olomouc/Olmütz (administrative centre – Central Moravia), Znojmo/ Znaim (administrative centre of the agrarian region – South Moravia), Jihlava/Iglau (administrative centre of the German language enclave on the Bohemian-Moravian land border), Moravská Ostrava/Mährisch Ostrau and Vítkovice/Witkowitz (industrial towns – North Moravia). In historical memory, these towns had become the symbol of the Czech-German conflict coexistence in numerous spheres of everyday life. The aim of the study is to outline the implementation of the legislative package of reforms known as the Moravian Pact on everyday life in Olomouc. The choice of Olomouc arises from the specific position of the town within the surveyed set of towns [for example, as an alternative centre of Czech politics in Moravia] and previous research, which also allows us to interpret the issue in its context.

⁸ The Moravian Pact consisted of four statutes adopted by the Diet based on a compromise between Czech, German and landowners deputies: 1. a reorganisation of the Provincial Diet and the Provincial Committee, 2. a new, nationally partitioned electoral system for the Provincial Diet, 3. new rules on public use of both languages of the land (*lex Parma*), and 4. the partitioning of educational authorities according to a national key and rules on the establishment of schools and school attendance (*lex Perek*). [*Lex Perek* included the division of the school boards of all levels (local, district, provincial) into Czech and German (under the last paragraph of Section 8, the representatives of the municipality in both local school boards had to be of the corresponding nationality) and, in particular, the introduction of the principle that a child generally attended a school in whose language of instruction it was proficient]. It was signed by the sovereign on 27 November 1905, but not promulgated until 1906. For a summary of the issue, see Lukáš Fasora, Jiří Hanuš, and Jiří Malíř, eds., *Moravské vyrovnání z roku 1905 – možnosti a limity národnostního smíru ve střední Evropě: sborník příspěvků ze stejnojmenné mezinárodní konference konané ve dnech 10.–11. listopadu 2005 v Brně* (Brno: Maticе moravská pro Výzkumné středisko pro dějiny střední Evropy: prameny, země, kultura, 2006); Pavel Marek, “K moravským smířovačkám z let 1898–1905,” *Časopis Maticе moravské* 111, no. 1 (1992): 75–92; Jiří Malíř, “Der Mährische Ausgleich – ein Vorbild für die Lösung der Nationalitätenfragen?,” in *Kontakte und Konflikte. Böhmen, Mähren und Österreich. Aspekte eines Jahrtausends gemeinsamer Geschichte*, ed. Thomas Winkelbauer (Waidhofen an der Thaya: Horn: Waldviertler Heimatbund, 1993), 337–345; Jiří Němec, “Der Mährische Ausgleich von 1905. Ein Muster zur Lösung der multiethnischen Ordnung der Gesellschaft?,” in *Ausgleich als Basis für Verständigung und Versöhnung: zum Beitrag der Historiker für eine integrative Erinnerungskultur*, ed. Rainer Bendel (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2020), 19–32.

Did the Moravian Pact have an impact on a nationally divided Olomouc? If so, in which spheres of activity? To what extent was the Moravian Pact implementable in education, which had been shaped by fights over schools and children since the 1870s? Did the municipality implement *lex Parma*? Did the Diet electoral reform have an impact on local politics? Did the Moravian Pact promote national reconciliation in the town, or did its legal anchoring of who was nationally who deepen the economic and cultural partitioning of the population?

In the mid-nineteenth century, Olomouc was a fortress town and the administrative centre of the Haná, an agrarian region. With the reorganisation of the state administration, Olomouc was included among the statutory towns. The status of the statutory town played a specific role in the establishment of the German district school board and the Czech school board within the implementation of *lex Perek*. A provisional status was granted to the town on 6 September 1850; the new status was issued on 24 January 1866.⁹ Apart from a District Administrative Office, or branch office of Imperial Austria's "political administration," the town housed a District Court and Public Prosecutor's Office. As a major railway hub, Olomouc also gained a Directorate of State Railways in the mid-1890s. Additional authorities and institutions included the Chamber of Commerce and Trade, the Trade Inspectorate and an office of the Forest Service.

The seat of the archbishopric and of the archbishop's consistory, Olomouc was also for a long period of time the only town in Moravia with a university. Its four faculties trained lawyers, medical doctors, doctors of philosophy and priests.¹⁰ Between 1848 and 1860, the university was pared of faculties until only the archbishop's seminary remained. Primary and secondary education also developed in the first half of the nineteenth century.¹¹ A modern network of secondary education developed on these foundations in Olomouc during the second half of the nineteenth century. Despite the loss of the university, Olomouc became a significant educational and cultural hub, as well as a centre for newspapers, a museum, and associations—both Czech and German.

In the late 1860s, with fifteen thousand inhabitants, Olomouc was the tenth most populous town in the Bohemian Lands. By 1910, the civilian population had increased to 19,268. Specific pull and push factors shaped migration. The

⁹ Selected sections of the statute were amended in 1868, 1883 and 1890.

¹⁰ Řehoř Tomáš Volný and Albin Heinrich, *Die Markgrafschaft Mähren, topographisch, statistisch und historisch geschildert. V. Band, Olmützer Kreis* (Brünn: Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1839), 65.

¹¹ *Provinzial-Handbuch für Mähren und Schlesien für das Jahr 1845* (Brünn: Franz Gastl, 1845), 196.

town was seen as a good home for the families of retired military officers and civil servants. Dozens of officials and technical experts moved to Olomouc after the Directorate of State Railways was established there. The demolition of the fortress and the development of housing development spurred construction, transport and the tertiary sector. The town retained its administrative functions and role as a centre of regional trade.¹²

Olomouc was, like most towns in Moravia, a locality with an ethnically¹³ heterogeneous population. The ethnic composition of the population in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth century can be outlined based on the records of the language of daily use, and even this was influenced in the town by the actions of the Czech and German national activists. Specifically, in 1890, 10,655 inhabitants claimed the German language of daily use, 4,915 the Czech one, 59 the Polish one, and 11 a different one. By 1900, the number of inhabitants claiming the German language of daily use had increased to 12,339 and the Czech one to 5,295, while the number of those claiming the Polish language of daily use had dropped to 39 and a different language to 5. In 1910, the number of people claiming the German language of daily use decreased to 12,156, and those claiming the Czech language of daily use increased to 6,746. The number of Polish-speaking inhabitants increased to 44 and the number of those speaking a different language to 10. The census did not take into account the traditional bilingualism of populations in mixed-language regions. Much of the town's population was actively or passively bilingual.

In the first half of the nineteenth century, Olomouc was a city with an exclusively Catholic population. In 1857, only two residents of the Jewish faith lived in the city. Migration changed the religious composition of the population. By 1869, 747 Jews resided in Olomouc. Their number increased to 1,633 in 1910, i.e. 8.5% of the city's civilian population. They largely identified themselves with the German-speaking population of the town. In municipal elections, they represented one of the pillars of the German liberal municipal government. Another pillar was the city's population of German ethnicity or people identifying with the concept of political and cultural Germanness.

¹² *Der statistisches Jahrbuch der königlichen Hauptstadt Olmütz V. Band 1905–1910* (Olmütz: Verlag des Gemeinderates, 1911), 533.

¹³ In 1890, of the 307 Moravian towns, only 50 had an exclusively Czech and 36 an exclusively German population. The population of the other 221 towns was more or less nationally mixed. Jiří Malíř, "Nacionalizace obecní samosprávy a limity demokratizace komunální politiky před rokem 1914 na příkladu Moravy," in *Mezi liberalismem a totalitou: komunální politika ve středoevropských zemích 1848–1918. Sborník příspěvků z konference Archivu hlavního města Prahy 1994*, ed. Jiří Malíř (Prague: Archiv hlavního města Prahy, 1997), 77.

In municipal politics, the era of cooperation between Germans and Czechs came to an end in the 1870s, when Czechs pushed to establish a public school and a municipal policy of language equality. In the 1880s, national activists began to create barriers between the two nationalities. The town's German leaders worked to create a German Olomouc, exploiting a municipal statute and electoral order that endowed the town with considerable powers and denied the vote to a large majority of the population. Czech activists made capturing this "German bastion" of the region a central goal. By the turn of the twentieth century, recurring and escalating Czech-German clashes characterised politics, the economy and culture.¹⁴ The press, both German and Czech, contributed to conflict with less than objective reporting. German newspapers of all political persuasions promoted an almost pathological fear in readers of the Czech population. Czech journalists foresaw radical change.

National conflict in Olomouc mirrored national conflict across Moravia. Elected representatives transposed local conflicts to the provincial parliament, or Diet, and vice-versa. Negotiations for a Czech-German settlement commenced in 1898. The Olomouc lawyer, Jan Žáček, submitted the Czech demands: revision of the provincial constitution and electoral code so as to accord equal rights to both nationalities, introduction of municipal government at the district level, implementation of full language equality in public life, establishment of a Czech university and polytechnic institute, adoption of legislation governing the establishment and financing of minority schools, as well as the principle that children had to attend primary and secondary schools whose language of instruction they already knew. Diet deputies Adolf Promber and Rudolf Rohrer submitted a German counterproposal centred on the introduction of national curias,¹⁵ revision of Moravia's electoral code, national partitioning of school boards at the district and crownland levels, funding of minority schools from the crownland budget, and establishment of a German university. Both proposals were assigned to a Diet Settlement Committee.¹⁶ Complex settlement negotiations commenced, and it can be said that the local conflicts were one of the factors making it difficult to find a consensus.

¹⁴ Andrea Pokludová, "Olomouc," in *Lesk a bída obecních samospráv Moravy a Slezska 1850–1914. Volume 2, part 1, Muži z radnice*, Pavel Kladiwa, Andrea Pokludová and Renata Kafková (Ostrava: Filozofická fakulta Ostravské univerzity, 2008), 225–330.

¹⁵ Both nations would be guaranteed the election of a fixed number of mandates with this electoral system.

¹⁶ Alfred Fischel, *Die mährischen Ausgleichsgesetze* (Brünn: R.M. Rohrer, 1910), 18; Alfred Skene, *Der nationale Ausgleich in Mähren 1905* (Wien: Carl Konegen, 1910), 18–20. By Provincial Act No. 16 of 18 February 1898, the Committee was declared permanent.

The escalation of the Czech-German relations in Olomouc is connected with the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of František Palacký (1898) in Holic. ¹⁷ When the Czech company was returning from Holic to Olomouc in the evening, they were attacked in the dimly lit streets of the town by groups of German youngsters shouting “Heil!”. Singing Pan-German songs, they started shoving the passing Czech inhabitants. The atmosphere in the streets thickened. The physical insults ended with the intervention of the police. ¹⁸ For several days, skirmishes took place in the streets with the intervention of armed forces. ¹⁹ Tension in the town was growing. The days of unease culminated with the assault of a group of Czechs in a park, at which the attackers shouted “das ist die böhmische Pakaž”. The Czechs were joined by passing Czech workers and the Germans by the municipal police who were called in and who drew their sabres during the intervention. ²⁰ Czech real estate, such as Czech schools, was a repeated target of attacks by German youth. ²¹

Street fights between Czech and German males became relatively common in the early twentieth century. A march of Sokols (Falcon - the nationalist gymnastic organisation) through Olomouc on 9 September 1901, banned by the German mayor but permitted after a Czech appeal by Moravia’s governor, ended with violence and intervention by the army. ²² In 1905, German youngsters smashed roughly 50 windows of a Czech school for girls. The town police averted an attack on the German National House. A Czech demonstration for universal suffrage on 28 November 1905 also ended in bloodshed; ²³ workers and sympathizers of social democracy participated in large numbers for the first time in a demonstration called by Czech activists. Outbreaks of mutual clashes occurred in several places in the town, such as in Maurice Square,

¹⁷ Andrea Pokludová, “Olomouc,” in *Lesk a bída obecních samospráv Moravy a Slezska 1850–1914. Volume 2, part 1, Muži z radnice*, Pavel Kladiwa, Andrea Pokludová and Renata Kafková (Ostrava: Filozofická fakulta Ostravské univerzity, 2008), 320–322.

¹⁸ “Hold Palackému,” *Pozor*, July 5, 1898.

¹⁹ “Opětná provokace olomoucké policie;” “Jak surově chovají se olomoučtí policisté;” “Události v Olomouci,” *Pozor*, 9 July 1898.

²⁰ *Der Statistischen Jahrbücher der königlichen Hauptstadt Olmütz III. Band. (1896–1899)* (Olmütz: Gemeinderath, 1898), 64; “Oběti německé provokace,” *Pozor*, August 2, 1898. According to the investigation, neither Olomouc Germans nor Olomouc Czechs, but undefined foreigners. Uncovering who was the real provocateur, from the few sources we have, is impossible.

²¹ Kladiwa, Pokludová and Kafková, *Lesk a bída obecních samospráv Moravy a Slezska 1850–1914*, 222.

²² *Der Statistischen Jahrbücher der königlichen Hauptstadt Olmütz IV. Band 1900–1904* (Olmütz: Gemeinderath, 1901), 33–35.

²³ “Demonstrace v Olomouci,” *Pozor*, 29 November 1905, 4.

where the ‘people’ fought back by hurling bricks and stones prepared for the repair of the Church of Saint Maurice. The confrontation had judicial repercussions and 19 people were found guilty and convicted.²⁴

What affected the microcosm of the small-town society more deeply than clashes in the streets was economic nationalism, namely mutual Czech and German boycotts of trade and services under the slogans “Each to His Own [Svůj k svému]” and “Germans to Germans”. In the mid-1890s, the *Club of Czech Merchants and Tradesmen in Olomouc*, supported by the *National Union for East Moravia* a national defence association, stood behind an initial boycott of German stores.²⁵ As Czech customers began to buy from a growing number of Czech merchants and traders, the loss of the Czech buying power soon became apparent in the circles of German retailers and traders. The first year of the town tram’s service was also boycotted, due to the exclusive use of the German language.²⁶ A reaction from the German side to the Czech boycott was not long in coming. In 1901, a list of Czech companies in Olomouc was issued, with the advice that Germans not patronise them. The publication of the list had become the subject of interpellation of Czech deputies in the Imperial Council.²⁷ Ten years later, the German deputy Rudolf Sommer interpellated the Interior Minister in the matter of the boycott of German merchants in Olomouc by the Czech population.²⁸

How did boycotts affect everyday life? Those who had, from the point of view of the national activists, broken faith with the boycott were harshly criticised on the pages of the Czech press.²⁹ The wives of German municipal politicians were not spared similar rebukes.³⁰ Apart from purchases and the use of services, other private matters also came under the scrutiny of Czech and German activists. For German leaders, every building transferred from German to Czech ownership was a blow.³¹ The municipal government, break-

²⁴ Richard Fischer, *Cesta mého života. Volume 3: Olomouc od r. 1896–1918. Part 2* (Olomouc: R. Fischer, 1937), 110–111.

²⁵ Kladiwa, Pokludová and Kafková, *Lesk a bída obecních samospráv Moravy a Slezska 1850–1914*, 323–327.

²⁶ Fischer, *Cesta mého života. Volume 3: Olomouc od r. 1896–1918*, 229.

²⁷ Richard Fischer, *České školství a Matice školská v Olomouci od r. 1872–1918, Volume 1* (Olomouc: Nákladem Fondu dr. Jana Ošťádal a při Matici školské, 1937), 100.

²⁸ “Věci Olomoucké,” *Pozor*, 17 May 1910. The interpellations were published in the supplement of the daily *Mährisches Tagblatt*.

²⁹ “Ach, ty naše dámy,” *Pozor*, 4 July 1910.

³⁰ Fischer, *Cesta mého života. Volume 3: Olomouc od r. 1896–1918*, 103.

³¹ “Z tábora německého,” *Pozor*, September 28, 1912. “There is quite an alarm in the German camp that, in recent times, a greater number of houses have once again passed from German

ing with liberal, free-market principles, tried to outbid Czechs. If a Czech succeeded in buying a building from a German, German newspapers condemned the seller.³² Not only the private and professional lives of men with power came under public scrutiny, but the doings of non-elites as well. The Moravian Pact had no impact on national boycotts in Olomouc. From the economic aspect, the boycott had a negative effect on the market economy.

In language-mixed towns, education figured as a national battlefield. According to Jeremy King: Majority rule combined with undemocratic electoral codes and national competition to undermine the increasingly important principle of national equality of rights in the field of German and Czech-language public education.³³ It was one of the key conflict zones between Germans and Czechs. Regarding the establishment of every Czech school (except the imperial-royal Slavic grammar school), there were fierce discussions at town council meetings, which resulted in unequivocal rejection. Czech schools were rejected as attacks on the German character of the town. The council also discussed the necessary steps that had to be taken in the event that the Czech side filed a recourse to higher instances against the rejecting stance of the municipal government. Petitions, resolutions and deputations were consequently sent on behalf of the municipal government to the highest instances in the land, to the government and to the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Education in Vienna.³⁴ The petitions usually justified the municipal government's rejecting stance, while recommending that if the establishment of a Czech school was indeed approved by the higher instances, it should at least not be granted subsidies for running and for the construction of school buildings. Deputies were also approached to interpellate the corresponding higher places in the matter of Czech schools not being established. If the steps taken did not result in a successful negotiation, i.e. failure to approve the establishment of a Czech school, numerous obstructions were carried out at the self-government level. These had the sole purpose of preventing the development of the school by the most diverse means, as was the case, for example, with the establishment of a public primary school with Czech as the language of instruction in 1884,

to Czech hands. The German National Council has issued an appeal to German houseowners to notify them before they sell their house to Czechs."

³² "Im tschechischen Besitz," *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 16 June 1910; "Im tschechischen Besitz," *Mährisches Tagblatt*, June 17, 1910.

³³ Jeremy King, "Who Is Who? Group Rights in Liberal Austria and the Dilemma of Classificatory Procedure," accessed 12 December 4, <https://is.muni.cz/el/1421/jaro2009/HIB0387/KingWhoisWho.pdf>.

³⁴ Protest against the establishment of a Czech Business Academy in Olomouc in 1912, container 560, Registry 2, Olomouc City Archives, State District Archive in Olomouc.

as well as a *Realschule*³⁵ opened in 1902.³⁶ For over a decade, the municipal government disputes with the school authorities dragged on over the construction of school buildings for Czech schools which officials found to be using inadequate premises. Neither of the above-mentioned Czech schools moved into a new building before the Great War, although, in the case of the *Realschule*, at least the preparation of the building documentation as well as the start of the construction had already taken place as a result of the pressure caused by the decrees of the Administrative Court of Justice and other authorities.

The topic of the fight for children is known in historiography thanks to the work of Tara Zahra.³⁷ In the case of Olomouc, a single child could tip the scales in favour of establishing or expanding a Czech primary school. Clashes over enrolment took place between the *National Union for North-east Moravia* (founded in 1885) and the municipal government from the beginning of the Czech public school. The municipal government strictly checked the age of the enrolled children, and if a child under six years of age was enrolled, it questioned the child's ability to attend school.³⁸ The children's residence was checked, i.e. whether it was not a calculated enrolment of children aimed to establish a parallel or higher class when the legal number of pupils was acquired. From the municipal government's side, pressure was exerted on the – in the period concept – dependent legal legislators of the children, i.e. individuals working in the service of the municipality, needing some kind of permit from the municipality, such as for selling on the market, or receiving municipal welfare benefits. This pressure also applied to parents employed by employers sympathising with the activities of the town council or living in

³⁵ Realschulen were two- to three-year schools with classic day lessons and a diverse curriculum and purpose. Some of them served as preparatory schools for studies at polytechnic schools.

³⁶ Fischer, *České školství a Matice školská v Olomouci od r. 1872–1918*, 126–160. The establishment of a Czech *Realschule* was being negotiated from 1868. The Ministry of Cult and Education permitted its establishment as a private school on 26 July 1902; this was followed by the usual process of transferring the school into a public school.

³⁷ Tara Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls. National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900–1948* (Ithaca – London: Cornell University Press, 2008).

³⁸ Decree no. 12085 on Dr. Žáček's complaint to the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Education regarding the expansion of the school from three to four classes. With 245 pupils, three classes are overcrowded, 4 July 1889; Decree no. 8736, 13 March 1903; Decree no. 8326, 27 March 1897; Decree no. 9518, 24 March 1891; Decree no. 7768 on the attendance of the Czech school by children about whom the municipality stated that they lived in the register of the municipality only to attend a Czech school, i.e. in its interpretation to artificially increase the number of Czech pupils, 16 April 1890, sign. 18 A, container U2 5235 and 5262, Unterrichts Allgemein 1848–1940, Austrian State Archives; Provincial School Board, inv. no. 222-8317, 258-4378, 270-8359, 271-15675, Moravian Provincial Archives, AVA.

German owners' rental houses. It should be noted at this point, however, that, in the early twentieth century, even Czech activists from the *National Union for North-east Moravia* left the stage of spreading enlightenment for the Czech school and used similar pressure methods to the town council. They addressed, for example, a trader in writing that, as a “well-known Czech”, he would surely enrol his child in a Czech school, and if he did not, he was threatened with economic boycott.³⁹ The pressure on individuals to identify with either the Czech or German society in the town was enormous in numerous spheres of everyday life, i.e. from economic activities to censuses and school enrolments to politics, i.e. namely elections.

Elections to representative bodies, like national street violence, boycotts, and struggles over schools, provide enough material for entire books.⁴⁰ The municipal electoral order in Olomouc divided voters into three electorates on the basis of direct tax brackets. From this narrow electorate of property owners, merchants, traders, officials, burghers, and the educated, came the municipal government of the town. Already in the 1870s, the municipal government of Olomouc proclaimed itself to be German. Defending the German character of the town was one of the programme's priorities. Causally, it was related to the presentation of the demands of the local Czech politicians, i.e. the development of education, language equality and participation in self-government. In the 1876 municipal elections, a conservative German electoral grouping ceded five places on the candidate list to the Czech party for supporting its candidates.⁴¹ This provoked a fanatical reaction from the town council, which is best captured by its proclamation to the voters: “Our town is in danger of losing its German representatives ... What will happen if they are in it one day and turn out to be complete Czechs; they will bring national disputes into the municipal hall, and they will want proposals to be submitted in German and in Czech in a German town. They will impose a useless national school on the town, and for equality to be satisfied, they will demand that our theatre play once in German and once in Czech.”⁴² The German ‘parties’ came to an agreement at the last moment, thereby excluding the Czech candidates from the fight for council seats. Under the given constellation of political forces and the prevailing stereotypical behaviour across German society about preserving

³⁹ “Hostinský Šlégr u Města Prahy na Úřední čtvrti teprve teď objevil se v plné nahotě jako národní zrádce,” *Pozor*, January 15, 1905.

⁴⁰ Kladiwa, Pokludová and Kafková, *Lesk a bída obecních samospráv Moravy a Slezska 1850–1914*, 240–286.

⁴¹ “Doplňovací volby do obecního zastupitelstva,” *Našinec*, October 11, 1876.

⁴² “K volbám obecním v Olomouci,” *Našinec*, 8 October 1876.

the German character, they could not succeed in the election. Czech politicians boycotted municipal elections. They retained this stance throughout the entire turn of the twentieth century.⁴³ They criticised the municipal government for clinging to an electoral system that artificially kept it in power.

In the early twentieth century, not only municipal elections, but municipal politics as a whole was dominated by German defence nationalism. With the generational exchange in the ranks of the Czech political leaders, with the increase of the Czech population in the town across the social stratification, with the creation of Olomouc as the centre of Czech politics for the agrarian Haná, with the emancipation of the Czech food industry intertwined with Olomouc's Czech lawyers, the local conflict had escalated not only in the economic and cultural spheres, represented specifically by education, but also in politics. The political programme of the incoming Czech political representation was published under the title *The Fight for Olomouc* [Boj o Olomouc] in the spring of 1901 by JUDr. Richard Fischer. The memorandum contained eight demands, the meeting of which Fischer considered a potential route to political reconciliation between the Czech and German political representations:

1. granting us, Czechs, representation in the municipal council of the City of Olomouc that would correspond to our numerical and cultural strength;
2. expanding the Czech school in Olomouc, dividing it into institutions for boys and for girls, and establishing a municipal school;
3. the municipality not resisting the establishment of a Czech Realschule here;
4. the municipality not resisting our demand for establishing a Czech university in Olomouc;
5. the municipality issuing all its decrees also in the Czech language;
6. the municipality putting up the same Czech signs next to the German ones in tram transport;
7. after the end of the season, the municipality lending the city theatre, without any defects, to the National Theatre company in Brno for Czech plays;
8. the municipality ceasing to constantly bully and persecute Czech traders and sole traders and treating them, especially in market matters and the awarding of concessions, as impartially and fairly as German sole traders and traders.

The statement ended with the uncompromising stance of the young politician, namely: "The Germans in Olomouc have their fate in their own hands.

⁴³ "Wahl-Versammlung," *Die Neue Zeit*, 6 October 1894.

Let them decide about it for themselves. Let them meet these fair and justified demands of ours; then in one instant there will be full agreement, peace and quiet in the city, and we Czechs, together with the Germans, will work towards the development, strength and glory of this old and famous city. If not, then with the strong support and help of our brotherly countryside, we Czechs will continue our fight to completely starve the German shops and businesses in Olomouc until the entire Germanness of the City of Olomouc is lying completely in the dust. There can be no other reconciliation between us.⁴⁴ The daily *Neue Zeit*, the press organ of the German party in the town hall, brushed the demands aside.⁴⁵

From the official agenda of the Municipality of Olomouc, the German and Czech press, associational agenda and the memoirs of prominent figures, I concluded in previous research that the gap between local Czech and German leaders was immense and difficult to overcome by political negotiations. In many ways, it was projected into provincial politics. After resigning on municipal politics, the leaders of the Czech political parties ran for and were elected provincial deputies. This was not, however, for the electoral district of the town of Olomouc, as here they had no chance of succeeding,⁴⁶ but for urban or rural electoral groups. They ran in those electoral districts where they were involved in economic associations.

Out of these deputies one should name, for example, JUDr. Jan Žáček, the submitter of the Czech demands at the Land Diet in 1898. He was a politician who, due to his knowledge of the situation in Olomouc, was sceptical about a reconciliation taking place. Therefore, after years of negotiations, the Moravian Pact was concluded in an escalated situation in the autumn of 1905. If it was deemed “model and worthy of following” by the government, it did not receive such an assessment on the pages of Olomouc’s *Pozor*. As part of the street riots, JUDr. Jan Žáček’s office in Olomouc was also attacked. Conservative, Old Czech, politicians viewed the negotiated Moravian Pact positively. An entirely opposite stance was taken, however, by the sympathisers of the progressive party with JUDr. Richard Fischer⁴⁷ at the head and the Social

⁴⁴ *Pozor*, 16 March 1901, 1.

⁴⁵ *Die Neue Zeit*, 17 March 1901, 6.

⁴⁶ As in the municipal elections, in the provincial elections the Czech voters resigned on exercising the right to vote. *Moravská orlice*, 31 October 1896, 3.

⁴⁷ Andrea Pokludová, “The Stances of JUDr. Richard Fischer on the Moravian Pact: The Limits of Civil Rights and Liberties in Dealing with the National Issues in Moravia on the Eve of the Great War,” in *Ne-svoboda, despotie a totalitarismus v kultuře a kulturních dějinách*, ed. Radovan Vlček (Prague: Česká společnost pro slavistická, balkanistická a byzantologická studia, z.s., 2021), 95–111.

Democratic workmen. The failure to introduce equal suffrage was seen as a betrayal of the workers. Weaknesses were found in Perek's Act.⁴⁸ Moreover, the opinion among the Czech activists was that, with the current development in Moravia, the political situation would turn in favour of the Czechs even without a reconciliation. This thesis was based, among other things, on the result of the by-election to the Imperial Council in the electoral district of Olomouc-Prostějov-Německý Brodek, in which a Czech candidate succeeded for the first time as a result of the economic emancipation of the region's Czech population.⁴⁹

From a general level, let us return to Olomouc, to a situation where the society of the town, getting rid of its fortress shell, was divided by national activists into 'us' and 'them'. What was going to happen in its social practice after the conclusion of the Moravian Pact in which the mayor of the town, Brandhuber, spoke for Germans and Žáček for Czechs? Shortly after the enactment of the Moravian Pact, attention turned to the elections to the Diet, now with so-called national curiae, i.e. separate Czech and German voter electorates. National registries of voters, Czech and German, were created. As with *lex Perek*, other nationalities were small in Moravia.

In Olomouc, compiling the national registries generated conflict. In early May of 1906, the Czech daily *Pozor* published criticism, a loose continuation of its condemnation of the Moravian Pact.⁵⁰ According to the newspaper, there should have been about 2,700 voters in the Czech electoral registry in Olomouc, but the numbers fell short. The *Mährisches Tagblatt*, a German liberal newspaper,⁵¹ responded with the claim that Czech agitators had been collecting proxy powers in order to challenge the national belonging of men in the German registry. Soon accusations followed of Czech terrorism. Activists threatened to boycott voters who they believed should be in the Czech registry.⁵²

⁴⁸ *Lex Perek* brought about a general adjustment of the educational situation in Moravia. This included the division of the school boards of all levels (local, district, provincial) into Czech and German (under the last paragraph of Section 8, the representatives of the municipality in both local school boards had to be of the corresponding nationality) and, in particular, the introduction of the principle that a child generally attended a school in whose language of instruction it was proficient.

⁴⁹ "Volební ruch," *Lidové noviny*, 19 March 1897.

⁵⁰ "Moravské věci," *Pozor*, 9 May 1906.

⁵¹ "Tschechische Katasterumstriesse," *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 11 May 1906, 6.

⁵² "Terrorismus," *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 12 May 1906, 4; "Reklamationschwindel," *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 18 May 1906.

In the first phase of corrections to the electoral registries, Czech leaders succeeded in challenging the national belonging of 273 voters registered as Germans.⁵³ In an article entitled *National Registers in the Olomouc Region*, Pozor again stated its opposition to national registries.⁵⁴ After the corrections were made, voters in the German registry numbered 3,212 and voters in the Czech one 1,353 instead of the original 972. Most of the Czech challenges were rejected.⁵⁵ Fischer led the Czech correction effort.⁵⁶ As a leading national activist, he had lists from school enrolments and from a private census. Who was a conscious Czech, and who was nationally ambivalent? Who sided with Germans as a consequence of assimilation, and who under duress and due to poverty?⁵⁷ In the run-up to the diet elections in 1913, large-scale challenging of national belonging was not repeated. By then, voters had been divided nationally several times, not only for diet elections but also for elections to the Imperial Council.

After the diet elections in 1906, *Mährisches Tagblatt* assessed the national registries positively. The new electoral system, it concluded, had eliminated German-Czech conflict from campaigning.⁵⁸ The claim seems valid. National conflict continued, however, in the diet. The German press commented on the election in the German electoral district, i.e. the re-election of the Mayor of Olomouc, Brandhuber. The Czech one was interested in the party fight for a mandate in the electoral district of towns ‘represented’ by Olomouc, which was not a separate Czech electoral district, although it was thus presented due to its importance on the Czech political scene. An uncompromising fight broke out over the mandate, which was a typical phenomenon for the fracturing of the Czech political scene, not only for the provincial but also for the Imperial elections.⁵⁹ This election struggle was exceptionally noticed by the press body of the Olomouc German liberals, which, after the elections, gave a posi-

⁵³ *Pozor*, 21 May 1906.

⁵⁴ *Pozor*, 27 May 1906.

⁵⁵ *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 12 July 1906; “Der nationale Kataster,” *Pozor*, 12 July 1906.

⁵⁶ Provincial elections 1906 – 2B National registers, Registry M1–1, Olomouc City Archives, State District Archive in Olomouc; Richard Fischer’s estate, State District Archive in Olomouc. He assumed that the lists could also be the basis for children’s school enrolments.

⁵⁷ Richard Fischer, *Cesta mého života. Volume 4, Pokroková Morava 1893–1918. Part 2* (Prague: Cesta 1937), 371. In 1912, from his position as a Land Diet deputy, he proposed, in the newly approved Settlement Committee, to discuss even the elimination of pressure during entries into the registers: “And the protection of dependent Czech people when imparting the national register must also be ensured”.

⁵⁸ *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 5 December 1906, 3.

⁵⁹ *Moravská orlice*, 1 December 1906; *Moravská orlice*, 1 December 1906, 3.

tive assessment of the election of JUDr. Richard Fischer. Loosely translated, the paper said: While JUDr. R. Fischer, running for the progressive party, is our opponent [author's note: meaning in the national struggle], he defeated a cleric, a common enemy.⁶⁰

National curiae did eliminate a conflict zone between Olomouc's Czechs and Germans in elections. The Czech parties boycotted municipal elections, as opposed to diet ones, because they saw no advantage to constituting a minority on the municipal council, and had no hope of constituting a majority. Czech leaders criticised the municipal electoral system as antiquated and undemocratic.⁶¹ Germans defended the system from a national point of view, seeing it as the best weapon and the best defence against Czechs.⁶² Czechs called for proportional representation and for other reforms of the municipal electoral system, not only in Olomouc. "Especially in Brno and Olomouc," commented Fischer in 1912, "a change has to take place if some kind of *modus vivendi* of both nationalities is to occur."⁶³

Let us now turn our attention to the conflict area of Olomouc education in relation to the implementation of *lex Perek*. Before 1905, through activities related to school enrolment, the census, economic boycotts, associational activities, and preparations for reclaiming the national registers, Czech activists had mapped out who was who in Olomouc. To quote from the minutes of a meeting of the School Matice on 27 April 1906, "the names of those persons in Olomouc and its surroundings were read out who had not yet been kind enough to become members of the School Matice in Olomouc and support our Realschule, extension schools, and nursery schools maintained by the School Matice. It has been noted with gratitude that, with very few exceptions, the entire Czech society in Olomouc and its surroundings conscientiously supports the School Matice and all the schools maintained by it."⁶⁴ The implementation of *lex Perek*⁶⁵, not least by means of a decree by the Minister of Religious Af-

⁶⁰ "Die Landtagswahlen," *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 30 November 1906.

⁶¹ "Obecní volby v Olomouci," *Pozor*, 6 August 1910.

⁶² "Die Olmützer Gemeidewahlordnung," *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 31 May 1910; "Unsere Gemeidewahlordnung," *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 8 June 1910.

⁶³ Fischer, *Cesta mého života. Volume 4, Pokroková Morava 1893–1918*, 371.

⁶⁴ Fischer, *České školství a Matice školská v Olomouci od r. 1872–1918*, 274.

⁶⁵ The Moravian Compromise divided school boards nationally. Until the autumn of 1907, a district school board was active in the city, chaired by the mayor of the city, and Czech education was represented in it by one of the pedagogues of Czech schools. In September 1907, in accordance with *lex Perek*, a German district school board for German schools and a Czech school board for Czech schools were established. Since it was a statutory city, by law the mayor of the city, i.e. the German liberal Brandhuber, was the chairman of both school boards. Personalities of

fairs and Education, a German Liberal named Marchet,⁶⁶ reinforced the criticism of Czechs. Perek's Act, which entered into force on 1 July 1906, stated in the key second paragraph of Section 20 that "In die Volksschule dürfen in der Regel nur Kinder aufgenommen werden, welche der Unterrichtssprache mächtig sind." (As a rule, only children proficient in the language of instruction can be admitted to a *Volksschule*). The term "as a rule" (in der Regel) signalled that exceptions would be allowed, but these were not exhaustively defined. The word 'proficient' (mächtig) was ambiguous, with no breakdown of what it meant more specifically. The main goal of Perek's efforts, i.e. to put an end to the denationalisation of children, could not be fulfilled. Czech children enrolled in German schools were reclaimed for not being proficient in the language of instruction. This concerned no more than a few dozen children. On 17 December 1907, the Czech District School Board in Olomouc submitted an appeal to the provincial school board to reclaim 22 children who did not know the German language in German schools, in response to the negative opinion of the German district school board in Olomouc. On 25 November 1907, the claim of 22 children was rejected, referring to the wording of the lex Perek and § 3 of Marchet's Regulation. Among other things, the answer mentioned that only children who know the German language at such a level that they are able to follow the lessons are admitted to Olomouc German schools. By the decree of the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Education of 12 December 1908, the Czech recourse was rejected. It follows from the reasoning that all the children were enrolled in schools in accordance with § 3 of Marchet's Re-

Czech political and cultural life were appointed to the Czech school board, such as JUDr. Jan Ošťádal – chairman of Matice in Olomouc. The Czech press did not question the appointed members of the Czech district council in terms of their nationality. *Pozor*, 11 September 1907, 3.

⁶⁶ Ivan Puš, "Lex Perek a Marchetova prováděcí nařízení: jejich vznik, aplikace a dobová recepce," *Časopis Matice moravské* 136, no. 1 (2017): 81–97; Pavel Kladiwa, "Revize tzv. Marchetova prováděcího nařízení," *Časopis Matice moravské* 140, no. 2 (2021): 263–281. The basic principle of Perek's Act, i.e. that children attended a school corresponding to their language competence, was significantly disrupted by Marchet's Regulation, which included an already very flexible definition: a child is seen as having knowledge of the language of instruction if it has enough command of the language to be able to follow the lesson. Moreover, Marchet's Regulation provided a list of the acceptable exceptions to knowledge of the language: 1. If it is the express wish of the parents or their representatives and this wish is justified by the fact that the child has not learned the language of its parents at pre-school age but, for example due to contact with relatives, peers, servants, etc., only the second land language, or if the parents or their representatives wish to send the child to a certain school for other valid reasons; 2. If the child had already attended another school of the same language in the previous year; 3. If the child is on "Kindertausch" (exchange) in order to learn the second land language. The total number of children thus exceptionally admitted who were not proficient in the language of instruction could not exceed a tenth of the number of pupils in the class, so as not to jeopardise teaching.

gulation.⁶⁷ Other complaints regarding the enrollment of Czech children in German schools also ended with a similar negative result. On 5 December 1911, the provincial school board rejected the complaints of the Czech school board regarding the enrollment of 32 'Czech' children in German schools. The examination showed that 24 children mastered the language of instruction. Others were German and Ruthenian nationalities, whether the *lex Perek* did not apply to them for other reasons.⁶⁸

As evidenced by the records of those who had often only recently moved to the town, the failure rate of claims resulting from legislatively set parameters was similar to other towns. As stated above, each child could tip the scales in favour of the development of public national education, and even reclaiming a single child could lead to a legal demand to expand the number of classes in a Czech school. Another front in the struggle was the fight to construct a new school building of the Czech public school. The German municipal schools in the town, on the eve of the Great War, corresponded to modern schools, but the Czech one also lagged behind the new school buildings in the countryside. On the legal level, it ended with Decree No. 9243 of the Administrative Court of Justice of 24 November 1913, which rejected the complaint of the municipality against the decision of the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Education to construct it. By the outbreak of the First World War, the municipality had not started the construction. Even according to the findings of the official authorities, the instruction was carried out in hygienically unsatisfactory conditions. The Moravian Pact did not explicitly address the issue of the construction of national schools, as it was governed by school legislation.

Another part of the Moravian Pact was *lex Parma*,⁶⁹ which the Olomouc municipal government approached laxly. The implementation is captured in Fischer's comments: "In 1905 the Moravian Land Diet adopted a law concerning equal rights for both languages of the land in municipalities; the Mayor of Olomouc, as a provincial deputy, voted in favour of this law, but when it came into force, the town of Olomouc was the first in Moravia not to abide by it, and we had to point out the disregard for the law again by complaints."⁷⁰ Indeed, Czech activists objected to the violation of *lex Parma* by the municipal

⁶⁷ Provincial School Board, inv. no. 288-2559 and 295-2824, Moravian Provincial Archives.

⁶⁸ Provincial School Board, inv. no. 313-22038, Moravian Provincial Archives.

⁶⁹ *Lex Parma* regulated the use of both land languages by municipalities. It guaranteed rights for the (non-ruling) minority in ethnically mixed municipalities. The municipality itself decided on the official language for all matters of independent and transferred jurisdiction in accordance with the rules established by this law.

⁷⁰ JUDr. Fischer's estate, State District Archive in Olomouc.

government in administrative appeals, as well as in interpellations in the Diet. A letter from Mayor Brandhuber in 1908 stated his interpretation of the law and how it was applied at the Olomouc municipality, i.e. the use of the German language in the internal administration of the municipality.⁷¹ After enactment of the Moravian Pact, language equality became a key issue for Czech activists. On 20 February 1914, Fischer submitted a bill to the Diet to amend *lex Parma* by extending its provisions to all public activities of municipal governments.

Another sphere of life in Olomouc partitioned nationally by the Moravian Pact was public employment. At a town council meeting in January 1906, the mayor was interpellated by alderman Rudolf Sommer⁷² regarding the Czechization of state offices. He stated that of 779 officials state offices and institutes in town, 388 were German and 391 Czech. He listed the state offices with the majority of Czech officials according to the criterion of nationality. He expressed concern about the Czechization of the district court.⁷³ Data from previous research confirm Sommer's data on the growing number of state officials in the city who subscribed to the Czech language of use. The increase was realised through natural development, i.e. the emancipation of the Czech intelligentsia in Moravian society. At the same time, the state reflected the equal status of the Czech language in external communication and the Czech surroundings of the city. The exception was the Directorate of State Railways. It was considered by Czech activists to be one of the bastions of Germanism in the city, similar to the municipality. In 1910, 97% of municipal officials subscribed to the German language of use. Some of them were in fact bilingual, due to compliance with *lex Parma*. With regard to land offices and institutions, we can state, with the example of the hospital, that the Moravian Pact was observed. Of the total number of doctors, 31% signed up for German and 68% for Czech. Primary seats were represented in terms of nationality fifty-fifty. The director of the hospital applied for German language of use.⁷⁴ Archival sources show behind-the-scenes struggles for every official post; would a Czech or a German be appointed judge, senior consultant at the land hospital, etc.? Both the municipal government⁷⁵ and Czech activists lobbied for positions. On the

⁷¹ Presidial record office 1888–1932, container 23, inv. no. 171, Brno City Archives.

⁷² Ivan Puš, "Vybrané aktivity olomouckého zastupitele a poslance Rudolfa Sommera," *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 70, no. 3 (2018): 244–252.

⁷³ *Der statistisches Jahrbuch der königlichen Hauptstadt Olmütz V. Band 1905–1910*, 20.

⁷⁴ Data from the 1890 and 1910 censuses have been processed for publication Pokludová, *Formování inteligence na Moravě a ve Slezsku 1857–1910*.

⁷⁵ Presidial files, container 19 12/1907, 263/1913, Olomouc City Archives, State District Archive in Olomouc.

eve of the Great War, the national belonging of candidates often played a more important role than their qualifications.

The archival bequests of national activists contain many confidential lists and surveys assessing the national stance of people in Olomouc. A Czech list from the autumn of 1918 contains notes about judges: a German, fiercely nationalist; a German, polite; a Czech, who raised his children in German; a Czech by birth, but a German by conviction; a Czech, solidly national and registered in the Czech electorate.⁷⁶ In practice, the list had been particularly applied after the takeover of the town hall by Czechs in 1918.⁷⁷ The change of the political hegemon at the town hall did not end the conflict coexistence in interwar Olomouc society.⁷⁸

The implementation of the Moravian Pact in individual towns followed local conditions and nuances of interaction between the German and Czech national movements. Olomouc was the centre of the *Czech National Union for North-east Moravia* and of the German Union of the Germans in Northern Moravia (*Bund der Deutschen Nordmährens*). Everyday life, including the economy, education, associational life and politics, was under their scrutiny. The partitioning of the economy into Czech and German spheres contradicted liberal, free-market principles and constrained development. In many aspects, individual rights and freedoms were infringed for the sake of collective rights,⁷⁹ i.e. acting in the name of the nation. Although the Moravian Pact reduced German-Czech friction in diet elections, tensions continued in education and in public use of the two national languages. Non-elites were drawn into the struggle of national activists. For all the national partitioning and separation, however, some people entered into nationally mixed marriages and raised their children bilingually.⁸⁰

⁷⁶ Richard Fischer's estate, State District Archive in Olomouc.

⁷⁷ "Uebergabe des Olmützer Stadtverwaltung an den Narodni výbor," *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 11 November 1918, 4; "Die Aufrichtung Tschechoslowakischen Staates. Die Ereignisse in Olmütz," *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 30 October 1918, 4; "Uebernahme der Handelskammer durch den Narodni výbor," *Mährisches Tagblatt*, 8 November 1918, 4.

⁷⁸ Andrea Pokludová, "Änderung in der Stadtverwaltung nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg in Troppau und Olmütz," in *Stadt und Krieg im 20. Jahrhundert: neue Perspektiven auf Deutschland und Ostmitteleuropa*, ed. Christoph Cornelisse, Václav Petrbock and Martin Pekár (Essen: Klartext, 2019), 87–112.

⁷⁹ Kladiwa, Pokludová and Kafková, *Lesk a bída obecních samospráv Moravy a Slezska 1850–1914*, 264. In the case of real estate sales, pressure was exerted on the seller not to sell to interested parties from among the 'others', i.e. Czechs/Germans.

⁸⁰ It is not possible to obtain an exact percentage of these marriages from the period data.

Abstract

The study deals with the issue of the Moravian Pact (1905) with the example of the city of Olomouc. In the collective memory, Olomouc ranks among Moravian cities with a conflicting coexistence of Czech and German populations at the turn of the twentieth century. The aim of the study was to answer the question of whether the conclusion of the Moravian Pact (1905), which was considered to be a political reconciliation between the Moravian Germans and the Czechs, also led to the overcoming of animosity between the Czech and German population of the city in Olomouc. The choice of Olomouc was not accidental, as: 1. it was an alternative political centre to Brno – the provincial capital, 2. it was a city with a traditionally bilingual population and 3. the city became a centre of Czech and German activists concentrated in organisations such as *National Union for East Moravia* and *Germans in Northern Moravia*.

In the introductory part of the study, the conflict zones of Czech-German coexistence are presented in detail, i.e. education, local economic life, municipal politics and elections to the Land Diet. Then, on a micro historical level, topics related to the political convention of Moravian Germans and Czechs from 1905, i.e. the Moravian Pact, are elaborated. Specific areas on which the Moravian Pact no longer had such an impact are listed, such as the fight for a child, as the intense activity of Czech activists partially resolved it before the *lex Perek* came into force. The impact of land elections and the national composition of city officials and civic service are described. There are two basic spheres in which animosity continued to deepen even after the Moravian Pact, namely municipal politics and the local economy. Life in Olomouc on the eve of the Great War did not take place under the sign of the national status quo, but in an atmosphere of persistent friction between Czech and German activists, which was transferred to the everyday life of the city's population. In the end, the consequences led to the fact that the inhabitants were not nationally indifferent, but divided on the national principle into Czechs and Germans. Bilingualism persisted, however, in the communication practice of the population.

Keywords: Moravian Pact 1905; Olomouc; Nationalism; Everyday life

Doc. PhDr. Andrea Pokludová, Ph.D.

Andrea Pokludová lectures at the Department of History of University of Ostrava, Dvořákova 7, Ostrava 701 00. She completed a doctoral programme (Ph.D.) in Economic and Social History at the University of Ostrava. She was

appointed associate professor of Cultural and Social Anthropology on the basis of a habitation procedure at the Faculty of Humanities of Charles University. She deals with the social and urban history of the Bohemian Lands of the 'long' nineteenth century in the context of Central European development. She examines the role and function of the social group intelligence of a multi-ethnic society in the process of modernisation. She deals with numerous aspects of the history of everyday life of urban and rural society in the process of modernisation: education and public health.

Department of History
University of Ostrava
e-mail: andrea.pokludova@osu.cz

Some Remarks on the Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice's Foreign Sources

Adrien Quéret-Podesta

Introduction

Written in the late 1140s in the Benedictine abbey of Hradisko in Olomouc and continued after the monks moved to Opatovice in Eastern Bohemia,¹ the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* are the oldest surviving historiographical work made in Moravia.² Although they offer precious information about the history of that region as well as about the beginnings of the monastery of Hradisko,³ they also contain a great deal of information about the history of Bohemia as well as a lengthy discussion dedicated to universal history, which is placed at the beginning of the work. The diversity of information provided in those annals results of course from the variety of sources used by its authors, since this work shows a likely influence from lost Moravian historical texts,⁴ large borrowings from the Bohemian historiographical production, especially from the *Chronicle of the Czechs* written by Cosmas of Prague, and considerable use of foreign sources. The main foreign source which the annalist had at their disposal was a “universal chronicle” which he used to relate information concerning general history up until the end of the tenth century, but two entries of the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* also show the influence of Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle* and its continuation. The presence of these sources and the fact that the place they occupy in the annals differs greatly raises the questions of their function in this work. In order to try to answer to this interrogation, we will first study the case of the universal chronicle before fo-

¹ Josef Šrámek, “Zamyšlení nad stránkami análů hradištsko-opatovických Poznámka na okraj jedné středověké památky ve světle současného bádání,” *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 63, no. 4 (2011): 305.

² Martin Wihoda, “Anály hradištsko-opatovické nebo První moravská kronika? Po stopách nekosmického pojetí českých dějin,” in *Morava a české národní vědomí od středověku po dnešek*, ed. Jiří Malíř and Radomír Vlček (Brno: Matice moravská, 2002), 25–32.

³ See for instance Lukáš Reitingger, *Vratislav. První Král Čechů* (Prague, 2017), 132.

⁴ Šrámek, “Zamyšlení nad stránkami análů hradištsko-opatovických,” 308. The use of lost Moravian sources, for instance, lost Medieval annals written in Olomouc, in the fifteenth century *Granum catalogi praesulum Moraviae* has been demonstrated by David Kalhous: David Kalhous, “*Granum catalogi praesulum Moraviae jako pramen k dějinám Moravy v 10. století?*,” *Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica*, no. 11 (2007): 23–37.

ocusing on the question of the entries coming from Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle* and its continuation.

The "Universal Chronicle" in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice*

The analysis of the universal chronicle used in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* shows that this work must be identified with the *Chronicon Universale* of Frutholf of Michelsberg, which was continued by Ekkehard of Aura in the first quarter of the twelfth century.⁵ Most specialists agree that the information coming from this source was added to the annals during the first phase of their editing in the late 1140s. According to some scholars, the copy of the chronicle used by the annalist of Hradisko could have come from the library of the Olomouc cathedral chapter, which might have obtained it from the abbey of Corvey, since the Bishop of this time, Henry Zdík, had strong links with the monastery on the Weser river.⁶

The information borrowed from the *Chronicon Universale* forms the first part of the annals since its beginning with an entry concerning the birth of Christ up until the end of the ninth century. From this date, the information from the chronicle is intertwined with elements coming from the Bohemian historiographical production until the mention of the death of Conrad I of Swabia in 997, which is the last entry in the annals which was borrowed from the *Chronicon Universale*. The presence of this lengthy excerpt from the *Chronicon Universale* in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* plays an important role in their composition, and Josef Šrámek states that the annals themselves belongs to the genre of "World Chronicles".⁷ For this Czech scholar, a "World chronicle" is "a chronicle which endeavours to insert the described local events, which are the main center of interest of the chronicle's author, in the context of general events":⁸ the examination of the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* confirms that the annals match this description.

This attempt to inscribe past events of a local nature in a broader scope is not specific, however, to the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice*, as this ten-

⁵ Šrámek, "Zamyšlení nad stránkami analů hradištsko-opatovických," 305. On this topic, see also Thomas J. H. Mc Carthy, *The Continuations of Frutolf of Michelsberg's Chronicle* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 2018).

⁶ *Ibid.*, 308.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 305.

⁸ Šrámek, "Zamyšlení nad stránkami analů hradištsko-opatovických," 305.

gency can also be observed in the *Chronicle of the Czechs* written by Cosmas of Prague as well as in the continuation of this work by the monk of Sázava. In Cosmas' case, the entries concerning foreign history come chiefly from the continuation of Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle* (about 20 entries), although some manuscripts of this chronicle also contain some notes borrowed from an annalistic work related to the lost *Annals of Hersfeld*. It is worth noting that all the foreign entries in the chronicle concern the tenth century and are preceded by a short mention of the Flood and the episode of the Tower of Babel (book I, chapter 1),⁹ by a brief geographical description to locate Bohemia (book I, chapters 1–2),¹⁰ by an account of the oldest past of the Bohemians (book I, chapters 2–18)¹¹ as well as by a reference to the baptism of Bořivoj in 894 (book I, chapter 14),¹² which is the first dated event in Cosmas' work. The foreign information, which concerned chiefly the history of the Ottonians, appear therefore not as a prologue to the national past but as intertwined with it. In the work of the monk of Sázava, the foreign entries concerned chiefly the history of the German lands in the tenth century and come from the *Annals of Quedlinburg*. They form the main part of the group notes dating from the period 932–1001 and preceding the reference to the foundation of the monastery of Sázava, as only four references concerning Bohemian history are recorded in this part of the work, the oldest of them concerning the year 990.¹³ This list of annalistic entries follows a short prologue which sums up the division of the ages of the world according to Saint Jerome,¹⁴ and the association of those two elements enhances the universal character of the first part of the work of the monk of Sázava. The annalistic notes recorded after the account

⁹ *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum-Cosmas Of Prague Chronicle of the Czechs*, ed. János M. Bák and Pavlína Rychterová (Budapest – New York: Central European University Press, 2020), 8–9.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 10–11.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 12–71.

¹² *Ibid.*, 60–61.

¹³ “Mnich sázawský” (Continuation of Cosmas of Prague) by the monk of Sázava, year 990: “Eodem anno sanctus Adalbertus, episcopus Pragensis ecclesiae sanctae, Romae ad sanctum Alexium confessorem et ad sanctum Bonifacium inscio abbate, quis esset, factus est monachus. Item eodem anno Nemci perdita est,” in *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum, volume II*, ed. Josef Emler, trans. Václav Vladivoj Tomek (Prague: Museum království Českého, 1874), 240.

¹⁴ “Mnich sázawský”, *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, 238: “De chronica sancti Hieronymi et compositione annorum. Beatus Hieronimus in chronica, quam propriis manibus contextuit, ita commemorat: Ab Adam usque ad diluuium anni 2242. A diluuius usque ad Abraham anni 942. Ab Abraham usque ad nativitatem Domini anni 2015. In quorum summa inveniuntur quinque milia et insuper centum nonaginta novem.”

of the monastery's foundation concern exclusively Bohemian and Moravian history, with a focus on the past of the monastery.

The examples of the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice*, of Cosmas' *Chronicle* and of its continuation by the monk of Sázava show clearly that attempting to insert a national or even a local past in a broader context was not an uncommon practice in twelfth century Bohemian and Moravian historiography, although this tendency is chiefly present in the works which propose an extensive narrative of Bohemian and Moravian history and does not usually appear in the works which are a continuation of Cosmas' *Chronicle*, the only exception being the continuation by the monk of Sázava. The extensive use of the *Chronicon Universale* in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* is thus clearly connected with this "metanational" vision of the past.

Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle* and its Continuation in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice*

The function of the *Chronicle Universale* in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* being established, it is now time to turn our attention to the use of Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle* and of its continuation. As stated above, the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* contain only one entry from both works. The entry from Regino's text relates the beginning of Svatopluk's rule in Bohemia in 890; according to the abbot of Prüm, the right to rule in this land would have been granted to the Moravian ruler by Arnulf of Carinthia. Svatopluk's rule in Bohemia is mentioned in four Bohemian and Moravian sources:

Table 1: Svatopluk's rule in Bohemia in Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle* and in Bohemian and Moravian narrative sources

<p><i>Reginonis Abbatis Prumensis Chronicon cum Continuatione Trevirensi</i>, ed. Friedrich Kurze (éd.) <i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi</i>, 50, Hannover, 1890, 134:</p>	<p><i>Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum</i>, 60 and 62:</p>	<p>“Letopisy hradištsko-opatovické”, <i>Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum</i>, Volume II, ed. Josef Emler, transl. by V. V. Tomek, Prague, 1874, 386:</p>	<p>“Letopisy české”, <i>Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum</i>, Volume II, ed. Josef Emler, transl. V. V. Tomek, Prague, 1874, 380:</p>	<p>“Auctarium Mellicense”, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach, <i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores in folio</i>, IX, Georg Heinrich Pertz (red.), Hannover, 1851, 536:</p>
<p><i>Anno dominicae incarnationis DCCCXXC. Arnulfus rex concessit Zuendibolch, Marahaensium Sclavorum regi ducatum Behemensium...</i></p>	<p><i>Eodem anno Zuatapoluch, rex Moraviae [...] cum recognovisset quod contra dominum suum et compatrem Arnolphum iniuste et quasi immemor beneficii arma movisset – qui sibi non solum Boemiam sed alias regiones [...] subiugarat.</i></p>	<p><i>Ante cuius tempora Arnolfus Zuatopluk, filio suo, Moraviensium et Boemiensium a. d. 890 concessit ducatum.</i></p>	<p><i>DCCCLXXXVII Arnolfus, filii Karolomanni, rex Romanorum, concessit Zuatopluc regi Moraviae, compatri suo, ducatum Boemie.</i></p>	<p>890. <i>Arnolfus rex concessit Zuatopluk regi Moraviae compatri suo ducatum Boemie.</i></p>

The analysis of the entries concerning the beginning of Svatopluk's reign in Bohemia in the Czech sources shows clearly that the entries contained in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice*, in the *Annales Bohemici* and in the notes concerning Bohemia and Moravia added to the *Annales Mellicenses* are very similar to each other as well as to Regino's text. Cosmas' relation is, in contrast, very different from the other Bohemian and Moravian sources as well as from the work of the abbot of Prüm and Trier. The similarities between

the entries in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice*, in the *Annales Bohemici* and in the notes of the *Annales Mellicenses* indicate that the three works must have known the entry of Regino's *Chronicle* through a common source, but the differences between those works and Cosmas' text exclude the possibility that the work of the Prague chronicler could have been this source. This conclusion was already drawn by Dušan Třeštík, who stated that the source of the diffusion of this entry in the Bohemian historiography was a lost redaction of the *Annals of Prague*.¹⁵

The entry of the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice*, which was borrowed from the continuation of Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle*, relates a conflict between the Duke of Bohemia, Boleslav I the Cruel and Otto I in 950. According to the continuation of Regino's work, the Duke revolted against Otto, which led this ruler to lead an expedition against Bohemia and make Boleslav submit. The conflict between Boleslav and Otto appears in three Bohemian and Moravian sources:

Table 2: Otto I's expedition in Bohemia against Boleslav I in the continuation of Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle* and in Bohemian and Moravian narrative sources

<i>Reginonis Abbatis Prumensis Chronicon cum Continuatione Trevirensi</i> , 164:	<i>Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum</i> , 78:	"Letopisy hradištsko-opatovické", 387:	"Auctarium Mellicense", 536:
<i>Eodem anno Boemorum princeps Bolizlao rebellat; quem rex validissima manu adibat suaeque per omnia dicioni subdebat.</i>	<i>Anno dominice incarnationis DCCCCL. Dux Boemorum Bolezlaus regi rebellabat, quem rex Otto valida manu adiit, suaeque dicioni per omnia subdidit.</i>	<i>A. d. 950. Boleslaus, dux Boemorum, frater beati Wencezlavi, Ottoni regi rebellavit, quem rex Otto valida manu adiit, suaeque ditioni per omnia subdidit.</i>	<i>950. Boleslaus dux Boemorum rebelavit contra regem Ottonem, quem rex debellavit, et per omnia subegit.</i>

The comparative analysis of the entries concerning Otto I's expedition in Bohemia against Boleslav I in 950 in the continuation of Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle* and in the Bohemian and Moravian narrative sources shows that the entries contained in Cosmas' *Chronicle*, in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice*, and in the notes added to the *Annales Mellicenses* are very similar to each other as well as to the text of the continuation of Regino's *Chronicle*. The existence of those analogies suggests the use of a common source and it

¹⁵ Dušan Třeštík, "Kosmas a Regino. Ke kritice Kosmovy kroniky," *Československý časopis historický* 8, no. 4 (1960): 584, note 88.

is likely that this source was once more the lost *Annals of Prague*, as the notes added to the *Annales Mellicenses* do not seem to be directly related to Cosmas' *Chronicle*.¹⁶

The analysis of the circulation of the entries from Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle* and from this chronicle's continuation which appear in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* shows thus clearly that those entries were borrowed from a Bohemian or Moravian source, and their presence in different Bohemian and Moravian historiographical works proves that they were integrated into the Bohemian and Moravian historiographical production already at the time of the redaction of Cosmas' *Chronicle*, i.e. in 1125, which suggests that they were probably incorporated into the Bohemian tradition in the eleventh century, or perhaps even at the very end of the tenth century. The fact that Cosmas' *Chronicle* is the only work to contain other notes from the continuation of Regino's *Chronicle* than the entry of 950 and the extensive use of Regino's work by the Prague chronicler suggests that he had access to a manuscript containing both works whereas the lost *Annals of Prague* contained in all likelihood only the entries for the years 890 and 950.

The question of the transfer of Regino's *Chronicle* and its continuation is more difficult to answer, although it is very likely that these two works were contained and transmitted by the same manuscript, which gives the beginnings of the 970s as a *terminus post quem*. We can observe, however, that in his attempt to retrace the itinerary followed by those works from the German Lands to Hungary, Lajos J. Csóka considers that these text must have come from the Benedictine monastery of Saint Emmeram in Regensburg.¹⁷ The Hungarian scholar adds that Regino's *Chronicle* and its continuation were brought by Ramwold, monk of Saint Maximin of Trier and Abbot of Saint Emmeram from 975 to 1000, since he considers that the *Liber Chronicorum* mentioned in the inventory of the abbey's books written at the time of Ramwold refers to the works of Regino and its continuator.¹⁸ If Csóka's hypothesis is correct, the abbey of Saint Emmeram could also have played a role in the transmission of those works to Bohemia, since the Bavarian abbey had strong

¹⁶ See for instance the stemma contained in Dušan Třeštík, "Anfänge der Böhmisches Geschichtsschreibung. Die ältesten Prager Annalen," *Studia Źródloznawcze* 23, no. 23 (1978): 33.

¹⁷ Lajos J. Csóka, *A latin nyelvű történeti irodalom kialakulása Magyarországon a XI–XIV században* (Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó, 1967), 338.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 338. The list of books was edited in "Annales et Notae Sancti Emmerami Ratisponenses et Weltenburgenses," in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores in folio, XVII*, ed. Philipp Jaffé (Hannover: Impensis bibliopoli aulici Hahniani, 1861), 567–568, note 1.

relations with two Prague churches, namely Saint Georges and Saint Vitus, in the tenth century.¹⁹

The integration of the note of Regino's *Chronicle* concerning Svatopluk's rule in Bohemia in 890 and of the entry of the chronicle's continuation mentioning Otto I's expedition against Boleslav I in the earliest phases of Bohemian historical production is of course due to the fact that they relate events directly concerning Bohemia. The entry for the year 890 contributes to shedding some light on the relationship between this country and Great Moravia. It indicates that Bohemia's dependence on this realm was rather short and due to the decision of other powers and it also gives an explanation to the account of the baptism of Bořivoj by Saint Methodius, which was dated erroneously from 894, i.e. almost a decade after Methodius' death. The presence of the entry for the year 950 is rather surprising, as it mentions the defeat of a Bohemian ruler. One should keep in mind that Boleslav I, the ruler submitted by Otto I, is depicted in a very negative manner in the Bohemian and Moravian historical tradition - as proved by his nickname of 'cruel', since he was above all seen as the murderer of his brother, Saint Wenceslas. In this context, the news of his defeat after his revolt against Otto could be seen as a kind of punishment for his behaviour.

Conclusion

The analysis of the use of the *Chronicon Universale* as well as of Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle* and its continuation in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* shows clearly a quantitative difference in their use, as the annals do possess numerous borrowings from the *Chronicon Universale*, whereas they contain only one entry from Regino's work and one from its continuation. The foreign sources whose influence can be spotted in the annals also have different functions. The extensive use of the *Chronicon Universale* in the first part of the annals attempts to place the events concerning Bohemia and Moravia in a broader perspective while the entries of Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle* and its continuation, which the author borrowed from a Bohemian annalistic work, owe their integration to the national historiography to their contribution to the narrative of Bohemia's past.

¹⁹ David Kalhous, *Bohemi: Prozesse der Identitätsbildung in frühpremyslidischen Ländern (bis 1200)* (Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2018), 186; Wojciech Jasiński, *Legenda Krystiana – autentyk czy mistyfikacja? Żywot i męczeństwo św. Wacława i św. Ludmiły w świetle analizy historycznej i filologicznej. Studium źródłoznawcze* (Poznań: Wydział Historii Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza, 2020), 150.

The case of the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* shows thus the presence of two different types of use of foreign sources in Bohemian and Moravian historiography. The coexistence of those two uses, which can be respectively described as ‘metanational/universal’ and ‘national’, is not, however, specific to these annals, since it can also be spotted in Cosmas’ *Chronicle*, which makes extensive use of Regino’s work and of its continuation for both purposes, as well as, to a lesser extent, in the *Annales Bohemici* and in the notes of the *Annales Mellicenses*. It should be mentioned, however, that among Central European Medieval historiography, the coexistence of the ‘universal’ and ‘national’ uses of foreign High Medieval narrative sources seems to be rather specific to the Bohemian and Moravian historical production, as the Hungarian historiographical works display only cases of ‘national’ use of those sources, whereas the Polish historiography integrates them chiefly for ‘universal purposes’, with the possible exception of three entries whose provenance is still disputed by scholars.²⁰ The existence of these discrepancies in the use of foreign High Medieval historical writings in Central European historiographical productions constitutes an interesting phenomenon, but the establishment of its causes would require further investigation.

Abstract

Written in the middle of the twelfth century, the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* show an extensive use of Bohemian and Moravian sources, but also of foreign works. The main foreign source which the annalist had at disposal was a ‘universal chronicle’ which he used to relate information concerning general history until the end of the tenth century, but two entries of the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* also show influence of Regino of Prüm’s *Chronicle* and its continuation. The analysis of the use of the *Chronicon Universale* as well as of Regino of Prüm’s *Chronicle* and its continuation in the *Annals of Hradisko and Opatovice* shows that these sources have a different function. The extensive use of the *Chronicon Universale* in the first part of the annals aims indeed to put the events concerning Bohemia and Moravia in a broader perspective whereas the entries of Regino of Prüm’s *Chronicle* and its continuation, which the author borrowed from a Bohemian annalistic work, owe their

²⁰ See for instance Adrien Quéret-Podesta, *Annales Magdeburgenses Brevissimi. The Short Annals of Magdeburg and their Signification in the Discussion on the Genesis of Czech and Polish Annalistic Productions* (Olomouc: Vydavatelství Filozofické fakulty Univerzity Palackého v Olomouci, 2016), 39–42.

integration to the national historiography to their contribution to the narrative of Bohemia's past. The coexistence of those two uses, which can be respectively described as "metanational/universal" and "national" is however not specific to these annals, since it can also be spotted in other twelfth century Bohemian historiographical writings.

Keywords: Middle Ages; Bohemian lands; Historiography; Annals; Chronicles

Dr Adrien Quéret-Podesta

Adrien Quéret-Podesta was born in Moulins (France) in 1983. In 2010, he defended his Ph.D. dissertation, which was prepared in co-tutorship between the Blaise Pascal University at Clermont-Ferrand (France) and the University of Debrecen, on the topic of the representation of the oldest Polish-Hungarian relationships in historiography since the Middle Ages. From July 2014 to September 2017, he worked as a postdoctoral fellow at the Department of History of Palacký University in Olomouc. Since October 2020, he has been working in Poznań (Poland), at the Department of History of the Institute for Slavic Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences. His main field of research is Medieval Historiography in Central Europe but he also has an interest in cultural contacts between France and Central Europe in the Middle Ages and in Medieval Central European numismatics.

Department of History
Institute of Slavic Studies
Polish Academy of Sciences
e-mail: adrien.queret-podesta@ispan.waw.pl

The Contribution of Czech Artists and Intellectuals to the Dynamics of the Development of Modern Slovak Art during the First Czechoslovak Republic¹

Martin Vašš

The First Czechoslovak Republic is without a doubt one of the most important periods (if not the most important) for the development of modern Slovak culture and art. Previously, under Hungarian rule, Slovak culture and art had been suffocated and limited; thus, the founding of the Czecho-Slovak state opened up previously unimagined possibilities and dimensions for overall development. It was, however, not only Slovak cultural and artistic actors who played an important role in this process; Czech artists and intellectuals did as well, arriving in Slovakia after the establishment of Czechoslovakia to work in the capital city for the development of modern Slovak culture and art. The Czech contribution to the advancement of Slovak culture in Czechoslovakia is generally most highlighted in the area of education, and in the field of art it is reflected on somewhat less so in this context. Therefore, in the present paper, I want to point out the importance of the Czech contribution and assistance in the development of modern Slovak art during the time of the First Czechoslovak Republic with a representative sample of Czech artists and intellectuals (Alois Kolísek, Jaroslav Jareš, Ludmila Rambouská, Josef Vydra, Leopold Mazáč and Josef Polák). The following criteria were crucial for the selection of the above personages: 1. These people left behind the most visible memory trace in the narrative sources of Slovak artists. 2. Within the scope of the research, these figures showed the most documented interactions with Slovak artists or representatives of modern Slovak culture. The paper is designed in such a way that each of the analyzed people has a separate section with generalized findings presented at the end of the study.

After the founding of Czechoslovakia, the Moravian Catholic priest, theologian, intellectual, politician and Slovakophile **Alois Kolísek** (1868–1931) moved permanently to Bratislava in early February 1919,² thus ending his

¹ The study is a publication output of the project VEGA 1/0139/21 A Slovak Intellectual at the Crossroads of Tradition and Modernity.

² *Do památníku dru Aloisu Kolískovi* [On the Memory of Dr. Alois Kolísek] (Prague: Kruh přátel Kolískových, 1930), 43.

more than twenty years of work in Hodonín. His arrival in Bratislava was motivated by several factors, in which his relationship with Slovak culture and art predominated. From the beginnings of the Czecho-Slovak state, he worked as a member of the Czechoslovak People's Party in Slovakia.³ In his only speech at the Chamber of Deputies of the Revolutionary National Assembly, which he gave on 23 January 1920, Kolísek expressed himself in his typical position as a patron of Slovak artistic and cultural life and appealed for increased subsidies in the state budget for various aspects of artistic life in Slovakia. He first pointed out the need to secure scholarships for Slovak students at the Academy of Fine Arts in Prague.⁴

From his position as a member of the Revolutionary National Assembly, he further highlighted the need for much greater financing of musical life and education in Bratislava, pointing out the predominance of the German and Hungarian elements in this field. He was concerned with securing a counter-balance of Slovak music and musical institutions against the particularly well-organized German musical life in Slovakia's capital. For the literary field, he requested within the Association of Slovak Artists a certain form of financial support from the state for Slovak writers.⁵

Kolísek ranked among the leading figures of cultural life in Bratislava in the first decade of Czechoslovakia's existence. After arriving in Bratislava, he lived in a modest two-room apartment on Kapitulska Street, no. 5.⁶ Similarly as in the Hodonín environment, he decorated his room with various rare relics, Slovak embroidery, ceramics and paintings by Slovak painters.⁷ Kolísek thus also established the so-called "Slovak room" in Bratislava. We also learn a great deal about the cultural and social functions of Kolísek's apartment from the memoirs of Slovak modernist painter Janko Alexy (1894–1970), who endeavored to create a new national style based on the achievements of modernity. Alexy was among the visitors to Kolísek's apartment, and its furnishings made a romantic impression on him. We also learn from Alexy's memories that it was a two-room apartment. Kolísek lived modestly in only one of the mentioned rooms; the other often served as a refuge for young

³ Slovenská národná knižnica – Literárny archív (SNK–LA), o. f. 153 (Alexyovci), sign. 153 AO 6.

⁴ Alois Kolísek, "Prejav v poslaneckej snemovni 23. januára 1920" [Speech in the National Assembly, January 23, 1920], Společná česko-slovenská digitální parlamentní knihovna, accessed June 6, 2022, <https://www.psp.cz/eknih/1918ns/ps/stenprot/110schuz/s110011.htm>.

⁵ Kolísek, "Prejav v poslaneckej snemovni 23. januára 1920".

⁶ AVU SNG, o. f. Jozef Hanula, sign. 2 A 15. Compare: Karel Sommer and Josef Julínek, *Politik a kněz Alois Kolísek* [The Politician and Priest Alois Kolísek] (Prague: ARSCI, 2012), 116–117.

⁷ Sommer and Julínek, *Politik a kněz Alois Kolísek*, 116–117.

and talented students who came from poor backgrounds. Alexy tells us that Kolísek's apartment on Kapitulská Street became a place of help for "the young and desperate, arriving for good advice or financial support".⁸ In this case, Alexy had in mind rather young and unsuccessful art novices, and he placed himself among them at that time.

Kolísek thus acted as a selfless patron to young and beginning Slovak artists; he was not only interested in the Christian motivation to help the needy, but also support for the development of Slovak art. Aside from providing housing and mediating the contacts needed for professional advancement, he also provided financial assistance and promotion. In this context, Alexy wrote: "But Kolísek also helped any art novice financially; he lent but perhaps never received anything back, and though he found complaints distasteful, he was always willing to help when they asked him for it."⁹

Another visitor to Kolísek's apartment from among Slovak artists, aside from Janko Alexy, was Karol Miloslav Lehotský (1879–1929), a painter with mystical and decadent inclinations, who died in Brno in 1929, and about whom Kolísek published an independent work.¹⁰ Alexy's later memories confirm that even Kolísek's selfless efforts to help Slovak artists were not enough to improve their position in society.¹¹

Based on Kolísek's letter to the Slovak painter and restorer Peter Július Kern (1881–1963), dated 11 December 1921, we know that Kolísek was compiling a systematic collection of contemporary Slovak visual art in his apartment, in which he wanted every Slovak artist to be represented.¹² From Kolísek's correspondence with Kern, we also learn that Kolísek was a patron of the young and prematurely deceased fine arts novice Ladislav Treskoň (1900–1923), who studied at the Prague Academy of Fine Arts from 1919 until his untimely death in 1923. A pioneer of post-war social art, Treskoň greatly valued Kolísek, something that is also evident from the legend he used for his drawing of Alois Kolísek.¹³ Kolísek's support for young beginning Slovak artists was not only limited to the Bratislava environment, it was also provided to Slovak students of the Academy of Fine Arts in Prague.

⁸ SNK–LA, o. f. Alexyovci, sign. 153 AO 6.

⁹ Janko Alexy, "Naši. (Úryvky)," in *Do památníku dru Aloisu Kolískovi* [On the Memory of Alois Kolísek] (Prague: Kruh přátel Kolískových, 1930), 127.

¹⁰ *Do památníku dru Aloisu Kolískovi*, 129.

¹¹ Alexy, "Naši. (Úryvky)," 124.

¹² AVU SNG, o. f. Peter Július Kern, sign. 13 A 62.

¹³ Archív výtvarného umenia Slovenskej národnej galérie [Archive of Fine Arts of the Slovak National Gallery] (AVU SNG), o. f. Peter Július Kern, sign. 13 A 62.

Alois Kolísek also became friends with the Slovak composer and collector of folk songs Miloš Ruppeldt (1881–1943), who after the founding of Czechoslovakia established the Music School for Slovakia in Bratislava, anticipating that it would gradually transform into a conservatory of a similar level as those in Prague and Brno. The paradox in terms of the status of the Music School was that it was private, and the Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment was supposed to support it only financially. Miloš Ruppeldt and the members of the board of trustees of the school, which operated on a federal basis, submitted a request for nationalization to the relevant ministry several times. These efforts were also intensively supported by Alois Kolísek, who as a result earned the title of the “Slovak Consul”.¹⁴

Another form of Kolísek’s support for Slovak artists in the 1920s consisted of pilgrimages of the faithful to Rome, where, as a spiritual leader and organizer, he liked to take Slovak artists so that they would have the opportunity to draw inspiration and knowledge from the rich well of Italian visual arts. For the first such Franciscan pilgrimage to Rome and Assisi during the First Republic, which Kolísek organized in 1923, he compiled and published a special work in the form of a memorial book. From this publication, one sees that the respected portraitist Štefan Polkoráb (1896–1951) was the first Slovak painter to take advantage of this pilgrimage to Italy organized by Kolísek.¹⁵ In 1932, Polkoráb became celebrated for his portrait of President T. G. Masaryk at the castle in Topoľčianky. Since the correspondence between Kolísek and Polkoráb has not been preserved, one cannot guess with certainty how long they had known each other, but it is probable that Polkoráb’s participation in the pilgrimage in 1923 helped to strengthen their friendship. In this context, it should be mentioned that Polkoráb also painted a portrait of Kolísek in 1928.

In 1926, Alois Kolísek organized a Franciscan pilgrimage to Rome and Assisi, which several Slovak artists took part in: the painters Milan Thomka Mitrovský (1875–1943), Andrej Kováčik (1889–1953) and Janko Alexy, and the writer Tido J. Gašpar (1893–1972).¹⁶ The editor Jur Koza Matejev (1884–1973) also took part in the pilgrimage. Kolísek wanted five Slovak artists to accompany him on this pilgrimage along with ordinary pilgrims, so that they could draw inspiration and stimuli for their artistic work. For the painter Andrej Kováčik, who was in a very problematic financial situation at the time,

¹⁴ AVU SNG, o. f. Peter Július Kern, sign. 13 A 71.

¹⁵ Alois Kolísek, *Do Ríma, Assisi. Pamätnica slovenskej terciárskej púti 1923* [To Rome, Assisi. Memorial Book to the Slovak Tertiary Pilgrimage 1923] (Bratislava: Serafínsky svet, 1924), 215.

¹⁶ *Do pamätníku dru Aloisu Kolískovi*, 81.

the opportunity to take part in the trip to Italy was a great boost. His wife also made the journey with him.¹⁷ Kováčik at this time was in such dire financial straits that he could not even afford a trip to Turčiansky Sv. Martin for the meeting of the Association of Slovak Artists. Alois Kolísek also helped him significantly in this case.¹⁸

As is apparent, Kolísek's share in the development of modern Slovak culture and art was multi-faceted. The first level was represented by direct personal contacts and meetings with Slovak artists, which most often occurred in Kolísek's Bratislava apartment, but to a large extent also through assemblies and meetings of various art associations (most often the Association of Slovak Artists), during the organization of exhibitions and art events and last but not least, through visiting artists throughout Slovakia. In the 1920s, Kolísek's apartment became an important place of the intellectual and artistic life of Bratislava. The meetings that took place as part of Franciscan pilgrimages to Rome and Assisi, which Kolísek led and organized, also fall into the category of personal meetings with Slovak artists. The second level comprises his written contacts with Slovak artists through correspondence. This also involves an important form that has wider historical value for historical studies because it allows us to look behind the scenes of the cultural and artistic life of Slovakia during the first decade of existence of the first Czechoslovak Republic. In terms of the professional focus of Slovak artists, Kolísek's contacts with Slovak artists in the given period were the most dynamic with artists and musicians.

The Czech painter **Jaroslav Jareš** (1886–1967), who already had a great deal of experience in organizing the artistic life in Prague as part of the Art Forum, also filled the role as a patron and all-round supporter for Slovak artists during his stay in Bratislava between 1919 and 1930. Jareš was an exceptionally versatile visual artist and intellectual, because along with his profession as a painter, he was also a sculptor, illustrator, scenographer, architect, artistic-industrial designer and publicist. He was also one of the creators of the national flag and coat-of-arms of Czechoslovakia from 1918. After arriving in Bratislava in 1919, he made significant contributions to the development of relations between Czech and Slovak artists. His greatest contribution to the development of modern Slovak art is without a doubt related to initiating the construction of the House of Art (today's Umelka) in Bratislava, where he found support from the well-known Slovak architect Dušan Jurkovič (1868–1947), the lawyer Jaroslav Dvořák (1894–1963) as well as Edvard Šafařík. The House of Art provided Slovak artists their first exhibition spaces built for this purpose.

¹⁷ SNK-LA, o. f. Alexyovci, sign. 153 AO 6.

¹⁸ AVU SNG, o. f. Peter Július Kern, sign. 13 A 65; SNK-LA, o. f. 153 (Alexyovci), sign. 153 AO 6.

Jareš also obtained the first functional studios for Slovak artists in Bratislava in the form of four studios in the state building at no. 5, Trnavská Road. The first studio went to Janko Alexy, and after him the sculptor Jozef Pospišil (1897–1976) and the painters Karol Miloslav Lehotský, Ludovít Fulla (1902–1980) and Mikuláš Galanda (1895–1938) also worked there. The second studio was assigned to the painter Július Koreszka (1895–1958), the third to František Malý (1900–1980) and the fourth to Imrich Weiner-Král (1901–1978). Jareš is also credited with the tasteful furnishing of the interiors of the apartment of Jozef Gregor Tajovský (1874–1940) and Hana Gregorová (1885–1958).¹⁹

After his arrival in Bratislava, Jareš himself lived in only a modest wooden house on the city's periphery, which at the time was called *Nový svet*. His wife at that time, the painter and illustrator **Ludmila Rambouská** (1899–1952), was also among the patrons and supporters of Slovak modernist artists. She became well-known due to her renowned caricatures of Slovak modernist writers and artists, which were published in Prague by *Elán*, the most prestigious Slovak art magazine of the time. Rambouská's contribution to the development of modern Slovak culture was most important in this area. Through her caricatures of predominantly modern Slovak artists, she contributed to building their legend and legitimizing Slovak modern art in the eyes of both the Slovak and Czech cultural public. Jaroslav Jareš is also credited with the founding of an art association in Bratislava based on the model of Prague's *Umelecká beseda* (Art Forum). He was the first, among Slovak and Czech painters in Bratislava, to understand that an art association had to be established here as well, which was eventually founded relatively rapidly in 1921 under the name *Umelecká beseda slovenská* (Slovak Art Forum). In the Bratislava cafes, Jareš gathered around him productive and influential collaborators (e.g. the architect Dušan Jurkovič, the lawyer Dr. Jaroslav Dvořák and his wife the Slovak writer Zuzka Zguriška, the lawyer Edvard Šafárik).

Jareš also constantly encouraged Slovak modern artists; he pushed back against lethargy and inactivity, and thanks to his coffee house group, succeeded in securing the necessary funds for the construction of the art pavilion *Dom umenia* (House of Art) on Šafáriková Square. Jareš did not even worry about the large debts that remained after the building was completed. In this context, it is peculiar that Jareš's modern conceived paintings did not find any understanding among the Slovak public, and he did not sell a single painting in Slovakia. Despite the financial setbacks, he continued to paint, even though he had to take a job as a clerk at the Education Department. Despite

¹⁹ SNK–LA, o. f. Alexyovci, sign. 153 AO 6.

the invaluable support he had provided, his years in Bratislava were a time of struggle, of construction problems, of bitterness from the lack of recognition and financial debacles, which ultimately led to the 50-year-old Jareš leaving Bratislava as a ruined and prematurely aged man. His marriage to Ludmila Rambouská also disintegrated in the process. She took a job in Prague at the Slovak publishing house of Leopold Mazáč (1900–1948), which was led by Ján Smrek, and set off on her path as a caricaturist of representatives of Slovak artists in the magazine *Elán*.²⁰

The Czech artist, art theoretician and teacher **Josef Vydra** (1884–1959) also left a significant imprint in relation to the development of modern Slovak culture and art. In Slovakia, his name is linked with his lifelong project, which was the School of Arts and Crafts (ŠUR) in Bratislava. This school, whose origins date to 1928, operated for the ten years of its short existence (1928–1939) under the leadership of Josef Vydra, until he, like other Czech teachers, had to leave Slovakia on 1 December 1938. Vydra became a pioneer of modern art education in Slovakia. In his conception of ŠUR, the Bauhaus played an important role as a source of inspiration, specifically its conception, organization and methods of pedagogical work. Vydra was of the opinion that the Bauhaus offered one of the most modern methods at that time for developing the skills of visual perception in line with the current knowledge of modern science.²¹

In this context, it is important to note that the already mentioned Alois Kolísek also stood by the birth of the first public art school in Slovakia in the form of the School of Arts and Crafts. When the founding of this kind of school was being discussed in Bratislava, Kolísek called for the concept of a school that should not only educate for the understanding of art, but also the needs of contemporary life.²²

It should be stated, however, that Vydra was not concerned with a mere mechanical copying of Bauhaus methods; he adapted his concept to the situation in Slovakia. ŠUR was not a university or a secondary school; it was a master's level of apprentice schools. This was not a direct copy of the Bauhaus,

²⁰ SNK–LA, o. f. Alexyovci, sign. 153 AO 6.

²¹ Alena Kavčáková, “Organizátorské a teoretické dílo Josefa Vydry v kontextu umělecké a výtvarně pedagogické avantgardy 20. století” [Organizational and Theoretical Work of Josef Vydra in the Context of Artistic and Fine Arts Teaching of the Avant-Garde of the Twentieth Century] in *Josef Vydra (1884–1959) v kontextu umělecké a výtvarně pedagogické avantgardy 20. století* [Josef Vydra (1884–1959) in the Context of Artistic and Fine Arts Teaching of the Avant-garde of the Twentieth Century], ed. Alena Kavčáková, and Alena Myslivečková (Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2010), 21.

²² Archív mesta Bratislava (AMB), fond Škola umeleckých remesiel (ŠUR), Documents 1928–1939, Minutes from the meeting of ŠUR board of trustees, 25 September 1930.

even though Walter Gropius (1883–1969) inspired Vydra in several directions, including his masterful talent for advertising. Led by Vydra, ŠUR played an important part in the modernization of art, material culture and lifestyle in Slovakia. This is currently among the most attractive topics in the history of modern art culture in Slovakia; therefore, the notion that the “Bratislava Bauhaus” was associated with ŠUR is not surprising. Josef Vydra wanted the ŠUR to raise domestic Slovak production to the international level of modern industrial creation.²³

In December 1928, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Bratislava opened evening courses in drawing and advertising engagement, on the basis of which ŠUR was built. Vydra succeeded in recruiting exceptional artists, such as the painters Ludovít Fulla and Mikuláš Galanda, to the teaching staff of ŠUR. In the context of Slovak visual arts at the time, Fulla and Galanda represented an avant-garde pair of artists. The painter Janko Alexy also lectured several hours a week as part of the evening courses in the building of the Industrial School.²⁴ Vydra had already noticed Ludovít Fulla during his studies at the School of Applied Arts in Prague. In its beginnings, ŠUR's classes were conducted three times a week on the premises of the State Industrial School next to the building of the Agricultural Museum.²⁵

If no classes were being taught at ŠUR in the early evening, Ludovít Fulla used to sit over coffee in the *Múzeum* cafe with the director Vydra. These meetings in the *Múzeum* cafe, which was located right next to the State Industrial School, in the building of the Agricultural Museum, were important in regard to talking over the plans and concepts of the development of ŠUR.²⁶ Fulla's fellow artist Mikuláš Galanda also began to teach at ŠUR, and before the arrival of his future wife in March 1932, he often spent evenings in the company of the director Josef Vydra. In a letter to Fulla dated 8 March 1932, Galanda mentions how he and Vydra were first at the *Atlon* cinema and had

²³ Iva Mojžišová, “Josef Vydra medzi utópiou a realitou (Škola umeleckých remesiel v Bratislave 1928–1939),” [Josef Vydra between Utopia and Reality (The School of Arts and Crafts in Bratislava 1928–1939)] in *Josef Vydra (1884–1959) v kontextu umělecké a výtvarně pedagogické avantgardy 20. století*, ed. Alena Kavčáková, and Alena Myslivečková (Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2010), 30–31.

²⁴ Janko Alexy, *Ovocie dozrieva* [The Fruit is Ripening] (Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo krásnej literatúry, 1957), 52.

²⁵ Radislav Matuščík, *Ludovít Fulla* (Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenského fondu výtvarných umení, 1966), 27. The Agricultural Museum was located in the building of today's Slovak National Museum.

²⁶ Ludovít Fulla, *Okamihy a vyznania* [Moments and Confessions] (Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ, 1983), 161–163.

then moved to a wine bar. The meeting was also of artistic significance, because in addition to conversations about ŠUR matters, they most likely also agreed on the content of the last issue of the *Súkromné listy Fullu a Galandu* [The Private Letters of Fulla and Galanda], which consisted only of Vydra's article.²⁷

Fulla and Galanda had also declared their efforts for artistic independence by publishing their own avant-garde magazine, which was published in 1930–1932 under the name *Súkromné listy Fullu a Galandu*. This was the only avant-garde periodical in Slovakia at that time. The first issue appeared on 28 February 1930 in a self-published edition of 500 unsold copies. The main goal of the magazine was to inform the Slovak public about new painting, their own artistic opinions and their own artistic work, but the Slovak public did not understand Fulla and Galanda's work at all.²⁸

Josef Vydra also supported Fulla and Galanda's initiative with an article he published in the last double issue of the *Súkromné listy Fullu a Galandu*, which was published on 15 February 1932. In that article, he highlighted the artistic significance of the avant-garde achievements of Fulla and Galanda and introduced his concept of "pure and high art". Vydra set out a clear contrast between high art and folk art, which in terms of artistic expression moves on the level of personal – impersonal, whereby "pure and high art" is, in his view, a product of the city and the extraordinary personality of the artist. In Vydra's view, a true artist refuses to submit to the consumer needs of the broader masses and refuses to paint his pictures for money, because then they would effectively lose their artistry and become mere handicraft products.²⁹ Josef Vydra understood very well the situation of Fulla and Galanda, in which they found themselves amidst an uncomprehending mass of consumers of predominantly folk art.³⁰ We can therefore state that the importance of Vydra's help in establishing Fulla and Galanda in the social consciousness was significant.

Josef Vydra also supported professors working at ŠUR during study stays abroad and various activities of transnational importance. He organized a number of exhibitions at the school as well as a lecture series, where several prominent representatives of the European avant-garde (Jan Tschold, László Moholy-Nagy, Karel Teige, Hannes Mayer, Ladislav Sutnar)³¹ presented their

²⁷ AVU SNG, o. f. Ludovít Fulla, sign. 22 B 9.

²⁸ SNK–LA, o. f. Alexyovci, sign. 153 AH 1.

²⁹ Josef Vydra, "Priatel'ia pp. Fulla a Galanda!," *Súkromné listy Fullu a Galandu*, February 15, 1932, 3–4.

³⁰ This is also confirmed by the memoirs of Ludovít Fulla.

³¹ Jan Tschold (1902–1974) – German typographer, book graphic artist, teacher and writer; László Moholy-Nagy (1895–1946) – Hungarian painter, photographer and teacher at the Bauhaus

work and ideas. Vydra himself primarily taught color harmony and composition at ŠUR. As part of his teaching, he promoted non-manual techniques that at the time were still futuristic and had only been brought to the visual arts in the twentieth century. Vydra's conception of the school was built on the combination of the tradition of folk-art production with functionalist-constructivist language, which gave ŠUR a privileged position in the context of the European avant-garde of the time. Vydra managed to disprove the general hypothesis that avant-garde modernism must principally and always negate tradition.³² Although his contribution for modern Slovak visual art was focused on his pedagogical activities, his promotion and apology of avant-garde Slovak visual art cannot be ignored.

The name of the Prague publisher **Leopold Mazáč** undoubtedly resonated significantly in Slovak culture during the interwar period. As a publisher, he was an important patron of young Slovak writers in the 1920s and 1930s, when his publishing house had its own Slovak editorial office specializing in publishing Slovak books, particularly from aspiring young authors. Mazáč became synonymous with the success of the young Slovak literature and a well-established brand. He was the first publisher who broke the long-standing myth about the unprofitability of publishing Slovak literature and also initiated a wave of interest in new and older Slovak literary works.³³

Among Slovak writers, he collaborated directly with the Prague-based Ján Smrek (1898–1982) and Štefan Letz (1900–1960). The Modernist writer Ján Hrušovský (1892–1975) recalls Mazáč as a friendly and helpful young man who had a positive relationship with both young and older Slovak writers. Whenever possible, he met with young writers, particularly if they were in an unfavorable financial position: “Rarely did anyone leave him empty-handed, or better said, with an empty wallet.” With his financial support of young, beginning and impoverished writers, Mazáč was not acting strictly out of charitable motives, but approached them in a spirit of business. He even published the works of young radical left-wing authors such as Laco Novomeský (1904–1976), Ján Poničan (1902–1978), Fraňo Král (1903–1955) and Peter Jilemnický (1901–1949).

Within Mazáč's editions of Slovak literature, the priority is the Edition of Young Slovak Authors (EMSA), which published a total of 61 volumes by

School of Art; Hannes Mayer (1889–1954) – Swiss architect and second director of the Bauhaus in 1928–1930.

³² Kavčáková, “Organizátorské a teoretické dílo Josefa Vydry v kontextu umělecké a výtvarně pedagogické avantgardy 20. století,” 21–22, 26–27.

³³ Monika Kapráliková, “Takmer zabudnutý nakladateľ Leopold Mazáč,” [The All But Forgotten Publisher Leopold Mazáč] *Slovenská literatúra* 58, 2011, no. 2, (February 2011): 143–144.

28 authors in the years 1925–1937.³⁴ Although Matica slovenská dominated the publishing of original Slovak literature, Leopold Mazáč published contemporary works of modernism.³⁵ Mazáč's authors' fees were also a sensation, as they enabled previously impoverished authors to earn for themselves through their work.³⁶ Although prior to 1928 Leopold Mazáč was the only Czech publisher offering the original work of Slovak authors, inspired by his example, additional Czech publishers gradually began to realize that publishing Slovak literature need not be automatically unprofitable.³⁷

In the scope of publishing Slovak authors, Mazáč insisted on the principle that they should be published in the original Slovak language; he thereby also wanted to strengthen the Czech-Slovak intercultural dialogue in the spirit of the state-building idea. Mazáč not only served to increase the interest in Slovak authors among Czech publishers but also triggered the same process among Slovak publishers and booksellers. A major milestone in this context was the opening of the Slovak book store in the building of Mazáč's publishing house in 1934.³⁸ In addition to the Slovak book store, the editorial office of the magazine *Elán*, headed by Ján Smrek, was also located in the building, as was a lecture hall for Slovak authors and an exhibition hall for *Elán*, in which they mainly exhibited the work of artists who took part in the graphic processing of Mazáč's books. The Slovak book store, together with the *Elán* lecture hall and exhibition hall, thus finally fulfilled the function of representing modern Slovak culture in Prague.³⁹

Leopold Mazáč often traveled to Bratislava to arrange the necessary details with his sales representative Karol Müller. After finishing with all his duties, Mazáč used to then visit Bratislava's wine bars in the afternoon hours. During one meeting in a small wine bar directly under the castle, on Zámocká Street, Mazáč was pleased to hear the guests present – ordinary Bratislavans – passionately discussing Jožo Nižnánský's (1903–1976) novel *Čachtická pani*. On an impulse, he had his publishing house increase the print run of this novel.⁴⁰

³⁴ The chief editor of the edition was Ján Smrek. EMSA represented the largest interwar edition of new original Slovak work and, in addition to prose, also published poetry and essays.

³⁵ SNK–LA, o. f. Ján Smrek, sign. 181 F 38.

³⁶ Kapráliková, “Takmer zabudnutý nakladateľ Leopold Mazáč,” 148.

³⁷ The publishing house Družstevní práce became the biggest follower and competitor of Leopold Mazáč in this regard. The Czech publishing houses STAN, Fr. Pine or Melantrich also occasionally published Slovak authors.

³⁸ SNK–LA, o. f. Ján Smrek, sign. 181 F 38.

³⁹ Kapráliková, “Takmer zabudnutý nakladateľ Leopold Mazáč,” 153–154.

⁴⁰ SNK–LA, o. f. Alexyovci, sign. 153 AO 6.

Thanks to Mazáč's remarkable managerial skills, several representatives of the young literary generation came to the attention of the wider domestic public.

Czech assistance with the development of modern Slovak culture did not bypass the eastern part of Slovakia either. Košice in the 1920s was a city whose cultural life was comparable to any other European city of the same size. As the cultural center of eastern Czechoslovakia, Košice represented a typical Central European conglomerate of religious confessions and nationalities. A major turning point in this regard was the founding of Czechoslovakia, which brought with it the arrival of Czech officials loyal to the central government in Prague.⁴¹ One of them was the young lawyer and cosmopolitan intellectual **Josef Polák** (1886–1945), whose name is indelibly linked with the establishment of the East Slovak Museum and with the support of the group of artists known as the *Košická moderna* [Košice Modernism]. He also devoted himself to the history of Slovak visual arts as well as promoting Slovak cultural monuments, theaters and libraries. Polák compiled a history of Slovak visual arts in the publication *Výtvarné umění na Slovensku* [The Visual Arts in Slovakia]. Often forgotten about Josef Polák is the fact that he was also a photographer who in the 1920s and 1930s liked to document various events and activities as part of everyday life in eastern Slovakia.

Polák's most important contribution, however, undoubtedly lay in his merits in founding the East Slovak Museum. It was Josef Polák who laid the grounds for the establishment of the East Slovak Museum in Košice. He had visited Košice as early as the beginning of 1919 and had become intensely interested in the museum collections there. Not long after, on 9 March 1919, he was commissioned to run the East Slovak Museum, which continued the activities of the defunct county museum. During his time running the East Slovak Museum, Polák proved to be an excellent administrator and manager, despite not having adequate education to perform such a function. In the 1920s, he intensively built up the museum's collections, despite a variety of obstacles: he did not have, for example, even a director's salary, and always had to apply for state subsidies every time anew and deal with a complex administrative procedure. The East Slovak Museum was specifically a state museum that had, on the one hand, been under the authority of the Ministry of Education and National Education since 1921,⁴² but at the same time, the

⁴¹ Zuzana Bartošová, "Medzivojnové Košice ako centrum umeleckého diania," [Interwar Košice as a Centre of Artistic Happenings] in *Košická moderna a jej presahy* [The Košice Modern and Its Influences], ed. Zuzana Bartošová, and Lena Lešková (Košice: Východoslovenská galéria, 2013), 43.

⁴² At that time, there was no separate Ministry of Culture, and this area fell under the authority of the Ministry of Education and National Enlightenment.

situation from a formal point of view was complicated by the fact that it was located in Slovakia, which had a certain limited form of self-government. In this context, it should be noted that the East Slovak Museum was the first, and for a long time the only, state museum in Czechoslovakia.⁴³

Thanks to Josef Polák, a graphics school was also established within the East Slovak Museum and was open to the general public during its existence from 1921–1927. Polák commissioned the painter Eugen Krón (1882–1974), who was one of the founders of Košice modernism, to manage it. Without Polák's work, Košice would not have acquired the status of an important art center in the interwar period, not only in the domestic but also in the European context. Under his leadership, the East Slovak Museum organized around a hundred exhibitions in the 1920s, and through these exhibitions, also presented the current work of personalities and groups focused on modernism and the avant-garde.⁴⁴

Conclusion

Based on the survey of the examined representative sample, one can conclude that Czech artists and intellectuals who worked in Bratislava in the interwar period were able to create a network of personages that was to a certain extent largely interconnected. They thus left the most significant traces in the Bratislava environment behind them. A similar model could be expected in the Košice environment, but there, based on preserved traces of memory, only Josef Polák showed a more notable response and influence. The fact that Czech artists and intellectuals were concentrated in the two largest Slovak cities (Bratislava and Košice) can be considered a phenomenon that also fits closely into the European modernist tendencies of the time and is not only associated with the administrative importance of these two Slovak cities during that period. The example of the publisher Leopold Mazáč demonstrated that a great deal of work for the development of modern Slovak culture could be done directly from the center of the country – in Prague. Thus, a personal presence in Slovakia was not an essential condition.

One can find the most significant results of Czech artists and intellectuals in the development of modern Slovak art in the field of fine arts and literature. This encompassed a wide range of activities: mainly participation in the crea-

⁴³ Magda Veselská, *Muž, který si nedal pokoj* [A Man Who Did Not Rest] (Prague: Židovské muzeum, 2005), p. 27.

⁴⁴ Bartošová, "Medzivojnové Košice ako centrum umeleckého diania," 44, 70.

tion of new institutional frameworks for modern Slovak culture, patronage activities towards Slovak artists, promotion of modern Slovak art and publishing activities. Therefore, it can be stated with complete objectivity that the contribution of Czech artists and intellectuals in the development of modern Slovak art in the period of the First Czechoslovak Republic was significant, and the previously mentioned protagonists often performed an irreplaceable acceleration function in this regard.

Abstract

On the basis of examining a representative sample of Czech artists and intellectuals (Alois Kolísek, Jaroslav Jareš, Ludmila Rambouská, Josef Vydra, Leopold Mazáč and Josef Polák), one can conclude that the contribution of the above-mentioned personalities to the development of modern Slovak art operated synergistically. One can note the most significant results in the development of modern visual arts and modern literature. The contribution of Czech artists and intellectuals in the development of modern Slovak art can be perceived in the following three main levels: 1. Share in the founding of new art institutions, schools and associations (e.g. the House of Art, the Slovak Art Forum, the School of Arts and Crafts, the East Slovak Museum), 2. Broad-spectrum patronage activity towards modern Slovak artists, writers and musicians, 3. Publishing activities stimulating the development and promotion of modern Slovak literature. In this context, the help of Czech artists and intellectuals was shown to have significantly contributed to the dynamics of the development of modern Slovak art during the First Czechoslovak Republic.

Key words: Czech artists; Czech intellectuals; Slovakia; modern Slovak art; First Czechoslovak Republic

Doc. Mgr. Martin Vašš, Ph.D.

Martin Vašš works as Associate Professor at the Department of Slovak History at the Faculty of Arts Comenius University in Bratislava and specializes in Slovak history of the twentieth century (political, cultural and social history, select problems of historiography). Among his most important outputs are the monographs *Zmenení Parížom: slovenskí umelci a Paríž v 20. storočí* (2020), *Medzi snom a skutočnosťou: umelecká bohéma v Bratislave 1938–1945* (2018), *Zlatá bohéma: umelecká bohéma v Bratislave 1920–1938* (2018), *Bratislavská umelecká bohéma v rokoch 1920–1945* (2016), *Slovenská otázka v 1. ČSR*

1918–1938 (2011), *Prievidza v rokoch 1918–1948* (2013). He received the Egon Erwin Kisch Award for the year 2018 (for his books *Zlatá bohéma* and *Medzi snom skutočnosťou*), the Award of Národné osvetové centrum for the best town monograph in 2014 (for his monograph on Prievidza).

Department of Slovak History
Faculty of Arts
Comenius University Bratislava
e-mail: martin.vass@uniba.sk

Petr Kadlec: *Vzdělání – společnost – hospodářství. Utváření profesně vzdělávací infrastruktury v Předlitavsku od poloviny 19. století do roku 1914 na příkladu rakouského Slezska*¹

Červený Kostelec: Pavel Mervart, 2020. 669 pp.
ISBN 978-80-7599-228-4

Reviewed by Ivan Puš

The topic of this book seems to be particularly relevant, as many of the points in it, researched in the context of the Austrian Empire, are currently discussed in relation to the Czech Republic. Primary and secondary school teachers, experts and school authorities discuss vocational education, and, above all, this topic is, regularly covered in the media, to which politicians, experts and educators react. This is a scenario which appeared as far back as the second half of the nineteenth century.

During the process of formation and transformation of vocational education, at the centre of which stood, of course, pupils and their parents, classical education at *gymnasium* was already in the 1840s pitted against trade and commercial education. The marketability of graduates, the needs of the local, regional and state economy were discussed.

These aspects accompanied the process of building an infrastructure in the context of the Austrian part of the Habsburg monarchy, which is – with a special emphasis on Austrian Silesia – the research topic of Petr Kadlec. It covers the time slot of more than a half century, between the revolutionary year 1848/1849 which brought striking changes in the economic sector, among others by the establishment of Chambers of Commerce, and the First World War, which brought the evolution of (vocational) education in the monarchy to an end and sped up its disintegration.

The author of this respectable monograph, not only in terms of its scope and source base, is an experienced specialist in history of education, economic and social history, a researcher at the Centre for economic and social history

¹ [Education – Society – Economy. The Development of the Cisleithanian Vocational Infrastructure from the Mid-Nineteenth Century to 1914 as Exemplified by Austrian Silesia].

at the University of Ostrava who has been working on the history of education for more than ten years. He has also been involved in projects exploring processes of modernisation, including Czech-German relations in Cisleithania.

Following a careful review of national and international literature (especially German, Austrian and Polish), Kadlec searched for the legislative, institutional and personal roots of modern vocational education and traditional societal transformation. He starts with phenomena such as legal treatment of menials or the functioning of guilds in the nineteenth century. The issue of menials in rural society has remained almost untouched in Czech historiography for a very long time, as regards its regulation or an analysis of its role in the traditional and then civic society.

One of the aspects that I would like to emphasise in the context of the entire monograph, is gender. It is an integral part of the book. It does not remain isolated and is not omitted by the author. Petr Kadlec mentions not only the specific schools, courses and classes designated for girls and women, their careers and possible motivations but explains, based on compelling quotations from primary sources, that in the eyes of the influential educators of these times, prior to World War I, a better education made girls better wives and housewives (pp. 307–317). “This kind of education served only to cement rather than advance women’s social status.” (p. 632).

The very complicated structure of the educational system, especially as regards institutions of commercial education, makes the research of it difficult. Various courses at primary schools, summer as well as winter schools were very frequent. Regular daily teaching gradually penetrated the education system.

In Silesia there was for instance *kaufmännische Fortbildungsschulen* for shopkeepers, higher trade schools in larger cities, agricultural schools and courses for basket-weavers, but a commercial college was missing. One of the reasons was insufficient funding, it being undervalued in comparison with other Crown lands.

Kadlec made the decision to follow this broad network of schools, from the primary schools and first vocational schools through the particular secondary schools, special trainings, finishing with an analysis of the educational landscape and school policy in Austrian Silesia.

The choice of this structure seems to be appropriate first of all for experienced specialists in this field who are seeking for specific information about the curriculum, teaching methods, funding, important pedagogues or politicians who were acting in the given era. Other scholars with an interest in this topic will find a great deal of relevant information about a specific type of

school, general information explaining not only regional but the state wide cultural and educational politics or the stances of key figures such as Armand Dumreicher (1845–1908).

To obtain a complete overview and knowledge, one has to read more subsections from the book. A carefully written final conclusion in Czech (and summaries in English and German) help(s) remind the readers of the most important facts and open up a discussion.

Multi-source funding, disciplination, legislation and a comparison of the particular Crown Lands of Cisleithania might be interesting points for further research. A register of names, places and a well-designed appendix with photographs of pupils, school reports, annual reports and maps of Austrian Silesia underline the great impression of the book.

**James Kelly, Henning Laugerud and
Salvador Ryan (eds.): *Northern European
Reformations: Transnational Perspectives***

London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020. 420 pp.
ISBN 978-3-030-54457-7

Reviewed by Andrea Trenta

Comparative in its approach and international in outlook, this volume aims to provide the English academic readership with state-of-the-art research on the Reformation in Scandinavia and the British Isles. This impressive collection of essays is the outcome of two workshops hosted by Durham University in the UK and University of Bergen in Norway. The editors, James E. Kelly (*English Convents in Catholic Europe, c.1600–1800*. Cambridge University Press, 2020), Henning Laugerud (*Reformasjon uten folk. Det katolske Norge i før- og etterreformatorisk*. Kunst og Kultur, 2018) and Salvador Ryan (*Remembering the Reformation: Martin Luther and Catholic Theology*. Fortress Press, 2017), having previously cooperated on other editorial projects, embarked together with fifteen authors upon an ambitious academic effort to jointly analyse the complex Reformation processes (i.e., Lutheran, Catholic, and Calvinist) taking place from the early fifteenth to the late eighteenth century in the territories of the English-Irish and Danish-Norwegian monarchies.

The volume opens by the editors' introduction, is divided into five sections, and closes with Carlos Eire's epilogue (*Reformations: The Early Modern World, 1450–1700*. Yale University Press, 2016). The large number of essays, despite their collocation in the book structure, touch on the same six over-arching themes: the interconnection between Northern and Continental Europe, Northern Europe as a zone of circulation of people and ideas, adaptation as a critical element in the spreading and acceptance of religious beliefs, the role of language and the question of identity, and ultimately the political-religious interplay and dynamics. In the introduction, apart from presenting the volume structure and content, the editors describe the artefacts showcased in the University Museum of Bergen to underlie the deep cultural and religious pan-Northern pre-Reformation connections, and to announce how new light will be cast on their development during and after the Lutheran Reformation by the essays of the contributors.

The first section of the volume, entitled “Slow Reformations,” begins with the contribution of Peter Marshall on the Reformation in the Orkney Islands. Marshall (*The Beginnings of English Protestantism*. Cambridge University Press, 2002), a native of the Northern archipelago, describes the slow implementation of the Reform ideas between 1560 and c.1700, highlighting the role of the Scottish clergy in the political, religious and linguistic takeover of those islands, which until 1468 belonged to the Norwegian-Danish crown. Jack P. Cunningham focuses on the slow demise of Catholicism and the cautious introduction of the Lutheran Reformation in Iceland, a phenomenon defined in Icelandic as *sidaskipti* (change of fashion). The Danish crown approach was deliberately light, in terms of theology, due to the fierce opposition of the last Catholic bishop Jón Arason. Henrik von Achen closes this section with a valuable contribution describing the radicalisation of the Reformation in Norway and its iconoclastic effects in Bergen in the 1570s. Von Achen’s insightful thesis is that a new generation of theologians resorted to radical Calvinist doctrine and methods to fight the persistence of the old ways, prompted by the popular resistance to religious change and Catholic activism after the Council of Trent.

The second section, “Migration, Exile, and Interconnections,” is similarly composed of three essays. The first one, written by Morten Fink-Jensen (*Den danske reformation*. Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 2020), deals with the links between Denmark, England, and Scotland at the beginning of the Reformation. Focusing on the biographies of several minor reformers and scholars (Johannes Machabeus, Miles Coverdale), Fink-Jensen stresses the role played by the universities and their students in spreading Reformation ideas in Northern Europe. Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, an expert in comparative history (*Catholic Europe, 1592–1648: Centre and Peripheries*. Oxford University Press, 2015), analyses the impact of religious migration and exile on the Reformations in Northern Europe. While certainly less structural than the case of Bohemia or France, the influence of specific groups (students, clergy members) significantly altered the religious landscape of Northern Europe. James January Mc-Cann compares the outcome of the Catholic Counter-Reformation efforts in Norway and Wales. Mc-Cann, an expert in Welsh & Celtic Studies, emphasises the role of seminaries and clerical hierarchy in the eventual success and failure of these efforts.

The third section, “Zones of Circulation: Transfer of Ideas and People,” manifests numerous similarities to the second. The article by Charlotte Mettuen (*Science and Theology in the Reformation: Studies in Theological Interpretation and Astronomical Observation in Sixteenth-Century Germany*. T and T Clark, 2008), dealing with the Orkney Islands, analyses the hypothesis of

direct transmission of Reformation ideas between the archipelago and Bergen. This is proven false by the author by means of an analysis of various primary (edited) and secondary sources. Despite being the shortest essay in the volume (only eight pages), apart from its importance, Methuen's contribution also integrates the previous article by Marshall. John McCafferty (*The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland: Bishop Bramhall and the Laudian Reforms, 1633–1641*. Cambridge University Press, 2009), concludes this section with a valuable article on the dissolution of the Franciscan Observant monasteries in Denmark, Norway, Ireland, England, Wales and Scotland. Given the lack of Europe-wide and regional-wide studies on Early Modern monastic dissolution and dispersal, McCafferty's article is a pioneering study of its kind.

The fourth section, entitled "Appropriations and Adaptations," focuses on cultural memory appropriation practices, including material culture adaptation. Laura Katrine Skinnebach deals in her essay with the survival and alteration of Danish and British Medieval prayer books. This comparative approach reveals a significant difference between the two Reformation processes: while British readers were keen to comply with royal directives, Danish readers were compelled to alter their prayer books for theological reasons. Susan Royal analyses the fate of an important English saint after the Reformation, the martyr St. Edmund (d. 869), and compares it with that of the Norwegian saint Olaf. By analysing the historical works of Protestant authors, Royal demonstrates how, although he was purified by omitting his pre-Reformation characteristics (i.e., miracles), Edmund's legacy was preserved far better than that of St. Olaf, mainly due to his intimacy to the English crown. Raymond Gillespie (*Reading Ireland: Print, Reading, and Social Change in Early Modern Ireland*. Manchester University Press, 2005) concludes this section by focusing on the role played by the press and printed book in the spreading of Reformations in Ireland and Norway. Gyllespie's essay, despite his comparative approach, makes a more substantial point in assessing the impact of orality in the advancement of the various Reformations in Ireland.

The fifth and last section, "Northern European Reformations over the Longue Durée," opens with an insightful analysis into the cultural world of Norwegian clergymen in the eighteenth century. In her essay, Gina Dahl (*Book Collections of Clerics in Norway, 1650–1750*. Brill, 2010) demonstrates that in the context of religious conformity, the Norwegian clergy was allowed to read religious texts forbidden or inaccessible to other social groups. Henning Laugerud and John Ødemark focus on the concept of superstition in Denmark-Norway and its evolution since the Reformation. Intended initially to undermine the Catholic faith and its ritual practices, the word later identified

the remnants of the old religion, paving the way for the emergence of another derogative concept, that of folkloristic religion, in the age of the Enlightenment. After McCafferty's essay, Alec Ryrie closes the last section with the second jewel of the volume. In another pioneering text, Ryrie (*Unbelievers: An Emotional History of Doubt*. Harvard University Press, 2019) attempts to solve a question rarely raised when discussing Early Modern Protestantism, the lack of deliberate and prolonged missionary efforts when compared with the Catholic Church. The tentative answer of the author is that a combination of factors, namely a lack of structures, institutions, financial and human capital, theological issues, as well as the colonial policies of the Protestant powers caused this missionary problem.

The authoritative conclusion to this series of essays, written by Carlos Eire, reminds the reader that, in a historical field often crowded with concepts (confessionalisation, social disciplining, confession building, Christianisation), the most crucial task of the historian is to observe and analyse the processes that gradually altered the religious map of Europe.

Given the novelty of its approach and the valuable insights it provides the reader, *Northern European Reformations* could be considered a successful example of the comparative Reformation history. Apart from a couple of contributions (January Mc-Cann, Gillespie), where the language barrier of Scandinavian languages impeded the English-speaking historians from corroborating their analysis with Scandinavian primary and secondary sources, the majority of the essays significantly benefited from the adoption of a comparative approach. Overall, the majority of the primary sources employed by the authors are editions (with a few exceptions). The abundance of secondary sources could also be helpful for those at the beginning of their academic careers or interested in starting new research paths. For scholars who are experts on these topics, the paucity of manuscript sources in the volume makes it less valuable. Even in this case, however, the novelty of the essays' approaches compensates for the lack of breakthrough archival research. The only significant drawback of the volume is the overall omission of the Swedish kingdom and the complex Vasa dynasty religious policy, despite being an integral part of the Northern Reformations.

In conclusion, this volume is highly recommended for all academic readership, with, however, a caveat. For young students or scholars unfamiliar with complex Northern European historiography, the advice is to additionally read the volumes published by the single authors (often the outcome of their doctoral studies).

Miloslav Szabó: *Kráska a zvrhlík: rasa a rod v literatúre 19. a 20. storočia*¹

Bratislava: N Press s.r.o., 2022. 175 pp.
ISBN 978-80-8230-057-7

Reviewed by Jana Turanská

Miloslav Szabó is a well-established Slovak historian and Germanist, who has been researching antisemitism and Catholicism throughout his professional career, focusing mainly on cultural history. He consequently has an extensive background that allows him in his new book to research the phenomenon of various gender and race based stereotypes through a literary analysis.

In the book, he approaches the phenomenon of racism from a different angle than it is usual in the social sciences and humanities. He uses the optics of culture, looking at images of “the other” with a focus on the emotions that these images evoke in people’s mind in their everyday life. The everyday life of people is characterized to a great extent by the construction of gender roles, especially the polar opposites (active vs. passive, spiritual vs. material, etc.) which also play a key role in racism. Male and female stereotypes are constantly present in racism. Szabo talks about established discriminatory ideas: foreigners/strangers as sexual predators and seductive oriental women, analysing the gender and race aspects of these ideas. When and where these pictures appear is not a coincidence but it is closely connected with the (twisted) logic of racism (p. 18).

Szabó focuses his research on Central Europe from the end of the nineteenth century up until the mid-twentieth century. His focus is predominantly on the German speaking centre and its reflections on the Slovak and Czech periphery (or vice versa). Szabó analyses in his book literary works which were written during this time period and offers the reader a detailed analysis of the racial stereotypes present in these literary works. As he states, he is not aiming for a complete list of the works which contain racial stereotypes, but is instead focusing on the major works that had a dominant influence over the geographical space he has chosen to explore (p. 19).

¹ [Beauty and the Pervert: Race and Gender in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Literature].

The selected authors of the analysed literary works are representatives of official German, Slovak, Czech and Swiss literature. Szabó highlights the links between the individual literary works for the reader.

In the first part of the book entitled “Beautiful Foreign Woman” (Pekná cudzinka), he explores the works of Svetozár Hurban Vajanský, Ludmila Podjavorinská, Gustav Mayerink, Ján Hrušovský and Martin Rázus, all of them with the main focus on the topic of antisemitism and generally Jewish related topics. In the literary work of Jozef Sekera, the author analyses the figure of oriental women, this time a gypsy/Roma woman, and finishes the section with an analysis of the work of the contemporary Swiss writer Lukas Bärfuss.

In the second part “Predator” (Predátor), Szabó looks closer at racism and lynching in the USA and connects it with the literary works analysed in the previous section. In the second chapter, Szabó explores the figure of the Jew Süß, introduced to literature by Wilhelm Hauff, in literature and film. This section continues with an analysis of the literary works and life of Thomas Mann and the topic of homosexuality. He concludes the section with an analysis of the trope of “the parasite” in works by Arthur Dinter and František Švantner.

He begins his literary analysis by focusing on the idea of orientalism – the exotic east. In the first part of the book, he chooses the figure of the seductive Eastern oriental woman and the racial stereotypes that were connected in literature with this figure. The concept of the Orient contains within in a certain tension between the East and the West and is loaded with negative ideas connected with the east, originally applied to Turks as a synonym for Muslims and later replaced by Arabs, despotic figures with an assumed endless sexual appetite (p. 19).

The oriental figure of woman transfers in nineteenth and twentieth century literature into the figure of the beautiful Jewess, also representing a mysterious *fame fatale*. This figure stands in sharp contrast with the idea of the Christian mother with an assigned reproductive role, always scarifying herself. Jewish woman was therefore viewed as a threat, which was also reflected in the writings of Slovak nationalists.

The second part of the book is dedicated to the male character – the perverted Jew and the stereotypes connected with male sexual predators. Szabó demonstrates in his analysis that this is not a purely antisemitic stereotype. This idea is the focus of the chapter “From Black to Jewish Thug” where the stereotype of the potential sexual or physical danger of racially non-white men (especially for a white women) is analysed. The depiction of the racial “other” as a parasite and one who carries diseases is further explored using the Bärfuss novella *Hundred Days* or in Thomas Mann’s *Death in Venice*.

Szabó manages to explore extensively in the book gender and antisemitic motifs (and the connections between them), also adding an exploration of the sexuality and the “other” as a parasite or carrier of diseases. It is especially appreciated that Szabo is putting the historical picture of racism into the context of today’s events in the “Introduction” and “Conclusion”, searching for its historical roots (immigrants harassing Western women) in the literature of the nineteenth and twentieth century and the cultural consciousness of Central Europe, where they have been, as we discover in the book, present for centuries.

The “Conclusion” not only offers a summary of the findings regarding the emotions connected with racial prejudices, but also continues with an exploration of the emotion of disgust and hate connecting all the analysed literary works.

The author made use of archival research and added historical book reviews and references to period newspapers into the text. Despite, however, the “Introduction” and “Conclusion”, which wraps up the individual studies into a more coherent context, a more detailed methodology on the selection of the particular authors and works analysed would serve as a considerable enrichment of this book.