

CHARLES UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Institute of Communication Studies and Journalism

Dissertation thesis

2024

Lydie Kárníková

CHARLES UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Institute of Communication Studies and Journalism

Lydie Kárníková

**Discourse(s) on Communism in post-socialist
Czech Republic: Memory, Heritage and Media**

Dissertation thesis

Prague 2024

Author: **Mgr. Lydie Kárníková**

Supervisor: **Doc. PhDr. Irena Reifová, Ph.D.**

Opponents: **M.A. Veronika Pehe, Ph.D., Prof. Sabina Mihelj**

Year of Defense: **2024**

Reference

KÁRNÍKOVÁ, Lydie. Discourse(s) on Communism in post-socialist Czech Republic: Memory, Heritage and Media. Prague, 2024. 188 p. Ph.D. Dissertation. Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Communication Studies and Journalism. Department of Media Studies. Supervisor Doc. PhDr. Irena Reifová, Ph.D.

Preface

This thesis is an original work. The study on socialist street names in Ostrava was published in the Czech language as “Socialistická uliční jména optikou post-socialismu: Případ (ne)přejmenování ostravských ulic a jeho tematizace v českém tisku po roce 1989“ (Socialist Street Names through the Lens of Post-socialism: (non)Renaming of the Streets in Ostrava and its Coverage in the Czech Press after 1989), in Dějiny-Teorie-Kritika (History-Theory-Critique), 2/2022, DOI: 10.14712/24645370.2962. Parts of the analysis, literature review and discussion developed for this study are integrated in the dissertation thesis. The specific segments are cited.

In Prague, September 17, 2024

Lydie Kárníková

Abstract

This dissertation thesis examines the process of constructing collective memory of the socialist past in the Czech Republic during the post-socialist period, approaching it as a part of a broader effort to reconstruct national and political identities in Eastern Europe post-1989. It focuses on the ways Czech mainstream media have represented issues related to the process of “reconciliation with the socialist past” and, through an interdisciplinary perspective, examines how they have drawn on, (re)produced, and sustained a narrative that became dominant in the early years of post-socialist development. Despite being periodically contested and the ideological landscape shifting in the last decade, the narrative has retained a powerful position in the Czech public sphere; referring to it as the “dominant discourse on communism”, the thesis pairs it with the strategies of members of the Czech liberal-conservative elite who became influential mnemonic agents, seeking to enforce a particular understanding of the socialist period. The thesis situates these efforts in the context of the regional and geopolitical reshufflings that have shaped the politics of memory and heritage of socialism in the post-socialist space.

The thesis investigates two specific instances of the reconciliation process: 1) the codification of memory through the establishment of the Czech national memory institute by law, and 2) the efforts to reappropriate the symbolic landscape through street renaming in the city of Ostrava. The two cases provide insight into two specific dimensions of the dominant discourse on communism – the crime-centred perspective on the communist regimes and the discontinuity in approaching the socialist past as a historical period – which are interdependent and justify the condemnation of the socialist past *en bloc*. Drawing on the theory of media as significant memory agents, the thesis exposes the prevailing tendencies and key emphases in the construction of these two instances in Czech mainstream media and discusses the power dynamics between the different perspectives, with a focus on the role of the dominant discourse on communism. It examines the influence of the specific political and power configurations on debates about the past, the ideological inclinations of the Czech journalistic community post-1989, the reductive focus on individualized stories of repression, and the exteriorization of socialist heritage as the heritage of the ideological and historical Other. The thesis concludes that the liberal-conservative mnemonic actors sought to enforce the dominant discourse on communism by emphasizing the inherently ideological nature of the communist regime, while obscuring the ideological character of their own efforts in constructing the memory of the socialist past.

Abstrakt

Disertační práce zkoumá proces vytváření kolektivní paměti socialismu v České republice v období post-socialismu a zasazuje jej do kontextu rekonstrukce politických a národních identit ve Východní Evropě po roce 1989. Zaměřuje se na zobrazování tématu „vyrovnávání se se socialistickou minulostí“ v českých mainstreamových médiích a z interdisciplinární perspektivy posuzuje, jakými způsoby tyto reprezentace využívaly, reprodukovaly nebo dále posilovaly historický narativ, který převládl v raných letech postsocialistického vývoje. Narativ, který práce označuje jako „dominantní diskurz o komunismu“, si udržuje silnou pozici v českém veřejném prostoru navzdory tomu, že je jeho hegemonie setrvale předmětem mnoha debat, i navzdory výrazným posunům, ke kterým v poslední dekádě došlo v české ideologické krajině. Práce narativ páruje se strategiemi aktérů české liberálně-konzervativní elity, kteří usilovali o prosazení konkrétního porozumění období socialismu a stali se významnými paměťovými aktéry. Jejich snahy práce zasazuje do kontextu regionálních i geopolitických rekonfigurací, které ovlivnily podobu politiky paměti a zacházení s dědictvím socialismu v post-socialistickém prostoru.

Práce se zaměřuje na dvě situace v procesu „vyrovnání se s minulostí“: 1) kodifikace paměti prostřednictvím prosazení zákona zakládajícího český ústav paměti národa a 2) snahy o nápravu historie v symbolické krajině prostřednictvím odstranění socialistických názvů ulic v Ostravě. Analýzy těchto situací jsou zároveň prozkoumáním dvou dimenzí dominantního diskurzu o komunismu: první je výlučné zaměření na zločiny minulého režimu, druhou pak diskontinuitní historický přístup k období socialismu. Obě dimenze jsou vzájemně provázané a v součinnosti ospravedlňují odsouzení socialistické minulosti *en bloc*. Práce vychází z teorie médií jako významných paměťových aktérů a popisuje převládající tendence a akcenty v konstrukci analyzovaných událostí v českých mainstreamových médiích. Zaměřuje se na mocenskou dynamiku mezi různými perspektivami, které se ve zkoumaných případech objevují, a na roli dominantního diskurzu o komunismu při projednávání i zobrazování tématu. Pojednává o vlivu konkrétních mocenských konfigurací na debatu, o ideologické inklinaci českých porevolučních novinářů, o reduktivním zaměření na příběhy represe a o exteriorizaci socialistického dědictví jako dědictví ideologického a historického Druhého. Práce dochází k závěru, že liberálně-konzervativní paměťoví aktéři prosazovali dominantní diskurz o komunismu cestou důrazu na veskrze ideologickou povahu bývalého režimu, zatímco zastírali ideologickou povahu vlastních snah v oblasti konstrukce paměti socialismu.

Key Words

Post-socialism; collective memory; memory politics; socialist heritage; media memory work; national memory institute; place names

Klíčová slova

Post-socialismus; kolektivní paměť; politika paměti; socialistické dědictví; paměťová práce médií; ústav paměti národa; místní jména

Length of the work: 406 197 characters with spaces, exclusive of abstract, references and appendices

List of Abbreviations

ČSSD	Česká strana sociálně demokratická	Czechoslovak Social Democracy
KDU-ČSL	Křesťanská demokratická unie – Česká strana lidová	Christian Democratic Party
KSČ	Komunistická strana Československa	Communist Party of Czechoslovakia
KSČM	Komunistická strana Čech a Moravy	Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia
IPN	Instytut Pamięci Narodowej	Institute of National Memory
ODA	Občanská demokratická alliance	Civic Democratic Alliance
ODS	Občanská demokratická strana	Civic Democratic Party
StB	Státní bezpečnost	State Security Service (Czechoslovakia)
ÚDV	Úřad dokumentace a vyšetřování zločinů komunismu	Office of Documentation and Investigation of the Crimes of Communism
ÚPN	Ústav paměti národa	Institute of National Memory
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
ÚSTR	Ústav pro studium totalitních režimů	Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes

Declaration

1. I hereby declare that I have compiled this dissertation using the listed literature and resources only.
2. I hereby declare that my dissertation has not been used to gain any other academic title.
3. I fully agree to my work being used for study and scientific purposes.

In Prague on September 17, 2024

Lydie Kárníková

Acknowledgement

As is often the case with PhD work, the project has stretched over several long years, during which the initial idea evolved significantly. Throughout this process, I had the honor of consulting my thoughts and early drafts with many inspiring individuals. My special thanks go to Irina Diana Mădroane from the University of Timișoara, who helped me find structure for my thesis and navigate the complex terrain of critical discourse studies. I am grateful to Nico Carpentier, who offered invaluable advice on handling the multidisciplinary nature of the thesis, particularly in balancing the “micro” and “macro” elements in a discourse-oriented study. I also wish to thank Adam Konopka, my dear colleague from the University of Gdańsk who shares my interest in the discourse-historical approach and introduced me to the fascinating field of critical toponymy. I am sincerely grateful to Veronika Pehe, whose invaluable feedback during the first round of defense inspired significant revisions that ultimately strengthened the thesis’s core argument. Last but not least, I am deeply indebted to my supervisor, Irena Reifová, who guided me through the final three years of my PhD. I could consult her at practically any time regarding the paradigmatic and epistemological challenges of studying post-socialist memory, as well as drafts, ideas, doubts, or trajectory. Irena provided invaluable advice with a warm and supportive approach, offering her time, attention, and patience throughout.

My thanks also go to the late Filip Láb, former head of the doctoral programme at the Institute of Communication studies and Journalism, who made doing a PhD sound enjoyable and flexible back in 2018 when I was considering applying, at that time on maternity leave with our first son. It saddens me he is not around anymore to witness the conclusion of this adventure he helped initiate. I dedicate this work to professor Jiří Kraus, who sparked my deep interest in the critical study of language use in society, and held unwavering trust in me, encouraging me in setting on this path in the first place.

Last package of thanks goes to my friends and family. My thanks go to Sofie for staying patient with me even when our paths diverged because I was so seldom available; to Alice and Adam, who provided me with a safe and calm space to develop my work in the summer of 2023; to Kristýna who encouraged me during the long stretches of finalizing the thesis. I am grateful for the numerous desperate discussions with my fellow PhD students at the Institute. Most of all, I am indebted to my family. Completing a PhD is a challenging journey especially for those who have to spend time with the doctoral candidate on a daily basis. I thank my parents, who

have been always helpful when things went complicated. I thank my sister and brother for listening to me complaining and whining all those years. I owe to my husband Milan who has been supportive across the long, long years, providing me with love, compassion and, above all, patience. My final and most heartfelt thanks go to my sons who had to endure my PhD-related ups and downs in their earliest years, and who, despite being so young, showed incredible compassion towards me even though I couldn't be as present or as engaged as I wanted to be.

Dedicated to professor Jiří Kraus, in memoriam.

Table of Contents

PROLOGUE.....	4
GOAL, OUTLINE AND CONTRIBUTION OF THE PROJECT	8
EPISTEMOLOGICAL AND PERSONAL DISCLAIMER	12
TERMINOLOGICAL NOTES	13
1. INTRODUCTION.....	15
1.1. Socialist past through the global lens of the 1990s	15
1.2. Tackling socialism post-1989 in the Czech context.....	18
2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	23
2.1. Making the social through language: Epistemic turn in social sciences	23
2.2. Critical discourse studies and its principles	26
2.2.1. The critical paradigm.....	26
2.2.2. Structured by and structuring the social: The dialectic nature of discourse.....	27
2.2.3. Assuming and presupposing: Interconnected texts and discourses.....	29
2.3. Ideology as background assumptions: Creating common sense through power and hegemony	31
2.3.1. Ideology at work: Naturalisation, universalisation and hegemony in discourse	33
2.4. Signifying work of media	35
2.4.1. Social production of news	35
2.4.2. Media as memory workers	37
2.5. A turn to memory: Key concepts in memory studies.....	41
2.5.1. Memory socially embedded: The trouble with the “collective”	43
2.5.2. Cultural and communicative memory	44
2.6. Memory, heritage and their role in the identity-making process	46
2.6.1. Heritage in the cultural landscapes: Values and domination in the public space	48
3. LAYERS OF CONTEXT.....	51
3.1. Eastern Europe post-1989: Geopolitical bearings for identity reformulations.....	51
3.1.1. So long, East; Enter the West	52
3.2. Central Eastern Europe: Regional tendencies of memory construction	54
3.2.1. Memory as a political agenda: From transitional justice to a mnemonic “grammar”	57
3.2.2. Codifying the past: The regional accent on crimes and decommunization.....	58
3.3. Czech Republic: Intellectual, political and legal approaches to the socialist past.....	60
3.3.1. Divisive projection of the social: Elite interpretations in the (re)constructed Czech public sphere.....	64

3.3.2. The right-wing consensus in the Czech mainstream media	67
3.3.3. Key ingredients of the dominant discourse on communism	69
4. DOING AWAY WITH THE SOCIALIST PAST: TWO INSTANCES	74
4.1. Codifying a crime-centred perspective on the socialist past:	
Establishment of the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes	74
4.1.1. History on political demand.....	76
4.1.2. Following a regional “grammar”: Socialist period as a preconceived object of study.....	78
4.1.3. Negotiating the law on the national memory institute amidst domestic political conflict	80
4.2. Tackling the socialist heritage in the post-socialist cultural landscape:	
(Dis)continuity and street renaming in Ostrava.....	82
4.2.1. Undoing the socialist past in the post-socialist cultural landscape	83
4.2.2. Place names through the lens of critical toponymy	84
4.2.3. Toponymy after 1989: Re-writing history in post-socialist cities.....	86
5. RESEARCH DESIGN	90
5.1. Doing critical discourse analysis: Main principles.....	90
5.2. Research goal and research questions	92
5.3. Data selection and analytical procedure.....	93
5.3.1. Passing of the Law on the establishment of a Czech national memory institute	95
5.3.2. Socialist street names in post-socialist Ostrava	100
6. EMPIRICAL STUDIES	106
6.1. Passing the law on the national memory institute	106
6.1.1. The discourse on the national memory institute(s): Analysing the broader context	106
6.1.2. Deconstructing the conflict: Micro textual analysis of the discourse on passing of the law on the Institute	110
6.2. Socialist toponymy in Ostrava	122
6.2.1. Some specifics of the Ostrava County	123
6.2.2. District Stalingrad and the Soviet soldiers in Ostrava-South.....	123
6.2.3. Analysis: Three perspectives on the issue of street renaming.....	126
7. DISCUSSION	135
7.1. Establishing the national memory institute:	
The anticommunist synergy between the political and journalistic fields.....	137
7.1.1. Weak position of the Left	139
7.1.2. Transparency, victims and agents: Main accents of the discourse on the passing of the law on the Institute.....	141
7.1.3. Mirroring the controversial regional “grammar”	143
7.2. Urban toponymy post-1989: Socialist spaces through a post-socialist lens	144
7.2.1. Rationale for (non)renaming: Bottom-up resistance to top-down appeals.....	145
7.2.2. Tendencies in media reporting: Power dynamic between the perspectives and the actors	146
7.2.3. Thematising socialist toponymy: Two aspects of discontinuity	148
7.3. Czech mainstream media as memory agents post-1989.....	151

CONCLUSION.....	154
SUMMARY	157
REFERENCES.....	159
LIST OF APPENDICES	189

“As with bad breath, ideology is always what the other person has.”

– Terry Eagleton

Prologue

In March 2022, a new director of the Czech Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes, an institution modelled after the memory institutes in Slovakia, Poland and Germany, has been elected. Sixth in the office since the institute’s opening in 2008, the task this time was to steer the orientation of the institute’s inquiry of the 20th century’s totalitarian regimes – the Nazi and the communist – back to the original intention, as codified in the 2007 Act on the grounds of which the institution was founded. Much in line with the unceasing contestations that have been accompanying the operation of the Institute since its inception (or, as a matter of fact, since the inception of the very idea to establish a state-sanctioned institution aimed at producing a national memory), the new director came out strongly against the work performed at the institute under the previous administration. Distancing explicitly from the “revisionist” line followed in the past mandate, the new management has dismissed scholars and employees and interrupted ongoing projects. According to them, it was necessary to get back to the institute’s initial mission, as codified in the letter of the law.

The event was an escalation of an ongoing conflict between irreconcilable views on how the country’s socialist past, i.e. the decades of the monopole rule of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia in the years 1948–1989, should be approached and studied: either as a history of totalitarian oppression imposed from the outside, or as a complex and structured historical period embedded in the country’s historical development. The establishment of the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes (Institute hereafter) represented a peak of the efforts in the Czech memory politics post-1989 that has come to be openly politically divisive (Kovanic, 2017). During the negotiations, the political underpinning of the very idea of “reconciliation” with the past regime became truly evident and confessed. With the election of the new director Ladislav Kudrna in 2022, the right-wing alliance that have pushed for the law on the Institute since the early 2000s took the reins again. The former regime was to be

studied through the prism of its ill deeds, based on the free access to the files of the communist secret police; although by then, the topic had lost much of its earlier passion among broader audiences.

The very same spring in 2022, another event of much greater and much more devastating consequences reinvigorated the politics of identity in the countries of the former Eastern bloc. The Russian full-scale invasion to Ukraine, as a culmination of the aggression amassing in the Eastern part of Ukraine since 2014, revived the sentiments over the binary categories of the “East” and the “West”, the notorious dichotomy that has been shaping cultures, societies and politics in the whole region since the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s. With the outbreak of the war, the need to claim or reaffirm allegiance to the West became urgent anew in the post-socialist countries, generating a new cycle of debates over where the border between the West and the East in Europe actually lay. The social and political reactions to the new geopolitical situation have differed in each country, bearing evidence of the divergent historical experiences with and sentiments towards Russia and the Soviet Union. Differences have been apparent not only across the states, but also on the intra-national level, as various issues were brought to light under the new circumstances. The event has reflected strongly in the realm of memory politics, reigniting emotions surrounding the process of reconciliation with the socialist past and refuelling the politics of decommunization (Betlii, 2022; Kudriavtseva, 2020).

The executive and symbolic acts of rejecting Russia’s military attack on Ukraine included a revival of appeals for cutting any ties with the Eastern empire, often through historical comparisons between the Russian and the Soviet imperial and expansive politics. Various actors, including grassroots communities and political entities, opened the question of a revision of the symbolic remnants of the socialist period within the post-socialist landscapes. The demand for erasing the cultural references to the Eastern empire came back to the fore, calling to remove monuments or street names that referred to Russia and/or Soviet Union, its culture or geography; appeals that have been codified earlier on in some countries, such as Poland or Ukraine (Marples, 2018; Skibinski, 2023). The resting imprints of the socialist past in the public space were a trigger for these new outcries in the Czech Republic as well, bringing to the fore the experience of subjugation of Czechoslovakia under the Soviet hegemony. Under this new light, these imprints appeared as “natural” adepts for removal. Immediately after the invasion, the mayor of the Czech capital Prague demonstratively renamed two places around the location of the Russian Embassy, following an example of

Latvia or Lithuania (ČTK, 2022). This reaction has not been universally acknowledged in the domestic community: Oppositional voices have countered that history should not be done away with through emotional manifestations of “burning bridges” with the past, or rewriting it, pointing also at the actual political instrumentalization of these acts.

Over the thirty years of the post-socialist period, the issue of approaching the decades of the monopole rule of the Czechoslovak Communist Party stretching from 1948 to 1989 have proven to be an extraordinarily controversial component of the new national identity, much like in the other countries of the former Eastern bloc. The historical period of state socialism was assessed from the critical angle of the new regimes that were formed across the countries of the Eastern Bloc in the aftermath of the Bloc’s dissolution, although the trajectories were as diverse as the political development in the individual countries; among these, for example, the difference between the Czech and the Slovak approach was striking (Nedelsky, 2004). The Czech approach to the socialist past since 1993, the year of the establishment of the independent Czech Republic, has pursued the pattern that was adopted in countries such as Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukraine or the Baltic states (Mörner, 2020): A new historical truth was to be found, through a process that was, to a significant degree, a counter-reaction to the vehemence with which the past had been rewritten during the monopole rule of the communist parties. In the individual countries, there was a consensus among the newly emerged political elites that aimed for a transformation towards a “Western style” political and economic liberalism. This involved a decisive break from the socialist past, a stance adopted by post-socialist political elites, particularly in Central Eastern countries, in the early 2000s as the dismal consequences of rapid transformation emerged. The stance started to take shape in the form of a new historical narrative enforced across various social institutions and gradually solidified in legislation.

Particularly in the early years of the post-1989 development, the narrative enjoyed a great deal of support from the local stakeholders that gained symbolic power during the transformation, such as the journalists; by extension, broader community was supportive as well. The radical historical cut from the socialist past seemed like a convenient way of making the story clear, delineating the good from the bad and externalizing the causes, legitimizing the new regime along the way. Although this perspective clearly originated from the liberal-conservative elites and never achieved broader political consensus, the dichotomous historical understanding has been presented as a commonsense interpretive framework and used to make sense of the Czechoslovak socialist period. Very soon, socialist past turned into a

convenient political instrument. “Playing the past card” has become an effective argumentative strategy applied in various areas, in different situations throughout the three decades of post-socialism. Embraced by the liberal political elites across the post-socialist countries, researchers have reflected on it through concepts of “zombie socialism” or “spectre of socialism”, referring to the projects of keeping socialist past alive on purpose and the instrumental deploying of selected historical narratives (Chelcea & Druță, 2016; Gibas & Pauknerová, 2021). The approach to the socialist past was paradoxical – while efforts were made to destruct its memory, the most convenient narrative for achieving this turned out to be the memory of destruction (Reifová, 2018).

Adopting a critical discursive approach and building on the vast literature dedicated to the realities of post-socialism, the presented thesis focuses on the issues related to the process of a “reconciliation with the socialist past”¹ in the Czech Republic and seeks to shed light on the hegemony of one specific historical narrative. It refers to the narrative as to the “dominant discourse on communism”, the adjective “communist” hinting at the colloquial uses and abuses of the past period in everyday talk, politics-related or not, often employed as a simplifying argumentative weapon or an outright insult. The thesis brings to the fore the social meanings deployed via this hegemonic discourse on communism and the symbolic power and action of specific social groups and group constellations that allowed the discourse to prevail. Despite ongoing challenges from academics and the Czech parliamentary Left, who have contested the hegemonic efforts of the narrative's proponents – particularly since the establishment of the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes – the question of whether and how Czech society should reconcile with its socialist past remains as controversial as ever.

Power over discourse operates through power within the structure, with both elements reinforcing each other in a mutually reinforcing way. The thesis combines an analysis of the discursive processes of naturalization and universalization of social meanings around the topic of reconciliation with the socialist past with a detailed discussion of the power configurations in the local social structure in the period of post-socialism, considering also the regional and

¹ The terms “reconciliation” and “coming to terms” with the socialist past are used in the thesis, while remaining sensitive to their contested nature. Especially the definite form (implying a fixed endpoint of the process) found in different documents or declarations within Czech memory politics renders it a biased concept, as it presupposes that a reconciliation is attainable, and with that prospect, legitimizes the focus on ill deeds of the past regime and the historically discontinuous perspective (M. Kopeček, 2007, 2008b). For better fluency, however, from here on, the terms will be used without quotation marks.

the geopolitical level. Looking at two specific cases that display different dynamic of the debate over reconciliation, it helps to elucidate how one perspective has become consolidated as a commonsensical, dominant understanding – not only by being *structurally prevailing*, through its origin in the political agenda of social actors with accumulated capitals and supported by powerful international discourses, but also by being *discursively persuasive*, to this day. It focuses on the media as one of the key actors in shaping social knowledge, and one of the major agents of memory: the media are endowed with power to set the public agenda, but also provide influential repositories of meanings for how the past can be understood. Lastly, it examines the role of mainstream media in maintaining the status quo within the Czech post-socialist context. The local post-1989 journalistic discourse largely supported the new political trajectory, including the rejection of the socialist past. This support, along with the consolidation and enduring argumentative power of this ideological stance, can be attributed to specific developments in the Czech journalistic field.

Goal, outline and contribution of the project

Combining a micro focus on texts and discourses with a macro focus on the social, political and historical context, the thesis consists of qualitative analyses of two specific moments of the process of reconciliation with the socialist past in the Czech Republic, hinted at in the Prologue: 1) The establishment of the Czech national memory institute, as a step characteristic of the mnemonic pattern adopted in the countries of Central Eastern Europe, and 2) negotiations over socialist street names in the post-socialist symbolic landscape, exemplified on a specific “place of memory”, a 1950s housing district in Ostrava, the Czech Republic’s third largest city. Through a focus on the power dynamic between the different views of the issue of reconciliation represented in the mainstream media reporting, the thesis seeks to elucidate whether and how the dominant discourse on communism, as a historically empowered narrative, operated as an ideological background, i.e. a value-coherent system of social meanings, and to what extent and how did the media representations of the issues under study draw on this background. Mindful of the political, cultural and historical bearings on the discursive processes, the thesis acknowledges the nature of the “dominant discourse on communism” as both a product and a founding stone of the Czech collective memory of the socialist past, which comprises also the approaches to the cultural heritage of the past regime.

This thesis contributes to the extensive literature on memory construction of the socialist past in the Czech and broader regional context by analyzing two local negotiations over enforcing

the dominant discourse on communism and examining the power dynamics involved. It builds on the theory of media as memory workers and elucidates the historical disposition of local mainstream media post-1989 to reproduce the ideological discourse established by powerful liberal-conservative actors. It points to how the dominant discourse has become a commonsensical meta-narrative, feeding interpretation on both macro and micro levels of discourse. It points to the “othering of socialism” as a prevalent mode of ideological construction. By doing so, it elaborates on the metaphor of ideology as bad breath, highlighting that the Czech liberal-conservative elite actors have systematically obfuscated their ideological positioning in dismissing communism *en bloc*. Eventually, it also demonstrates how the hegemonic discourse holds a looser grip in less exposed and less prominent areas, such as peripheral urbanscapes, where other views can prevail.

The two cases under scrutiny are different in scope and character, but both count as major top-down, state-driven acts of memory politics. They also display a different dynamic of deliberation, as they take place in different “tiers” of the social and the political: While the study on the law on the national memory institute investigates the media reporting on institutionalized political processes and institutionalized actors, i.e. on negotiations in the Lower Chamber of the Czech Parliament, the study on street names change in the city of Ostrava explores continuous media reporting on a deliberation taking place at a local municipal level. However distinct, both cases represent a unique opportunity to demonstrate the ways in which the dominant discourse on communism serves as an interpretive background, an actual *ideological* discourse, while its ideological workings remain obscured, refuted, unacknowledged or inadvertent. Concurrently, each study provides with an exploration of a distinct dimension of the dominant discourse on communism: While the first study unveils its emphasis on crimes of the communist regimes, the second study points to the stress on historical discontinuity, allowing to exteriorize the socialist past and anything associated with it. The dimensions are intertwined and cross-dependent: The socialist past is all the more worth exteriorization if the past regimes were criminal.

In both cases, the events are reconstructed by looking at the reporting in mainstream media discourse, considering media an arena for public deliberation but also a significant social agent with major effects on the processes of making of social meanings and construction of memory. Drawing on the literature that explores the links between memory and journalism, the thesis examines the mechanisms through which one interpretation of the past has become a commonsense reference point, dominating among the *discourses* on communism and

sidelining other views and experiences. It discusses the role of media in constructing the power dynamics between the different perspectives and particularly in sustaining or contesting the hegemony of the dominant discourse on communism, mindful to the historically predominant tendency of local mainstream media to support the agenda of the liberal-conservative political elites.

This problematizing perspective stems from a critical discursive approach which the thesis adheres to. Blending the epistemologies of critical discourse studies, cultural studies, cultural memory studies, media studies, cultural geography and critical toponymy, the thesis aims to contribute to the growing body of research on memory in the European post-socialist context with a comprehensive qualitative study of the Czech process of reconciliation with the socialist past. Paradigmatically, it is situated in the critical constructivist realm and fuses the focus on language and discourse with an analysis of the structural conditions that render discourses powerful and persuasive.

The thesis is structured in the following way. Chapter 1 introduces two key influences shaping the process of memory construction in the studied context – the international, which places the process within the broader historical circumstances of the collapse of the socialist bloc in the early 1990s, and the domestic, which examines the power reconfiguration of the Czech public arena following the break-up of Czechoslovakia and the emergence of the independent Czech Republic in 1993. Chapter 2 presents a conceptual framework that proceeds from the theories of meaning-making and language in the social context to concrete discursive projects: constructions of identity through memory politics and heritage planning. It spans the critical constructivist paradigm, theories of discourse, representation and signification, the role of media and journalism in construction and perpetuation of social meanings including memory work, and ultimately the core concepts from the field of memory studies and cultural geography, such as memory in its social dimension, identity and heritage. It provides backing for the qualitative discourse analysis and a necessary conceptual background for developing the thesis' arguments.

Following the conceptual clarification, Chapter 3 explores further the historical and geographical context under scrutiny and discusses the tendencies in the area memory and identity construction in the post-socialist (Central) Eastern Europe. It reviews the processes through which a discontinuous, crime-centred perspective on the socialist past has been established and officialized in the studied region, owing to both extra-discursive and

discursive factors. Chapter 4 is dedicated to a review of the developments in the two specific areas where the dominant historical interpretations are shaping further political action: Establishment of a national memory institute and tackling memory of the socialist period in the symbolic landscape through place renaming.

Chapter 5 presents the research design developed for the two studies. It presents the methodology and research questions and elucidates the process of data selection and the composition of the final data corpora. It describes the analytical procedure, including the toolkit used in both studies. Chapter 6 is dedicated to the actual analyses and presents the results of the two empirical studies. In both cases, two levels of discourses were considered for the analysis of meaning-making. Both studies operate with two tiers of data, the macro and the micro discourses. The macro discourse represents a broader dimension in which the micro discourse is embedded in each case.

The thesis is wrapped up by a discussion and conclusion in Chapter 7 and Chapter 8 respectively. In this final stretch, the analytical results are revisited and interpreted against the theoretical and conceptual framing. The main points and findings for the two studies are overviewed, consulting both the level of discourse and the level of structure. For the study on the national memory institute, it discusses the weak position of the Czech political Left, as a major opponent of the law proposal, in the given period. It also points to the strong position of the motif of transparency and the reductive focus on the victims and the perpetrators of the former regime, as major actors of the crime-centred perspective on the socialist past. For the study of the socialist street names in Ostrava, it discusses the limits of the state-driven appeals to change socialist toponymy at the local level. Further, it points to the tendency to interpret the socialist past as alien to the “normal” historical trajectory, strengthened by a projection of socialist heritage as a heritage of the ideological and historical Other, and the related “aesthetic-cultural aversion” to communism. The thesis concludes that the post-socialist political right-wing elite, as the major powerful actor grouping that succeeded in consolidating and enforcing the dominant discourse on communism, contrasted itself with the previous political regime *en bloc* by obfuscating the political and ideological nature of their appeals in the area of memory politics.

Epistemological and personal disclaimer

This is a qualitative study. As an analyst-insider, I am endowed with a curse and a blessing: A blessing in that I navigate the language and cultural context confidently, a curse because I cannot avoid my own social and cultural embeddedness in the social context I study. This situatedness was, as is usually the case, what drove me to this research idea in the first place, and it was my personal experience with the dominant discourse on communism that made me focus on its hegemony. As a child growing up in an anticommunist home in the 1990s, my understanding of “communism” had been shaped entirely by the memory of my parents and their understanding of the social and the political. The word “communism” was to designate the gloomy, contemptible and still potentially dangerous undercurrent of the Czech (or, perhaps, any) society. As I grew older, it gradually became clear there was more to the story, either by watching my social-democratic grandfather’s reluctant approach to engaging in the condemnations or from realizing the increasingly dubious fervour for denouncing anything communist, socialist or leftist – whether real or projected. Acquiring secondary significant others outside my social bubble in my young adulthood proved painfully eye-opening, and frustrating. The confrontation with the diverse social backgrounds of the kids I hanged out with left me baffled. Their moralities or the moralities of their families just so did not fit into the master-narrative of the good and bad dichotomy between the humpback socialist past and the elegant democratic present. They were negligent, sometimes conformist, cynical, definitely not outspokenly anticommunist, or not enough. Spending time outside my primary social bubble, the anticommunist consensus stopped making sense, as it appeared that it actually has not existed.

There was another life experience that drove me to the topic and that made me realize “a post-socialist burden”. It was the buzzing mix of excitement and shame I experienced when I started travelling, as an Eastern European citizen, to the developed West; a frustrating cultural experience masterfully captured by Slavenka Drakulić (2013) or Agata Pyzik (2014). The “nonstandard” historical development of my home country turned me into a disoriented and devouring traveller. What we knew seemed so second-class and out of touch; Eastern Europe with its socialist legacy was really the clumsy, less developed and stigmatized (br)other (Buchowski, 2006).

The deconstruction of the dominant discourse on communism that will be presented in the following text is partially an exploration of the effects of anticommunism I have observed on

myself, as a recipient of this powerful narrative, and as someone whose story, given my relatively privileged social background, should have aligned with it. I see this as a valuable opportunity to explore the dangers of framing the Czechoslovak socialist past in such exclusionary terms and to highlight how this has fuelled the increasingly dramatic social divisions that Czech society currently faces, deeming so many stories unworthy.

Terminological notes

Lastly, a few terminological notes must be made. The first concerns the concept of “discourse”, which is used primarily in two understandings that should be distinguished at the outset. First, it refers to the hegemonic narrative on the socialist past, referred to as the “dominant discourse on communism”. In this sense, it is deliberately rendered singular, as other discourses on communism are mitigated in the cases under scrutiny in this thesis. Second, it is used to refer to language practice specific to particular social fields, as in “journalist discourse”, where it is used in a singular sense as well. “Media discourse” and “journalist discourse” are used interchangeably, and both refer to the complexes of texts distributed through media or by media. Lastly, “discourse” is used to refer to the thematic clusters of the analysed texts and denotes, for example, the discourse on the national memory institute and the discourse on socialist street names, i.e. the collection of texts coherent based on a topic. In this usage, it is used as a countable noun.

The second note concerns one of the central terms of the thesis, that of collective memory, used as a synonym for “cultural memory”. The thesis follows Jan Assmann’s (2008) understanding of cultural memory as memory that is purposefully constructed, formalized and stabilized by “institutions of learning, transmission, and interpretation” (p. 111). For better fluency of reading, however, the use of adjectives in referring to memory is intentionally avoided, and where necessary, the term “collective” is used.

The last terminological clarification concerns the way the period of the monopoly rule of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in the years 1948–1989 is referred to, as well as the period that followed the communist rule’s demise, i.e. “the post-1989” period. The differences between using socialism or communism (or post-socialism and post-communism respectively) are both terminological and epistemic, referring to the cultural and political dimensions of the two: Where communism was the political project for the future, socialism was the lived experience (Bailyn et al., 2018). Following this and other similar reflections

building on the fact that the state establishments were officially socialist and that communism was never reached as a state (Verdery, 1999), the period of the monopoly rule of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia will be referred to as “socialist past”, “state socialism”, including the adjective “socialist” to denote the elements originating from this period (as in “socialist street names”). In the same spirit, the period after the regime change will be referred to as “post-socialism”. In contrast to this, the stories of the socialist past, i.e. the ideational dimension of the regime, particularly the dominant interpretation under focus in this thesis, will be referred to as the discourse on *communism*. The choice is driven by the observation that “communism” is how the period is colloquially referred to; importantly, “communist” becomes a simplified label that involves important negative connotations. Additionally, the adjective “communist” will also be used to refer to anything related to the political party, parties or regimes.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Socialist past through the global lens of the 1990s

The end of the bipolar world following the collapse of the Soviet Union represents one of the major reconfigurations in global modern history. In the wake of it, the countries east of the Iron curtain were up against enormous social and political projects, especially with regards to tackling the fallen communist regimes that were dismantled with the curtain. Despite the uniqueness of the historical and geographical situation, taking a wider look allows to see parallels with how problematic pasts have been handled in different territories and different historical contexts, such as Latin American states or post-apartheid South Africa (Achugar, 2009; Costa Pinto & Morlino, 2013; Kenkmann & Zimmer, 2005; Marszałek-Kawa et al., 2017; Verdoolaege, 2009). The fundamental re-establishment of social and political institutions and mechanisms that was on the immediate agenda in the transforming countries was necessarily connected to momentary politics and to the visions of the newly emerged elites, usually comprising of groups suppressed by the overthrown regimes (Huyse, 1995; Weiffen, 2012). Besides that, however, there were important “exogenous effects” shaping the local debates and actions, such as policies and practices that originated outside the home communities, either in other countries or with international organizations (Welsh, 2015, p. 168).

The post-socialist transformations, labelled also as the “third wave of democratization” (Huntington, 1993), did, however, had its peculiarities. Taking place in the times of the “end of history” marked by major shifts in political thinking, the transition to liberal democracy undertaken by most post-socialist countries seemed even more legitimate, as liberal democracy was the ideology historically validated after the collapse of the Soviet socialist empire and its “defeat” in the Cold War. The triumph of liberalism, as an antithesis of socialism, also meant that the neoliberal doctrine, as applied in the West, was implemented in economics as well as in politics as having “no alternative” (M. Kopeček & Wciślik, 2015, p. 12; Ther, 2022, p. 24). The transformations were framed by the newly established elites as a “return to Europe”, meaning the West of the continent, epitomized and urged by the accession of the countries to the international Western structures such as the NATO and the European Union. Indeed, the “vigorous embracing of the political and economic orthodoxy of Western Europe” was almost universal across the former Eastern bloc (Young & Light, 2001, p. 947)

and symbolized a 180-degree spatial reorientation. In the spirit of the Cold War division, fading away, but actually still guiding the political and cultural imaginations, this meant also a fundamental ideological turn which included a wholesale abandoning and cutting of any ties with the East, including the socialist past. In this sense, as the anthropologist Katherine Verdery points out, the re-orientation was rather “post-Cold War” than “post-socialist” (Hann et al., 2002, p. 17). The dichotomies and strategies inherited from the Cold War seem to be one of the most salient continuities that affect the realities and mentalities to this day, on a worldwide scale.

As a radical regime change, the transformations of the late 1980s and early 1990s across Eastern Europe included a lot of discursive work: The task for the new actors emerging from the transformational political take-over was to reformulate the collective identities and introduce or reinvigorate the principles of legitimizing power. Indeed, as soon as the Eastern Bloc started breaking apart, restoring an “authentic history” was one of the earliest projects of the newly emerging democratic regimes. The vigorous reaction to the collapse of the Eastern bloc was, as a matter of fact, a reverse response to the vast ideological indoctrination that became symptomatic for the authoritarian rule of the communist parties, supervised, although with varied intensity in the individual countries, by the USSR. After 1945, the post-war socialist project was shaped (again) as a fundamental restructuring of the existing order and a new human condition based in the vision of nothing less than a new world, face to face the disastrous war experiences and the inconceivable breaching of humanist values the war entailed – a perspective that belongs inherently to the post-war atmosphere of a “year zero”. In the countries of the socialist bloc, the communist Marxist-Leninist doctrine was used as the binding interpretation framework in all public areas of social life, which became vastly politicized. From education to culture, gender roles or urban planning, the goal was to invent a new mindset that would be also based in a shared, *revised* historical consciousness (Macura, 2008; Nečasová, 2018). The ideological apparatus of the authoritarian regimes in the former Eastern Bloc tackled the pre-socialist past in a manner akin to myth-making, rewriting the past so it fitted the newly installed revolutionary project. In this narration, socialism was treated as historically inevitable (Young & Light, 2001).

The making of post-socialist national identities in the individual countries after the dissolution of the Eastern Bloc followed a strikingly analogous trajectory: the enormity of the usurpatory communist apparatus deemed it necessary to convey an equally enormous apparatus to compensate the wrongdoings (Apor et al., 2017). The actors newly endowed with

power in the post-socialist countries, comprising very often of groups repressed by the previous regimes that soon became highly influential in the reconstructed public spheres, sought to manifest a distance from the socialist past. Their reaction to the totalizing aspects of the rule of the communist ideology indeed took the form of a “noisy rejection of the socialist past” (Young & Light, 2001, p. 947), in line with the Eastern European “commonsense” rejection of Marxism (Kennedy & Galtz, 1996). In the light of the historical triumph of liberal democracy and capitalism as actual driving principles of many socio-political transformations in modern history, the past communist regimes were depicted as totalitarian, an evolutionary dead-end that had isolated the countries in the socialist bloc from broader social and economic change that took place elsewhere. The newly created states sidelined the period of state socialism as a historical interruption and sought reconnection with their pre-socialist pasts and identities (Rees, 2010).

Detaching from the experience with the communist regime was, therefore, a central ethos for nation-building in many of the post-socialist countries. The redemption from the troubling historical legacy was to be achieved by abandoning *all* principles associated with the fallen, discredited regimes (Hann et al., 2002; Jelača et al., 2017; Makovicky, 2016). According to the sociologist and historian Pawol Śpiewak, the socialist period was generally contextualized in public discourse as a time and space of “oppression, devastation and tyranny” (Śpiewak, 2005). As the political geographer Mariusz Czepczyński elaborates further, this also presupposed denying and rejecting of “any positive developments and achievements” of the socialist period, where the only facts to be remembered by the post-socialist communities were those that were to be avoided, incorporated as warnings from future mistakes (Czepczyński, 2008, p. 138). Across different levels of the emerging mnemonic apparatuses in the post-socialist countries, and propelled by concrete influential actors and their projects, a totalitarian frame started to be promoted, fuelled by stories of oppression. It was constructed particularly on the conceptualization of a distance between the state and the society, stressing the innocence of the nations through images of failure, shortcomings and mistreatment (Pullmann 2008, Apor et al 2017).

The fundamental premise of this thesis concerns the political conditionality of these processes. The resolution to cut all the ties and condemn the socialist past *en bloc* through a focus on its ill deeds “so that the history would not repeat” should be understood as a political strategy: a strategy that has been complemented by a particular discursive strategy and pursued in the individual countries by actors with specific (and often similar) biographies.

The pursuit of liberal democracy was a truly distinctive political project in this historical context. As the triumphal political ideology at the end of the bipolar world, it became an undifferentiated positive, indeed a humanizing objective, losing its ideological underpinnings along the way. Indeed, it was rendered an ideological “point zero”, to which the societies would inevitably return (Fukuyama, 2006; Hughes, 2012). The positive project of building something *new*, however, presupposed a political definition of the *old*; specifically, a negation of the past. As the historian George Mink argues, when recounting the strategies in the individual post-socialist countries, “putting paid to the communist regime in the name of healthier democratic functioning often amounted to a kind of normative presupposition” (Mink, 2013, p. 158).

1.2. Tackling socialism post-1989 in the Czech context

The strategies of doing away with communism were followed by concrete political actors or groups of actors in the individual countries, who represented members of the newly established or reconstructed elite. The actors were also specifically politically situated: The shifts in power in many of the post-socialist countries, notably in Central Eastern Europe, brought electoral victories of mostly right-wing elites who were largely committed to decommunization (Mink, 2013, p. 156). The emerging power configurations bore traces of this specific political orientation and resulted mostly from the actual processes of regime change in the individual countries. In Czechoslovakia, the type of the political transition has been described as a “replacement” owing to the “exceptionally weak position” of the communist leadership in the capital Prague (Kraus, 1995, cited in Nedelsky, 2004, p. 72). The previous regime became so weak in the short span after the revolution in November 1989 that “the outcome of the negotiations reflected almost wholly the preferences of the opposition” (ibid.). In the earliest years of the transformation, the Czechoslovak opposition amounted to the Civic Forum, a heterogeneous group consisting of a variety of actors, mostly intellectuals from dissent and members of the “grey zone”. By 1992, the group split into couple fractions that came to compete over issues, including the issue of reconciliation with the previous regime, on both actual and symbolic levels (Suk, 2014).

After the break-up of Czechoslovakia in 1992, the new Czech government started to pursue the decommunization goal through legal measures, a phenomenon that soon evolved into a regional pattern. The attempts to legally institutionalize history were witnessed across all the

post-socialist space with politicians using legislation to reshape the past to fortify their position (Krawatzek & Soroka, 2022, p. 208). In the case of Central Eastern Europe, the pattern soon developed into a distinctive regional “grammar”, a notion used to refer to a “language-like system” of rules for operation but also of representations in the area of reconciliation (Lefranc, 2007, cited in Mink, 2013, p. 157). In the Czech case, the demonstrative rejection of the socialist past was strengthened, advanced and stabilized through several laws, the first emerging in the very first year of the independent Czech Republic, passed by the new Parliament in 1993 (Přibáň, 2008). Although the notion of “decommunization” was not used officially to refer to the activities, unlike in Poland, Ukraine or the Baltic states (Törnquist-Plewa, 2020), the content of the legislation and its ideological underpinning was clear: it discerned a strategy of “legalist legitimation” (Přibáň, 2001, cited in Mayer, 2009, p. 54).

What drove the politicization of the construction of collective memory of the socialist past was the concrete biographies of some members of the emerging Czech elite. Following the break-up of Czechoslovakia in 1992, governance was taken over in the Czech Republic by a coalition of right-wing forces, namely two specific powerful fractions. On one hand, the technocrats, a group comprising mostly of internally exiled economists and finance experts who worked in the socialist State Bank in the 1980s or in one of the economic institutes of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and who soon occupied the top positions in the emerging political and economic fields. On the other hand, the dissidents, a heterogeneous group that formed in the late 1970s around the oppositional movement Charter 77 and included mostly philosophers, historians, jurists, social scientists, and journalists – many of whom were associated with the philosophical and law faculties of Charles University in Prague – later assumed roles as ministers, deputies, or attachés in the new President’s office (Eyal, 2003). However distinct, even opposite in some facets, both groups shared an antipolitical perspective and a desire for clean, technicist (and legalist) solutions. Both also resolutely refused any compromises with the former regime, if not socialism and/or Marxism.

This “managerial-intellectual alliance” (Dujisin, 2010) formed the backbone of the new Czech dominant class that emerged in the early 1990s and from this grouping mostly, the mnemonic actors – i.e. political forces interested in a specific interpretation of the past (Bernhard & Kubik, 2014) – started to be recruited. The Czech process of coming to terms with the socialist past after 1993 was, therefore, in the hands of a specific coalition of intellectuals (dissidents) and technocrats (managers) who united in their anticommunist views and who

could, and indeed sought to and succeeded in co-opting “all those who form public opinion”, notably the “intelligentsia, academics, social scientists, artists, and most importantly, the media” (Szelényi and E. Townsley, 1997, cited in Dujisin, 2010, p. 482). This was made possible by the power they derived from the accumulation of their capitals: technocrats well versed in the fundamental (and hegemonic) economic works of that time, dissidents granted the moral authority of resistance fighters against the communist oppression and providing valuable symbolic content, such as the vision for a civil society (Eyal, 2003). Both groups were principally in line with the Western standards and narratives, and both enjoyed support – tangible or moral – from the powerful actors abroad, such as donors providing support “to those who have been recognized as the heroes of the 1989 ‘revolutions’” (Dujisin, 2010, p. 486; see also Možný, 2009, p. 58). And both groups were deeply devoted to anticommunism: the dissidents drawing on their own traumatic experiences with the repressive forces of the former regime, the technocrats building on their fundamental ideological disagreement with Marxism.

The powerful alliance voiced its visions in the reconstructed public sphere while the emerging media endorsed them almost unisono. The post-transformational public sphere was emblematic of a striking ideological unity and explicit support for the new political elites who designed the process of transformation in the name of liberal values. Indeed, it was the liberal, or indeed neoliberal, principles that drove the reconstruction of the local media system. The tendency of the Czech post-socialist media to favour liberal and conservative values was striking, yet self-confessed – and as many remark, observed to this day (Jirák & Köpplová, 2012; Pehe, 2023). The unwavering support to the right-wing perspective embraced by the new government was coming from the emerging local media professionals, who lacked a professional confidence and rigour and so failed in maintaining political neutrality in the turbulent years of the transformation. In many cases, they occupy influential positions in the Czech media to this day, retaining their perspective and contributing to the still-apparent skewing of the local ideological landscape (Volek & Urbániková, 2017).

This ideological skewing was clearly most apparent in the issues of coming to terms with the socialist past. The abolition of censorship allowed formerly repressed groups to finally be heard in the newly reconstructed free public sphere, but soon the debate narrowed to only these voices. The media were casually accommodating the views of the dissidents and other intellectuals who shared their testimonies of the former regime’s persecution and of its malevolent practices (Reifová, 2018). It was particularly in the Czech print media, restored or

refurbished to meet the new economic and political standards, and in various think tanks where these groups, as specific intellectual resources aligned to the political Right, enjoyed “overwhelmingly privileged access” (Dujisin, 2010, 476–477), and so succeeded in creating a quasi-monopoly of “anticommunist interpretive frames” in the Czech public sphere (ibid.). The media thus became the major carrier and amplifier of the common-sense appeal of anticommunism, which eventually resulted in “dominant and persistent framing of contested political issues under the logic of a collective memory of socialism” (ibid.). Owing to the high social, political and historical credit that the coalition of dissident and technocrat intelligentsia enjoyed, this discourse eventually consolidated, as the historian Michal Kopeček argued, into a “political rhetoric and mainstream historical legitimization strategy of the nascent democratic order” that had “an impact on the public cultural-historical discourse” (2008c, p. 79).

Indeed, the early 1990s saw a ubiquitous consensus of denouncing the socialist past in the Czech public sphere, a tendency explored by the historian Stanislav Holubec in his analysis (2015) of the Czech print media weeklies of that time. Active in the media sphere were the “guardians of the post-November anticommunist consensus,” sensitive to any breaching of this interpretation, and denouncing any work or utterance diverging from it (p. 198–199, 125–136). Towards the end of the 1990s, the anticommunist charge was still prevalent in approaching the socialist past, reflected as “nihilist revisionism” by the philosopher Václav Bělohradský (cited in Rupnik, 2002). After a brief interlude during the governmental crisis in the late 1990s, the liberal conservatives regrouped to tighten their control over the memory agenda, considering the “reconciliation process” unfinished. This development also occurred in other Central European countries, driven by the need to “become truly European” before joining the European Union (Mark, 2010).

The efforts of liberal conservative elites to impose a particular historical understanding as a commonsensical framework were the subject of heated political debates. After the conservatives regained power following several terms of social democratic government (1998–2006), advocates of the dominant discourse on communism renewed their efforts to enforce it, with the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes being the most prominent and controversial result of their actions. Drawing a thick line between the past and the present, they framed their power struggle as a return to “normalcy”. The parliamentary Left and the academics (both domestic and international) have repeatedly challenged the “consensus” over the memory of the socialist past and pointed to the sheer politicization. The critique further

solidified in the wake of a diversification of voices in the Czech public sphere in the late 2000s, as the upsurge of the Internet but also the 2008 crisis gave rise to the first local leftist online dailies, making the new left milieus more vocal (Pehe, 2018, Slačálek, 2022).

The struggle for retaining hegemony led to adoption of various new strategies since the 2000s, including fervent campaigns backed by concrete political figures, civil society groups or artists and public intellectuals, uncompromisingly leveraging the totalitarian anticommunist frame (Slačálek, 2009; Hrubeš and Navrátil, 2017; Navrátil and Hrubeš, 2018). It also became a *raison d'être* of various non-governmental organizations, often personally intertwined with the influential figures of the post-transformational elite (Pehe, 2018). The lack of broader political consensus, however, has contributed to the prolonging of the controversy, deepening the conflict and eventually to a deadlock situation between the proponents and opponents of the discontinuous discourse on communism centred around the regime's crimes.

As apparent in the ongoing struggles over the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes and the controversies of the socialist heritage in the Czech public space (as discussions over the removal of statues or public art show, see for example Khazalová and Svobodová, 2021; Gibas and Pauknerová, 2021; ČTK, 2024), two dimensions of the dominant discourse on communism seem to be still very effective: on one hand, clinging on the repressive nature of the former regime and on the other, the discontinuous “othering” interpretation of the period of state socialism as a whole. By revisiting two particular instances of the process of reconciliation with the socialist past, the thesis offers a detailed exploration of these two dimensions.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

As the thesis focuses on both discursive mechanisms and structural determinants, the conceptual framework flows from the abstract theories of signification and social knowledge production to the way they operate in the concrete studied context of memory construction. It starts with the theories of meaning-making which are attended to by revisiting some of the seminal post-structuralist, critical discursive or cultural studies works. It focuses on the mechanisms through which meanings are solidified into interpretive frameworks, i.e. ideologies, and explains the critical underpinning and problem-orientedness of the critical discourse approach which the thesis adopts. It includes a treatise on the “semiotic” work of the media, against the background of their social role in (re)distribution and (co)construction of social meanings, also with respect to the area of memory and identity construction. It continues with a detailed explication of the concepts seminal to memory studies and cultural geography, namely memory, identity and heritage, including their actual application in the historical situation under question (tackling the socialist past in the Central Eastern European region, notably the Czech Republic) and highlighting their intertwinement. As such, the conceptual framework provides a theoretical and epistemological background for studying the mechanisms of establishing and sustaining hegemony of anticommunism in the particular historical and geographical context. It elucidates the mechanisms of how powerful social groups succeed (or not) in consolidating their particular meanings of various phenomena – the memory of the socialist past in the case of this thesis – and render them universal.

2.1. Making the social through language: Epistemic turn in social sciences

In the second half of the 20th century, several epistemological turns took place that skewed attention to the constructive potential of language in society. Among these, the linguistic turn gaining prominence in the social sciences and humanities since the late 1960s ushered a perspective on language as a socially constitutive human practice with far-reaching consequences for the social. The view was adopted in the work of post-structuralists, who aimed especially at extracting language from the technicist linguistic treatment; text was to be understood as a “translinguistic apparatus” (Kristeva, cited in Barthes, 1981, p. 36). According to Roland Barthes, seeing language this way meant restoring its “active energy”, while also implying the complexity and plurality that belies communication, directing focus on its dialectic and productive nature. A text, according to Barthes, never “stops working” –

well outside the scope of the agency of the producer or the receiver, the text does not cease to work (Barthes, 1981, p. 37). It creates new connections, produces more meanings, becoming available for re-interpretation, ultimately mirroring the complex social structure in which it was produced. This approach ushered a perspective on texts as social phenomena that do more than just reflect the social: They co-produce it, and construct reality by being enmeshed with it (ibid.)

The postulate that society is constructed within communication and language, and that it is linked to power relations in a society, has lied at the heart of two disciplines that met in their interest in the dialectic relationship between the language practices and the social structure – discourse studies and cultural studies. Both disciplines converge in their critical angle on how society is produced through everyday talk and writing, and especially on how this process reflects the distribution of power in the social fabric. Both are concerned with language and its role in constructing social meanings, and both focus on the strategies of representation. The point of common interest is the process of meaning-making, which also stands in the centre of this thesis.

Apart from being a self-standing research angle and a specific disciplinary approach, the cultural studies perspective has affected the epistemologies of numerous social science disciplines, particularly after the cultural turn, which intertwined with the linguistic turn. It shifted emphasis on how culture has been constitutive of social relations and identities, pointing to the historical unprecedented role of culture in constituting social relations and identities in modern and particularly late modern societies (K. Nash, 2001). Notably for this thesis, it has formed a productive stream in media studies, where it has been applied to balance the domination of political-economy approach and its materialist emphasis (Phelan, 2018). Under this new perspective, the role of ideas in constituting the social order started to be foregrounded, “ideas” denoting the abstract system of thought that comprises a culture. Culture, as theorized after the cultural turn, is constituted through meanings. Following the seminal theorization by Stuart Hall, culture means first and foremost shared meanings, produced and exchanged by the means of language, as a number one medium. Language comprises a representational system that discloses the culture of the given society or group, by disclosing the shared values, i.e. the meanings the given community has created and wrapped itself around (Hall, 1997, p. 2). What things mean, as the theory follows, is always dependent on social actors. Social meaning, and social knowledge as an aggregate of meanings, is

always anchored in the context of the social actors: Meanings are ascribed to things purposefully, phenomena are represented under a perspective.

Since the shift of focus to semiosis, i.e. to the practices of signification via an increased focus on language and textual practice, the main aim has been to explore the situatedness of the signifying processes in the social context. The attention has turned to how they are related dialectically to the social structure – i.e. with the actors who are defined through intentions and desires, with social relations, and with how the whole system is interrelated in the “practical engagement of embodied and socially organized persons with the material world” (Fairclough et al., 2003, p. 4). Pairing the signifying practices with concrete actors or events and locating them within their engagement means looking at the power mesh as at an actual “bedding” of the social structure (ibid.).

The cultural studies perspective, winning over the traditional Marxist political economy in many areas from the late 1970s on, has figured among the main influences on the rise of discourse studies, and notably the critical discourse studies (CDS hereafter), formerly and more habitually known as critical discourse analysis. The work of Stuart Hall is said to have been of exceptional importance to the rise of the theoretical position of Norman Fairclough, the leading protagonist of the CDS (Phelan, 2017, p. 287). One of his seminal postulates is that language is an irreducible part of social life, dialectically interconnected with other elements of social life; Any social analysis and research then must provide an account of language (Fairclough, 2003, p. 2).

The focus on power as exerted through language and discourse is one of the main points of intersection between cultural studies and discourse studies. As the linguists Chris Barker and Dariusz Galasiński point out in their synthesizing treatise on these disciplinary intersections, it is less about questions of whether a representation is adequate, but rather of who is in charge of the process of representation, what is the “politics of representation” (Barker & Galasiński, 2001, p. 19). Both fields are interested in who owns these processes or who tries to win over in them, in other words, who strives for power. Before looking into these questions, a deeper look must be taken at the paradigmatic position that also explains the critical approach to investigating discourses.

2.2. Critical discourse studies and its principles

2.2.1. The critical paradigm

Unlike the other strands in the broad field of discourse studies (see Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002 for an overview), the critical discourse studies research programme (CDS) is distinctive for its explicit grounding in the “political and ethical grid of values of critical theory”, adopting its socio-philosophical orientation (Wodak et al., 2009, p. 2). As a feature connecting all practitioners of the CDS across the different branches, the commitment to social critique means a focus on the unequal distribution of power as an inherent feature of the late modern societies. For the theorization of power, the CDS protagonists have been most influenced by Gramsci’s understanding of hegemony as achieved not through coercion, but through creation of consensus (Fairclough et al., 2011). The theory of symbolic power of Pierre Bourdieu (2003) has also been influential, although epistemic inconsistencies in drawing on Bourdieu’s theory have been acknowledged (Forchtner & Schneickert, 2016). Lastly, CDS has, to a limited degree – and sometimes too vaguely – drew upon the theory of power by Michel Foucault, who saw power as both productive and restrictive: Productive as it lies at the heart of how our social world is created, how it can be talked about, restrictive for it rules out alternative ways of being and talking (Foucault, 2008). The basal understanding shared by critical discourse scholars and Foucault was the linking between power, knowledge and discourse, and the focus on their capacity to construct the social, including the subjects (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002)².

The CDS, however, has been firmly rooted in the critical paradigm, which has reflected in its explicit focus on the power asymmetries typical of modern societies and the actual abuses of power stemming from the unequal distribution. The focus of most work carried out under the CDS rubric has been the texts produced by elites and powerful institutions, such as politicians and other officials, or institutionalized channels of social communication, such as news media. It has aimed at “revealing the kinds of discourses used to maintain power and sustain existing social relations” (Fairclough et al., 2011, p. 12). By examining and challenging the discursive and language practices through which inequalities are sustained in societies, CDS practitioners have also strived for achieving emancipation of the marginalized groups. The

² Although influential across the different branches of the CDS, Foucault’s theory of discourse was elaborated in detail and rigorously applied only in the so-called Foucauldian critical discourse analysis and Dispositive analysis (Maier & Jäger, 2009).

reparatory role of CDS and its leanings towards deliberative democracy distinguishes the approach from other strands of discourse studies, but also from the protagonists of Discourse theory in political science, i.e. Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe and the Essex school of Discourse and Ideology (see Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002; Laclau & Mouffe, 2014).

Critique is notably integrated in the principles of the Discourse-Historical approach (DHA hereafter), developed by a team of Vienna-based linguists led by Ruth Wodak and Martin Reisigl in the late 1990s. This thesis draws on the framework developed under the DHA heading, on both paradigmatic and methodological levels, yet wary of the epistemological inconsistencies in the DHA's conception of the critical paradigm (Forchtner, 2011; Forchtner & Tominc, 2012). The individual principles, topics and methods will be attended to in the following text of this chapter and further in Chapter 5. The DHA approach has been explicitly socially critical, given the authors' thematic focus on discrimination and the mission to "relate the discriminatory linguistic features to the social, political and historical contexts of the analysed 'discursive events'" (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p. 31). The critical angle has consisted in the accent on "showing how *some* have the power over the discourses—and therefore the ideas, values, and priorities—that define our societies" (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, emphasis added). From this critical angle also springs the explicit orientation on social problems, i.e. a problem-oriented approach.

2.2.2. Structured by and structuring the social: The dialectic nature of discourse

Following up on the work of critical linguists (Fowler, 1991; Hodge & Kress, 1993), the protagonists of CDS have set out to in the early 1990s to focus on how the social structure shapes language and how language shapes society. According to the most cited definition, discourse is "language in social use" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). Studying it means to study the interaction between text and context, i.e. between discourse (or language) and social structure (or culture). CDS assumes a dialectical relationship between discursive acts and the determinants of the social situations in which the acts are embedded: The situational, institutional and social context shapes and affects discourses, and, in turn, discourses influence social and political reality. In other words, discourse constitutes social practice but is at the same time constituted by it. Critical discourse research is seeking to make this reciprocal relationship transparent (Wodak et al., 2009, pp. 8–9).

The structures of late modern societies are, however, quite complex. To understand the power structure, the complex relations should be revealed through a model of “multicausal, mutual influences between different groups of persons within a specific society” (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, pp. 31–32). One should especially look at the distribution of power between different social groups determined by the political historical conditions of the given space and time. According to Wodak et al., this dialectical relationship also means that discourses have “macro-functions” that concern their capacity to affect the status quo: As they contribute significantly to genesis, production and construction of particular social conditions, they are both capable of reproduction, restoration or legitimation, as well as relativisation, transformation or eventual dismantling of status quo (Wodak et al., 2009, p. 8).

The greatest challenges throughout the three decades of studying social phenomena under the CDS rubric have involved finding ways to incorporate a micro focus on language, text and discourse (i.e. the communication processes) in social science analyses, while accounting for the structural conditions in which the communication processes occur. Indeed, its natural micro-focus on linguistic phenomena has been cited as a characteristic feature of this approach compared to other discourse-oriented approaches (Carpentier, 2018). Given its linguistic roots and origin, CDS practitioners have become the main promoters of bringing the linguistic micro-focus on texts into a dialogue with other disciplines, aiming at providing methodological tools and procedures for analysing texts *against* the social context. As Norman Fairclough explained in his seminal work on the method and the paradigm, it should be the mission of CDS to start a “transdisciplinary dialogue”, in which language and discourse would be approached *within* social theory and research. To be able to discuss and criticize the language in social use, it is necessary to “develop our capacity to analyse texts as elements in social processes”, and make sure to include the broader social context of the communicative event in its scope (Fairclough, 2003, p. 7). In this sense, textual description and analysis should be interwoven with the social analysis and critique (ibid, p. 16). This also marks the last core principle of doing a CDS-informed research, i.e. an interdisciplinary approach.

The pluri-directional relations between texts and the social context, mindful of the numerous levels of each, has been theorized by many protagonists of the CDS. Apart from Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak and her colleagues at the Vienna discourse school have attended to these issues through a theory of multidimensional context, developed under the aforementioned Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). The word “history” in the name of

the approach expresses two accents: First, it refers to an attempt to integrate as much available information as possible on the historical, political and social background in which discursive events are embedded; second, it acknowledges that discourses evolve *in time*, transforming under the changing conditions (Wodak et al., 2009, p. 8). It also helps researchers to adhere with the interdisciplinary principle, which becomes essential if complex social phenomena are to be investigated (Wodak & Krzyżanowski, 2008, p. 12). The acknowledgment of different dimensions of context is related to the interdisciplinary, or rather transdisciplinary nature of the whole CDS approach (Weiss & Wodak, 2003) as the individual context levels presuppose understanding of a variety of phenomena, i.e. employing of different theories and concepts.

Working in an interdisciplinary way means integrating as much contextual information as possible, to depict the conditions under which discursive events evolve. DHA identifies itself explicitly as “a context-sensitive approach” (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009); Ruth Wodak and Martin Reisigl have been seeking to develop a framework which would enable a wide, interdisciplinary and both synchronic and diachronic approach, to be able to address the complex nature of the social phenomena under scrutiny (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, p. 31). The principle has been adopted in this thesis, seeking to “integrate as much available knowledge about the historical sources and the background of the social and political fields in which discursive ‘events’ are embedded” (ibid., p. 35).

2.2.3. Assuming and presupposing: Interconnected texts and discourses

Discourse is a polysemous word, and it is used in several meanings in the thesis. While discourse can refer to language use in general, and be therefore used as an uncountable noun, it can also be understood as a sum of values specific to a particular social area, field, or group. This second understanding presupposes that discourses are plural (Flowerdew & Richardson, 2017b, pp. 2–3). Thirdly, a discourse can be coherent based on a topic, and this coherence organizes discourses from general to more concrete, revealing how meanings are produced across this topical structure. As will be explained further, this understanding helps to navigate the data sample in this thesis, but also elucidates the process of meaning construction: It shows how the levels of corpus, from broader to concrete, are layered and embedded and cross-fertilizing the meaning construction. The concrete thematic micro discourses on the passing of the law on the Institute and on socialist toponymy in Ostrava are embedded in the macro discourses, the discourse on national memory institute(s) and the discourse on socialist toponymy respectively. These discourses are embedded in the broader discourses on

decommunization or reconciliation with the socialist past. On the broadest level, eventually, they are referring implicitly to and “consulting with” the dominant discourse on communism, as an hegemonic, codified (and hence binding) historical narrative driving the interpretations across the lower levels.

The structure of different discourse levels or dimensions is theorized also through the concept of context, a buzzword occurring in almost all approaches that have developed within the CDS programme. Given the mission of CDS to study critically the interaction between text and context, i.e. the dialectic relationship between discourse and structure (Flowerdew, 2017, p. 165), it has been essential to understand the complex network of influences on how meanings arise in texts and discourses. Paying attention to context has meant to be mindful of “the *totality of conditions* under which discourse is being produced, circulated and interpreted” (Blommaert, 2005, p. 251, emphasis added).

The sensitivity to context in CDS derives from the post-structuralist focus on intertextuality. According to the seminal conceptualization of Roland Barthes, texts do not exist independent of one another, and no text is a tabula rasa: There are always other texts present in a text. Text is a “new tissue of past citations”, full of references, codes, fragments of social languages, bringing sociality to the fore (Barthes, 1981, p. 39). Intertextuality notifies of the presence of past knowledge in the current contexts, and as such indicate the implicit layer of the “already-said”. Same applies to interdiscursivity, where the already-said occurs across the larger units, i.e. discourses.

Intertextual relations within texts (or interdiscursive in discourses) are grounded in the process of assuming and presupposing: When a proposition is assumed or presupposed, it means that the text includes a reference to another text, a “text of others”. As Norman Fairclough highlights, this “other” does not have to be a specified or identifiable text or author; rather, it is a “text” corresponding to a general opinion, to a common knowledge, what people tend to say, an accumulated textual experience, defined only very vaguely (1992, p. 283). As Fairclough argues further, incorporating presuppositions is very often a manipulative tactic, because what is presupposed is actually difficult to challenge: “Manipulative presuppositions postulate interpreting subjects with prior textual experience and assumptions, and in so doing they contribute to the *ideological* constitution of subjects” (ibid., emphasis added).

This point is essential for understanding the process that lies in the centre of attention in this thesis: How do ideas and meanings become treated as commonsensical? The process of assuming is a crucial moment in the ideological production of meaning and represents the cognitive operation through which knowledge becomes naturalized, universalized or normalized (Fairclough, 1995, pp. 12–13; Pickering, 2001). The act of assuming reveals a power play behind (promoting) texts and discourses: What is assumed refers to something that has already been said and that is *assumed* relevant; this already-said, the assumed, presupposed sum of knowledge is validated through the attention it is given, and becomes taken for granted, creating a sense of an existing social consensus over such knowledge. As Fairclough continues, “assumed meanings are of particular ideological significance – one can argue that relations of power are best served by meanings which are widely taken as given” (2003, p. 58). The sum of the assumed and presupposed, i.e. the background assumptions, then serves as an interpretive framework, a framework of *intelligibility* that is far from a neutral language phenomenon: It is how ideology is described.

2.3. Ideology as background assumptions: Creating common sense through power and hegemony

Due to the primary focus on ideas in the culturalist and poststructuralist analyses of the social, ideology might well be the most frequently declined term within these research traditions. The concept has been interpreted in a variety of ways, some of which have been, as literary theorist Terry Eagleton notes, quite incompatible (1994, p. 2). Ideology is, by no means, deeply relevant for the functioning of the social: The patterns of meaning that emerge and spread through discourses are not simply abstract constellations of ideas, but form the basis for any social action, as language, broadly speaking, is the medium of social action. Ideology is therefore, in the words of sociologist John B. Thompson, “a creative and constitutive element of our social lives” (1987, p. 523). Far from striving for an exhaustive interpretation, this section will review some of the key works and summarize the core postulates informing the understanding of the concept adhered to in the thesis. The very fundament of this understanding is aptly summarized by Terry Eagleton (2004), who compared ideology to a bad breath: you only think that others have it.

Proceeding chronologically, the understanding of ideology adopted in this thesis draws on the philosophy of language of the Marxist linguists Mikhail M. Bakhtin and Valentin N.

Vološinov formulated in the 1920s, as the earliest elaboration of a dialectical relationship between language and society. In the pursuit of analysing the process of meaning creation, the essential quality of language that needs to be acknowledged is its multi-accentuality, which is, in the view of Bakhtin and Vološinov, based in social stratification: As language is the medium that is used universally across social classes, then every ideological sign necessarily becomes *an arena* where differently orientated accents intersect. “A sign becomes the arena of the class struggle”, i.e. a struggle of closing the space of discussion and enforcing only one meaning, thereby cancelling the “dialogical nature of language” (Vološinov, 1986, p. 23).

This view has been adopted notably by sociolinguists and pragmatists. In the work of Jeff Verschueren, ideology is the moment when ideas, beliefs and opinions are discursively used to serve a concrete role in the social (2011, p. 7). Ideology, as patterns of social meanings and a social framework for intelligibility, typically balances description and prescription. According to Verschueren, it provides a *normative* view on society by providing a set of meanings about how things are, and how they should be. This normativity is akin to commonsensicality: Common sense is the shared knowledge which is persuasive, because members of the community appeal to it (ibid., 8). However, the question arises of who is in control over the descriptions and prescriptions. Meanings therefore play a crucial role in the processes of domination which, according to Verschueren, renders the study of ideology an essentially critical enterprise.

Verschueren’s take aligns with the theorization of John B. Thompson, who explicitly foregrounds the critical conceptions of ideology and stresses the role of power in constructing and sustaining shared ideas. In line with the critical conceptions, ideology, according to Thompson, is essentially linked to the process of maintaining domination, i.e. sustaining *asymmetrical* relations of power. Put shortly, ideology is meaning in the service of power; any research focusing on ideology should then consist in “a study of the *ways* in which meaning serves to establish and sustain relations of domination” (Thompson, 1987, p. 519, emphasis added). Thompson also emphasizes the difference between power and domination: While power refers to the general ability “to act in pursuit of one’s aims and interests”, domination refers to an already established configuration in which power was distributed in a systematically asymmetrical way (1987, p. 519).

The focus on power asymmetry in ideological functioning is also prevalent in the work of Stuart Hall, who was developing his theory of ideology in a dialogue with the classical

Marxist conception. He sought to expand Marx's materialist premise that "ideas arise from and reflect the material conditions and circumstances in which they are generated", a view he deemed reductionist (Hall, 1986, p. 28). In opposition to ideology as "false consciousness", Hall conceives of ideology as of *all organized forms of social thinking*, including well-elaborated, consistent systems of thought, as well as disparate social ideas, i.e. the results of everyday practical thinking and reasoning. Either as disparate social ideas, or coherent systems of thinking, these thought frames are of the same service to a society – they provide with categories and discourses through which social groups and individuals account for the reality and their experiences, and "figure out" the conditions of their social existence (1986, p. 26). In order to give account for the process of how social ideas arise, Hall's conception of ideology was based on the metaphor of a "mental framework" which various social groups use in order to render intelligible the way society works (ibid.). This said, ideology does not need, in Hall's view, a general theory: It should be rather studied through the focus on concrete processes through which ideas organize social groups in particular historical situations (p. 40).

2.3.1. Ideology at work: Naturalisation, universalisation and hegemony in discourse

Within the tradition of the CDS, ideology has been approached as the latent type of everyday beliefs, hidden in various language operations and mechanisms, such as metaphors or analogies (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 8). Ideology, as a sum of background assumptions that are taken-for-granted, serves as a basis for argumentation and production of social meanings. The dominant ideologies, then, seek to appear *neutral, natural, universal*; trying to appear "commonsense" by losing its connection to a certain perspective, hence shaking off the power connotations. It is through the process of naturalisation, universalization, but also legitimation that a set of beliefs and values can become widely accepted, where power is the key ingredient: The success of this process lies in the fact that those who disseminate these sets of beliefs are recognized and accepted by the society (Flowerdew & Richardson, 2017b, p. 3).

According to Teun Van Dijk, another founding protagonist of the CDS, ideology is defined in terms of *servicing the interests of different groups* within a community or society. It is connected to group relations, where each group works with a different set of truth criteria. Ideologies are group-dependent, because truth criteria are group dependent: Ideological

conflict may very often be not about socio-economic conditions, but about truth-criteria themselves (Van Dijk, 1998, pp. 36–42). What is truth, what counts as truth, is in the hands of those who have the power to control production of meanings and knowledge. In the case of the dominant discourse on communism under investigation in this thesis, the power is also used to create a group boundary, as an indispensable side project of the struggle for dominance: Defining an out-group of those who defy this “consensus”, who breach the truth-criteria, and consolidate the dominance based on the polarization. This was particularly evident in the broad support that the new government implementing sweeping liberal reforms in the 1990s received from the local journalists, while dissenting voices were treated with disdain and casually rejected in the public sphere (Pehe, 2023).

In the work of critical discourse analysts – and cultural theorists and poststructuralists alike –, the concepts of power and ideology are theorized to account for the issue of discursive hegemony. According to the classical definition by Antonio Gramsci, hegemony describes the process in which a ruling class persuades all other classes to accept its rule and their subordination (Gramsci 1971, cited in Richardson, 2007, p. 35). Hegemony is where the discursive space is usurped for one perspective; As a part of the social struggle for domination, hegemony accounts for the process of ideas becoming socially effective through a connection to a particular constellation of social forces. Hegemony should be treated as “a process by which a historical bloc of social forces is constructed and its ascendancy secured” (Hall, 1986, pp. 41–43). It is through hegemonic struggles that a “universal” status is given to particular discourses and representations (Fairclough, 2003, p. 7), and it is achieved through the construction of consensus: The status quo is accepted even by the dominated groups who, rather than rebelling against it, eventually assist in reproducing the dominant ideology (ibid., 218).

Stuart Hall explains that turning our attention to the processes by means of which certain events get repeatedly signified *in particular ways* is especially important in cases where “events in the world are problematic”: When developments are unexpected, when powerful social interests are at play, or when “starkly opposing or conflicting interests” are facing each other (Hall, 1997, pp. 64–65). The cases under focus in this thesis can be defined as exactly such problematic social events. In the social problem under question, that of coming to terms with the socialist past through constructing its memory, the “framework for intelligibility” rendered commonsensical has specific social origin. The dominant discourse on communism

in the Czech Republic naturalizes truth criteria of particular social groups, hence rendering the discourse ideological.

2.4. Signifying work of media

The media is one of the key spaces where social meanings are constructed and continuously reinforced, serving as a highly institutionalized domain of public communication and an influential, widely accessible source of information. Media and journalistic discourse, as professionalized arenas for constructing and circulating social meanings, have been extensively studied, particularly within the above described closely interrelated fields of discourse studies and media studies. Indeed, the concept of discourse was fundamental to the emergence of the field of media studies in the 1970s and 1980s (Phelan, 2017). The common emphasis on communication processes and their interrelation with the social context has often resulted in convergence of the research topics in these two disciplines. The early works under the rubric of Critical Discourse Analysis, following the work of critical linguists and emerging notably in the UK and Australia at the height of the neoliberal reforms in the 1980s (Fowler, 1991; Hodge & Kress, 1993), focused almost entirely on the processes of reproduction of dominant social meanings through the mainstream news media. Above all, they pointed to the role of media in sustaining the status quo through sustaining the power asymmetries between social groups (Kelsey, 2020). It was particularly the news genre that was in the prominent focus of linguistic approaches to texts (Wodak & Busch, 2004). The following section reviews the major premises of how media and/or journalist discourse is approached from a critical-discursive point of view, pointing to the key role of the media in construction of social meanings and their specific position in the social structure, including their enmeshment with the structures of power.

2.4.1. Social production of news

In the influential works published by the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies in Birmingham in the late 1970s (Hall et al., 1978, 2007), Stuart Hall and his colleagues offered a persuasive account of how news production is socially embedded. Outside investigating the role of the institutional setting (i.e. the internal factors in news organizations such as bureaucratic structure or news values-based selection process), the authors put emphasis on an aspect of news production that consists in “shaping the news for its *assumed audience*” (emphasis in original). The way reported events are organized and categorized consists mostly

in that they are “identified (i.e. named, defined, related to other events known to the audience), and assigned to a social context (i.e. placed within a frame of meanings familiar to the audience)” (Hall et al., 1978, p. 54). Journalists, therefore, necessarily interpret recent events against “certain cultural ‘maps’ of the world”, projecting them against some familiar context to make sure the news make sense to the audience. In this process, they inevitably draw on a myriad of background assumptions. According to the authors, a typical and fundamental assumption in modern democratic and capitalist nation-states is that society is inherently *consensual*. In other words, societies are constructed as “a consensus”, frequently a national one, and media practices are most widely predicated upon such a construction (p. 55). This mechanism is key to realizing how media are prone to (re)producing consensual, commonsensical structures of meanings, i.e. dominant ideologies, and by so doing significantly contribute to ideological reproduction and perpetuation of the status quo. As noted earlier, this was particularly evident in the early stages of the transformation process in Czechoslovakia in the early 1990s. The media contributed to consolidating a consensus over which path the country was taking in terms of the political and economic reforms, and openly endorsed the liberal-conservative government’s goals (Pehe, 2023).

The cultural studies’ analyses of social production of news were highly influential for the emergence of the CDS approaches to media discourse, notably the one developed by Norman Fairclough. His three-dimensional model (1995, 2003) makes it explicit that outside the micro-level of texts and the macro-level of social and political factors, the mezzo-level of a production context should be attended to in order to give a full account of the meaning-making process and the dialectical relationship between discourse and society. As the dominant discourses are mostly distributed through the mainstream news media, the production context most typically refers to the structural determinants such as institutional or professional routines of news reporting (Fairclough, 2003). This emphasis already signalled Fairclough’s steering towards political economy and a “critical realist” approach that he later adopted, seeking to take on a stronger materialist position and gain a wider recognition for discourse-oriented research, i.e. a recognition outside the concordant linguistic or cultural studies community (Phelan, 2017).

The political economy of news, although an important and influential research stream in media and communication studies, but also beyond (Briziarelli, 2014; Chiumbu & Radebe, 2020; Hardy, 2014; Mosco, 2009), is contrasting with the approaches that focus on discourse, including the analyses carried out under the CDS rubric – although some attempts have been

made to bridge the divide (Fenton, 2007). Analysing media texts through a critical-discourse perspective generally consists in looking for intertextual and interdiscursive relationships between thematically linked media content, aiming at elucidating the “politics of representation”, i.e., aiming to show how the meaning-making process reflects the group relations. This emphasis is what the CDS practitioners share with cultural studies, as mentioned earlier (Barker & Galasiński, 2001, p. 19). The modes of representation are explored to discern the work of universalization and naturalization of social meanings occurring within the media discourse, and linking it to different voices and their positioning, both in the social structure and in the analysed discourse(s). In other words, the approach consists in elucidating which voices are present and which are absent, which discourses are privileged or which are sidelined. These findings are then discussed in connection to the broader issues of discursive construction of complex social phenomena, linking the results from media analyses to other data and theory (Phelan, 2017).

Building on this common ground between cultural studies and the CDS, the media discourse under investigation in this thesis is explored as a *continuous flow of social meanings*, produced in line with the (dominant) social knowledge, but also contributing to its construction and consolidation. The news are conceptualized as a social narrative, yielding stories that both reflect and construct the culture of which they are part of (Bird & Dardenne, 2008). The continuous flow resembles a “ritualistic narration” about social events that the news consists of, which has an essential role in the process of creation and fixation of collective memories and identities (Fürsich, 2009, p. 245).

2.4.2. Media as memory workers

As evidenced in the above overview, media and journalism are intricately intertwined in the processes of (re)production of social knowledge. Their distinct position in the social structure results in that they affect the process of knowledge production in multiple ways – media serve as platforms for debate, offer narratives of everyday life, but also actively influence or catalyse discussions. In the words of the historical sociologist Jeffrey K. Olick, journalism “records what is going on, provides an archive of what happened, but also constitutes a repository”, including the “manifest and the latent, the actual and the potential” about the society’s past and present (2008, pp. 29–30). A highly distinctive role, however, consists in the capacity of media to set the public agenda, referring to one of the most influential theories in media studies. A particular type among these agendas is the past, and media have been

pointed to with regards to their importance in offering powerful representations of the past with enormous impact across the social, as such representations virtually cannot be avoided (Edy, 2006).

To account for the ways how media work with the topics of the past and with the past as a topic, but also explore the broader role of media in shaping the collective memory, the media scholar Neta Kligler-Vilenchik and her colleagues applied the seminal theory of agenda setting. The original theory (McCombs & Shaw, 1972) posits that the media affect the perception of social relevance and salience of topics based on the level of attention they grant to them. Building on this claim, Kligler-Vilenchik (2011) posits that same applies for the way the media tackle the past: The frequent activation of past events that are deemed relevant, or indeed central, to the group's identity, renders them "chronically accessible" via the media exposure, raising their social relevance in the public eye (p. 231). Numerous works, notably from the field of memory studies, journalism studies, or media memory studies, have further elaborated on the role of media as agents of memory. Media and memory do indeed intersect in multiple ways. Media have been pointed to as the main contributors to the process of professionalization and institutionalization of memory throughout the 20th century (Garde-Hansen, 2022, p. 53); They are a memory network that functions as a nod for other memory networks (Kitch, 2008, p. 317). According to the communication scholar Barbie Zelizer, it is the journalists who actually play a "systematic and ongoing role in shaping the ways in which we think about the past" (2008, p. 379). This depends on the fact that, in accord with the view of Stuart Hall and his colleagues, no matter the journalistic default and presupposed interest in and focus on the "here and now" – the up-to-dateness and hands-on approach as the ultimate prerequisites of the journalist work –, journalists do depend on the past; or, to be specific, on memory, rather than history. Memory becomes an explanatory background, amounting to a reservoir of social sentiments and official narrations that affect the social knowledge about the society's past. In other words, recent events are necessarily *projected on* past events. The selection of the past events as a reference, as well as of the future events to be affected, is based, among other things, on journalists' and editors' consideration of what "belongs to the public domain" (Lang & Lang, 1989, cited in Zelizer, 2008, p. 380). Referring to past events is understood as a regular journalist tactic of making sense of the present: The past, according to Zelizer, represents for journalists "one of the richest repositories (...) for explaining current events" (ibid., p. 381).

According to the media scholar Jill Edy, three instances are especially noteworthy among the various journalistic uses of the past events: anniversaries of past events, analogies with past events, and supplying historic context to current events (Edy, 1999). But past itself is a journalistic topic for the media, summoned at various occasions within the mnemonic practice. There are specific habits, regularities and commonalities in how media handle the stories of the past, which relate mostly to the professional and institutional routines of journalism. These too, by extension, affect journalism's alignment with memory, treating the past both as stories *and* repositories. The memory work of media bear traces of the procedural shortcuts typical of the profession's routine, summarized by Barbie Zelizer as "gravitation towards simplified narratives, recounting without context, and minimization of nuance and the grey areas of phenomena" (2008, p. 382). As Neta Kligler-Vilenchik further points out (2011), even though the media landscape usually comprises more styles or attitudes, it is the shared journalistic routines and values that unify their production, leading to "a relatively unified agenda among different media" as an "antecedent condition for agenda-setting" (p. 229).

The daily operation of media institutions, and the journalist discourse as the product of it, is determined by relations with other social agents and institutions endowed with symbolic and/or material power. As critical discourse scholar John Richardson remarks, the way news are selected and constructed is "intimately linked to actions and opinions of (usually powerful) groups" (2007, p. 1), a view shared by cultural theorists, who contend that media are "orientated (...) in general to the 'definitions of the powerful'" (Hall et al., 1978, p. 60). This also reflects in that as a mnemonic agent, the news media reproduce the memory politics of the state, rather than objecting it (Kligler-Vilenchik, 2011, p. 232). In combination with its high reach and intensity of production and reporting, media become a significant, albeit only additional memory agent. The rising interest in the issues of collective memory since the 1980s, as will be explicated in the following section, resulted in the past being actively and consciously handled by present-day actors, becoming a lively political agenda to which the journalists also responded (*ibid.*).

This said, and also recounting on the "chronic accessibility" of memory through media (Kligler-Vilenchik, 2011), the socialist past, as the direct historical precedent and the most immediately troubling past to be reconciliated with, retains its high social relevance and newsworthiness in the Czech post-socialist context due to the significance it holds in the identity-making process. This process is related closely to the legitimation of the current state

of affairs and, by the same token, to current political projects. Combining with this interconnectedness is what Barbie Zelizer refers to as an *institutional* memory of journalism which is “nurtured by the tensions surrounding the critical incidents of the public sphere” (2008, p. 383). The centrality of the socialist past in the political agenda and identity-making process makes the socialist past, as a topic, replete with such critical incidents. As a frequent subject of contestation and debate, it determines the memory work that media engage in when reporting on the incidents. The socialist past is in itself a trigger for contestation and debate, given “the political friction” embedded in its interpretations (ibid.).

With the growing social relevance of memory, the media, too, have become a crucial component of the process of its consolidation, leading to the emergence of a subfield of media memory studies focusing on “the systematic exploration of collective pasts, narrated by the media, through the media and about the media” (Neiger, Meyers, and Zandberg, 2011: 1). According to the media memory scholar Astrid Erll, particularly cultural memory, a notion to be explained in the following chapter, is “unthinkable without media”, as media and journalist discourse contribute most to its construction, consolidation and mainstreaming.

On the other hand, as the media memory scholar Andrew Hoskins argues, the categorisations of memory, especially the distinction between the communicative and cultural memory (see section 2.5.2.), seem to be no longer sufficient in the Internet age which has “transformed the temporality, spatiality, and indeed the mobility of memories” (Hoskins, 2014). The new digital implications for both memory and the media have been pointed to, with reference to the revolutionary change of the “connective turn” (Hoskins, 2011), reshaping the media-collective relations and transforming the roles in the communicative process through the participatory logic of the Web 2.0 (Hoskins, 2018a, p. 87). The participatory aspects of today’s mediascapes are not in the focus of this thesis. Drawing on Hoskins’ distinction between the two levels of mediatization (Hoskins, 2014), the thesis is concerned with the memory work occurring at the level of the “traditional”, hierarchically organized non-participatory media. No matter the growing numbers of channels and the ever-evolving ways of engaging with the media content, the thesis posits that the nature of mainstream news media discourse (print or digital), the traditionally formed relation to the official power structure and the resulting entanglement with the memory politics of the state remain fairly stable.

The thesis provides a thorough analysis of the memory work occurring in this non-participatory area of the Czech media landscape. It discusses the tendency of Czech mainstream media narration to cling to the narratives foregrounded by official memory politics and specific powerful right-wing actors, owing to the historically conditioned proneness of local journalists to favor liberal and conservative values (Volek & Urbániková, 2017). It discusses the media's reproduction of the dominant discourse on communism, as a specific discourse originating from and promoted by concrete powerful social groups which drives the institutionalized memory production. As Kligler-Vilenchik points out, the supportive role of the mainstream news media in perpetuating official memory discourses is obvious, as they, instead of contesting the narratives or acting as an independent mnemonic agent, tend to reflect the state's "memory-work" (2011, p. 232).

It is this top-down operation of the media and its entanglement with other agents of power that is in the focus of this thesis, while the participatory, popular interpretations of or reactions to the discourses disseminated from this power network remain deliberately out of scope. Rather, the thesis is concerned with the intricate relations between memory and journalism, and the role of media in memory construction, which has tended to be taken for granted or simplified by scholars, overlooking its complex nature (Kitch, 2008). This is why adopting the critical discourse perspective and looking at the "boring old media" (Olick, 2008, pp. 29–30), i.e. the mainstream media and journalist discourse, is a convenient way to broaden the understanding of the top-down part of the process of memory construction in the post-socialist Czech Republic.

2.5. A turn to memory: Key concepts in memory studies

As Barbie Zelizer overviewed in her 1995 essay on the (ever)evolving field of memory studies, the multi-disciplinary research approach has consolidated itself amidst great epistemological debates over the social roles and usages of history. Its mission has been, among other things, to bring into dialogue various disciplines that have been engaging with memory, acknowledging the conceptual and methodological inconsistencies that come inevitably with the diversity (Garde-Hansen, 2022). While memory and remembering has been of interest to people since ages, it was only around the *fin de siècle* when attention turned to the fact that the acts of remembering were embedded, and indeed shaped, by broader, i.e. societal circumstances. During the first half of the 20th century, several seminal

works emerged, among which *Les Annales Sociologiques* associated with the work of Maurice Halbwachs were most prominent, aiming to theorize the personal-social relation in memory. But it was only in the 1980s when the rather sudden “memory turn” occurred. In an exhaustive account of the works testifying of the rising scholarly interest in memory and its social and collective implications, the historical sociologists Jeffrey K. Olick and Joyce Robbins explain that the ground was indeed set for this change: By this time, the alternative epistemological approaches have consolidated in academia that gave rise to problematization of the social aspects of history, pointing mainly to the fact that historical narratives way too automatically served as tools for cultural domination. Attention turned to the power struggles behind historical narration and to political instrumentalization of the past (Olick & Robbins, 1998, p. 108).

The “new memory studies”, as labelled by Astrid Erll, date to the 1980s as the years following the numerous paradigmatic shifts, such as the cultural or narrative turn, but also the “death of history”. The seminal works include Pierre Nora’s conceptualization of the *lieux de memoire* or Le Goff’s theorizing of memory as an intersection of discourse, forms and practices (Le Goff 1992, p. 51, cited in Garde-Hansen, 2022, p. 23). Among the influential epistemological shifts, the cultural turn reflected across disciplines; culture has started to be viewed as “a constitutive symbolic dimension of all social processes” (Crane 1994, cited in Olick & Robins, 1998). Another one was the constructivist: As Olick and Robbins conclude, much of the work on social memory followed the constructivist argument persuasively proposed by sociologists Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann in the late 1960s (*ibid.*). The upsurge of scholarly interest in social memory later combined with a major geopolitical and historical shift, that of the collapse of the bipolar world following the dissolution of the Soviet union in early 1990s. The breakdown of the communist states brought a giant wave of memory phenomena, including the issue of transitional justice as an inherent part of coming to terms with the legacies of authoritarian regimes (Erll, 2008, p. 9).

In the colloquial language, memory usually associates with human experience, specifically with the act of remembering that resides within an individual – a person, or a group such as family, but still a *personal* context. As Astrid Erll points out, it is understood as referring to “how things have happened *to people*”, as opposed to history, approached as the version of the past of “how things *happened*”. History and memory have been, furthermore, often juxtaposed in the academic work, leading to conclusions about the veridicality or authenticity of one or the other. Drawing a division line between the two, however, as Astrid Erll argues,

has never proven to be very fruitful. Rather, history and memory should be treated as different modes of remembering, where “history is but yet another mode of cultural memory, and historiography its specific medium” (2008, p. 7). At the same time, however, the blending is specific in the case of contemporary history, which is situated at the intersection of history and memory and has an inherent political dimension; it is connected to the process of searching and constructing political identity of the given society (Randák, 2011).

2.5.1. Memory socially embedded: The trouble with the “collective”

Amidst the process of consolidation of social memory studies as a “nonparadigmatic, transdisciplinary, centreless enterprise” (Olick, 1999), debates were taking place over how memory, socially embedded as it is, should be conceptualized in the first place. Most importantly, it entailed finding a solid ground for the theorization of its social dimension. In his seminal article on collective memory, Jeffrey K. Olick discusses the differences and relations between the individualist and collectivist understandings of memory (1999), developing the groundbreaking argument laid out in the first half of the 20th century by Maurice Halbwachs. In Halbwachs’s understanding, collective memory is, in contrast to autobiographical or historical memory, “the active past that forms our identities” (1999, p. 335). Halbwachs, developing the idea of his teacher Émile Durkheim, characterized collective memory as plural, referring to social groups rather than to “society” (ibid., p. 334). Through this accent, he pointed to the fact that shared memories can be “effective markers of social differentiation” (Wood 1994, p. 126, cited in Olick & Robbins, 1998, p. 111).

Olick’s work can be seen as a response to the critique raised at the popularity and abundance of the term collective memory across historiographic work (for the discussion, see for example Gedi & Elam, 1996). He weighted advantages and disadvantages of using the term, trying to overcome the tensions between individual and social influences on memory that remained unresolved in Halbwachs’s influential work, due to his premature death in a Nazi concentration camp in the 1940s (Migliorati, 2015). The two sorts of phenomena to which the term collective memory refers – collective memory as the *socially framed individual memories* and collective memory as the *collective commemorative representations* – are, according to Olick, of “radically distinct ontological orders”, thus requiring “different epistemological and methodological strategies”. As he argues, it is the conception of (political) culture that makes the difference between the two. Opting for understanding (political) culture as a “symbolic dimension of all social situations”, Olick, as a representant

of “the new political culture theorists”, then moves to highlighting the *discursive* dimension of politics: The interests and identities are always constituted by language, through symbols and the processes of claim-making. His understanding of collective memory, then, opposes the aggregate approach that views collective memory as a collection of individual memories. He stresses the advantages of a *collective* perspective, as opposed to *collected*, which brings to the fore the group rather than an individual. It also points to the powerful (social and political) institutions that have the capital and motivation to provide narratives and stimulate memory, hence supplying individuals with commemorative frames and representations (Olick, 1999, pp. 337–343).

This distinction made and explained, the second conceptualization is clearly more fruitful for this thesis, as it theorizes memory as a “symbolic order”, which include different “media, institutions, and practices by which social groups construct a shared past” (Erll, 2008, p. 5). Under this light, the word “memory” turns into a metaphor. The processes of reconstructing the past do, however, bear liking with the processes of individual memory, among which selectivity and perspectivity are central (*ibid.*). On the same note, acknowledging the distinction is not to say that the two would be separated. The individual and the collective is always in interaction: The memories of an individual are shaped by and within particular sociocultural contexts, but media and institutions that represent memory are actualized by individuals, by the “members of a community of remembrance”, who hold different views on the shared notions of the past” (*ibid.*). In other words, it is the human agency behind the activity of conceiving of a shared past that makes memory lively, and, to be sure, political.

2.5.2. Cultural and communicative memory

Despite the efforts to rigorously ground the collective nature of memory reviewed in the previous section, collective memory has remained a contested concept. The non-rigorousness often combined with an over-totalizing tendency, driving many scholars to avoiding the term, opting instead for the adjectives “social” or “cultural”. An influential distinction between an individual and collective remembrance was proposed by the archeologist and religionist Jan Assmann. Mapping the earlier works that set the foundations for studying social embeddedness of memory, Assmann concludes that only since 1980s have the dimensions between the social, the personal and the cultural become clearly connected, through the connection of time, identity and memory (Assmann, 2008). He develops the work of

Halbwachs by breaking up his understanding of collective memory into two types of memory, the *communicative*, and the *cultural*.

In Assmann's understanding, cultural memory is a form of collective memory, in that it is shared and conveys identity for a number of people (ibid.). Furthermore, cultural memory is defined through its institutional character: Indeed, cultural memory is a "kind of institution" – the social work entailed within it consists of objectifying and exteriorizing, creating external symbols which remind us and trigger our memory, for they "carry memories we have invested in them". The communicative memory, on the other hand, is not cultivated by specialists, formalized, stabilized nor "supported by any institutions of learning, transmission, and interpretation" (p. 111). Handling with cultural memory is, therefore, instrumental, and the act of remembering is necessarily complemented by an act of deliberate forgetting. This deliberate, explicitly selective work with the sum of knowledge about the past implies the process of identity construction, as "memory is knowledge with an identity-index" (p. 114). As opposed to knowledge as an universalist concept, memory is local and rooted in values of a certain group. Remembrance is, in Assmann's view, "a realization of belonging, even a social obligation". As such, cultural memory is a political project in its own right, "strongly interdependent with the processes of construction of collective identity and political legitimation" (Erl, 2011, p. 27).

What lies at the heart of the problem with cultural memory is its contested, *political* nature: The discussions over memory are always embedded in larger societal negotiation over identity, of which memory is an integral part (Gillis, 1994). Cultural memory is a project of a memory that is "shared", i.e. purposefully made "collective". For the sake of fluency of reading and facilitation of orientation in the text, therefore, the rest of the text avoids using adjectives in referring to memory, and where necessary, uses the term "collective" to refer to projects of stabilizing and formalizing memory by institutions "from above". Collective memory means a self-reflection of a political community organized by time, and it is a first condition of its identity. It sets a referential framework to delimit the interpretation of the past (Příbáň, 2008, p. 290). Yet as Olick and Robbins conclude, it is "a contestation that stands clearly at the centre of both memory and identity" (Olick & Robbins, 1998, p. 126), as both the memory and identity projects are politically conditioned.

2.6. Memory, heritage and their role in the identity-making process

The past has been central to the formulations and reformulations of national identities, as projects that are essentially political. Historical narratives sit at the very heart of the process of (re)constructing identities and become the main material for memory-making (M. Kopeček, 2008a, p. 244). At the same time, both identity and memory are sociopolitical constructs, and as such subjective phenomena, always under construction and consisting of representations. Its construction is a continuous project that is always situated and contextual and reflects the changing circumstances.

Various disciplines have focused on the processes of identity-making, studying them very often in the context of spaces and places. Given the thesis's focus on negotiations over memory in the public space, the theoretical framework includes the concepts of political and cultural geography. In their introduction a special issue on post-socialist identity politics, the cultural geographers Craig Young and Duncan Light posit that the core duality at the heart of the process of identity-making are the senses of the Self and the Other. The two groupings get repeatedly (re)shaped and (re)formulated by the ever-evolving challenges, constructed each time "for new ends" (Young & Light, 2001, p. 947). The actual process of constructing an identity becomes a battlefield: The question of *who is in charge* of these processes comes to the fore, reflecting the current socio-political conditions and power struggles.

The social conflicts over constructing memory and identity make it apparent that rather than on inclusion and description, the processes are based on selection and inscription, while they serve particular interests and ideological positions in the society (Gillis, 1994, pp. 3–4). According to critical discourse scholars, in creating boundaries between groups, nations are particularly distinctive discursive constructs: national identities tend to primarily emphasize national uniqueness and intra-national uniformity, thereby often ignoring intra-national differences (Wodak et al., 2009, p. 4). In other words, the Self is articulated for external consumption, turning a blind eye on the need to properly address the actual intra-social varieties.

On the most general level, the identity-construction process relates to "senses of belonging" and is rooted in the work of inclusion and exclusion. It is a work of differentiation: According to one of the seminal theorizations offered by the political scientist Seyla Benhabib, identity politics is "always and necessarily a politics of the creation of difference" (Benhabib, 1996, p.

3). In concord with this view, the cultural geographers Gregory Ashworth and Brian Graham posit that identity is constructed through the attributes of *otherness*:

“Central to the concept of identity is the Saidian idea of the other, groups – both internal and external to a state – with competing – and often conflicting – beliefs, values and aspirations. These attributes of otherness are fundamental to representations of identity, which are constructed in counter-distinction to them” (Ashworth & Graham, 2005)

The identity-making processes further intertwine with heritage, as an important means of articulating the senses of belonging, often in the physical space. From the perspective of cultural geography, a sub-discipline shaped after the critical turn and by the constructivist paradigm, the focus on heritage means a focus on how “very selective past material, artefacts, natural landscapes, mythologies, memories and traditions become cultural, political and economic resources for the present” (B. Graham & Howard, 2008, p. 2). The concept of heritage is used to account for the contemporary uses of the past, notably by official powers (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 1999; Harvey, 2008). It refers to the “processes by which people use the past”, which are “omnipresent, interwoven in the power dynamics of societies and intimately bound up with identity construction at both communal and personal levels” (Harvey, 2008, p. 32).

Interpretations of the past are always politically conditioned, and so is heritage: it becomes a political project anew with every change of a political regime. It manifests as a set of value-based rules and a pre-selected heritage content which only seemingly derives from the current societal demand. The current demand is always conditioned by a variety of factors and shaped by different social institutions, thus never devoid of power (Czepczyński, 2008, p. 57). The role of heritage is to politically legitimize governments and governing ideologies, a process essential for any political regime. However, as Ashworth and Tunbridge remark, this essentiality is sometimes less obvious in pluralist democracies than in totalitarian regimes (1999, p. 155). This is particularly evident in the turn-taking of regimes following the collapse of the socialist bloc in the early 1990s. The politics of heritage observed in the post-socialist space revealed a common strategy among the newly empowered groups to enforce changes in the symbolic landscapes. They exhibited a selective and universalizing tendency in reshaping public spaces, aiming for two main objectives: Marking the end of the old era and

consolidating the new value system, mostly through a loud and explicit denial of the previous regime.

2.6.1. Heritage in the cultural landscapes: Values and domination in the public space

Politics of heritage, or heritage planning, is characterized as politics of the past in the present (C. Nash & Graham, 2000). The power implications of how the past is used for contemporary purposes are best studied through the concept of cultural landscapes, which refers to an “ensemble of material and social practices and their symbolic representation” (Zukin, 1993, p. 16). The cultural landscapes are where memory, heritage and identity intersect (McDowell, 2008); as societies make sense of the present through the accounts of the past, the historical narration becomes the central material. The historical accounts are deployed in a cultural landscape as an effective strategy for legitimizing and consolidating sociopolitical structures and formations, such as political regimes or nation-states (Azaryahu, 1996). This is crucial for understanding the power implications of changes enforced by the powerful groups in the public space, such as the street names on which the second case study focuses.

As a blend of material practices and aesthetic forms, cultural landscapes reflect the configurations and expose the totalizing, universalizing tendency in the way powerful groups strive to prescribe cultural values into the landscape (Czepczyński, 2008). A cultural landscape is an integral part of the political and social systems of representation, conceptualized, among other things, as a *symbolic exchange*. Landscape “always represents and symbolizes the relationship of power over which it has emerged and the human processes that have transformed it” (ibid.). At the same time, it is through the landscape that the power relations, inevitably asymmetrical, are naturalized. The conflicts and contestations underlying the process of articulating heritage, memory and identity are characterized by a work of universalisation. As the “pasts, heritages and identities should be always considered as plurals, even in a single society” (B. Graham & Howard, 2008, p. 1), the struggle for power between different social groups necessary entails a struggle for discursive hegemony, i.e. striving to install, codify and consolidate their version of what and how things should be remembered.

Tackling heritage in the cultural landscape also relates to the concept of places of memory (Jaworski & Stachel, 2007; Nora, 1989), conceptualized both literally and metaphorically as

places of concentration of social meanings regarding the past. The concept brings in focus the process of manipulation with history, as a typical tool employed in modern societies that are widely politicized (Hlavačka, 2011). The places of memory are “the actual physical spaces through which official and governing discourses are eternalized” (Raková, 2011, p. 25). At the same time, the places of memory can be used to “break the social meta-narratives”, because their symbolical meaning can be, as a matter of fact, “breaching the history”: The places of memory can thus be, in the first place, the places of *contestations* over memory (Slačálek, 2013).

In this respect, tackling heritage through heritage planning and other related “manipulations” is closely linked to the processes of cultural memory construction. The way heritage relates to memory could be described as solidification: cultural memory materializes and “hardens” through the forms and formats of cultural heritage, i.e. often tangible elements in the cultural landscape. Memory and heritage – both referring to what we opt to select from the past – are used in the cultural landscape to shape emblematic place identities and support particular political ideologies, often reflecting divisions within societies (B. J. Graham et al., 2004). Both represent the powerful means of articulating “feelings and senses of belonging”, however vague these can often be (B. Graham & Howard, 2008, p. 1). The inscription of values manifesting the power relations is most evident in the urban landscape, as cities represent the main spots for manifestation of the value systems of political regimes: Cities are specific types of cultural landscapes that have both structured and structuring qualities, shaping people’s perceptions, interactions and senses of belonging (Czepczyński, 2008).

Tackled most visibly and attentively within the moments of historical (re)claiming of the symbolic landscapes, i.e. revisions accompanying major changes of political context, heritage planning is closely connected to the process of reconciliation with the past – a process firmly embedded in and shaped by contemporary politics (Czepczyński, 2008, p. 54). Heritage is thus defined through a present-centred perspective, as the past is used and interpreted to validate the present. In this process, typically, an idea of “timeless values and unbroken narratives” arise (Ashworth & Graham, 2005).

As a specific form of knowledge, a cultural product and a political resource, heritage has a fundamental socio-political function. This also means it is inherently conflictual: Just as societies are plural, so are the approaches to heritage. Heritage is thus always a subject to negotiation accompanied by “a complex and often conflicting array of identifications” (ibid.).

The post-socialist context represents a laboratory of these changes. The re-constructions of identities, also through memory and heritage politics, were strikingly universalistic, suppressing the plurality of interpretations. The groups newly endowed with power mostly opted for the strategy to validate the new democratic system through denunciation of the socialist past. The end of the bipolar world at the turn of the 1980s, resulting in a triumph of Western liberalism, offered an extraordinary context for consolidation of such dichotomic historical projections.

3. LAYERS OF CONTEXT

3.1. Eastern Europe post-1989: Geopolitical bearings for identity reformulations

When the Soviet dominion collapsed in the early 1990s and the decades-long bipolar world came to an end, the countries of the former Eastern bloc were up against the task of (re)constructing their identities, a task that became one of the most salient features of this historical process. The projects were various and realized by different actors from above as well as from below (Niedermüller, 1998; Pickles & Unwin, 2004; Polese et al., 2019; True, 2003). At the core of the identity projects usually stood a binary discourse rooted in the dichotomy of the Self and the Other. As Young and Light remark (2001, pp. 947–948), in the post-socialist context, the mentality of a *binary identity* was, in fact, inherited from the previous period: It consisted in reformulating the sense of “us” versus “them” that was established as an essential element of the status quo by the communist parties ruling during the past regimes. It is important to note, however, that the dichotomous thinking in official identity politics was part of the *Zeitgeist*, natural to the political reality of the Cold War. As Katherine Verdery (1996) points out, this way of forming identities actually represented an important continuity between the two systems.

After the communist state party was removed from the position of the “constitutive outside”, i.e. of the element necessary for identity demarcation, the socialist past has been situated in this void. Epitomized by the discredited communist regimes in the individual countries, the socialist past was swiftly reformulated within a new national history narration as an integral component of national identity (Young & Light, 2001). The mnemonic practices through which the past regime started to be approached soon became the fundamentals of the construction of identities, consisting mostly in “setting the past Self in relation to the present Self” (Erll, 2008, p. 6). Although remembering was taking on many forms across the social, within a diversity of “mnemonic cultures with their own interpretation frames and values” (Mayer, 2009, p. 14), the memory work consisting in delineating the Self and the Other was mostly situated in the realm of the official power structure, as a political strategy of legitimation implemented by groups newly endowed with power. This memory work, soon evolving into a sophisticated field of memory politics, usurped the unsurpassable position of

“providing narrative patterns and exemplars of how individuals can and should remember” (Olick, 1999, p. 342).

3.1.1. So long, East; Enter the West

As Young and Light further point out, a particular tendency came to characterize the memory politics in the region. It had to do with the fact that post-socialist national identities were redefined for both internal and external consumption, the former aiming to answer the question “who are we?”, while the latter focusing rather on “how do we want others to see us?” (2001, p. 947). In this respect, the construction of new identities often entailed a demonstration of new geographic orientation and alliances, reflecting the larger geopolitical shifts of the early 1990s. In the case of Eastern Europe, this re-orientation consisted in renewing the ties with “the West” and rejecting any associations with “the East”, including the socialist past (Czepczyński, 2008; M. Kopeček, 2008c; Young & Kaczmarek, 2008). Indeed, one of the most common – and nearly notorious – themes had been the “swift abandonment of the eastward orientation”, hand in hand with “a vigorous embracing of the political and economic orthodoxy of Western Europe”.

This spatial reorientation was almost universal in the Central Eastern European countries, but strongly present also in the other European countries of the former Eastern Bloc (Young & Light, 2001, p. 947). And by no coincidence: Draped in the “end of history” atmosphere of the early 1990s, the historical triumph was indeed situated in the West, condemning the historical reality of the Soviet socialist project to oblivion (Tlostanova, 2015). Very soon then, a new dichotomy emerged in the ruins of the Eastern Bloc, which distinguished the defeated East (and defeated socialism) from the triumphal West (and triumphal liberalism). The West was consolidated as the historically triumphal core and the ultimate reference point with a definitional authority (ibid.). The consolidation was a continuous, synergic work of actors from within the national communities as well as from abroad: Western experts importing their knowledge and helping with the transition process, and their local allies from the reconstructed elite, mostly right-wing, and mostly explicitly anticommunist (Dujisin, 2010).

For the countries in Central Eastern and Eastern Europe, the westbound reorientation translated as a quest for “Europeanisation” (Ágh, 1998). The processes of Europeanisation were somewhat intuitively responding to the dichotomy that had comprised the “myth of Europe” since the late 17th century, as the period where the first attempts are situated to

orientalize East Europe and constitute it as the European “Other” (Wolff, 1994; Sušová-Salminen, 2012; Schenk 2017). The strong symbolism that the name “Europe” implied consisted in a complexity of positive values and a natural association with modernity and progress that owed particularly to the powerful Eurocentric myths, backing the colonialist projects since the Enlightenment (Conrad, 2012). Projected historically and powerfully on virtually any interactions taking place across the globe (ibid.), these myths also served in the 20th century to contrast the “old, communist, poor, primitive Oriental Eastern Europe” (Drakulic, 2013). As a territory on a different trajectory of development due to its geographical position outside the Atlantic while also close to the Eastern Ottoman and Russian Empires, Eastern Europe was ideationally framed as an ill-defined borderland, chronically late to modernization (Kuldkepp, 2023). The representation of the Self and the Other within the European territory, labelled by some as Euro-Orientalism (Adamovsky 2005) was indeed bearing traces of a colonial encounter, as postcolonial scholars have pointed out: an imagination resembling the West imposing “orientalist” discourses of the “savage”, non-Western spaces (Pickering, 2001; Said, 2001). The hierarchical imagination internalized and sometimes weaponized in the post-socialist space (Bakić-Hayden, 1995, Zarycki, 2014) represented a substantial cultural pressure, which later led to harsh political consequences, but also had deep roots (Kalmar, 2022).

A self-standing strategy in the process of coming “back to Europe” was a particular re-interpretation of national histories. The re-westernizing tendencies were especially salient in the Central Eastern European countries where actual historical ties with the West existed (Young & Light, 2001). These former ties were often weaponized to destruct any associations or bonds with the communist regime, including any geographical, cultural, economic or political bounds with the East; a programme that was symptomatic for the value system of the newly emerging or reconstructed elite in the individual countries. The westbound logic pursued in the transformations was largely orchestrated by alliances of Western experts and their local allies, who also imposed a sense of urgency to local memory politics, endowing it with a special dynamic and intensity, but also with a clear orientation (Mark, 2010). It was this specific historical development through which “the obsession with the past and a surfeit of memories” became a distinctive feature of the newly emerging identities of the countries in Eastern and Central Eastern Europe (Törnquist-Plewa, 2020, p. 19).

The dynamic of these processes was also implied by the immenseness of the task that the post-socialist societies were up against. The ultra rapid exposure to Europeanization and various trends of globalization have proven to be a particularly exhausting experience, with incredible outcomes across many different levels of the post-socialist social realities. These are in detail examined elsewhere (Eyal et al., 1998; Sztompka, 2004; Ther, 2022; Pehe & Wawrzyniak, 2023, among many others). As one of the levels, the “reappropriation” and reconstruction of the national historical narratives, tackled within official memory politics dominated by anticommunist actors, encompassed an appeal to condemn the discredited communist regimes *en bloc* (Blaive, 2022; Buden, 2013; M. Kopeček, 2013). The uncompromising interpretation had effects on how different groups within the national communities were to be regarded and given sense to: The proximity to or distance from the former abusive regime became an important benchmark and gave rise to a new intra-national dichotomy, creating a “social Other” with a strong moralist but also socioeconomic underpinning. The simplified division between the brave and the conformist, the moral and the immoral, the selfless and the selfish was also building on the totalitarian frame that juxtaposed the omnipotent regime and the helpless society, offering a flattened story of life under the communist rule (Pullmann, 2008). In the Czech Republic, concrete social groupings and powerful actors that shared a need to cut the past from the present embraced this framing, insisting on the perception of the former regime as malevolent. Although there were local accents, they still followed broader trends in constructing the new historical narrative.

3.2. Central Eastern Europe: Regional tendencies of memory construction

In terms of memory, Central Eastern Europe is referred to as a particularly dynamic place, for it lacks “a quiet and continuous history” (Jaworski 2007, cited in Holubec, 2018, p. 124). The region of Central Eastern Europe, or Eastern Europe more broadly, is highly specific in the way history and politics intersect. In their examination of the regional tendencies that have distinctively shaped the processes of remembering in the region, the political scientists Félix Krawatzek and George Soroka (2022) identify several common historical traits, that – despite the many local variations and divergences – have had effect across those countries as *formative meta-experiences*. These include 1) the collapse of the multinational empires at the first quarter of the 20th century; 2) the profound impact of the Second World War (ten times more severe than in the West of Europe, to be exact); 3) The project of building Communism; 4) The fall of multinational states; and eventually, 5) the process of European Integration.

Given the challenges that arose with the profound transformations experienced in the last decade of the 20th century in this region, but also in continuity with the politicized nature of life under state socialism, a distinct feature was a strong politicization of many social actions in the post-socialist societies. This has, naturally, affected the area of memory politics as well. Even though re-interpretation of historical events for political reasons, including the political project of “inventing a tradition”, has belonged to the weaponry of newly establishing orders and regimes since the early modern times (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 2012), politicization was particularly prominent in this historical context, described as an actual political *manipulation* of memory and remembrance (Gaunt & Lane, 2020). The vehemency, observed in the activities of local mnemonic actors, including grassroots movements or engaged individuals, should be also read as a response to the massive manipulation occurring under the former regime, which excelled in the politicization of the public life as well – although this was by no means a feature exclusive to communist regimes (see Bělohradský, 1991).

The mnemonic work and projects carried out within the emerging memory politics was followed by particular social groups in the individual societies, concretely the “members of the newly emergent titular national group” (Smith, 1999, cited in Young & Light, 2001, p. 948). The post-socialist elites consisted of different groups of intelligentsia who were lifted to power during the transition negotiations and the early years of democratic development. Although not a homogenous group, the voices that prevailed shared a liberal and conservative (or sometimes nationalist) orientation. Building on their privileged social positioning and the related direct influence on most of the ongoing transformatory processes, they sought to universalize their view on the socialist past as well, while their structural advantage allowed them to succeed.

As Krawatzek and Soroka remark, what all the post-socialist elites in the individual countries shared was a tendency of using legislation to reshape the past within the process of nation-building. This tendency emerged during the 1990s transformation, notably in the mid-1990s which immersed the countries into numerous hardships that the transformation processes entailed. Some elite actors, particularly the conservative leaders in Poland and Hungary, soon transformed into practitioners of “a new memory politics” and framed the efforts as “finishing the revolutions”, criticizing the presence of former communists and the continuation of earlier attitudes and outlooks derived from the communist period. They viewed these elements as hindering democratization and obstructing the development of a new post-socialist national identity (Mark, 2010). This strategy was working well. The habit of “a legal

institutionalization of history” turned into a “cross-border dynamic”, with the “political impetus for ‘juridifying’ the past” shared across the borders and adopted in all the neighbouring countries (Krawatzek & Soroka, 2022, p. 208). The act of following a regional model then served as a justification, providing the political approach to memory with a transnational legitimacy.

At the same time, these legislative efforts were a part of a much greater project of the integration of the individual countries to the European Union. As a part of the nation-state projects, the reconstruction of “national historical consciousness” in the local communities followed the goal to appear consolidated enough to become eligible for the EU accession (M. Kopeček, 2008b, p. 82). The process has had contradictory effects: On the one hand, the earlier legislations emerging in the 1990s and early 2000s were to be aligned with the European memory and its accents, which, among other things, consisted in condemnation of communism in order to become “truly European” (Mark, 2010; Neumayer, 2019). In the very early stages, this process was rather prompted from the West as the need to celebrate the defeat of communism was not shared in the local communities (Bernhard & Kubik, 2014); only since the mid-1990s, vis-à-vis the emerging troubles associated with the transformation, did the local elites come up with strategies for the societies to confront their experiences with the authoritarian communist regimes, deeming the issue unsolved (Mark, 2010).

Memory of communism underpinned by an anticommunist understanding remained a priority in the programs of various national and/or liberal parties across several Central Eastern European countries as well as in the portfolio of concrete individuals, often with mixed academic-political biographies and with respected positions in the Western power structures (Dujisin, 2021). On the other hand, on the European level, the memory of communism had to compete with the memory of Holocaust, holding a number one position in the official remembrance frame of the European Union and required to be adopted by the countries newly accessing the EU as a token of their westernization (Mark, 2010; Blaive & Gerbel, 2010).

The developments in the 2010s have exposed that different accents in collective memories have continued to divide the imaginations in both East and West (Verovšek, 2021). Particularly the further political development in some of the Central Eastern European countries complicated the mnemonic terrain, as memory legislation notably in Poland and Hungary started to be increasingly used as “instruments of illiberal transition” (Sadowski,

2021). The increasingly authoritarian governments capitalized on the politicized mnemonic grammar that has developed on the cross-border basis in the late 2000s and 2010s.

3.2.1. Memory as a political agenda: From transitional justice to a mnemonic “grammar”

The Eastern European communist regimes were marked by authoritarian rule, evolved repressive apparatuses, and numerous human rights abuses. After their fall, therefore, the task of transitional justice came to the forefront (Stan, 2009). Often though, the newly emerged political elites were selective in what programs from the area of transitional justice would be followed (Grodsky, 2015). Attention soon skewed particularly to the issues of complicity and collaboration, including violations of freedom, i.e. the focus on collaborators on one hand and on victims on the other (Apor et al 2017).

These processes, however, had a broader symbolic wrapping, some of which were already alluded to above. In general, the processes followed a classificatory, distancing logic: Past behaviour had to be revealed, re-interpreted and re-labelled from a particular distance, using a specific and markedly politically-conditioned lens. Besides practical impact, this sanctioning had a far-reaching symbolic significance: It set a standard for evaluating the previous regime as a whole (Meyer, 2008, p. 174). Using a totalitarian, criminal frame that promoted “images of failure, shortcomings, mismanagement and mistreatment”, it also foregrounded the actual “innocence of nations” and the distance between the state and the society (Apor et al., 2017; Pullmann, 2008).

The activities in the region soon evolved into “memory games”, summarized by historians Laure Neumayer and George Mink in four trends: 1) “intensive reconciliationism”, referring to “a set of relations between former oppressors and victims that includes acts of crime confession, requests for pardon and official consent to pardon”; 2) re-opening and reactivation of conflicted memory and memory-related representations for political use, instrumentalized to stigmatize or discredit political opponents; 3) legally and normatively framed “memory policies” resulting into a “net of laws”; and 4) extracting or shifting “memory games” from the national framework to extra-national arenas (2013, pp. 2–3).

These regional specificities attracted attention of various scholars and yielded numerous studies. The focus was particularly on the procedural nature of memory politics, on concrete

actors and their efforts behind various mnemonic products, or on the individual mnemonic practices (Dujisin, 2015, 2021; Nedelsky, 2004; Renwick, 2006; Tomczuk, 2016). An actor-centred model was devised by political scientists Michael Bernhard and Jan Kubik (2014), who focused on the 20th anniversaries of the collapse of the communist regimes in ten post-socialist countries (including the Czech Republic). Focusing on the specific configurations of mnemonic actors, their model sought to elucidate the “strategies that political actors employ to make others remember in certain, specific ways”, as well as “the effects of such manipulations” (ibid., p. 7). In doing so, they emphasized the instrumental and political nature of developing historical memory of the socialist past in the individual political landscapes. Next to them, James Mark (2010) focused on the actors in seven different countries to point to their concrete goals and strategies in turning the remembering of the past into a pan-societal programme. Classifying the actors politically as “liberal oppositionists”, he highlighted how their strategies were built on the idea of communism as a problematic historical object.

3.2.2. Codifying the past: The regional accent on crimes and decommunization

As reviewed in the section 2.6, memory has been always central to the formation of identity of political communities. As a complex task automatically on the agenda when a political regime changes, it has typically consisted of delimiting the interpretation of the past, constituting the political symbols and stabilizing the conventions. According to the philosopher of law Jiří Přibáň, the legal system represents a very effective way of achieving it: memory codified through legal measures represents interpretive frames and norms, ensures stability but also speeds up transformation (2008, p. 290).

Logically, the juridification of memory entails a strong presence of the state as a mnemonic actor (Törnquist-Plewa, 2020). The “state”, however, is hardly an anonymous entity and should be always specified as individual actors, groups, movements or initiatives that pursue its interests and stand behind concrete activities (M. Kopeček, 2008b, pp. 89–90). Through such a top-down activity, issuing memory laws, as laws that delimit historical interpretation of the past regimes, establishes a symbolic framework that can be used for discrediting the past. Despite being enforced top-down eventually, concrete actors or groups of actors – either from the political field or from otherwise prominent environments – drafted, campaigned, and lobbied for the law proposals. At the same time, the legislative framework for denouncing the past, built mostly on foregrounding the criminal nature of the past regime, reflected the political outlooks of majoritarian (and often nationalist) governments in the individual

countries (Barkan & Lang, 2022). Notably in Central Eastern Europe, the early post-transformational development brought electoral victories for mostly right-wing elites who held strongly anticommunist positions (Mink, 2013, p. 156).

Mariusz Czepczyński, when examining other studies, also observed that the key role in decision-making over the socialist past was played by “the new right wing, nationalistic and anti-communist parties and governments, which usually anchored their identities in anti-socialist, anti-Soviet and often anti-Russian narratives” (2008, p. 116). As a consequence, the driving principle of the post-1989 legal mnemonic measures that prevailed in the European post-socialist space has been the politics of “decommunization”. Pursued explicitly in Ukraine, Poland and the Baltic states, these efforts reflected notably in the area of tackling the Soviet heritage in the symbolic landscape and mirrored the degree of the Soviet imprint/legacy in the individual landscapes, but also the power dynamic between the local “mnemonic warriors” (Koposov, 2017, 2022; Marples, 2018; Skibinski, 2023; Zhurzenko, 2022). The readjustments of the symbolic landscape that the laws ordained consisted mostly in decommemoration through removing monuments and changing street names. This purging process has been usually complemented by creating new sites of memory, in accordance with the newly establishing historical canon (Skibinski, 2023). As Tatyana Zhurzenko points out further, the urgency of decommunization laws issued or called for in the individual countries was high as they were regarded as a prerequisite for a successful democratic transition and, by extension, a ticket to integration to the European Union (2022, p. 4).

The resoluteness of denying the historical legacy of the socialist past was inspired by, and sometimes even resembled, the process of denazification. The analogy soon became one of the important layers of the habitual and instrumental comparison between the Nazi and the communist regimes. The analogy between the “two European totalitarian regimes” has been periodically promoted through powerful political and other projects, both on national and international levels (Behr et al., 2020; Mark, 2010; Neumayer, 2019; Rees, 2010; Törnquist-Plewa, 2020). It sought legitimacy through the stress on the extremist ideology, authoritarian state power and the amount of approved, state-orchestrated crimes. The campaigns were usually deliberately oblivious to the fact that, as historical processes, denazification and decommunization were entirely different (Přibáň, 2008). At the same time, dealing with the socialist past in a similar fashion to the way the Nazi past was dealt with was something the post-socialist countries were expected to do upon their “reintegration” to Europe (Apor et al., 2017).

3.3. Czech Republic: Intellectual, political and legal approaches to the socialist past

In the case of the Czech Republic, the term “decommunization” never explicitly occurred in legislation, although it was used in non-formal communication about the legislation and at times occurred in wording of campaigns driven by various civic actors (Slačálek, 2009). In a similar vein, none of the laws prior to the 2005 law proposal on the national memory institute really used the word “memory”. Unlike the Polish or Ukrainian cases, no particular law has ordained to purge the symbolic landscape of the historical traces of the communist regime, yet the approach has been garnering legitimacy through the existing regional “grammar” – a language-like system of reconciliatory measures (Lefranc, 2007, cited in Mink, 2013, p. 157) – that endorsed the purging efforts.

On the national level, the illegitimacy and criminality of the Czechoslovak communist regime had been gradually affirmed through a chain of laws that have paved Czech memory politics since the early 1990s³. There were, however, major disagreements among the members of the emerging elite concerning the role of legislation in the reconciliation process. The split in the dissident community was essential: As a group with significant symbolic power and influence in the early post-transformational public sphere, two positions emerged among its members that mirrored their fundamentally different approaches to legality. On one hand, liberal, conservative, and Catholic dissidents, including the prominent philosopher Václav Benda, advocated for a radical approach to defeating communism. On the other hand, there was the vision of the former reform communists, represented most vocally by the journalist and politician Petr Uhl, who starkly opposed the idea of collective guilt and criticized any legalist solutions of the issue of reconciliation (Mayer, 2009, p. 155-159).

The responsiveness to the issue in the political field was also of major importance. Following Civic Forum’s electoral victory in 1990 – a broad political body that had been in charge of negotiations with the communist government and where dissident voices were highly influential – the new government took office after the 1992 election. The winner was the liberal-conservative Civic Democratic Party (*Občanská demokratická strana*, ODS) led by

³ These laws and measures include: Act 451/1991 of October 4, 1991 Act 279/1992 of April 28, 1992, known as the “big lustration” and the “small lustration” laws; Act 198/1993 “On the Illegality of the Communist Regime and Resistance to It”; new paragraphs in the update of the Czech Criminal Code 40/2009 (paragraphs No. 400–405); Act 181/2007 of June 8, 2007 on the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes and the Security Services Archive, and on Amendments of some Acts; Act 262/2011 of July 20, 2011 On the Participants in Anti-Communist Opposition and Resistance.

Václav Klaus, a neoconservative economist with a strong preference for Thatcherism. Prime minister in the years 1992–1998 and a leading personality of the cohesive influential group of technocrats (Eyal, 2003), Klaus was never personally enthusiastic about reconciliation with the socialist past yet supported a swift solution of the issue. Responding to the sentiments in the lower tiers of the party (although rather dilatorily), ODS embraced the topic of reconciliation for political profiling, and used it to support the planned policies which emphasized prompt, effective and future-oriented solutions (Gjuričová, 2008).

There was another influential grouping that shared the orientation on the future: The Civic Democratic Alliance (*Občanská demokratická aliance*, ODA), the second most successful party in the 1992 elections, where dissidents with neoconservative views consolidated. The forward-looking approach was, in fact, key to their electoral success and helped them win over other dissidents who had grouped in the Civic Movement (*Občanské hnutí*, OH), but failed to formulate a stimulating political programme. The members of the ODA such as Pavel Bratinka, Daniel Kroupa or Vladimír Dlouhý, the first two of them leading dissidents from the Prague Catholic community, provided a clear, “objective” anticommunist formulation: Their “anti-communism of the future”, as an ideological package that turned towards the present and away from the past, was based in the recipe for a quick and radical solution of the issue of communist heritage, consisting in a set of neoliberal policies that had a “purifying” power (Roubal, 2015; Mayer, 2009, p. 150–151).

The legislative process of tackling the issue of reconciliation started almost immediately after the monopole rule of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (*Komunistická strana Československa*, KSC hereafter) disintegrated in December 1989 (Sniegon, 2013). Its goal was twofold: to deal with the problems associated with the regime change and with the legacy of the fallen regime. Face to face the challenge of tackling the issues of retroactive criminal justice, retributions, restitutions or amnesty, the legislation was supposed to mirror both the pragmatic rationality of juridical decision and a “moral-symbolic rationality” of building a new identity (Přibáň, 2008, p. 290). Across the earlier and later periods of post-socialism, a whole collection of laws emerged, delineating the path for reconciliation. One of the earliest ones that also yielded the most attention – political, popular as well as scholarly – was the Act Number 451 known as the “lustration law”: Passed in 1991 by the Federal Assembly, the Czech and Slovak Federal republic was the first post-socialist state to apply a law banning

former state officials or secret police personnel from public office for a number of years⁴ (R. David, 2015; Robertson, 2006). The law as well as the whole principle was subject to heated debates preceding and following the passing of the law, starkly opposed by the leftist dissident Petr Uhl, among others, and even vetoed twice by the president Václav Havel (Mayer, 2009, p. 155; Nedelsky, 2004). Important to note here is the striking divergence of the Czech and Slovak approaches to the reconciliation process, which appeared, among many other things, in the approach to lustrations (Nedelsky, 2004). After all, the different accents and especially the different position of anticommunist sentiment in the two emerging national (and ethnic) communities appeared to be a major reason for the eventual split of Czechoslovakia in 1992 (Eyal, 2003).

The diverging views on reconciliation were confirmed already in 1993. The freshly formed Czech parliament, in which the political parties – notably the ODS – played a crucial role (on the political but also on the functional and procedural level; Kopecký et al., 1996), passed the Law 198/1993⁵ “On the Illegality of the Communist Regime and Resistance to It”. The role of the law was purely symbolic, and its goal was to delimit the nascent Czech democracy from the troublesome communist legacy (M. Kopeček, 2008b, p. 91). Through its resolute wording, it solidified the imperative of wholesale condemnation and provided a symbolic framework for the future steps of the reconciliation process (Blaive, 2020a; R. David, 2015). This denouncing view was further enforced through a collection of new articles in the Criminal code in added in 2000, listing the communist crimes next to the Nazi ones or “other genocide crimes” and penalizing any forms of denial, dispute, approval or attempts to justify these (Blaive, 2020a, p. 108).

Much in the spirit of the major influence of the political parties on the functioning of the Czech parliament in the years 1992–1996 (Kopecký et al., 1996), the personal initiative was important in this matter. Outside the initiative of the individual law makers, often shrinking to a few devoted personalities close to the right-wing parties, such as Martin Mejstřík, Alena Páralová or Marek Benda, the son of Václav Benda (see Gjuričová, 2008), the creation of the laws was supported by various elite actors who contributed to the juridification with their “world philosophies” and aspirations. Next to Václav Benda, who eventually became rather isolated in his crude vision for decommunization, there were other figures influential in the

⁴ The law was prolonged twice and eventually set up as an indeterminate condition, becoming the most continuous lustration in the post-socialist world (David, 2015).

⁵ As a matter of fact, this was the first law passed after the split up, as Slovaks did not share this decommunization perspective (Rupnik, 2002).

public sphere who were capable to enforce the perspective, often senators with dissent or otherwise oppositional experiences, or members of organizations such as the Confederation of the Political Prisoners. The particular vision for reconciliation, based on a particular interpretation of the experience with the communist regime, was foregrounded despite never receiving much sympathy or broader support from the general public. By putting the communist experience to the fore of political and social differential processes, it contributed to social divisions and endorsed codification of forms of condemnation that deepened the social cleavages (Mayer, 2009). Effectively, the legislation codified a rationale for intra-national divisiveness which soon came to characterize the local disputes over the memory of the socialist past.

The law “On the Illegality of the Communist Regime and Resistance to It” confirmed both continuity and discontinuity – continuity in law, stating that the legislation of the former regime will remain in place, while also declaring and affirming a sharp discontinuity of values (Blaive, 2020a). It also set up a legal framework that was used as a base for a new institute, The Office of the Documentation and the Investigation of the Crimes of Communism (*Úřad pro dokumentaci a vyšetřování zločinů komunismu*, ÚDV hereafter), a precursor for the local national memory institute, the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes. Drafted by right-wing politicians mostly associated with the ODS and established in the early 1995 as a state bureau under the Ministry of the Interior, its task was to map all injustices, cruelties and crimes of the communist regime and its representatives; it had the right to “both document and to investigate” (Sniegón, 2013).

From the outset, the operation of ÚDV combined legal and non-legal measures of coming to terms with the past, rendering its role both historical and judicial, symbolic and pragmatic (Přibáň, 2008). It was closely related to the visions of the ODS and the Catholic-conservative dissidents, with Václav Benda serving as the first head of the office. The agenda was to a large extent shaped by Pavel Žáček, one of the most determined Czech post-socialist mnemonic actors in the area of memory of the socialist past. His biography is a particular academic-political hybrid. Having worked in various positions at the ÚDV since its inception and later at the Institute for the Study of Contemporary History, Žáček gradually acquired extensive knowledge about the archives and self-identified as a historian, despite having formal education in journalism and social sciences. He has been closely associated with the ODS, running for a Senate seat in 2017 and being elected to the Lower Chamber in 2021, where he became a member of the ODS parliamentary club. He envisioned reconciliation with

the socialist past particularly in terms of identification and exposure of the perpetrators of the former regime's crimes (Pehe, 2020). He soon became renown as one of the most fervent advocates for open access to the secret police files (Žáček, 2006). It was through Žáček that this vision of reconciliation was channelled into The Institute for the Study of Totalitarian regimes.

Importantly for the Czech memory politics and the emergent dominant discourse on communism, the ÚDV was the first to explicitly identify and separate the actors of the story of the socialist past – the victims, i.e. the nation, and the perpetrators, i.e. the KSČ and anyone associated with it, drawing on the strict separation of the regime and the society typical for the totalitarian historical frame (Pullmann, 2008). By doing so, it imposed an imperative of collective responsibility (Blaive, 2020a; Mayer, 2009). As the historian Tomas Sniegon observes, this tendency to externalize perpetrators from a victimized nation was still prevalent fifteen years later when The Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes started to work (2013, p. 112), corresponding to the accents of Pavel Žáček's approach. By making a clear reference to the 1993 law "On the Illegality of the Communist regime and Resistance to It", the 181/2007 law on the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian regimes exemplified a resurgence of a political and cultural anticommunism and the recovered national history paradigm (M. Kopeček, 2008b, p. 91; see section 4.1 for details on the law).

Through passing the individual laws, the Czech Parliament thus codified the illegitimacy of the past regime, taking on a role of a major mnemonic actor. The effect was a symbolic "externalization" of the socialist past from the history or traditions of the nation and a normalization of the view on communism as a condemnable period (Blaive, 2020a). As recounted earlier, this strategy was significantly empowered through the cross-border dynamic of decommunization legislation in other post-socialist countries, and ultimately through the powerful East-West dichotomy which deemed the socialist project historically defeated.

3.3.1. Divisive projection of the social: Elite interpretations in the (re)constructed Czech public sphere

The legislative steps taken in the field of Czech memory politics were draped in a logic that derives from the experience of a radical regime change, as a particular "meta experience" characteristic of the history of the Eastern European region more broadly. In the Czech

Republic, it was particularly salient to and formative of the local style of reconciliation. The political scientist Roman David recounts that the turn-taking of regimes became fairly habitual for Czechs, who, in the course of the 20th century alone, experienced seven political regimes. Each change happened to be accompanied by a similar set of measures, and all were aimed at negating the past; among these, extensive purges, shaming of the representatives of the old regime and glorification of its victims were particularly popular (R. David, 2015, pp. 100–101).

The motifs of dealing with the socialist past after 1993 were then indeed confluent with this overarching logic: Stemming from a habitual behaviour, the political and other actors in power and control over the mnemonic processes were somewhat historically blinded by the supposed acute need to compensate, retribute and uncover. They steered the focus and efforts on injustices, and by doing so, effectively widened the social divisions that were already at stake in the issue of the memory of the socialist past. According to David, the “ritual conclusion” of the past regime was driven by an exclusivist logic requesting a thick division line, where “anyone connected with that regime should be ‘finished’ by being dismissed, punished, or excluded from the public eye” (R. David, 2015, pp. 100–101). The imperative of justice rooted in such divisive projection of the social became one of the important ingredients of the emerging hegemonic historical narration, accentuated throughout the decades of post-socialism and spread by the right-wing political elites (*ibid.*). Furthermore, the divisive politics was not accidental: As George Mink observes, the historicizing strategies of the actors that emerged in power in the individual post-socialist countries were actually used to *resuscitate* dividing lines, as bringing discord and dissent back to the fore proved to be very politically effective (Mink, 2013, pp. 157–158).

The issue of the memory of the socialist past was essentially political, although the main mnemonic actors opted for a moral, socially responsible and seemingly politically neutral rhetoric. Many of the influential voices that insisted on crude decommunization, exposure of communist crimes and punishment of perpetrators, were associated with the Catholic-conservative stream in the dissident community, and later came to consolidate in the political party Civic Democratic Alliance (ODA). Among them, the influential figure with significant standing in the Czech public sphere was the philosopher Daniel Kroupa. His anti-communist stance was furthered through a project launched by his son, Mikuláš Kroupa, who has also become a prominent Czech mnemonic actor. In 2006, he established an influential and successful media project *The Memory of the Nation*, focused on collecting the stories of the

communist regime's victims. The programme has been holding a privileged position in the Czech public broadcasting station and came to embody the memory of the socialist past. A complementary actor in the area of public awareness to communist crimes has been the educational programme for high schools *Stories of Injustice* launched by People in Need, the major Czech developmental and human rights agency personally intertwined with cultural streams in the dissident community (the director of the educational programme Karel Strachota) and the student leaders of the 1989 November demonstrations (the agency's director Šimon Pánek). Next to these figures, the visions were also supported by individual proactive right-wing and/or anti-Communist politicians, such as Jiří Liška, Marek Benda, or Martin Mejstřík.

Given the influential projects and the proactiveness of concrete individuals, the public deliberation over the memory of the socialist past has skewed towards distinct interpretative patterns. As the media scholar Irena Reifová argues, the post-transformational Czech public sphere was from the outset typical for casually accommodating the views of the dissidents, i.e. mostly intellectuals who were persecuted by the state socialist power structures, while their voices were influential across other areas as well, notably in arts, diplomacy and foreign policy (Reifová, 2018). For different reasons, local scholarly voices were somewhat sidelined or played an instrumental role (see Rupnik, 2002) and started to step in into the discussions only later, since the early 2000s on.

The credibility of right-wing voices was a consequence of the ideological confluence between two powerful elite groups, the dissidents and the technocrats (see section 1.2 for details), who united in their denial of the communist experience. Another crucial factor for such historically unprecedented credibility in the Czech (or broadly post-socialist) public sphere was a particular convergence of the sectors of academia and politics. Zoltán Dujisin highlights the *hybrid nature* of many of the biographies and the actual “academic-politician identities” that came to patronize the emerging mnemonic practices across different post-socialist countries (2021). Biographies of the personnel and ambassadors of the emerging institutional mnemonic apparatuses testify to the alignment of interests between the academic and political sectors, both engaged, as powerful fields, in imposing their “visions of division” (Bourdieu, 2005); one of the striking examples in the Czech case being the ODS member Pavel Žáček, the fervent advocate for establishing a national memory institute based on secret service archives.

As a result of this frequent convergence, the political decisions on promoting an anticommunist perspective on the socialist past were granted a scholarly authority (Dujisin, 2015), even though a proper scholarly debate was mostly lacking. The partiality of the scholarly voices in the public sphere was also a specific heritage of the socialist past: According to the political scientist Jacques Rupnik, the politicization of the process of reconciliation in the Czech Republic was facilitated by the relative silence of the historians in the 1990s, who would not contribute to the public discussions and help provide an expert view on the ongoing discussions. The reason was rooted in historical circumstances: In the first decade of the post-socialist development, Czech historiography was busy reestablishing itself after the field's decimation in the 1970s and 1980s (Rupnik, 2002, p. 25).

Thanks to the ideological convergence with the (then popular) liberal-conservative government, the conservative dissident voices were prominent in the 1990s discussions over reconciliation, even though this perspective was not universally accepted, as studies on public perceptions of the dissident community during the last decade of state socialism have shown (Možný, 2009; see also Mayer, 2009). A distinctive position was taken by Václav Havel, the leading figure of the Charter 77 and the country's president in the years 1989–2003. As the leading Czechoslovak dissident figure providing ideational content to the emerging political community, he repeatedly called for a measured and socially sensitive approach to the process of reconciliation with the socialist past. Despite the prominence of his political position, however, it was the other actors with more resolute view on the socialist past who were more proactive and eventually more influential, and paved way to the Czech memory politics oriented on crimes and discontinuity. Given the power associated with their privileged social positions and the public credibility that came with it, their discourses easily gained solid ground. Moreover, the historical circumstances were highly conducive to the establishment of hegemony in the public sphere.

3.3.2. The right-wing consensus in the Czech mainstream media

The Czech public sphere and media landscape was remarkably distinctive in the early 1990s. The rapid application of neoliberal principles in politics and economy – privatization, liberalization or deregulation – mirrored in the emerging media system as well. The “no alternative” approach was adopted in the transformation of the Czech media landscape, where Western trends such as tabloidization or commercialization were pursued almost mechanically (Jirák & Köpplová, 2013). The emerging journalist community was a prodigy of

the unprecedented transformational process: As Volek and Urbániková (2017) argue in their analysis of the Czech post-socialist journalist field, one of the unintended consequences that have shaped the field at the outset was a lack of professional standards and the inexperience of its members, resulting in vulnerability to political pressure and alignment with the government's agenda. As Veronika Pehe remarks based on interviews with several journalists of that time, there was a striking consensus in what path the country would follow, politically and economically. Criticism was only voiced from extreme poles of the spectre, or from “non-serious” media outlets, such as tabloid (Pehe, 2023). The conservative orientation of the major political figures elevated to power in the early 1990s reflected also in the journalist community. Thanks to the unprecedented historical conditions, many early-career journalists occupied top positions in the media, which they have held to this day. As a result, right-wing orientation has prevailed in the Czech journalist community, contrary to the trends observed in the Western European countries (Volek and Urbániková, 2017, p. 62).

The journalists in the Czech mainstream media, until the political crisis of 1997, openly supported all reforms taken by the liberal-conservative government led by Václav Klaus and shared their appeal to minimise the state and discard any “leftist” ideas. This attitude had a long-lasting effect, and owed, among other things, to the striking personnel continuity. As one of the long-serving journalists active in the Czech media since the early 1990s reflected in an interview (Rychlíková, 2023), the 1990s only ended with the 2008 financial crisis, which led to major shifts in media ownership in the Czech Republic. The acquisition of local media concerns by local oligarchs affected the political leaning of the individual outlets and with it the journalist routines and working conditions. The editorial teams started to reshuffle which led to an ideological diversification. The late 2000s also saw another shift in the Czech media landscape, as new voices critical of the status quo and its trajectory began to emerge in the wake of the situation in global economy. The diversification of voices was facilitated by the advancement of the Internet and emergence of diverse online outlets. Nonetheless, the prevalence and privileging of liberal-conservative values is still appearing as a commonsensical, non-ideological perspective in most of the Czech mainstream media, owing to the unprecedented political unity witnessed at the dawn on the free Czech media in the early 1990s.

The transformation in the name of liberal democracy and market economy designed and enforced by the “managerial intellectual alliance” (Dujisin, 2010) of conservative dissidents and right-wing politicians and technocrats was granted with an unprecedented credit in the

public sphere. The mainstream media support to the decision-making endowed the alliance with enormous symbolic power. The result was a near monopolisation of the Czech public sphere, in which the anticommunist interpretative framework took the lead, as a necessary ingredient of the right-wing liberal-conservative perspective. Zoltán Dujisin points to the actual extensive “infrastructure” consisting of resources that the proponents of this alliance were capable of amassing – mostly social and financial capital from influential actors both at home and abroad. The infrastructure allowed these specific intellectual resources to really be enjoying an “overwhelmingly privilege access” in most of the print media and influential think tanks in the early formative years, and rendered their views absolute (2010, p. 477). The common-sense appeal of anticommunism that soon evolved in this setting consisted in persistent framing of contested political issues under the logic of a “collective memory” of socialism but also in minimum contestation of this view among the publicized voices (Holubec, 2015; Reifová, 2018). The hegemony of dissidents and technocrat intelligentsia, however short-lived, resulted in a consolidation of a new mainstream discourse in the public arena that drew on the anticommunist underpinning of their ideologies, and legitimated their political steps (M. Kopeček, 2008c, p. 79).

3.3.3. Key ingredients of the dominant discourse on communism

The factors summarized above converged to create a specific historical context that enabled a dominance of a specific “discourse on communism”, effectively giving shape to the Czech process of reconciling with the socialist past. Shaped by structural forces and power dynamics, the discourse solidified into an interpretive framework, legitimized and driven by an ideology largely positioned as the antithesis of “communism”. This ideology masked its political foundations under the narrative of a return to “normal” values (Reifová, 2018). In the future discussions and interpretations of the memory, heritage or legacies of the former regime, the discourse became a reference point, naturalized and universalized, hence ideological in its effect.

The ideological underpinning of the dominant discourse on communism comprised several fundamental ingredients. As reviewed in the previous section, the first was a strong anticommunist sentiment, as an essential component of the political repertoire of the post-socialist elite groups who enjoyed direct influence on the public discourse after 1989. According to the political scientist Ondřej Slačálek, anticommunism is, as a political position, characterized through three main features: 1) it essentializes the “communist” and dehistoricizes

it into a diabolic phenomenon; 2) on the grounds of this essentialization, it refuses to accept communism within a democratic recognition, keeping it outside the boundaries of the politically (or otherwise) thinkable; and lastly, 3) it has a significance for the identity of the actor who adopts this position, in order for them to make political commitments based on this ground (Slačálek, 2021).

Albeit rooted in fairly specific, mostly elite social settings (Renwick, 2006; Roubal, 2015), the anticommunist position became an appealing strategy of political identification for very diverse political and civic actors and has served as an underpinning for various campaigns or adopted as an outright political strategy (Hrubeš & Navrátil, 2017; Koubek & Polášek, 2013; J. Navrátil & Hrubeš, 2018; Slačálek, 2009; Witzlack-Makarevich, 2023). Its position was unique also due to the particular development on the Czech political scene, where, unlike in the other countries of the former Eastern bloc, the former monopolist communist party (*Komunistická strana Československa*, KSČ) had not undergone any major reform, and stayed on the political map in a fairly untransformed state, applying merely a cosmetic change to its name, replacing “Czechoslovakia” with “Czechia and Moravia” (*Komunistická strana Čech a Moravy*, KSČM) (Grzymala-Busse, 2002; L. Kopeček, 2005; Strmiska, 2002). Czech anticommunism was, therefore, addressing two imagined threats at one time: The issue of a still-existing communist party and its ongoing voters’ support, and the issue of an unfinished reconciliation with the socialist past (Slačálek, 2009).

The anticommunist position is, at the same time, a cornerstone of a binary approach to the interpretation of the modern Czechoslovak history, as the second fundamental ingredient of the dominant discourse on communism. The approach is based in judging the historical periods on a good and bad dichotomy and allowed to extract the socialist past from the nation’s historical flow. Socialist past represents an external project, an aberration in the otherwise linear development of the nation towards democracy, or an actual import from the East, while any internal factors for development of the regime are ignored (Blaive, 2016; M. Kopeček, 2008c; Pullmann, 2008). Related to the binary nature of nation-building specific to the post-socialist reconstructions of identities described in detail in chapter 3.1, a prominent procedure in the process of re-interpreting the socialist past has become the application of a contrasting dual matrix. According to the historians Michal Kopeček and Matěj Spurný, the official Czech memory politics and historical interpretation taking place in the first two decades after the fall of the communist regime departed from drawing a fix line between “us” and “them”: The regime and the society, communism and the nation, or the perpetrators and

the victims, leading to a one-sided and dichotomic approach to the post-war history (M. Kopeček & Spurný, 2010). In other words, history of the Czechoslovak state socialism became a history of resistance, victims and heroes on the front face, and of repressions, crimes and perpetrators on the reverse (Randák, 2011, pp. 205–206).

Thirdly, as explained in chapter 3.3.1., the Czech reconciliation process has been founded on a strong imperative of justice; however, this imperative lacked a positive program in its pursuit. According to Roman David (2015), it was the absence of an actual reconciliatory discourse in the whole program that paved way to a stigmatization and to an actual deepening of social cleavages, as a major troubling effect of the Czech post-socialist memory politics. It was also this lack that prevented an actual negotiation over the memory of socialism between different groups, which would have been a more effective, inclusive and conciliatory way of coming to terms with the shared past (M. Kopeček, 2008c). Connected to the absence of the reconciliatory ethos was also the central position of truth, as a generally overemphasized motif across the region (Dujisin, 2010). In the Czech context, it was rooted in the dissident discourse that praised “a life in truth” as an authentic style of living, contrasting it with the “life in a lie” characterizing the citizenry under the totalitarian communist rule (Eyal, 2003; Havel, 1990). This also meant, however, that this contrast served mostly as a means of shaming and eventually skewed the objectives of the reconciliation. As Roman David argues further, when pursued in a climate that lacks expression of positive goals, truth loses its reintegrative potential: While it might help certain social groups to reconcile with the past, universally, it is prone to causing more harm by “opening old wounds and reviving past hostilities”. It leads to social isolation of collaborators and decreases their views for social reintegration (R. David, 2015, p. 105), while also establishing a strong position of guilt that channels into vengeance (Nedelsky, 2004, p. 75).

The last ingredient that characterizes the Czech dominant discourse on communism and testifies of the simplifying reductive tendencies in the Czech memory politics is the prevalent focus on strong individual stories of martyrdom or heroism, as a complementary strategy to treating communism as a depersonalized monolithic machinery (Hrubeš and Navrátil, 2017). The claims for justice combine with the emphasis on the repressiveness of the past regime and the overly reductive view on the post-war history of Czechoslovakia, giving rise to a universalized narration template for “stories of oppression and resistance”. Through this template, the focal point fixes on stories of victims, villains and heroes and substitutes almost entirely the multiplicity of realities of life during the rule of the monopole communist party

(Pullmann, 2008). A key aspect of this storytelling is the strong individualization of the stories of repression characteristic of the Czech memory work, in a striking contrast to Slovakia (Tomczuk, 2016). This is due to the fact that the Czech mnemonic regime has been, since the very start, constructed on and shaped by stories of personal pasts, and notably on individual compromises with the regime (Mayer, 2009). As the first objective within the newly set agenda of transitional justice, pursuing the perpetrators placed the morale of suspicion and guilt above all and reflected in many different activities, albeit never yielding the desired outcomes, as none of the culprits was actually penalized (David, 2015). The only “tangible” effect was that the implicit sense of guilt – the spectre of the compromised – was distributed across the society, casting an imperative of declaratory distancing oneself from the regime and the apparatus, no matter the actual diverse social and political stances experienced or adopted in the historical period.

In a similar way, victimhood, as a second central theme of the stories of oppression, was shaped by compelling individual accounts of suffering and martyrdom (Tomczuk, 2016), much in line with the national tendency to create martyrs (Holý, 1996). The stories of victims have, however, often become politically instrumentalized. As the historian Muriel Blaive remarks, reflecting a broader trend that emerged in the mid-1980s – where complex histories of various authoritarian regimes were simplified into narratives of victims, villains, and bystanders within a global culture of memory – the Czechs harnessed the moral imperatives of these stories to weaponize the Western “human rights grammar”, both locally and internationally (Blaive, 2020a, pp. 112–113). The figure of a victim was usually infused with a heroic identity: Stemming from a resistant attitude, the heroes were those who refuted the regime regardless of the penalization. The focus on acts of heroism, be it the “great heroes” facing actual physical persecution or the “petty heroes” risking rather minor life discomforts, helped create a model story of braveness and moral commitment, casting a shadow of suspicion over activities that lacked the motif of resistance (Pehe, 2020).

As will be explained in the following chapters, the ingredients of the dominant discourse on communism outlined in this section were implicitly or explicitly present in the deliberation and decision-making over the individual mnemonic measures under focus in this thesis. For the purpose of clarity, they are summarized and clustered in two dimensions, that are synergic in their effect: First, the dominant discourse on communism is defined by 1) focusing on the criminal aspects of the past regime, restricting the view to a couple of visible actors and stories and obfuscating the plurality of experiences; second, it is defined by 2) a discontinuous

approach, which amounts to externalizing the historical period of the communist rule, rendering the histories, artefacts, aesthetics, customs or policies alien to the nation and its history. The acknowledgment of these two dimensions, as an aggregate of the ingredients outlined in this section, informs the analyses presented in chapter 6.

4. DOING AWAY WITH THE SOCIALIST PAST: TWO INSTANCES

4.1. Codifying a crime-centred perspective on the socialist past:

Establishment of the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes

National Memory institutes became a signature activity characterizing the style of reconciliation with the past in the region of Central Eastern Europe. On the broadest level, the motivation to establish state-sanctioned history-oriented institutions fall under a wider phenomenon of “the re-nationalization and legalization of history” which has been appearing throughout Europe, but also beyond since late 2000s (M. Kopeček, 2008b, p. 92). In the context of European post-socialist countries, the activity was connected to the newly emerging elites in whose understanding the socialist past should be reconciled with through the politics of decommunization (Mink, 2013, p. 155). Among these elite groups, the sentiment was strong to condemn the period of state socialism by bringing to the fore the crimes and injustices occurring under the former regime. The crimes were to be exposed and made public through a combination of mnemonic measures, as outputs of institutions engaged in memory work.

A legislation that became particularly popular in the region were the laws grounding the establishment of special scholarly institutions authorized to focus on the former regime’s crimes, through careful investigation of the materials from the communist secret police (Törnquist-Plewa, 2020, p. 19). The centrality of the secret police files in the concept of reconciliation with the communist regime was based in the idea of revealing the truth about the past regimes, and actually played a major role in consolidating the view on the regimes as totalitarian: The files were deemed authentic because they were hidden, and their very existence was the proof of the regimes’ malevolence. More generally, the files were seen as an adequate historical source owing to the high credit of a written bureaucratic document in the respective regional cultures, drawing perhaps on the high sociocultural status that bureaucracy and state service enjoyed in the times of the Austrian Hungarian monarchy (Apor et al., 2017).

In legislative terms, the National Memory institutes (NMIs hereafter) founded in the 2000s in Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic, followed the example of Germany, where the

“Gauck Institute” (Office of the Federal Commissioner Preserving the Records of the State Security Service of the former German Democratic Republic, *Bundesbeauftragte für die Unterlagen des Staatssicherheitsdienstes der ehemaligen Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* in German, shortly BStU) has been operating since 1990. The NMIs were one of the two most popular forms of “memory shaping” institutions in the post-socialist context; in other countries, such as Romania, the second format – a history commission – was applied. What these two formats shared was a strategy of co-opting politically compliant scholars and other intellectual capacities who would provide and authorize the new rewriting of national histories “from above” (Mark, 2010, p. XXIV).

In the case of Central Eastern Europe, the German model was looked up to, as it was believed it has settled the issue of reconciliation generally very well. As the first in the row, a law serving as a basis for establishment of the Polish Institute of the National Memory was explicitly modelled on the German law; based on the Polish law, the Slovak one was fashioned. The Czech one was the last in the chain, eventually giving rise to a regional grammar”, i.e. a system of rules for operation but also of representations in the area of reconciliation (Mink, 2013, p. 159). The role of the Gauck institute, however, was never explicitly to settle „the issue of communist heritage“ or draw any conclusions from the opening of the secret police archives and making them accessible: Its role as a governmental office was delimited to thoroughly mapping the structure of Stasi (*Staatssicherheitsdienst*, as the best-documented Communist secret police force in the former Eastern bloc) and make it possible for the public to learn about its structure and activities. Even though the Gauck Institute did monopolize the processes of constructing meanings around the socialist past, particularly the image of collaboration and the dictatorship, through its connection to East German dissidents (Schaefer, 2017), it never had an ambition to become a scientific institution and affect the German “national memory”. This was in a stark contrast to the Polish institution, which was drafted with a clear mandate for identity work and memory politics (M. Kopeček, 2008b, p. 88; Sniegón, 2013, pp. 101–102). The Slovak and Czech institutions followed this hybrid model and were envisioned through the memory and identity work they would convey, although the mnemonic trajectories were quite different in both countries (Kovanic, 2017).

As a result, one of the most problematic factor in the historiographic work of the Polish, Slovak and Czech NMIs has been the central (indeed, sacred) position of the secret police archives. As historian Michal Kopeček asked plainly in his 2007 article, published at the

height of the negotiations over the establishment of the Czech NMI: “Why should the concept of national memory be connected with a basically archival institution (...) i.e., materials produced by the communist security services?” (p. 89). Far from the original model of the German Gauck Institute, still instrumentally referenced as an inspiration, the Polish, Slovak and Czech institutes have never thoroughly focused on the institutional structure of the communist or Nazi secret police. Through the work with the files, the ambition was to “come to terms” with the troublesome past and learn about the socialist period through one particular historiographic source, i.e. in a fairly restricted way. The political agenda behind this was obscured with a higher goal of seeking the *historical truth* through learning the perpetrators, a perspective that is, according to Kopeček, rooted in a positivist understanding of history (M. Kopeček, 2008a).

As opposed to the goals of the Truth and Reconciliation Committees, a format most famously applied in post-apartheid South Africa (Stanley, 2001), the truth was fairly pre-conceived within the Central Eastern European regional grammar, needed solely as a justification for the establishment of the institutes, as through its operation it was to be unmasked. In this specific take on transitional justice that materialized through the Central Eastern European NMIs, what happened was that the “archives replaced confessions”: As George Mink remarks, there was a general oblivion to the need for deliberation or indeed any exchange between the oppressors and the victims (Mink, 2013, p. 166). This oblivion was symptomatic of the Czech approach to transitional justice, which notoriously lacked a reconciliatory ethos, playing the “truth card” casually but failing to activate its reintegrative potential (R. David, 2015, p. 105). In George Mink’s words, all that counted for the proponents of the NMIs was *behaviour*: a decontextualized conviction that “a traitor is a traitor, a hero is a hero”. The actual secret police files, their nature, origin or authorship, was never to become a part of the scientific scrutiny; any nuanced view on the individual biographies was rejected within the “cult of the archives” (Mink, 2013, pp. 163–164). This was surely the case for the Czech NMI where the “archival document was to become a tool for legitimating one way of looking at the past” (Pehe, 2018, p. 208). Notably during the first years of the institute’s operation, its problematic role in the historiographic inquiry remained fairly unreflected (Randák, 2011).

4.1.1. History on political demand

The idea of using the secret police archives for reconciliation with the socialist past thus emerged from an initial (and perhaps intentional) misinterpretation of the social role of the

Gauk Institute in Germany. The Polish institute was the first to introduce an approach to contemporary history based on, in Kopeček's words, an "emotionally charged nationalist rhetoric and black-and white historical meta-narrative" (M. Kopeček, 2013, p. 88). The three institutes in Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic eventually formed a consolidated network: In the role of an encompassing logic as well as a legitimization strategy, there was the moral vow for the quest for truth, given the strong position of the "regime of truth" in the mindmap of the post-socialist elites devoted to the politics of decommunization (Dujisin, 2010; Krawatzek & Soroka, 2022; see also Waisová, 2011). Applying a model of the Swedish historian Klas-Göran Karlsson, the historian Tomas Sniegon observes that all the three institutes have sought to use history particularly in three ways: the scientific, the moral and the ideological. While the first dimension consists in assessing the past in the "true or false" dichotomy, the second is devoted to telling the "right from wrong". The third one, consequently, concerns exploiting history for the justification of those in power (Karlsson, 2010; cited in Sniegon, 2013, p. 100). The political aspects of founding the NMIs – among them particularly the urgency of legitimization of the post-communist democracies and the growing significance of the memory of victims in the public debate – was clearly overriding the demand for scientific rigour (M. Kopeček & Spurný, 2010).

The issue of the socialist heritage⁶, however, was never really to be resolved. The "memory games", a concept introduced to capture the various strategies through which concrete social and political actors use memory-related policies and politics in the Central Eastern European post-socialist context to "maintain, define or improve their position in society" (Mink & Neumayer, 2013, p. 5), are connected to political identities and current political struggles fought in the individual countries. These games are by default "infinite"; they have never been played with any real intention to winning them. Over the past decades, the struggles over history and memory have turned into an irreconcilable and everlasting political conflict between the political Left and Right, or, more concretely, between the advocates of a thorough social and cultural contextualization of the socialist realities on one hand and the strictly crime-centred perspective on the regime on the other. As for the actors, the games have often translated as a conflict between two politically defined sides (Törnquist-Plewa, 2020, p. 19). As George Mink observes, the historicizing strategies have been "used to resuscitate dividing lines" as these have a role in the real politics:

⁶ The Czech institute is by law focusing on the crimes of the Nazi regime as well, similarly to the Slovak institute (Kovanic, 2017). It was, however, only added on the grounds of amendments to the law and always stood in the shadow of the focus on the socialist period (Randák, 2011; Sniegon, 2013).

“For particularly zealous actors, saying that the time has come to put an end to the immoral aftermath of Communism is part of the rhetoric required to legitimate quite the *opposite* objective: keeping the memory mines in operation as long as possible, since producing non-consensual memory is what guarantees present-day actors a strong position on the national political scene.” (Mink, 2013, p. 158, emphasis added)

The NMIs have become “instruments influenced by local contexts and situations” which made them “ultrasensitive to internal political power shifts” (ibid., 166). This is, to be sure, the case of the Czech Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes, which has, in 2022, suffered yet another 180-degree turn in ideological orientation with the election of the new director, who, during his inauguration, explicitly referred to and warned against the “trivialisation of the (..) period of 1970s and 1980s” exerted by some of the local historians (ÚSTR, 2022). As a testament to its political nature, the institute’s role in the scientific inquiry of the socialist past has been disputed anew with each personnel change in the institute’s board and on the post of the director, depending on the current constellation in the parliament (Kovanic, 2017). In a sense, the institutes, heavily politicized and rooted in the domestic politics’ clashes, turned into “machines for de-legitimizing political opponents” (Mink, 2013, p. 167).

4.1.2. Following a regional “grammar”: Socialist period as a preconceived object of study

The establishment of the NMIs in the countries of Central Eastern Europe resembled a chain reaction: starting with the Polish Institute of National Remembrance (*Instytut Pamięci Narodowej*, IPN hereafter) in 2000 in Warsaw, Slovakia took over the concept to establish the Institute of National Memory (*Ústav pamäti národa*, ÚPN hereafter) in late 2002, succeeded by the Czech Republic which copied both Polish and Slovak cases and established its version of the institute (passed eventually as the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes, *Ústav pro studium totalitních režimů*, ÚSTR hereafter) in 2007. The notion of “national memory”, which was eventually dropped from the name of the Czech institution in the last moment (a change that has not, however, reflected in any significant way in the main arguments or the diction of the law, Dvořáková, 2007), has been used as a “normatively structured, sharp, majoritarian, and moralizing concept” with a clear goal to produce an “exemplary historical

master-narrative” (M. Kopeček, 2008b, p. 92). The whole mindset behind the establishment of ÚSTR was rooted in the tendency to dichotomize the historical narration, including the simplified theory of totalitarianism (ibid.). It followed the approach set by its predecessor, ÚDV, and particularly by Pavel Žáček, who put most emphasis and effort on identifying, exposing and holding accountable the perpetrators of the former regime’s crimes (Pehe, 2020).

One of the most problematic points for ÚSTR as an institution endowed with scientific legitimacy was the preconception of the incriminate historical periods as objects of study in the text of the law as a founding document. In the case of state socialism, this preconception was most of all driven by an influential regional understanding of collaboration, consolidated through broader public framing and consequently scholarship. Characterized by sensationalist stories about informants and agents, it deemed the complex relations between state and society a rather narrow phenomenon, reducing collaboration to an “evidence of totalitarian control of state *over* society” and (Apor et al., 2017, pp. 2–3). Starting with the change of the name of the institution, proposed by an accepted amendment by one of the coalition parties, the Institute for the Study for Totalitarian regimes equalized the Nazi and communist regimes as totalitarian periods⁷ of unfreedom, to be studied through the prism of their crimes.

For the socialist period, this interpretation clearly took up the logic of the very first memory law passed in 1993, Act 198/1993 “On the Illegality of the Communist Regime and Resistance to It”. Strengthened by the amendments to the Criminal code from the year 2000 (Act 405/2000) that penalized any promotion of Nazi *or* communist genocide (where the latter has never been specified, scientifically proven or explicated, Blaive, 2020a), the criminalization of the communist regime has become the departure point for the “studying and objective evaluation of the time of non-freedom and the time of communist totalitarian power” (Act 181/2007, p. 3). According to the law, no other traits but the criminal ones were to be given space in the new historiographic institution (Blaive, 2020a, p. 109). The lens has been chosen *a priori*: Through the law, the period has been codified as “totalitarian” and evaluated as “criminal”, leaving the historians as potential employees of the institute in a highly dilemmatic position with regards to the rigorousness of their scientific work (Apor et al., 2017).

⁷ The problematic analogy has been fervently discussed among scholars (see, among others, Havelka, 2009; Hoenigová, 2009; Novák, n.d.; Segert, 2009; Todorov, 2004).

Eventually, according to the political scientist Vladimíra Dvořáková, this has had an effect on pluralism as a pre-requisite of the functioning of science in democratic systems, as “any narrowing of the scientific research goes against its basic principle” (2007, p. 155). Nestled in an “antitotalitarian conceptual universe” upheld by the group of NMIs in the region (Dujisin, 2015), the Czech law was a part of the domestic political struggles of that time and, effectively, deeply rooted in the overall strategy of the post-socialist Czech memory politics. As recounted in chapter 3.3., the Czech path of the reconciliation with the socialist past has been symptomatically paved with legislation; the law on ÚSTR has become but one moment in this whole collection of laws delimiting and codifying the memory of the socialist past (M. Kopeček, 2008b, p. 76; Kovanic, 2017; Příbáň, 2008).

4.1.3. Negotiating the law on the national memory institute amidst domestic political conflict

The ideological accents driving the effort to establish a Czech NMI were shared and promoted by a considerably stable team of actors. The law proposal for establishing ÚSTR can be subsumed under a series of various anticommunist activities taking place in mid 2000s forged by the right-wing post-socialist elites, testifying of the then failing hegemony of the non-consensual memory, referred to by the political scientist Ondřej Slačálek as “anticommunist consensus” (2009). Politically, it related closely to the activities of the strongest Czech liberal conservative political party (*Občanská demokratická strana*, ODS) who, in the late 1990s, radicalized politics of memory as a part of building its political identity (Gjuričová, 2009; Rupnik, 2002). Along with the Christian Democrats (*Křesťanská demokratická unie – Česká strana lidová*, KDU-ČSL), who also supported the idea, they believed the issue of coming to terms with the socialist past to be unresolved (Kovanic, 2017).

Drafted in late 2005 by a group of right-wing senators (19 in total, out of which 17 came from ODS) as a “first comprehensive legislative attempt in the field of institutional arrangements directing attention on the memory of the nation” (*Expl.Memorandum*, 2006), the law proposal was negotiated in a turbulent political atmosphere of that period. At that time, the ODS was holding a majority in the Czech Senate for more than a decade (Sniegon, 2013) and in May 2006, the country was shrouded in a starkly polarized political atmosphere around the parliamentary elections. The elections yielded same amount of parliamentary chairs for the Left and the Right and the looming scenario that the Communist Party of the Czech and

Moravia (*Komunistická strana Čech a Moravy*, successor of the monopole communist party, KSČM) could form a coalition with the Social Democrats (*Česká strana sociálně demokratická*, ČSSD), gaining direct political influence, resulted in an alarming anti-Left campaign (part of which was a publication by Drda & Dudek, 2006; for an analysis of the concrete campaigns see Křeček & Vochocová, 2009; Slačálek, 2013; Venclík, 2021). Eventually, a right-wing coalition formed the government led by the ODS and approved the law on ÚSTR in early fall 2006, only to find it barely passing the first reading in the Lower Chamber in November of the same year; only one mere vote allowed the proposal to pass. According to Françoise Mayer, this procedure copied the atmosphere of the negotiations of all Czech decommunization laws (2009, p. 53), testifying that the issue was politically virtually irreconcilable.

The same procedure occurred a couple months later during the second and final reading. Despite some compromises, the major objections remained unanswered and the logic of the law unchanged (Dvořáková, 2007, p. 158). The clash of the political Left and Right over the mnemonic measures had a history, as the political scientist Martin Kovanic remarks, referring to the earlier attempt to establish a documentation institution in 2001–2002 which was blocked by the two leftist parties, ČSSD and KSČM (2017). The institute and its scientific results have been under critique since the first years of its operation, and the ongoing emotional debates have been demonstrating that there was by far no consensus over the enforced model of official memory politics (Pehe, 2018, p. 208). In the retrospect, founding of ÚSTR has been interpreted as an attempt to “authoritatively collectivize public memory” (Příbáň, 2020), calling for a historical inquiry of the socialist period under a strong political bias.

The further life of ÚSTR has been raising media attention on each occasion of the changes in the personnel, scientific as well as supervisory and managerial, and the role the political and ideological preferences of the concrete individuals played in the way the institute would operate and what results it would yield. The first director, Pavel Žáček, was replaced by Daniel Herman, only to be replaced soon by a politically indifferent state official Pavla Foglová after the elections reshuffled the Left-Right forces in the Senate (Kovanic, 2017). While the first years of ÚSTR were criticized for a lack of professionalism or scientific depth (Randák, 2011), each following change on the post of the director and the subsequent changes in the personnel yielded a vehement reaction from the opposite side, such as open letters accusing of not abiding with the law ordaining to study the crimes of the totalitarian regimes

(Vodrážka, 2015), or warning of slipping into a propagandist institute producing instrumental results that only fit within the allowed frame (*Open Letter to Institute's Board*, 2022).

4.2. Tackling the socialist heritage in the post-socialist cultural landscape: (Dis)continuity and street renaming in Ostrava

Outside the efforts to codify the memory of the socialist past through narratives produced by a state-sanctioned scientific institution, the memory has been constructed in other areas using different means, including interpretation, management and planning of cultural heritage. Analogously to memory, one of the core functions of heritage is validation and legitimation (Lowenthal, cited in Ashworth & Graham, 2005); as such, it is a process inherently influenced by the power dynamics of political and social conflicts within societies. The public space as a shared milieu is theorized through the concept of cultural landscape, i.e. as a “mélange of forms, meanings and functions” (Czepczyński, 2008). Through the lens of cultural geography, landscapes are serving as mediums through which dominant social groups create and structure the external world, imbuing it with significance and contributing to the construction of identities and meanings (*ibid.*, pp. 183, 26). It is in the cultural landscape where different systems of representations based on different experiences and expectations are manifested. As a politically driven process and a part of the official memory work, management and planning of heritage is based on what particular interpretation is currently promoted, by whom, and whose interests are advanced or retarded through it (Ashworth & Graham, 2005).

The way past is represented in the public space profoundly shapes the collective understanding of it. In the context of post-socialist transformations, analogously to other historical situations of regime changes, the two core and intertwined activities taking place were distancing from the past regime on one hand, and demonstrating the commitment to new political values on the other. The reconciliation with the past in the urban space, i.e. the “public” memory, thus interlinks the process of active remembering with the process of active forgetting, especially in relation to “matter-like” elements of heritage (Bergson, 1896/1988; Johnson, 2004). The most common tool for the processes of forgetting and remembering has been the practice of commemoration. As the most visible and accessible statement through which a political regime manifests what is worth of remembrance, it is used to validate and officialize certain personalities, events or phenomena while at the same time expunge from

public space those praised by the past regime, through the act of de-commemoration (Light & Young, 2018).

As recounted in chapters 3.2.2 and 3.1, in the historical and geographical context of post-socialism, the processes of purging and removing remnants of the past regimes came to be signified through the notion of “decommunization”, following a logic of a “year-zero” (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 1999). Although the term was used also metaphorically in other context, these efforts have most commonly concerned tackling of the actual visible imprints of the communist regimes in the cultural landscape. Decommunization has been legalized as a “purifying” strategy in different countries across the region. It took on different forms, testifying of the diverse forms of state socialism and relations to the Soviet Union but also of different motivations of the local political or social groups. The latest wave of these revisions was provoked by the Russian aggression towards Ukraine taking place since 2014 (Betlii, 2022; Marples, 2018; Skibinski, 2023; Törnquist-Plewa & Yurchuk, 2019; Zhurzhenko, 2022). In the Czech case, however, the demand for wholesale removal of the socialist heritage remained on the discursive level, albeit heavily supported by the array of local memory laws that helped frame the socialist imprint in the cultural landscape as relics of an “unwanted past” (Czeczynski, 2008).

4.2.1. Undoing the socialist past in the post-socialist cultural landscape

As a *mélange*, cultural landscapes always contain residua of the past which can be reacted to in a variety of ways. For the residua of the socialist past, some attitudes have become symptomatic in the cities across the former Eastern Bloc. The cultural geographer and anthropologist Mariusz Czeczynski identifies three main schemes or social constructions: the *Funky*, which consists in turning the icons of the past regime into an attractive product, usually by younger agents for the younger audiences; the *Freaky*, which instead focuses on the oppressive and destructive aspects of the regime, foregrounding negative remembering of the socialist period as a time and space of “oppression, devastation and tyranny”; and the *Fantastic*, as an attitude that consists in incorporation of what was left to the functional urban tissue through commercial re-interpretation, turning away from forms and meanings to functions (Czeczynski, 2008, p. 183). Particularly the reformulations driven by the scheme “freaky” might include removal.

The challenges of how to approach the socialist heritage intermingled with the rather sudden and swift processes of privatization, reintroduction of land rent, or the appearance of new actors on the landscape, such as local governments, free media, private owners and investors (Czepczyński, 2005). Consisting of architecture, monuments or street names, socialist heritage has soon become a subject of controversies, often interpreted as a burden or a hinderance in the development of the societies towards democracy and capitalism. The socialist past was rendering the cities of the former Eastern bloc as inherently opposite to the Western capitalist cities (Hirt et al., 2016). One of the fundamental sources of the dismissal were orientalist constructions, turned all the more powerful with the triumph of the West in the early 1990s: The Eastern element was deemed unmodern and underdeveloped by default, an interpretive frame that applied to socialism as well (Buchowski, 2006). The socialist project epitomized by the Eastern Bloc was so utterly discredited that the remnants became devoid of any former content or motivation; very often, they were treated as empty shells (Kulić, 2018).

Memory work taking place through tackling the heritage in the post-socialist cultural landscapes followed the logic of excising the historical period of the rule of the communist parties and reconnecting to the pre-war period. This “anastomosis” was to create a sense in the public memory of resuming on a trajectory that was aberrated by the Soviet intervention (Verdery, 1999; Young & Light, 2001). This corresponds fully to the way the national past has been narrated in the Czech context (Blaive, 2016). Due to its geographical position in the Central Eastern European region, the Czech restoring of the right historical trajectory involved the rediscovery and reassertion of “European” heritage, which was situated in the West (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 1999), hence validating the externalization and abandoning of the past Eastern orientation altogether.

4.2.2. Place names through the lens of critical toponymy

As essential components of the cultural landscapes, the geographical names of places – streets, boulevards, squares or embankments, referred to as toponyms – contribute significantly to the inscription of ideological messages about the past to the public space, becoming integral to it and making the selected versions of history appear as the natural order of things (Azaryahu, 1996). They count among the most common means of commemoration which political regimes use to make a rhetorical statement in the public landscape of the currently valid political values (Light & Young, 2018, p. 234). The practice of place naming

and renaming represents “a way of creating new connections between the past and the present” (Alderman, 2008, pp. 195–196). The place names are, additionally, interwoven with a number of practices of everyday life, permeating “our daily vocabulary, both verbal and visual” (ibid.).

From the various mnemonic practices in the cultural landscape, commemoration through place names is distinctive for being a predominantly top-down process. Unlike monumentalization, i.e. commemorating through monuments which might emerge from negotiations between state and non-state actors with often competing agendas (Light & Young, 2018, p. 234; Wüstenberg, 2011, 2020), street names are always state-curated “from above”, albeit negotiations at the lower political levels in concrete locations always take place. The political and social implications of toponymy have been attended to within the research field of critical toponymy. Gaining momentum after the critical turn within cultural geography, critical toponymy has focused on the toponymic landscape as on a dynamic process: Toponyms are approached as fundamental components of the cultural landscapes with a fundamental role in the promotion of privileged or hegemonic worldviews in the public space (J. David & Mácha, 2014, pp. 140, 35).

Of the whole of geographical names, a specific subset is habitually used for political instrumentalization – the urbanonyms, i.e. sets of urban place names. The city is the most politicized type of cultural landscape, for it concentrates people and power, and it is prone to be usurped by the governing elites and ideologies (Ptáčnicková, 2021, pp. 30–31). As the urbanscape itself is a shifting entity, the toponymy is where this shifting nature can be very well demonstrated (ibid.). The place names are used for commemorative purposes in order to transform the urban environment into “a virtual political setting” (Azaryahu, 1996, p. 311). The political context of urbanscapes renders urbanonyms a category of place names that is inherently instable and distinctively artificial. Except for the medieval names in the cores of the old European cities, which reflect the original functions of the urban areas (Harvalík, 2004), the selection of place names in the urbanscape is most often driven by a commemoration motif. The names are selected from a reservoir of significant personalities, events or phenomena considered praiseworthy by the individual political regimes. The longest periods of “relative stability” in the area of toponymy have lasted around twenty years, which means that members of any generation experience at least one, and frequently up to three or four waves of street renaming (ibid., p. 32).

It is through commemoration that the political value system is inscribed into the urban tissue, thereby rendering urbanonyms artificial by default. The system of place names is motivated by the will of the political structure currently in power to officialize its values, standardizing and naturalizing it by “reshaping” the symbolic urbanscape (Azaryahu, 2009; J. David & Mácha, 2014). As political regimes take turns, so do the systems of urban place names: They are produced within a concrete political context and as such very vulnerable to change (Azaryahu, 1996). The names mirroring the values of the former regime may be in discord, or indeed sharp contrast, with the currently foregrounded values (Light & Young, 2018): The procedure that follows is, then, a “symbolic retribution” of the old regime (Azaryahu, 2015, p. 29).

The rewriting of the toponymic landscape with each regime change is a tendency that has been observed in the Czech/Czechoslovak context as well (Kojetínová, 2013, p. 149). Embedded in the Central Eastern European context typical for its lack of “a quiet and continuous history” (Jaworski, 2007, cited in Holubec, 2018, p. 124), the political development has been remarkably dynamic since the national awakenings of the late 19th century. According to the political scientist Roman David, the Czech lands have experienced seven changes of political regimes in the 20th century alone; purging has been the overarching moral stance in responding to the changes, and manifested as shaming of the representatives of the old regime and a glorification of its victims (R. David, 2015, p. 98). This reflected in the approach to toponyms, as well – one of the forms of shaming would consist in decommemoration, i.e. in a deliberate rewriting of place names referring to personalities, events or phenomena valued by the former regime, depriving them from the privileged position and social significance they have been granted, and effectively condemning them to oblivion.

4.2.3. Toponymy after 1989: Re-writing history in post-socialist cities

In times of political upheaval and change, renaming of public spaces accompanies the transformation process as a typical revolutionary ritual: a ritual which manifests the attempt to align the geographical names with the currently valid value system, including a reinterpreted version of history (Azaryahu, 2009, p. 59). According to Katherine Verdery, the early 1990s saw one of the most profound transformations of urban spaces: What was taking place in the cities across the former Eastern Bloc was no less than a total reconfiguration of time and space (Verdery, 1999).

The reconfiguration of the public space was, as a matter of fact, considered one of the most noticeable changes in the transforming societies in the 1990s (Light, 2004). The transformations of the post-socialist urbanscapes are an ideal, almost textbook-like material for critical toponymy: Since the very early 1990s, research started to arise investigating the changes in the toponymic landscapes of the former socialist cities including the power structures as drivers of these major, and mostly top-down, transformations. In the aftermath of the collapse of the socialist Bloc, the toponymic landscapes started almost immediately to change. The “toponymic cleansing” (Rose-Redwood et al., 2010, p. 460) was exemplified during the early months after the collapse of the Soviet union across most of the cities of the former Eastern Bloc. At the same time, the activity formed an important layer of the protest response to the vast instrumentalization of public space pursued by the communist authorities (Czepczyński, 2008; Light & Young, 2018).

The changes were approached from diverse angles. In some cases, the toponymic reflection of political turn-taking was used to demonstrate the boundaries between the new sense of the categories of “us” and “them” and to articulate the shifting geopolitical alliances, as in the case of Zagreb (Šakaja & Stanić, 2011). In Budapest, fervent discussions were taking place across the different levels of the political apparatus and resulted in power struggles over who has the right to decide which versions of national history should be reflected in the urban place names (Palonen, 2008). One of the most prevalent and most striking aspects of the toponymic post-socialist transformations, however, has been the way the former historical narratives were obviously replaced by the new ones: In his study of the changing toponymy in Bucharest in the 1990s, Duncan Light points to the blatant strategy of erasing the socialist past from Romania’s collective memory (Light, 2004). The same strategy was observed in the process of street renaming in Berlin after the unification of Germany (Azaryahu, 1997). The ideological motivation of the commemorating practices was in the focus of a large Polish-German comparative project, pointing to the diverging conceptions of ideology in the background of the renaming processes in the 20th century, including the socialist period (Fabiszak et al., 2021). In Poland, toponymy is subject to extensive research since the 2016 decommunization legislation ordering the socialist place names to be removed, along with other elements of the socialist heritage in the public space (Dubicki, 2018; Fabiszak & Brzezińska, 2020; Różycki, 2017). The effects of decommunization efforts in toponymy are also researched in Ukraine (Kuczabski & Boychuk, 2020; Kudriavtseva, 2020), including the

shift to de-russification in the wake of the Russian military aggression (Gironi, 2023; Gnatiuk & Melnychuk, 2023).

In Czechoslovakia, the toponymic landscape began to change throughout the whole country in the aftermath of the revolutionary events in November 1989. The changes were implemented under the supervision of toponymy committees, usually spontaneously organized and consisting of historians, linguists and other experts (Šídlo, 2020). The revision process was intense in the early transformation years and lasted until the mid 1990s, becoming the longest renaming process in Czechoslovakia's history (Ptáčnicková, 2022, p. 318). Realized in a triad of *naming – renaming – returning to the original name*, one of the key tasks was to deschematize the names of the public spaces, i.e. remove the key based on which the place names were selected during the socialist period. Very often, however, the old schematization was replaced with a new one, applying the same logic that was supposed to be avoided (Odaloš, 1996).

In a reflection on the current state of the Czech onomastics and its interdisciplinary aspirations, the onomastician Jaroslav David states that the critical toponymic approach has been so far adopted only scarcely in the Czech and Slovak context. A significant contribution to the field has been made through the work of Martina Ptáčnicková (né Kojetínová) who explores toponymy from the perspective of memory studies as *lieux de memoire* or as fundamental components of the process of forming urban identity (Kojetínová, 2013; Ptáčnicková, 2022). In her latest monography, Ptáčnicková offers a detailed account of the toponymic interventions in the socialist period in Prague and hints at some important continuities (Ptáčnicková, 2021). Outside the study by Jaroslav David who addressed the political tensions in tackling socialist toponymy in urban districts originating from the socialist period (J. David, 2013), the transformation of the toponymic landscape after the regime change in the early 1990s and its political implications remain rather unreflected in research, except for works recounting the changes from the onomastician perspective in the early years of the transformation (Knappová, 1993; Odaloš, 1996). A promising stream in the local interdisciplinary approach to toponymy focuses on the social dimension of the place names. The “lived toponymy”, or non-standardized toponymy, maps the actual experiences and strategies of appropriation and customization of the standardized toponymy by its users (Ptáčnicková, 2018, 2022).

5. RESEARCH DESIGN

The adoption of a critical discursive approach reflects both on the level of paradigm (critical and constructivist) and analysis (qualitative toolkit and procedure). The research design chapter is structured in the following way: It opens with a review of the main principles and concepts of a critical discursive research that drive the analyses but recounts them in the light of their practical application in the research process. The chapter continues with a formulation of the project's goal and research questions, both for the individual studies and for the whole thesis. It concludes with a detailed description of the analytical process of conducting the individual studies, including an account of the data selection process and the analytical procedure and toolkit used.

5.1. Doing critical discourse analysis: Main principles

As was described in detail in chapter 2.2., the critical perspective adopted in this thesis follows the paradigmatic and epistemological principles of the research programme critical discourse studies (CDS hereafter). Research conducted within this CDS aims at examining and challenging the discursive and language practices through which inequalities are sustained in societies. It is also defined through a social commitment: Compared to other discourse-oriented research approaches, it openly and explicitly positions itself on the side of dominated and oppressed groups and against dominating groups (Fairclough et al., 2011). The critical angle consists in an accent on “showing how *some* have the power over the discourses—and therefore the ideas, values, and priorities—that define our societies” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, emphasis added). The focus of most seminal works carried out under the CDS rubric have been texts produced by elite or otherwise powerful agents or institutionalized channels of social communication, such as the media (Flowerdew & Richardson, 2017a).

Aiming at “revealing the kinds of discourses used to maintain power and sustain existing social relations” (Fairclough et al., 2011, p. 12), the main subject of interest has been the ideological work in discourse, i.e. showing how ideas are used in service of power, which is asymmetrically distributed in societies (Thompson, 1987). The power implications of ideology also mean that ideologies are naturally prescriptive and normative (Verschuere, 2011) which at the same time means they act on other discourses: They need to suppress or

sideline other interpretations and views. This is done by rendering ideological ideas commonsensical, naturalizing them and making them persuasive (ibid., 8).

The meaning-making is occurring across different levels of texts and discourses. At the micro-analytical level of language use, the processes of signification, representation and narration can be studied, with extra focus on the mechanisms through which meanings are rendered natural and universal. Both studies in this project are explorations of intertextuality, i.e. of “how elements of other texts are incorporated and combined within a particular text” (Fairclough, 2015). Intertextuality is a quality of texts referring to their productivity. Texts and discourses are always connected to other texts and discourses which were produced earlier, as well as those which are produced synchronically and subsequently (Fairclough et al., 2011, p. 11).

The links between texts and discourses are made through the acts of assuming and presupposing. But productivity of texts is socially limited and constrained, dependent on the existing power relations. The textual analysis, focused on intertextuality and productivity of texts, has to be combined with an analysis of the power relations in which the texts are evolving. As Fairclough remarks, the theory of intertextuality cannot itself account for these social limitations, and so it needs to be combined with “a theory of power relations and how they shape (and are shaped) by social structures and practices” (Fairclough, 1992, p. 270). The social context, in Fairclough’s view, is what we need to understand as a limitation to the process of meaning-making: It defines the ‘possible’ in a communicative situation” (ibid.).

The critical discursive approach, as applied in this thesis, is thus characterized by three main features: 1) An emphasis on micro-context of language demonstrated through the central position of the detailed textual analysis; 2) a paradigmatic grounding in Marxist critical social theory which aims at problematizing existing power relations; and 3) a methodological emphasis on the dialectical relation between language and society, meaning that different context levels are examined and considered as “shapers” of social meanings. Through this focus, the core postulate of the CDS is brought into attention, i.e. that discourse is both socially constituted and socially constitutive (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). Applied on the concrete issue under investigation in this thesis, the two analysed instances of “reconciliation with the socialist past” – the establishment of the local national memory institute and the debates over the socialist street names – are studied through a focus on discursive mechanisms, aiming at elucidating the way the dominant discourse on communism is drawn

on, consulted or negotiated as an interpretive framework, thereby drawing attention to its ideological nature. The dominant discourse on communism is theorized vis-à-vis its interrelatedness with the process of construction of Czech cultural memory post-1989, including its political conditionality and the broader contexts in which the processes are embedded – the regional, historical, and geopolitical.

5.2. Research goal and research questions

Through a focus on the two specific cases, the thesis explores the dynamic between different perspectives on the process of reconciliation with the socialist past, as represented in Czech mainstream media discourse. The cases are explored to expose the habitual media work with the topic, with a specific focus on the position of the dominant discourse of communism. While in the case of the national memory institute, the events surrounding its establishment are routinely newsworthy due to their embedding in the procedures of the highest governmental bodies (Chambers of the Parliament), in the case of the unrenamed streets in Ostrava, the socialist heritage is thematized (and the issue of coming to terms with it, i.e. of the memory of state socialism) on a variety of occasions, reflecting the journalist habits and routines in handling topics and setting an agenda, such as anniversary journalism, seasonal reporting or comparative reports on both local and international levels (Zelizer, 2008).

The thesis explores the discursive dominance of one particular narration on the socialist past, referred to as the dominant discourse on communism, through a focus on its two dimensions: crime-centredness and historical discontinuity, as aggregates of the main accents of the dominant discourse summarized in chapter 3.3.2. The two studies are an investigation of the relation between the dominant discourse and the journalist representations of the socialist past, acknowledging that Czech mainstream media profile as predominantly centre-right owing to the liberal-conservative “consensus” that has characterized the Czech public sphere since the 1990s (Volek, 2022; Pehe, 2023). The goal is thus to elucidate whether and how is the dominant discourse reproduced in the journalist and media discourse, whether and how it operates ideologically through its connection to powerful agents and their interpretations, and through which discursive mechanisms it retains its hegemonic position. Building on this exploration, it unfolds and discusses the power dynamic between the different perspectives that emerge in the two monitored cases.

Further, the role of mainstream media as specific memory actors is discussed, acknowledging their powerful position in the social structure, their proximity to state power and their capacity to construct, stabilize and normalize particular views in society. As explained in chapter 2.4.1, the organizational and professional practices of journalism are not considered in this research; the focus is on the cultural agency of the media in the area of memory (Neiger et al., 2011), elaborated on in chapter 2.4.2., particularly their role of mimicking the memory work of the state reflecting in the way the media treat past events (Kligler-Vilenchik et al., 2014).

These concerns translate into research questions for the two individual studies. The studies are different on the level of temporality, longevity and topicality, as will be explained in detail in the following section. In both studies, however, the same discursive phenomena are addressed – the form of thematization, the role and position of the dominant discourse on communism and the attitude of the media towards the topic:

RQ1a: What is the power dynamic of the dispute over the passing of the law on the Institute? In what way does the dominant discourse on communism influence this dynamic? What role do media play in this dynamic?

RQ1b: What is the power dynamic of the dispute over the socialist street names in Ostrava? In what way does the dominant discourse on communism influence this dynamic? What role do media play in this dynamic?

There are also two complementary questions that draw the results to the broader level, i.e. to the issue of memory construction and the mnemonic work of media:

RQ2: What is the relation of the journalistic representations of the socialist past in the Czech mainstream news media and the dominant discourse on communism?

RQ3: How does this relation correspond to the construction of cultural memory in the public arena?

5.3. Data selection and analytical procedure

The two studied cases represent specific instances in the process of “reconciling with the socialist past”. As analytical cases, they differ in the type of discursive event they constitute, in size and longevity of the analysed corpora and in the temporality of the cases. Outside the

differences, however, there are common features to the way each case is thematized, represented or constructed in the and by the media.

In both cases, two levels of discourses were considered for the analysis of meaning-making. Both studies work with two tiers of corpora, the so called macro and micro discourses, where the macro discourse represents a broader dimension in which the micro discourse is embedded in each case. The embeddedness and the relation between the micro and macro levels is different: In the case of the study on the national memory institute, the macro dimension amounts to the parliamentary negotiations of the law proposal spanning eighteen months in the years 2005 to 2007, while the micro dimension consists of one particular event in this time span, i.e. the passing of the law in May 2007. In the case of socialist toponymy in Ostrava, on the other hand, the macro dimension is the media coverage of the topic of socialist street names on a pan-national level published over two decades, between 1999–2019. The micro dimension, then, is the selection of articles dedicated to one particular region, that of Ostrava.

As for the research procedure, both cases were explored in the same way, starting with a long-term view on the media coverage of the topic to identify patterns of thematization and representation, and then identifying a micro corpus to implement the textual analysis. The macro discourses were used for sensitization and intertextuality assessment. Although the textual analyses of the micro discourses are central, the study on the national memory institute includes an analysis of the macro discourse as well, as it provides a chronology of the event.

In terms of newsworthiness and the way the two topics are handled by media, there is a quantitative and qualitative difference between the two. In the study on the national memory institute, the long-term corpus consists of the media coverage of the parliamentary disputes over the law on the Institute over the period of 18 months, where the newsworthiness of the topic is self-defined, assumed from the natural media attention to the procedures of the bodies of official political power structure (Richardson, 2007). In the second case, on the other hand, the long-term corpus was composed by looking at the media coverage over the span of three decades, seeking to track patterns of introducing the topic of socialist street names and bringing it to attention. In this second case, thus, the role of the media in setting the agenda of the past was considered. Despite the similarities of the research procedure, the analyses are distinct and differently structured. Therefore, the analytical procedure and details of the data selection are explained individually for both cases.

5.3.1. Passing of the Law on the establishment of a Czech national memory institute

At the level of corpus selection, I operated with both meanings of the notion discourse as explicated in chapter 1.5. While keeping in focus the dominant discourse on communism, as a hegemonic narrative interrelated with constructions of memory of the socialist past, I investigated the selected topics as *discourses*, i.e. as sums of texts coherent based on a topic, i.e. as “a discourse on x” (Reisigl & Wodak 2009, p. 90). The study revisits the period of 18 months from December 2005 to May 2007 and tracks the discourse on the national memory institute through coverage in Czech print and online media, starting with the first law proposal presented by a group of senators all the way to the passing of the law by the Lower Chamber of the Czech Parliament. The media texts were retrieved from the Czech digital media archive in the delimited time period using key words “institute” and “memory”. The key word search generated also articles about other national memory institutes in the region, namely in Poland and Slovakia. The period was scanned to identify discourse peaks, where the evident peak is the media coverage of the passing of the law on the Institute in the Lower Chamber of the Parliament on May 2nd 2007. On that day, the Czech press agency published an official press release summarizing the proceedings and the result. The text was republished by numerous online media outlets. On the following day, May 3rd, four editorial texts were published in four major newspaper dailies and their online versions. The coverage of passing of the law on the following day was selected as the corpus for micro textual analysis. The data was sorted into a two-tier data sample, respective of the two discourse levels:

Tier 1: The discourse on the national memory institute(s): Macro corpus for sensitization and interdiscursivity assessment (513 articles, corpus A1, Appendix 1)

Tier 2: The discourse on passing of the law on the Institute: Micro corpus for textual analysis (5 articles, corpus A2, Appendix 2, Table 1)

The tier-one corpus consisted of 513 articles, commentaries and op-eds, in print and online, dedicated to the Czech proposal for the local national memory institute and its numerous readings in both chambers of the Czech parliament, but also to events related to the institutes in Poland and Slovakia. Through the prism of the literature on the regional “grammar” driving the local efforts to establish the institute (Mink, 2013), these news and reports are considered significantly contributing to the gradual construction of the case in the media. The tier-one corpus was used to capture the sentiments in the negotiations over the law proposal and

identify peaks in media coverage, but also to expose key pro- and counter-arguments, as they were emerging and reflecting eventually in the later micro discourse on passing of the law. The first-tier corpus covers the Czech daily news reporting, including major dailies (*MF DNES*, *Lidové noviny*, *Právo*, *Hospodářské noviny*), tabloid press (*AHA!*, *Šíp*, *Blesk*) regional press (e.g. *Deník* and its regional mutations, *Metro*), or political party's press (*Haló noviny*). From the online media, it covers the major online news outlets of that period (e.g. *aktuálně.cz*, *idnes.cz*, *novinky.cz*, *lidovky.cz*), political webzines (*neviditelnypes.cz*, *blistry.cz*), but also the web news provided by the Czech public service media (*rozhlas.cz*, *ceska-media.cz*). It contains both news and editorials, including multiple medialized reactions from different local stakeholders, such as politicians, historians, journalists and other public intellectuals.

The tier-two corpus consists of five texts (see Table 1). One article is from the Czech press agency (ČTK), published on May 2nd on the day of the passing of the law. The press release was republished with minor edits on the day of the passing across different online outlets, including the online versions of four major Czech news dailies, *ihned.cz* (*Hospodářské noviny*), *iDnes.cz* (*Mladá fronta DNES*), *lidovky.cz* (*Lidové noviny*), and *novinky.cz* (*Právo*). The resting four news texts of the micro corpus were published on the following day, May 3rd, in the mentioned four major dailies, in the form of an editorial report from the proceedings. As for their overall journalistic character, the outlets qualify as “semi-quality press” (Volek, 2022), or “pop newspapers” (Jiráček & Köpplová, 2020) owing to their casual mixing of previously incompatible editorial ingredients of quality and tabloid press, resulting from the market-type transformation of traditional Czech dailies in the early 1990s.

The political alignment of the four dailies largely reflects the stories of their emergence on the local media landscape after 1989. The monitored period, spanning 2006–2007, precedes significant changes in the Czech media landscape that began in 2008, when local oligarchs first acquired media outlets, affecting both political orientations and journalistic autonomy (Štětka, 2012). Among the four analysed dailies, *Lidové noviny* (“People’s News”) is by far the oldest one. Founded in 1893, the outlet counted as a prominent quality broadsheet paper during the interwar period in the 1920s and 1930s. After the Communist party monopolized power in 1948 and openly reprobated the interwar political system and its idea of the public sphere, the publishing of the daily was suspended in 1952. *Lidové noviny* only emerged as samizdat in the late 1980s, resurrected by a group of dissidents in celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Charter 77 (Pernes & Ruml, 1993). As an important communication channel of the opposition, it played a significant role in the November revolution of 1989.

The association with the dissident intellectuals granted the daily an aura of *the* liberal daily, a prestigious publication restoring the tradition of a democratic cultivated political debate.

Právo (Law), the leftist daily with an unusually stable ownership profile and until the diversification of voices in the Czech public sphere in the late 2000s the only media representant of the centre-left, transformed from *Rudé právo* (Red Law), the official press of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia. It was relaunched as an ‘independent’ leftist daily after 1989, taking consequent steps to distance itself from its past character as the mouthpiece of the communist regime and becoming a surprisingly quality newspaper (Jirák & Köpplová, 2020; Rychlíková, 2023). *Mladá Fronta DNES* (Young Front TODAY), a former paper of the Socialist Youth Union published in socialist Czechoslovakia with various changes in the organisational structure since the 1950s, also took on a historical role in November 1989, as it accommodated young journalists who avidly covered the student-led demonstrations. Gradually, the paper was refurbished into a centre-right daily; in the early 1990s, it even aligned explicitly with the political agenda of the government (Pehe, 2023; Kettle, 1996). *Hospodářské noviny* (The Economic News), as a newly established daily founded in 1991, distinguished itself on the emerging market through an “attempt at a serious, conservative-oriented daily” (Jirák & Köpplová, 2020) by adopting an economic, neoliberal perspective. With such a view, it clearly copied the dominant accents favoured in the public sphere until the late 2000s, where the social-democratic or leftist views were explicitly sidelined and the meaning and legacy of the socialist era fell under this interpretation.

Index	Date	Heading	Media	Author
A2.1	02.05.2007	Česko bude mít ústav pro zkoumání éry komunismu a nacismu (<i>Czechia will have an Institute for studying the era of Communism and Nazism</i>)	ceska-media.cz	ČTK
A2.2	03.05.2007	Ústav bude zkoumat období totality (<i>The Institute will study the period of totalitarianism</i>)	Hospodářské noviny	
	03.05.2007	Triumf pravice: totalita se má zkoumat (<i>Triumph of the Right: Totalitarianism should be studied</i>)	Hospodářské noviny	Jan Kubita
A2.3	03.05.2007	Okupaci a éru komunismu prozkoumá zvláštní úřad (<i>A Special Institute will study the Occupation and the era of</i>	Lidové noviny	Václav Drchal

		<i>Communism)</i>		
	03.05.2007	„Ústav totality“ má zelenou (<i>The “Totalitarian Institute” has the green light</i>)	Lidové noviny	<i>Václav Drchal</i>
A2.4	03.05.2007	Ústav proti agentům StB (<i>Institute against the StB agents</i>)	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Josef Kopecký</i>
A2.5	03.05.2007	Koalice s přeběhlíky prosadila Ústav pro studium totalit (<i>Coalition with the defenders pushed through the Institute for the Study of Totalitarianism</i>)	Právo	<i>Nada Adamičková, Marie Königová</i>

(Table 1: Tier-two corpus. Discourse on the passing of the law on the Institute)

The political profiling of the individual dailies reflected in the way the event of passing the law on the national memory institute, as a major step in the process of reconciliation with the socialist past, was interpreted. The result of the negotiations, i.e. the passing of the law on the Institute as a decision in line with the dominant discourse on communism, was generally endorsed in the articles in *Hospodářské noviny*, *Lidové noviny* and *Mladá Fronta DNES*, along with most of other Czech mainstream media, profiled as centre-right (Volek, 2022). On the contrary, the text published in *Právo*, a sole representant of the centre-left in the Czech media landscape of that time, diverged from the resting three texts and problematized the passing of the law, pointing particularly to the political bias behind the proposal and the general discord emerging around the idea. Lastly, the ČTK press release serves as a reference for the reporting in the analysed media outlets, as a metaphorical indicator of how the event was approached from a public service press agency with legally declared principle to “deliver objective and multi-perspective information for free formation of opinion” (Trunečková, 2016).

The analytical procedure started on the broader level. An exploratory analysis of the tier-one corpus was conducted, consisting in familiarizing reading sensitive to intertextuality and interdiscursivity. Considering the tier-one corpus a “bedrock” for the tier-two corpus, the broader discourse dimension was analysed as encompassing and informing the narrower discourse dimension. On the micro level, the coherence of the argumentation and the semantic structure was considered vis-à-vis the dynamic interaction between the microlevel and the broader dimension (Fairclough et al., 2003, p. 36). For the textual analysis of the tier-two

corpus, a toolkit was devised combining Fairclough's approach to textual analysis (Fairclough, 2003) and tools and procedures from the Discourse-Historical Approach (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, 2009). The procedure started with identification of the individual elements of the discourse – actors, objects, events and phenomena. Second, the modes of their presentation and introduction were assessed by looking at the discursive strategies of presenting the elements across the individual texts, separately as well as in comparison. The five strategies – referred to as nomination, predication, perspectivization, mitigation/intensification and argumentation – were explored and assessed asking the following questions during the close-reading of the analysed texts (Reisigl, 2017, p. 52):

1. How are persons, objects, phenomena, events, processes and actions named and referred to linguistically in the discourse in question?
2. What characteristics or qualities are attributed to social actors, objects, phenomena, events, processes and actions mentioned in the discourse?
3. From what perspective are the nominations, attributions, arguments expressed?
4. Are the respective utterances articulated overtly, are they intensified or mitigated?
5. What arguments are employed in the discourse?

Following this identification and assessment, auxiliary questions were formulated:

- How was the conflict over the law represented?
- Who is opposing the law proposal, and why? How is he/she represented, how are the counter-arguments represented?
- Who is defending the law proposal, and why? How is he/she represented, how are the pro-arguments represented?
- How is the outcome represented?

As for the internal relations within texts, the focus was on all levels of linguistic expression, including semantic, grammatical and lexical, considering relations between different words, expressions, clauses of sentences, but also between words in phrases or relations of collocation and co-occurrence. The choices of the final linguistic expression were scrutinized on both syntagmatic and paradigmatic axis – both on the level of how the individual elements presented in the text were interrelated, but also on what was included in the text at the expense of something else (Fairclough, 2003, pp. 36–38). In addition, the analysis on the textual level was also approached relationally: Both internal and external relations were

considered in order to capture the multiple influences on the meaning-making process (ibid.). As for the external relations, these were elucidated thanks to the anchoring of the micro corpus in the tier-one corpus, i.e. the broader discourse on national memory institutes.

All of these mechanisms of representation and construction of the topic in the tier-two corpus – i.e. the discursive elements and strategies, and the relations between different levels of linguistic expression – were analysed to discuss the power dynamic of the dispute. In the chapter 6.1. with empirical results, they are presented via a procedural layout of the conflict, looking at 1) the representation of the conflict, 2) representation of the processes of defending and opposing the institute, and 3) the representation of the outcome.

5.3.2. Socialist street names in post-socialist Ostrava

Analogously to the goal of the first study, the second study, too, is committed to exploring the role of the dominant discourse on communism in making sense of the processes of coming to terms with the socialist past. To investigate the issue of socialist toponymy as a controversial cultural heritage, the peculiar case of socialist street names in a 1950s housing district in Ostrava-South is revisited based on a longitudinal monitoring of Czech media discourse since the change of the regime in the early 1990s, reconstructing the issue of street renaming first on a national and subsequently on a specific regional level.

As with the first study, the gathered material was organized into two corpora, representing two tiers. The interrelatedness of the two tiers, however, follows a different logic – the micro discourse is a cluster of texts thematizing the socialist street names in Ostrava, while the broader tier-one corpus represents the media coverage of socialist toponymy across the whole country. It is, therefore, delineated geographically, not temporarily as in the case of the first study. The base for both tiers was a search in the Newton IT digital media monitoring system, using a combination of key words (“communist street names”; “socialist street names”; “street renaming”). First, the time period from the early 1990s to 2019 was scanned. The ending point for the monitoring was selected as the year of the 30th anniversary of the November revolution of 1989. After this initial search, the starting date of the corpus was adjusted to the late 1990s, as it appeared that the first notable thematization of the street renaming process only occurred in the Czech mainstream media in 1999, within the reflections of the reconciliation process on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the 1989 revolution. The outcome of the longitudinal search was a corpus of articles that focus specifically or include a

focus on the toponymy of the socialist period (247 articles). This data, forming the tier-one corpus, also revealed the higher relevancy of the topic on the level of individual Czech and Moravian regions, as it contained articles about cases in particular localities across the country. Out of the regions represented in this corpus, the socialist heritage in the region of Ostrava was mentioned the most, hence justifying the selection of the case for the study as the tier-two micro corpus.

The tier-two micro corpus was formed from the tier-one corpus by selecting 18 articles thematizing socialist place names in Ostrava, with special focus on the case of the complex of streets in the district of Ostrava-Zábřeh, referred to as Old Zábřeh in colloquial language, completed in 1952 and holding a name “district Stalingrad” in the first nine years of its existence. The final shape of the corpus was cross-checked and confirmed by an additional search in the media archive through specified key words of “Ostrava renaming” and “Ostrava district Stalingrad”.

The resulting two tiers of corpus and the two interrelated discourses then looked like this:

Tier 1: Discourse on socialist toponymy in the Czech Republic: Macro corpus for sensitization and interdiscursivity assessment (247 articles, corpus B1, Appendix 3)

Tier 2: Discourse on socialist street names in Ostrava: Micro corpus for textual analysis (18 articles, corpus B2, Appendix 4, Table 2)

The media in the sample represent mainstream production, regardless of their regional scope, though alternative views, if expressed at all, are most likely to appear in regional outlets within the Czech media landscape (Hájek & Carpentier, 2015). In the sample, there are influential regional outlets with strong historical roots, such as *Moravskoslezský den*, established in the early 1990s and consolidating a strong local journalist community (Pehe, 2023). Further, the topic was covered in the *Deník* outlet, both in print and online, as an influential daily publishing over seventy regional mutations. It occurred more prominently in the lifestyle titles of the *Mladá Fronta DNES* daily (see 5.3.1. for details about the media outlet). The sample also includes articles published in online news websites of the Czech public television and radio broadcasters (*Česká televize* and *Český rozhlas*). Based on the assumption of the ideological skewing in the Czech media landscape and the mainstream profiling of the included titles, all are expected to align ideologically with the dominant

understandings, following anticommunism as a sub-ingredient of the liberal-conservative perspective.

Index	Date	Heading	Media	Author
B2.1	11.02.1999	Některé ostravské ulice nesou jména i bezvýznamných lidí (<i>Some street in Ostrava carry the name of insignificant people</i>)	Ostravský den	Jana Paštiková
B2.2	05.03.1999	Ruská jména ulic se zřejmě jen tak nezmění (<i>The Russian street names probably will not change any time soon</i>)	Mladá fronta DNES	Pavel Grossmann
B2.3	21.06.1999	Předseda muzejní komise: Nemůžeme nařídít přejmenování ulic (<i>The Head of the Museum Committee: We cannot order street renaming</i>)	Moravskoslezský den	Šárka Swiderová
B2.4	21.06.1999	Na jména komsomolců a vojáků v adresách si obyvatelé zvykli (<i>The inhabitants got used to the names of Komsomoles and soldiers in their addresses</i>)	Moravskoslezský den	Mirka Chlebounová
B2.5	24.06.2003	Ostrava půjde do Evropy s komunistickými názvy ulic! (<i>Ostrava goes to Europe with Communist street names!</i>)	Region - Týdeník Ostrava	(jas, rac)
B2.6	20.11.2006	Od Gottwalda ke Krakonošovi (<i>From Gottwald to Krakonos</i>)	Týden	Ivan Motýl
B2.7	21.03.2007	Jména ulic ve vleku historie (<i>Street names in tow of history</i>)	Domažlický deník, Jihlavský deník, Českolipský deník, Písecký deník, Prostějovský deník, Benešovský deník	Josef Šlerka
B2.8	03.10.2009	Názvy ulic před rokem 1989 určovala politika (<i>The street names before 1989 were determined by politics</i>)	Moravskoslezský deník	Boleslav Navrátil
B2.9	11.01.2013	Gavlas, Matuška, Miska. Ulice nazvané po členech KSČ rozdělují Ostravany (<i>Gavlas, Matuška, Miska. Street names after KSČ members divide the people of Ostrava</i>)	ostrava.iDNES.cz	Markéta Radová

B2.10	07.01.2013	Duch KSČ v ulicích Ostravy obchází i nadále (<i>The spectre of KSČ keeps haunting the streets of Ostrava</i>)	Mladá fronta DNES	Markéta Radová
B2.11	25.11.2014	Řadu ulic čekala po listopadu 1989 změna názvu (<i>Many street names were to change after November 1989</i>)	Moravskoslezský deník	Jakub Malchárek
B2.12	21.12.2014	Řadu ulic v Ostravě čekala po listopadu 1989 změna názvu (<i>Many street names were to change after November 1989</i>)	denik.cz	Jakub Malchárek
B2.13	28.02.2015	Stalinov, Uhlokopy, Pokrokov (<i>Stalin Town, Coalminersville, Progressville</i>)	Magazín Víkend DNES	Klára Kubičková
B2.14	07.03.2015	Místopisné rošády v Česku v běhu času: Stalinov, Mrdákov i Sračkov (<i>Toponymic shuffles in Czechia over time: Stalin Town, Fuckwille and Shitville</i>)	cestovani.iDNES.cz	Klára Kubičková
B2.15	31.08.2017	Ostrava-Zábřeh má jednu raritu. Řadu ulic pojmenovaných po sovětských vojácích (<i>Ostrava has one rarity. A set of streets names after Soviet soldiers</i>)	rozhlas.cz, ČRo - ostrava.cz	Petra Sasínová
B2.16	01.02.2018	Ostravsku vévodí Zahradní ulice (<i>The Garden street dominates the Ostrava county</i>)	Moravskoslezský deník	Aleš Uher
B2.17	02.02.2018	Ostravsku vévodí Zahradní ulice. Je jich devět. Víte, kde je najdete? (<i>The Garden street dominates the Ostrava county. Do you know where to find them?</i>)	denik.cz, moravskoslezsky.denik.cz	Aleš Uher
B2.18	20.11.2019	Z Pionýrské Jahodová, z Rudé armády Beethovenova. Před 30 lety začalo masivní přejmenování ulic (<i>From Pioneers' to Strawberry street, from Red Army's to Beethoven. The massive street renaming began 30 years ago</i>)	ct24.cz	Eva Kolovrátková

(Table 2: Tier-two corpus. Discourse on socialist toponymy in Ostrava)

As for analytical procedure, the broader tier-one corpus was explored to provide anchoring and a general understanding of the thematizing and representational tendencies and patterns in the media, i.e. a means of sensitization for the second stage of analysis. The corpus was

explored through subtitle analysis and a familiarizing reading, with a focus on the mode of thematization of the renaming process. A particular mode of presenting the topics was prevalent in the tier-one corpus, i.e. presentation through the conflictual potential, following the basic news values logic of dramatising event to enhance its newsworthiness (Hall et al., 1978, p. 58). The style of representation and thematization also corresponded to the “semi-quality” character of the post-socialist Czech dailies and societal-focused weeklies, combining the elements of quality and tabloid outlets (Volek, 2022). The results from the familiarizing reading are incorporated in the analysis of the tier-two corpus presented in chapter 6.2.

The tier-two corpus (Table 2) was subjected to a detailed textual analysis following the analytical procedure outlined in the previous section (5.3.1). The first step consisted in identifying actors, events, objects and phenomena, the second in exploring the strategies of their presentation, i.e. nomination, predication, perspectivization, mitigation/intensification and argumentation, guided by the DHA procedure (Reisigl, 2017, p. 52). To discuss the position taken by the media in representing and constructing the topic, particularly the strategy of mitigation/intensification was paid attention to, i.e. which elements were foregrounded and which were sidelined (*ibid.*). On the micro textual level, the analysis was driven by the intertextual and interdiscursive sensitivity, to consider both internal and external relations affecting the process of meaning-making. Following the principles of textual analysis by Norman Fairclough (2003), the semantic, grammatical and lexical levels of linguistic expression were considered, and choices of expressions were scrutinized on the syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes, exposing what was included in the texts at the expense of something else (Fairclough, 2003, pp. 36–38).

With regards to the actors and phenomena represented in the discourse, the analysis focused on capturing the complex dynamic of relations between the different stakeholders and the object of the dispute. For this reason, a set of auxiliary questions was formulated:

- What are the conflicting perspectives on the question of persistent names in Old Zábřeh?
- Which actors represent these perspectives in the discourse, or distribute them?
- What is the discourse-constructed relationship of the actors to the given perspectives?
- What are the discourse-constructed relations between the individual actors?
- What is the relationship of the media to the perspectives?

Mapping of the elements and the relations between them yielded an overview of perspectives present in the discourse on the street renaming, exposing also the connection of different actors to them and their interrelation with one another and with the perspectives. The outcome of the analysis of the tier-two corpus presented in chapter 6.2.3. is a layout of three perspectives confronted in the dispute over the socialist street names in the Old Zábřeh and Ostrava, which correspond to the three aspects of renaming and tackling the toponymy heritage: 1) renaming streets as a necessary step in the process of coming to terms with the socialist past (a “decommunization” perspective); 2) renaming of streets as a disruption of continuity and everyday life (an “administrative and life burden” perspective); and 3) renaming of streets as a disruption of the urban integrity (a perspective of “(socialist) street names as part of cultural heritage”). The analysis of the tier-two corpus is preceded by a contextualizing description of the case under study, drawing on archival data from the municipal administration from the 1950s and the 1990s.

6. EMPIRICAL STUDIES

6.1. Passing the law on the national memory institute

6.1.1. The discourse on the national memory institute(s): Analysing the broader context

Across the monitored period, several peaks are evident in the media discourse on the Czech national memory institute (Appendix 1). The first one is when the initial law proposal was first announced by a group of right-wing senators (*Senate Proposal*, 2005) in early December 2005. An article published in late January 2006 on the front page of *Lidové noviny* introduced the law proposal through a remark that such institutes are already running in the countries with a parallel historical experience: In “all of the surrounding post-totalitarian states, institutions for administering the archives have not long ago been established. (...) it is necessary to have a special institute (..) not for the scandalisation of individuals, but for understanding the mechanism of totalitarian power” (A1.5).

The next peak in media coverage is evident in the weeks following the passing of the law proposal through the first reading in the Senate in January 2006. This moment elicited news reports in the major dailies and various commentaries and editorials, both in press and online. The mainstream news reporting is generally positive of the progress, and includes the references to the regional strategy that is worthy following: “In Slovakia and Poland, the Institutes of National memory are already running for a couple of years. They make accessible the documents of the State Security Police and help to inform truthfully about the past 50 years. Now such an institute is also negotiated and decided upon in Czechia” (A1.16–19). The appeal repeats again later in a briefer text by the same journalist, published across dozens of regional mutations of the daily *Deník* under an explicit title “The Slovaks got ahead of us”. Within this report, also the counter-arguments are mentioned, namely the redundancy of the institute and the controversy of centralization of the archives (A1.21–23). In this period, the first thread of commentaries in *Lidové noviny* was published, which later became a major site of medialized disputes over the institute between various publicly engaged intellectuals and scholars (A1.28–36).

An unexpected peak in the media coverage occurred with the sudden death of the director Slovak ÚPN, Ján Langoš, who died in a car accident in June 2006. As a significant figure of

the post-transformational politics, a former federal Minister of the Interior in the years 1990 – 1992 and a member of the Czechoslovak dissident community (Kovanic, 2017), his tragic death was reflected in dozens of reports and obituaries. Langoš was depicted as a “devoted fighter against communist heritage” (A1.92), who stood behind the establishment of the Slovak memory institute “whose establishment he literally achieved through defiance.” Indeed, Slovakia has lost the “defender of National memory”, as one of the headings suggest (A1.93–94). His work, consisting in “years of striving for Slovaks not to forget their totalitarian past” (A1.93–94), “unweaving the spider of totalitarianism” (A1.96), was interrupted in the “most inconvenient time”, as Pavel Žáček, the future director of ÚSTR, explained in his reflection of the event in *Mladá fronta DNES*: “...in a time, when his institute was preparing new serious projects that would help broaden our knowledge of the communist regimes in Central Europe. He helped the Czech senators prepare the legislative conditions for an analogous institution to be established in Prague” (A1.85). His political profiling is reflected, but unproblematized in relation to the memory work; before becoming director of the ÚPN, he is reported to have “counted among the most visible figures of the Slovak right-wing politics”, as the article in *Lidové noviny* describes (A1.65). Petr Uhl, a dissident and one of the most prominent representants of the so called sixty-eighters, i.e. reform communists from 1968, complemented his words of respect to Langoš with a notice of the opinion split that took place between them in 1991, when Langoš pushed strongly for a lustration law to be passed, a law unacceptable for Uhl for being “sweeping and grounded in collective guilt”, relying on “the notes from the criminal organization StB” (A1.86). Given Langoš’s political profile and his role of an epitome of the Slovak ÚPN, the tragic event turned into a strong pro-argument for establishing the Czech national memory institute based on the Slovak model without any further delay.

Only a week later, the law proposal was approved by a majority in the Senate. A number of texts set out to assess the state of reconciliation in the two countries, contending that “Slovakia is engaging with the past since 2003” (A1.111), reducing “the engagement with the past” to the pursuit of the crimes of the communist and Nazi apparatuses via a state-sanctioned memory institute. The criticism voiced in this moment is addressing this reductive view on history, but also the redundancy of the institute, challenging the alleged need for a new institution to study the secret police archives. The arguments are refuted for pointing to the actual scholarly role of the new institute, going beyond mere administration of the archives. As for oppositional voices, except for being problematized by individual

personalities in mainstream news dailies, the law proposal and the idea had been, expectedly, actively criticized and refused throughout the whole monitored period in *Haló noviny*, the official print media outlet of the KSČM, arguing, among other things, that the institute will “divide the society” or serve as “a depository of senators” (A1.102, A1,112).

The media coverage raised in numbers again few months later when the government, a coalition just freshly formed by the ODS after the parliamentary elections held in May, endorsed the Law on September 13th, 2006. The Slovak institute became presented as a pro-argument more fervently, with the urgency augmented by the tragic death of its director Ján Langoš. Although some critiques emerged in the mainstream media discourse at this point as well (notably the problematic conception of archive as a source for historical inquiry, or the accusation of creating new job opportunities in the institute for people politically loyal to the right-wing initiators), the logic underlying the media representation of the events is mostly procedural. Only one more step is missing on the path to the institute: “For the Institute of National Memory to be created in the Czech republic, that should administer the documents from the communist period and that already exists in Slovakia for example, only an approval from the Lower Chamber is missing” (A1.145). Interestingly though, the consensus was lost in the Senate after the election of 2006, as a project of the server *Aktuálně.cz* showed that explored the attitudes of the new senators: Out of all the senators who commented on the national memory institute situation, only half expressed themselves somewhat positively over the role of such an institution in coming to terms with the socialist past (A1.148).

The fourth peak occurred in November 2006 when the Law was passed to the second reading in the Lower Chamber, albeit by one single vote. At this point, the dispute is already clearly polarized: the chamber was “split on the Left and the Right side”, as described in an article in *Právo* (A1.158). On the other hand, in the reporting of the mainstream centre-right outlets, the positive interpretation prevails. The image of a positive procedure is especially obvious in the regional reports: “The emergence of the national memory institute, that would better administer and make accessible the documents from the communist period, is on a *good way*” (A1.161–162, emphasis added). The political clash over the institute gets mentioned in these reports, but the critics of the law proposal are only mentioned through their effort to hinder it, and no references to problematic points are present: “The Communists and Social Democrats had not succeeded with their effort to block the law” (A1.161–162, A1.155–156). Indeed, having the institute is gradually rendered a shared interest of the nation, as expressed, for

example, through the following personification: “The members of the Lower Chamber made a first step yesterday so that Czechia can have its own national memory institute” (A1.158).

The oppositional Social Democrats and Communists had indeed tried to block the law proposal, but were unsuccessful. Their effort was reflected in the online reporting, through a republished ČTK report. Layering of the characteristic treats of the institute, already repetitive in the discourse on the institute(s), speaks in favour of the institute’s establishment, hence rendering the opposition’s effort unsubstantiated: “The Left in the Lower chamber has not prevented the attempt to create the national memory institute, which should help in coming to terms with the communist past, research and administer and make accessible the documents from this period. It should also be in charge of the lists of collaborators with the former State security service (StB). Similar institutions are already working in Slovakia, Poland or Germany” (A1.153–156). At this point, it is already evident that the Left is positioned as the ideological Other, going against the desired, indeed natural flow of the process of reconciliation.

The passing of the law proposal to the second reading in November 2006 aroused another wave of disputes between the intellectuals engaged in the topic. The political bearings of the proposal, i.e. its connection to the political Right, are repeatedly made explicit in the centre-Left daily *Právo* and in the Communist party outlet *Haló noviny* (A1.159, A1.163, A.166). While the historian Michal Kopeček reflects critically on the path of the Czech reconciliation devoted to a “political-legal image of communism rooted in simplified theory of totalitarianism” in *Lidové noviny* (A1.185), the objections to the institute are continuously refuted by references to the moral obligation vis-à-vis the memories of other commenters as members of the prosecuted groups, such as Petruška Šustrová (A1.164, A1.167, A1.168, A1.172). In the same period, an interview was published with the future director of ÚSTR, Pavel Žáček, across dozens of regional mutations of the Czech daily *Deník*: in the interview, Žáček critically reflected on the debate among local historians and expressed his outrage over the lack of interest and progress in the Czech historiography of working with the secret service files (A1.182), without a reflection of the actual arguable position of these documents as a historical source (Dvořáková, 2007).

The debates had continued across the early 2007 as well, in some cases connecting to the individual affairs of alleged collaboration disclosed in that period or to the election of the new director of the Slovak ÚPN. A reaction to the project “Open Past” designed as a facilitation of

access to the secret police files and proposed by the Minister of the Interior Ivan Langer from ODS in mid-February (A.216, A1.229–230) comes from the deputy chair of the Lower Chamber, Lubomír Zaorálek from ČSSD: in a text published in *Mladá fronta DNES*, he problematizes the looming political influence on the interpretations of the past but also challenges the proclaimed social benefit of making the archives broadly accessible (A1.250). The law proposal was passed by the Constitutional-Legal committee of the Lower Chamber at the end of February 2007 (A1.240). In March, during the second reading in the Lower Chamber, a compromise version of the law was passed, which already counted with the idea of adding the Nazi period, following the Slovak model. The law proposal split “both politicians and historians”: summarized in *tyden.cz*, the critics argued that the institute is “on political demand” and with no real benefit for historiographic inquiry, while the proponents saw it as a way of making the archives accessible based on the positive example from the neighbouring countries (A1.315). The second reading in the Lower Chamber was interrupted by a peculiar incident with an anti-leftist underpinning – red flyers with portraits of the communist icons accompanied by the portraits of the Czech Social Democratic politicians were tossed over the left-wing MPs by a citizen intruding to the Chamber’s balcony. The incident led to a massive rise in media coverage (A1.293–301, A1.321-336). In the same period, the Polish IPN had proposed a new lustration law and announced a first draft of the decommunization law banning propagation of the communist ideology in the public space (A1.282, A1.405, A1.406). The heated atmosphere was opening to the biggest of the peaks in media coverage that took place in May 2007, when the Law was eventually passed during the third reading in the Lower Chamber.

6.1.2. Deconstructing the conflict: Micro textual analysis of the discourse on passing of the law on the Institute

On the day of the passing, a press release by the Czech press agency (ČTK) was republished across several online news sites, including the online versions of four major dailies that covered the event on the front page of their printed versions on the following day. The micro corpus consists of five media articles: the front page articles of the four major Czech dailies, *Hospodářské noviny*, *Lidové noviny*, *Mladá fronta DNES* and *Právo*, and the ČTK report.

In each of the four dailies, the topic was endowed the prominent position on the front page and the event was attended to through an editorial text. As explained in chapter 5.3.1., the political profiling is influencing the way the topic is approached in the individual outlets. While *Hospodářské noviny*, *Lidové noviny* and *Mladá Fronta DNES* seem to endorse the outcome of the procedure, complying with the dominant understanding, *Právo*, as the only centre-left daily clearly draws on different assumptions in interpreting the event. The ČTK text is treated as politically neutral, although the inclination to sustaining status quo is reflected (Richardson, 2007).

The main feature of the media coverage of the passing of the law on the Institute in the Lower Chamber is the obvious political polarization between the right-wing coalition, formed by the Czech Civic Democratic Party (ODS), Christian Democrats (KDU-ČSL) and The Greens, and the left-wing opposition, formed by Social Democrats (ČSSD) and the Communist party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSČM). An important actor in the vote, and also in other votes in that period, were two MPs defecting the ČSSD, Michal Pohanka and Miloš Melčák, who also played a key role in the inception of the right-wing government coalition⁸.

Drawing on the DHA procedure (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001), the structure of the conflict is first elucidated through the identification of individual elements of the discourse, grouped into objects and bodies, phenomena (acts, processes, events) and actors:

Objects and bodies	Acts, processes and Events	Actors
Law (proposal) for the Establishment of the Institute	Negotiations in the Lower Chamber	Coalition parties (ODS, KDU-ČSL, Greens)
The proposed Institute	Arguing for the Law Proposal	Coalition MPs (Alena Páralová, Petr Pleva, Ivan Langer)
The socialist past	Opposing the Law Proposal	Opposition parties (ČSSD, KSČM)
Totalitarian period(s)	Proposing amendments to the Proposal	Opposition MPs (Zdeněk Jičínský, David Rath, Lubomír Zaorálek, Stanislav Křeček, Kateřina Konečná)

⁸ In the vote of the government's confidence in January 2007, the two MPs made a deal with the then prime minister Mirek Topolánek (ODS) to leave the room during the final vote, thus allowing the vote to be successful (for more details, see Havlík & Foltýn, 2006).

Archives of the StB	Opposition losing the voting	Prime Minister Mirek Topolánek
Lustration condition (for the membership in the Board)	ČSSD leaving the Chamber	President Václav Klaus
Name of the Institute	The final passing of the law	Defectors
StB (Communist secret police)	Opening the archives	Agents
Effectuated Changes to the original proposal	Uniting the archives	Opposing historians
Pre-November Communist party	Criticizing politization of the Board	Political prisoners
Senate		
Lower Chamber		
Board of the Institute		

(Table 3: Elements of the discourse on the passing of the law on the Institute)

The categorisation is auxiliary and helps exposing the relation between the elements in the discourse. The categories are illustrative and should not be taken strictly: For example, the category of Objects and bodies does not imply passivity of the individual objects and bodies. By the same token, despite listed as Actors, some of them have no real agency in the studied discourse, such as Agents and Opposing historians. The relations between the individual elements are discussed also through looking at the discursive strategies through which the elements are introduced (or not) in the discourse. The strategies are inevitably intertwined and complementary in the texts and discourses. They were explored to discuss the representation of the political clash, of the two sides of the conflict and the pro-arguments and counter-arguments. The analysis is laid out through a basic structure of the conflict, looking at the representation of:

1. The conflict
2. Opposing the institute
3. Defending the institute
4. The outcome

The structure is used to demonstrate the mixed strategies of “using” the individual elements in the discourse in the analysed media texts. All emphases in italic are made *ex post* to highlight the semantic and discursive operations.

6.1.2.1. The conflict

The basic characteristic witnessed across the texts of the second-tier corpus (micro corpus) is the nature of the conflict as emotional and passionate. As the text in *Právo* states in a subtitle, there were “*A lot of emotions* in the dispute” (A2.5). In *Hospodářské noviny*, the emotional character is directly linked to discussions of the contemporary history: “Only money and the pre-November past can provoke such *stormy* arguments in the Lower Chamber” (A2.2). The conflicting nature of the dispute is mentioned in all of the texts, albeit with different accents: “The discussion of the law was accompanied by *fierce clashes* between the ruling coalition and the opposition” (A2.3). In *Mladá Fronta DNES*, the passions are only assigned to the Left, as there were “great passions of the leftist MPs” (A2.4).

Secondly, the conflict is represented as divisive, splitting the Lower Chamber into two irreconcilable fractions of the coalition and the opposition: “The ‘fight’ over the institute *has split* the chamber. The ruling coalition voted in favour, while the opposition was against” (A2.3). In two of the media texts, in *Právo* and *Hospodářské noviny*, the “*equal strength*” of the two fractions is mentioned. The strategies are different though. In *Hospodářské noviny*, the opposition is blamed for losing the vote, by including an explanation of why the vote was actually lost. Some of the opposition’s members were absent, opting instead for a different program:

“The ČSSD and the KSČM came close to rejecting the law, but lost all the votes on amendments almost always by two or three votes. For example, ČSSD chairman and deputy chairman Jiří Paroubek and Zdeněk Škromach were absent yesterday. They preferred to go to the Přerov and Nový Jičín regions to support their Senate candidate” (A2.2).

Právo, on the other hand, puts emphasis on the two defectors of the Social Democratic party as the main reason of losing the vote: “Already the decision on dozens of amendments showed that, *since the coalition had won both defectors to its side*, the Social Democratic Party had no chance of winning the vote” (A2.5).

Thirdly, the conflict is epitomic for being divisive along the Left-Right line, as explicitly thematized by *Hospodářské noviny*: “It was a showdown battle between the Right and the Left”. This dichotomization also ascribes the fractions with certain values, summarized in the subtitle that opens the article continuation inside the issue: “The triumph of the Right: totalitarianism is to be examined” (A2.2). The triumph can be interpreted as a reference to the boost of transparency that the new institute promises, as a frequent motif in the appeals for a reconciliation with the socialist past (Apor et al., 2017). It is also deeply related to the much discussed and problematized labelling of the socialist period as totalitarian, skewing attention to unfreedom and crimes, as negative aspect that need to be examined and overcome.

Lastly, the conflict is demonstrated through an exchange of arguments between the two fractions. On the side of the opponents, the critical stance is voiced by the opponents of the institute, the political opposition in the Lower Chamber consisting of the two leftist parties, who also present the criticism of historians and other scholars. On the side of the proponents, the criticisms are responded to by the individual members of the coalition parties. As also evident from the analysis of the first-tier corpus, the power over the meaning-making is unevenly distributed between the two fractions. The representation of the criticism in the news texts is already driven by the outcome of the final vote, i.e. the “triumph of the Right” (A2.2), and rendered positive (A2.2–A2.4), or negative (A2.5). Although the proposal is “a result of a discussion on the basis of critique from historians and archive workers, and also includes the suggestions of the opposition”, the oppositional MPs argued with “persisting objections of experts” (A2.1).

6.1.2.2. Opposing the Law proposal

The act of opposing the institute in the Lower Chamber is connected to the oppositional parties, ČSSD and KSČM. At the same time, they voice the objections of other critics of the institute, various scholars and public intellectuals whose critical view is introduced to the debate through a letter provided to the oppositional MPs in support of refuting the law proposal. The opponents’ argumentation is linked intertextually to the preceding texts and negotiations and consists, for the most part, in criticizing the ideological bias as a driving force of the proposal, hinting at the state-sanctioned promotion of one particular type of historical inquiry of the socialist past, and thereby constructing the “memory” of this period in a restrictive way.

In the first cluster of the objections, the institute is denied as such, for being politically motivated and obviously connected to the right-wing strategy of tackling the socialist past. Most visibly, the counter-arguments are presented through citations of concrete Social Democratic MPs who talked in the Lower Chamber on the day of the passing. The distinctive discursive strategy of representing the act of opposing in the centre-right outlets is the intensification of the emotional character of the individual speeches and objections raised within them: “‘This propaganda institute is a denial of dignity and law,’ *Zaorálek thundered*”; “David Rath, the former Social Democratic Health Minister, was the most *aggressive* in opposing the establishment of the institute” (A2.3); “‘This will be a new institute of Marxism-Leninism turned inside out,’ *thundered* David Rath, a Czech Social Democratic Party MP, during his speech” (A2.4).

The ideological bias behind the law proposal is also stressed by pointing to the actual redundancy of the institute. This criticism is voiced by a ČSSD MP Zdeněk Jičínský, quoted in *Právo*: “It will be an imposed ‘dubious institution’” as there are “*already* scientific institutions for the historical research, the Academy of Sciences and universities” (A2.5). According to his party colleague, Stanislav Křeček, the ideological bias will inevitably affect the institute’s results: “‘Whatever this institute produces will be regarded as a propagandistic gibberish that has no real scientific meaning’” (A2.5). The emotional character of the opposing is not emphasized in *Právo*.

The second cluster of objections concerns the conditions for appointment to the board of the institute, as the institution’s top organizing body. As explained in the text by ČTK, “It was the board and the conditions of its membership that were a thorn in the eye of the ČSSD and KSČM MPs”. With regards to the board, two major objections were raised from the opposition against the proposal. The first one is the ban for any former members of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia (KSČ) or the Secrete police (StB), the second one consists in the influence of concrete political bodies on the board’s make-up and hence the whole institute through the mechanism of nominating the board members by the Lower Chamber, the president and “the associations of resistance fighters and political prisoners”, and electing them by the Senate (A2.1). In combination, the two mechanisms were to affirm the political conditionality of the institute’s operation by making them dependent on the current political configuration. At the same time, however, they were building on and reinforcing the black-and-white narrative of the perpetrators and the victims, epitomized in

the contrast between the “former members” (the perpetrators) banned in the board and the “resistance fighters or political prisoners” (the victims) influencing the staffing of the board.

The first mechanism, the condition for the “clean record” for future members of the institute’s board, is presented as substantial and unproblematic across the news texts from the centre-right outlets. Within this representation, it is the opposition who is ridiculed for fighting this safeguard mechanism, rendered undisputably beneficial: “The opposition was also annoyed that former Communist Party members or candidates for membership were not allowed to be members of the council. They *tried in vain* to break the law by proposing amendments (...)” (A2.4). On the other hand, in *Právo*, this issue is explored more thoroughly through citations of the Social Democratic MPs, who problematized the “clean record” imperative by pointing to the actual compromise of the right-wing politicians with the official bodies of the former regime: “Rath wondered whether the ODS is not bothered by the same affiliation of its former high-ranking officials – Kočárník, Dyba and Tlustý. (...)” (A2.5).

Ultimately, an important moment in the “clean record” argumentation and an example of its weaponization is the letter signed by historians and other scholars who appealed on the oppositional MPs to vote against the law proposal. Thematized by *Hospodářské noviny* and *Právo*, the credibility of their position was challenged by a coalition MP Alena Páralová, who “took the names one by one from the list of discontented historians” (A2.5) and assessed them based on their past proximity to the state-party, “saying that some of the appointed scientists were members of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia” (A2.2), but also describing them as “people who are either not at all, or minimally concerned professionally with the history of the communist regime” (A2.5). This intervention “infuriated the opposition” (A2.5): Particularly “from the ranks of the Social Democrats there were harsh words about the right wanting to ‘cadre’ again after November” (A2.2).

The objections against the “clean record” condition were frequently combined with the objections against the second mechanism, i.e. the nomination of members of the institute’s board by a combination of political and non-political bodies and their election by the Senate. The objections against this mechanism were, however, rendered unsubstantial: “They [the opposition] did not like the fact that the Senate appoints the institute’s management and that no one who was a member of the pre-November Communist Party or the StB is allowed to join” (A2.3). The reference to the two institutions, as key agents of the power apparatus of the former regime, is argumentatively persuasive drawing on the dominant discourse on

communism. The meaning derives from the discursive context and is linked intertextually to the preceding negotiations: The presupposed criminality of the apparatus renders the membership in either one of the organizations “naturally” problematic.

The control of concrete institutions over the nominations, objected by the opponents for being politically interfering, can be also rendered substantial by highlighting the actual plurality of institutional actors who will take part in the nominations. Such plurality can hardly be an obstacle for the actual research work, as the argumentation in *Mladá Fronta DNES* goes: “The fact that the supreme body of the institute (..) will be a seven-member board elected by the Senate from candidates nominated by the Chamber of Deputies, the president and civic associations also aroused great passions among the left-wing deputies. The oppositional Left considers this an interference in free scientific work” (A2.4). As a result, the politicization of the institution is rendered growingly unproblematic, perhaps even desirable, as the sub-heading in the article in *Mladá Fronta DNES* suggests: “The institute will be watched over by politicians” (A2.4). In line with the dominant discourse on communism, the issue of the political conditionality of the institute, as the core objection of the opponents, is generally mitigated and argumentatively refuted.

At the same time, the accusations of political bias are only presented within the reactions from the opponents, whose argumentative position is generally weaker due to their political profiling, specifically their (imagined) ideological proximity to the former regime. In the three centre-right dailies endorsing the dominant interpretation, the objections against the political interference and the ban for “any former members” are interpreted within the suspicious atmosphere in approaching the socialist past, relating to the reductionist focus on the stories of victims and perpetrators (Mayer, 2009, David, 2015).

6.1.2.3. Defending the Law proposal

The first group of pro-arguments revolve around situating the effort of establishing the Institute in time and space: In terms of time, the stress is on the long period stretching since the demise of the communist regime, augmenting the sense of urgency for reconciliation: “More than seventeen years after November 1989, MPs yesterday approved the creation of a new Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes” (A2.4). This fact figures also in the *ČTK* text, specifying that “in Czechia [the institute] is emerging more than 17 years after the fall of the communist regime” (A2.1). In terms of space, the law proposal explicitly follows a

strategy applied in the neighbouring post-socialist countries, i.e. Slovakia, Poland and Germany, adding a sense of justification by following a validated method and procedure. The fact that “analogous institutes already exist in the neighbouring countries” (A2.1) boosts the sense of desirability of such institute and figures among the first pro-arguments in most of the texts of the micro corpus. The institute “whose equivalent is already running in Germany, Poland and even Slovakia” (A2.4) “brings us to the level of other post-communist countries,” according to Pavel Žáček quoted in *Lidové noviny* (A2.3).

The second group of pro-arguments is the emphasis on openness, enhanced visibility and access, as positive values contrasting with the inaccessible and classified character of the (communist) secret police archives: The law will enable the “archives documenting the activities of the former communist secret police” to be “opened up more” (A2.4). The motif of openness and access is actually at the very DNA of a project under which the idea of the institute is also subsumed: “The whole thing fits within the Open Past project we have launched. Our goal is, among other things, to put all the archives of the state security service *under one roof*”, as the Minister of the Interior Ivan Langer explains in *Mladá Fronta DNES* (A2.4). In an oppositional reading, however, the unification of the archives under one institution is potentially problematic, hinting at the political control implied in the move, as the formulation in the text in *Právo* suggests: “At the same time, an archive of the security forces will be created, to which all security forces *will have to hand over* all their archival material from those periods” (A2.5).

The discursive object of “the archives” is used differently across the studied texts. While its clearly the core element in the text in *Mladá Fronta DNES*, where the most emphasis is laid on the closed vs. open dichotomy as a black-and-white binary, in *Lidové noviny*, the hybrid nature of the institute, as both administrator of the archives and a scientific institution, is taken for granted: The institute, if approved “by the Senate and the president”, “will begin to emerge in a few months from the Archives of the Security Forces of the Ministry of the Interior” (A2.3). Clearly, the StB archives as a material for historiographic inquiry have gradually become naturalized and the problematic nature of this source for studying the past remains unreflected at this stage, however strong it was in the preceding negotiations.

As mentioned in the section about opposing the law, the first objection was the political bias behind the very idea for the institute. On the defenders’ side, however, the new institute actually helps overcome an ideological bias occurring at a different level: “One of the authors

of the law, Senator Jiří Liška of the ODS, highlighted the fact that the StB archives will be exempted from the direct control of the Ministry for the Interior, which, he said, will limit the possibility of political influence on what will be exposed and what will remain closed to the public” (A2.4). According to the Minister of the Interior Ivan Langer cited in the same article, the potential misuse and misinterpretation of the past will be avoided as “the persons who have negative lustration certificates and clearances will no longer have such documents in their hands” (A2.4). Skewing attention to these ideological preventions, the problem of an actual bias behind the very idea of the institute is obfuscated.

On this note, an effective strategy of defending the institute is juxtaposing the negative aspects with the positive aspects: the emphasis is on the ends that justify the means. This strategy mobilizes the motif of the secret police StB and its collaborators as the malevolent figures with harmful effects on society, both in the past and in the present. In this light, any opening and investigation of the files, as a synonym for the practice of abuses of power and violence, must be socially beneficial. The following paragraph from *Hospodářské noviny* orders semantically the two information in a way that suppresses the problematic nature of the last utterance, i.e. the actual political supervision of the institute: “The institute’s historians are to research, collect and publish documents from the time of the totalitarian communist regime, including the StB volumes. All this under the supervision of a politicians-proposed board.” (A2.2). A suggested reading could be that the political curation of the institute’s operation is actually desirable.

The last pro-argument concerns the victims, i.e. the political prisoners of the former regime. The perspective is brought up by two actors across the texts: First, it is voiced by Pavel Žáček who points to the “satisfaction to political prisoners” that the Institute will represent, second, it is voiced by the Prime Minister Mirek Topolánek. Topolánek, quoted in *Lidové noviny* and *Právo*, uses the argument of reconciliation for the political prisoners to support his position. Additionally, however, it serves to justify the commonsensicality of supporting the law, building on the dominant discourse on communism: “The law has the support of political prisoners, I will vote for the law just because of them, I am sick of the debate” (A2.3). By drawing attention to the prominent figures of the crime-centred view on the socialist past, the victims alone must be an argument sufficient to counter any criticisms.

6.1.2.4. The outcome

The general sentiment is that the passing of the law was surprising for both the institute's proponents and its opponents. Unlike the text in *Právo*, the news texts from the centre-right outlets are reproducing the sense of success of the passing of the law. This triumph is not translated in political terms, but rather in general terms, with allusions to the fact that the founding of the institute is natural, logical and most of all overdue in the process of reconciliation with the socialist past. The pro-argument of levelling up with the neighbouring countries becomes the primary justification.

The political connection to the right-wing strategy is exposed in a reference to the steps that should follow: "The establishment of the Institute will still have to be confirmed by the Senate and President Václav Klaus. This, however, will probably not bring much trouble. The ODS has a comfortable majority in the Senate and Klaus's veto is not expected"⁹ (A2.3). The power balance between the parties, or rather factions, is also strongly embedded in the political climate of that period, as will be discussed later.

As recounted in the preceding sections, the amendments suggested by the opposition were not passed during the negotiations. Thanks to it, they did not succeed in hindering the idea, as formulated in *Lidové noviny*: "The forces in the chamber were evenly balanced, and a number of amendments *that would have made the Institute more difficult to operate* failed to pass the law by a vote or two" (A2.3). In addition, it was deemed to fail from the outset, as the absurdity of some of the opposition's arguments suggests, recounted in *Mladá Fronta DNES*: "*In vain* they [the opposition] tried to break the law with amendments, such as that no members of the former National Front can be in the board. The Communist Kateřina Konečná even promoted for the new institute to be engaged with the history already since the Habsburg times in the 16th century." (A2.4).

The main change in the outcome is the acceptance of the amendments proposed by the Greens, as a party of the coalition. It consisted in adding "another" totalitarian period, that of Nazism, a change discussed already in the previous reading in the Lower Chamber: "in addition to researching the communist past, [the institute] is also supposed to focus on the Nazi period" (A2.4). Most importantly, adding another historical period resulted in a change

⁹ Václav Klaus is the founder and the most prominent figure of the ODS and also the major proponent of ODS's 1990s anticommunist politics, however it was, rather than an ideological position, a pragmatic political strategy (see Gjuričová, 2009).

of the institute's name: "The Greens (...) managed to push through most of their proposals. It was they who ensured that the new institution would not be called the Institute of National Memory (...), and extended its scope to include the period of Nazi occupation" (A2.3).

The transformation of the planned national memory institute into an institute focusing on "totalitarian regimes" – the problem of totalitarianism remaining unreflected – was a rather hasty provision, albeit it occurred among the amendments discussed earlier in the process, and also followed the Slovak model that, too, focuses on the period of the Second World War. The amendments to the original proposal of the senators consisted in extending the period beyond "the communist totalitarianism" and include also the "period of the Second World War" (A2.3). No closer reflection of this change is present across the media texts, except for the reaction of Ivan Langer, quoted in *Mladá Fronta DNES*, who "welcomes" the change: "The period of non-freedom is the same whether under the swastika or under the red star with the hammer and the sickle" (A2.4). The lack of reflection testifies of the fact that the source of contention is actually situated elsewhere: It concerns the political instrumentalization of tackling the socialist past.

Building on one of the pro-arguments, particularly in *Mladá Fronta DNES* and *Lidové noviny*, the result is constructed through the social benefits of broad accessibility of the secret police files, as the institute should "unify historical inquiry of communism and Nazi occupation and open the archives to the public" (A2.3). The institute "will document communist and Nazi crimes" and "make documents about the period of communist totalitarianism available to the public" (A2.4); drawing on the accent on the repressive character of the former regime present in the dominant discourse on communism, the positive motif of disclosing formerly hidden materials and promoting transparency is argumentatively strong enough to justify the activity. The opening of the archives turns into a metaphorical defeat of the former regime. On top of that, the interpretation in *Mladá Fronta DNES* is grounded in a defeat of the core figure of the criminal story of communism, that of "agent"; the whole news report is actually opened with reference to this figure, titling the article "Institute against the StB agents" (A2.4).

The last distinctive aspect of the reporting on the outcome is the representation of the final vote and the protest stance taken by the oppositional ČSSD MPs, who decided to leave the room before the final vote. Unlike the oppositional *Právo* and the *ČTK* text, who report on the actual numbers of the vote and explain why the voting appeared univocal ("representatives of the Social Democratic Party did not take part in the vote in protest, while the Communists

opposed it. Of the 118 MPs present, 92 supported the law”, A2.1), this information is left out in the articles within the discursive coalition. In the article in *Právo*, the mechanism is explained attentively to emphasize the lack of consensus and the disputability of the result, exposing the dissatisfaction with it:

“In the end, all coalition MPs supported the law and *were joined by both former ČSSD MPs Miloš Melčák and Michal Pohanka*, so instead of a close, combative vote, the result was 92 to 24. Sixty votes were needed.” (A2.5)

The news texts from the centre-right outlets mention that ČSSD MPs left the room, but they seem to interpret it as a relief for the whole procedure (“(...) the final vote on the actual creation of the constitution passed quietly. The Left realized that it was going to lose and the ČSSD MPs left the Chamber”, A2.3) or link it to the generally fair conclusion:

“In the end, the Socialists could not endure the constant defeats and walked out of the chamber just before the final vote. It was clear that the ODS, KDU-ČSL, the Greens and finally the two defectors Michal Pohanka and Miloš Melčák would push the law through” (A2.2).

6.2. Socialist toponymy in Ostrava

As recounted in chapter 4.2, the strategies of tackling socialist heritage in the post-socialist landscapes are embedded in and follow the logic and sentiments permeating the memory politics in the whole region, attuned to interpretations and political projects of concrete social groups endowed with power in the post-socialist setting. Street renaming stands out as a specific political project that combines the universal and the particular. This was notably the case in the times of the turbulent changes in the early 1990s where the local and the “trans-local” motivations were brought into lively conversation. The case under study, the housing district in Ostrava-South planned in late 1940s as a part of post-war housing construction and completed in the early 1950s under the name of District Stalingrad, is a convenient case to look at how the internal and external factors were negotiated after the regime change, facing the need to tackle the remnants of the former regime vis-à-vis the process of the new identity construction.

6.2.1. Some specifics of the Ostrava County

As for the internal factors, the city of Ostrava and the whole northeastern region of the Czech Republic represents a specific “place of memory”: As a historically significant heavy industry region, it enjoyed a substantial economic (and, by extension, political) prominence in the socialist period. The position of KSČ and its organizations was strong in Ostrava and the whole county; a telling detail is that in November 1989, the municipal committee of KSČ organized a protest in defence of the crumbling regime and in response to the anti-regime demonstrations, gathering around eight thousand people on the square Lidových milicí (today’s Masarykovo náměstí) (Ondráčková, 2019). Second, due to its geographical position in the northeast of the country, the county is also a specific place in terms of the memory of the Second World War: In 1945, the city of Ostrava and its surroundings were the site of one of the most brutal liberation battles in the Czechoslovak territory. The Red Army played a major role in the battles, with almost fifteen hundred Soviet soldiers losing their lives and interred in the area (B. Navrátil, 2006; Strakoš, 2010).

Regarding the external factors, the most significant is by, no means, the post-war division of Europe and the enforced subsuming of Czechoslovakia under the Soviet political and cultural sphere. The geopolitical split of the Cold War manifested strongly on the ideological level on both sides of the Iron Curtain, fed by the idea of bipolarity (Thies, 2013). In the case of socialist Czechoslovakia, it consisted in condemning the “heroes” of the pre-socialist past, especially those connected to the interwar republic, the Western traitors demonized through the “Munich betrayal” (Tesař, 2000) or the US troops’ share on liberating the Western parts of the country in May 1945. At the same time, the new world was to be represented through a new powerful iconography (Macura, 2008). A significant part of the legitimation of the postwar communist regimes was antifascism (M. Kopeček, 2001; Sabrow, 2012), notably the merits of the Red Army during the Second World War, both actual and hyperbolized, nevertheless still fresh in memory in the early 1950s.

6.2.2. District Stalingrad and the Soviet soldiers in Ostrava-South

After the collapse of the communist regimes in the early 1990s, one of the earliest projects was the reappropriation of the symbolic landscape. Besides the removal of the Soviet or socialist monuments (Kuczyńska-Zonik, 2018), it consisted in revising the place names connected to the former regime and its ideological universe and followed the logic of

deschematization or reschematization (Odaloš, 1996 see chapter 4.2.3 for details). The prevailing sentiments of the period recounted in detail in chapters 3.1 and 4.2 ordained to tackle the imprint of the former regime as remnants of an “unwanted past” (Czepczyński, 2008). This logic was also pursued in the cities across Czechoslovakia and later Czech Republic. Under the emerging post-socialist historical canon, shaped from the very outset by the newly emerged elite who was, for the most part, devoted to decommunization (Mink, 2013), the socialist imprint was to be removed altogether, pointing to its unacceptable ideological grounding and the political instrumentalization of public space by the former regime (Young and Light, 2001).

In Ostrava, the main streets in the city centre, as the core space for political exposure and hence changing names with each political change in the 20th century, were renamed and returned to their pre-war names (*Ostravský Uličník*, n.d.). Numerous changes were suggested by the newly established toponymical committee also for districts outside the centre, although only units were implemented: Already in 1990 and 1991, local administrations in the individual areas responded negatively to the committee’s appeals, arguing with low interest and motivation among the local population, as well as with the administrative burden associated with the street name change (*City Council Res. 426/M*, 1991).

The same pressing questions emerged in Ostrava-South, in a district colloquially referred to as “Old Zábřeh”. As a post-war project and a part of a complete reconstruction of the city following the war devastation, the new housing district in the southwest part of the city was established in 1947 as a model housing estate and given the name of Bělský les (Bělský forest) referring to the nearby recreational forest area (Strakoš, 2010, pp. 119–126). Following the onset of the new political regime in early 1948, many organizational processes around the development of the project had shifted. The changes reflected also in the discussions over the place names for the newly created urban spaces. Eventually, the naming of the newly emerging district in Ostrava-Zábřeh was subsumed under the broader plan to celebrate the seventh anniversary of the Battle of Stalingrad; the intention was announced on behalf of the Minister of the Interior in March 1950 and suggested the naming of “some of the public spaces by the name of the city of Stalingrad” (*Min. of Interior*, 1950). Aiming at the fifth anniversary of the “May Revolution”, i.e. the end of the Second World War, the Regional National Committee in Ostrava decided to rename four places within the region. In the Ostrava district, the new settlement arising in the area of Zábřeh was selected, becoming “district Stalingrad” in May 1950 (*Reg. Nat. Comm.*, 1950). In August 1952, the twenty-six

newly emerged streets forming the district were given names of twenty-six members of the Red Army group defending the city of Stalingrad: To specify the army's merits, the official document referred to the book *The 62nd Army in the Battles for Stalingrad* by authors A. D. Stupov and V. L. Kokunov (*Reg. Nat. Comm. 2*, 1950). Following the revision of the Stalin's cult in the late 1950s, the Soviet city returned to the geographically motivated name Volgograd. In 1961, the housing district in Ostrava-Zábřeh was renamed back to its original name Bělský les (Strakoš, 2018, pp. 208, 349); the streets, however, retained the names of the Soviet soldiers.

In 1990 and 1995, two initiatives advocated renaming the collection of streets in Old Zábřeh. The initiatives were led by the representatives of the then toponymy committee of the Ostrava City Council and proposed to remove the names of the Soviet soldiers and, instead, commemorate Czechoslovak pilots operating in the Second World War (*City Council Comm.*, 1995; *City Council Comm.*, 1991). However, both initiatives were unsuccessful as the council of the Ostrava-South, i.e. the official body in charge of the Old Zábřeh district, rejected both proposals, arguing with significant administrative difficulties combined with zero motivation on the side of the local residents to change the street names (*ibid.*). In the following two decades, the street names of Old Zábřeh reappeared in the Czech media several times, most often amidst broader periodical reflections on the transformation of public space after the regime change in early 1990s, as a subtopic of retrospective views on the period or revisions of the reconciliation process.

Along with other cases of the place names from the Czechoslovak socialist period, the street names in Old Zábřeh have been triggering attention for representing a site of contestation over memory, i.e. a prototypical place of memory (Nora, 1989): It continued to resist the appeals for a thorough decommunization of the public space after the regime change, supported and demanded by certain actors but largely ignored or opposed by others. The request for doing away with the socialist heritage as a shameful imprint of the unwanted past should be understood as embedded within the official memory politics which draws on and enforces the dominant discourse on communism, characterized through the dimensions of crime-centredness and discontinuity. The dimension of discontinuity is the main point of dispute over the street names in Old Zábřeh and adds legitimacy to the request for their removal (Kárníková, 2022).

6.2.3. Analysis: Three perspectives on the issue of street renaming

As described in detail in chapter 5.3.2., the second-tier micro corpus for the analysis of the discourse on socialist street names in Ostrava (corpus B2, Appendix 4) comprised of 18 news media articles published in the years 1999 – 2019 on different occasions and in various mainstream media outlets, both national and regional, in print and online. In the articles, journalists reflected on the local negotiations whether or not should the streets be renamed, but also framed the event through independent thematization, attending to the topic on anniversary occasions (Zelizer, 2008). Where not forming the main topic of the article, the case of Old Zábřeh was listed as a striking example of toponymy remaining from the socialist period.

As the first step, the structure of the discourse on renaming in Ostrava was clarified through identification of actors, objects and phenomena, adapted for the particular case:

Actors	Acts, processes and Events	Objects
Toponymy committee	(Wave of) renaming of the streets after 1989	Commemorative street names
Local residents	Changes of street names	Inappropriate street names (politically motivated)
Old residents	Cases of renaming	Appropriate street names (non-politically motivated)
Local administration (collective denomination)	Commemoration through place (re) naming	Socialist street names
Local councillors (individual denominations)	Arguments against renaming	Set of street names in Old Zábřeh
The City hall	Arguments for renaming	Socialist period urban district(s)
Experts - Chroniclers	Examples of renaming	Russian street names
Experts - Onomasticians	Initiative for renaming	

Experts - Archivists	Assessing the commemoration name relevance	
	Local residents denying the changes	
	Local officers respecting the residents	

(Table 4: Elements of the discourse on the socialist toponymy in Ostrava)

As the strategies of the presentation of these elements in the discourse are complementary and intertwined (Reisigl, 2017), the interrelatedness was analysed using a layout of the main perspectives and relations to the issue of street renaming. Although the fundamental binary opposition of the dispute corresponds to a positive or negative attitude to the need for street renaming after the regime change, these attitudes are variously distributed and interrelated. In the discourse under scrutiny, the dispute over the appropriateness, inappropriateness or a need to cope with the socialist toponymy is realized in the following three perspectives:

1. The perspective of decommunization: Street renaming as a means of coming to terms with the socialist past,
2. The perspective of an administrative and life burden: Street renaming as a disruption of everyday life,
3. The perspective of street names as cultural heritage: Street renaming as a disruption of historical continuity and urban integrity (Kárníková, 2022)

6.2.3.1. Perspective of decommunization: Street renaming as a means of coming to terms with the socialist past

Under the decommunization perspective, the change of street names is approached as a means of cleansing the public space and relies heavily on a polarized separation of the past from the present. As an argumentative starting point, there is the image of the former regime's totalizing tendency in usurping the public space, with implicit references to the irrationality with which the communist regime used the commemoration motif: Although "the times of the boulevards of the Victorious February or Lenin streets are over", still "somewhere there are streets with unfamiliar Russian names that have nothing to do with the location" (B2.2). Indeed, in some places, the streets carry names of "insignificant people" (B2.1). Under this

perspective, the removal of the socialist place names is constructed as a natural progression of the purging process after the fall of the discredited regime, which was, however, not consistent enough: although “the pressure to cleanse the streets of the communist regime’s aftertaste was great after the Velvet Revolution (...) throughout the country” (B2.18), “hundreds of streets in our country were missed out in the post-Soviet renaming process, and so they still bear the names associated with the past regime” (B2.7). The nature of this pertaining imprint is disturbing, as the title of the article in MF DNES published in January 2013 suggests: “The spectre of KSC̆ is still haunting Ostrava” (B2.10). The demand for removing the socialist place names is often reinforced by the emphasis on the repressive and criminal nature of the former regime. Indeed, the streets retain the names chosen in the socialist period despite the fact that they refer to personalities associated with the regime “which stood behind the imprisonment and murder of many innocent people” (B2.9). Although it would be appropriate to change such street names, the renaming process has “not succeeded everywhere (...). Even today, people of Ostrava can encounter street names that recall the totalitarian regime” (B2.7). Attention is skewed to the totalitarian character of the former regime, whose remembrance in public is naturally not desirable. A comparison between two totalitarian regimes that Czechoslovakia experienced in the 20th century occurs, raised by a local citizen, quoted in an article on the idnes.cz website as the only local resident getting a voice in the examined corpus: “The names such as Hitler Square, Goebbels Street or Mussolini Street were dropped in Ostrava. And now the names representing the former regime remain” (B2.9). In the popular understanding, the socialist period is as totalitarian as the Nazi period; The renaming process after 1989 is interpreted as an unfinished decommunization, which should be a process analogous to denazification.

The perspective of decommunization is characterized by the creation of a contrasting image of the past and the present, encountered in both levels of the corpus, i.e. also in the broader media representation and construction of the renaming processes after the regime change in early 1990s. The past regime loses any concrete contours through emphasis on its ideological character, especially in comparison with the present regime, as expressed by the headline of a 2009 article in the regional daily *Denik*: “Street names before 1989 were determined by politics” (B2.8). The practice of the current regime is described as nearly apolitical, even though it follows the same key: “Commemoration continues today, although we choose the names of heroes more judiciously – we have Jan Palach Square or the street of November 17th” (B2.13–14). The communist regime is singled out above other regimes, presented as

utterly ideological through its ambitions to politicize space, indeed as the only one with these ambitions: “200 years ago we named Czech towns after master potters or weavers. After the Victorious February, this role was taken over by comrades and Stakhanovites” (B2.13–14). This interpretation suggests a great discontinuity of values and also decontextualizes the socialist period within the 20th century history; additionally, the use of the personal pronoun “we” suggests the image of a distant past, romanticized as pre-political, and contrasts it with the power hierarchy and resulting detachment typical of the life under the communist regime.

An important layer of this contrasting rendering is a confrontation of the cultural reference spheres of the past and present regime. Here again, the comparison of the ideological and non-ideological stands out, as evidenced by the headline of a 2018 article on the *ČT24.cz* website: “From Pioneers’ to a Strawberry street, from the Red Army’s to Beethoven’s. The massive renaming of streets began 30 years ago.” Socialist place names are turning into a kind of a cultural peculiarity (“To go to the National Security Corps street, walk along the Bedřich Engels embankment or take the red metro C line all the way to the Street of Victorious February”, B2.18) provoking an emotional reaction (“Today, the names of the Ostrava streets from twenty years ago often evoke amazement or a smile”, B2.8). However, street names can also provoke an outrage, as demonstrated by the article “With Communist Names to Europe” published in an regional outlet *Region – Týdeník Ostrava* in June 2003. Published in the year preceding the accession of the Czech Republic to the European Union, it is building on contrasting the current political trajectory with the unsatisfactory state of coming to terms with the past and presents socialist toponymy as an object of international shame. It opens with a list of areas where the socialist names still persist: in Ostrava’s westernmost district Vřesina, “the old structures’ hearts will leap with joy over the Bolshevik street”, while Ostrava-South “evokes the red flags the most”, as here “people still walk along the street of Jiskříček [Sparklets’, a Pioneer club for young children] or Svazácká [Communist Youth Organization]”. Furthermore, it is in this district where the area of Old Zábřeh is located, “which consists entirely of Russian names” (B2.5). As the Eastern orientation is supposed to be fully abandoned, the persistence of the Russian names in Czech urban toponymy becomes a sign of an inconsistent demonstration of the new cultural and geopolitical ties.

The demand for removing of the socialist place names comes also from the local officials and experts. The area of Ostrava-Zábřeh, where “the situation is probably the worst”, for example, is recalled by Antonín Barcuch, the then Director of the Ostrava City Archives, in an article published in February 2018 in the regional *Moravskoslezský deník* and on the *denik.cz*

website. In this area, “more than ten streets are named after Russian soldiers who fought in the Second World War at Stalingrad and have nothing to do with Ostrava” (B2.16–17). Jan Becher, a former city councillor and a member of the city’s Commission for Museum, Annals, Names and Heraldry, quoted in an article on *ostrava.idnes.cz* in January 2013, has a similar remark: “ (..) for example, I do not understand why a number of streets in Ostrava should continue to hold names of Soviet soldiers or leaders who fought at Stalingrad”. He offers to change the names to ones that would be more ideologically appropriate to the present, which are grounded in the reminder of the repressive character of the former regime: “I’m sure there would be a whole range of other personalities who would deserve a street name. For example, General Vilém Stanovský, a native of Ostrava, who was tortured by the communists” (B2.9). Through this remark, he taps into another important argument for renaming: the names from the period of the former regime stand in the place for names that should be reflected in the public space through the lens of the current regime. This also refers to the need to rehabilitate the figures who the former regime had damaged.

6.2.3.2. Perspective of the administrative and life burden: Street renaming as a disruption of the everyday life

In the corpus under study, the local residents’ rejection of the renaming process is verbalized by the officials under whom the local naming agenda falls. Relationship of local officials and residents is a key layer of this perspective and manifests on the scale between *understanding – statement – disagreement*, where the last position links the perspective to the perspective of decommunization. The negative position of the locals is most often interpreted as indifference or lack of political determination. Locals are insufficiently motivated to remove the names from the period of state socialism to demonstrate the existence of a new sociopolitical reality: “Pioneer Street will remain in Poruba even after the EU accession. Its residents are obviously not bothered at all.” The original names “even became here to stay for them” (B2.5). An important aspect is an adaptation, as evidenced by the headline of the June 1999 article in *Moravskoslezský deník*. It points out the regretability of the adaptation of locals vis-à-vis the inappropriateness of the persistence of socialist street names due to their belonging to the value system of the former regime, which has now been overcome: “...[the local residents] got used to the names of the Komsomols and soldiers in their addresses” (B2.4).

Although the apathy of the local population has various sources, one of the most important is that the public do not perceive the street names as politically saturated, either at all or to a

very neglectable degree. On the other hand, it is precisely the lack of knowledge of the origins of the local toponymy that should be the reason to change the street names; residents in the areas in question have “usually no idea who the street is named after, in which they live” (B2.2). Although they “often have no idea after whom [the streets] are named...”, they “probably don’t care and don’t consider the name change to be their current problem...” – as Karel Sibinský, former mayor of the city, explains (B2.4).

The indifferent attitude of the local population to the renaming process, however, appears as a significant factor in describing the overall context of the symbolic reappropriation of the public space in early 1990s. The unrenamed streets are interpreted as a missed opportunity, as the immediate aftermath of the political upheaval was a period which allowed the street names to be changed with unforeseen promptness: Although “renaming was best done immediately after the revolution” (B2.18), the distant approach of the local population to the process was already evident at the time, when “already during the 1990s there was no will of the residents to change the names”(B2.9). This brings us to the second key motivation for rejecting the renaming, which is its technical implementation. The process represents a significant administrative burden: The “several-month-long merry-go-round” consists of having to “completely revise all the official documents”, which is why “people are rather terrified of it” (B2.5). This is typical of the Old Zábřeh district: “This particular area is densely populated, there are old residents who have got used to the name and nowadays do not bother with it anymore. Every change means a number of administrative procedures” (B2.16–17). The negative attitude towards renaming is correlated with the “old-residency” and refers again to a habit that over time have transformed into indifference. However, indifference can also be read, from the perspective of decommunization, as a lack of political determination and as an obstacle to the desired progress in the reconciliation process, that the removal of the street names would be. The relationship between officials and locals, however, is also a relationship of subordination: “Officials are afraid that people would stone them to death should they be obliged to change all of their documents...”, and therefore “they agree that the communist street names would only be changed if the citizens themselves asked for it” (B2.5). Divergent perspectives and motivations were ultimately the reason why officials always resorted to avoid renaming in favour of the local residents: “We discussed street names several times. But each time we came to the conclusion that we would not complicate people’s lives” (B2.4).

At the same time, apart from one quote of a concrete local resident, who supports decommunization by comparing the communist regime to the Nazi regime, the local population is rendered undifferentiated, characterized merely by their lack of motivation, interest and determinacy. The local residents appear as passive recipients, and no indication of their interaction with the toponymy is represented.

6.2.3.3. Perspective of street names as cultural heritage: Street renaming as a disruption of historical continuity and urban integrity

The last perspective includes arguments that place the issue in a broad historical context and provide an expert framework for assessing where, how, why, and whether at all the socialist street names should be changed. In this respect, they represent a response to the perspective of decommunization, although under it, the contextualization of the commemoration practice is used mostly to provide arguments for removal of the street names from the former regime. Arguments problematizing the demand for wholesale renaming after the regime change mainly concern three aspects of urban toponymy: 1) the differences between individual commemoration names, i.e. the diverse biographies of the individual commemorated personalities, 2) the by-default political nature of the commemoration practice with emphasis on the popularity of using it as a common political tool by different regimes, and 3) the specificities of the historical and spatial context, i.e. the circumstances of the particular commemorations in the individual locations.

Arguments regarding the first aspect of urban toponymy emphasize the need to distinguish between individual commemoration names and include a call for individual consideration of the cases at stake. In Ostrava-South, “about three dozen streets are still named after members of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia”, but as Martin Juřica, the chronicler of the statutory city of Ostrava, explains in a November 2019 article on *ČT24.cz*, these are “participants in the anti-Nazi resistance and most of them were martyred during the Second World War” (B2.18). This specification confirms the tendency among experts to consider the life stories of the individual personalities in debates about commemoration or decommemoration. Explaining of the individual commemoration names is also embedded in explanations of the overall logic of the demand for renaming: “The reasons for changing street names after 1989 were twofold. Either they were explicitly named after communist leaders and events, or because people felt the need to rehabilitate important people who had been harmed by the regime,” as Jan Becher, a former member of the Ostrava’s Commission

for Museum, Annals, Names and Heraldry, explained in a December 2014 article in the online version of *Moravskoslezský deník* (B2.11–12). Through this explanation, he refers to the habitual usages of toponymy by political regimes and the automaticity of its reconsideration in times of regime changes.

Related to this is the second aspect of urban toponymy, emphasizing the essentially political character of standardized toponymy: The inscription of political symbols into the symbolic landscape of the city should be seen as a common practice exerted by all ruling regimes. This broader contextualization of the issue is brought to attention by journalists as well (“When Czechoslovakia was created, streets were renamed in the same way as when Ostrava was occupied by the German army in 1939”, B2.8), pointing out the commonality, indeed historical inevitability of the process of renaming, as it has always accompanied regime changes (“With each regime change comes a change in the name of streets and squares” B2.11–12). Moreover, it is classified as an ideological practice: “Each regime change brought about a change of ideology, to which some street names did not fit” (B2.11–12). This expert argument serves both sides of the dispute, i.e. it builds ground for changing the toponymy *because* the regime has changed, or softens the look at the socialist toponymy as not an illegitimate usurpation of the public space, but merely one of the political imprints in the symbolic landscape. On the side of the opponents of the removal of socialist street names, the sharp division between the practices of the individual 20th century regimes is erased, problematizing the evaluation of the socialist toponymy practice as the only ideological one. Onomastician Jaroslav David, quoted in an article in MF DNES and *cestovani.idnes.cz* in February and March 2015, explains the commemoration practice in a broader historical perspective. Although he admits that “the totalitarian regimes managed to take commemoration to perfection” and “every town had its Lenin Avenue”, this practice started already “at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with names like Neruda’s, Jungmann’s, Svatopluk Čech’s, Hus’s or Komenský’s. And in the twentieth century, the practice continued with names such as Masaryk Street or Czechoslovak Legions” (B2.13–14).

Finally, an important argument for the preservation of socialist street names is the emphasis on understanding the particular context of commemoration, i.e. when and why the personalities were selected. The process is most often elucidated by journalists: “Výškovice [a broader district in Ostrava-South], where the housing estate once called Stalingrad is located, has dozens of streets that bear the names of commanders and soldiers, who distinguished

themselves in the battles for the city of Stalingrad.” (B2.8). A report by the regional editorial office of the public radio service *Český rozhlas* on “the rarity of a set of streets named after Soviet soldiers” provides the most detailed description of the background to the creation of these street names, while also drawing attention to the existence of another layer of memory: the streets “named after soldiers of the Soviet army” remain here “from the times of post-war socialist construction”. Because the Zábřeh housing estate “was called Stalingrad under Communism”, the streets there “specifically bear the names of soldiers from the battle for the town on the Volga, which marked a turning point in World War II” (B2.15).

The historical contextualization brings to attention also the spatial context of the particular places. This perspective includes the argument about toponyms as part of cultural heritage. Place names should be understood as an integral part of urban buildings and projects, as Jaroslav David states in an article in *Mladá fronta DNES* and *ostrava.idnes.cz* from January 2013: “The current issue is the protection of street names in localities that are relatively young, (...) where the period architecture of the so-called ‘Sorela’ [socialist realism], together with the street names such as Budovatelská [Builders’], Dělnická [Workers’], Pionýrů [Pioneers’] or Čujkovova and Gurt’jevova, complements the urban space as it was created in the 1950s.” (B2.9–10). At the same time, the historical connection of the street names to the particular housing developments means that a different, new street name would be unjustified, as Michael Kutty, former spokesman for the Ostrava-South district, mentions in the example of Patrice Lumumba and Alois Gavlas streets in the 1970s housing estate of Dubina, a neighbouring district to Zábřeh: “Both streets have always been called that, no other name is historically substantiated.” (B2.9–10). The emphasis on sensitivity to the historical and spatial context as a third aspect of urban toponymy is demonstrated through concrete efforts by the local authorities to provide more detailed information about individual street names. These efforts are illustrated, for example, by the series devoted to the origin of street names in the newsletter of the Ostrava-South Municipal Hall¹⁰. This activity, carried out by the local officials, is also a further evidence of the intermingling of positions and attitudes in the debate on street renaming.

¹⁰ The year-long series Do you know where you live? was published in three issues of the Jižní listy newsletter in 2012. In the editorial to the last issue, former mayor Karel Sibinský writes about the extraordinary response from readers. The newspaper’s archive can be accessed on <https://ovajih.ostrava.cz/cs/o-jihu/jizni-listy> [náhled 3.12. 2021].

7. DISCUSSION

The cases investigated in this thesis represent two distinct activities and instances of the process of “reconciliation with the socialist past”, both falling within the realm of memory politics. As the analyses have shown, the cases are different in several aspects. First, they differ in terms of legislative grounding: While the idea of a national memory institute is disputed for being constituted by law, the demand for street renaming has no legislative backing. Instead, it seeks justification through pointing to the naturality of depoliticization of the public space, to be achieved by removing the remnants of the former regime (i.e., decommunization). The view on the former regime as historically discredited and illegitimate has been codified in the Czech Republic through a series of laws (Blaive, 2020, see also chapter 3.3) which boosts the sense of substantiatedness of such demand, although an explicit legislative demand for decommunization of the Czech public space is missing. Related to this is the second distinction, which consists in a different position of the dominant discourse on communism: In the case of the national memory institute, the passed law proposal is an actual enforcement of the dominance of the discourse, as it enables a codified production of knowledge on the socialist past through the prism of the regime’s criminality, as one of the dominant discourse’s core dimensions. In the case of the street renaming, although the dominant discourse on communism drives the perspective of decommunization and renders the socialist street names undesired in the post-socialist public space, it is not successful in competition with other perspectives. Thirdly, the two cases of disputes over the socialist past are building and elaborating on the different dimensions of the dominant discourse on communism: While the proponents of the national memory institute are arguing with, building on and eventually enforcing a *crime-centred* look at the socialist past, the proponents of removal of socialist street names are arguing with, building on and struggling to enforce a *discontinuous* look at the socialist past. Despite these accents, both dimensions are present in both disputes and render any of the past regime’s deeds virtually illegitimate – although this perspective only “succeeds” in the case of the national memory institute.

Fourthly, the cases are different in their temporality: While the first dispute corresponds to a legislative political procedure of negotiating and eventually passing a law proposal, the second case tracks a longitudinal public deliberation on socialist street names that lacks, therefore, a concrete dynamic; rather, it exposes the general tendencies in thematizing the topic by the media. Lastly, the cases are different with regards to which tiers of the social are

included in the deliberations: While the national memory institute is a purely top-down measure, debated mostly across the privileged and top-of-hierarchy political, journalistic and academic fields, the socialist heritage in the form of street names is negotiated in the lower political tier, between the local administration, local population and related experts, and reported on as such.

The following sections will provide a closer look at the tendencies and dynamics exposed through the two analyses. Before discussing the cases individually, a summarizing note on the intertextual and interdiscursive links should be made. In both cases, the micro discourses, that of 1) the discourse on passing the law on the Institute and 2) the discourse on socialist street names in Ostrava, are embedded in the broader discourses occurring within the topic of reconciliation with the socialist past, which serve as broader dimensions for the process of meaning-making. The arguments are enforced through allusions to the dominant discourse on communism, which deems the socialist past criminal by nature and historically discontinuous, where the crime-centred perspective actually legitimates the discontinuous look: The state-orchestrated crimes render the regime immoral and deplorable, and hence not worthy following or belonging to the historical trajectory. This rendering reflects the power dynamic of the Czech post-socialist memory politics and the dominance of memory projects promoted by concrete social groups, as recounted in chapters 1.2 and 3.3. At the same time, however, it is deeply embedded in the broader narrations of the European socialist pasts: As Mariusz Czepczyński notes, post-socialism (or post-communism) alone connotes “the burdensome relations with the communist regimes or pejorative social, cultural, economic inheritance” (2008, p. 3).

The discussion chapter is divided into three parts. The first part summarizes the polarized nature of the dispute over the national memory institute and explains it vis-à-vis the context of domestic politics around the mid-2000s, to bring the results of the analysis in discussion with the structural context explicated in chapters 3 and 4. It elucidates the then weak position of the political Left as main opponents of the Institute, and also points to the locking of the debate in the prominent fields of politics, academia and journalism. Further, it returns to the main accents of the discourse on the passing of the law on the Institute revealed by the analysis – the motif of transparency and the prominence of the figures of agents and victims – and explores them further against existing literature. It concludes with locating the efforts to establish the Czech institute in the regional context of Central Eastern Europe.

The second part is dedicated to the dispute over the socialist street names in Ostrava and overviews the power dynamic of the deliberation in the micro-scale context of municipal politics, with a focus on the local reluctance toward the renaming appeals. It then moves to discussing the representation of this dynamic and the overall reporting on the issue in the Czech media, considering the specificities of the media handling the socialist past as a topic. It concludes with identifying two discursive tendencies that drive the media interpretations – historical “externalization” of the socialist past and an aesthetic-cultural aversion to socialist street names as to a heritage of the ideological and historical Other. Lastly, the third part brings back in focus the media as significant memory actors. It overviews their memory work in the cases under study and discusses their role in sustaining the mnemonic projects of the state or otherwise powerful actors.

7.1. Establishing the national memory institute: The anticommunist synergy between the political and journalistic fields

As the historian Françoise Mayer (2009) remarked, the conflict over the law proposal on the Czech national memory institute was as heated as the disputes accompanying the emergence of other laws intended to tackle the socialist past, such as the lustration law, or the 1993 law “On the illegitimacy of the Communist regime and Resistance to it”. The media news reports of the event analysed in chapter 6.1 acknowledged the political grounding of the conflict, as the two sides were clearly politically demarcated, but also mirrored the broader polarization over the topic. The online and print media monitored in the period of the negotiations of the law proposal in the Czech Parliament played different roles: They had routinely and meticulously covered the political clashes, but also constituted a public arena where disputes between different engaged personalities, scholars, public intellectuals or politicians were taking place.

The media discourse in the monitored period was a *mélange* of genres: News reports, editorials, disputes, or interviews, where different voices and their arguments were presented. Mostly, these voices were from the areas of politics and academia. The case was, therefore, a period of a striking fusion of the political, journalistic and the academic fields as powerful “universes” within the social: Fields that, according to Pierre Bourdieu (2005), have in common that they all strive to impose their categories as a legitimate vision of the social world. The groups of proponents and opponents of the Institute were located on opposite

poles of the individual fields and from there, struggling for imposing their “principles of vision and division” (ibid.). Typically for the post-socialist memory legislation, the law proposal became yet another source of polarization, demarcating the poles and making them appear homogenous, as antitheses.

The two fractions that clashed over the law proposal for the Institute compounded a variety of actors: The proponents of the idea united in the need to keep in focus the crimes of the communist regime and seek reconciliation through that. Politically, they represented the conservative or center-right spectrum of the political field, notably from the ODS or the Greens, then the coalition partners. The individual active politicians included Ivan Langer, Jiří Liška, Marek Benda, Martin Mejstřík, or Kateřina Jacques, who contributed to the parliamentary debates or voiced their stances in the media in the monitored period. The politicians were complemented by scholars, public intellectuals, journalists or former dissidents (Petruška Šustrová, Mirek Vodrážka or Jan Rejžek), historians later associated with the “anticommunist hardcore” in ÚSTR (Petr Zídek), civil society activists (Adam Drda) and personalities with hybrid biographies, such as Pavel Žáček. The first director of ÚSTR, Žáček counts among the most proactive local mnemonic actors (see section 3.3 for details). As Veronika Pehe (2020) remarks, ÚSTR was largely his brainchild; a former employee and later head of the Office for Documentation and Investigation of the Communist Crimes (ÚDV), he insisted on the importance of the secret service files and pushed the crime-centred perspective in reconciliatory agenda, wrapping it around the idea of exposing and holding the perpetrators accountable.

The opponents of the institute, on the other hand, were warning of the reductive and exclusionary focus that the proponents’ perspective engendered, reminding also of the risk of codification of memory. The opposing fraction encompassed the left-wing parties in the political field, the Social Democrats (ČSSD) and the Communists (KSČM), and individual personalities within them (notably Zdeněk Jičínský, František Bublan, Lubomír Zaorálek or Miroslav Grebeníček). The political actors participated in parliamentary debates and joined media discussions both before and after the passing of the law. The politicians were complemented by a variety of scholars, public intellectuals or journalists, such as Vladimír Bystrov, the dissidents from the reform communist fraction (Zdeněk Jičínský, Petr Uhl), or local distinguished historians or political scientists from the Academy of Science and other institutes (Michal Kopeček, Tomáš Vilímeck, Lukáš Jelínek, Vladimíra Dvořáková). The clash of the two fractions testified of a specific power constellation in the Czech public arena in the

incriminate period of the post-socialist development, a constellation characterized particularly by a weak argumentative position of the Left, as one of the characteristic features of the deliberation.

7.1.1. Weak position of the Left

The negotiations over the law proposal were taking place in a specific power configuration on the domestic political scene, affected by an intense and confrontational campaign before the parliamentary elections in May 2006. Except for the centre-left *Právo* or the KSČM's party partisan media outlet *Haló noviny*, the mainstream news media monitored in the tier-one macro corpus displayed a tendency to mimic official memory politics and augment the political power imbalance and polarization of that period. As a matter of fact, given the rather unanimous reporting on the passing of the law, the three media outlets, *Mladá Fronta DNES*, *Lidové noviny*, and *Hospodářské noviny*, formed an actual “discourse coalition”, a concept used to describe a group of actors who share a social construct and who are, collectively, capable of a “discursive closure”, i.e. an interpretive process resulting in a simplifying summary of complicated events (Hajer, 1997, pp. 58–62). The outlets also provided space for individual proponents or opponents to voice their perspectives.

The heated atmosphere before the elections yielded also a particular political-media campaign in which the outlets from the discourse coalition played a major role. The campaign was designed as a warning against a potential leftist government, as the forecasts prognosed an electoral success of Social Democrats who could form a coalition with the Communist party of Bohemia and Moravia, the KSČM. The scenario gave rise to a massive anticommunist campaign to which the journalists, editors and publicists from the dailies *Mladá Fronta DNES*, *Lidové noviny* and *Hospodářské noviny* explicitly contributed. In their analysis of the “red danger before elections”, the media scholars Lenka Vochocová and Jan Křeček (2009) pointed to the blatant strategy of the journalists from these outlets to intervene in the political field but also to the general bias among Czech journalists against the Communists and, by extension, the Social Democrats. This stance was only opposed by the centre-left *Právo* whose journalists actively challenged the anticommunist framing. Researchers have shown that the discreditation of Social Democracy and the political Left through the “threat of communism” took on a form of a particular political strategy in the context of Czech domestic politics (Koubek & Polášek, 2013) or of a leitmotif of various anticommunist or anti-leftist campaigns taking place at different moments of the post-socialist development (Hrubeš &

Navrátil, 2017; Koubek & Polášek, 2013; J. Navrátil & Hrubeš, 2018; Slačálek, 2013; Štechová, 2015). In the incriminate period, moreover, the position of the Left as the ideological Other was strengthened through repetitive attempts to ban the communist symbols, one of them taking place amidst the negotiations of the national memory institute (Honzejek, 2006).

On the other hand, the polarized atmosphere was mutually experienced. Jiří Paroubek, the then leader of the ČSSD and the outgoing prime minister of the social democratic government, reflected on and warned about the concentration of political power in the hands of the ODS. At that time, Václav Klaus, the party's founding father, was the country's president, and the ODS held a long-term, seemingly unshakeable majority in the Senate. Fears were voiced of the looming "blue dictatorship", blue being the official colour of the ODS. The May 2006 elections, ending in a dead-lock (J. Pehe, 2006) eventually yielded a fragile right-wing ODS-led coalition. Despite its numeral weakness, it proved to be surprisingly efficient in passing most of its desired legislation, relying on, for example, the support of the two defecting Social Democratic MPs, who played a major role in the passing of the law on the Institute.

At the same time, what also amplified the bias against the Left was the successful self-projection of the right-wing actors as ideologically neutral. This was nothing new in the post-socialist context: The initiatives forging particular understandings of the socialist past were generally characterized by a tendency to promote a neutral self-definition, obfuscating the political context behind their foundation and presenting themselves as "impartial arbiters of a complex and difficult past" who "stood above politics" (Apor et al., 2017; see also Mark, 2010, p. 47). Ultimately, drawing the discourse on the passing of the law on the Institute to the broadest dimensions, the power asymmetry between the Left and the Right in the disputes of that time and the pertaining relevance of anticommunism for some social groups should be also interpreted as a result of the ideological skewing of the post-Cold War political discourse in the post-socialist countries. At least in the first decade after the transformation, the processes of political identity (re)construction had been driven by a perception of the post-transformational political Right as historically triumphant, leaving the post-socialist Left in a defensive position (Barša & Císař, 2001; Císař, 2005). Any associations or sympathies, actual or imagined, with the historically defeated communist regimes, would be interpreted as going against the grain and easily refuted as such. Notably in the early stages of the political development in the post-socialist Czech Republic, the Left, defying the establishing memory

politics, had been disadvantaged: They were projected as opponents of measures that followed the regionally, or perhaps even globally-valid interpretation of the socialist past.

7.1.2. Transparency, victims and agents: Main accents of the discourse on the passing of the law on the Institute

Among the main accents of the discourse on the passing of the law on the Institute, the motif of transparency enjoyed a central position. As a generally pronounced value, it figured high in the priorities of the newly established regimes across the post-socialist countries, rooted in the moral vow of the societies to face its “totalitarian” past(s) (Apor et al., 2017). The free access to the secret police files, as one of the major pro-arguments of the proponents of the Institute, was supposed to be an act amplifying the freedom of speech, abolishing the restrictions associated with the former regime and finally revealing the truth that has been kept secret for so long. At the same time, it was interconnected with the demand for cutting of ties for people compromised by collaboration with the former regime: A request for a clean record that was seen as a way of strengthening the democratic values and institutions (ibid.).

As recounted in chapter 4.1, the national memory institutes’ *raison d’être* was linked intrinsically to the archives of the former secret police of the communist regimes. The files were, in fact, a proof of the totalitarian nature of the past regimes, while their centrality in the study of these regimes led to a production of a quite narrow understanding of collaboration (Apor et al., 2017). The central position of the secret service archives in the process of reconciliation with the socialist past was a feature most attacked by the opponents of the idea, who countered with the limiting view on the communist regime that the archives provide, but also pointed to the political bias behind favouring this historical source. In the broader corpus, historians and other scholars or public intellectuals were opposing the idea of the institutes, raising the very same arguments: The secret police archives are an inherently problematic source for historical inquiry that should be studied as a historical object in the first place; Its predictive value about the communist regime has been very limited and limiting, as it reduced the socialist era to the repressive apparatus of the past regime. Eventually, the clash over the mission of and vision for the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes (and over the other memory institutes as well as other projects of the anticommunist memory entrepreneurs in the region, see Dujisin, 2021) led to an irreconcilable split of the Czech historiographic community and largely also the public sphere (Blaive, 2020b).

Regarding other accents, a prominent motif of the discourse on the passing of the law on the Institute, but also of the broader discourse on the national memory institute(s), is the figure of agent. As one of the key figures of the crime-centred perspective on the socialist past, an agent of the former secret police became the pronominal stigma of the post-socialist societies (Mink, 2013). At the same time, the national memory institutes, through their intrinsic connection to the secret police archives, predetermined their goal to producing and promoting an idea of “the collaborator” (Apor et al. 2017).

The spectre of the collaborator has been notoriously permeating the public discussions over the socialist past across many discussions in the post-socialist context, including the case under study. The analysis of the micro discourse on the passing of the law on the Institute has shown how blatantly the motif of collaboration has been instrumentalized and weaponized, through the central role of the condition for former KSC members to be banned in the Institute’s board. The deliberate strategy to draw a simplifying line between the presupposed or likely collaborators and the personalities with a “clean record” has been fervently discussed, yet arguments against it were easily refuted by directing attention to the opponents’ biography and his potential proximity to the former regime, weaponizing paranoia as a characteristic feature of the reconciliation process. The micro discourse was not floating in void, quite the opposite: As the analysis of the broader corpus has shown, the whole monitored period that led to the final discussions over the law proposal was replete with scandals over accusation of collaboration, both in the Czech Republic and in the neighbouring countries (Poland and Slovakia), giving the process of reconciliation a sense of a paranoid witch hunt. Furthermore, the lustration activities were still ongoing at that time, or entering new phases in that period, driven by the idea of saving the post-socialist social or political structure from the malicious elements of the past regime (see Appendix 1).

The proponents have advocated the opening of the archives to reach another goal, not as emphasized, but still present in the discourse on the law on the Institute: that of paying off the debt to the victims of the communist regime. As a motif strongly present in other anticommunist campaigns and activities (Slačálek, 2013), the actual existence of victims of the regime has proved to be self-justifying and used as an argumentative rebuttal in the studied discourse. In the micro corpus, this strategy exemplified in the role taken by the then Prime Minister Mirek Topolánek (ODS) during the discussions. Joining the debate only minimally, he limited his input to a reminder of the political prisoners, using the reference to their figure as an argument *ad baculum* during the final negotiations in the Lower Chamber.

By emphasizing the sole fact that the communist regime had been persecuting people on political grounds, he implicitly refuted all other arguments, boosting the commonsense appeal to justify the crime-centred perspective. This finding corresponds with the specificity of the position the victims of the communist regimes occupied in the post-socialist societies: Associated usually in special organizations (The Confederation of Political Prisoners, in the case of the Czech Republic), they were often backed by pressure groups and influential public intellectuals (Apor et al., 2017, p. 2).

7.1.3. Mirroring the controversial regional “grammar”

Coming back to the regional and historical context in which the Czech national memory institute was debated, the incriminate period was indeed exceptional in the area of memory politics, both on the national and the regional level. In early 2007, the new ODS-led Ministry of the Interior launched a project labelled Open past that started to make significant moves in the area of digital administration of the secret service archives (Koura, 2007), putting the disclosing of the repressive practices at the top of priorities, and, in doing so, following actually a path already paved in the Czech memory politics (Kovanic, 2017). In Poland, meanwhile, the local national memory institute IPN was busy chasing collaborators (Klich-Kluczevska, 2017) and preparing the decommunization law, that was passed in 2016 and ordained the communist monuments, symbols and place names to be removed from the public space (Skibinski, 2023). In Slovakia, the ÚPN, as the explicit model institution for the Czech ÚSTR, suffered a loss of its founding father, Ján Langoš, in a tragic car accident in June 2006. The numerous obituaries in the Czech media were clearly building the case for the Czech institute to be urgently founded, calling for it as a fulfilment of Langoš’s legacy. As the political scientist Martin Konavic remarks, given their strong connection to personal biographies of right-wing oriented elites, both ÚPN and ÚSTR were standing out as examples of an “institutional expression of anticommunist beliefs of right-wing political elites”, functioning as producers of anticommunist collective memory (2017, p. 81). In the Czech context, however, in contrast to Slovakia, ÚSTR was a continuation of efforts to politically instrumentalize and monopolize the memory production on the socialist period (ibid.).

While historians at that time pointed out the clear enmeshment of the model institutes in momentary political conflicts in the individual countries, and the political bias in the proposed style of reconciliation, the region-specific Central Eastern European “grammar” for studying the socialist past was never approached from a further distance or problematized in the news

reporting in the Czech media. This may have to do with the ideological inclination described in 3.3.2, as most Czech journalists have adhered to the liberal values and profiled as center-right (Volek & Urbániková, 2017). The analysis of the micro discourse on the passing of the law exposed that the media from the discourse coalition – *Mladá Fronta DNES*, *Lidové noviny* and *Hospodářské noviny* – used the fact of following the example of Slovakia and Poland as a justificatory factor. This appears as the major contribution to a gradual normalization of the political conditioning of tackling contemporary history in the given historical and geographical context. As Tomas Sniegon points out, “both ÚPN and ÚSTR can be seen primarily as *ideological* projects” (2013, p. 122, emphasis added), although the argumentation for the institutes revolved mostly around moral vows and scientific goals. The Czech institute, formulated and shaped by the controversial law proposal, was even more concretely ideologically grounded, as the outcome of its research was clearly skewed towards legitimising “only the right-wing post-communist politics” (ibid.).

7.2. Urban toponymy post-1989: Socialist spaces through a post-socialist lens

In contrast to the discourse on the national memory institute(s), the discourse on the socialist street names concerns an agenda that belongs to a different level of the political decision-making, which also implies a different power balance between the parties and actors involved. The deliberation under study was taking place on the level of local governance in the Ostrava-South district, between the municipality administration and the local population, who are, as actors related to the concrete local context, fairly proximate in the structure. This balance reflected in and was formative of the thematization and representation of the issue in the media. The discourse on socialist street names in Ostrava is drawing on the dominant discourse on communism but owing to the power dynamic between the stakeholders involved, the argumentation has a different charge. As the analysis of the case of Old Zábřeh showed, the dominant discourse does occur as an ideological background for the demand for decommunization of the public space, claiming legitimacy through a commonsensical understanding of the need for doing away with remnants of an authoritarian and discredited regime. However, it may not be heard nor supported on the level of everyday life which would be affected by the street names change.

There are specificities to how the symbolic imprint of the previous regime has been handled, as observed by local onomasticians. The urban district of Old Zábřeh, as an original housing development built at the turn of the 1940s on a greenfield site in the southwest part of Ostrava, represents a particular case in the post-socialist politics of renaming. As a place that has not existed before the socialist period, there was no pre-socialist name to return to after the regime change in the early 1990s – there were “no sins to be redeemed” (David and Mácha 2014, p. 150). This fact has been complicating the otherwise clear-cut requests for renaming after the regime change and has created argumentative space for alternative views.

From the perspective of critical toponymy, the place names, including the politically motivated, form an integral part of the urbanscape of the individual districts and housing projects. In other words, the toponymy composes a thematic whole with the urban development; the renaming of the streets is perceived as an ahistorical intervention and a violation of the integrity of the areas. Another important factor is the peripheral nature of many of the socialist housing developments: In contrast to the city centres that were as the most exposed and representative parts of the cities usually renamed first, the peripheral areas have in most cases escaped this kind of attention. Finally, the last factor is the density of population in these developments, which makes the technical implementation of street renaming highly challenging and consequently decreases the motivation of local residents and other local stakeholders to change place names, as it represents a significant administrative burden (J. David, 2013, cited in Kárníková, 2022, p. 294).

7.2.1. Rationale for (non)renaming: Bottom-up resistance to top-down appeals

Outside the prevalent strategies of decommunization and expunging (see chapter 4.2), socialist heritage has been also approached in other ways across the post-socialist cities, as diverse actors have been engaging with it in the individual urbanscapes (see, for example, Young & Kaczmarek, 2008; Betlii, 2022). The socialist past can be handled officially and as such, it may be subject to official and codified remembrance, or, reversely, of official marginalization and disregard. At the same time, a big portion of it evade any of these codifying attempts and some aspects resist forgetting (Adler, 2005). The role of non-state actors or lower-level political tiers are also of significance, as they can promote alternative narratives, reflecting plurality in the symbolic landscape, often through an open contestation of the dominant narrations (Wüstenberg, 2011, Skibinski, 2023). The deliberation in Old Zábřeh can be classified as a clash of bottom-up and top-down perspectives: In the discourse

on the socialist street names, what becomes apparent are the limits of the official state “meta-level” interpretation that local political authorities strive to enforce on the local micro-level. The dominant interpretation of the past might not be as easy to enforce across all the tiers of the political apparatus, as studies from other post-socialist cities also show (see Light & Young, 2018).

On the local micro-level, the changes of socialist street names in Ostrava-South have not been implemented as the local administration has resorted to respecting the will of the residents who have been repeatedly refusing the change – including quite recently, in the wake of the reassessments following the open military attack of Russia on Ukraine (Jiříček, 2022). As the analysis revealed, the locals represented a discursively passivated, yet structurally powerful actor with a crucial role in the deliberation. The local population’s negative stance has been voiced by other actors endowed with authority as an argument for the change of street names not to be implemented, interpreted both as unfortunate and as worth respect. In a way, the representation of the local population’s perspective corresponds to the indifference to the ideological and political motivation of place names that onomasticians observe among users: Owing to the tendency of the standardized urban toponymy to change with every political regime, the different schemes for place names cease to carry any ideological connotations and come across as apolitical (J. David & Mácha, 2014). The reluctance of the local population to change the street names, however, is not explored in any further detail in the studied sample, and the different perceptions of the locals would be worth a separate study.

7.2.2. Tendencies in media reporting: Power dynamic between the perspectives and the actors

The three perspectives described in the analytical section 6.2.4. are linked to the discursive positions of the different actors outlined in Table 4 in chapter 6.2. The actors of the discourse, both individual and collective, find themselves in various relations to the perspectives, and in some cases, are not *de facto* actors. What is rather worth attention are the ways in which the actors, as one type of the discursive elements, distributed the identified perspectives, how they related to them, to the issue and to each other, including the power connotations of this configuration.

The actor type ‘local officials’, whose discursive position is to a notable degree determined by the role of state institutions as one of the key sources for the media (Fairclough, 1995),

became the main distributor of the decommunization perspective promoting the removal of the socialist place names, while copying the accents of the state-curated memory politics. On the other hand, the local officials and representatives are tied by responsibility towards the electorate, i.e. the local population. In some cases, actors representing this type were voicing the perspective of street renaming as an administrative and life burden. Additionally, diverse biographies were subsumed under this actor type, i.e. the personalities quoted in the discourse, and their individual motivations remain unknown. In the analysis, they were assessed based on their proximity to the legally-endorsed appeal for renaming and on their role as elected representatives accountable towards the local population. The actor type ‘local population’ represented mostly the perspective of the administrative and life burden, and, as explained in the previous section, became a passivized actor: Their perspective was used argumentatively by other actors on both sides of the dispute as a reason for keeping the original names or as an obstacle to the renaming process. Thirdly, the actor type ‘experts’ which amounted mostly to onomasticians and local chroniclers and archivists, provided context for local rationale or for the process of place naming. The role of the expert view consisted in providing arguments for both sides of the dispute and confirmed the controversial nature of the issue under investigation. The various expert assessments were distributed and voiced either by experts themselves, by state or county officials or directly by the journalists as authors of the media texts.

In the media, the debate was owing to the still apparent center-right profiling of the mainstream journalist community. As the monitored period spanned several decades and included diverse media, the ideological skewing typical for the Czech post-socialist journalist discourse and the local media landscape more broadly could be observed. It seemed to have affected the distribution of power among the different perspectives – albeit on the level of discourse only, as the decommunization perspective was not successful and the street names in Zábřeh did not change. The power constellation between the voices that were present in the negotiations has revealed a tendency to skew the debate over the socialist heritage towards the dominant understanding, deeming the heritage unwanted. In the Czech media, this has been resulting from the inertia of the tendency to endorse the liberal-conservative standpoint (Pehe, 2023), which includes anticommunism and a radical cut between the past and the present. Yet, the expert views have seemed to dilute this tendency: They provided an objective perspective on elements and phenomena from the socialist era, introducing the idea that place renaming is a continuous political practice. The advocates of the decommunization perspective expressed

their helplessness and resignation in the situation, even though they still urged on the powerfulness, authority and indeed morality of the purging view. This view is symptomatic for two specific aspects on which the following section focuses.

7.2.3. Thematising socialist toponymy: Two aspects of discontinuity

Initially, the analysis of the renaming controversy in Ostrava-South reveals the interconnected levels of media discursive action. The media created a space for the debate, but at the same time actively raised and framed the issue as a conflict of values – a dispute over the memory of the socialist past, specifically. The style of thematization of the period of the rule of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia, including the occasions for thematization, corresponded to the tendencies in Czech memory politics discussed in detail above and tended to draw on the dominant discourse on communism, notably its discontinuous dimension, thereby reinforcing, stabilizing and normalizing its position as a default interpretive framework.

The actual dispute over the socialist toponymy in Old Zábřeh housing district had an analogous dynamic as the debates taking place in different parts of the Czech Republic, as apparent from the familiarizing reading of the tier-one corpus (Appendix 3). The heritage in the form of socialist toponymy was rendered controversial, as the socialist past itself is controversial. Socialist toponymy has a problematic status in the symbolic landscape primarily because it represents the legacy of a “discredited regime”: In the prism of the dominant understanding, the question is not whether the change of toponymy is justifiable in the first place, but rather how extensive should the “purification process” be (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 1999, p. 107, cited in Kárníková, 2022, p. 305).

The textual analysis of the tier-two corpus, the eighteen articles thematising the socialist street names in Ostrava and Old Zábřeh, confirmed this tendency, concluding that mainstream media tend to construct the heritage of the former regime in a pejorative sense. Specifically, two aspects of representing the socialist past were traced that complemented each other in the process of constructing the socialist place names as an illegitimate and undesirable imprint in the contemporary Czech symbolic landscape. The first aspect consists in the representation of the socialist period as an external project, a historical aberration unrelated to the otherwise linear historical development of the nation. The second aspect is an aesthetic-cultural aversion to socialist street names as a heritage of the ideological and historical Other, which also includes an aversion to the “language of communism” as an apparatus of a totalitarian

ideological indoctrination. Complementary and intertwined as they are, the two aspects provide a background to the arguments for a wholesale rejection of the socialist heritage in the form of place names.

7.2.3.1. Socialist past as an external project

The first aspect, “socialist past as an external project”, has its roots in the discontinuous image of the Czechoslovak 20th century history, as one of the essential components of the newly formed memory and the related dominant discourse on communism. Within this outlook, the period of the monopole rule of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia represents a deviation from the normal historical flow, disrupting the otherwise linear and natural development towards democracy (Blaive, 2016; M. Kopeček, 2008c; Mayer, 2009, p. 255; Rupnik, 2002, p. 10). It relies heavily on the dichotomous language of freedom vs. repression and democracy vs. totalitarianism and shows a strong tendency to externalize communism and the phenomena associated with it, interpreting them as imports “from the East” (Kopeček, 2008, p. 79, cited in Kárníková, 2022, p. 306). In such a view, the regime’s evolution within the structures of the Czechoslovak society is marginalized, and with it the actual continuity with previous historical development (see Dobeš, 2009 for details).

This dichotomized view divides the 20th century historical unfolding in Czechoslovakia into “democratic” and “undemocratic” periods and deems the socialist period a totalitarian monolith – a factor crucial for discussions over the legitimacy of the regime’s heritage in the symbolic landscape. The radical cuts between the individual regimes reflect in the representation of the socialist toponymy in Old Zábřeh as an inability to acknowledge the overlapping layers of memory: In the case of the Soviet soldiers, commemorated in Old Zábřeh in the early 1950s for their merits in the battle for Stalingrad, the anti-fascist motivation is entirely omitted. The street names are interpreted as an illegitimate imprint of the socialist period, building on the sense of discontinuity as the essential component of the dominant discourse on communism.

It is, therefore, the suppression of the memory of the Second World War that is manifested in the rejection of street names commemorating Soviet soldiers; they are a negative reminder of the socialist past *en bloc*, perceived purely as a part of Soviet propaganda and “a symptom of the Sovietization of Czechoslovakia” (Strakoš, 2018, p. 349, cited in Kárníková, 2022, p. 307). The overlaps of the socialist and anti-fascist heritage are frequent subject of controversy

over renaming in other post-socialist cities as well (Šakaja & Stanić, 2011), bearing evidence of Eastern Europe as a region of conflictual memory (Krawatzek & Soroka, 2022). The Soviet soldiers also represent an anonymous bloc of external motivation for place names. The renaming initiatives' arguments seek further legitimacy through an appeal to localization: By removing the commemoration of external patrons (Soviet soldiers), they claim space for local patrons that deserve commemoration in the given symbolic landscape.

7.2.3.2. The aesthetic-cultural aversion to communism

The symbolic annihilation of socialist commemoration and its rendering as devoid of meaning is also linked to the second aspect of the media representation of the socialist toponymy, that, contributes to the hegemonic position of the dominant discourse on communism as well. This aspect, the aesthetic-cultural aversion, consists in sentiments of incomprehensibility, illegitimacy and ugliness. Embedded in the broader cultural dichotomy between the civilized, aesthetically moderate and rational West, and the wild, megalomaniac and irrational East (Bakić-Hayden, 1995; Drakulic, 2013; Todorova, 2009), this construction may be even read as an orientalist discourse. Drawing on the argumentation of the architect Vladimir Kulić (2018) who focused on the Western perception and discursive construction of socialist architecture, the main criteria for assessing the aesthetic of the socialist period has been, according to him, the totalitarian frame: The reason for othering the East (of Europe) is that it represents the “socialist world”, as a world alien to the West. According to Kulić, the basis of this otherness, unlike the original Saidian orientalist discourse, is rather ideological than cultural or racial: Its motivations and effects are essentially political, reinvigorating the Cold War anticommunist consensus in the West and reassuring of the anticommunist memory politics in the East (ibid.). This imagination relates to the spatial reorientation in the post-socialist countries, that turned towards the West, yet simultaneously “against” the East in the 1990s (Young and Light, 2001). The spatial and ideological refusal renders the products of the socialist era eerie and incomprehensible, hence worth refusal.

As the hundred-and-eighty-degree reorientation towards the West occurred almost universally in the 1990s across the former Eastern Bloc, this “orientalist”, othering lens was automatically adopted in the post-socialist states as well (Young & Light, 2001). As a result, the local remnants of the past regimes were re-interpreted as vestiges of a “mysterious gone world” and sometimes subjects to self-orientalising ideological activities. Through the perspective of the dominant discourse on communism, the socialist heritage appears as beyond comprehension.

The main effect, however, consisted in justifying the erasure of the actual meaning of socialist commemoration, in monuments or street names, rendering them empty shells that are not worth of preservation (Kulić, 2018). These criteria were formative of the Czech post-transformational perspective as well, where “ugliness” appeared as a common denotate for any product of the socialist era, notably in architecture and urban development (Holubec, 2015, p. 135).

This “othering” lens appeared in the way the monitored media interpreted the persistence of the surnames of the Soviet soldiers, i.e. Russian surnames, in the contemporary Czech post-socialist urban landscape: They come across as references to the Eastern sphere of influence that the society already abandoned and condemned. As linguistic elements, moreover, the Russian surnames tap into the negative reminiscence of how “totally” language was co-opted in the period of the communist rule. The dirigiste rhetoric of the communist regime, pervasive across public communication channels, frequently referenced the Soviet Union and mandated Russian as the compulsory foreign language, which fostered a strong aversion to Russian as a top-down imposed language. It was language through which the new values were supposed to be internalized, as the historian Oldřich Tůma (2010) argues, drawing attention to “the language of the communist totalitarianism” as the central medium through which the communist ideology had been established throughout the socialist period. This view, however, reinforces the image of a controlled society and a repressive state, highlighting the externality of the language of the regime that “never became the language of the society” (ibid.). The emphasis on disconnecting the language of the regime from the actual life of the society then becomes the means by which this language (and all the regime’s meaning-making expressions belonging to the “ideological fiction of the ‘world of socialism’”, (Fidelius, 1998, p. VIII) can be considered in total isolation from the reality and dismissed as a layer without any intrinsic connection to the world it is supposed to denotate. The language of the regime, as a language that is supremely ideologized, becomes primarily an identifier of the period of state socialism, as a period of an “inauthentic” past whose heritage does not need to be preserved (Kárníková, 2022).

7.3. Czech mainstream media as memory agents post-1989

The Czech mainstream media in the post-socialist period have been concerned with the socialist past in a way that mirrored the accents of the powerful agents, i.e. politicians, public

intellectuals and other influential memory actors. As the directly preceding historical period with numerous significant continuities, some of which were deeply troubling, the topic of reconciliation and socialist legacy has retained a high social relevance and newsworthiness in the Czech post-socialist public sphere. On top of that, the socialist past has continued to hold a prominent position in the political life of the Czech society, including the ongoing identity-making process, becoming a frequent subject of contestation and public debate. This has, consequently, determined the memory work that the media engage in when reporting on the various incidents (Zelizer, 2008). Remaining a socially relevant and newsworthy topic, the media's handling of it was skewed by the local right-wing elite's accents in Czech memory politics, discussed in chapter 3.3. The accents converged in the dominant discourse on communism and interflowed with the "commonsensical" liberal perspective that characterized the profiling of most Czech mainstream media post-1989 and of majority of the local journalist community (Volek and Urbániková, 2017).

As the analyses presented in this thesis showed, the representations of the socialist past in the Czech mainstream media have proved to be relying on and eventually enforcing understandings that became dominant throughout the decades of post-socialism, despite the fact they have been growingly challenged or "diluted" by other understandings (Činátl, 2014; Pehe, 2020; Reifová, 2018). Interpretations that later emerged and contested the dominant discourse have, on the other hand, turned the struggles for retaining hegemony even more fervent (Slačálek, 2009), as the latest developments since 2022 around the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes also show.

The memory of the socialist past has been constructed, on the level of official memory politics, through selected narratives and pre-conceived frames, drawing on the experiences of influential actors in the public domain (Dujisin, 2010, 2015, 2021) and giving rise to a dominant discourse on communism. Constructed under this angle, it soon turned into an explanatory background against which journalists projected recent events (Zelizer, 2008). This inclination combines with the tendencies in the journalistic work with memory, which typically relies on simplified historical narratives: The main characteristic of such simplifications consists in explaining of the meaning of events outside the overall context, downplaying of nuances and resigning on explanation of the "grey areas of phenomena" (Zelizer 2008, p. 381).

The dominant discourse on communism, as a dismissive approach to the socialist past, must be seen as a part of the liberal-conservative “consensus” (Barša, quoted in Pehe, 2023) which has proven chronically resistant to contestation in the Czech post-socialist context, despite further challenges that have brought some new reshuffling in the ideological landscape (Barša et al., 2021). The Czech mainstream media analysed in the two studies showed a tendency to incline to the official, state-authorized or otherwise institutionalized narrations, therefore reproducing the memory politics of the state, rather than objecting it (Kligler-Vilenchik, 2011, p. 232). This inclination can be traced back to the inherited tendency of local media professionals to endorse and align with the liberal-conservative, anti-communist trajectory promoted by the influential early 1990s coalition of elite actors – specifically, the “intellectual-managerial alliance” of dissidents and technocrats (Dujisin, 2010; Eyal, 2003) – which has shaped the local ideological landscape. As Veronika Pehe (2023) notes, the right-wing interpretation continues to be seen as the neutral status quo.

The dominant understanding is also largely distributed top-down, from powerful institutions or agents to peripheral spaces, including geographically. This reflects in the approach to socialist toponymy in Ostrava. On the local level, however, the ideological grip appears to be looser, and other locally relevant interpretations are getting traction. The various interpretations that contest the dominant understanding are also expressed via participatory media, particularly since the “connective turn” (Hoskins, 2011) which has transformed the media-collective relations. Despite this development, however, as the thesis posits, the role of the “traditional”, institutionalized journalist work has remained important, as journalists, as actors endowed with symbolic power, keep playing a “systematic and ongoing role in shaping the ways in which we think about the past” (Zelizer, 2008, p. 379).

CONCLUSION

This thesis focused on two specific instances of the process of reconciliation with the socialist past in the post-socialist Czech Republic and pointed to the discursive struggles over the hegemony of one particular “discourse on communism”. The analyses focused on two distinct disputes over how to address the period of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia’s rule from 1948 to 1989: The first case involved the establishment of a national memory institute, and the second, the renaming of socialist-era street names in the post-socialist cultural landscape. While the two cases involve different dynamics among the actors, both represent top-down efforts to shape how the socialist past should be approached – either as a subject of historical inquiry or as part of the symbolic landscape. These efforts play a key role in shaping the identity-making process following the regime change in the early 1990s. They highlight the strategies used to define the past and separate it from the present. The cases are grounded in specific temporal and spatial contexts, but both reflect a regional, if not universal, tendency to dismiss the socialist past entirely, rooted in the interpretation of the communist regime as criminal and the historical period as aberrant. The challenge with the socialist past lies in its status as contemporary history, where memory and history intersect in complex ways: It is common for regimes to seek control over the narrative of recent history.

The thesis relies on a great body of scholarly works that have focused on the political bias driving the constructions of the memory of the socialist past in the Czech Republic and beyond and seeks to contribute to it with a qualitative account of communication processes in the public sphere. It offered an analysis of how two specific events from the area of tackling the memory of the socialist past have been reported on in the mainstream media discourse and identified tendencies in the construction of the memory of the socialist past, pairing them with the structural determinants. It brought to attention the powerful actors who historically had the authority to enforce their values and meanings in the public sphere, making them appear commonsensical. It pointed to the media as significant mnemonic agents who influence the construction of memory through their multiple roles in the process of making of social meanings: distribution of voices, mediation of debates, but also active agenda setting through habitual selection of topics and their topicalization. The media themselves represent a powerful social field, but they are also proximate to other fields of power, which often makes them compliant with the strategies of the state. This could not be more true for the Czech mainstream media in the post-socialist period. The thesis has stressed how in the extraordinary historical circumstances of the early 1990s transformation in Czechoslovakia

(and later Czech Republic) the media turned into avid supporters of the political path paved by the newly empowered right-wing elites. It has pointed to the tendencies in the Czech public sphere and the journalist community to endorse the direction of the transformation towards liberal values which also included a radical separation from the socialist past.

The thesis connected the discursive processes of universalization to the power of Czech right-wing elite actors, often with mixed political and academic biographies, who were capable and motivated to enforce a particular understanding of the socialist period, driven to condemn it “so that history would not repeat”. The stress of these actors on ideology and hypocrisy as drivers of the past regime’s legitimacy served also to obscure their own political agenda and the ideological bias in pushing to enforce such understanding. The liberal-conservative elite, embodied in the political field especially by the ODS (in power in years 1992–1997, 2006–2009, 2010–2013 and since 2021) and joined by other center-right parties and numerous public intellectuals or other influential figures, has contrasted itself with the communist rule by rendering itself barely apolitical. Liberalism has become the neutral unquestionable status quo, yet there is ideology that drives the post-socialist memory politics. Obfuscated as it is in the Czech context, it conforms to Terry Eagleton’s comparison of ideology to bad breath – you act as if it’s only what other people have.

By focusing on one top-tier negotiation taking place across prominent fields of power (the political and the journalist, and by extension the academic) and one micro-political negotiation occurring at a municipal level (between local administration and local population, vis-à-vis the journalist understanding), the thesis has pointed to the different charge and ratio between the individual arguments and perspectives. Even though the agenda around reconciliation became over-politicized, and mostly captured by anticommunist conservatives, both in the Czech Republic and in other countries of the post-socialist area, the thesis has shown that the dominant discourse on communism has its limits depending on the circumstances of the negotiation and the configuration of the actors involved in the negotiation. While in the case of national memory institute, the conservatives were clearly in charge of the process, given their strong position in the political field of that time and supported by the then strong anti-leftist charge in the mainstream media, in the case of the deliberation over the street names on the municipal level in Ostrava, the political profiling was much more subtle. It has shown that in the micro context, other perspectives can be discussed or given space, or credit. The locking of the discourse on the national memory institute within the powerful fields of politics and journalism (and only partially in the

academia), on the other hand, results in over-politicization, rendering it a partisan issue and limiting the inclusion of contesting and diverse viewpoints.

The study on toponymy in Ostrava provides a brief insight into the popular understanding and reveals discord over the reconciliation strategies between the members of the general public on one hand and the authorities and other empowered actors on the other. It taps into a broader issue concerning which memories are considered valuable for developing a healthy relationship with the troubling past and thus worthy of attention. The plurality of memories regarding the socialist past is evident across various social domains, but these memories are mostly confined to private memory or popular production. New communicative tools have certainly amplified their impact on remembrance. However, incorporating these diverse narratives into official memory politics would not only deepen our understanding of the past regime but also foster a sense of social inclusiveness. The media, as influential agents, should embrace this plurality, amplify underrepresented voices, and explore new perspectives beyond established formats of remembrance.

Summary

Bringing together perspectives from critical discourse studies, media studies, cultural studies, cultural geography, critical toponymy, and memory studies, this dissertation explores the construction of collective memory of the socialist past in the post-socialist Czech Republic. It focuses on media representations of the process of “reconciliation” with the socialist past and the “dominant discourse on communism”, a powerful narrative that gained prominence during the early post-transformation years of the 1990s, driven by its association with liberal-conservative elite actors. Despite continuous contestation and shifts in the local ideological landscape, this narrative has maintained its hegemony in Czech public discourse. The thesis links the process of constructing collective memory of the socialist past to the reconstructions of political identities in the post-socialist countries, at both the intra-national and international levels, and examines the strategies, grammars and alliances that have developed and formed around the process of reconciliation that sought to (re)construct, universalize and codify new historical narrations. Combining a micro focus on texts and discourses with a macro focus on social and political circumstances, the thesis presents qualitative analyses of two thematic discourses from two specific areas of the reconciliation process with the past: the passing of the law on establishment of a memory institution, running since 2008 under the name of Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes, and 2) the negotiations over the street names originating from the socialist period, exemplified on a specific “place of memory”, a 1950s urban district in the city of Ostrava. Using a textual analysis grounded in the critical discourse studies research program, the thesis explores whether and how the Czech mainstream media have drawn upon, reproduced, and sustained the dominant discourse on communism.

The two cases are different in many respects, at both the structural and discursive levels. While the first case tracks a dispute over a law proposal taking place in the top tier of the political apparatus, the second concerns tackling socialist heritage in the symbolic landscape and reflects the senses of belonging in the spatial context, debated on a municipal level. However, the cases are complementary in that they provide a deeper insight into two specific dimensions of the dominant discourse on communism that are intertwined and interdependent: the focus on crimes of the communist regimes and the discontinuous approach to the socialist past as a historical period. As aggregates of accents that have characterized the memory of the socialist past constructed within the Czech official memory politics, the two dimensions legitimize a wholesale condemnation of the socialist past.

The two cases are reconstructed from the mainstream media discourse, drawing on the theory of media as significant memory agents. The thesis adopts a critical approach to the mainstream media representations and pays attention to the complex relations between memory and journalism. It elucidates the ideological skewing of the Czech mainstream media landscape post-1989 and discusses how the inclination of the local journalist community have affected the local media's approach to the topic of reconciliation. The thesis concludes with a discussion on the tendencies and prevailing accents in the construction of the two topics in the media, with a focus on the power dynamic between the stakeholders involved in the deliberations under focus. For the study of the passing of the law on the national memory institute, it points to the weak argumentative position of the Czech political Left, as a major opponent of the law proposal, in the given period. It also points to the strong position of the motif of transparency and the reductive focus on the victims and the perpetrators of the former regime, as major actors of the crime-centred perspective on the socialist past. In the study on the socialist street names in Ostrava, it discusses the specific power dynamic in the local deliberations and the bottom-up resistance to top-down appeals to remove the socialist street names. Further, it demonstrates the effect of the discontinuous approach to the socialist period which results in expelling the period from the nation's otherwise linear past, and the interrelated accent on socialist heritage as a heritage of the ideological and historical Other. The thesis concludes that the liberal-conservative elite actors, as key agents in the Czech post-socialist memory politics, have contrasted the previous social order with the post-1989 social order by emphasizing the ideological character of the communist regime, while obfuscating the ideological factors influencing decisions about how the socialist past is remembered. In addition, by foregrounding selected narratives in mapping the past historical period, it has left a lot of stories unrecognized, thereby deepening cleavages between different segments of the society.

REFERENCES

- Achugar, M. (2009). Constructing the past and constructing themselves: The Uruguayan military's memory of the dictatorship. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 6(4), 283–295.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900903181051>
- Adamovsky, E. (2005). Euro-Orientalism and the Making of the Concept of Eastern Europe in France, 1810–1880. *The Journal of Modern History*, 77(3), 591–628. <https://doi.org/10.1086/497718>
- Adler, N. (2005). The future of the soviet past remains unpredictable: The resurrection of Stalinist symbols amidst the exhumation of mass graves. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 57(8), 1093–1119.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09668130500351100>
- Ágh, A. (1998). *The Politics of Central Europe*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446279250>
- Alderman, D. H. (2008). Place, naming and interpretation of cultural landscapes. In *The Ashgate research companion to heritage and identity* (pp. 195–214). Ashgate.
- Apor, P., Horváth, S., & Mark, J. (2017). Introduction: Collaboration, Cooperation and Political Participation in the Communist Regimes. In P. Apor, S. Horváth, & J. Mark (Eds.), *Secret Agents and the Memory of Everyday Collaboration in Communist Eastern Europe* (pp. 1–20). Anthem Press.
- Ashworth, G. J., & Graham, B. J. (2005). *Senses of place: Senses of time*. Ashgate.
- Ashworth, G.J., & Tunbridge, J. (1999). Old cities, new pasts: Heritage planning in selected cities of Central Europe. *GeoJournal*, 49(1), 105–116.
- Assmann, J. (2008). Communicative and Collective memory. In A. Nünning & A. Erll (Eds.), *Cultural Memory Studies* (pp. 109–118). Walter de Gruyter.
- Auer, S. (2004). *Liberal nationalism in Central Europe*. Routledge.
- Azaryahu, M. (1996). The Power of Commemorative Street Names. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 14(3), 311–330. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d140311>
- Azaryahu, M. (1997). German reunification and the politics of street names: The case of East Berlin. *Political Geography*, 16(6), 479–493. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298\(96\)00053-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298(96)00053-4)

- Azaryahu, M. (2009). Naming the Past: The Significance of Commemorative Street Names. In L. D. Berg & J. Vuolteenaho (Eds.), *Critical toponymies: The contested politics of place naming* (pp. 53–70). Ashgate.
- Azaryahu, M. (2015). The Critical Turn and Beyond: The Case of Commemorative Street Naming. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, 10(1), 27–33.
- Bailyn, J. F., Jelača, D., & Lugarić, D. (2018). *The Future of (Post)Socialism: Eastern European Perspectives*. State University of New York Press.
- Bakić-Hayden, M. (1995). Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia. *Slavic Review*, 54(4), 917–931. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2501399>
- Barkan, E., & Lang, A. (2022). Mapping Memory Laws. In E. Barkan & A. Lang (Eds.), *Memory Laws and Historical Justice* (pp. 1–21). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94914-3_1
- Barker, C., & Galasiński, D. (2001). *Cultural studies and discourse analysis: A dialogue on language and identity*. SAGE.
- Barša, P., & Čisáň, O. (2001). *Levice v postrevoluční době: Občanská společnost a nová sociální hnutí v radikální politické teorii 20. století*. Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury.
- Barša, P., Hesová, Z., & Slačálek, O. (2021). Introduction: How Post-Communist Ends. Central European Cultural Wars in the 2010s. In *Central European culture wars: Beyond post-communism and populism* (pp. 7–27). Faculty of arts, Charles University.
- Barthes, R. (1981). Theory of the Text. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader* (pp. 31–47). Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Behr, V., Blaive, M., Constantin, A., Neumayer, L., & Zombory, M. (2020). An anti-communist Consensus: The Black Book of communism in Pan-European Perspective: *Revue d'études Comparatives Est-Ouest*, N° 2-3(2), 55–88. <https://doi.org/10.3917/rece01.512.0055>
- Bělohradský, V. (1991). *Přirozený svět jako politický problém: Eseje o člověku pozdní doby*. Československý spisovatel.
- Benhabib, S. (1996). *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton University Press.

- Bergson, H. (1988). *Matter and Memory*. Zone Books. (Original work published 1896)
- Bernhard, M., & Kubik, J. (2014). Introduction. In M. Bernhard & J. Kubik (Eds.), *Twenty Years After Communism* (pp. xx–6). Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199375134.003.0001>
- Betlii, O. (2022). The Identity Politics of Heritage: Decommunization, Decolonization, and Derussification of Kyiv Monuments after Russia’s Full-Scale Invasion of Ukraine. *Journal of Applied History*, 4(1–2), 149–169. <https://doi.org/10.1163/25895893-bja10031>
- Bird, E. S., & Dardenne, R. W. (2008). Rethinking news and myth as storytelling. In T. Hanitzsch & K. Wahl-Jorgensen, *The handbook of journalism studies* (pp. 205–217). Routledge.
- Blaive, M., & Gerbel, C. (2010). *Clashes in European memory: The case of Communist repression and the Holocaust*. Studienverlag.
- Blaive, M. (2016). National Narratives of Czech identity from the 19th Century to the Present. In A. Pelinka (Ed.), *Geschichtsbuch Mitteleuropa. Vom Fin de Siècle bis zur Gegenwart* (pp. 161–189). New Academic Press.
- Blaive, M. (2020a). Codeword “Criminal”: Moral Remembrance in National Memory Politics. In Mörner, N. (ed.) *Constructions and instrumentalization of the past: A comparative study on memory management in the region*. Centre for Baltic and East European studies, CBEES, Södertörn university.
- Blaive, M. (2020b). History and politics: Dealing with the Communist past in the post-1989 Czech public sphere. *Storia Della Storiografia*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.19272/202011502004>
- Blaive, M. (2022). Writing on Communist History in Central Europe: Introduction. *East European Politics and Societies: And Cultures*, 36(3), 957–969.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/08883254211049512>
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003). *Language and symbolic power* (Reprinted). Harvard Univ. Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005). The Political Field, The Social Science Field, and the Journalistic Field. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (pp. 29–47). Polity Press.

- Briziarelli, M. (2014). Hide and Seek: Neoliberalizing the State and “Stating” the Neoliberal in the Italian Media System. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 11(3), 195–210.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2014.927582>
- Buchowski, M. (2006). The Specter of Orientalism in Europe: From Exotic Other to Stigmatized Brother. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 79(3), 463–482. <https://doi.org/10.1353/anq.2006.0032>
- Buchtík, M., Eichler, P., Kopečný, O., Smejkalová, K., & Uhrová, J. (2021). *Jedna společnost - různé světy: Poznatky kvalitativní studie o fragmentarizaci české společnosti / One society – different worlds: findings from a qualitative study of the fragmentation of Czech society* (1. vydání). Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung e.V. zastoupení v České republice Masarykova demokratická akademie.
- Buden, B. (2013). *Konec postkomunismu: Od společnosti bez naděje k naději bez společnosti*. Rybka Publishers.
- Carpentier, N. (2018). Discourse-theoretical analysis (DTA). In J. Flowerdew & J. E. Richardson (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies* (pp. 272–284). Routledge.
- Cervinkova, H. (2012). Postcolonialism, postsocialism and the anthropology of east-central Europe. *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 48(2), 155–163.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2012.658246>
- Chelcea, L., & Druță, O. (2016). Zombie socialism and the rise of neoliberalism in post-socialist Central and Eastern Europe. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 57(4–5), 521–544.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15387216.2016.1266273>
- Chiumbu, S., & Radebe, M. (2020). Towards a decolonial critical political economy of the media: Some initial thoughts. *Communicatio : South African Journal of Communication Theory and Research*, 46(1).
- Činátl, K. (2014). *Naše české minulosti*. Nakladatelství Lidové noviny. <https://www.nln.cz/knihy/nase-ceske-minulosti-aneb-jak-vzpominame/>
- Císař, O. (2005). The Left in the beginning of the 21st century. In L. Kopeček, *Trajectories of the left: Social democratic and (ex-)communist parties in contemporary Europe: Between past and future*. Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury.

- Conrad, S. (2012). Enlightenment in Global History: A Historiographical Critique. *The American Historical Review*, 117(4), 999–1027. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/117.4.999>
- Costa Pinto, A., & Morlino, L. (2013). *Dealing with the Legacy of Authoritarianism: The “Politics of the Past” in Southern European Democracies*. Routledge.
<https://www.routledge.com/Dealing-with-the-Legacy-of-Authoritarianism-The-Politics-of-the-Past/Pinto-Morlino/p/book/9780415846936>
- ČTK (2022, April 22). Ulice u ruské ambasády v Praze se oficiálně přejmenovala na Ukrajinských hrdinů (The street by the Russian Embassy in Prague was officially renamed on Ukrainian Heroes’). *Novinky.Cz*. <https://www.novinky.cz/clanek/domaci-ulice-u-ruske-ambasady-v-praze-se-oficialne-prejmenovala-na-ukrajinskych-hrdinu-40394630>
- ČTK (2024, May 14) Nápis Moskva–Praha v metru bude mít vysvětlující tabulku (The sign Moskva–Praha in the Metro will have an explicatory plaque). *Hn.cz*. <https://archiv.hn.cz/c1-67323050-napis-moskva-praha-v-metru-bude-mit-vysvetlujici-tabulku>
- Czepczyński, M. (2005). Post-socialist landscape management and reinterpretation. In L. Oliver, K. Millar, D. Grimski, U. Ferber, & C. P. Nathanail (Eds.), *CABERNET 2005. Proceedings of CABERNET 2005. The international conference on managing urban land*. Land Quality Press.
- Czepczyński, M. (2008). *Cultural landscapes of post-socialist cities: Representation of powers and needs*. Routledge.
- David, J. (2013). Street Names—Between Ideology and Cultural Heritage. *Acta Onomastica*, 54, 53–60.
- David, J., & Mácha, P. (2014). *Názvy míst: Paměť, identita, kulturní dědictví* (1. vyd). Host.
- David, R. (2015). Lustration and transitional justice: Personnel systems in the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland. In L. Stan & N. Nedelsky (Eds.), *Post-Communist Transitional Justice* (1st ed, pp. 97–122). University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dobeš, J. (2009). Unexpected Parallels: Currents below the Surface. *Soudobé dějiny*, 16(4), 653–663.
<https://doi.org/10.51134/sod.2009.039>
- Drakulic, S. (2013). *Café Europa: Life After Communism*. Hachette UK.
- Drda, A., & Dudek, P. (2006). *Kdo ve stínu čeká na moc: Čeští komunisté po listopadu 1989*. Paseka.

- Dubicki, A. (2018). What do we accept, what we neglect? The quest for the proper version of collective memory. Some considerations about the names present in urban space after the 2015 elections in Poland. The case of Łódź and its neighbourhood. *Evista de Științe Politice. Revue Des Sciences Politiques*, 58, 141–154.
- Dujisin, Z. (2010). Towards a collective memory of socialism? Grounding the discursive production of Hungarian and Czech post-communist anti-communism. *SEER*, 13(4), 475–488.
<https://doi.org/10.5771/1435-2869-2010-4-475>
- Dujisin, Z. (2015). Post-Communist Europe: On the Path to a Regional Regime of Remembrance? In *Thinking through Transition* (pp. 553–586). Central European University Press.
<https://www.ceeol.com/search/chapter-detail?id=425182>
- Dujisin, Z. (2021). A history of post-communist remembrance: From memory politics to the emergence of a field of anticommunism. *Theory and Society*, 50(1), 65–96.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-020-09401-5>
- Dvořáková, V. (2007). The Institute of National Memory: Historical Memory as a Political Project. In V. Dvořáková & A. Milardović (Eds.), *Lustration and consolidation of democracy and the rule of law in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 153–168). Political Science Research Centre Zagreb.
- Eagleton, T. (1994). *Ideology*. Pearson Education Limited.
<https://www.routledge.com/Ideology/Eagleton/p/book/9780582237162>
- Eagleton, T. (2004, March 23). Why ideas no longer matter. *The Guardian*.
<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2004/mar/23/immigrationpolicy.politics>
- Edy, J. (1999). Journalistic Uses of Collective Memory. *Journal of Communication*, 49(2), 71–85.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1999.tb02794.x>
- Edy, J. (2006). *Troubled Pasts: News and the Collective Memory of Social Unrest*. Temple University Press.
- Ekman, J., & Linde, J. (2005). Communist nostalgia and the consolidation of democracy in Central and Eastern Europe. *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 21(3), 354–374.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13523270500183512>

- Erl, A. (2008). Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction. In A. Erl & A. Nünning (Eds.), *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (pp. 1–18). Walter de Gruyter.
- Erl, A. (2011). *Memory in Culture*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230321670>
- Explanatory Memorandum to the Act on the Nation's Memory Institute, and on Amendments of some Acts / Důvodová zpráva k Zákonu o Ústavu paměti národa a o změně některých zákonů.* (2006). Senát Parlamentu České republiky.
- https://www.senat.cz/xqw/xervlet/pssenat/webNahled?id_doc=38427&id_var=32423
- Eyal, G. (2003). *The origins of postcommunist elites: From Prague Spring to the breakup of Czechoslovakia*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Eyal, G., Szelenyi, I., & Townsley, E. (Eds.). (1998). *Making Capitalism Without Capitalists: The New Ruling Elites in Eastern Europe*. Verso Books.
- Fabiszak, M., & Brzezińska, A. W. (2020). Konflikt pamięci czy konflikt władzy? Strategie językowe w dyskusji nad zmianą nazwy ulicy w Poznaniu. *tekst i dyskurs - text und diskurs*, 13 (2020), 81–99. <https://doi.org/10.7311/tid.13.2020.05>
- Fabiszak, M., Buchstaller, I., Brzezińska, A. W., Alvanides, S., Griese, F., & Schneider, C. (2021). Ideology in the linguistic landscape: Towards a quantitative approach. *Discourse & Society*, 32(4), 405–425. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926521992149>
- Fairclough, N. (1992). Intertextuality in Critical Discourse Analysis. *Linguistics and Education*, 4, 269–293.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203697078>
- Fairclough, N. (2015). Textual Analysis. In M. Bevir & R. A. W. Rhodes (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Interpretive Political Science* (pp. 186–198). Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., Jessop, B., & Sayer, A. (2003). Critical Realism and Semiosis. *Department of Sociology, Lancaster University*, 1–14.

- Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak, R. (2011). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 357–378). SAGE Publications Ltd.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446289068>
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 258–284). Sage.
- Fenton, N. (2007). Bridging the Mythical Divide: Political Economy and Cultural Studies Approaches to the Analysis of the Media. In E. Deveroux (Ed.), *Media Studies: Key Issues and Debates* (pp. 7–31). Sage.
- Fidelius, P. (1998). *Řeč komunistické moci*. Triáda.
- Flowerdew, J. (2017). Critical discourse studies and context. In J. E. Richardson & J. Flowerdew (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* (pp. 165–178). Routledge.
- Flowerdew, J., & Richardson, J. E. (2017a). Introduction. In *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies* (pp. 1–10). Routledge.
- Flowerdew, J., & Richardson, J. E. (Eds.). (2017b). *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies*. Routledge.
- Forchtner, B. (2011). Critique, the discourse–historical approach, and the Frankfurt School. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2011.533564>
- Forchtner, B., & Schneickert, C. (2016). Collective learning in social fields: Bourdieu, Habermas and critical discourse studies. *Discourse & Society*, 27(3), 293–307.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926516630892>
- Forchtner, B., & Tominc, A. (2012). Critique and argumentation: On the relation between the discourse-historical approach and pragma-dialectics. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 11(1), 31–50. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.11.1.02for>
- Foucault, M. (2008). Power/Knowledge. In S. Seidman & J. C. Alexander (Eds.), *The New Social Theory Reader*. Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. Routledge.
- Fukuyama, F. (2006). *The End of History and the Last Man*. Simon and Schuster.

- Fürsich, E. (2009). In defense of Textual Analysis: Restoring a challenged method for journalism and media studies. *Journalism Studies*, 10(2), 238–252.
- Garde-Hansen, J. (2022). *Media and Memory*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Gaunt, D., & Lane, T. (2020). Remembrance as a weapon for political manipulation. In *Constructions and instrumentalization of the past: A comparative study on memory management in the region* (pp. 9–14).
- Gedi, N., & Elam, Y. (1996). Collective Memory—What Is It? *History and Memory*, 8(1), 30–50.
- Gibas, P., & Pauknerová, K. (2021). The Fall of Marshall Konev: Silencing Beyond Post-Socialist Monument Removal(s). *Ethnologia Polona*, 42. <https://doi.org/10.23858/ethp.2021.42.2681>
- Gillis, J. R. (1994). Introduction: Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship. In *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity* (pp. 3–24). Princeton University Press.
- Gironi, C. (2023). Decolonizing Kyiv’s politics of memory: Current and potential implications of Russia’s 2022 invasion of Ukraine on Ukrainian monuments and toponyms. *The Journal of International Relations, Peace Studies, and Development*, 8(1).
- Gjuričová, A. (2009). A Rather Traditional Break with the Past: The Presence of the Past in the Ideology and Political Rhetoric of the Civic Democratic Party. *Soudobé dějiny*, 16(2–3), 313–332. <https://doi.org/10.51134/sod.2009.018>
- Gnatiuk, O., & Melnychuk, A. (2023). A Case Study of De-Russification of Ukrainian Hodonyms: Rigged Trial or Justice Restored? *A Journal of Onomastics*, 71(4), 41–55.
- Graham, B., & Howard, P. (Eds.). (2008). *The Ashgate research companion to heritage and identity*. Ashgate Pub. Co.
- Graham, B. J., Ashworth, G. J., & Tunbridge, J. E. (2004). *A geography of heritage: Power, culture and economy* (Reprinted). Arnold.
- Grodsky, B. (2015). Transitional Justice and Political Goods. In L. Stan & N. Nedelsky (Eds.), *Post-Communist Transitional Justice: Lessons from twenty-five years of experience*. Cambridge University Press.

- Grzymala-Busse, A. M. (2002). *Redeeming the Communist Past: The Regeneration of Communist Parties in East Central Europe* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511613388>
- Hájek, R., & Carpentier, N. (2015). Alternative mainstream media in the Czech Republic: Beyond the dichotomy of alterative and mainstream media. *Continuum*, 29(3), 365–382.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2014.986061>
- Hajer, M. A. (1997). *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process* (1st ed.). Oxford University PressOxford.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/019829333X.001.0001>
- Hall, S. (1986). The Problem of Ideology-Marxism without Guarantees. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 10(2), 28–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019685998601000203>
- Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. Sage in association with the Open University.
- Hall, S., Connell, I., & Curti, L. (2007). The ‘unity’ of current affairs television. In A. Grey, J. Campbell, M. Erikson, S. Hanson, & H. Wood (Eds.), *CCCS selected working papers, Vol. 2* (1. publ). Routledge.
- Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J., & Roberts, B. (1978). *Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state, and law and order*. The Macmillan Press.
- Hann, C., Humprey, C., & Verdery, K. (2002). Introduction: Postsocialism as a topic of anthropological investigation. In *Postsocialism: Ideals, ideologies and practices in Eurasia* (pp. 1–28). Routledge.
- Hardy, J. (2014). The contribution of crtical political economy. In J. Curran (Ed.), *Media and Society* (pp. 186–209). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Harvalík, M. (2004). *Synchronní a diachronní aspekty české onymie*. Academia.
- Harvey, D. C. (2008). The history of heritage. In *The Ashgate research companion to heritage and identity* (pp. 19–36). Ashgate.
- Havel, V. (1990). *Moc bezmocných*. Lidové noviny.

- Havelka, M. (2009). Comparing the Incomparable: Was There a Totalitarian Era in Contemporary Czech History? *Soudobé Dějiny*, 16(4), 607–624.
- Hirt, S., Ferenčuhová, S., & Tuvikene, T. (2016). Conceptual forum: The “post-socialist” city. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 57(4–5), 497–520.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15387216.2016.1271345>
- Hlavačka, M. (2011). Místa paměti a jejich „místo“ v historickém a společenském „provozu“. In M. Hlavačka, A. Marès, & M. Pokorná (Eds.), *Paměť míst, událostí a osobností. Historie jako identita a manipulace*. (pp. 10–21). Historický ústav AV ČR.
- Hobsbawm, E., & Ranger, T. (Eds.). (2012). *The Invention of Tradition* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107295636>
- Hodge, R. I. V., & Kress, G. R. (1993). *Language as Ideology*. Routledge.
- Hoenigová, B. (2009). Možnosti a meze jednoho paradigmatu. Teorie totalitarismu aplikovaná na státní socialismus středovýchodní Evropy (The Possibilities and Limits of a Paradigm: The Theory of Totalitarianism Applied to State Socialism in East-central Europe). *Soudobé Dějiny*, 4, 640–652.
- Holubec, S. (2015). *Ještě nejsme za vodou: Obrazy druhých a historická paměť v období postkomunistické transformace*. Scriptorium.
- Holubec, S. (2018). Lenin, Marx and Local Heroes: Socialist and Post-Socialist Memorial Landscapes in Eastern Germany and Czechoslovakia—The Case Study of Jena and Hradec Králové. In A. Mrožik & S. Holubec (Eds.), *Historical Memory of Central and East European Communism* (pp. 122–140). Routledge.
- Holý, L. (1996). *Malý český člověk a velký český národ*. Sociologické nakladatelství (SLON).
- Honzejek, P. (2006, March 28). Srpu a kladivu hrozí zákaz. *Lidovky.Cz*.
https://www.lidovky.cz/domov/srpu-a-kladivu-hrozi-zakaz.A060328_075355_In_domov_znk
- Hoskins, A. (2011). Media, Memory, Metaphor: Remembering and the Connective Turn. *Parallax*, 17(4), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13534645.2011.605573>
- Hoskins, A. (2014). The mediatization of memory. In K. Lundby (Ed.), *The mediatization of communication* (pp. 661–679). De Gruyter.

- Hoskins, A. (2018a). Memory of the multitude: The end of collective memory. In A. Hoskins (Ed.), *Digital memory studies: Media Pasts in Transition* (pp. 85–109). Routledge.
- Hrubeš, M., & Navrátil, J. (2017). Constructing a Political Enemy. *Intersections*, 3(3).
<https://doi.org/10.17356/ieejsp.v3i3.347>
- Hughes, C. (2012). *Liberal Democracy as the End of History* (0 ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203802175>
- Huntington, S. P. (1993). *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. University of Oklahoma Press.
https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Third_Wave.html?hl=cs&id=6REC58gdt2sC
- Huyse, L. (1995). Justice after Transition: On the Choices Successor Elites Make in Dealing with the Past. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 20(1), 51–78.
- Jaworski, R., & Stachel, P. (2007). *Die Besetzung des öffentlichen Raumes: Politische Plätze, Denkmäler und Straßennamen im europäischen Vergleich*. Frank & Timme GmbH.
- Jelača, D., Kolanović, M., & Lugarić, D. (Eds.). (2017). *The Cultural Life of Capitalism in Yugoslavia: (Post)Socialism and Its Other*. Springer International Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47482-3>
- Jiráček, J., & Köpplová, B. (2012). Two Decades of Free Media in the Czech Republic: So What? Remarks on the Discourse of Post-1989 Media Transformation. In P. Gross & K. Jakubowitz (Eds.), *Media Transformations in the Post-Communist World: Eastern Europe's Tortured Path to Change* (pp. 183–194). Lexington Books.
- Jiráček, J., & Köpplová, B. (2020). Advantages and Problems of a Liberal Democratic Media Model. Media and Politics in the Czech Republic. In A. Lorenz & H. Formánková (Eds.), *Czech Democracy in Crisis* (pp. 157–178). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jiríček, P. (2022, June 3). Přejmenovat ruské ulice v Ostravě? Obyvatelé nemají jasno, úřady vyčkávají (Renaming streets in Ostrava? Inhabitants are in two minds, the authorities are waiting). *Moravskoslezsky.Denik.Cz*.
https://moravskoslezsky.denik.cz/zpravy_region/prejmenovat-ruske-ulice-v-ostrave-obyvatele-nemaji-jasno-urady-vyckavaji-2022030.html

- Johnson, N. C. (2004). Public Memory. In J. S. Duncan, N. C. Johnson, & R. H. Schein (Eds.), *A Companion to Cultural Geography* (1st ed., pp. 316–327). Wiley.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996515.ch21>
- Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. SAGE.
- Karlsson, K.-G. (2010). The Uses of History and the Third Wave of Europeanisation. In *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance* (pp. 38–55). Berghahn Books.
- Kárníková, L. (2022). Socialistická uliční jména optikou postsocialismu: Příklad (ne)přejmenování ostravských ulic a jeho tematizace v českém tisku po roce 1989 (Socialist Street Names through the Lens of Postsocialism: (Non)Renaming of the Streets in Ostrava and its Coverage in the Czech Press after 1989). *Dějiny - Teorie - Kritika*, 283–310.
- Kelsey, D. (2020). News, Discourse and Ideology. In K. Wahl-Jørgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*. Routledge.
- Kenkmann, A., & Zimmer, H. (Eds.). (2005). *Nach Kriegen und Diktaturen. Umgang mit Vergangenheit als internationales Problem. Bilanzen und Perspektiven für das 21. Jahrhundert*. Klartext-Verl.
- Kennedy, M. D., & Galtz, N. (1996). From Marxism to Postcommunism: Socialist Desires and East European Rejections. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22(1), 437–458.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.22.1.437>
- Kettle, S. (1996). The development of the Czech media since the fall of communism. *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics*, 12(4), 42–60.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13523279608415322>
- Khazalová, G., & Svobodová, Š. (2021, November 19). *Rozhovor s Pavlem Karousem: Sochy mají otevírat palčivé otázky. To se neděje. (Statues should open painful questions. They do not.)* Deník Referendum. <https://denikreferendum.cz/clanek/33355-rozhovor-s-pavlem-karousem-sochy-maji-otevirat-palcive-otazky-to-se-nedeje>
- Kitch, C. (2008). Placing journalism inside memory—And memory studies. *Memory Studies*, 1(3), 311–320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698008093796>

- Klich-Kluczewska, B. (2017). Goodbye Communism, Hello Remembrance: Historical Paradigms and the Institute of National Remembrance in Poland. In P. Apor, S. Horváth, & J. Mark (Eds.), *Secret Agents and the Memory of Everyday Collaboration in Communist Eastern Europe* (pp. 37–58). Anthem Press.
- Kligler-Vilenchik, N. (2011). Memory-Setting: Applying Agenda-Setting Theory to the Study of Collective Memory. In *On Media Memory Collective Memory in a New Media Age*. Palgrave Macmillan Limited.
- Kligler-Vilenchik, N., Tsfati, Y., & Meyers, O. (2014). Setting the collective memory agenda: Examining mainstream media influence on individuals' perceptions of the past. *Memory Studies*, 7(4), 484–499. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698014523443>
- Knappová, M. (1993). Jazyková kultura a urbanonymie. In M. Jelínek (Ed.), *Brno – město uprostřed Evropy* (pp. 188–190).
- Kojetínová, M. (2013). Toponyma jako místa paměti (na příkladu vybraných pražských urbanonym) Toponyms as Places of Memory /With the Example of Selected Prague Urbanonyms. *Acta Onomastica*, 54, 145–150.
- Kopecký, P., Hubáček, P., & Plecítý, P. (1996). Political Parties in the Czech Parliament (1992-1996): Organisation, Behaviour and Influence. *Czech Sociological Review*, 32(4), 439–456. <https://doi.org/10.13060/00380288.1996.32.4.05>
- Kopeček, L. (Ed.). (2005). *Trajectories of the Left: Social Democratic and (Ex-)Communist Parties in Contemporary Europe: Between Past and Future*. Institute for Comparative Political Research of the Faculty of Social Studies of Masaryk University.
- Kopeček, M. (2001). Ve službách dějin, ve jménu národa. Historie jako součást legitimizace komunistických režimů ve střední Evropě v letech 1948-1950. *Soudobé Dějiny*, 8(1), 23–43.
- Kopeček, M. (2008a). Historická paměť a liberální nacionalismus v Česku a střední Evropě po roce 1989. In A. Gjuričová & M. Kopeček (Eds.), *Kapitoly z dějin české demokracie po roce 1989* (pp. 232–264). Paseka.
- Kopeček, M. (2008b). In Search of “National Memory” The Politics of History, Nostalgia and the Historiography of Communism in the Czech Republic and East Central Europe. In M.

- Kopeček (Ed.), *Past in the making: Historical revisionism in Central Europe after 1989* (pp. 75–92). Central European university press.
- Kopeček, M. (Ed.). (2008c). *Past in the making: Historical revisionism in Central Europe after 1989*. Central European university press.
- Kopeček, M. (2013). *Czech Republic: From the Politics of History to Memory as Political Language*. Cultures of History Forum. <https://doi.org/10.25626/0011>
- Kopeček, M., & Spurný, M. (2010, ledna). Dějiny a paměť komunismu v Česku. *Lidové Noviny*. https://www.lidovky.cz/domov/dejiny-a-pamet-komunismu-v-cesku.A100109_000084_in_noviny_sko
- Kopeček, M., & Wciślik, P. (2015). Introduction: Towards an Intellectual History of Post-Socialism. In M. Kopeček & P. Wciślik (Eds.), *Thinking through transition: Liberal democracy, authoritarian pasts, and intellectual history in East Central Europe after 1989* (pp. 1–35). Central European University Press.
- Koposov, N. (2017). *Memory Laws, Memory Wars: The Politics of the Past in Europe and Russia* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108304047>
- Koposov, N. (2022). Populism and Memory: Legislation of the Past in Poland, Ukraine, and Russia. *East European Politics and Societies: And Cultures*, 36(1), 272–297. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325420950806>
- Koubek, Jiří., & Polášek, M. (2013). *Antikomunismus: Nekonečný příběh české politiky?* Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- Koura, P. (2007). Archiv bezpečnostních složek. *Paměť a Dějiny*, 1, 194–197.
- Kovanic, M. (2017). Institutes of Memory in Slovakia and the Czech Republic: What Kind of Memory? In P. Apor, S. Horváth, & J. Mark (Eds.), *Secret Agents and the Memory of Everyday Collaboration in Communist Eastern Europe* (pp. 81–104). Anthem Press.
- Krawatzek, F., & Soroka, G. (2022). Circulation, Conditions, Claims: Examining the Politics of Historical Memory in Eastern Europe. *East European Politics and Societies: And Cultures*, 36(1), 198–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325420969786>

- Křeček, J., & Vochocová, L. (2009). Red danger before elections: Trick or threat? *Central European Journal of Communication*, 2, 307–317.
- Kubik, J., & Bernhard, M. (2014). A Theory of the Politics of Memory. In M. Bernhard & J. Kubik (Eds.), *Twenty Years After Communism* (pp. 7–34). Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199375134.003.0002>
- Kuczabski, A., & Boychuk, A. (2020). Decommunization of urban toponymy in Ukraine: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Geography, Politics and Society*, 10(4), 8–16.
<https://doi.org/10.26881/jpgs.2020.4.02>
- Kuczyńska-Zonik, A. (2018). Dissonant Heritage: Soviet Monuments in Central and Eastern Europe. In A. Mroziak & S. Holubec (Eds.), *Historical Memory of Central and East European Communism*. Routledge.
- Kudriavtseva, N. (2020). Reconfiguring Identities Within the Cityscape: Ideologies of Decommunization Renaming in Ukraine. *Ideology and Politics Journal*, 1(15), 63–82.
<https://doi.org/10.36169/2227-6068.2020.01.00004>
- Kuldkepp, M. (2023). Western Orientalism Targeting Eastern Europe: An Emerging Research Programme. *Central European Journal of International and Security Studies*, 17(4), 64–80.
<https://doi.org/10.51870/AEMQ7827>
- Kulić, V. (2018). Orientalizing Socialism: Architecture, Media, and the Representations of Eastern Europe. *Architectural Histories*, 6(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.5334/ah.273>
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2014). *Hegemony And Socialist Strategy: Towards A Radical Democratic Politics*. Verso Books.
- Ladislav Kudrna se ujal funkce ředitele ÚSTR. (2022, May 1). Institution Website.
<https://www.ustrcr.cz/ladislav-kudrna-se-ujal-funkce-reditele-ustr/>
- Light, D. (2004). Street names in Bucharest, 1990–1997: Exploring the modern historical geographies of post-socialist change. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 30(1), 154–172.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-7488\(02\)00102-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-7488(02)00102-0)
- Light, D., & Young, C. (2018). The politics of toponymic continuity: The limits of change and the ongoing lives of street names. In R. Rose-Redwood, D. H. Alderman, & M. Azaryahu (Eds.),

- The Political Life of Urban Streetscapes: Naming, Politics and Place* (pp. 185–201).
Routledge.
- Mácha, P. (2020). The Symbolic Power of Place Names: The Case of the River Olše/Olza/Łolza in Northeastern Czechia. *Names*, 68(3), 169–184.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00277738.2020.1786925>
- Macura, V. (2008). *Šťastný věk a jiné studie o socialistické kultuře*. Academia.
- Makovicky, N. (2016). *Neoliberalism, Personhood, and Postsocialism* (0 ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315597799>
- Mark, J. (2010). *The unfinished revolution: Making sense of the communist past in Central-Eastern Europe*. Yale University press.
- Marples, D. R. (2018). "Decommunization, Memory Laws, and “Builders of Ukraine in the 20th Century. *Acta Slavica Iaponica*, 39, 1–22.
- Marszałek-Kawa, J., Piechowiak-Lamparska, J., & Ratke-Majewska, A. (2017). *The Politics of Memory in Post-Authoritarian Transitions, Volume One: Case Studies*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Mayer, F. (2009). Češi a jejich komunismus: Paměť a politická identita (Vyd. 1). Argo.
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187.
- McDowell, S. (2008). Heritage, Memory and Identity. In B. Graham & P. Howard (Eds.), *Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity* (pp. 37–53). Ashgate Pub. Co.
- Meyer, E. (2008). Memory and Politics. In A. Erll & A. Nünning (Eds.), *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (pp. 173–180). Walter de Gruyter.
- Migliorati, L. (2015). Maurice Halbwachs: Classical Sociology after the Classics. *Italian Sociological Review*, Vol 5, 251 Pages. <https://doi.org/10.13136/ISR.V5I2.99>
- Mink, G. (2013). Institutions of National Memory in Post-Communist Europe: From transitional justice to political uses of biographies (1989 – 2010). In *History, memory and politics in Central and Eastern Europe: Memory games*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Mink, G., & Neumayer, L. (2013). Introduction. In G. Mink & L. Neumayer (Eds.), *History, Memory and Politics in Central and Eastern Europe: Memory Games* (pp. 1–22). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mörner, N. (Ed.). (2020). *Constructions and instrumentalization of the past: A comparative study on memory management in the region*. Centre for Baltic and East European studies, CBEES, Södertörn university.
- Mosco, V. (2009). *The political economy of communication*. Sage.
- Možný, I. (2009). *Proč tak snadno: Některé rodinné důvody sametové revoluce* (3. vyd). Sociologické nakladatelství (SLON).
- Nash, C., & Graham, B. J. (2000). *Modern Historical Geographies*. Longman.
- Nash, K. (2001). The ‘Cultural Turn’ in Social Theory: Towards a Theory of Cultural Politics. *Sociology*, 35(1), 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0038038501000050>
- Navrátil, B. (2006, May 6). Vzpomínka na padlé, kteří nemají jméno. *Moravskoslezský Deník*.
- Navrátil, J., & Hrubeš, M. (2018). Contesting communism after its fall: Exploring two modes of anti-communist activism in the Czech Republic. *East European Politics*, 34(1), 6–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21599165.2018.1423966>
- Nečasová, D. (2018). *Nový socialistický člověk: Československo 1948-1956* (První vydání). Masarykova univerzita Brno.
- Nedelsky, N. (2004). Divergent responses to a common past: Transitional justice in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. *Theory and Society*, 33(1), 65–115. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:RYSO.0000021428.22638.e2>
- Neiger, M., Meyers, O., & Zandberg, E. (2011). On Media Memory: Editors’ Introduction. In M. Neiger, O. Meyers, & E. Zandberg (Eds.), *On Media Memory: Collective Memory in a New Media Age* (pp. 1–24). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230307070_1
- Neumayer, L. (2019). *The Criminalisation of Communism in the European Political Space after the Cold War*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/The-Criminalisation-of-Communism-in-the-European-Political-Space-after-the-Cold-War/Neumayer/p/book/9780367589028>
- Niedermüller, P. (1998). History, Past, and the Post-Socialist Nation. *Ethnologia Europaea*, 28(2). <https://doi.org/10.16995/ee.889>

- Nora, P. (1989). Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire. *Representations*, 1989(26).
- Novák, M. (n.d.). K aplikaci pojmu totalitarismus na komunistické systémy: Obecné problémy a česká specifika (On applying the concept of totalitarianism to communist systems: General problems and Czech conditions). *Securitas Imperii*, 23, 14–27.
- Odaloš, P. (1996). Urbanonymá v procese spoločenských zmien 90. Rokov v európskych postsocialistických krajinách / Urbanonyms in the process of social transformation of the 1990s in European post-socialist countries. In P. Odaloš & M. Majtán (Eds.), *Urbanonymá v kontexte histórie a súčasnosti. Zborník materiálov z onomastického kolokvia konaného v Banskej Bystrici 3.–5. Septembra 1996 / Urbanonyms in the historical and present context. Onomastic colloquium proceedings in Banska Bystrica, September 3-5, 1996* (pp. 80–87). Pedagogická fakulta Univerzity Mateja Bela – Fakulta humanitných vied Univerzity Mateja Bela – Jazykovedný ústav Ľudovíta Štúra Slovenskej akadémie vied.
- Olick, J. K. (1999). Collective Memory: The Two Cultures. *Sociological Theory*, 17(3), 333–348. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0735-2751.00083>
- Olick, J. K. (2008). Reflections on the Underdeveloped Relations between Journalism and Memory Studies. In B. Zelizer & K. Tenenboim-Weinblatt (Eds.), *Journalism and Memory* (pp. 17–31). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Olick, J. K., & Robbins, J. (1998). Social Memory Studies: From “Collective Memory” to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24(1), 105–140. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.105>
- Ondráčková, T. (2019, November 29). Proti revoluci. Před 30 lety demonstrovali v Ostravě lidé na podporu komunistického režimu. *ČT24*. <https://ct24.ceskatelevize.cz/clanek/regiony/moravskoslezsky-kraj/proti-revoluci-pred-30-lety-demonstrovali-v-ostrave-lide-na-podporu-komunistickeho-rezimu-56646>
- Ostravský uličník*. (n.d.). Ostravský Uličník. Retrieved June 4, 2024, from <http://www.mapomol.cz/UliceHistorie/Historie.html>
- Otevřený dopis Radě Ústavu pro studium totalitních režimů týkající se propuštění historičky Muriel Blaive / Open letter to the Board of the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes*

- regarding the the dismissal of historian Muriel Blaive. (2022, October 28).
<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSeO7c6igtrt3VHP7gF6JxW4Mhfgrf1JCKpa7p0rToZubVcMBg/viewform>
- Palonen, E. (2008). The city-text in post-communist Budapest: Street names, memorials, and the politics of commemoration. *GeoJournal*, 73(3), 219–230. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-008-9204-2>
- Pehe, J. (2006). A Czech dead end. *He Analyst - Central and Eastern European Review*, 2, 15–26.
- Pehe, V. (2018). Authenticating the Past: Archives, Secret Police, and Heroism in Contemporary Czech Representations of Socialism.. In M. Blaive (Ed.), *Perceptions of society in communist Europe: Regime archives and popular opinion* (pp. 207–222). Bloomsbury Academic.
<https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350051782>
- Pehe, V. (2020). *Velvet retro: Postsocialist nostalgia and the politics of heroism in Czech popular culture*. Berghahn.
- Pehe, V. (2023). Bez cenzury, ale komerčně. In V. Pehe et al., *Věčná devadesátá: Proměny české společnosti po roce 1989* (pp. 59–78). CPress.
- Pehe, V., & Wawrzyniak, J. (2023). *Remembering the Neoliberal Turn: Economic Change and Collective Memory in Eastern Europe after 1989* (1st ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/b23366>
- Pernes, J., & Ruml, J. (1993). *Svět Lidových novin 1893-1993: Století kapitola z dějiny české žurnalistiky, kultury a politiky*. Lidové noviny.
- Phelan, S. (2017). Critical discourse analysis and media studies. *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*.
https://www.academia.edu/34124822/Critical_discourse_analysis_and_media_studies
- Phelan, S. (2018). Neoliberalism and media. In D. Cahill, M. Cooper, M. Konings, & D. Primrose (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Neoliberalism* (pp. 539–552). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Pickering, M. (2001). *Stereotyping: The Politics of Representation*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pickles, J., & Unwin, T. (2004). Transition in context: Theory in post-socialist transformations. In *Europe*. Routledge.

- Pojmenování náměstí, ulic jménem Stalingradu (Naming of squares, streets with the name Stalingrad).* 171-4-5-1950-I/1 (kart. 2513, spis 222). (1950). Krajský národní výbor v Ostravě; Zemský archiv v Opavě (ZAO), fond KNV Ostrava.
- Pojmenování náměstí, ulic, silnic a železničních tratí jménem Stalingradu (Naming of squares, streets, roads and railways with the name Stalingrad).* 222/1-1/3-1950-I/2 (kart. 2513, spis 222). (1950). Ministerstvo Vnitra (Ministry of the Interior); Zemský archiv v Opavě (ZAO), fond KNV Ostrava.
- Pojmenování nových ulic v městské čtvrti O.-Zábřehu /v zastavené části zv. Stalingrad/. (Naming of streets in the urban district O.-Zábřeh. In developed area called Stalingrad) III/1a – 222.1-16/8-52-Vá* (kart. 2513, spis 222). (1950). Krajský národní výbor v Ostravě; Zemský archiv v Opavě (ZAO), fond KNV Ostrava.
- Polese, A., Morris, J., Pawłusz, E., & Seliverstova, O. (Eds.). (2019). *Identity and nation building in everyday post-socialist life* (First issued in paperback). Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Příbáň, J. (2008). Právo, kolektivní identita a vyrovnávání se s minulostí: Středoevropské zkušenosti s postkomunismem. In *Kapitoly z dějin české demokracie po roce 1989* (Vyd. 1). Paseka.
- Příbáň, J. (2020, December 18). *Political and Legal Constitution of Collective Memory and its Functionaries: On Post-National Europe of Historical Hopes and Fears*. Juridification of History: between Collective Memory, Polish Academy of Sciences, Scientific Centre in Vienna, Austria.
- Prokop, D. (2022). *Slepé skvrny – O chudobě, vzdělávání, populismu a dalších výzvách české společnosti (Blind Spots—On poverty, education, populism and other challenges of the Czech society)*. Host. <https://www.hostbrno.cz/slepe-skvrny/>
- Ptáčnicková, M. (2018). Pražské Václavské náměstí očima nestandardizované urbanonymie. *Acta Onomastica*, 59(1), 177–183.
- Ptáčnicková, M. (2021). *Mezi Stalinovou třídou a Husákovým tichem: Kapitoly z pražské toponymie* (Vydání první). Academia.
- Ptáčnicková, M. (2022). O úředních i neúředních jménech pražské městské krajiny. In *Od Velkého tržiště k náměstí Jana Palacha: Názvosloví veřejných prostranství ve městech střední Evropy*

- = *Vom Großen Markt zum Jan Palach Platz = Die Namensgebung öffentlicher Räume in den Städten Mitteleuropas: From Grand Market to Jan Palach Square = The nomenclature of public spaces in Central European cities*. Scriptorium.
- Pullmann, M. (2008). Sociální dějiny a totalitněhistorické vyprávění. *Soudobé dějiny*, 3–4, 703–717.
- Pyzik, A. (2014). *Poor but Sexy: Culture Clashes in Europe East and West*. John Hunt Publishing.
- Raková, S. (2011). Místa paměti na přelomu tisíciletí: Výzvy a proměny jednoho konceptu. In M. Hlavačka, A. Marès, & M. Pokorná (Eds.), *Paměť míst, událostí a osobností. Historie jako identita a manipulace*. (p. 25). Historický ústav AV ČR.
- Randák, J. (2011). Paměť a (soudobé) dějiny. Nejen nad třemi ročníky časopisu Paměť a dějiny. *Soudobé Dějiny*, 18(1), 196–209. <https://doi.org/10.51134/sod.2011.008>
- Rees, A. (2010). Managing the History of the Past in the Former Communist States. In *A European Memory: Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance* (Vol. 2010, pp. 219–232). Berghahn Books.
- Reifová, I. (2018). The pleasure of continuity: Re-reading post-socialist nostalgia. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 21(6), 587–602. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877917741693>
- Reisigl, M. (2017). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* (pp. 44–59).
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism*. Routledge.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 87–121). Sage Publications.
- Renwick, A. (2006). Anti-Political or Just Anti-Communist? Varieties of Dissidence in East-Central Europe and Their Implications for the Development of Political Society. *East European Politics and Societies: And Cultures*, 20(2), 286–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325405274672>
- Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing Newspapers: An approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- RMOb Ostrava jih usn. 4/5 z 6.2.1995.* (1995). Rada Města Ostrava.
http://mapomol.cz/UliceHistorie/Hist_1990.html
- RMOb Ostrava jih usn. 102/8 z 7.5.1991.* (1991). Rada Města Ostrava.
http://mapomol.cz/UliceHistorie/Hist_1990.html
- Robertson, D. (2006). A Problem of their Own, Solutions of their Own: CEE Jurisdictions and the Problems of Lustration and Retroactivity. In W. Sadurski, A. Czarnota, & M. Krygier (Eds.), *Spreading Democracy and the Rule of Law? The Impact of EU Enlargement on the Rule of Law, Democracy and Constitutionalism in Post-Communist Legal Orders* (pp. 73–96). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3842-9_4
- Rose-Redwood, R., Alderman, D., & Azaryahu, M. (2010). Geographies of toponymic inscription: New directions in critical place-name studies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34(4), 453–470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132509351042>
- Rozehnalová, I. (2021, March 13). Kauza ostravské sochy Komunisté otevírá důležitou diskusi (The cause of the statue Communists in Ostrava opens an important discussion). *Denikalarm.cz*. <https://denikalarm.cz/2021/03/kauza-ostravske-sochy-komuniste-otevira-dulezitou-diskusi/>
- Roubal, P. (2015). Anti-Communism of the Future: Czech Post-Dissident Neoconservatives in Post-Communist Transformation. In *Thinking through transition: Liberal democracy, authoritarian pasts, and intellectual history in East Central Europe after 1989*. Central European University Press.
- Różycki, B. (2017). Renaming urban toponymy as a mean of redefining local identity: The case of street decommunization in Poland. *Open Political Science*, 1(1), 20–31.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/openps-2017-0004>
- Rupnik, J. (2002). Politika vyrovnávání s komunistickou minulostí. Česká zkušenost. *Soudobé Dějiny*, 9(1), 9–26.
- Rychlíková, A. (2023). Byli jsme parta nadšených amatérů, říká o devadesátých letech v českých médiích Robert Čásenský. In Pehe et al., *Věčná devadesátá: Proměny české společnosti po roce 1989* (pp. 79–84). CPress.

- Sabrow, M. (2012). *Socialismus jako myšlenkový svět Komunistická diktatura v kulturněhistorické perspektivě*. 2, 196–208.
- Sadowski, M. M. (2021). Law and Collective Memory in the Service of Illiberalism. Through the Looking-Glass: Transformation or a Reactionary Revolution? *Krakowskie Studia Międzynarodowe*, 1, 107–128. <https://doi.org/10.48269/2451-0610-ksm-2021-1-003>
- Said, E. (2001). *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. Penguin Books.
- Šakaja, L., & Stanić, J. (2011). Other(ing), self(portraying), negotiating: The spatial codification of values in Zagreb's city-text. *Cultural Geographies*, 18(4), 495–516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474011414636>
- Schaefer, B. (2017). A Dissident Legacy and Its Aspects: The Agency of the Federal Commissioner for the Stasi Records of the Former GDR (BStU) in United Germany. In *Secret Agents and the Memory of Everyday Collaboration in Communist Eastern Europe* (pp. 21–36). Anthem Press.
- Schenk, F. B. (2017). Eastern Europe. In D. Mishkova & B. Trencsényi (Eds.), *European Regions and Boundaries: A Conceptual History* (pp. 188–209). Berghahn Books.
- Segert, D. (2009). Státní socialismus nebyl jen politický mocenský vztah. Poznámky k teoretickému deficitu konceptu totalitarismu (State Socialism was More than a Political Relationship of Rulers and Ruled: Remarks on Theoretical Shortcomings of the Totalitarianism Concept). *Soudobé Dějiny*, 4, 709–718.
- Šídlo, J. (2020, February 15). Místo Lenina Evropská, místo Gottwalda Vyšehrad. Jak jsme si přejmenovali Prahu. *Seznamzpravy.cz*. <https://www.seznamzpravy.cz/clanek/misto-lenina-evropska-misto-gottwalda-vysehrad-jak-jsme-si-prejmenovali-prahu-88864>
- Skibinski, I. (2023). Dealing with an Unloved Past – Decommunization in Poland under PiS. In A. Marková & M. Kuznetcova (Eds.), *Memory of Central and Eastern Europe: Past Traumas, Present Challenges, Future Horizons* (pp. 93–116). Karolinum.
- Slačálek, O. (2009). Český antikomunismus jako pokus o obnovu hegemonie. *Britské Listy*.
- Slačálek, O. (2013). Léčba nemoci a splácení dluhu. KSČM a ÚSTR v diskurzu českého antikomunismu Healing Illnesses and Repaying Debts: The Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia and the Institute for the Study of Totalitarian Regimes in Czech Anti-Communist

- Discourse. *Forum Historiae. Časopis a Portál Pre História a Pribuzné Spoločenské Vedy*, 1, 106–137.
- Slačálek, O. (2021). How to typologize Czech anti-communism: A reflection on three decades of memory conflicts. *Securitas Imperii: Journal for the Study of Modern Dictatorships*, 39(2), 169–187. <https://doi.org/10.53096/EDAG9029>
- Slačálek, O. (2022). Conclusion: Seven Excursions into the Ideological Landscape of Eastern Europe. In A. Gagyi & O. Slačálek (Eds.), *The Political Economy of Eastern Europe 30 years into the 'Transition'* (pp. 251–266). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-78915-2_14
- Sniegon, T. (2013). Implementing Post-Communist National Memory in the CZ and SK. In *European Cultural Memory Post-89 (Mithander, Sundholm, Velicu)*. BRILL. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401208895>
- Śpiewak, P. (2005). *Pamięć po komunizmie*. Wydawn. Słowo/obraz terytoria.
- Stan, L. (Ed.). (2009). *Transitional Justice in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union* (0 ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203887783>
- Stanley, E. (2001). Evaluating the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 39(3), 525–546. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022278X01003706>
- Štechová, M. (2015). Celebrities in Czech political communication. *Celebrity Studies*, 6(2), 247–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2015.1035045>
- Štětka, V. (2012). From multinationals to business tycoons: Media ownership and journalistic autonomy in central and Eastern Europe. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 17(4), 433–456.
- Strakoš, M. (2010). *Nová Ostrava a její satelity. Kapitoly z dějin architektury 30.–50. Let 20. Století*. Národní památkový ústav.
- Strakoš, M. (2018). *Ostravská sídliště. Urbanismus, architektura, umění a památkový potenciál*. Národní památkový ústav.
- Strmiska, M. (2002). The Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia: A Post-Communist Socialist or a Neo-Communist Party? *German Policy Studies/Politikfeldanalyse*, 2(2), 220–240.

- Suk, J. (2014). Political Games with the “Unfinished Revolution” Settling Accounts with Communism in the Times of the Civic Forum and after its Disintegration (1989–1992). *Czech Journal of Contemporary History*, 2, 101–136.
- Sušová-Salminen, V. (2012). Rethinking the Idea of Eastern Europe from Postcolonial Perspective: Coloniality, Eurocentrism, Border Thinking and Europe’s Other. *Vieraan Rajalla*, 191–209.
- Sztompka, P. (2004). The Trauma of Social Change: A Case of Postcommunist Societies. In J. C. Alexander, *Cultural trauma and collective identity* (pp. 155–194). University of California Press.
- Tesař, J. (2000). *Mnichovský komplex: Jeho příčiny a důsledky*. Prostor.
<https://www.knihydobrovsky.cz/kniha/mnichovsky-komplex-423791296>
- Ther, P. (2022). *Jiný konec dějin: Eseje o velké transformaci po roce 1989* (Z. Schwarzová, Trans.; První české vydání). Univerzita Karlova, nakladatelství Karolinum.
- Thies, C. G. (2013). The Roles of Bipolarity: A Role Theoretic Understanding of the Effects of Ideas and Material Factors on the Cold War. *International Studies Perspectives*, 14(3), 269–288.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-3585.2012.00486.x>
- Thompson, J. B. (1987). Language and Ideology: A Framework for Analysis. *The Sociological Review*, 35(3), 516–536. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1987.tb00554.x>
- Tlostanova, M. (2015). Postcolonial Theory, the Decolonial Option and Postsocialist Writing. In D. Pucherova & R. Gafrik (Eds.), *Postcolonial Europe? Essays on Post-Communist Literatures and Cultures* (pp. 25–45). BRILL.
- Todorov, T. (2004). The Uses and Abuses of Comparison. In H. Dubiel & G. Motzkin (Eds.), *The lesser evil: Moral approaches to genocide practices*. Routledge.
- Todorova, M. (2009). *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Todorova, M., & Gille, Z. (Eds.). (2010). *Post-communist Nostalgia* (1st ed.). Berghahn Books.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt9qd8t4>
- Tomczuk, S. J. (2016). Contention, consensus, and memories of communism: Comparing Czech and Slovak memory politics in public spaces, 1993–2012. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 57(3), 105–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020715216658187>

- Törnquist-Plewa, B. (2020). Eastern and Central Europe as a Region of Memory. Some Common Traits. In *Constructions and instrumentalization of the past: A comparative study on memory management in the region* (pp. 15–21). Centre for Baltic and East European studies, CBEES, Södertörn university.
- Törnquist-Plewa, B., & Yurchuk, Y. (2019). Memory politics in contemporary Ukraine: Reflections from the postcolonial perspective. *Memory Studies*, 12(6), 699–720.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1750698017727806>
- True, J. (2003). *Gender, Globalization, and Postsocialism: The Czech Republic After Communism*. Columbia University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7312/true12714>
- Trunečková, L. (2016). *Zákon o ČTK: Transformace na půli cesty: Vývoj vztahů mezi politickou a mediální sférou v České republice v 90. letech 20. století*. Charles University in Prague, Karolinum Press.
- Tůma, O. (2010). Proměny komunistického režimu. In F. Čermák, V. Cvrček, & V. Schmiedtová (Eds.), *Slovník komunistické totality* (pp. 9–15). Nakladatelství Lidové noviny / Ústav Českého národního korpusu.
- Usnesení Rady města (RM) 426/M, NA*. (1991). Rada Města Ostrava.
- Van Dijk, T. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage Publications.
- Venclík, J. (2021). „Totalita“ po devětaosmdesátém (P. Agha & J. Géryk, Eds.; pp. 91–116). Karolinum.
- Verdery, K. (1996). *What Was Socialism, and What Comes Next?* Princeton University Press.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7rnmm>
- Verdery, K. (1999). *The political lives of dead bodies: Reburial and postsocialist change*. Columbia University Press.
- Verdoolaege, A. (2009). Dealing with a traumatic past: The victim hearings of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission and their reconciliation discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 6(4), 297–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900903181135>

- Verovšek, P. J. (2021). Caught between 1945 and 1989: Collective memory and the rise of illiberal democracy in postcommunist Europe. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 28(6), 840–857. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2020.1768279>
- Verschueren, J. (2011). *Ideology in Language Use: Pragmatic Guidelines for Empirical Research* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139026277>
- Vodrážka, M. (2015, December 13). *Místo, aby ÚSTR zkoumala zločinecké organizace, vyšetřuje vlastní historiky. Open letter to the situation in ÚSTR / Otevřený dopis k situaci v ÚSTR.* <https://www.parlamentnilisty.cz/arena/nazory-a-petice/Miroslav-Vodrazka-Misto-aby-USTR-zkoumala-zlocinecke-organizace-vysetruje-vlastni-historiky-412679>
- Volek, J. (2022). The Czech Media Landscape in the Post-transformation Stage: Main Trends and Problems. In *Civic and Uncivic Values in the Czech Republic: Value Transformation, Politics, Education, and Gender Equality* (pp. 85–104). Springer International Publishing.
- Volek, J., & Urbániková, M. (2017). *Čeští novináři v komparativní perspektivě: Hybridní, virtuální a mizející žurnalisté v post-transformační fázi.* Academia; Masarykova Univerzita.
- Vološinov, V. N. (1986). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language.* Harvard University Press.
- Waisová, Š. (2011). *Tíha volby: Česká zahraniční politika mezi principy a zájmy. Ústav mezinárodních vztahů.*
- Weiffen, B. (2012). From Domestic to International Instruments for Dealing with a Violent Past: Causes, Concomitants and Consequences for Democratic Transitions. In *Memory and Political Change* (pp. 89–111). Palgrave Macmillan. https://www.academia.edu/14835441/From_Domestic_to_International_Instruments_for_Dealing_with_a_Violent_Past_Causes_Concomitants_and_Consequences_for_Democratic_Transitions
- Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003). Introduction: Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 1–32). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230288423_1

- Welsh, H. (2015). Beyond the National: Pathways of Diffusion. In L. Stan & N. Nedelsky (Eds.), *Post-Communist Transitional Justice. Lessons from Twenty-Five Years of Experience* (pp. 167–187). Cambridge University Press.
- Witzlack-Makarevich, K. (2023). Ich gehe erhobenen Hauptes. In K. Witzlack-Makarevich, *Havel fehlt uns* (pp. 208–217). Frank & Timme GmbH. https://doi.org/10.57088/978-3-7329-9018-4_25
- Wodak, R., & Busch, B. (2004). Approaches to Media Texts. In J. Downing, D. McQuail, P. Schlesinger, & E. Wartella, *The SAGE Handbook of Media Studies* (pp. 105–122). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976077.n6>
- Wodak, R., De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (2009). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748637355>
- Wodak, R., & Krzyżanowski, M. (2008). *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 1–33). Sage.
- Wolff, L. (1994). *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford University Press.
- Wüstenberg, J. (2011). Transforming Berlin’s Memory: Non-State Actors and GDR Memorial Politics. In D. Clarke & U. Wölfel (Eds.), *Remembering the German Democratic Republic* (pp. 65–76). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230349698_5
- Wüstenberg, J. (2020). Agency and Practice in the Making of Transnational Memory Spaces. In J. Wüstenberg & A. Sierp (Eds.), *Agency in Transnational Memory Politics* (pp. 3–23). Berghahn Books.
- Young, C., & Kaczmarek, S. (2008). The Socialist Past and Postsocialist Urban Identity in Central and Eastern Europe: The Case of Łódź, Poland. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 15(1), 53–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776407081275>

- Young, C., & Light, D. (2001). Place, national identity and post-socialist transformations: An introduction. *Political Geography*, 20(8), 941–955. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298\(01\)00039-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298(01)00039-7)
- Žáček, P. (2006). Role ODS při překonávání komunistické minulosti. In S. Balík (Ed.), *Občanská demokratická strana a Česká politika, ODS v českém politickém systému v letech 1991 – 2006* (pp. 195–213). Centrum pro studium demokracie a kultury.
- Zákon o Ústavu paměti národa a o změně některých zákonů—Senátní návrh.* (2005). Senát Parlamentu České republiky.
<https://www.senat.cz/xqw/xervlet/pssenat/htmlhled?action=doc&value=35171>
- Zelizer, B. (1995). Reading the Past Against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12, 214–239.
- Zelizer, B. (2008). Journalism's Memory Work. In *Cultural memory studies: An international and interdisciplinary handbook* (pp. 379–387). de Gruyter.
- Zhurzhenko, T. (2022). Legislating Historical Memory in Post-Soviet Ukraine. In E. Barkan & A. Lang (Eds.), *Memory Laws and Historical Justice* (pp. 97–130). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94914-3_5
- Zukin, S. (1993). *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World*. University of California Press.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Discourse on the national memory institute(s).

Tier 1 - Macro Corpus A1 for sensitization and interdiscursivity assessment

Appendix 2: Discourse on the passing of the Law on the Institute.

Tier 2 - Micro Corpus A2 for textual analysis

Appendix 3: Discourse on Socialist Toponymy in the Czech Republic.

Tier 1 - Macro Corpus B1 for sensitization and interdiscursivity assessment

Appendix 4: Discourse on socialist toponymy in Ostrava.

Tier 2 - Micro Corpus B2 for textual analysis

Appendix 1: Discourse on the national memory institute(s). Tier 1 - Macro Corpus A1 for sensitization and interdiscursivity assessment

Index	Date	Heading	Media	Author
A1.1	01.12.2005	Vznikne Ústav paměti národa?	Mladá fronta DNES	
A1.2	08.12.2005	Získáme přístup ke spisům členů StB?	Mladá fronta DNES	
A1.3	14.12.2005	Důvody pro zřízení Ústavu paměti národa	ČRo - cro6.cz	<i>Petr Hartman</i>
A1.4	30.12.2005	Lidské osudy místo statistik	ČRo - cro6.cz	<i>Peter Gabal</i>
A1.5	25.01.2006	Senát má rozhodovat o instituci kvůli zkoumání zločinů komunismu	zakony.iDNES.cz	<i>redakce (sp) (Epravo)</i>
A1.6	25.01.2006	Senát souhlasí se zkoumáním zločinů komunismu	iHNed.cz	
A1.7	25.01.2006	Také Česko potřebuje ústav paměti národa	Lidové noviny	<i>Radek Schovánek</i>
A1.8	25.01.2006	Ústav pro zkoumání a zveřejňování zločinů KSČ má v Senátu zelenou	ceskenoviny.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.9	26.01.2006	Senátoři prosazují Úřad paměti národa	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Josef Pravec</i>
A1.10	26.01.2006	Senátoři prosazují Úřad paměti národa	iHNed.cz	
A1.11	26.01.2006	Ústav paměti národa zatím prochází Senátem	Lidové noviny	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.12	26.01.2006	V Česku zřejmě bude Ústav paměti národa	Lidové noviny	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.13	26.01.2006	Vznikne Ústav paměti národa	Právo	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.14	26.01.2006	Ze včerejších rozhodnutí Senátu	zpravodaj.cz	
A1.15	01.02.2006	Odsuzování komunismu jde ztuhla	Právo	<i>Petr Uhl</i>
A1.16	11.02.2006	Oživíme paměť národa?	Domažlický deník	<i>Veronika Forková</i>
A1.17	11.02.2006	Oživíme paměť národa?	Listy Písecka	<i>Veronika Forková</i>
A1.18	11.02.2006	Oživíme paměť národa?	Pardubické noviny	<i>Veronika Forková</i>
A1.19	11.02.2006	Oživíme vznikem instituce paměť národa?	Prostějovský den	<i>Veronika Forková</i>
A1.20	11.02.2006	Preambule zákona o Ústavu paměti národa	Českolipský deník	<i>Veronika Forková</i>
A1.21	11.02.2006	Slováci nás předběhli	Domažlický deník	<i>Veronika Forková</i>
A1.22	11.02.2006	Slováci nás předběhli	Listy Písecka	<i>Veronika Forková</i>
A1.23	11.02.2006	Slováci nás předběhli	Prostějovský den	<i>Veronika Forková</i>
A1.24	11.02.2006	Šepové v akci.	Českolipský deník	<i>Zdroj: výstava polského Ústavu paměti národa</i>
A1.25	13.02.2006	Děkuji za připomínku	lidovky.cz	<i>Martin Mejstřík, senátor</i>
A1.26	13.02.2006	Oživíme paměť národa?	Benešovský deník	<i>Veronika Forková</i>
A1.27	13.02.2006	Slováci nás předběhli	Benešovský deník	<i>Veronika Forková</i>
A1.28	13.02.2006	Víc než jen policejní stát	Lidové noviny	<i>Vladimír Bystrov</i>
A1.29	13.02.2006	Víc než jen policejní stát	lidovky.cz	<i>Vladimír Bystrov</i>
A1.30	14.02.2006	Argumenty Vladimíra Bystrova proti ÚPN jsou slabé a zmatené	Lidové noviny	<i>Petr Zidek</i>
A1.31	14.02.2006	Děkuji za připomínku	Lidové noviny	<i>Martin Mejstřík</i>
A1.32	16.02.2006	Ubohé argumenty zabíjejí diskusi	lidovky.cz	<i>Petr Zidek, Praha</i>
A1.33	16.02.2006	Zídkovi nejde o poznání, ale jen o dobré kšefty	Lidové noviny	<i>Vladimír Bystrov</i>
A1.34	17.02.2006	Ubohé argumenty zabíjejí diskusi	Lidové noviny	<i>Petr Zidek</i>
A1.35	19.02.2006	Proč má význam vznik ÚPN?	lidovky.cz	<i>Tomáš Bursík, t.bursik@quick.cz</i>

A1.36	20.02.2006	Proč má význam vznik Ústavu paměti národa?	Lidové noviny	<i>Tomáš Bursík</i>
A1.37	04.03.2006	Mejstříkova oblíbená písnička	Haló noviny	<i>Jaroslav Procházka, Karviná</i>
A1.38	22.03.2006	Politická facka Parlamentu ČR	lidovky.cz	<i>Vladimír Bystrov</i>
A1.39	30.03.2006	znik Ústavu paměti národa chce Senát navrhnout až nové sněmovně	zakony.iDNES.cz	<i>redakce (sp) (Epravo)</i>
A1.40	31.03.2006	Ústav paměti národa vznikne později	Pardubické noviny	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.41	02.04.2006	Politická facka Parlamentu ČR	virtually.cz	<i>Vladimír Bystrov</i>
A1.42	03.04.2006	Paměť národa ano, ale nikoli zkreslená	Haló noviny	<i>Zdeněk Žalud</i>
A1.43	04.05.2006	Komunisté jako předvolební trhák	Pardubické noviny	<i>Veronika Forková</i>
A1.44	26.05.2006	Jen místo pro další vyvolené a semeniště další nenávisť	Haló noviny	<i>Jitka Gruntová</i>
A1.45	27.05.2006	Archivy promluvily, ale málo	Frýdecko-místecký a třinecký deník	<i>Josef Šlerka, Kateřina Volná</i>
A1.46	27.05.2006	Archivy promluvily, ale řekly málo	Českolipský deník	<i>Josef Šlerka, Kateřina Volná</i>
A1.47	27.05.2006	Strašidlo komunismu už netáhne	Právo	<i>Zdeněk Jičínský</i>
A1.48	30.05.2006	POLITIKA: Strašidlo komunismu už netáhne	neviditelnypes.cz	<i>Zdeněk Jičínský</i>
A1.49	31.05.2006	Pohrobci StB stále ještě působí	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(tb)</i>
A1.50	02.06.2006	Slovenští historici smejí bádát v polských archivech	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.51	15.06.2006	Bývalý československý ministr vnitra Ján Langoš tragicky zahynul	novinky.cz	<i>Ivan Vilček (Bratislava), Právo</i>
A1.52	15.06.2006	Bývalý československý ministr vnitra Langoš zemřel při autonehodě	ceskenoviny.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.53	15.06.2006	Bývalý československý ministr vnitra Langoš zemřel při autonehodě	ceskenoviny.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.54	15.06.2006	Bývalý československý ministr vnitra Langoš zemřel při autonehodě	ČRo - izurnal.cz	<i>Eubomír Smatana, Marie Matúšů, Martin Hromádka</i>
A1.55	15.06.2006	Bývalý československý ministr vnitra Langoš zemřel při autonehodě	zakony.iDNES.cz	<i>redakce (luc) (Epravo)</i>
A1.56	15.06.2006	Bývalý federální ministr Langoš dnes zemřel při autonehodě	aktualne.cz	<i>Aktuálně.cz</i>
A1.57	15.06.2006	Bývalý ministr vnitra Langoš se zabil při autonehodě	iHNed.cz	
A1.58	15.06.2006	Exministr ČSFR Ján Langoš se zabil v autě	lidovky.cz	<i>Lidovky.cz, ČTK</i>
A1.59	15.06.2006	Exministr vnitra Langoš zahynul při autonehodě	iHNed.cz	
A1.60	15.06.2006	Federální exministr Langoš se zabil	zpravodaj.cz	
A1.61	15.06.2006	Federální exministr Langoš se zabil při autonehodě	zpravy.iDNES.cz	<i>ČTK, iDNES, mia</i>
A1.62	15.06.2006	Langošovo úmrtí přijaly české i slovenské osobnosti se zármutkem	ceskenoviny.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.63	15.06.2006	Otec lustrací Langoš se zabil v autě	aktualne.cz ~ str. 00 ~	<i>Red Zah, ČTK</i>
A1.64	15.06.2006	TISKOVÁ ZPRÁVA: Vzpomínka na pana Jána Langoše	ceska-media.cz	<i>Tisková zpráva ČT - Martin Krafl, (BoJ)</i>

A1.65	16.06.2006	Bývalý federální ministr vnitra Langoš zahynul	Lidové noviny	<i>Luboš Palata</i>
A1.66	16.06.2006	Bývalý federální ministr vnitra Langoš zemřel při autonehodě	Českolipský deník	
A1.67	16.06.2006	Bývalý ministr vnitra Ján Langoš zahynul při autonehodě	Metro	<i>Jiří Reichl</i>
A1.68	16.06.2006	Bývalý ministr vnitra, Ján Langoš, zahynul při nehodě vozidel	Metro	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.69	16.06.2006	České osobnosti si Langoše vážily	Právo	<i>(ČTK, lh)</i>
A1.70	16.06.2006	Dlouhovlasý fyzik, který bojoval s totalitou	Právo	<i>Lenka Hloušková</i>
A1.71	16.06.2006	Dlouhovlasý ministr Langoš zahynul v troskách octavie	Frýdecko-místecký a třinecký deník	<i>Daniel Vražda</i>
A1.72	16.06.2006	Dlouhovlasý ministr Langoš zahynul v troskách octavie	Listy Písecka	<i>Daniel Vražda</i>
A1.73	16.06.2006	Dlouhovlasý ministr Langoš zahynul v troskách octavie	Pardubické noviny	<i>Daniel Vražda</i>
A1.74	16.06.2006	Dlouhovlasý ministr Langoš zahynul v troskách octavie	Prostějovský deník	<i>Daniel Vražda</i>
A1.75	16.06.2006	Dlouhovlasý ministr Langoš zahynul v troskách octavie	Rovnost - Deník Vyškovska	<i>Daniel Vražda</i>
A1.76	16.06.2006	Exministr Ján Langoš zemřel KOŠICE (ČTK) - Někdejší polistopadový	Aha!	
A1.77	16.06.2006	Exministr Langoš zahynul při nehodě	Valašský deník	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.78	16.06.2006	Exministr Langoš zahynul v autě	Právo	<i>Ivan Vilček</i>
A1.79	16.06.2006	Exministr Langoš zahynul!	Blesk	<i>(NČ)</i>
A1.80	16.06.2006	Exministr Langoš zemřel na silnici	Domažlický deník	
A1.81	16.06.2006	Exministr Langoš zemřel na silnici	Chebský deník	
A1.82	16.06.2006	Exministr vnitra Langoš zemřel	ŠÍP	<i>Jitka Zadražilová</i>
A1.83	16.06.2006	Exministra Langoše zabila multikára	Haló noviny	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.84	16.06.2006	Indián, který vytrval	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Tomáš Němeček</i>
A1.85	16.06.2006	Ján Langoš zemřel v nejméně vhodné chvíli	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Pavel Žáček</i>
A1.86	16.06.2006	Ján Langoš zůstal čs. občanem	Právo	<i>Petr Uhl</i>
A1.87	16.06.2006	Langoš nepřežil nehodu	24 hodin	<i>vs</i>
A1.88	16.06.2006	Langoš zemřel na silnici	Metropolitní expres	<i>rap, hra</i>
A1.89	16.06.2006	Muž, který se nikdy nevzdával	Lidové noviny	<i>Petruška Šustrová</i>
A1.90	16.06.2006	Muž, který vždy zápasil s nespravedlností	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Michaela Bučková</i>
A1.91	16.06.2006	Naplňme Langošův odkaz i v Česku	lidovky.cz	<i>Lubomír Stejskal, Karlovy Vary</i>
A1.92	16.06.2006	Při autonehodě zahynul exministr vnitra a disident Ján Langoš	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(miš)</i>
A1.93	16.06.2006	Slovensko ztratilo "ochránce paměti"	Hospodářské noviny	<i>(ber, čtk)</i>
A1.94	16.06.2006	Slovensko ztratilo "ochránce paměti"	iHNed.cz	
A1.95	16.06.2006	Ústav paměti národa má osvětlit minulost Slovenska	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(miš)</i>
A1.96	16.06.2006	Zemřel slovenský politik Ján Langoš	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Michaela Bučková</i>
A1.97	17.06.2006	Naplňme Langošův odkaz i v Česku	Lidové noviny	<i>Lubomír Stejskal</i>
A1.98	21.06.2006	Senát chce zavést Ústav paměti národa	iHNed.cz	
A1.99	21.06.2006	Senát je pro vytvoření ústavu pro zkoumání komunistických dokumentů	iHNed.cz	

A1.100	21.06.2006	Senát: Komunistické dokumenty by měl lépe zkoumat nový ústav	ceskenoviny.cz	ČTK
A1.101	21.06.2006	Sociální demokraté ovlivní vznik Ústavu paměti národa	Kurýr Praha	(čtk/lit)
A1.102	21.06.2006	Ústav paměti národa, odkladiště senátorů	Haló noviny	(jad)
A1.103	21.06.2006	V Polsku chtějí lustrvat také novináře	ceska-media.cz	ČTK, autor: Jan Vavrušák, mik, (jka)
A1.104	22.06.2006	O statečném Jánovi	Lidové noviny	Jan Rejžek
A1.105	22.06.2006	Poláci lustrují novináře	Lidové noviny	Petruška Šustrová
A1.106	22.06.2006	Senát navrhl zřídit Ústav paměti národa	Lidové noviny	čtk
A1.107	22.06.2006	Senát odložil hlasování o zúžení imunity, několik zákonů schválil	zakony.iDNES.cz	redakce (sp) (Epravo)
A1.108	22.06.2006	Senátoři chtějí Ústav paměti národa	Hospodářské noviny	Petr Sehnoutka
A1.109	22.06.2006	Senátoři chtějí Ústav paměti národa	Hospodářské noviny	Petr Sehnoutka
A1.110	22.06.2006	Slováci i Češi řekli sbohem Langošovi	aktualne.cz	pat
A1.111	22.06.2006	Slovensko se minulostí zabývá od roku 2003	Hospodářské noviny	Renata Havranová
A1.112	22.06.2006	Ústav paměti národa rozdělí společnost	Haló noviny	(jad)
A1.113	22.06.2006	Ze včerejších rozhodnutí Senátu	zpravodaj.cz	
A1.114	23.06.2006	Začaly dějiny únorem 1948?	Právo	Petr Uhl
A1.115	25.06.2006	Komunista? V ústavu nedostane práci	aktualne.cz	Martina Macková
A1.116	26.06.2006	Polské lustrační trable	Lidové noviny	Petruška Šustrová
A1.117	30.06.2006	Když neprošel zákaz KSČM, prošel Ústav paměti národa	Haló noviny	Jana Dubnicková
A1.118	08.07.2006	Problémy dneška?	Haló noviny	Jan KLÁN
A1.119	15.07.2006	Nenávist na pokračování	Haló noviny	
A1.120	03.08.2006	Klapky na uších	lidovky.cz	Tomáš Bursík
A1.121	04.08.2006	Klapky na uších	Lidové noviny	Tomáš Bursík
A1.122	26.08.2006	Německé problémy s minulostí	Lidové noviny	Erik Siegl
A1.123	30.08.2006	Válečné oběti budou přepočítány	Lidové noviny	ČTK
A1.124	04.09.2006	Slovensko se bojí minulosti	iHNed.cz	
A1.125	08.09.2006	Pohyb na vnějšku	Lidové noviny	Petruška Šustrová
A1.126	10.09.2006	Vláda rozhodne o vzniku Ústavu paměti národa	iHNed.cz	
A1.127	11.09.2006	Paměti proti sviním	reflex.cz	Petr Holec
A1.128	11.09.2006	SEZNAMY SPOLUPRACOVNÍKŮ STB PRO VŠECHNY	Metro	P2P
A1.129	11.09.2006	Ústav paměti národa projedná vláda	Lidové noviny	ČTK
A1.130	13.09.2006	Komunistická minulost: další šance ke zmapování	Pardubické noviny	Kateřina Volná
A1.131	13.09.2006	Rudá minulost: nová šance k reflexi	Prostějovský deník	(kv)
A1.132	13.09.2006	Totalitní historie: šance ke zmapování	Rovnost - Deník Vyškovska	Kateřina Volná
A1.133	13.09.2006	Ústav paměti národa zřejmě vznikne	iHNed.cz	
A1.134	13.09.2006	Vláda je pro vznik Ústavu paměti národa	aktualne.cz	Aktuálně.cz
A1.135	13.09.2006	Vláda je pro vznik Ústavu paměti národa	ceskenoviny.cz	ČTK

A1.136	13.09.2006	Vláda je pro vznik Ústavu paměti národa, v návrhu chce ale úpravy	zakony.iDNES.cz	redakce (sp) (Epravo)
A1.137	14.09.2006	* vláda pro Ústav paměti národa	Právo	(gö)
A1.138	14.09.2006	Topolánková vláda je pro vznik Ústavu paměti národa	Pardubické noviny	ČTK
A1.139	14.09.2006	Vláda je pro vznik Ústavu paměti národa	Prostějovský deník	ČTK
A1.140	14.09.2006	Vláda podpořila vznik zbytečné instituce	Haló noviny	(jad)
A1.141	15.09.2006	Topolánkovsko-paroubkovská politika druhé ligy	Haló noviny	Josef Petruš
A1.142	15.09.2006	Vzniká archiv, jenž má pomoci nezapomenout	iHNed.cz	
A1.143	22.09.2006	Slovensko odtajnilo svazky StB	Lidové noviny	ČTK
A1.144	22.09.2006	Ústav paměti národa odkrývá minulost ČSSR	Metropolitní expres	(mrm), ČTK
A1.145	26.09.2006	Ústav paměti národa čeká na sněmovnu	Lidové noviny	(rm)
A1.146	11.10.2006	Hledání paměti	Mladá fronta DNES	
A1.147	11.10.2006	Jak funguje „Langošův ústav paměti“ v Bratislavě	Mladá fronta DNES	Luděk Navara
A1.148	19.10.2006	Noví senátoři: Co si myslí o komunistech	aktualne.cz	Jakub Antoš
A1.149	25.10.2006	Ústav bez opravdové paměti národa	Lidové noviny	Vladimír Bystrov
A1.150	27.10.2006	SPOLEČNOST: Jen je nechte, stejně vymřou	neviditelnypes.cz	Vladimír Bystrov
A1.151	07.11.2006	Bádat o komunismu? Možná budeme	aktualne.cz	Martina Macková
A1.152	07.11.2006	Grebeníček se rozohnil kvůli Ústavu paměti národa	zpravy.iDNES.cz	iDNES.cz, Radek Bartoniček
A1.153	07.11.2006	Levice bojuje proti vzniku Ústavu paměti národa	lidovky.cz	Lidovky.cz, ČTK
A1.154	07.11.2006	Levice neuspěla ve snaze zabránit vzniku Ústavu paměti národa	ceskenoviny.cz	ČTK
A1.155	07.11.2006	Levice neuspěla ve snaze zabránit vzniku Ústavu paměti národa	ceskenoviny.cz	ČTK
A1.156	07.11.2006	Levice nezabránila vzniku Ústavu paměti národa	iHNed.cz	onl-iHNed
A1.157	07.11.2006	Poslanci se přeli o vznik Ústavu paměti národa	novinky.cz	Novinky
A1.158	08.11.2006	Archivy z dob komunismu by se mohly sloučit	Mladá fronta DNES	(om)
A1.159	08.11.2006	Pravice o hlas protlačila Ústav paměti národa	Právo	Nad'a Adamičková, Marie Königová
A1.160	08.11.2006	Ústav paměti národa dostal zelenou	Lidové noviny	ČTK
A1.161	08.11.2006	Ústav Paměti národa má šanci	Frýdecko-místecký a třínecký deník, republished in 26 regional mutations	(lf)

A1.162	08.11.2006	Ústav Paměti národa má šanci	Pardubický deník, republished in 47 regional mutations	<i>(lf)</i>
A1.163	08.11.2006	Vznik Ústavu paměti národa Poslanecká sněmovna nezamítla	Haló noviny	<i>(ku)</i>
A1.164	09.11.2006	O zamrzlých hodinkách	Lidové noviny	<i>Jan Rejžek</i>
A1.165	09.11.2006	Paměť národa nezačala teprve rokem 1948	Haló noviny	<i>(zr)</i>
A1.166	09.11.2006	Úlitby bohům antikomunismu	Haló noviny	<i>Milada Halíková</i>
A1.167	10.11.2006	Paměť národa	Lidové noviny	<i>Petruška Šustrová</i>
A1.168	10.11.2006	Pravda o Ústavu paměti národa	Lidové noviny	<i>Jiří Liška</i>
A1.169	11.11.2006	Potřebujeme nový výklad historie?	Haló noviny	<i>Ludvík Šulda</i>
A1.170	13.11.2006	Co s komunismem 17 let po jeho pádu?	aktualne.cz	<i>(abb)</i>
A1.171	13.11.2006	Paměti národa chybí piár	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Vladimír Kučera</i>
A1.172	13.11.2006	Političtí vězni - o nich bez nich	Lidové noviny	<i>Vladimír Bystrov</i>
A1.173	13.11.2006	Potřebujeme paměť národa nebo jeho ochranu?	ceska-media.cz	<i>Josef Petří</i>
A1.174	13.11.2006	Senátní návrh na zřízení Ústavu paměti národa je účelový a v rozporu s Ústavou	Haló noviny	<i>František Vybíral</i>
A1.175	13.11.2006	SPOLEČNOST: Pravda o Ústavu paměti národa	neviditelnypes.cz	<i>Jiří Liška</i>
A1.176	13.11.2006	Ústav paměti národa či ústav dezinformací národa?	Haló noviny	<i>Daniel Rovný</i>
A1.177	13.11.2006	Ústav paměti národa. K čemu?	aktualne.cz	<i>Aktuálně.cz</i>
A1.178	13.11.2006	Ustavíme novodobou inkviziční stolicí?	aktualne.cz	<i>Miroslav Grebeníček</i>
A1.179	13.11.2006	Vyrovnat se s komunistickou minulostí	aktualne.cz	<i>Tomáš Vilímek</i>
A1.180	14.11.2006	Návrat k principům	lidovky.cz	<i>Milan Jíra, Praha</i>
A1.181	15.11.2006	Srp a kladivo jsou hákovým křížem komunistů	zpravy.iDNES.cz	<i>iDNES.cz, Pavel Eichler</i>
A1.182	15.11.2006	Z bádání o StB se stává žvanírna	Domažlický deník	<i>Kateřina Volná</i>
A1.183	15.11.2006	Z bádání o StB se stává žvanírna	Frýdecko-místecký a třínecký deník	<i>Kateřina Volná</i>
A1.184	18.11.2006	1989? Střed Evropy chce novou revoluci	aktualne.cz	<i>Petr Holub</i>
A1.185	18.11.2006	Paměť národa new style	Lidové noviny	<i>Michal Kopeček</i>
A1.186	20.11.2006	Paměť národa	Haló noviny	
A1.187	04.12.2006	Témat je dost, chybějí historici	Lidové noviny	<i>Robert Malecký</i>
A1.188	06.12.2006	Estébáci hlídali svazky StB	lidovky.cz	<i>Lidové Noviny, Robert Malecký</i>
A1.189	14.12.2006	Divoké lustrace v Polsku	reflex.cz	<i>Jan Potůček</i>
A1.190	16.12.2006	LN: Miloslav Vlček: S agenty StB jsme se uspokojivě nevyrovnali	ceska-media.cz	<i>Miloslav Vlček</i>
A1.191	16.12.2006	S agenty StB jsme se uspokojivě nevyrovnali	Lidové noviny	<i>Miloslav Vlček</i>
A1.192	20.12.2006	Věřím mu, když říká, že byl jen srab	Lidové noviny	<i>Václav Drchal</i>

A1.193	30.12.2006	Otevírání archivů	Lidové noviny	<i>Petr Zidek</i>
A1.194	03.01.2007	Kam uklidit paměť národa	Haló noviny	<i>Lýdie Grecká</i>
A1.195	09.01.2007	STŘEDEVROPY	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Martina Ehla</i>
A1.196	09.01.2007	Ústav paměti národa se může stát bezdomovcem	Haló noviny	<i>Lýdie Grecká</i>
A1.197	13.01.2007	„Měl odvahu,“ zastal se kolega arcibiskupa Sokola	Lidové noviny	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.198	13.01.2007	Arcibiskup Sokol se hájí: neudával jsem	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(ČTK, ash)</i>
A1.199	13.01.2007	Arcibiskup Sokol tvrdí, že s StB nespolečně pracoval	Právo	<i>(ivi)</i>
A1.200	16.01.2007	Slovenský Ústav paměti národa v ohrožení	ČRo - cro6.cz	<i>Gabriel Sedlák</i>
A1.201	19.01.2007	O paměti národa	Haló magazín Pro Vás	<i>Tomáš Hejzlar</i>
A1.202	19.01.2007	VVVKMT: Zpravodajská zpráva ke zřízení Ústavu paměti národa	ceska-media.cz	<i>Zbyněk Novotný</i>
A1.203	27.01.2007	Děravá paměť – hotové neštěstí	Benešovský deník	<i>Milan Lasica</i>
A1.204	27.01.2007	Děravá paměť – hotové neštěstí	Českolipský deník	<i>Milan Lasica</i>
A1.205	27.01.2007	Děravá paměť – hotové neštěstí	Jihlavský deník	<i>Milan Lasica</i>
A1.206	27.01.2007	Děravá paměť – hotové neštěstí	Pardubický deník	<i>Milan Lasica</i>
A1.207	27.01.2007	Děravá paměť – hotové neštěstí	Pražský deník	<i>Milan Lasica</i>
A1.208	27.01.2007	Děravá paměť: hotové neštěstí	Prostějovský deník	<i>Milan Lasica</i>
A1.209	29.01.2007	Podpořte výzvu na zachování Ústavu paměti národa	eportal.cz	<i>Redakce</i>
A1.210	31.01.2007	Langošovým nástupcem bude historik Matice slovenské Petranský	ceskenoviny.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.211	01.02.2007	Langošovým nástupcem bude historik Petranský	Právo	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.212	01.02.2007	Ústav paměti národa povede historik	Hospodářské noviny	<i>(rha)</i>
A1.213	01.02.2007	Ústav paměti národa povede historik	iHNed.cz	
A1.214	02.02.2007	Petranský vidí na Tisovi klady	Lidové noviny	<i>Luboš Palata</i>
A1.215	04.02.2007	Vnitro chystá revoluci ve zkoumání dějin	aktualne.cz	<i>Jakub Jareš</i>
A1.216	05.02.2007	Přístup do archivů StB má být jednodušší	iHNed.cz	<i>(dom)</i>
A1.217	07.02.2007	Ivan Petranský: Proti zavedení lustrací bych nebyl	iHNed.cz	<i>Renata Havranová</i>
A1.218	07.02.2007	Ivan Petranský: Proti zavedení lustrací bych nebyl	pubweb.cz	<i>Renata Havranová</i>
A1.219	07.02.2007	Mladí vidí historii trochu jinak	Hospodářské noviny	<i>(me)</i>

A1.220	07.02.2007	Proti zavedení lustrací bych nebyl	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Renata Havranová</i>
A1.221	08.02.2007	Zvolení nového šéfa slovenského Ústavu paměti národa	ČRo - cro6.cz	<i>Gabriel Sedlák</i>
A1.222	09.02.2007	Lustrace budou v Polsku potřebovat i novináři	ČRo - izurnal.cz	<i>Martin Dorazín</i>
A1.223	13.02.2007	Historik: Jména agentů StB nám moc neřeknou	iHNed.cz	<i>Jan Černý</i>
A1.224	14.02.2007	Chyběla vůle archívy odtajňovat	Právo ~ str. 02	<i>Josef Koukal</i>
A1.225	14.02.2007	I sousedi znají své Tošovské	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Lubomír Heger</i>
A1.226	14.02.2007	Kilometry spisů StB budou na webu, slíbil Langer	zpravy.iDNES.cz	<i>iDNES.cz, Pavel Eichler</i>
A1.227	14.02.2007	Ministerstvo vnitra chce zjednodušit přístup k materiálům StB	ČRo - izurnal.cz	<i>Václava Vařeková, Marika Táborská</i>
A1.228	14.02.2007	Nové lustrace odhalí policejní stát	aktualne.cz	<i>Petr Holub, Tomáš Rákos</i>
A1.229	14.02.2007	Projekt "Otevřená minulost" má zveřejnit další dokumenty StB	ceskenoviny.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.230	14.02.2007	Projekt "Otevřená minulost" má zveřejnit další dokumenty StB	ceskenoviny.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.231	14.02.2007	Rozvědka: Tošovský s StB nespolupracoval	Právo ~ str. 02	<i>(gö. ČTK)</i>
A1.232	15.02.2007	Estébáci ztratí anonymitu	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Jan Vaca, Jan Gazdík a Jan Mates</i>
A1.233	15.02.2007	Kauza Tošovský přišla ze Slovenska, míní Langer	Právo	<i>(jfk)</i>
A1.234	15.02.2007	Langer chce na internetu odtajnit minulost	Právo	<i>Josef Koukal</i>
A1.235	15.02.2007	Langer chce odtajnit i Tošovského spis	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Robert Břešťan, Radek Kedroň</i>
A1.236	15.02.2007	Materiály StB budou na webu	Lidové noviny	<i>(drv)</i>
A1.237	17.02.2007	Kterého agenta odhalí příště?	Právo	<i>Petr Uhl</i>
A1.238	19.02.2007	Seznamte, otevři se	finance.cz	<i>Týden</i>
A1.239	21.02.2007	Melčák hlasoval s ODS pro Ústav paměti národa	iHNed.cz	<i>čtk</i>
A1.240	21.02.2007	Ústavně právní výbor podpořil Ústav paměti národa, pro i Melčák	ceska-media.cz	<i>ČTK, autor: Jan Hrdlička, mal, (BoJ)</i>
A1.241	22.02.2007	Melčák pro Ústav paměti národa	Právo	<i>(ČTK)</i>
A1.242	22.02.2007	Senátní návrh Ústavu paměti národa vyhláší občanům lustrační válku	Haló noviny	<i>František Vybíral</i>
A1.243	23.02.2007	Minulost malá a velká	Vyškovský deník	<i>Pavel Kopecký</i>
A1.244	27.02.2007	Jak lépe zneužít nedávných dějin	Právo	<i>Petr Uhl</i>
A1.245	27.02.2007	Padne arcibiskup Sokol?	Benešovský deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.246	27.02.2007	Padne arcibiskup Sokol?	Písecký deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.247	27.02.2007	Padne arcibiskup Sokol?	Prostějovský deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.248	01.03.2007	Sněmovna: Spor o Ústav paměti národa a komisi ke Kubiceho zprávě	ceska-media.cz	<i>ČTK, autor: hj mal (OB)</i>

A1.249	01.03.2007	Sněmovna: Spor o Ústav paměti národa a komisi ke Kubiceho zprávě	ceska-media.cz	ČTK, autor: <i>hj mal (OB)</i>
A1.250	02.03.2007	Nepokračujme v praxi StB	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Lubomír Zaorálek</i>
A1.251	02.03.2007	Nepokračujme v praxi StB	zpravy.iDNES.cz	<i>Lubomír Zaorálek, místopředseda poslanecké Sněmovny</i>
A1.252	03.03.2007	Arcibiskupa Sokola estébáci upláceli	Domažlický deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.253	03.03.2007	Arcibiskupa Sokola estébáci upláceli	Frýdecko-místecký a třinecký deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.254	03.03.2007	Biskup bral peníze od StB	Frýdecko-místecký a třinecký deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.255	03.03.2007	Biskup bral peníze od StB	Jihlavský deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.256	03.03.2007	Biskup bral peníze od StB	Písecký deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.257	03.03.2007	Biskup bral peníze od StB	Vyškovský deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.258	03.03.2007	Estébáci upláceli arcibiskupa	Benešovský deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.259	03.03.2007	Estébáci upláceli arcibiskupa	Jihlavský deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.260	03.03.2007	Estébáci upláceli arcibiskupa	Písecký deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.261	03.03.2007	Estébáci upláceli arcibiskupa	Prostějovský deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.262	03.03.2007	Slovensko Biskup bral peníze od StB	Prostějovský deník	<i>Monika Žemlová</i>
A1.263	03.03.2007	Sokol údajně dostával od StB peníze	Právo	<i>(ivi)</i>
A1.264	03.03.2007	SPOLEČNOST: Nepotřebujeme státní výklad historie	neviditelnypes.cz	<i>Lubomír Zaorálek</i>
A1.265	06.03.2007	O informacích a skandalizování	ceska-media.cz	<i>Vojtěch Filip</i>
A1.266	12.03.2007	Zápas o paměť i s pamětí	ceska-media.cz	<i>Lukáš Jelínek</i>
A1.267	12.03.2007	Zápas o paměť i s pamětí	Právo	<i>Lukáš Jelínek</i>
A1.268	13.03.2007	Dnešní tisk glosuje spor kvůli Ústavu paměti národa	ceska-media.cz	ČTK, autor: <i>khj, (BoJ)</i>
A1.269	13.03.2007	Dnešní tisk glosuje spor kvůli Ústavu paměti národa	ceska-media.cz	
A1.270	13.03.2007	Odškodní Slováci komunisty?	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Nmagdalena Sodomková</i>
A1.271	13.03.2007	Past na Ústav paměti národa	Lidové noviny	<i>Robert Malecký</i>
A1.272	13.03.2007	Trn v oku	Lidové noviny	<i>Petruška Šustrová</i>
A1.273	13.03.2007	Zkrácené dějiny	Právo	<i>Jiří Hanák</i>
A1.274	14.03.2007	Bublan neprosadil změny v Ústavu paměti	Právo	<i>(dan)</i>
A1.275	14.03.2007	Iniciativa těch, kdo chtějí národ bez paměti	Lidové noviny	<i>Milan Jira</i>
A1.276	14.03.2007	Iniciativa těch, kdo chtějí národ bez paměti	lidovky.cz	<i>Milan Jira, Praha</i>
A1.277	14.03.2007	Melčák: byl jsem v rezervě	Právo	<i>(trj)</i>
A1.278	14.03.2007	Nová vlna lustrací se dotkne až 700 tisíc Poláků	tyden.cz	ČTK
A1.279	14.03.2007	SPOLEČNOST: Zápas o paměť i s pamětí?	neviditelnypes.cz	<i>Lukáš Jelínek</i>
A1.280	14.03.2007	Ústav národního zapomnění	virtually.cz	<i>Jiří Oberfalzer</i>
A1.281	15.03.2007	Aspoň víme, jak daleko vlevo ČSSD stojí	lidovky.cz	<i>Tomáš Pek, Praha</i>
A1.282	15.03.2007	Nový polský lustrační zákon se bude týkat až 700 tisíc lidí	ČRo - izurnal.cz	<i>Martin Dorazín, Marie Matušíů</i>

A1.283	15.03.2007	Průzkumník archivů StB Žáček bude hostem iDNES.cz	zpravy.iDNES.cz	iDNES.cz, pei
A1.284	15.03.2007	Přímluva pro zákon o Ústavu paměti národa	Právo	Vilém Prečan
A1.285	15.03.2007	Ústav národního zapomnění	ceska-media.cz	Jiří Oberfalzer
A1.286	15.03.2007	V Polsku platí nový přísnější lustrační zákon	ČRo - izurnal.cz	Martin Dorazín
A1.287	15.03.2007	V Polsku začaly nové přísné lustrace	iHNed.cz	Martin Ehl
A1.288	16.03.2007	Debata o Ústavu paměti národa: Grebeníček, Lenin, soudruzi i leták	nova.cz	autor: Pavel Orálek, zdroj: TV Nova, ČTK
A1.289	16.03.2007	Grebeníček: Vytěžení dokumentů bezpečnostních orgánů nestačí	iHNed.cz	ann-iHNed
A1.290	16.03.2007	Chci (ne)být jako vy	reflex.cz	Petr Holec
A1.291	16.03.2007	Komunistům neprošlo odložení projednávání zřízení Ústavu paměti národa	ceska-media.cz	Vlastní zpráva ČM - Josef Petruš, (BoJ)
A1.292	16.03.2007	Křeček: Připomínání minulosti je cestou do pekel	iHNed.cz	ann-iHNed
A1.293	16.03.2007	Děšť letáků přerušil schůzi poslanců	blesk.cz	
A1.294	16.03.2007	Mezi poslance dopadaly letáky s Leninem	novinky.cz	ada, Právo, Novinky
A1.295	16.03.2007	Na poslance KSČM spadly letáky, sněmovna chce incidentům předejít	ceskenoviny.cz	ČTK
A1.296	16.03.2007	Na poslance KSČM spadly letáky, sněmovna chce incidentům předejít	ceskenoviny.cz	ČTK
A1.297	16.03.2007	Na poslance padal Lenin i Paroubek	bleskove.centrum.cz	bleskově, čtk
A1.298	16.03.2007	Na poslance se z galerie snesli Lenin s Paroubkem	zpravy.iDNES.cz	iDNES.cz, MF DNES, miz, kop
A1.299	16.03.2007	Poslanci přerušili schůzi, host na ně hodil letáky s Leninem	aktualne.cz	Aktuálně.cz
A1.300	16.03.2007	Poslance zasypaly letáky proti Paroubkovi	lidovky.cz	ČTK
A1.301	16.03.2007	Schůzi sněmovny přerušily padající letáky	iHNed.cz	cob-iHNed
A1.302	16.03.2007	Nový lustrační zákon vyvolal v Polsku rozruch	ČRo - cro6.cz	Alexander Tolčinský
A1.303	16.03.2007	Poslance čeká hádka o »paměť národa«	Hospodářské noviny	Robert Břešťan, Vladimír Šnidl
A1.304	16.03.2007	Poslanci podruhé projednají zřízení Ústavu paměti národa	ČRo - izurnal.cz	Marie Matušíš, Veronika Hankusová, Václava Vařeková
A1.305	16.03.2007	Schvalování Ústavu paměti národa směřuje ve sněmovně do finále	ceska-media.cz	ČTK, autor: mhm, rot, (BoJ)
A1.306	16.03.2007	Schvalování Ústavu paměti národa směřuje ve sněmovně do finále	ceskenoviny.cz	ČTK
A1.307	16.03.2007	Poslanci rozhodnou o Ústavu paměti národa zřejmě příští týden	novinky.cz	znk, Novinky
A1.308	16.03.2007	Poslanci se přeli, zda a jak zkoumat totalitu	zpravy.iDNES.cz	iDNES.cz, rb
A1.309	16.03.2007	Průzkumník archivů StB Žáček bude hostem iDNES.cz	zpravy.iDNES.cz	iDNES.cz, pei
A1.310	16.03.2007	Přes odpor levice dostal ve sněmovně šanci Ústav paměti národa	aktualne.cz	Aktuálně.cz

A1.311	16.03.2007	TISKOVÁ ZPRÁVA: Hosté pořadu Otázky Václava Moravce - neděle 18. března 2007	ceska-media.cz	Tisková zpráva Česká televize - Martin Krafl (vom)
A1.312	16.03.2007	Topolánek: Nohavica neztratí popularitu, dále zpívá	iHNed.cz	ann-iHNed
A1.313	16.03.2007	Topolánek: Nohavica neztratí popularitu, dále zpívá	kultura.iHNed.cz	ann-iHNed
A1.314	16.03.2007	Ústav paměti národa bude zkoumat i protektorát	tyden.cz	ČTK
A1.315	16.03.2007	Ústav paměti národa i přes letáky prošel do druhého čtení	iHNed.cz	František Novák, čtk , psp.cz
A1.316	16.03.2007	Výběr výroků při jednání sněmovny o vzniku Ústavu paměti národa	ceska-media.cz	ČTK, autor: ner kš (OB)
A1.317	16.03.2007	Zákonodárci poslali návrh na Ústav paměti národa do třetího čtení	ČRo - izurnal.cz	Marie Matušů, Veronika Hankusová
A1.318	17.03.2007	Co předložil Senát	Právo	
A1.319	17.03.2007	Jak se KSČM urazila	Zlínský deník	(kp)
A1.320	17.03.2007	Naše dnešní minulost	Právo	Jiří Franěk
A1.321	17.03.2007	Komunisty zasypaly plakáty	Vyškovský deník	(kp)
A1.322	17.03.2007	Na poslance přel Paroubek s Leninem	Mladá fronta DNES	(kop, iDNES)
A1.323	17.03.2007	Na poslance s plakáty	Brněnský deník	
A1.324	17.03.2007	Na poslance spadl Lenin!	ŠÍP	(had, čtk)
A1.325	17.03.2007	Náhle na poslance spadly letáky	Lidové noviny	baw
A1.326	17.03.2007	Plakáty s Leninem zasypaly komunisty	Benešovský deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.327	17.03.2007	Plakáty s Leninem zasypaly komunisty	Českolipský deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.328	17.03.2007	Plakáty s Leninem zasypaly komunisty	Domažlický deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.329	17.03.2007	Plakáty s Leninem zasypaly komunisty	Kroměřížský deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.330	17.03.2007	Plakáty s Leninem zasypaly komunisty	Pardubický deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.331	17.03.2007	Plakáty s Leninem zasypaly komunisty	Písecký deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.332	17.03.2007	Plakáty s Leninem zasypaly komunisty	Prostějovský deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.333	17.03.2007	Plakáty s Leninem zasypaly komunisty	Šumperský a jesenický deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.334	17.03.2007	Plakáty s Leninem zasypaly komunisty	Valašský deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.335	17.03.2007	Plakáty s Leninem zasypaly parlament	Přerovský deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.336	17.03.2007	Plakáty zasypaly sněmovnu	Frýdecko-místecký a třinecký deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.337	17.03.2007	Konec života v milosrdné lži	Mladá fronta DNES	Mikuláš Kroupa
A1.338	17.03.2007	Meditace pana Hanáka na téma Ústav paměti národa	Haló noviny	Jaroslav Kojzar
A1.339	17.03.2007	Poslanci se pohádali o Ústav paměti národa	Právo	Nad'a Adamičková, Marie Königová
A1.340	17.03.2007	Poslanci se přešli o zkoumání minulosti	Českolipský deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.341	17.03.2007	Poslanci se přešli o zkoumání minulosti	Frýdecko-místecký a třinecký deník	Kateřina Perknerová
A1.342	17.03.2007	Protikomunistická provokace ve Sněmovně!	Haló noviny	(jad)
A1.343	17.03.2007	Soudruzi, bratři	Lidové noviny	Bob Fliedr
A1.344	17.03.2007	Ústav - ostuda českého parlamentu	Haló noviny	(jad)

A1.345	18.03.2007	Dojde i na premiéra Čalfu?	tyden.cz	Tomáš Menschik
A1.346	19.03.2007	Adam Drda: Souboj o Ústav paměti národa	iHNed.cz	Adam Drda
A1.347	19.03.2007	Bémovi komunisté nevaří	Lidové noviny	jam
A1.348	19.03.2007	Bémovi komunisté nevaří	lidovky.cz	Lidové noviny, jam
A1.349	19.03.2007	Bývalí komunisté v Ústavu paměti národa?	Metro	ČTK
A1.350	19.03.2007	Komunisti do čela Ústavu paměti národa?	Frýdecko-místecký a třinecký deník	ČTK
A1.351	19.03.2007	Komunisti do čela Ústavu paměti národa?	Pardubický deník	ČTK
A1.352	19.03.2007	Komunistickou minulost otevře možná komunistka	Mladá fronta DNES	ČTK
A1.353	19.03.2007	LN: Bémovi komunisté nevaří	ceska-media.cz	jam, (BoJ)
A1.354	19.03.2007	Média a Ústav paměti národa	louc.cz	
A1.355	19.03.2007	Na koho ta špína padne	Právo	Petr Uhl
A1.356	19.03.2007	Nová inkvizice - Ústav paměti národa	ceska-media.cz	Vojtěch Filip
A1.357	19.03.2007	Paměť národa budou moci hlídat i komunisté	Hospodářské noviny	ČTK
A1.358	19.03.2007	Pokřivená spravedlnost	Lidové noviny	Pavel Máša
A1.359	19.03.2007	Polský lustrační zákon vyvolává znepokojení u manažerů zahraničních firem	ČRo - izurnal.cz	Martin Dorazín, Marie Matušů
A1.360	19.03.2007	Poslanci rozhodnou o Ústavu paměti národa	iHNed.cz	lus-iHNed
A1.361	19.03.2007	Souboj o Ústav paměti národa	Hospodářské noviny	Adam Drda
A1.362	19.03.2007	Souboj o Ústav paměti národa	pubweb.cz	Adam Drda
A1.363	19.03.2007	Ústav národní pomsty	blisty.cz	Štěpán Kotrba
A1.364	19.03.2007	Ústav paměti národa? V čele asi i komunisté	Metropolitní expres	ČTK
A1.365	19.03.2007	Vyrovňování se s minulostí	Haló noviny	Karel Konšel
A1.366	19.03.2007	Žáček: Nohavicovo mlžení o StB neřeším. I mně dával sílu	zpravy.iDNES.cz	iDNES.cz, pei
A1.367	20.03.2007	ČSSD znovu odmítla ústav o období komunismu	iHNed.cz	Jan Osúch, ČTK
A1.368	20.03.2007	iHNed: ČSSD znovu odmítla ústav o období komunismu	ceska-media.cz	Jan Osúch, ČTK, (BoJ)
A1.369	20.03.2007	Milan Šmíd: Média a Ústav paměti národa	ceska-media.cz	Milan Šmíd, (BoJ)
A1.370	20.03.2007	Nejde jen o Čalfu	lidovky.cz	Lidové noviny, Martin Weiss
A1.371	20.03.2007	Poslanci dnes o Ústavu paměti národa	Pardubický deník	ČTK
A1.372	20.03.2007	Poslanci dnes o Ústavu paměti národa	Prostějovský deník	ČTK
A1.373	20.03.2007	Rath: Ústav paměti národa bude paměť kontrolovat	tyden.cz	ČTK
A1.374	20.03.2007	SPOLEČNOST: Ústav národního zapomení	neviditelnypes.cz	Jiří Oberfalzer
A1.375	20.03.2007	Tisk: Právě teď je vhodný čas pro vznik Ústavu paměti národa	ceska-media.cz	ČTK, autor: pba, (BoJ)
A1.376	20.03.2007	Vznikne orwellovský ústav?	Právo	Vít Smetana
A1.377	21.03.2007	Co jedny těší, druhé šve	Domažlický deník	

A1.378	21.03.2007	Co jedny těší, druhé števe	Jihlavský deník	
A1.379	21.03.2007	Co jedny těší, druhé števe	Pardubický deník	<i>Jiří Stránský</i>
A1.380	21.03.2007	Co jedny těší, druhé števe	Vyškovský deník	<i>Jiří Stránský</i>
A1.381	21.03.2007	ČSSD odmítá Ústav paměti národa	Metro	<i>OSA</i>
A1.382	21.03.2007	František Bublan: Tohle je souboj o paměť národa!	iHNed.cz	<i>František Bublan</i>
A1.383	21.03.2007	O tom, co jedny těší, druhé števe,...	Prostějovský deník	<i>Jiří Stránský</i>
A1.384	21.03.2007	O tom, co jedny těší, druhé števe...	Kroměřížský deník is	<i>Jiří Stránský</i>
A1.385	21.03.2007	O Ústavu paměti později	Právo	<i>(ada, nig)</i>
A1.386	21.03.2007	Perný týden českého národa	Metro	<i>Libuše Barková</i>
A1.387	21.03.2007	Podivná vyrovnání s minulostí	blisty.cz	<i>Vladimíra Dvořáková</i>
A1.388	21.03.2007	Podivná vyrovnání s minulostí	ČRo - cro6.cz	<i>Vladimíra Dvořáková</i>
A1.389	21.03.2007	Pouliční názvoslovné hrátky	Frýdecko-místecký a třinecký deník	<i>Kateřina Perknerová</i>
A1.390	21.03.2007	Pouliční názvoslovné hrátky	Pardubický deník	<i>Kateřina Perknerová</i>
A1.391	21.03.2007	Schvalování vzniku Ústavu paměti národa se odkládá	ceska-media.cz	<i>ČTK, autor: mhm mkv (OB)</i>
A1.392	21.03.2007	ŠAMANOVO DOUPĚ: Proč si uchovat paměť	neviditelnypes.cz	<i>Jan Kovanic</i>
A1.393	21.03.2007	Tohle je souboj o paměť národa!	Hospodářské noviny	<i>František Bublan</i>
A1.394	21.03.2007	Tohle je souboj o paměť národa!	pubweb.cz	<i>František Bublan</i>
A1.395	21.03.2007	Vznik Ústavu paměti národa projedná sněmovna až příště	iHNed.cz	<i>cob-iHNed</i>
A1.396	22.03.2007	Divné obavy poslance Bublana	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Adam Drda</i>
A1.397	22.03.2007	O »paměti národa« za měsíc	Haló noviny	<i>(ku)</i>
A1.398	22.03.2007	Potomkům	Lidové noviny	<i>Jan Rejžek</i>
A1.399	22.03.2007	Zhoubná arogance moci	Haló noviny	<i>Václav Junr</i>
A1.400	23.03.2007	Ta paměť!	Lidové noviny	<i>Petruška Šustrová</i>
A1.401	26.03.2007	Minulost je důležitá	Hradecký deník	
A1.402	29.03.2007	Jak poslanci jednali o Ústavu paměti národa...	Haló noviny	
A1.403	30.03.2007	istorie bez historiků	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Vojtěch Mencl</i>
A1.404	30.03.2007	Komunisté zmizí z názvů	lidovky.cz	<i>Lidové noviny</i>
A1.405	30.03.2007	Polsko se rázně loučí s komunistickou minulostí	ČRo - izurnal.cz	<i>Martin Dorazín, Milan Kopp</i>
A1.406	30.03.2007	Ústav paměti národa a utopie Soudu Dějin	ČRo - cro6.cz	<i>Petr Přihoda</i>
A1.407	31.03.2007	Polští historici se zaměří na činnost státní bezpečnosti mezi umělci	ČRo - izurnal.cz	<i>Martin Dorazín</i>
A1.408	13.04.2007	Návrhy zelených přiblíží vznik Ústavu studií totalitních režimů	Právo	<i>(trj)</i>
A1.409	17.04.2007	Má paměť a Ústav paměti	Haló noviny	<i>Jakub Malý</i>
A1.410	17.04.2007	SPOLEČNOST: Úskalí Ústavu paměti národa	neviditelnypes.cz	<i>Svatopluk Minařík</i>

A1.411	20.04.2007	Paměť národa není jen politická	ČRo - cro6.cz	Jiří Ješ
A1.412	24.04.2007	"Ano" pro Ústav paměti národa	virtually.cz	Jiří Liška
A1.413	24.04.2007	„Ano“ pro Ústav paměti národa	Lidové noviny	Jiří Liška
A1.414	30.04.2007	Choroba partajní sebestřednosti	Právo	Lukáš Jelínek
A1.415	30.04.2007	Spor o ideologii, nebo o moc?	Právo	Petr Uhl
A1.416	01.05.2007	Polský lustrační zákon se stal terčem posměchu	ČRo - izurnal.cz	Martin Dorazín
A1.417	02.05.2007	„Ano“ pro Ústav paměti národa	ceska-media.cz	Jiří Liška
A1.418	02.05.2007	Česko bude mít nový ústav pro zkoumání éry komunismu a nacismu	ČRo - izurnal.cz	Veronika Hankusová, Martin Hromádka
A1.419	02.05.2007	Česko bude mít ústav pro zkoumání éry komunismu a nacismu	ceska-media.cz	ČTK, (BoJ)
A1.420	02.05.2007	Česko bude mít ústav pro zkoumání éry komunismu a nacismu	ceskenoviny.cz	ČTK
A1.421	02.05.2007	Česko bude mít ústav pro zkoumání éry komunismu a nacismu	ceskenoviny.cz	ČTK
A1.422	02.05.2007	Poslanci budou rozhodovat o vzniku Ústavu paměti národa	ČRo - izurnal.cz	Veronika Hankusová, Vilém Janouš
A1.423	02.05.2007	Poslanci odhlasovali ústav pro studium minulosti	zpravy.iDNES.cz	iDNES.cz, Radek Bartoníček
A1.424	02.05.2007	Poslanci odsouhlasili vznik Ústavu paměti národa	tyden.cz	ČTK
A1.425	02.05.2007	Poslanci schválili vznik Ústavu paměti národa	aktualne.cz	Martina Macková
A1.426	02.05.2007	Sněmovna dnes rozhodne, zda v Česku vznikne Ústav paměti národa	aktualne.cz	Aktuálně.cz
A1.427	02.05.2007	Sněmovna schválila vznik Ústavu paměti národa	iHNed.cz	ČTK
A1.428	02.05.2007	Ústav paměti národa asi vznikne ČSSD a KSČM navzdory	nova.cz	autor: Pavel Orálek, zdroj: ČTK
A1.429	02.05.2007	Ústav paměti národa prošel, Zaorálek zavelel k odchodu ze sálu	novinky.cz	Novinky, ČTK
A1.430	02.05.2007	Věda musí být apolitická, řekl Rath ke zřízení ústavu	iHNed.cz	František Novák
A1.431	02.05.2007	Veronika Hankusová: Poslanci budou rozhodovat o vzniku Ústavu paměti národa	ceska-media.cz	Veronika Hankusová (OB)
A1.432	02.05.2007	Vznikne Ústav pro studium totalitních režimů	lidovky.cz	Lidovky.cz, ČTK
A1.433	02.05.2007	Vznikne ústav pro zkoumání totalitních režimů	blesk.cz	
A1.434	03.05.2007	„Ústav totality“ má zelenou	Lidové noviny	Václav Drchal
A1.435	03.05.2007	Koalice s přeběhlíky prosadila Ústav pro studium totalit	Právo	Nad'a Adamičková, Marie Königová
A1.436	03.05.2007	Obrana národní paměti	Hospodářské noviny	Tomáš Němeček
A1.437	03.05.2007	Okupaci a éru komunismu prozkoumá zvláštní úřad	Lidové noviny	Václav Drchal
A1.438	03.05.2007	Politická nekultura nás vyjde draho	ceska-media.cz	Zdeněk Jičínský
A1.439	03.05.2007	Poslanci dali včera zelenou Ústavu pro studium totalitních režimů	Domažlický deník	Kateřina Perknerová

A1.440	03.05.2007	Poslanci dali zelenou Ústavu pro studium totalitních režimů	Benešovský deník	<i>Kateřina Perknerová</i>
A1.441	03.05.2007	Poslanci dali zelenou Ústavu pro studium totalitních režimů	Jihlavský deník	<i>Kateřina Perknerová</i>
A1.442	03.05.2007	Poslanci dali zelenou Ústavu pro studium totalitních režimů	Prostějovský deník	<i>Kateřina Perknerová</i>
A1.443	03.05.2007	Sobotka: až vyhraje volby, ústav skončí	Právo	<i>(trj)</i>
A1.444	03.05.2007	Tomáš Němeček: Obrana národní paměti	iHNed.cz	<i>Tomáš Němeček</i>
A1.445	03.05.2007	Triumf pravice: totalita se má zkoumat	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Jan Kubita</i>
A1.446	03.05.2007	Triumf pravice: totalita se má zkoumat	iHNed.cz	<i>Jan Kubita</i>
A1.447	03.05.2007	Ústav bude zkoumat období totality	Hospodářské noviny	
A1.448	03.05.2007	Ústav paměti národa schválen	Haló noviny	<i>(jad)</i>
A1.449	03.05.2007	Ústav proti agentům StB	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Josef Kopecký</i>
A1.450	03.05.2007	Všechno zapomenout a nic neodpustit	Pardubický deník	<i>Lída Rakušanová</i>
A1.451	03.05.2007	Všechno zapomenout a nic neodpustit	Prostějovský deník	<i>Lída Rakušanová</i>
A1.452	03.05.2007	Vznikne ústav paměti národa	24 hodin	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.453	04.05.2007	ANKETA DNE: Souhlasíte se zřízením Paměti národa?	Svitavský deník	
A1.454	04.05.2007	Diktaturu nelze vysvětlit jen z pohledu gestapa nebo StB	Právo	<i>Nad'a Adamičková, Marie Königová</i>
A1.455	04.05.2007	JAK TO VIDÍ	24 hodin	<i>Milan Kounovský</i>
A1.456	04.05.2007	Kateřina Jacques: Nelíbily se mi pojmy paměť a národ	iHNed.cz	<i>Tomáš Němeček</i>
A1.457	04.05.2007	Komu vadí paměť národa	ceska-media.cz	<i>Bohumil Pečinka</i>
A1.458	04.05.2007	Komu vadí paměť národa	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Bohumil Pečinka</i>
A1.459	04.05.2007	Na obzoru fašismus	Haló noviny	<i>Václav Jurnr</i>
A1.460	04.05.2007	Nejde o estébácké protokoly, ale o historickou pravdu	ČRo - cro6.cz	<i>Jiří Ješ</i>
A1.461	04.05.2007	Nelíbily se mi pojmy paměť a národ	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Tomáš Němeček</i>
A1.462	04.05.2007	Paměť národa? Lidé s ústavem souhlasí	Svitavský deník	
A1.463	04.05.2007	Právo: Diktaturu nelze vysvětlit jen z pohledu gestapa nebo StB	ceska-media.cz	<i>Nad'a Adamičková, Marie Königová</i>
A1.464	04.05.2007	Sláva!	Lidové noviny	<i>Petruška Šustrová</i>
A1.465	04.05.2007	TISKOVÁ ZPRÁVA: Pavel Žáček hostem Impulsů Václava Moravce	ceska-media.cz	<i>Tisková zpráva Rádia Impuls - Kristýna Štíhelová, (BoJ)</i>
A1.466	04.05.2007	Tomáš Němeček: Kateřina Jacques: Nelíbily se mi pojmy paměť a národ	ceska-media.cz	<i>Tomáš Němeček, (BoJ)</i>
A1.467	04.05.2007	UDÁLOSTI: Z posledních dnů	neviditelnypes.cz	<i>Bohumil Doležal</i>
A1.468	04.05.2007	Ústav paměti národa prošel	Metro	<i>OSA</i>
A1.469	04.05.2007	Užitečný ústav	ČRo - cro6.cz	<i>Ondřej Konrád</i>
A1.470	04.05.2007	V Česku jsou nedemokratické tendence, tvrdí KSČM	iHNed.cz	<i>Ludmila Hamplová, KSČM</i>
A1.471	04.05.2007	Věrní přeběhlíci	Právo	<i>Petr Uhl</i>
A1.472	04.05.2007	Zahozené téma totality	Právo	<i>Martin Hekrdla</i>

A1.473	05.05.2007	Po bitvě o ústav	Lidové noviny	<i>Petr Zídek</i>
A1.474	07.05.2007	Boj o historii	Lidové noviny	<i>Petruška Šustrová</i>
A1.475	07.05.2007	Komu vadí paměť národa	virtually.cz	<i>Bohumil Pečinka</i>
A1.476	07.05.2007	Komunisté se obávají „honu na čarodějnice“	Metropolitní expres	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.477	07.05.2007	Konečně prolustrujeme všechny!	Právo	<i>Petr Uhl</i>
A1.478	07.05.2007	Máme v minulosti jasno?	Lidové noviny	<i>Bohumil Doležal</i>
A1.479	07.05.2007	POLITIKON	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Jindřicha Šídla</i>
A1.480	07.05.2007	Vyjde Senát ze slepých uliček?	ceska-media.cz	<i>Lukáš Jelínek</i>
A1.481	08.05.2007	POLITIKA: Vyjde Senát ze slepých uliček?	neviditelnypes.cz	<i>Lukáš Jelínek</i>
A1.482	08.05.2007	Předčasný jásot	lidovky.cz	<i>Vilém Prečan, historik, precan@csds.cz</i>
A1.483	09.05.2007	Plebejským novinářům vstup zakázán	reflex.cz	<i>Jan Potůček</i>
A1.484	09.05.2007	Slovo paměť, prosím, vyškrtnout	Pardubický deník	<i>Jiří Stránský</i>
A1.485	09.05.2007	Slovo paměť, prosím, vyškrtnout	Prostějovský deník	<i>Jiří Stránský</i>
A1.486	09.05.2007	Slovo paměť, prosím, vyškrtnout	Vyškovský deník	<i>Jiří Stránský</i>
A1.487	10.05.2007	Podle vzoru bratří Kaczynských	ceska-media.cz	<i>Vojtěch Filip</i>
A1.488	10.05.2007	ptáme se zákonodárců	Vysočina - regionální týdeník	
A1.489	10.05.2007	UDÁLOSTI: Studujeme totalitní režimy	neviditelnypes.cz	<i>Bohumil Doležal</i>
A1.490	11.05.2007	Hrob národní paměti	Domažlický deník	<i>Jiří Dědeček</i>
A1.491	11.05.2007	Hrob národní paměti	Písecký deník	<i>Jiří Dědeček</i>
A1.492	11.05.2007	Hrob národní paměti	Pražský deník	<i>Jiří Dědeček</i>
A1.493	11.05.2007	Hrob národní paměti	Prostějovský deník	<i>Jiří Dědeček</i>
A1.494	11.05.2007	Polské lustrace rozhodne soud	iHNed.cz	<i>Martin Ehl</i>
A1.495	11.05.2007	Polský ústavní soud uznal část lustračního zákona za neústavní	ceskenoviny.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.496	11.05.2007	Polský ústavní soud uznal část lustračního zákona za neústavní	ceskenoviny.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
A1.497	11.05.2007	Rozhovor s evangelickým farářem Svatoplukem Karáskem	ČRo - cro6.cz	<i>Jana Šmídová</i>
A1.498	11.05.2007	Slovensko zveřejnilo seznam osob z kontrarozvědky StB	Právo	<i>(ivi)</i>
A1.499	12.05.2007	Poláci si oddechli, soud zablokoval lustrace	zpravy.iDNES.cz	<i>MF DNES, Magdalena Sodomková</i>
A1.500	12.05.2007	Ústavní soud v Polsku výrazně omezil nový lustrační zákon	ČRo - izurnal.cz	<i>Martin Dorazín, Marika Táborská</i>
A1.501	14.05.2007	Ale my chceme »paměť národa«!	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Bára Černá</i>
A1.502	15.05.2007	Amnesty International zve na besedu	Mladá fronta DNES / Kraj Pardubický	<i>(mb)</i>
A1.503	15.05.2007	Bádejte, bádejte	Slovácko - regionální týdeník	
A1.504	15.05.2007	Beseda k Ústavu paměti národa	Pardubický deník	<i>(mik)</i>

A1.505	16.05.2007	Klaus souhlasí s Hanákem	Právo	<i>(gö)</i>
A1.506	17.05.2007	Paměť vody a národa	Nový život - zpravodajský týdeník	<i>Věra Fojtová</i>
A1.507	19.05.2007	Klaus a Kaczyński se dobře doplňují	Právo	<i>Petr Uhl</i>
A1.508	21.05.2007	Odpověď „výtečníka“	Lidové noviny	<i>Pavel Mücke</i>
A1.509	21.05.2007	Odpověď „výtečníka“	lidovky.cz	<i>Pavel Mücke, Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR, v.v.i</i>
A1.510	22.05.2007	Ústav národní paměti i amnézie	pubweb.cz	<i>Jiří Pehe</i>
A1.511	23.05.2007	Minulost dohnala i Kapuścińskiego	Lidové noviny	<i>Maciej Ruczaj</i>
A1.512	27.05.2007	Zamyšlení - 27.5. (Hrátky s minulostí)	ČRo - praha.cz	<i>Petruška Šustrová</i>
A1.513	30.05.2007	Langer s ručením omezeným	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Jaroslav Kmenta</i>

Appendix 2: Discourse on the passing of the Law on the Institute. Tier 2 - Micro Corpus A2 for textual analysis

Index	Date	Heading	Media	Author
A2.1	02.05.2007	Česko bude mít ústav pro zkoumání éry komunismu a nacismu (<i>Czechia will have an Institute for studying the era of Communism and Nazism</i>)	ceska-media.cz	ČTK
A2.2	03.05.2007	Ústav bude zkoumat období totality (<i>The Institute will study the period of totalitarianism</i>)	Hospodářské noviny	
	03.05.2007	Triumf pravice: totalita se má zkoumat (<i>Triumph of the Right: Totalitarianism should be studied</i>)	Hospodářské noviny	Jan Kubita
A2.3	03.05.2007	Okupaci a éru komunismu prozkoumá zvláštní úřad (<i>A Special Institute will study the Occupation and the era of Communism</i>)	Lidové noviny	Václav Drchal
	03.05.2007	„Ústav totality“ má zelenou (<i>The “Totalitarian Institute” has the green light</i>)	Lidové noviny	Václav Drchal
A2.4	03.05.2007	Ústav proti agentům StB (<i>Institute against the StB agents</i>)	Mladá fronta DNES	Josef Kopecký
A2.5	03.05.2007	Koalice s přeběhlíky prosadila Ústav pro studium totalit (<i>Coalition with the defenders pushed through the Institute for the Study of Totalitarianism</i>)	Právo	Nad'a Adamičková, Marie Königová

Appendix 3: Discourse on Socialist Toponymy in the Czech Republic. Tier 1 - Macro Corpus B1 for sensitization and interdiscursivity assessment

Index	Date	Heading	Media	Author
B1.1	27.11.1998	Volgograd zase Stalingradem: Jaká je to zpráva pro Ostravu?	Haló noviny	<i>Ivo Havlík</i>
B1.2	11.02.1999	Ruské názvy trnem v oku	Liberecký den	<i>Dagmar Vodvářková</i>
B1.3	11.02.1999	Některé ostravské ulice nesou jména i bezvýznamných lidí	Ostravský den	<i>Jana Paštiková</i>
B1.4	08.04.1999	Názvy ulic po komunistických předácích někde přežívají	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Rostislav Hányš</i>
B1.5	21.04.1999	Názvy ulic z období komunismu zůstaly v paměti starousedlíků	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(čv)</i>
B1.6	11.05.1999	Z Bolševické bude nyní Spojná	Region - Týdeník okresu Nový Jičín	<i>(vlk)</i>
B1.7	21.06.1999	Na jména komsomolců a vojáků v adresách si obyvatelé zvykli	Moravskoslezský den	<i>Mirka Chlebounová</i>
B1.8	21.06.1999	Předseda muzejní komise: Nemůžeme nařídít přejmenování ulic	Moravskoslezský den	<i>Šárka Swiderová</i>
B1.9	02.11.1999	Leninovu ulici ani Lidových milicí dnes lidé nenajdou	Region - Havířovsko	<i>Lenka Císařová</i>
B1.10	28.12.1999	Pozor: další změna názvu náměstí!	Region - Týdeník Ostrava	<i>Kachnislav Divoký</i>
B1.11	08.01.2000	Přejmenovávání ulic skončilo	Večerník Praha	<i>Luděk Schreib</i>
B1.12	10.01.2000	Přejmenovávání ulic snad skončilo	Střední Čechy	<i>Luděk Schreib</i>
B1.13	06.02.2001	"Názvy ulic se již nemění"	Region - Frýdecko - Místecko	<i>Pavla Fucimanová</i>
B1.14	05.06.2001	Nové názvy vybírá komise	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(zch)</i>
B1.15	05.06.2001	Jména měnily státní režimy	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Tomáš Zajíc</i>
B1.16	18.08.2001	Stalin se opět vrací	Svoboda	<i>Jiří Navrátil</i>
B1.17	29.01.2002	Jak se Karlova huť stala Stalingradem	Region - Frýdecko - Místecko	
B1.18	01.03.2002	Přejmenují se "rudé" ulice?	Deník Jablonecka	<i>Alena Šejblová</i>
B1.19	24.06.2003	Ostrava půjde do Evropy s komunistickými názvy ulic!	Region - Týdeník Ostrava	<i>(jas, rac)</i>
B1.20	02.07.2003	Ulici zůstane komunistovo jméno	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(hdk)</i>
B1.21	16.08.2003	Stehelčeveští reformátoři	Haló noviny	<i>Miroslav Hrach, Stehlečeves</i>
B1.22	11.06.2004	Volgograd kritizoval	Právo	<i>(kab)</i>
B1.23	06.08.2004	Bude ulice Šmeralova, či Tigridova?	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Petr Štefan</i>
B1.24	13.08.2004	Přejmenovávání pražských ulic	TV Praha	
B1.25	31.08.2004	Masaryk ani po letech nevystřadil z ulice Fučíka	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(dvo)</i>
B1.26	01.09.2004	Fučíkova ulice z domů nezmizela	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(dvo)</i>
B1.27	13.11.2004	Nemizely jen pomníky, ale měnila se i jména desítek ulic	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(vid)</i>

B1.28	13.11.2004	Symbole režimu připomínají jen fotky	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(pse, j až)</i> <i>Vladimír Bílek,</i> <i>Ivan Truhlička,</i> <i>Martin Filip, Jan</i> <i>Hrudka</i>
B1.29	13.11.2004	Nejprve zmizely z náměstí sochy	Mladá fronta DNES	
B1.30	20.11.2004	Stovky lidí žijí stále v ulicích, které připomínají komunismus	Deník Mostecka	<i>Martin Vokurka</i>
B1.31	19.01.2005	Ulice Pavla Tigrida? Kvůli dokladům zůstane Šmeralovou	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Jan David</i>
B1.32	22.01.2005	Svoji ulici v Liberci budou mít také dobrodruhové	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Jan Šůra</i>
B1.33	24.01.2005	Lenost vítězí	Týden	
B1.34	07.02.2005	Přejmenovat při změně počasí	Týden	<i>Marek Pokorný,</i> <i>Karel Kačmařík,</i> <i>Brno</i>
B1.35	08.02.2005	Chtějí přejmenovat ulici Zdeňka Nejedlého zatím hledají jak...	Noviny Náchodska	<i>Jiří Řezník (řez)</i>
B1.36	19.02.2005	Místo Nejedlého půjdou K Ráji	Hradecké noviny	<i>(řez)</i>
B1.37	21.02.2005	Uctíváči Gottwalda	Týden	<i>Ivan Motýl</i>
B1.38	23.02.2005	Jak se ruší komunista?	Lidové noviny	<i>Jiří X. Doležal</i>
B1.39	27.02.2005	Jména daná stranou	Nedělní Blesk	<i>Eva Michorová</i>
B1.40	16.11.2005	Lidé často používají názvy ulic z komunistické éry	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(stc)</i>
B1.41	16.11.2005	V Praze stále zůstávají stopy komunismu	Mladá fronta DNES	
B1.42	16.11.2005	Minulost připomíná i socha budovatele	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Pavla Kubálková</i>
B1.43	01.04.2006	Semily: boj o Olbrachtu	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Jana Šrůtková,</i> <i>Michael Polák</i>
B1.44	21.06.2006	Obyvatelé Kadaně: Fučíkovu ulici chceme!	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(ČTK, ula)</i>
B1.45	16.11.2006	Komunistické názvy ulic přežívají	Vyškovský deník	<i>(mor/cid/msk)</i>
B1.46	16.11.2006	Ulicím se vrátila původní jména	Blanenský deník	<i>Karolína</i> <i>Opatřilová</i>
B1.47	16.11.2006	Jak se ulice dříve jmenovaly?	Mělnický deník	
B1.48	16.11.2006	Modly komunismu skončily ve dvoře	Třebíčský deník	<i>Miroslava</i> <i>Čermáková</i>
B1.49	16.11.2006	Už šestnáct let bez Gottwaldova	Zlínský deník	<i>Libuše Kučerová</i>
B1.50	16.11.2006	Po revoluci zmizela z ulic jména stranických vůdců	Krkonošský deník	
B1.51	16.11.2006	Komunistické vůdce poslali Mělničtí k šípku	Mělnický deník	<i>(wik)</i>
B1.52	16.11.2006	V ulicích je stále vidět minulý režim	Ústecký deník	<i>(pf)</i>
B1.53	16.11.2006	Marxova ulice zůstala díky levici	Svitavský deník	<i>(mag. klu, ref)</i>
B1.54	16.11.2006	Iljiče nahradila svoboda, Klému exstarosta Ulrich	Hradecký deník	<i>Martin Černý</i>
B1.55	16.11.2006	Jména vůdců komunismu zmizela z ulic a náměstí	Náchodský deník	<i>(ost, řez, mm)</i>
B1.56	16.11.2006	Lenin i Marx zmizeli z ulic	Náchodský deník	
B1.57	16.11.2006	Změnily se i názvy ulic	Litoměřický deník	<i>(ich)</i>
B1.58	16.11.2006	Engelsova je pryč, Marxova zůstala	Hodonínský deník	<i>Petr Lysoněk,</i> <i>Bohuna Mikulicová</i>
B1.59	16.11.2006	Z Leninovy je Růžová	Břeclavský deník	<i>Ivana Solaříková</i>

B1.60	16.11.2006	Z názvů ulic zmizela jména hrdinů socialismu	Žatecký a lounský deník	<i>Hynek Dlouhý</i>
B1.61	16.11.2006	Ulicím dává jméno režim	Kroměřížský deník	<i>Eva Gremlicová</i>
B1.62	16.11.2006	Ulice se mění s dobou	Jičínský deník	
B1.63	16.11.2006	Ulice s novými jmény navrhla komise	Frýdecko-místecký a třinecký deník	<i>Boleslav Navrátil</i>
B1.64	16.11.2006	O nových jménech na ostravských nárožích, stará označení nikdo nechtěl	Frýdecko-místecký a třinecký deník	<i>Boleslav Navrátil</i>
B1.65	16.11.2006	17. listopad zboutil Gottwalda i komín	Nymburský deník	<i>Zdena Léblová</i>
B1.66	16.11.2006	Pionýrská v Rožnově zůstala	Valašský deník	<i>Lenka Plačková</i>
B1.67	20.11.2006	Od Gottwalda ke Krakonošovi	Týden	<i>Ivan Motýl</i>
B1.68	21.11.2006	Engelsova vzala za své, Marxova ulice zůstává	Slovácko - regionální týdeník	<i>Petr Lysoněk, Bohuna Mikulicová</i>
B1.69	22.11.2006	Listopad 1989 změnil mnohé	Týden u nás, okresní noviny	<i>Jiří Ševčík</i>
B1.70	08.08.2007	Názvy ulic: jak Palach porazil Rudou armádu	tyden.cz	<i>Dina Podzimková</i>
B1.71	15.08.2007	Staroměstská ulice přežila komunistický režim	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Jan Štifter</i>
B1.72	04.09.2007	Na jihu má park Lenin i Gottwald	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Jan Štifter</i>
B1.73	10.09.2007	Stačil by dvacet centimetrový Koněv	Haló noviny	<i>Jaroslav Kojzar</i>
B1.74	07.11.2007	Radnice připravuje přejmenování některých ulic a veřejných míst	TV Nova	
B1.75	08.11.2007	Komunisté udrželi pozice, oběť procesů musí počkat	Právo	<i>(ib)</i>
B1.76	09.01.2008	Devět ulic dostalo vlastní názvy	Metro	<i>ČTK</i>
B1.77	11.03.2008	Jihlava má stále „Rudák“	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Tomáš Blažek</i>
B1.78	07.07.2008	Sametová revoluce vrátila Praze náměstí Jana Palacha	Listy hlavního města Prahy	<i>Rudolf Blažek</i>
B1.79	28.11.2008	Přerovské ulice nesou jména rodáků	Nové Přerovsko	<i>Miroslav Rozkošný</i>
B1.80	20.12.2008	Dřív Stalínova třída, dnes Bařova	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Zdeněk Matyáš</i>
B1.81	04.03.2009	Karvinští komunisté se bili za Julia Fučíka	Karvinský deník	<i>Tomáš Januszek</i>
B1.82	04.03.2009	Park už ne Fučíkův, ale Univerzitní	Haló noviny	<i>(ca)</i>
B1.83	05.03.2009	Park už se nejmenuje podle Fučíka. Komunisté protestují	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Jaroslav Baďura</i>
B1.84	05.03.2009	Karviná přišla o park Julia Fučíka	ČRo - Ostrava	
B1.85	17.03.2009	Rekordmanem mezi přejmenovanými ulicemi je Opletalova	Právo	<i>Jana Šprunková</i>
B1.86	01.10.2009	Listopadová revoluce vrátila do Ústí nad Labem náměstí	Sedmicka	<i>Romana Žatecká</i>
B1.87	01.10.2009	Listopadová revoluce vrátila do Ústí nad Labem náměstí	sedmicka.cz	<i>Romana Žatecká</i>
B1.88	03.10.2009	Názvy ulic před rokem 1989 určovala politika	Moravskoslezský deník	<i>Boleslav Navrátil</i>
B1.89	27.10.2009	V. I. Lenina vystřídal Masaryk	sedmicka.cz	<i>Zdeněk Mlynařík</i>
B1.90	28.10.2009	Gottwalda a Lenina nahradil Masaryk	sedmicka.cz	<i>Martina Muziková</i>
B1.91	29.10.2009	Křížová, Pionýrů a zase zpět	Sedmicka	<i>Tomáš Blažek</i>
B1.92	02.11.2009	Křížová, Pionýrů a zase zpět	sedmicka.cz	<i>Nela Maťašeje</i>
B1.93	10.11.2009	Leninka a Gagarinka. Za zásluhy	sedmicka.cz	<i>Pavel Mokřý</i>

B1.94	12.11.2009	I za války nesla ulice jméno starosty Bašteckého. Změnu přinesli soudruzi	Táborský deník	<i>Václav Jelínek</i>
B1.95	28.11.2009	Hradba vzdoru	Haló noviny	<i>Miroslav Grebeníček</i>
B1.96	30.11.2009	Stalin zmizel z města před dvaceti lety	Šumperský a jesenický deník	<i>Stanislava Rybičková</i>
B1.97	01.12.2009	Před dvaceti lety zmizel Stalin	Moravský sever	<i>Stanislava Rybičková</i>
B1.98	15.12.2009	Zlín se vrátil ke svému původnímu jménu před 20 lety	ČT 1	
B1.99	15.12.2009	Zlín se vrátil ke svému původnímu jménu před 20 lety	ČT 24	
B1.100	15.12.2009	Jak se Gottwaldov přejmenoval zpátky na Zlín	ct24.cz	<i>ČT24</i>
B1.101	12.01.2010	Opavské ulice a veřejná prostranství měnily názvy i vzhled	sedmicka.cz	<i>Žaneta Horáková</i>
B1.102	14.01.2010	Cesta do pravěku. S úřední mapou	Sedmicka	<i>Václav Fikar</i>
B1.103	22.01.2010	Cesta do pravěku. S úřední mapou	sedmicka.cz	<i>Václav Fikar</i>
B1.104	22.02.2010	Památka na pohlaváry? Praha minulost odmítá	Pražský deník	<i>Jan Zelenka</i>
B1.105	22.02.2010	Pozůstatky komunismu města neřeší	Hradecký deník	<i>...13</i>
B1.106	27.03.2010	Komunistické názvy ulic stále dráždí	Sokolovský deník	
B1.107	27.03.2010	Komunistické názvy ulic dráždí i roky po pádu režimu	Sokolovský deník	<i>Jiří Drozdík</i>
B1.108	31.03.2010	Komunistické názvy ulic dráždí i roky po revoluci	Týdeník Sokolovska	<i>Jiří Drozdík</i>
B1.109	22.09.2010	Lenin má na ulici v Mikulově pořád svoji ceduli	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Ivana Solaříková</i>
B1.110	13.01.2011	Proč má ulici Pulíř a kdo byli jircháři? Historie vepsaná do cedulí	Sedmicka	<i>Jana Soukupová</i>
B1.111	24.02.2011	Co soudruzi odkázali Přerovu	Přerovský a hranický deník	<i>Petra Poláková-Uvírová, Pavla Kubištová</i>
B1.112	25.02.2011	Duch minulosti: co soudruzi odkázali Přerovu	Nové Přerovsko	<i>Petra Poláková-Uvírová, Pavla Kubištová</i>
B1.113	15.06.2011	Nesouhlasíš s vývojem po roce 1989? Tak to budeš komunista! (Pavel Nítka)	idnes.cz - blog	
B1.114	22.09.2011	Jména libereckých ulic: velitel sovětské armády i komunista	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(mt)</i>
B1.115	08.06.2012	Ulice v centru Karviné nese jméno dělnického vůdce	Karvinský deník	<i>(ava)</i>
B1.116	08.06.2012	Ulice v centru Karviné nese jméno dělnického vůdce	Havířovský deník	<i>(ava)</i>
B1.117	16.07.2012	Stanice Pionýrů. Chybělo málo	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Pavel Švec</i>
B1.118	10.08.2012	Karvinská ulice se jmenuje po komunistickém novináři	Havířovský deník	<i>(dog)</i>
B1.119	17.08.2012	Ulice nese jméno klasika socialistické pedagogiky	Havířovský deník	<i>(jp)</i>

B1.120	29.09.2012	Ulice v Havířově nese jméno manželů popravených za špionáž	Havířovský deník	(p)
B1.121	10.11.2012	Havířovská ulice nese jméno levicové novinářky	Havířovský deník	Tomáš Januszek
B1.122	29.12.2012	Ulice nesoucí jméno pedagoga vizionáře je dnes ostudou města	Havířovský deník	Tomáš Januszek
B1.123	04.01.2013	Stále najdeme ulice bolševických idolů	Novojičínský deník	(edm)
B1.124	07.01.2013	Duch KSČ v ulicích Ostravy obchází i nadále	Mladá fronta DNES	Markéta Radová
B1.125	11.01.2013	Gavlas, Matuška, Miska. Ulice nazvané po členech KSČ rozdělují Ostravany	ostrava.iDNES.cz	MF DNES, Markéta Radová
B1.126	02.02.2013	Stalingrad	Lidové noviny	Zbyněk Petráček
B1.127	08.03.2013	Bruntál si připomíná Čs. armádu, Krnov Čsl. armádu	Bruntálský a krnovský deník	Fidel Kuba
B1.128	05.04.2013	Ulice s názvem po předválečném komunistickém předákovi	Havířovský deník	Josef Pintér
B1.129	31.05.2013	Jméno připomíná socialistický realismus	Novojičínský deník	(ipa)
B1.130	09.08.2013	Ulice v Havířově je pojmenovaná po duchovním otci komunismu	Havířovský deník	(jp)
B1.131	24.09.2013	Chomutov se stydí za exstarostu, jinde nevdáí Gottwald či Stalin	tyden.cz	Josef Kolina
B1.132	22.11.2013	Ulice ve Frýdku nese jméno novináře Jana Švermy	Frýdecko-místecký a třinecký deník	(mach)
B1.133	21.02.2014	Hrdinové budou mít své ulice	5plus2	Veronika Pohanková
B1.134	22.02.2014	Generál Píka dostane v Budějovicích ulici	5plus2.cz	5plus2.cz, Veronika Pohanková
B1.135	11.04.2014	Havířovská ulice pojmenovaná po spoluzakladateli komunistické strany	Havířovský deník	Josef Pintér
B1.136	18.04.2014	Ulice v centru Havířova nese jméno prvního národního umělce in memoriam	Havířovský deník	Josef Pintér
B1.137	25.04.2014	Ulice v Havířově nese jméno únorového komunistického ministra průmyslu	Havířovský deník	(jp)
B1.138	16.05.2014	Ulice v Havířově pojmenovaná po nacisty popraveném spisovateli	Havířovský deník	Josef Pintér
B1.139	16.05.2014	Po stopách názvů ulic / 23	Jihlavské listy	Lenka Kopčáková
B1.140	10.07.2014	Archivář: Pojmenovat ulici po Zdeňku Vojířovi je špatně	Příbramský deník	Markéta Jankovská
B1.141	05.08.2014	„Masarykác“: Ringplatz, náměstí Lidových milicí nebo Hlavní náměstí	Moravskoslezský deník	Jakub Malchárek
B1.142	20.10.2014	V roce 1991 mizely z Třebíče sochy a měnily se názvy ulic	Třebíčský deník	František Vondrák
B1.143	13.11.2014	Jaroslav Vykouk: Dnešní generace už název Švermov s bývalým komunistickým poslancem nespojuje	Kladenský deník	Daniela Řečínská
B1.144	13.11.2014	17. listopadu uplyne 25 let od revoluce Laurin vymazal Engelse. Tedy z mapy	Boleslavský deník	Lucie Růžková
B1.145	14.11.2014	Z Gottwaldova se zase stal Zlín a náměstí i ulice měnily jména	5plus2	Petr Skácel

B1.146	14.11.2014	Gottwald, Lenin i Fučík zmizeli z mapy města, jiní však zůstali	5plus2	<i>Petr Wojnar</i>
B1.147	14.11.2014	Revoluce Budějovice rozsvítila	5plus2	<i>Antonín Pelíšek</i>
B1.148	15.11.2014	Zmizeli i z ulic	Písecký deník	
B1.149	15.11.2014	Listopad Plzeň přejmenoval, později i proměnil	Plzeňský deník	<i>Miroslava Tolarová</i>
B1.150	18.11.2014	Z Marxovky na Gottwaldův. Hradec před Listopadem 89	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Michaela Rambousková</i>
B1.151	18.11.2014	Trefili byste v Hradci před Listopadem? Byla tam Marxovka i Gottwaldův	hradec.iDNES.cz	<i>MF DNES, Michaela Rambousková</i>
B1.152	20.11.2014	Listopad přejmenoval ulice, náměstí i školy	Klatovský deník	<i>David Kojan</i>
B1.153	25.11.2014	Řadu ulic čekala po listopadu 1989 změna názvu	Moravskoslezský deník	<i>Jakub Malchárek</i>
B1.154	14.12.2014	Revoluce v metru: Z Gottwaldovy Vyšehrad a z Moskevské Anděl	ct24.cz	<i>mld</i>
B1.155	21.12.2014	Řadu ulic v Ostravě čekala po listopadu 1989 změna názvu	denik.cz	
B1.156	03.01.2015	Zlín je znovu Zlínem už čtvrt století	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(alá)</i>
B1.157	03.01.2015	Uběhlo 41 let a z Gottwaldova byl opět Zlín	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Martina Malá, Milan Libiger</i>
B1.158	11.01.2015	Pětadvacet let od návratu ke Zlínu: Gottwaldov místní nikdy nepřijali	zlin.iDNES.cz	<i>Martina Malá, Milan Libiger</i>
B1.159	20.01.2015	Archivář bojuje proti „ruským“ názvům ulic v Karlových Varech. Zatím neúspěšně	zpravy.tiscali.cz	<i>mba</i>
B1.160	20.01.2015	Názvy ulic v Karlových Varech jsou ostudou, zlobí se archivář	tyden.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
B1.161	21.01.2015	Vary budou dál jako odraz mapy Ruska: Charkovská, Gorkého, Jaltská, Krymská	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>(ČTK)</i>
B1.162	22.01.2015	Petr Cais: Karlovy Vary přejmenovaly jen nejkřiklavější názvy ulic z komunistické éry	Karlovarský deník	<i>(iva)</i>
B1.163	29.01.2015	Názvy ulic související s Ruskem se měnit nebudou	Právo	<i>Rudolf Voleman</i>
B1.164	19.02.2015	Liberecké ulice: vítejte v socialismu	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Tomáš Lánský</i>
B1.165	20.02.2015	Proletářská i Cesta JZD. Názvy libereckých ulic pořád vězí v socialismu	liberec.iDNES.cz	<i>5plus2.cz, Tomáš Lánský</i>
B1.166	28.02.2015	Stalinov, Uhlokopy, Pokrokov	Magazín Víkend DNES	<i>Klára Kubičková</i>
B1.167	16.04.2015	Sady Pětatřicátníků: Historie s Nejedlého otazníkem	Plzeňský deník	<i>David Růžička</i>
B1.168	31.07.2015	Ulicím nestihli dát nová jména	Vyškovský deník	<i>(haf)</i>
B1.169	17.08.2015	Sovětský název se vžil. Přečkal i nové pořádky	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Jiří Bárta</i>
B1.170	20.08.2015	Ulice Ludvíka Svobody sice odrážela naději, ale měla jepičí život	Plzeňský deník	<i>David Růžička</i>
B1.171	30.12.2015	Svazarmovská, Pionýrská, Julia Fučíka. Názvy ulic města nezmění	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Viktor Chrást</i>
B1.172	30.12.2015	Svazarmovská, Pionýrská, Fučíka. Názvy ulic se kvůli byrokracii nezmění	zlin.iDNES.cz	<i>MF DNES, Viktor Chrást</i>
B1.173	09.02.2016	Hloupost se přejmenovat nedá	Haló noviny	<i>Jiří Maštálka</i>

B1.174	28.03.2016	Původně vzorový projekt ostravského sídliště se změnil ve Stalingrad	moravskoslezsky.denik.cz	
B1.175	14.05.2016	Bydlíme Na Rušičce. Zuříme v kolonách u Totálu	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Miloslav Lubas</i>
B1.176	16.05.2016	Gottwald'ák, Totál, Rušička. Úředně nejsou, ale bez nich by se bloudilo	liberec.iDNES.cz	<i>MF DNES, Miloslav Lubas</i>
B1.177	20.09.2016	Olomoucké ulice jak je (ne)znáte - 17. listopadu	olomouckadrbna.cz	
B1.178	15.11.2016	Nejvíce vadila jména komunistů a revolucionářů, říká pamětnice	Týdeník Havířovsko	<i>(toj)</i>
B1.179	15.11.2016	Z náměstí Vítězného února bylo najednou náměstí Republiky	Týdeník Havířovsko	
B1.180	16.11.2016	Revoluční Praha	Pražský deník	
B1.181	16.11.2016	Ulice v hlavním městě se zbavovaly komunistických názvů až do poloviny 90. let	prazsky.denik.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
B1.182	16.11.2016	Ulice v hlavním městě se zbavovaly komunistických názvů až do poloviny 90. let	denik.cz	<i>ČTK</i>
B1.183	16.11.2016	Ulice v hlavním městě se zbavovaly komunistických názvů až do poloviny 90. let	Pražský deník	<i>Andrea Karlíková</i>
B1.184	18.11.2016	Ulice v hlavním městě se zbavovaly komunistických názvů až do poloviny 90. let	Benešovský deník	<i>Andrea Karlíková</i>
B1.185	22.03.2017	Rudé armády, Sovětská. Ulice, které uvízly v socialismu	Vyškovský deník	<i>Adéla Jelínková</i>
B1.186	22.03.2017	Rudé armády, Sovětská. Ulice, které uvízly v socialismu	vyskovsky.denik.cz	<i>Redakce</i>
B1.187	10.11.2017	Ve jménu Lenina: Vypátrali jsme, jaký osud měly bývalé Leninovy třídy a náměstí v Česku	ihned.cz	<i>Vladimír Ševela</i>
B1.188	10.11.2017	Ve jménu Lenina	ego!	<i>Vladimír Ševela</i>
B1.189	10.11.2017	Ve jménu Lenina: Vypátrali jsme, jaký osud měly bývalé Leninovy třídy a náměstí v Česku	iHNed.cz	<i>Vladimír Ševela</i>
B1.190	01.02.2018	Hitlera a Gottwalda vystřídaly neutrální názvy	Tachovský deník	<i>JIŘÍ KOHOUT</i>
B1.191	01.02.2018	Ulicím Chomutovska dominuje Jan Hus. „Porazil“ Havlíčka, Smetanu i Němcovou	chomutovsky.denik.cz	<i>Miroslava Šebestová</i>
B1.192	01.02.2018	Ulicím Chomutovska dominuje Jan Hus	Chomutovský deník	<i>Miroslava Šebestová</i>
B1.193	01.02.2018	Gagarin v Boskovicích? Už přes 40 let	Blanenský deník	<i>(jch)</i>
B1.194	01.02.2018	Ulicím vládne Tyrš	Prostějovský deník	<i>Michal Sobecký</i>
B1.195	01.02.2018	Ostravsku vévodí ulice Zahradní	Moravskoslezský deník	<i>Aleš Uher</i>
B1.196	01.02.2018	Ulice připomínají Masaryka, Komenského... Ale též Gagarina nebo Makarenka.	Karvinský a havířovský deník	<i>Tomáš Januszek</i>
B1.197	01.02.2018	Ulice z českého nebe	Olomoucký deník	<i>Adam Fritscher</i>
B1.198	01.02.2018	Jaká jména vévodí ulicím? Komenský, Tyrš i významní odbojáři	prerovsky.denik.cz	<i>Petra Poláková-Uvírová</i>
B1.199	01.02.2018	Názvy ulic: Změny už skončily	Jihlavský deník	<i>Zpravodajové Deníku</i>

B1.200	01.02.2018	Ulice či náměstí na Vysočině nejčastěji patří novináři Borovskému	zdarsky.denik.cz, havlickobrodsky.denik.cz, jihlavsky.denik.cz, pelhřimovsky.denik.cz, trebický.denik.cz	<i>Marcel Moržol</i>
B1.201	01.02.2018	Ulicím vládne Amos	Přerovský a hranický deník	<i>Petra Poláková-Uvírová</i>
B1.202	02.02.2018	Ostravsku vévodí Zahradní ulice. Je jich devět. Víte, kde je najdete?	moravskoslezsky.denik.cz, denik.cz	<i>Aleš Uher</i>
B1.203	02.02.2018	Ostravsku vévodí Zahradní ulice. Je jich devět. Víte, kde je najdete?		<i>Aleš Uher</i>
B1.204	02.02.2018	Názvy ulic na Prostějovsku? Populární je Tyrš, nesmutní ani zahradníci	prostejovsky.denik.cz	<i>Michal Sobecký</i>
B1.205	02.02.2018	Ulicím vládne Komenský	Nové Přerovsko	<i>Petra Poláková-Uvírová</i>
B1.206	06.02.2018	Krátká, Nádražní. Názvy, které vydrží nejdéle	Moravský sever	<i>Petr Krňávek</i>
B1.207	06.02.2018	Názvy ulic? Vede místopis	Moravský sever	<i>Hana Kubová, Petr Krňávek</i>
B1.208	07.02.2018	Gagarinova ulice má přes 40 let	Týden u nás, okresní noviny	<i>Jan Charvát</i>
B1.209	14.04.2018	Diskuse: Komunistická Leninka se coby název ulice drží mezi lidmi v Teplicích dodnes	teplicky.denik.cz	
B1.210	14.04.2018	Komunistická Leninka se coby název ulice drží mezi lidmi v Teplicích dodnes	teplicky.denik.cz	<i>Petr Málek</i>
B1.211	03.06.2018	Zajímavost: Tabulka ve Strojeticích značí Stalinovu ulici	e-lounsko.cz	<i>Libor Želinský</i>
B1.212	24.10.2018	Názvy ulic se měnily i vracely k původnímu pojmenování	Písecký týden	<i>(kol)</i>
B1.213	13.01.2019	Jak se žilo v divokých 90. letech? Přejmenovávaly se ulice i města, vznikaly hypermarkety a internetem byly Zlaté stránky	refresher.sk, refresher.cz	
B1.214	18.04.2019	Marxova nebo Zápotockého. Komunistické názvy ulic přežívají i 30 let po revoluci	denik.cz	<i>Redakce</i>
B1.215	18.04.2019	Marx nebo Zápotocký. I 30 let po revoluci	Vyškovský deník	<i>Michal Sumec</i>
B1.216	18.04.2019	Marx nebo Zápotocký. Jména ulic z minulého režimu přežívají i 30 let po revoluci	znojensky.denik.cz, vyskovsky.denik.cz, blanensky.denik.cz, hodoninsky.denik.cz, denik.cz, breclavsky.denik.cz	<i>Redakce</i>
B1.217	20.04.2019	Přejmenovat ulice by bylo nákladné	TV Nova	
B1.218	11.05.2019	Marx nebo Zápotocký. I 30 let po revoluci v ulicích Vyškovska	Vyškovský deník	<i>Michal Sumec</i>
B1.219	27.06.2019	Leninovou třídou na letišti	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Matěj Ludvík</i>

B1.220	17.07.2019	Přejmenujte Koněvovu ulici, žádají Žižkov místní. Vadí jim, že se osvoboditel Prahy účastnil okupace Maďarska i ČSR	ihNed.cz	<i>Benedikt Lederer</i>
B1.221	17.07.2019	Žižkov zvažuje, že přejmenuje Koněvovu ulici	Hospodářské noviny	<i>Benedikt Lederer</i>
B1.222	17.07.2019	Přejmenujte Koněvovu ulici, žádají Žižkov místní. Vadí jim, že se osvoboditel Prahy účastnil okupace Maďarska i ČSR	ihned.cz	
B1.223	17.07.2019	My jsme zvyklí na Koněva, odmítají Žižkované snahu radnice Koněvovu ulici přejmenovat	aktualne.cz	<i>Magdaléna Čevelová, Marie Kolajová</i>
B1.224	21.07.2019	„Osvoboditel“ byl lump. Přejmenuje se Koněvova ulice na Žižkově?	prazsky.denik.cz, nusle.cz, michle.cz, podoli.cz, hradcany.cz	
B1.225	12.08.2019	Život před 30 lety. Z Gottwaldova je Zlín a z Gottwaldovy ulice je 28. října.	zoom.iprima.cz	
B1.226	22.08.2019	Krnov 1969: z Mikulášské..	Bruntálský a krnovský deník	
B1.227	22.08.2019	Krnov 1969: z Mikulášské je zas ulice Sovětské armády	bruntalsky.denik.cz	<i>František Kuba</i>
B1.228	24.08.2019	Nová jména, návrat dávných. Desítky ulic změnil název	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Klára Mrázová</i>
B1.229	01.09.2019	Stalinova i Moskevská, ulice si vysloužila titul Třída politických omylů	idnes.cz, regiony.impuls.cz	
B1.230	08.09.2019	Přemysl Votava: „Škraloupy“ Julia Fučíka?	politicke-listy.cz, parlamentnilisty.cz	
B1.231	08.09.2019	„Škraloupy“ Julia Fučíka?	magazin.panobcan.cz, novarepublika.cz, rukojmi.cz	<i>Ivan David</i>
B1.232	18.09.2019	Fučíkův? Chtějí přejmenovat most	Vyškovský deník	<i>Iva Haghofner</i>
B1.233	25.09.2019	V Břeclavi chtějí Havlův most, vystrnadil by Fučíka	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Ivana Solaříková</i>
B1.234	29.09.2019	V Břeclavi řeší název Fučíkova mostu, mohl by se jmenovat po Havlovi	regiony.impuls.cz	<i>Ivana Solaříková</i>
B1.235	29.09.2019	V Břeclavi řeší název Fučíkova mostu, mohl by se jmenovat po Havlovi	idnes.cz	
B1.236	18.10.2019	Zlín znovu Gottwaldovem? Trollové usilují o změnu názvu města	denik.cz	<i>Jana Zavadilová</i>
B1.237	20.10.2019	Lidových milicí, Gottwaldova, Leninova i Stalinova. Jak se měnila jména ulic?	olomoucky.rej.cz	
B1.238	31.10.2019	Lenina nahradil Masaryk, Fučíka Reynek. Názvy ulic se po revoluci změnil	regiony.impuls.cz	<i>Tomáš Blažek</i>
B1.239	31.10.2019	Lenina nahradil Masaryk, Fučíka Reynek. Názvy ulic se po revoluci změnil	iDNES.cz	<i>Autor: Tomáš Blažek</i>
B1.240	08.11.2019	Jak se ulicemi valilo 20. století	5plus2	<i>Jiří Bárta, Tomáš Blažek</i>
B1.241	11.11.2019	Lidových milicí, Gottwaldova, Leninova... Jak se měnila jména ulic?	Olomoucké listy	<i>mif</i>

B1.242	12.11.2019	S revolucí se ulicím a městům měnila jména! Někde se ale čas zastavil	nova.cz, tnbiz.cz, tn.cz	<i>rod TN.cz</i>
B1.243	18.11.2019	Po listopadu 1989 přišla další vlna přejmenovávání	Mladá fronta DNES	— <i>Petr Przeczek</i>
B1.244	19.11.2019	Pryč se symboly komunismu	REGION OPAVSKO	<i>Nikol Pačková</i>
B1.245	20.11.2019	Z Pionýrské Jahodová, z Rudé armády Beethovenova. Před 30 lety začalo masivní přejmenování ulic	ct24.cz	<i>brychtam</i>
B1.246	20.11.2019	Leninka, Stalin, Fučíkárna. Ideologický místopis zmizí až se třetí generací, říká etnoložka	ct24.cz	<i>manakv</i>
B1.247	09.12.2019	Proletářská nebo Spartakiádní? Ulice jsou skanzenem komunismu	Mladá fronta DNES	<i>Tomáš Lánský</i>

Appendix 4: Discourse on socialist toponymy in Ostrava. Tier 2 - Micro Corpus B2 for textual analysis

Index	Date	Heading	Media	Author
B2.1	11.02.1999	Některé ostravské ulice nesou jména i bezvýznamných lidí (<i>Some street in Ostrava carry the name of insignificant people</i>)	Ostravský den	Jana Paštiková
B2.2	05.03.1999	Ruská jména ulic se zřejmě jen tak nezmění (<i>The Russian street names probably will not change any time soon</i>)	Mladá fronta DNES	Pavel Grossmann
B2.3	21.06.1999	Předseda muzejní komise: Nemůžeme nařídít přejmenování ulic (<i>The Head of the Museum Committee: We cannot order street renaming</i>)	Moravskoslezský den	Šárka Swiderová
B2.4	21.06.1999	Na jména komsomolců a vojáků v adresách si obyvatelé zvykli (<i>The inhabitants got used to the names of Komsomoles and soldiers in their addresses</i>)	Moravskoslezský den	Mirka Chlebounová
B2.5	24.06.2003	Ostrava půjde do Evropy s komunistickými názvy ulic! (<i>Ostrava goes to Europe with Communist street names!</i>)	Region - Týdeník Ostrava	(jas, rac)
B2.6	20.11.2006	Od Gottwalda ke Krakonošovi (<i>From Gottwald to Krakonos</i>)	Týden	Ivan Motýl
B2.7	21.03.2007	Jména ulic ve vleku historie (<i>Street names in tow of history</i>)	Domažlický deník, Jihlavský deník, Českolipský deník, Písecký deník, Prostějovský deník, Benešovský deník	Josef Šlerka
B2.8	03.10.2009	Názvy ulic před rokem 1989 určovala politika (<i>The street names before 1989 were determined by politics</i>)	Moravskoslezský deník	Boleslav Navrátil
B2.9	11.01.2013	Gavlas, Matuška, Miska. Ulice nazvané po členech KSČ rozdělují Ostravany (<i>Gavlas, Matuška, Miska. Street names after KSČ members divide the people of Ostrava</i>)	ostrava.iDNES.cz	Markéta Radová
B2.10	07.01.2013	Duch KSČ v ulicích Ostravy obchází i nadále (<i>The specter of KSČ keeps haunting the streets of Ostrava</i>)	Mladá fronta DNES	Markéta Radová
B2.11	25.11.2014	Řadu ulic čekala po listopadu 1989 změna názvu (<i>Many street names were to change after November 1989</i>)	Moravskoslezský deník	Jakub Malchárek

B2.12	21.12.2014	Řadu ulic v Ostravě čekala po listopadu 1989 změna názvu (<i>Many street names were to change after November 1989</i>)	denik.cz	Jakub Malchárek
B2.13	28.02.2015	Stalinov, Uhlokopy, Pokrokov (<i>Stalin Town, Coalminersville, Progressville</i>)	Magazín Víkend DNES	Klára Kubičková
B2.14	07.03.2015	Místopisné rošády v Česku v běhu času: Stalinov, Mrdákov i Sračkov (<i>Toponymic shuffles in Czechia over time: Stalin Town, Fuckwille and Shitville</i>)	cestovani.iDNES.cz	Klára Kubičková
B2.15	31.08.2017	Ostrava-Zábřeh má jednu raritu. Řadu ulic pojmenovaných po sovětských vojácích (<i>Ostrava has one rarity. A set of streets names after Soviet soldiers</i>)	rozhlas.cz, ČRo - ostrava.cz	Petra Sasínová
B2.16	01.02.2018	Ostravsku vévodí Zahradní ulice (<i>The Garden street dominates the Ostrava county</i>)	Moravskoslezský deník	Aleš Uher
B2.17	02.02.2018	Ostravsku vévodí Zahradní ulice. Je jich devět. Víte, kde je najdete? (<i>The Garden street dominates the Ostrava county. Do you know where to find them?</i>)	denik.cz, moravskoslezsky.denik.cz	Aleš Uher
B2.18	20.11.2019	Z Pionýrské Jahodová, z Rudé armády Beethovenova. Před 30 lety začalo masivní přejmenování ulic (<i>From Pioneers' to Strawberry street, from Red Army's to Beethoven. The massive street renaming began 30 years ago</i>)	ct24.cz	Eva Kolovrátková

