

# Abstract

## Reflexia totalitných režimov v Poľsku a Československu po roku 1989

### Coming to term with totalitarian past in Poland and Czechoslovakia after the year 1989

The aim of the thesis is to compare the process of redistribution of justice (coming to term with communist past) in Poland and Czechoslovakia (with the emphasis on the Czech part of previous federal state) after the fall of authoritarian regime. In order to be able to understand all the circumstances and the discrepancies of these two transitions, the thesis analytically compares the way how transition was proceeded in both countries using Huntington typology of transition.

Based on Huntington and transitional justice theories, Poland went through slow transition since new elites had to negotiate every piece of an agreement, which took many years for Poland to transform into democratic country with all basic aspects of liberal democracy. While in Czech republic, transition took merely two weeks which is considered to be „hectic“ type of transition.

Based on the thesis, hectic transition had an influence on quick legislative changes enacting administrative lustration, while Polish progressive transition (and therefore strong necessity to cooperate for longer period of time with communist leaders) caused delay of administrative lustration.

Hectic transition and quick enactment had direct influence on punishment of former elites, which were displaced from public life. Although this has caused colonisation of private sphere by former elites which at the present is considered to be controversial.

On the other side, immediate implementation of law prevented from more important abundance of so called *wild lustration* which became reality in the Polish case. Therefore legal based administrative (not penal) transitional justice (in which lustration represents very efficient institute) is judged as vital model for decommunization of the region.

Last 20 years is characteristic for both transitions, Polish and Czech, normative insight and criminal labelling of authoritarian past (often confused with totalitarian one) and its elites.

Nevertheless, according to the personal belief of the author, next 20 years should be about professional, deliberative and independent research about our past. The ambition to punish previous leaders might seem sufficient in the very first years of democracy challenging transitional countries, but the approach attends its limits after two decades of the time.