

OCTOBER 28, 1918 AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE ORIGIN OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA IN HISTORY TEXTBOOKS OF THE CZECHS' NEIGHBOURS

Denisa LABISCHOVÁ

University of Ostrava

Blažena GRACOVÁ

University of Ostrava

ABSTRACT

October 28, 1918 represents one of the most important milestones of the Czech collective memory. The aim of the study is to capture the main traits of the explanatory reflection of the events related to the formation of the first Czechoslovak Republic in history textbooks of the selected neighbouring countries (Poland, Slovakia, Austria, and Hungary as a “historical neighbour”) and to compare them with the Czech approach, as well as mutually with each other focusing on the characteristics of educational texts which are typical for historical narration in each of the given countries. We focused in particular on the secondary school textbooks and a specific interpretation of the concrete themes which are accentuated in the national explanatory texts, on the one hand, or suppressed, on the other. The content analysis shows that there is an apparent effort for an objective approach, however, we can find there also stereotypical views which the authors of textbooks often repeatedly adopt or derive from the same specialized publications. The objectivity of their elaboration could be achieved by the elimination of inaccuracies, the simplifying characteristics leaving aside some essential facets of the problem and by overcoming a one-sided view focused only on one situation or event and neglecting other essential historical information.

KEYWORDS:

Czech collective memory; history textbooks; October 28, 1918.

The declaration of the independent Czechoslovak State in October 28, 1918 represents one of the most important milestones of modern national history. It is well impressed in the Czech collective memory and its symbolic significance has been codified in the form of a public holiday of the Czech Republic. Czech citizens have long shown deep respect and admiration to the efforts of the Czech and Slovak political representatives to push through and build a new democratic republic in the heart of Europe which is also confirmed by the results of a repeated empirical research focused on the sites of memory in the historical consciousness of the population, as well as on other similar surveys performed in a group of schoolchildren.¹

Stradling's principle of multi-perspectivity has been generally accepted in the modern theory of history teaching², and the theme of the breakup of the Habsburg monarchy and formation of Czechoslovakia is just the most appropriate to clarify the interpretation of historical events from various points of view. After World War I the ruling nations of Austro-Hungary were among the defeated and, on the contrary, the subjugated nations, due to the willingness of the winning powers to admit a fundamental change of the organization of Europe, got a chance to fulfil their long-time ambitions and ranked among the "winners" of the war. Of course, the results of the war will be viewed differently by the winner and the defeated. We should understand that within the newly formed "successor" states some of their nations or nationalities considered themselves as the winners while the others as the defeated. Czechoslovakia is a proof of this. The CSR was a desired state for the Czechs and the feelings of the Slovak national environment towards the end of the war can be also considered positive. The German population in the Czech lands experienced the war results as a crushing defeat, however, the winning states did not avoid mutual conflicts either, e.g., the Czech-Polish conflict resulted in the creation of a new form of a negative stereotype of a Czech as a "Prussian of the East".³

The aim of the present study is to capture the picture of the developments leading to the formation of Czechoslovakia created by foreign history textbooks, the differences between individual interpretations, on the one hand, and identical elements found

1 Š. Pfeiferová, J. Šubr, "Veřejné mínění o problematice českých dějin", *Naše společnost*, 2009, č. 2, p. 16-23; J. Šubr, J. Vinopal, "K otázce historického vědomí obyvatel České republiky", *Naše společnost*, 2010, č. 1, p. 9-20; D. Labischová, *Co si uchováme v paměti? Empirický výzkum historického vědomí*, Ostrava 2013.

2 According to R. Stradling, this is the term which is more used and less defined. The explanation that multi-perspectivity means "the ability and willingness to see a situation from various points of view" is sufficient for us. See R. Stradling, *Multiperspektivita ve vyučování dějepisu: příručka pro učitele*, Rada Evropy 2003, český překlad Praha 2004.

3 R. Kvaček, "Ke vzniku Československa", *Český časopis historický*, 1998, roč. 96, č. 4, p. 717-735; B. Gracová, *Vědomosti a postoje české a polské studující mládeže*, Ostrava 2004, p. 19.

in the narration of our neighbours, on the other. For this purpose we have analysed Polish, Austrian, and Slovak textbooks and we have also used two Hungarian texts in the Slovak translation for the purpose of comparison. We focused in particular on more recent secondary-school publications.⁴

In the research of school textbooks, various research tools have been applied taking into account the research subject and objective. Both the quantity and quality approaches are applied. Quantity methods in general monitor the occurrence, frequency, sequence, or degree of existence of the phenomenon studied and as regards textbooks they are mostly directed at the frequency of occurrence of structural components of a verbal and iconic text.⁵ Their disadvantage consists of the impossibility to capture the degree of functionality and adequacy of the implementation of individual didactic elements. Therefore, the quantity analysis is usually supplemented at least partially by a quality interpretation of the data studied.

The research in the discipline of history didactics is focused in particular on the quality (respectively non-quantity⁶) content analyses of textbooks for elementary and secondary schools governed by the criteria set in advance which are usually supplemented by inquiry methods (empirical research with respect to the use and preference of the concrete textbook titles) and comparative procedures (comparison of the Czech and foreign textbooks, synchronic and diachronic points of view).

In accordance with the research objective, the following themes have been determined in the research presented the interpretation of which became a basic criterion of the analysis of foreign textbooks:

- Evaluation of the reasons of the breakup of the Habsburg monarchy;
- The attitude of Czechs and Slovaks to the war, the Czechoslovak legions;
- The activities of the Czechoslovak exile and the domestic policy in the final phase of the First World War;
- The course of events from October to November 1918 (the Washington Declaration of 18 October 1918 and the subsequent appointment of the government on 14 November 1918);

⁴ We also make use of some of our previous works. Viz D. Labischová, *Čech závistivec – Rakušan byrokrat? Proměny obrazu Čechů, Rakušanů a jejich minulosti ve vědomí studující mládeže*, Ostrava 2005; B. Gracová, *Vědomosti a postoje...*; B. Gracová, "První republika v učebnicích našich sousedů", *Historica*, 2005, č. 12, p. 299–312; B. Gracová, "Češi a Poláci ve 20. století – obraz souseda na stránkách polských a českých dějepisných učebnic", in: *Vzájemný obraz souseda v polských a českých školních učebnicích*, ed. B. Gracová, D. Labischová, J. Szymczek, Ostrava 2014, p. 25-39.

⁵ The method was developed in our country in particular by Jan Průcha. See J. Průcha, *Učebnice: Teorie a analýzy edukačního média*, Praha 1998.

⁶ The concept was introduced by Peter Gavora. See P. Gavora, *Úvod do pedagogického výzkumu*, Brno 2000, p. 117.

- The Versailles system;
- Territorial conflicts, formation of the borderline of the CSR;
- Democratic nature of the CSR, political representatives of the country;
- Status of the national minorities in the newly formed CSR.

AUSTRIAN VIEW ON THE BREAKUP OF THE MONARCHY AND FORMATION OF THE CSR

The conception of Austrian textbooks reflects a specific integrating approach to history, social and political education where the educational content of these disciplines is integrated in a general school subject “*Geschichte und Sozialkunde/Politische Bildung*“. The results of the longitudinal research of the textbooks of our southern neighbour indicate a certain gradual reduction of historical subject matter in favour of the topical social themes (migration, terrorism, global environmental issues).

If we look into the publication *Netzwerk Geschichte&Politik* designated for junior classes of the general secondary school (*allgemeinbildende höhere Schule*), we will find out that students learn only fragmentary information about the formation of Czechoslovakia. It contains an abbreviated and simplified text of Wilson’s peace plan – it is students’ task to look up the passages in the text which concern the right to national self-determination and measures to secure peace.⁷ The dissolution of the Danube monarchy is included in a separate subchapter within the chapter entitled “How was the Republic of Austria formed from the Habsburg monarchy?” Czechoslovakia is plotted on the map of successor states of Austro-Hungary with a question attached to it – Which of these new states became multinational again? In connection with the Treaty of Saint-Germain determining a new borderline of the state it is only briefly stated that Austria had to recognize the independence of Poland, the CSR and other states.⁸

We turned our particular attention, however, to the textbooks designated for the senior classes of secondary schools. The development leading directly to the breakup of Austro-Hungary in the textbook *Der Mensch im Wandel der Zeiten* is definitely attributed to the nationalistic efforts of the Czech politicians. It is written here that a conciliatory gesture of Charles I to convene the Reichstag and grant a pardon to the Czech politicians imprisoned for high treason was interpreted by the Slavs as the

⁷ J. Hofer, B. Paireder, *Netzwerk Geschichte@Politik 3. Geschichte und Sozialkunde/Politische Bildung, Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch für die 7. Schulstufe*, Linz 2013, p. 135.

⁸ J. Hofer, B. Paireder, *Netzwerk Geschichte@Politik 3. Geschichte und Sozialkunde/Politische Bildung, Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch für die 7. Schulstufe*, Linz 2013, p. p. 136.

emperor's weakness and they intensified their demands for a change of the monarchy into a federal country of equal nations. The demand for the right to self-determination of nations contained in the 14 Points of President Wilson is interpreted as "the most dangerous weapon" of the West against the Central Powers. The authors emphasize that although the 14 Points did not require the dissolution of the monarchy, Tomas Masaryk understood it in such a way and established the Czechoslovak National Council, formed his own legions from deserters and prisoners of war fighting on the side of the Alliance, achieved the participation of Slovaks in the common state against a promise of equality, and finally he reached the recognition of the National Council as the Czechoslovak government.⁹

The issues concerned are quite briefly addressed in the textbook *Einst und heute*.¹⁰ In the chapter "The end of the war and revolution" we learn that after the death of Franz Joseph I, Slavonic and in particular Czech military groups deserted to the side of the Russian Army and that Tomas Masaryk established the exile government in London (?) and the Czechs declared independence in Paris (?).¹¹ In the passage "A dangerous right to self-determination" the authors used a quotation from the publication *The state and nation in the history of Europe* stating that the newly formed states became the power instruments of majority nations to suppress minorities. The attached table of the numbers of national minorities in ten European countries taken over from another source attributes to the CSR a figure of their 52% representation in 1921 (?). The students are then asked to assess the topicality of national conflicts and principles based on which the individual national states have been formed.¹²

Readers learn about "a denial of the right to self-determination" to the German citizens in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia and annexation of their territories to the neighbouring country, which had nevertheless occupied them by military forces, in the context of the terms and conditions of the agreement with Austria. Their task is to find out territorial losses and consider the conflicts of the 20th century which are related to that borderline delimitation.¹³ The annexation of Slovakia to Czechoslovakia by the Treaty of Trianon is just mentioned.¹⁴ The issues concerning the establishment of Czechoslovakia and "non-fulfilment" of the Germans' right to self-determination is again and more thoroughly addressed in the chapter "The fight for the national territory". A cartogram depicting the *German Austria 1918-1920* points out the territories

⁹ A. Absenger, *Der Mensch im Wandel der Zeiten 1*, Wien 1999, p. 234.

¹⁰ G. Hueber, E. Shröckenfuchs, *Einst und heute 7*, Wien 2001.

¹¹ G. Hueber, E. Shröckenfuchs, *Einst und heute 7*, Wien 2001, p. 81-105.

¹² G. Hueber, E. Shröckenfuchs, *Einst und heute 7*, Wien 2001, p. 84.

¹³ G. Hueber, E. Shröckenfuchs, *Einst und heute 7*, Wien 2001, p. 84.

¹⁴ G. Hueber, E. Shröckenfuchs, *Einst und heute 7*, Wien 2001, p. 86.

of the Czech Lands which Deutsch-Österreich claimed.¹⁵ A question is attached to this cartogram, namely whether the administration of Deutschböhmen and Sudetenland could be possible from Vienna. Moreover, the Austrian demands are documented also by the law of November 22, 1918. In the passage “The lost ‘Sudeten’”, the demonstrations of the Germans in the CSR against the annexation to Austria are mentioned with reference to the right of the nations to self-determination. It is said that the military occupation of these territories upon agreement of the Allied Powers denied such right to three million Germans.¹⁶ A more detailed explanation of the interpretation of the breakup of the monarchy and establishment of the CSR and Austria can serve as an example which is typical also to other Austrian teaching materials.

The authors of the publication *Zeitzeichen* state, in the comments on the Treaty of Trianon, the loss of Slovakia in favour of the CSR; however, they also mention an attempt to acquire it again by the communist government of Béla Kun. They present Europe after the First World War by a cartogram and mark out the national minorities in individual countries. From the Austrian point of view, a particular interest is devoted to the German minority which is located in the Czech borderlands but also in Slovakia. On the contrary, however, no Hungarians remained there according to the map included therein. The Carpathian Ruthenia is reflected as a foreign-nation territory inhabited by Slavs (with no detailed specification).¹⁷

The clarification of ethnic composition of the teaching text *Durch die Vergangenheit zur Gegenwart* does not leave aside the German minorities living in the territory of the CSR, Hungarians, Ruthenians and Poles. Just the title of the passage “A magic word of self-determination” indicates that the attention will be again turned to a promise of the right to self-determination given by President Wilson. The authors add that the Austrians soon had to take into account that this did not apply to them. It is specified that when delimiting borders in the Czech Lands a historical principle prevailed over the ethnic aspect, based on which Slovakia became part of Czechoslovakia. They say that the Czech exile politicians persuaded the Allied Powers that the state would not be viable without the industrial borderlands. The text is supplemented by a quotation that the CSR received a “mortgage” due to which the monarchy crashed. It became a multinational state denying the right to self-determination to three million Germans and took a military action against their resistance.¹⁸

¹⁵ G. Hueber, E. Shröckenfuchs, *Einst und heute 7*, Wien 2001, p. 86.

¹⁶ G. Hueber, E. Shröckenfuchs, *Einst und heute 7*, Wien 2001, p. 106-107.

¹⁷ M. Eigner et al., *Zeitzeichen Geschichte und Kultur II WB*, Linz 2002, p. 138-139.

¹⁸ Pokorný, Lemberger, Lobner, *Durch die Vergangenheit zur Gegenwart 7*, Linz 2002, p. 76-77.

The authors of the latest analysed textbook *Thema: Geschichte* for the senior classes of the secondary school state that the nationalism stirred up during the war continued to spread after its end and led many countries to dictatorship and oppression. In the Chapter entitled “The Versailles system”, it is written that World War I has completely changed the map of Europe. The successor states are enumerated while the establishment of the Little Entente and its purpose is also mentioned here – a defence against any attempts to restore the Habsburg monarchy.¹⁹ The death of Franz Joseph I is mentioned in the subchapter entitled “The breakup of the monarchy” as a symbol of a certain political turn topped off on October 10, 1918 with the Manifest of the emperor Charles on the federalisation of the state. According to the authors it appeared too late and even speeded up the breakup of the monarchy. The date of the declaration of Czechoslovakia, October 28, 1918 is explicitly indicated there next to other exact dates (the declaration of the Polish independence – October 10, the unification of Transylvania, Bukovina and Rumania – November 1, the establishment of the Republic of Hungary – November 16, the Kingdom of Serbians, Croats and Slovenians – December 1) and documented by a cartogram.²⁰

In the subchapter “The Treaty of Saint-Germain” we first read that the Austrian government made a claim to all the territories with a majority of the German-speaking population based on the right to the national self-determination; however, the authors also point out that such artificially delimited geographical state formation would make sense only if annexation to Germany had been planned. The negotiations in Saint Germaine showed then that such ambitions were just an illusion and Austria had to accept very tough conditions and agree with annexation of those territories to Czechoslovakia and to other countries. Students learn very briefly about the reflection in the period press, as well as about the evaluation by contemporary history science indicating certain hindsight – the Saint-Germaine conditions were hard but not impossible to fulfil.²¹

The analysis of Austrian textbooks, which can be appreciated for their good didactic elaboration, clearly shows that the authors tried to find “someone else’s” fault for such catastrophe as the breakup of Austro-Hungary is considered to be. It is the person of T. G. Masaryk to be blamed first of all and the Alliance biased in favour of his plans, initial intents and the 14 Points of the President Wilson. The newly established Czechoslovak Republic is very thoroughly presented in the text of varying extent as a multinational state suppressing its numerous minorities. Special attention is paid

¹⁹ M. Schindlbauer, G. Kröter, *Thema: Geschichte. 7. Klasse. Vom 20. zum 21. Jahrhundert*, Wien 2007, p. 46–48.

²⁰ M. Schindlbauer, G. Kröter, *Thema: Geschichte. 7. Klasse. Vom 20. zum 21. Jahrhundert*, Wien 2007, p. 82–83.

²¹ M. Schindlbauer, G. Kröter, *Thema: Geschichte. 7. Klasse. Vom 20. zum 21. Jahrhundert*, Wien 2007, p. 85–86.

to the German minority which was forced by military and diplomatic ways to stay on the territory of the CSR. The Hungarian minority in the CSR which was also part of Austro-Hungary is not given so much attention. It appears in the list of other nations just to document the national diversity of the country. Austrian textbooks are characterized by numerous inaccuracies of information provided on the Czech past. The accentuation of only one side of the beginning of the neighbourly coexistence proves that even after many years a trauma of the dissolution of the Habsburg monarchy has not mitigated and the Austrian stereotype of a Czech as an “ungrateful diversionist of the state” still persists. When the authors of the latest texts try to avoid such approach, they do not solve it by an attempt at a multi-perspective approach, e.g. they fail to clarify persecution of Czechs during the war, Czech prospects in the so-called “Mittel Europe” or the transport of food away from the starving Czech lands during the last days of the war but simply leave out contradictory passages.²²

POLISH VIEW ON THE DISSOLUTION OF AUSTRO-HUNGARY AND FORMATION OF THE CSR

Although the so-called Austrian Partition was an integral part of Cisleithania, the authors of the textbook *Historia 1871-1939* devote much attention to the “extremely complicated” situation in Hungary. They note that Hungarians were the second ruling nation in the Habsburg monarchy, therefore the ambitions of Slovaks, Serbs or Rumanians were directed against them similarly as the Czech or Polish efforts for independence turned against Austria. There is quite a detailed description tracing back the Hungarian development starting from a democratic attempt of Károly’s government up to the “white terror” of Miklós Horthy, also recalling a threat to the unity of the Czechoslovak state from the Hungarian Republic of Order. Finally, there is also noticeable a detailed enumeration of territorial losses of the defeated former Habsburg monarchy, and a significant decrease in the number of their population.²³ The attention paid to the complicated situation in Hungary and a thorough and detailed enumeration of the territorial and population losses can be explained either by the traditional pro-Hungarian tendency or resonance of the Polish catastrophe at the end of the 18th century.

In Polish textbooks the most important consequence of World War I is considered to be the dissolution of Austro-Hungary, which was replaced by the independent Austria

²² Viz nové vydání učebnice *Eins und heute*.

²³ A. Radziwiłł, W. Roszkowski, *Historia 1871-1939. Podręcznik dla szkół średnich*, Warszawa 1998, p. 148-149, 153-155.

and Hungary, while parts of its territory passed to the new states – Czechoslovakia, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and Poland. The attached map shows the area of the successor states and territorial gains of other countries benefiting from the downfall of the monarchy. The Table of peace agreements with the defeated countries represents another opportunity to fix territorial changes of the after-war Europe.²⁴

The complicated after-war situation is more thoroughly clarified in the textbook *Poznać przeszłość*, in the subchapter entitled “Ethnic problems”. The authors call attention here to the impossibility of implementing the principle of nations’ right to self-determination proclaimed by the President Wilson in the ethnically very complex area of Central Europe. The model adopted by most territories, not only those newly established, did not involve the recognition of autonomy of national minorities living in their territories but rather their gradual assimilation. This resulted in high ethnic tensions. The authors introduce the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia as an example where national consciousness is classified as extremely strong. Furthermore they point out the attempts at artificially forming new nations, referring to the idea of the Czechoslovak nation.²⁵

The information on the formation of Czechoslovakia in Polish texts sound diametrically different from Austrian texts. The co-authors Radziwiłł&Roszkowski do not limit their characteristics only to the critical point in the after-war Czech-Polish relations and express their admiration to the creator of an independent state. We can read there that the politician and philosopher Tomas Masaryk, the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic had been winning the Western Powers for the idea of the Czech independence for many years. The extended information about this personage is provided by the portrayal accentuating Masaryk’s democratic attitudes which contributed to the maintenance of the democratic character of the state under his rule²⁶ most similar in its civilisation level to the rich and stable western democracies.²⁷

The text, which differs positively from others by detailed information about the Czech past, does not emphasize the conflict aspect of coexistence more than it is usual in Polish textbooks. On the one hand, the authors shifted part of the information about the Czech-Polish struggle of 1918–1920 to a cartogram, and, on the

²⁴ A. Brzozowski, G. Szczepański, *Ku współczesności. Dzieje najnowsze 1918-2006. Podręcznik do historii dla klasy I liceum i technikum – zakres podstawowy*, Warszawa 2012, p. 12-13; R. Dolecki, K. Gutowski, J. Smoleński, *Po prostu historia. Szkoły ponadgimnazjalne, zakres podstawowy*, Warszawa 2012, p. 17.

²⁵ S. Roszak, J. Kłaczek, *Poznać przeszłość. Wiek XX. Nowa era*, Warszawa 2011, p. 24.

²⁶ The quotation from an unnamed book by the “Czech historian František Kubka” (later *Mezi válkami*) that Masaryk required from his compatriots “critical patriotism, humanism, worldwide reputation, culture, justice, the rule of law and freedom” tries to depict the credo of this extraordinary figure of Czech modern history. A. Radziwiłł, W. Roszkowski, *Historia 1871-1939. Podręcznik dla szkół średnich*, Warszawa 1998, p. 148.

²⁷ A. Radziwiłł, W. Roszkowski, *Historia 1871-1939. Podręcznik dla szkół średnich*, Warszawa 1998, p. 216.

other hand, resigned to emotional passages included in the Chapter “The struggle for borders”.²⁸ The occupation of the former Cieszyn County at the end of January 1919 by the “Czech” troops, which the Polish forces massed in the eastern front were unable to resist, is classified as a breach of the local agreement. The discourse is concluded by a message that in the period of Bolshevik offensive the dispute for Cieszyn was decided unfavourably for Poland.²⁹

Polish textbooks traditionally give much space on their pages to the description of the struggle for the borders of the restored Poland and thus to the Czechoslovak-Polish dispute over Cieszyn as well. In the publication *Po prostu historia*, the paragraph entitled “The border with Czechoslovakia” starts with information about the conclusion of the agreement on the spheres of influence between the regional authorities (Rada Narodowa Księstwa Cieszyńskiego appointed here) in November 1918, namely according to ethnical criterion. There was no explanation, however, that it was a provisional definition of the demarcation line in order to ensure supplies to this territory, that the agreement should have been confirmed by the central authorities, but the Czech authorities did not accept it for many reasons, that the Polish government called an election also on the disputed territory failing to react to the protests on the Czech side, followed by the information about the crossing of the demarcation line on January 23, 1919 and occupation of almost the whole territory of historical Cieszyn County by the Czechoslovak army. This information sounds simplified and misrepresented, because the occupation took place just before the elections which the Polish side – in its efforts to create *fait accompli* for the negotiations of the Paris Peace Conference – did not cancel in the Cieszyn County. The Polish incapability to effectively react to that attack is explained by the Polish military involvement in the East. The newly defined spheres of influence in Paris on February 2, 1919, which left some districts with a majority of Polish population on the Czechoslovak side, are considered by the authors less favourable for Poland. They further state that definite borders should have been delimited based on plebiscite but it did not take place. They again neglect the complexity of the situation and fail to explain the reluctance to plebiscite of one or the other side, according to its current international position and chances to reach a positive result of the voting. They concluded the discourse by the statement that the disputed territory was divided in July 1920 at the conference in Spa – unfavourably for Poland. The attached Table

28 A. Radziwiłł, W. Roszkowski, *Historia 1871-1939. Podręcznik dla szkół średnich*, Warszawa 1998, p. 185f.

29 In the cartogram *The formation of the Republic of Poland 1918-1922* we can find a usual simplifying statement that Cieszyn County was conceded to Poland in November 1918 and occupied by the Czech troops on Jan 23, 1919.” (Note: This did not involve the whole Cieszyn County and was only an interim agreement between regional authorities on the territorial administration.) *Ibidem*, p. 186, 189–191.

outlines the length of the borderline with each neighbouring country and in the text it is stated that 75% of the Polish border was permanently endangered, 20% uncertain, and only 5% was safe.³⁰

A similar interpretation can be found in another Polish textbook where a disagreement of the Czechoslovak government with the interim regional agreement is included. Here we also lack the explanation of the reasons for the Czechoslovak military intervention. The number of Poles is given (150 000) who appeared in Czechoslovakia after the split of the Cieszyn County. The authors provide, however, a reflection on the factors which determined the delimitation of the borders of the restored state noting that the Polish representation was also aware that in the existing situation it was impossible to return to the borders of the late 18th century. They also realized that the delimitation of the borders as advantageous as possible would also depend on the negotiating skills of the Polish representatives, general willingness to cooperate with the winning powers but also on the actions which were frequently of military nature. It is added that the Polish government only formally agreed with the solution of the dispute over the Cieszyn County in 1920, considered that territory only temporarily lost, and that the border issues fundamentally influenced Polish foreign policy during the whole interwar period.³¹

The textbook *Poznać przeszłość* mentions that since the 14th century the Cieszyn County was outside the territory of Poland but at the beginning of the 20th century it was “still” inhabited by a Polish majority. It says there that this was the argument used by Roman Dmowski in Paris to support the demand for annexing the Cieszyn County to the restored state of Poland but the Czech side considered that territory as its historical territory and did not intend to renounce its claim and also supported its claim by strategic reasons, namely the main railway line connecting the Czech lands with Slovakia. This explanation is followed by usual information about the Czech “offensive” against the Cieszyn County using the Polish involvement in the war against Ukrainians which disabled the outnumbered Polish troops to suppress the Czechoslovak army. The decision of the Allied countries Council of representatives which forced the Polish delegation a year later, in a critical moment of the Polish war against Bolsheviks, to agree with the solution of the dispute over the Cieszyn County and renounce plebiscite is considered by them as disadvantageous for Poland. They support this by the facts that the Czech side acquired 57% of the territory includ-

³⁰ R. Dolecki, K. Gutowski, J. Smoleński, op. cit., p. 44.

³¹ A. Brzozowski, G. Szczepański, op. cit., p. 24-25.

ing the whole industrial area, whereas the borderline divided the town Cieszyn and 150 000 Poles remained in Czechoslovakia.³²

In the textbook by Grażyna Szelągowska the efforts of nations for independence are considered to be the reason of the downfall of the dualistic Habsburg monarchy. The exact dates of the formation of new states in this area are indicated, as well as the end of Austrian reign in Krakow (Oct 31, 1918). Also here they point out territorial losses of Austria and Hungary and hard conditions imposed on them by the Treaties of Saint-Germain and Trianon.³³ The author tried, however, for a more general reflection on the after-war organization of Central Europe. She wrote that the new European borders should have been delimited according to the national or respectively language criterion in compliance with the principle of the right to self-determination. It was, however, in her opinion a very misleading criterion. In consequence of the policy of denationalization, nations very often spoke the language of their oppressors. Moreover, many territories were nationally mixed, which made impossible to draw a dividing line. The language criterion, on the other hand, did not take into consideration historical, economic, political or religious aspects. She closed her discourse stating that the interests of great powers had the main say in the after-war organization. The author documented the radicalism of after-war changes by an illustration. She specifies that from the territory of the three former empires nine independent states were formed, 80 million people changed their nationality, and 6 thousand kilometers of new borders were drawn. She considers the fact that national states were only rarely formed and in some countries national minorities represented a high percentage of their population as the major problem. The contractual obligation of the newly formed Central European states to respect the rights of minorities is mentioned.³⁴

In the context of the formation of the CSR the author appreciates the founder of this state, its democratic character and stability, and tries to clarify the reasons of such differences within Central European.³⁵ She points out, on the other hand, that Czechoslovakia was not just a Czech and Slovak country, it also had a large German minority, the so-called Sudeten Germans; its territory was also inhabited by Ruthenians, Poles, Hungarians, and Jews, but Czechs had a privileged status.³⁶ The presentation

³² S. Roszak, J. Kłaczków, op. cit., p. 86.

³³ G. Szelągowska, *Ludzie – społeczeństwa – cywilizacje. Historia IX i XX wieku. Część III. Podręcznik dla liceum ogólnokształcącego, liceum profilowanego i technikum*, Warszawa 2002, p. 161–163.

³⁴ G. Szelągowska, *Ludzie – społeczeństwa – cywilizacje. Historia IX i XX wieku. Część III. Podręcznik dla liceum ogólnokształcącego, liceum profilowanego i technikum*, Warszawa 2002, p. 164–165.

³⁵ G. Szelągowska, *Ludzie – społeczeństwa – cywilizacje. Historia IX i XX wieku. Część III. Podręcznik dla liceum ogólnokształcącego, liceum profilowanego i technikum*, Warszawa 2002, p. 174–175.

³⁶ G. Szelągowska, *Ludzie – społeczeństwa – cywilizacje. Historia IX i XX wieku. Część III. Podręcznik dla liceum ogólnokształcącego, liceum profilowanego i technikum*, Warszawa 2002, p. 166–167.

of the dispute over the Cieszyn County in a half-page passage emotionally entitled “Czechoslovak aggression in the Cieszyn County” contains usual information interpreted with a higher number of inaccuracies than in the textbook by Radziwiłł&Roszkowski. The passage ends with the statement that the Czechoslovak Minister of Foreign Affairs Edvard Beneš made use of a difficult situation of the Polish government and obtained from it consent to the breakup of the Cieszyn County.³⁷

Polish textbooks point out an obligation of Central European countries to make a commitment to protect national minorities (here designated as the Little Treaty of Versailles) which could then address their potential claims to the United Nations. To document an unequal assessment of the countries on the international scene it is noted that such commitment applied to Poland, as well as to Czechoslovakia but Germany.³⁸

In general, we can state that the reflections on the reasons of the breakup of the Danube monarchy in Polish teaching materials are dominated by the reasons arising from a multinational character of the dualistic state and a privileged status of the ruling nations. They did not leave unnoticed, however, the problematic after-war organization of Central Europe and the threats which the chosen solution posed to the future. As for the picture of the formation of Czechoslovakia, it is split in two positions. A positive one appreciating not only the efforts for independence but also a civilisation level of the state and its democratic nature and, on the other hand, a controversial one brought by the national character of the country on whose territory the Polish minority “was left”. Most authors attempt at a factual and impartial presentation of the conflict point of mutual coexistence, the interpretation of these issues becomes a less emotional cliché accompanying the reflection on the dispute over the borders in 1918-1920³⁹ has not fully ceased. This is connected in many cases with incorrect demarcation of the disputed geographical area too.⁴⁰ A more objective view would certainly contribute to the clarification that when the borders were drawn, both countries combined historical and ethnic arguments and for this reason in both of them the members of minorities represented a third of the population.

³⁷ G. Szelałgowska, *Ludzie – społeczeństwa – cywilizacje. Historia IX i XX wieku. Część III. Podręcznik dla liceum ogólnokształcącego, liceum profilowanego i technikum*, Warszawa 2002, s. 240–241.

³⁸ Radziwiłł, W. Roszkowski, op. cit.; R. Dolecki, K. Gutowski, J. Smoleński, op. cit., p. 16.

³⁹ We mean the assertion that Cieszyn County was conceded to Poland in November 1918.

⁴⁰ The term Cieszyn County is used there. Such inaccuracy is frequent in Czech textbooks too. The expression Czechia (Pol. *Czechy*) is substituted for Czech, Czech lands, Czechoslovakia and the CSR. Similarly, *Sudety* in Polish textbooks covers the whole frontier area which was annexed to Germany in 1938.

SLOVAK VIEW ON THE DISSOLUTION OF THE MONARCHY AND FORMATION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Slovak and Czech textbook views on the breakup of the monarchy are identical in many points. A difference lies in the explanations of the general and national history, which provide more chances to discuss the events on “the domestic ground”. The attitude to the war and the consequences of extraordinary situation are expressed a bit more emotionally compared to the Czech texts. We can read, e.g., that the citizens of Austro-Hungary did not want to die in the war for the interests of the monarchy which was suppressing their national requirements and that Hungarians “established terror in Slovakia” and persecuted Slovak patriots.⁴¹ Moreover, this assertion is documented by an equally emotional excerpt from Šrobár’s Memoirs.⁴² Pro-Russian tendency of the Slovaks is more often mentioned, as well as the considerations about a possible accession of Slovakia to Russia or its joining to the Polish-Czech-Slovak common state. In a detailed description of the foreign events, the activities of the Slovak compatriots, deployment of Slovaks in legions, and the role of M.R. Štefánik in the resistance movement are highlighted and a commentary on the documents regulating future relations between the Czechs and Slovaks in their common state is provided.⁴³ They also mention the April Congress of the subjugated nations of Austro-Hungary in Rome and the representatives of Czechs and Slovaks there.⁴⁴ When describing the war situation in Slovakia, the social aspect is accentuated and all domestic activities leading to the support of the idea of a common state are listed.⁴⁵

The authors of one textbook demonstrate the complexity of the after-war organization of Central and Eastern Europe with the help of a comparative listing of all nations living in the territory of the CSR, Poland, Lithuania, and Rumania, followed by a list of countries where, on the other hand, the Slovaks lived in the position of a minority.⁴⁶ The main positives of the new situation are considered to be the facts that Slovakia “avoided an unfavourable fate in Hungary” due to the formation of the Czechoslovak Republic and Slovaks could feel equal and free citizens for the first time in history which is documented by one of the analysed texts.⁴⁷ The separation

41 D. Kováč et al., *Dějepis 4. Slovensko v novom storočí*, Bratislava 1997, p. 8.

42 D. Kováč et al., *Dějepis 4. Slovensko v novom storočí*, Bratislava 1997, p. 9.

43 D. Kováč et al., *Dějepis 4. Slovensko v novom storočí*, Bratislava 1997, p. 10–13; A. Bartlová, R. Letz, *Dejepis. Národné dejiny. Pre 3. ročník gymnázií*, Bratislava 2005, p. 10–21.

44 A. Bartlová, R. Letz, *Dejepis. Národné dejiny. Pre 3. ročník gymnázií*, Bratislava 2005, p. 19.

45 *Ibidem*, p. 7–9, 22–27; D. Kováč, *op. cit.*, p. 14–15.

46 In the passage titled “Spoluobčania či protivníci?”, D. Kováč et al.: *Dejepis 4. Svet v novom storočí*, Bratislava 1995, p. 17.

47 D. Kováč et al.: *Dejepis 4. Svet v novom storočí*, Bratislava 1995, p. 24.

from Hungarians is evaluated only positively, regardless of a critical attitude to some aspects of the Czech-Slovak coexistence. A complicated and lengthy process of the factual domination of the territories of Slovakia is described in detail.⁴⁸ General history textbooks then comment more extensively on the Treaty of Trianon and the troubled situation in Hungary before its signing.⁴⁹

In the latest Slovak textbook for elementary schools, the introduction of the chapter devoted to the fortunes of Slovaks during World War I states that the serious war conflict logically had to lead to the downfall of the multinational Austro-Hungary weakened by internal conflicts: individual nations pursued their own goals, their members joined the army with antipathy while showing more favour to the opponents of the Danube multi-state. There are mentioned possible options of the after-war organization of Slovakia appearing in the reflections of Slovak politicians, e.g., a proposal to join Russia or the formation of the Polish-Czech-Slovak federation. According to the authors, the unification of Czechs and Slovaks in one state gradually appeared to be the best option. Students will read then that this idea was intensively spread during the Russian attack in the Carpathian Mountains and supported in particular by the former “*Hlas* supporters” (headed by V. Šrobár) cooperating with the Czech-Slavonic Union in Prague.⁵⁰

A separate chapter is devoted to the Czechoslovak foreign resistance. We learn here about the formation of the Czechoslovak National Council in Paris (February 1916), activities of the compatriots in the USA and Canada, and the Pittsburgh Agreement of May 30, 1918 which demanded the Slovak autonomy in the newly formed state. The war merits of the Czechoslovak legions are emphasised which, together with “enormous diplomatic activity” of the National Council, contributed to the recognition of the Czechoslovak government by the Allies. It is stressed that the domestic politicians in Bohemia as well as in Slovakia mostly supported the idea of a common state. This is contained in the Washington Declaration of October 18, 1918.⁵¹

The extended text contains a portrayal of the personage of T.G. Masaryk (we can find here, inter alia, the information that his students at Prague University included also the students of the Slovak association “*Detvan*”, V. Šrobár and M.R. Štefánik, who were encouraged by Prof. Masaryk to issue the journal *Voice – Cz. Hlas*), a brief portrayal of E. Beneš, and excerpts from the Memorandum of the Slovak League in the USA of September 10, 1914 and from the Washington Declaration.⁵² The statement

48 A. Bartlová, R. Letz, *Dejepis. Národné dejiny. Pre 3. ročník gymnázií*, Bratislava 2005, p. 35.

49 D. Kodajová, M. Tonková, *Dejepis. Svetové dejiny. Pre 3. ročník gymnázií*, Bratislava 2006, p. 32.

50 D. Kováč, V. Kratochvíl, I. Kamenec, *Dejepis pre 9. ročník ZŠ*, Bratislava 2012, p. 14.

51 D. Kováč, V. Kratochvíl, I. Kamenec, *Dejepis pre 9. ročník ZŠ*, Bratislava 2012, p. 16.

52 D. Kováč, V. Kratochvíl, I. Kamenec, *Dejepis pre 9. ročník ZŠ*, Bratislava 2012, p. 16–17.

of the Secretary of the Slovak League in the USA Ivan Daxner said in 1918 “Away from the Hungarians, however, not under the Czechs but to the Czechs”⁵³ may give food for thought.

A separate chapter is devoted to the personage of M.R. Štefánik which includes a subchapter entitled “The Fighter for the Czechoslovak state”. The authors state that this excellent diplomat strained every nerve fighting for the common state in spite of his ill health (in 1916 he helped to organize legions in Russia, one year later he took part in the recruitment of voluntaries in the USA, in 1918 he went to Siberia when the Czechoslovak legions got into trouble).⁵⁴

In connection with the Martin Declaration of October 30, 1918 the declaration of the republic in Prague two days earlier is mentioned, there is included the portrait of V. Šrobár, the quotation of A. Hlinka’s statement of May 24, 1918 that the marriage with Hungarians failed and he supported the Czechoslovak orientation⁵⁵ and an extract from the Declaration of the Slovak Nation containing the idea of the Czechoslovak nation.⁵⁶ Among questions for students we can find one about the evaluation of the importance of the formation of the CSR.⁵⁷

A recently released publication designated for secondary schools contains a ten-page chapter “The Slovak contribution to the formation of Czechoslovakia” divided into passages consecutively devoted to the foreign resistance, legions, the Pittsburgh Agreement, domestic resistance, declaration of the Republic on October 28 and the Martin Declaration.⁵⁸ The authors introduce the text by the words that the war allowed “to put an end to the inferior position of Slovaks”.⁵⁹ Students learn that initially the union with Russia seemed to be the simplest and promptest solution (deliberations in 1914 between J. Országh and Nicholas II about a potential formation of the Czechoslovak Kingdom under the rule of the Romanovs are mentioned), they learn about the activities of the Slovaks in the USA (in particular the Memorandum of the Slovak League of September 1914 requiring a full Slovak autonomy), the Cleveland Agreement of October 22, 1915, which contained the idea of a federative union of the Czechs and Slovaks, the establishment of the Czech Foreign Committee in September 1915, and

53 „Preč od Maďarov, ale nie pod Čechy, lež ku Čechom.“ – D. Kováč, V. Kratochvíl, I. Kamenec, *Dejepis pre 9. ročník ZŠ*, Bratislava 2012, s. 16.

54 D. Kováč, V. Kratochvíl, I. Kamenec, *Dejepis pre 9. ročník ZŠ*, Bratislava 2012, s. 18.

55 D. Kováč, V. Kratochvíl, I. Kamenec, *Dejepis pre 9. ročník ZŠ*, Bratislava 2012, p. 20.

56 D. Kováč, V. Kratochvíl, I. Kamenec, *Dejepis pre 9. ročník ZŠ*, Bratislava 2012, p. 21.

57 D. Kováč, V. Kratochvíl, I. Kamenec, *Dejepis pre 9. ročník ZŠ*, Bratislava 2012,

58 R. Letz, M. Tonková, A. Bocková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií a stredných škôl*, Bratislava 2013, p. 34-43.

59 „skoncovať s podradným postavením Slovákov.“ – R. Letz, M. Tonková, A. Bocková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií a stredných škôl*, Bratislava 2013, p. 34-43

the Czechoslovak National Council in February 1916.⁶⁰ The merits of M. R. Štefánik are highlighted, whose diplomatic contacts persuaded French politicians to start taking the Czechoslovak foreign resistance seriously: “Masaryk could thus explain that Austro-Hungary would be always more favourable to Germany and only its breakup would result in the formation of new states allied to France.”⁶¹

Much attention is devoted to the presentation of successes of the foreign legions in Russia, France and Italy. The reader finds out that Štefánik arrived personally to the legionaries in Siberia to explain their mission to them and to encourage them to hold on.⁶²

Regarding the Pittsburgh Agreement the emphasis is put on the stipulation of the Slovak autonomy with its own parliament and the Slovak language as the official language. At the same time it is noted here that in contrast to the Cleveland Agreement it did not guarantee equal status of both parts of the state and consequently led to a certain asymmetry. Based on extracts from the sources, the students are given an opportunity to compare the wording of both documents.⁶³

The next subchapter outlines the activities of the domestic resistance (hard conditions, a threat of imprisonment or even execution). It is stated here that the Czech and Slovak politicians “sought the way to each other” and since the beginning of 1918 they started making common public statements even before the idea of a common state was perceived “as a dream rather than a reality.”⁶⁴ The development in 1918 is quite thoroughly described (the so-called Epiphany Declaration of Jan 6, 1918, the assembly in Liptovský Mikuláš on May 1, 1918, the meeting in Turčiansky Sv. Martin on May 24, 1918, the Washington Declaration, the declaration of the CSR on Oct 18, 1918, Declaration of the Slovak Nation on Oct 30, 1918).⁶⁵ The significance of the Martin Declaration is stressed by the statement that the absence of the expression of the position of the Slovak politicians “would strengthen Hungary’s arguments about a violent annexation of Slovakia to Bohemia.”⁶⁶ Historical documents are represented by extracts from the speech of F. Juriga in the Hungarian Parliament on Oct 19, 1918, declaration of the Czechoslovak National Council on Oct 29, 1918 and the Martin

60 R. Letz, M. Tonková, A. Bocková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií a stredných škôl*, Bratislava 2013, p. 35–36.

61 “Masaryk tak mohol vysvetliť, že Rakúsko-Uhorsko vždy bude viac naklonené Nemecku a iba jeho rozbitie povedie k vzniku nových štátov priateľských k Francúzsku.” – R. Letz, M. Tonková, A. Bocková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií a stredných škôl*, Bratislava 2013, p. 36.

62 R. Letz, M. Tonková, A. Bocková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií a stredných škôl*, Bratislava 2013, p. 36

63 R. Letz, M. Tonková, A. Bocková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií a stredných škôl*, Bratislava 2013, p. 37.

64 R. Letz, M. Tonková, A. Bocková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií a stredných škôl*, Bratislava 2013, p. 39.

65 R. Letz, M. Tonková, A. Bocková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií a stredných škôl*, Bratislava 2013, p. 40–42.

66 “...posilnilo argumentáciu Maďarska o násilnom pripojení Slovenska k Česku.” – R. Letz, M. Tonková, A. Bocková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií a stredných škôl*, Bratislava 2013, p. 42.

Declaration passed on Oct 30, 1918. The students' task is, inter alia, to clarify why in the text of the Declaration both the Slovak nation and the Czechoslovak nation are mentioned and to explain why it was more advantageous for the Slovaks to join Czechoslovakia than to remain in Hungary.⁶⁷

It is quite logical that the Slovak interpretation is closest to the Czech one while both the development on the Slovak territory and Slovak activities of the foreign resistance are accentuated, and in general the analysed texts are characterised by a higher emotionality in the approach to historical narration. It is typical for the more recent texts that they are focused on the interpretation of the source material and its multi-perspective assessment which is certainly a positive finding.

HUNGARIAN VIEW ON THE DISSOLUTION OF AUSTRO-HUNGARY AND FORMATION OF THE CSR

The textbook by Konrád Salamon⁶⁸ is the only one out of the analysed texts to map in detail and without emotions the military activities of the Czechoslovak legions, namely their involvement in the Russian civil war, which essentially contributed to the recognition of the independent state.⁶⁹ An extensive treatise about the so-called Belgrade Armistice and its subsequent corrections is less surprising. The purported statement of the French General Franchet d'Esperey is quoted here saying that the Hungarians will "suffer and pay" for the war alliance with Germany. The war activities of 1919 and events of those days in Hungary and Slovakia are described in detail in the passage entitled "Attacks of Czecho-Slovakia and Rumania".⁷⁰ In the chapter "Reorganisation of Central and Eastern Europe" the author explained the French support of the Polish, Czechoslovak, Rumanian and Yugoslavian territorial claims as a French national interest to form a line of francophone countries on Germany's eastern border. Polish textbooks devote much attention to the affairs in Hungary, and similarly in one Hungarian textbook we can find an extensive passage providing information about the restoration of the Polish state, portrait of Józef Piłsudsky, and the Polish-Bolshevik struggle in 1920 outlined in a manner unparalleled in any other textbook.⁷¹ Our theme is best highlighted by passages in the chapter "The neighbouring countries and Hungarians under their rule". The quotation from the text of the Treaty on Minorities Protection is a basis for the discussion on its observance in different

⁶⁷ R. Letz, M. Tonková, A. Bocková, *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií a stredných škôl*, Bratislava 2013, p. 43.

⁶⁸ K. Salamon, *Dejepis pre IV. ročník gymnázií*, Budapest 1995. (Přeložil O. Knichal).

⁶⁹ K. Salamon, *Dejepis pre IV. ročník gymnázií*, Budapest 1995, p. 26.

⁷⁰ K. Salamon, *Dejepis pre IV. ročník gymnázií*, Budapest 1995, p. 37, 47–48.

⁷¹ K. Salamon, *Dejepis pre IV. ročník gymnázií*, Budapest 1995, p. 50–51.

countries. It is stated with respect to the neighbour on the west that 26 thousand Hungarians on the “western Hungarian” territories annexed to Austria were unable to create relevant national organisations and continue the policy to protect the nation.⁷² The characteristic of the CSR where the war activity of the president T. G. Masaryk is mentioned contains the intriguing information that although it guaranteed democratic rights and relative welfare to its citizens it disadvantaged its nations.⁷³ It is said that despite the commitments undertaken it denied or even deprived some members of national minorities of the citizenship, because only the nationals had all rights guaranteed by the Constitution. The Language Law and the possibility to avoid its 20% clause, the ways of restricting the municipal self-government in the areas with a numerous representation of Hungarians are analysed in detail, as well as the alleged liquidation of the then existing network of Hungarian schools. Not unnoticed is the course of the land reform with its negative consequences for the Hungarian population in the CSR, which pursued the aim to break the compactness of the Hungarian population in Slovakia. In spite of simplifying and often also distorting information but not without a rational core, the Hungarian textbook appreciates the democratic system of the CSR which allowed the Hungarians to have political life, representation in the legislative body, publication of their own press and literature in their national language. This reflection gives the impression that although being in the position of a minority the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia maintained their nationality.⁷⁴

Another Hungarian textbook written in the Slovak language and published in 2007 clearly declares that it is based on the analysis of historical sources (*History focused on sources*).⁷⁵ Much attention is devoted here to the circumstances surrounding the origin of the Czechoslovak Republic. The subchapter dealing with the national attempts within the Habsburg monarchy says that before the war the Czechs (and the Croats) wanted more independence within the monarchy which protected them against German and Russian expansion but in the result of the war defeat “there was a glimmer of hope for independence” for them. According to the authors, Masaryk and Beneš were persuading the Alliance representatives abroad as follows: “They permanently conducted propaganda against the monarchy which contained both true and false criticism.”⁷⁶ The support of such efforts provided in particular by France is

72 K. Salamon, *Dejepis pre IV. ročník gymnázií*, Budapest 1995, p. 59–60.

73 K. Salamon, *Dejepis pre IV. ročník gymnázií*, Budapest 1995, p. 60–61.

74 K. Salamon, *Dejepis pre IV. ročník gymnázií*, Budapest 1995, p. 60–61

75 M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007.

76 “Vyvinuli nepretržitú propagandu proti monarchii, ktorá obsahovala popri pravdivej kritike aj falšovanú.”; M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007. p. 17.

explained by the efforts to form new Allied states which would recognize the leading position of France against Germany.⁷⁷

The passage with the relevant sources entitled “Propaganda and peace attempts” includes an outline of the future Czechoslovakia from the period of peace negotiations referring to the Great Moravia and supplemented by a caption calling it the Czech propagandistic map: “In support of their claims they used the remembrance of the former Moravian state, Great Moravian Empire, thus violating the historical fact.”⁷⁸ Students’ task is to specify the arguments used by Czechs to justify their attitudes, state whether their claims were legitimate, explain why the Czechs “contradicted even themselves” and evaluate what role in the decision of the Alliance played the fact that “falsified facts” were involved.⁷⁹ The students are required to study the cartogram and identify to what extent the territorial changes took into consideration ethnic situation.⁸⁰ The quotation of the extract from Masaryk’s memorandum to the President Wilson dated Aug 31, 1918 about an inferior status of Slovakia within Hungary contains questions about the objectives of the memorandum and the means by which Masaryk confirmed his attitudes. The students have to evaluate whether his arguments were truthful and what reasons could have determined Masaryk’s motives.⁸¹

With regard to the content of the excerpt from the Treaty of Saint-Germaine concerning the rights of minorities on the territory of the CSR the students are required to reflect on the problems which might have arisen from the solution proposed by M. Hodža in September 1913 (the article “The dead meat” containing reflections on Palacký’s statements on the relevance of the Danube Monarchy).⁸²

A separate seven-page chapter is devoted to the Treaty of Trianon. The authors emotionally describe that the signing of the Treaty put one third of Hungarians under “foreign rule” and ethnic principles were not taken into consideration: “It was extremely painful and hard to explain the that majority of Hungarians who became a minority lived on the purely Hungarian territories just behind the Trianon borders.”⁸³ Cartograms show territorial losses in square km and a cut-off of the railway network, pie charts and a detailed table show a percentage representation of other minorities

77 M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007.

78 “Na podporu svojich požiadaviek použili pamiatku niekdajšieho moravského štátu, Veľkomoravskej ríše, znásilniac tak historickú skutočnosť” – M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007, p. 18.

79 M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007, p. 18

80 M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007, p. 18

81 M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007, p. 20

82 M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007, p. 21–22.

83 “Bolo obzvlášť bolestivé a ťažko vysvetliteľné, že prevažná časť Maďarov, ktorí sa dostali do menšiny, žila na čisto maďarských územiach hneď za trianonskými hranicami.” – M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007, p. 40.

living on the territories of the new states. Students' task is to assess in which states the ethnic problems were the most serious.⁸⁴ Economic losses are mentioned (the CSR acquired an iron ore deposit).⁸⁵ The chapter ends with three relatively long and one-sided quotations from the period sources (the article by Lord Lothmere of 1927 on the “unfortunate” Treaty of Trianon, the speech of I. Bethlen of 1928 requiring a border revision, and the speech of A. Apponi of 1920 on the conditions unacceptable to Hungary).⁸⁶

Although it is obviously impossible to draw a more general conclusion on the approach to the theme in history education in Hungary from these two in a way exceptional Hungarian textbooks (moreover, the first one was published twenty years ago) designated for the members of the Slovak minority in Hungary, they certainly provide an interesting insight into this specific interpretation of the events related to the formation of Czechoslovakia.

CONCLUSION

We tried to outline some similarities and differences among national textbook interpretations of the break-up of the Habsburg monarchy and formation of Czechoslovakia in 1918. We can find in the Slovak and Polish, as well as in Austrian and Hungarian texts a relatively unbiased depiction of the course of the First World War and the state of exhaustion of the central powers, in particular Austro-Hungary. There is information about a disastrous supply situation leading to anti-war demonstrations and starvation riots, references to military mutinies, desertions which even more weakened the operational readiness of the army, as well as to revolutionary climate which affected individual Central European countries to a different extent. Of course, subsequently all the texts present the new after-war organisation of Europe and the world. As for the inclusion of a particular date of the declaration of Czechoslovakia on October 28, 1918, it is far from being considered such an important milestone as to be mentioned in the textbooks of our neighbours (it does not appear even in all the Slovak textbooks).

In spite of apparent attempts at an unbiased approach some stereotype views still persist in them, as well as certain clichés which the authors of textbooks adopt from each other or derive from the same professional publications. An unbiased elaboration would help to eliminate inaccuracies, the simplifying characteristics omitting

84 M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007, p. 41–43.

85 M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007, p. 40.

86 M. Száray, J. Kaposi, *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007, p. 44–46.

some essential aspects of the problem, overcome one-sided approach focused only on one situation or event.

The Austrian view would be less black-and-white if it revealed all the fundamental grounds for the Czechs' resignation from further coexistence within the monarchy. After all, the Czech teaching materials do not conceal the discontent of the Czech Germans with the formation of the CSR, their protests accompanying such decision. On the other hand, it would be beneficial to the latest Hungarian text to reduce explicitly negative information about the Czech propaganda based upon falsification of a historical fact.

The inclusion of the viewpoint of "the other" in the source data of textbooks tied to various tasks suggests itself as a possible contribution to the multicultural approach similarly as this is addressed in British materials when presenting the policy of appeasement and the so-called Sudeten crisis. We can appreciate the elements of multi-perspective approach in the recent Slovak teaching text for the purpose of comparison of contradictory historical sources. The use of didactic apparatus of textbooks to reach a multi-perspective view remains a challenge also for the authors of the Czech texts.

TRANSLATION: Eva SCIRANKOVÁ

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Absenger A., *Der Mensch im Wandel der Zeiten I*, Wien 1999.
- Bartlová A., Letz R., *Dejepis. Národné dejiny. Pre 3. ročník gymnázií*, Bratislava 2005
- Brzozowski A, Szczepański G., *Ku współczesności. Dzieje najnowsze 1918-2006. Podręcznik do historii dla klasy I liceum i technikum – zakres podstawowy*, Warszawa 2012
- Dolecki R., Gutowski K., Smoleński J., *Po prostu historia. Szkoły ponadgimnazjalne, zakres podstawowy*, Warszawa 2012.
- Eigner E. et al., *Zeitzeichen Geschichte und Kultur II WB*, Linz 2002
- Gavora P., *Úvod do pedagogického výzkumu*, Brno 2000,
- Gracová B., *Vědomosti a postoje české a polské studující mládeže*, Ostrava 2004.
- Gracová B., "První republika v učebnicích našich sousedů", *Historica*, 2005. č. 12, s. 299–312;
- Gracová B., "Češi a Poláci ve 20. století – obraz souseda na stránkách polských a českých dějepisných učebnic", in: *Vzájemný obraz souseda v polských a českých školních učebnicích*, ed. B. Gracová, D. Labischová, J. Szymeczek, Ostrava 2014, p. 25-39.
- Hofer J., Paireder B., *Netzwerk Geschichte@Politik 3. Geschichte und Sozialkunde/Politische Bildung, Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch für die 7. Schulstufe*, Linz 2013
- Hueber G., Shröckenfuchs E., *Einst und heute 7*, Wien 2001.
- Kodajová D., Tonková D., *Dejepis. Svetové dejiny. Pre 3. ročník gymnázií*, Bratislava 2006
- Kováč D. et al., *Dějepis 4. Slovensko v novom storočí*, Bratislava 1997,
- Kováč D., Kratochvíl V., Kamenec I., *Dejepis pre 9. ročník ZŠ*, Bratislava 2012.

- Kvaček R., "Ke vzniku Československa", *Český časopis historický*, 1998, roč. 96, č. 4, p. 717–735;
- Labischová D., *Čech zástupce – Rakušan byrokrat? Proměny obrazu Čechů, Rakušanů a jejich minulosti ve vědomí studující mládeže*, Ostrava 2005.
- Labischová D., *Co si uchováme v paměti? Empirický výzkum historického vědomí*, Ostrava 2013.
- Letz R., Tonková M., Bocková A., *Dejepis pre 3. ročník gymnázií a atrednych škôl*, Bratislava 2013
- Pfeiferová Š., Šubrt J., "Veřejné mínění o problematice českých dějin", *Naše společnost*, 2009, č. 2, p. 16–23;
- Pokorny, Lemberger, Lobner, *Durch die Vergangenheit zur Gegenwart* 7, Linz 2002.
- Průcha J., *Učebnice: Teorie a analýzy edukačního média*, Praha 1998.
- Radziwiłł A., Roszkowski W., *Historia 1871-1939. Podręcznik dla szkół średnich*, Warszawa 1998
- Roszak S., Kłaczek J., *Poznać przeszłość. Wiek XX. Nowa era*, Warszawa 2011.
- Salamon K., *Dejepis pre IV. ročník gymnázií*, Budapest 1995.
- Schindlbauer M., Kröter G., *Thema: Geschichte. 7. Klasse. Vom 20. zum 21. Jahrhundert*, Wien 2007
- Stradling R., *Multiperspektivita ve vyučování dějepisu: příručka pro učitele*, Rada Evropy 2003, český překlad Praha 2004.
- Száray M., Kaposi J., *Dejepis 12 pre gymnáziá*, Budapešť 2007.
- Szelągowska G., *Ludzie – społeczeństwa – cywilizacje. Historia IX i XX wieku. Część III. Podręcznik dla liceum ogólnokształcącego, liceum profilowanego i technikum*, Warszawa 2002
- Šubrt, J. Vinopal, "K otázce historického vědomí obyvatel České republiky", *Naše společnost*, 2010, č. 1, p. 9-20.