

Cambridge Studies in
Social and Cultural Anthropology

THE LITTLE CZECH AND THE GREAT CZECH NATION

National identity and the post-
communist social transformation



Ladislav Holy

THE LITTLE CZECH AND THE GREAT
CZECH NATION

Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology

The monograph series Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology publishes analytical ethnographies, comparative works, and contributions to theory. All combine an expert and critical command of ethnography and a sophisticated engagement with current theoretical debates.

A list of books in the series will be found at the end of the volume.

Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology

- 11 Rethinking Symbolism*
DAN SPERBER. Translated by Alice L. Morton
- 15 World Conqueror and World Renouncer: A Study of Buddhism and Polity in Thailand against a Historical Background*
S. J. TAMBIAH
- 16 Outline of a Theory of Practice*
PIERRE BOURDIEU. Translated by Richard Nice
- 17 Production and Reproduction: A Comparative Study of the Domestic Domain*
JACK GOODY
- 28 Hunters, Pastoralists and Ranchers: Reindeer Economies and their Transformations*
TIM INGOLD
- 32 Muslim Society*
ERNEST GELLNER
- 39 The Fish-People: Linguistic Exogamy and Tukanoan Identity in Northwest Amazonia*
JEAN E. JACKSON
- 51 Individual and Society in Guiana: A Comparative Study of Amerindian Social Organizations*
PETER RIVIERE
- 53 Inequality among Brothers: Class and Kinship in South China
RUBIE S. WATSON
- 54 On Anthropological Knowledge*
DAN SPERBER
- 55 Tales of the Yanomami: Daily Life in the Venezuelan Forest*
JACQUES LIZOT. Translated by Ernest Simon
- 56 The Making of Great Men: Male Domination and Power among the New Guinea Baruya*
MAURICE GODELIER. Translated by Rupert Swyer
- 59 Native Lords of Quito in the Age of the Incas: The Political Economy of North-Andean Chiefdoms
FRANK SALOMON

- 60 Culture and Class in Anthropology and History: A Newfoundland Illustration*
GERALD SIDER
- 61 From Blessing to Violence: History and Ideology in the Circumcision Ritual of the Merina of Madagascar*
MAURICE BLOCH
- 62 The Huli Response to Illness
STEPHEN FRANKEL
- 63 Social Inequality in a Northern Portuguese Hamlet: Land, Late Marriage, and Bastardy, 1870–1978
BRIAN JUAN O'NEILL
- 64 Cosmologies in the Making: A Generative Approach to Cultural Variation in Inner New Guinea*
FREDRIK BARTH
- 65 Kinship and Class in the West Indies: A Genealogical Study of Jamaica and Guyana*
RAYMOND T. SMITH
- 68 Tradition as Truth and Communication
PASCAL BOYER
- 70 The Anthropology of Numbers*
THOMAS CRUMP
- 71 Stealing People's Names: History and Politics in a Sepik River Cosmology
SIMON J. HARRISON
- 72 The Bedouin of Cyrenaica: Studies in Personal and Corporate Power
EMRYS L. PETERS. Edited by Jack Goody and Emanuel Marx
- 73 Bartered Brides: Politics, Gender and Marriage in an Afghan Tribal Society
NANCY TAPPER
- 74 Property, Production and Family in Neckerhausen*
DAVID WARREN SABEAN
- 75 Fifteen Generations of Bretons: Kinship and Society in Lower Brittany, 1720–1980
MARTINE SEGALÉN. Translated by J. A. Underwood
- 76 Honor and Grace in Anthropology
Edited by J. G. PERISTIANY and JULIAN PITT-RIVERS
- 77 The Making of the Modern Greek Family: Marriage and Exchange in Nineteenth-Century Athens
PAUL SANT CASSIA with CONSTANTINA BADA
- 78 Religion and Custom in a Muslim Society: The Berti of Sudan
LADISLAV HOLY
- 79 Quiet Days in Burgundy: A Study of Local Politics
MARC ABÉLÈS. Translated by Annella McDermott
- 80 Sacred Void: Spatial Images of Work and Ritual among the Giriama of Kenya
DAVID PARKIN
- 81 A Place of their Own: Family Farming in Eastern Finland
RAY ABRAHAMS
- 82 Power, Prayer and Production: The Jola of Casamance, Senegal

- OLGA F. LINARES
- 83 Identity through History: Living Stories in a Solomon Island Society
GEOFFREY M. WHITE
- 84 Monk, Householder and Tantric Priest: Newar Buddhism and its Hierarchy
of Ritual
DAVID GELLNER
- 85 Hunters and Herders of Southern Africa: A Comparative Ethnography of
the Khoisan Peoples*
ALAN BARNARD
- 86 Belonging in the Two Berlins: Kin, State, Nation*
JOHN BORNEMAN
- 87 Power and Religiosity in a Post-Colonial Setting: Sinhala Catholics in
Contemporary Sri Lanka
R. L. STIRRAT
- 88 Dialogues with the Dead: The Discussion of Mortality among the Sora of
Eastern India
PIERS VITEBSKY
- 89 South Coast New Guinea Cultures: A Regional Comparison*
BRUCE M. KNAUFT
- 90 Pathology and Identity: The Work of Mother Earth in Trinidad
ROLAND LITTLEWOOD
- 91 The Cultural Relations of Classification: An Analysis of Nuauulu Animal
Categories from Central Seram
ROY ELLEN
- 92 Cinema and the Urban Poor in South India
SARA DICKEY
- 93 In the Society of Nature: A Native Ecology in Amazonia
PHILIPPE DESCOLA
- 94 Spirit Possession and Personhood among the Kel Ewey Tuareg
SUSAN J. RASMUSSEN
- 95 Learning to be Vezo: Identity and Descent among the Vezo of Madagascar
RITA ASTUTI
- 96 Social Reproduction and History in Melanesia: Mortuary Ritual, Gift
Exchange, and Custom in the Tanga Islands*
ROBERT J. FOSTER
- 97 The Roads of Chinese Childhood: Learning and Identity in Angang
CHARLES STAFFORD
- 98 Education and Identity in Rural France: The Politics of Schooling
DEBORAH REED-DANAHAY
- 99 The Architecture of Memory: A Jewish-Muslim Household in Colonial
Algeria, 1937-1962*
JOELLE BAHLOUL
- 100 Contesting Culture: Discourses of Identity in Multi-ethnic London*
GERD BAUMANN
- 101 Tradition and Modernity in Mediterranean Society: The Wedding as
Cultural Symbol
VASSOS ARGYROU

- 102 Mass Culture and Modernism in Egypt*
WALTER ARMBRUST
- 103 The Little Czech and the Great Czech Nation: National Identity and the
Post-Communist Transformation of Society*
LADISLAV HOLY
- 104 Managing Existence in Naples: Morality, Action and Structure*
ITALO PARDO

** available in paperback*

When Ladislav Holy precipitately left Czechoslovakia for the UK in 1968, he was already one of the leading anthropologists in Central Europe. In the following decades he carried out important field studies in Africa. Since 1986 he has been engaged in research in the Czech Republic, and he brings to this timely study of national identity the skills of a seasoned researcher, a cosmopolitan perspective, and the insights of an insider. Drawing on historical and literary sources as well as ethnography, he analyses the particular Czech discourses on national identity and the changing but always problematic relations between nation and state in a period of revolutionary transformation. He argues that there were specifically 'Czech' aspects to the communist regime and to the 'velvet revolution', and paying particular attention to symbolic representations of what it means to be Czech, he explores how notions of Czech identity were involved in the debates surrounding the fall of communism, and the emergence of a new social system.

THE LITTLE CZECH AND THE GREAT CZECH NATION

National identity and the post-communist
transformation of society

LADISLAV HOLY

University of St Andrews



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by

Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521555845

© Cambridge University Press 1996

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1996

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Holy, Ladislav.

The little Czech and the great Czech nation : national
identity and the post-communist transformation of society / Ladislav Holy.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0 521 55469 1 (he.) – ISBN 0 521 55584 1 (pbk.)

1. Czech Republic – Politics and government. 2. National
characteristics, Czech. 3. Social change - Czech Republic.

I. Title.

DB2238.7.H65 1996

943.7105-dc20 95-48157 CIP

ISBN 978-0-521-55469-5 Hardback

ISBN 978-0-521-55584-5 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in
this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is,
or will remain, accurate or appropriate. Information regarding prices, travel
timetables, and other factual information given in this work is correct at
the time of first printing but Cambridge University Press does not guarantee
the accuracy of such information thereafter.

For Kate

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>page x</i>
Introduction	1
1 Nation against state	16
2 Freedom, nation, and personhood	55
3 Self-stereotypes and national traditions	72
4 National traditions and the imagining of the nation	114
5 National traditions and the political process	138
6 Nation and state in the context of Czech culture	168
<i>Notes</i>	205
<i>References</i>	213
<i>Index</i>	220

Acknowledgements

Most of the material for this book was collected during my research in the Czech Republic from July 1992 to January 1993. My trip was sponsored by the Nuffield Foundation and I am very grateful for their generosity. In the Czech Republic my work would have been impossible without the continual help I was given. Jindřich and Soňa Švecovi, Josef and Olga Kandertovi, Milouš and Hana Stárkovi, Karel and Míla Dolečkoví, and Eliška Fučíková provided a much appreciated hospitality. Josef Kandert, secretary of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Society, put the society's facilities at my disposal and helped with bibliographic searches. Soňa Švecová, Miriam Moravcová, Václav Hubinger, and Zdeněk Uherek gave constructive criticism of my various interpretations. Furthermore, I wish to acknowledge the help provided by my two research assistants, Radim Tobolka and Štěpán Žežula. My thinking and writing has been profoundly influenced by invaluable comments on the earlier draft of the manuscript made by Nigel Rapport and Roy Dilley. Special thanks are due to Barbara Metzger for having edited the final draft for style, Jiří Všeťka for allowing me to use his photograph for the cover illustration, and Jessica Kuper for her editorial help.

Some of the material in chapter 5 was first published in *Contesting markets*, ed. R. Dilley (1992) and *Socialism: ideals, ideologies, and local practice*, ed. C. M. Hann (1993); and part of chapter 6 was first published in *Man* (N.S.) 29 (1994). I gratefully acknowledge the permission of the Edinburgh University Press, the Association of Social Anthropologists of the Commonwealth, and the Royal Anthropological Institute, respectively, to use this material in this book.

Introduction

Most of the sociological and political-scientific writing on Central and Eastern Europe is still grounded in a sociological universalism (Kapferer 1988: 3) which treats this region as a politically, economically, and, to some extent, even culturally undifferentiated whole. Various Central and Eastern European countries up to 1989 had essentially the same political and economic system and at present are undergoing what is again seen as essentially the same kind of transformation from a totalitarian political system to democratic pluralism and from a centrally planned to a market economy. Although various countries of the former Eastern bloc displayed many common features which made it possible to perceive the socialist system as radically different from the capitalist and liberal-democratic systems of the free world, there were also considerable differences among them. In so far as Western observers and commentators paid attention to these differences, they explained them by reference to pre-socialist history and political culture (Brown and Gray 1979; Rothschild 1989).

Social equality was an important aspect of the ideology of all former socialist countries, but in Czechoslovakia it was realised in practice to a far more significant degree than anywhere else in Eastern Europe. Czechoslovakia eliminated the private sector to a much greater extent and had a more egalitarian income policy than the other states of the socialist bloc. The political system in Czechoslovakia also had its specific features even under communist rule, particularly in retaining the office of president of the republic (Taborsky 1961: 167–72, 182–95).

The ‘velvet revolution’ of November 1989 which abruptly ended communist rule in Czechoslovakia differed significantly from the way in which the communist system was overthrown in other Eastern European countries. The political change in Czechoslovakia, in contrast with, for

example, the Soviet Union or Bulgaria, was not instigated by the ruling elites and largely accepted below, but brought about by the open revolt of the population. Perhaps the most significant feature of the 'velvet revolution' was that it was initiated by students, actors, and other intellectuals, whose publicly expressed opposition to the communist regime was swiftly followed by the masses. Although the creation of a post-socialist social order in Czechoslovakia and in what became the independent Czech Republic in 1993 has many similarities with the process which is now under way particularly in Poland and Hungary, it too has its unique features.

The differences in the form of the socialist system, in the way in which it ended and in the process of political and economic transformation which is now taking place in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, are the result of the different historical development of these countries and of the different cultures which are the product of this development. The aim of this book is to investigate the specific ways in which Czech cultural meanings and in particular the notion of Czech identity and the accompanying nationalist sentiments have affected life under communism, its overthrow, and the political and economic transformation of post-communist society.

Culture and politics; discourse and text

In discussing the role of cultural meanings in the post-communist transformation of Czech society, I make a distinction between culture and discourse. Following the line of thought developed, among others, by Geertz (1973), Schneider (1976, 1980), and Spiro (1982), I understand culture as a system of collectively held notions, beliefs, premises, ideas, dispositions, and understandings. This system is not something that is locked in people's heads but is embodied in shared symbols which are the main vehicles through which people communicate their worldview, value orientations, and ethos to one another.

Politics has for the most part not been the subject of study as a cultural system. It is still often conceptualised as governed by strictly rational considerations of a purely utilitarian kind, of which considerations of costs and benefits are a classical model. Numerous books by historians and political scientists on the political history of the Czechoslovak state are informed by this conceptualisation of the political, and many anthropological studies of politics have also been grounded in it. Anthropologists have examined politics as a give-and-take in which people follow their material interests as consumers in the market of benefits, rights, duties, and privileges. For many, politics is about interest groups, economic forces, and power relations.

I do not conceptualise politics simply as the pursuit of group and sectional interests independent of any particular culture. My assumption is that politics is an aspect of the overall cultural system and every political action is embedded in a wider cultural context. Thus cultural presuppositions and values which in themselves would not be seen as political (in the strict sense of the term) inevitably influence political action (in the narrow sense of the term). In referring to specific political events I pay less attention to particular policies than to the various symbols through which people make sense of the political process.

A similar conceptualisation of the political has been suggested by those anthropologists who see political action as first of all symbolic. In their view, symbolic action is the main form of interaction of political elites with the public and with each other when they are in public view; it is used to assert the legitimacy of power and to bolster the rulers' authority. Symbols are widely used to arouse emotions and enthusiasm for politics. They are used to express identification with particular policies or political forces and are the main means by which people make sense of the political process, which presents itself to them primarily in symbolic form. All in all, attitudes are shaped more by symbolic forms than by utilitarian calculations (Kertzer 1988). The potency of symbols in political processes derives from the fact that they are vehicles for conception, as Geertz expressed it (1966: 5). In my discussion of specific political events in recent Czechoslovak history, I concentrate on the myths, symbols, and traditions which make possible the identification of people as members of the Czech nation and create Czech national consciousness.

The shared cultural notions underlying and giving meaning to events are invoked not only in symbolic form but also in specific discourses as either implicit or explicit assumptions which underlie their logic or are their explicit subject. The term 'discourse' derives from many different sources and scholarly traditions and in social scientific practice carries different meanings which are often purposely vague (Scherzer 1987: 296). For many writers it is employed in reference to a particular view, model, definition, argument, or even relation. In a more rigorous usage the term has two different senses. Whereas linguists tend to see discourse as units of language that exceed the limits of a single sentence and are produced in everyday communication (see, e.g., Halliday 1978: 109; Halliday and Hasan 1976: 10), anthropologists and some discourse analysts, following the usage shaped largely by Foucault (1972, 1979), tend to see it as a corpus of 'texts' taking spoken, written, iconic, kinesic, musical, and other forms (Seidel 1989: 222) and produced in a variety of contexts (see, e.g.,

Fairclough 1989: 24; Fairclough 1992; Seidel 1989; Milton 1993). Adopting the latter view, I take discourse to be socially constituted communication which leads to the production of a set of 'texts'. These need not be written or oral but may be constituted through other modes of expression, for example, through the representational or performative arts. Even in their written or spoken form they need not be restricted to a single genre. 'Culture' I take to be a system of notions, ideas, and premises which is not exclusive to any particular discourse but underlies a multiplicity of them.

My discussion concentrates on discourses which gained prominence in Czech society after the fall of the communist regime, and either could not have emerged under communism or had been driven underground and restricted to a narrow circle of dissidents: discourses on the market economy, various forms of ownership, democratic pluralism, civil society, the environment, gender relations, individualism and nationalism, modern Czech history, and Czechoslovak and Czech statehood, among others. These are all public discourses concerned with issues which the fall of communism and the post-communist transformation of society brought into prominence. In limiting myself to the consideration of this type of discourse I do not imply that they are the only ones which currently exist in Czech society.

Linguistic anthropologists have examined the ways in which grammatical categories are used in poetic, magical, and political discourse and reflect culturally specific ways of expressing meaning and the unconscious patterning of thought (Scherzer 1987). Their insight that to 'study culture we must study the actual forms of discourse produced and performed by societies and individuals' (Scherzer 1987: 306) has, however, been hampered by the fact that they have concentrated mainly on 'the formal patterning principles that organize forms of oral discourse' (Bauman 1986: ix). In focusing on structure they have largely overlooked the fact that discourse also always says something about something (J. B. Thompson 1984: 8, 100; J. B. Thompson 1990: 287ff.). In my analysis of Czech discourses I concentrate not on their structure but on their content. All of them creatively seize on and make explicit what can be seen as basic premises of Czech culture. This is not, however, the only reason I consider discourse an important entry into Czech cultural meanings.

The concept of culture as an ideational system has often led anthropologists to consider culture as a product or object, 'a unitary code of meaning that passes down over time without fundamental alteration and that operates apart from individual or collective action' (Fox 1985: 154).

More often than not, this conceptualisation of culture has limited our insight into the dynamics of cultural processes, particularly the simultaneous processes of continuity of tradition and constant cultural change. An adequate conception of culture must account for the mechanisms which produce both continuity and change. As many discourse analysts have pointed out, discourse is the locus of such mechanisms (Halliday 1978: 124–5; Scherzer 1987: 296, 306; G. Urban 1991: 17). In discussing contemporary Czech discourses I pay particular attention to the way in which what Czechs consider their time-honoured traditions and deep-rooted cultural notions are reproduced and thus perpetually re-created in the present. These discourses are the locus of “‘a management of meaning” by which culture is generated and maintained, transmitted and received, applied, exhibited, remembered, scrutinised, and experimented with’ (Hannerz 1987: 550). As Czech culture, like any other, is continuously re-created in contemporary discourses, it is ‘always in the making’ (Fox 1985: 137, 199) and always a ‘work in progress’ (Hannerz 1987: 550). Czechs themselves are able to see it as an enduring and unchanging tradition because any particular discourse is always constructed in opposition to some other (Thomas 1992). The post-communist transformation of society is a situation of dramatic social change. The discourses which have emerged in this situation either have explicitly invoked discourses current in pre-socialist Czech society or have been constructed in conscious opposition to the official discourses current during the socialist period. In either case, by referring to previous historically situated discourses, they keep alive and, in a new historical situation, make relevant the notions expressed in them and thus create the impression of an unchanging cultural tradition. At the same time, because the current discourses are always conceived of as in contradistinction to past ones, they also foster the impression of change. These two seemingly contradictory impressions form the background for my discussion of the notion of Czech identity.

Czechs and Slovaks

National identity, like all other identities, is always constructed in opposition to those perceived as the Other (Cohen 1974; Grillo 1980; Heiberg 1980; Schlesinger 1987). During their nineteenth-century ‘national revival’, Czechs constructed their identity in conscious opposition to the Germans with whom they shared geographical, political, and economic space within the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Their pursuit of national sovereignty culminated in 1918 with the creation of the Czechoslovak Republic as one of the successors of the defeated empire. Although estab-

lished on the principle of every nation's right to self-determination, Czechoslovakia was in fact a multinational state. Most importantly, it had a sizeable German minority. The Czechs did not feel numerically strong enough to assert themselves against the German element, and therefore the new state was conceived as that of the Czechs, until then part of Austria, and the Slovaks, until then an ethnic minority in Hungary. The inclusion of Czechs and Slovaks in a common state was to the advantage of both. For Czechs it meant the achievement, together with the Slovaks, of an indisputable majority in a multiethnic state. For Slovaks it meant the preservation of their national identity, which had been under constant and ever-increasing threat.

Although Czechoslovakia was a multiethnic state, the Czechs identified fully with it, considering it the restoration of their statehood after three hundred years of Habsburg rule. A growing number of Slovaks were, however, dissatisfied with the dominant role of the Czechs and began to perceive the new republic as replacing their former subordination to Budapest with subordination to Prague. Uneasy Czech-Slovak relations eventually led to the declaration of an independent Slovak state under Nazi tutelage in 1939, the constitution of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic as a federal state in 1968, the confirmation of the federal structure after the demise of communism in 1989, and the eventual separation of Czechoslovakia into independent Czech and Slovak states in 1993.

There were only three federated states among the former socialist countries whose political systems were divided along national lines: the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. All three disintegrated in the aftermath of the fall of the communist system amidst increasing national tensions. The upsurge of nationalist sentiment in Czechoslovakia did not take the violent form that it did in Yugoslavia and parts of the former Soviet Union but manifested itself in prolonged constitutional crisis and political paralysis. The prevailing feeling in the Czech lands – Bohemia and Moravia – is that the disintegration of Czechoslovakia in 1993 was the result of Slovak nationalism, anti-Czech sentiment, and Slovak separatism.

This book is not a study of Czech-Slovak relations but a study of Czech national identity. In it I try to formulate what it means to be a Czech to those who describe themselves as such. The reason I pay some attention to Czech-Slovak relations is that since the expulsion of the German population from Czechoslovakia in 1945, Czechs have been constructing their national identity mainly in opposition to Slovaks, perceived as their most significant Other. In discussing Czech-Slovak relations, I describe them

solely from the Czech point of view. As I lived and worked only among Czechs, I can talk only about how Czechs see the Slovaks but not about how Slovaks see the Czechs. I suggest, among other things, that against Slovak nationalism stands what may be called Czech nationalism: awareness of a separate Czech identity, the deep-rooted conviction of the existence of a Czech nation, and an explicit or tacit identification with it. This Czech nationalism tends to be overshadowed by the manifest Slovak nationalism even for many Czechs, who, paradoxically, manifest it through its vehement denial. This is because it is the nationalism of a dominant nation which, unlike the Slovak nation, had in its own view already achieved sovereignty in the Czechoslovak Republic.

Czech national identity

The disintegration of Czechoslovakia is generally seen as one instance of a general process of transformation taking place in the former communist countries whereby the ideology of communism is replaced by that of nationalism. The disintegration of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, accompanied by the rise of an often violent nationalism, as well as the peaceful disintegration of Czechoslovakia along national lines, reinforces the image of nationalism as 'the last word of communism' (Alan 1992: 8). According to this image, the disintegration of the 'communist empire' is accompanied by the proliferation of nation-states.

However, the image of the rise of nationalism as an ideology which has filled up the ideological vacuum created by the demise of communism is to a great extent an illusion. Verdery (1993) has argued that the roots of ethno-national conflict in the former socialist societies are not to be sought primarily in 'age-old enmities' and that it would be a mistake to imagine that ethnic and national conflicts had been simply suspended and held in 'cold storage' under socialism. On the contrary, national ideology and thinking in national terms were fostered by the political economy of socialism itself, particularly by its 'economy of shortage'. Although this particular explanation does not fit the Czechoslovak case, Verdery is right to point to the presence of nationalist sentiment under socialism, in spite of the suppression of its political expression. As far as socialist Czechoslovakia is concerned, hand in hand with the officially proclaimed ideology of 'proletarian internationalism' went the recognition of the national principle in the organisation of communist society and the communist state. In fact, the importance of this principle pre-dates the communist state. A constitutional decree of August 1945 deprived of Czechoslovak citizenship all Germans except those who had officially

adopted Czech or Slovak nationality before the war. Until then, Germans and Hungarians living on Czechoslovak territory had formally been Czechoslovak citizens, although, except for active anti-fascists, they had been considered 'unreliable' ones. The decree automatically confiscating their property took into consideration only their nationality. Consciousness of national identity and membership of a nation have in many other ways been strengthened by official policy. Post-war Czechoslovakia declared itself the common state of Czechs and Slovaks officially conceptualised as two equal nations. The federation of 1968 was a federation of two republics created on a national principle. The parliament – the Federal Assembly – included both the Chamber of the People and the Chamber of Nations, the deputies of which were representatives not of the citizens but of their respective nations. People were made aware of their nationality and reminded that it mattered in the occasional population censuses and in the inclusion of nationality on their identity cards.

The national principle in politics and the division of the political scene along national lines remained in place after the revolution of 1989 in spite of the new political rhetoric emphasising the ideals and values of civil society. The constitutional law of 1991 stipulated once again that the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was a voluntary union of the two equal republics of the Czech and Slovak nations based on the right of self-determination of each. The post-communist state retained the pre-war system of separate Czech and Slovak political groupings. The most important political organisation to emerge from the 'velvet revolution' was the Civic Forum, operating in the Czech lands; its Slovak counterpart was the Public Against Violence. All but one of the newly established political parties were either Czech or Slovak. The single exception was the Civic Democratic Party, a Czech party that in the 1992 elections campaigned and fielded its own candidates in Slovakia as well. However, the feeling of Czech political commentators was that the party began presenting itself as truly 'federal' too late in the campaign, and because of this failed to gain the 5 per cent of the popular vote in Slovakia necessary for representation in the Slovak National Council (the Slovak parliament).

Verdery (1992) points to various other causes of the rise of nationalist sentiment and xenophobia which are now observable in all former socialist countries of Eastern Europe. Among other things, she mentions that nationalism provides a convenient answer to the question of who is to blame for the economic and political backwardness of the former socialist countries in comparison with their Western counterparts. The idiom of national difference has become a convenient means of assigning blame to

others. In post-1989 Czechoslovakia, Slovaks habitually blamed the Czechs and Czechs blamed the Slovaks for all the ills of their common socialist past. According to opinion polls conducted in 1991, most Czechs and most Slovaks felt that they were financially subsidising the other nation (*Respekt*, 1991, no. 16: 1).

Because Czech nationalism since the creation of the republic in 1918 has been for the most part the nationalism of a dominant nation, Czechness has not needed to be openly asserted. This has led to the view, expressed some fifteen years ago in the discussion in Czech émigré circles about the meaning of Czechness, that the Czech nation no longer existed – that all that was left was a Czech-speaking population. Awareness of being Czech is tacit (Macura 1993: 11). It is grounded in an implicit awareness of the common historical fate of the collectivity spoken of as ‘we’, but is seldom the subject of an explicit discourse. It becomes such either in situations which are perceived as national crises or when what is tacitly taken as the Czech way of doing things is threatened by those perceived as the Other. In my exploration of Czech identity I concentrate on certain such recent situations which are of special methodological significance because they represent moments of explicit symbolic manipulation. Just as this manipulation makes assumptions about shared national identity transparent to its participants, it makes them transparent to the observing anthropologist. This is in no small measure due to the fact that in such situations symbols are often contested, verbally interpreted, and in numerous other ways explicitly linked to the values, notions, and ideas for which they stand. For these reasons, I use as my main ethnography a few selected events from recent political history, which I discuss more or less in the order in which they unfolded in historical time: the demonstrations in Prague in 1988 and 1989 which preceded the ‘velvet revolution’ of November 1989 (chapter 1), the events of November 1989 and the discussion surrounding the beginning of the transformation of Czechoslovak economy (chapter 5), and the political negotiations over the structure of the post-communist state and the discourse about the independent Czech state (chapter 6).

Examining the first public demonstrations against the communist regime in 1988 and 1989 and the overthrow of the communist system in 1989, I argue that the opposition to the communist system was carried out in the name of the nation and was construed as the nation’s rising against what was generally perceived as foreign oppression. The rise of nationalist sentiment, far from being a result of the fall of communism, in fact preceded it and stemmed from the perception of socialism as an alien, Soviet imposition which had ruthlessly destroyed the traditions and values which