Czechoslovak Social Democracy Between Revolution and Evolution: Party Daily Press *Právo lidu* 1918–1935[1]

František Chalupa[2]

Abstract

This article deals with the ideological and strategic crossroads of the social-democratic movement. Despite the choice of the environment of interwar Czechoslovakia, the article's conclusion is intended to provide a new conceptualisation of the topic of socialism when the author uses a specific Central European case. Using discursive analysis, this pilot study follows the revolutionary discourse, represented press by articles in the official daily newspaper of the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Labour Party – Právo lidu. The discursive strategies emerging from the articles in the newspaper Právo lidu correspond to a revolutionary-socialist discourse that stretches from early Marx to the present. Some aspects of revolutionary thinking change, but the fundamental pillars remain the same. The reduction of social problems to a class scheme, the division between us and them, the division between exploiters and exploited. All this is set in a linear scheme that ends in redemption in the form of an egalitarian society. Based on the observed discourse and a reflection on the literature, the article concludes by offering starting points for an analysis of the position of social democracy at the ideological and strategic crossroads.

Keywords: revolution; socialism; social democracy; Marxism; critical discourse analysis; Czechoslovakia

DOI: 10.5817/PC2026-2-40830

1 This article was written at Masaryk University with the support of the Specific University Research Grant.

2 PhD Candidate at the Department of Political Science, Masaryk University, Joštova 10, 602 00 Brno, Czech Republic. E-mail: 462335@mail.muni.cz. ORCID: 0009-0005-5755-3620.

1. Introduction

This article focuses on the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party's newspaper Právo lidu. Its primary aim is to examining the nature of socialist ideology as reflected in party press – an expression that significantly differs from its manifestation in high politics. The findings of this pilot study aim to contribute to the discourse on whether interwar social democracy represents continuity or discontinuity with its present-day counterpart. The analysis of articles is conducted using critical discourse analysis (CDA), grounded in a social constructivist framework. The objective is to challenge the entrenched interpretive schemas, which will be discussed below.

The Czechoslovak Social Democratic Workers' Party (ČSDSD) is the historical predecessor of today's Czech party Social Democracy (SOCDEM), formerly known as the Czech Social Democratic Party (ČSSD) until June 2023. Founded as early as 1878 (Kořalka, 1999, p. 283), it is the oldest Czech political party that continues to operate. In this spirit, the contemporary SOCDEM invokes its historical lineage on its official website, emphasising consistent continuity with the present (SOCDEM, n.d.). Since the 1990s, ČSSD has faced challenges similar to those of 1920–1938 and 1945–1948. Then, as of now, social democracy has had to contend with the existence of another left-wing party that also emphasises the issue of social equality. The question thus remains: what distinguished these two parties in the past, and what distinguishes them today?

In the context of the 1990s and the early decades of the 21st century, the answer to this question may appear relatively straightforward. Social democracy advocates for greater economic regulation and progressive taxation (similar to the Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia, KSČM), but through democratic means, whereas the communists ruled for nearly 41 years under a totalitarian, or at least authoritarian, regime. KSČM, successor to the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (KSČ), ideologically maintains continuity with the revolutionary path to socialism, despite formally distancing itself from violence and despotism (KSČM, 1992). Even after years of functioning in a democratic political regime, the highest representatives of KSČM have legitimised the events of 1948, 1968, etc. (e.g. Malát, 2018; Horák, 2018), while speaking out against the West and capitalism (Stačilo!, 2025a). The dividing line drawn between the ČSSD and the KSČM thus appears unmistakable and unquestionable. One belongs to the old European family of social democratic parties, the other follows the tradition of the Third International and continues to take anti-Western and revolutionary positions. This changed completely before the 2025 parliamentary elections, when the Social Democrats decided to run together with the Communists on the same electoral lists (Stačilo!, 2025b). Candidacy on the same electoral list with the Communist Party of Bohemia and Moravia (KSČM) deputies is, however, in conflict with the Bohumín Resolution. (Charvát, 2013, p. 699–701). This decision

by the Social Democratic Party leadership is indicative of the presence of revolutionary thinking within an otherwise evolutionary socialist party not even today.

The communist regime, the communist party and the ideology of revolutionary socialism were the target of delegitimising interpretations in the Czech environment, especially during the 1990s. In 2012, the historian Jakub Rákosník (2012) commented on these interpretations in his article Three Paths of Contemporary Czech Historiography of Communism. The author speaks of the so-called delegitimisation current, which views the communist regime in a purely critical light and allegedly overestimates the role of politics in everyday life (Rákosník, 2012, p. 13–15). One does not have to agree with this critical characteristic of the delegitimisation current to accept the premise that communism, with all that characterises it, has been undergoing delegitimisation in Czechoslovakia and the Czech Republic since the 1990s, whether justified or not.

However, the concept of central planning and socialism in general is also undergoing a certain degree of delegitimisation. The electoral success of the neoliberal Civic Democratic Party (ODS) in the early 1990s can be explained this way. We were soon convinced otherwise by the renewed ČSSD, which would quickly become the main rival of ODS. However, it also has to deal with delegitimising some aspects of socialism. It does so by distancing itself from revolutionary rhetoric, from traditional Marxism, but above all from the vocabulary that can be associated with the previous regime. In retrospect, we would have expected a similar distancing from 1920 to 1938, when the two parties in question also sought a similar electorate, albeit in different realities. This assumption is only reinforced by the thesis of historian Zdeněk Kárník, who writes about social democracy as a stabilising element of interwar politics. I am convinced this view is primarily influenced by the author's ties to ČSSD (Schejbal, 2021, p. 156–158). This is not the only reason why a revision is necessary. The fact that the continuity of the current SOCDEM with ČSDSD and with the party from 1878 - the Social Democratic Czech-Slavic Party - is essential for the current SOCDEM leadership is illustrated by the History of Social Democracy section on the SOCDEM website. The authors of the section try to define themselves in particular against mixing the terms socialism and communism:

> It is becoming an unfortunate tradition that the terms socialism, communism and Stalinism are conflated and that the struggle for the social and political rights of the workers is, perhaps purposefully, identified by many with the effort to establish the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. However, the workers' movement in Western and Central European countries began to develop within the framework of democratic national movements in connection with the development of large-scale factory industry. (SOCDEM, n.d.)

Has the line between communism and democratic socialism always been as sharp as the authors of this column portray it? To understand the development of the Social Democratic Party, it is necessary to reopen this discussion. Some authors have done so before me. For example, Jakub Rákosník, already cited above, refers to the contradiction between democratic high politics and revolutionary rhetoric in his work Capitalism on its Knees (Rákosník & Noha, 2012, p. 241) about the interwar ČSDSD. However, such a claim also deserves support from empirical data. This article serves, among other things, as evidence for similar claims. The object of the investigation is the party press of the ČSDSD in the period from the establishment of Czechoslovakia in 1918 to the establishment of the so-called Popular Front against Fascism in 1935.

The structure of the paper is divided into theoretical conceptualisations, including a review of the literature, methodological framing, and analysis itself. The analytical part is further divided according to the images of the revolution that emerge from the articles in the pages of the party newspaper Právo lidu. The article is conceived as a pilot study of critical discourse analysis in line with the methodological principles of this approach. As such, it serves as a basis for comprehensive research that could answer the question of whether it is really possible to speak of revolutionary rhetoric within the Social Democratic Party during the period in question.

The research aims to present the discourse on revolution (revolutionary discourse) in the daily Právo lidu articles. These objectives lead me to formulate the following research questions:

- Q1: Are elements of revolutionary socialism present in the daily Právo lidu as part of the media discourse of Czechoslovak interwar social democracy?
- Q2: How may the analysis results change the interpretation of the social democratic position in the party system of interwar Czechoslovakia?

For this paper, it is necessary to operationalise the dichotomy of terminology between revolution and evolution. From this point of view, it is exceptionally functional to follow the original premises of Marx and Engels, who stand behind the idea of an inevitable proletarian revolution. I present the traditional interpretation of the division between evolutionary and revolutionary socialism in the sections below.

2. Evolutionary socialism and social democracy

Socialism as an ideology is defined by the principle of equality and by the aspiration to establish a new society founded upon this principle (Heywood, 2005, pp. 111–113). From the very beginning of socialist thought, perspectives have differed on how such a society might be achieved. The so-called utopian socialists

are regarded as the first generation of socialists; they sought to set an example for others by establishing communities based on the principle of equality, expecting that more and more people would eventually join them until socialism came to encompass society as a whole (Newman, 2005, p. 7). A fundamental re-evaluation of this strategy occurred around the mid-nineteenth century. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels formulated the foundations of the socialist revolution, which they understood as the inevitable outcome of history in its final stage of bourgeois capitalism (Marx & Engels, 1970). The cornerstone of Marxism was the so-called materialist dialectic, which is, by its very nature, based on the conflict between material thesis and antithesis (Engels, 1949). The so-called class struggle is grounded in the division between 'us' and 'them'. The essence of the revolution lies in the replacement of one form of rule by another, brought about through violent social upheaval (Marx & Engels, 1970, p. 60). I consider this dichotomy to represent the fundamental dividing line between revolutionary and evolutionary socialism.

Evolutionary socialism is founded upon the principle of state intervention aimed at equalizing the material conditions of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Instead of revolution, change is to be achieved through an evolutionary, democratic process within the system (Newman, 2005, p. 32). Social legislation and the establishment of state enterprises guaranteeing equal conditions for workers represent typical instruments of evolutionary socialism. Within this model, the state is to be governed democratically, and reforms are to be implemented through parliamentary and governmental positions. The success of this project is predicated upon the numerous working class, endowed with universal and equal suffrage.

A detailed analysis of this current was provided by Eduard Bernstein, the keeper of Engels' legacy and a prominent figure in German social democracy, in his work *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie* (1899), later published in English as *Evolutionary Socialism* (1907).

Bernstein positioned himself in opposition to traditional Marxism. By drawing on specific macroeconomic indicators, he demonstrated the inaccuracy of Marx's thesis that capitalism necessarily leads to increasing exploitation. According to Bernstein, when capitalist production is accompanied by regulation and social measures, it gives rise to a middle class and fosters a degree of prosperity even among the most disadvantaged. Elements of evolutionary socialism were already evident in the debates surrounding the Gotha Program of the German Social Democratic Party (SPD), which Marx criticized for its reactionary tendencies (Carver, 2012, pp. 208–226).

In this context, the distinction between revolutionary and evolutionary socialism is adopted chiefly to ensure analytical clarity. Various authors use analogous terms to designate the same distinction. Evolutionary socialism, for example, is also referred to as reformist or democratic socialism. The editors

of *The Cambridge History of Socialism* differentiate between 'state-negating' and 'state-transforming' movements (2022). Bernstein's work constitutes a pivotal milestone in the history of socialism, which is why the term evolutionary socialism is retained here. The dichotomy of revolutionary versus evolutionary socialism is likewise employed by other scholars (see Lebowitz, 2015; Heywood, 2004; Enyeart, 2003; Dietrich, 2017).

The most prominent representative of the evolutionary current in Central Europe has traditionally been social democracy. Originating in Germany in the 1860s, it was followed by national counterparts across Central Europe. One such movement was the Czech (later Czechoslovak) Social Democracy, which was developed as part of the pan-Austrian Social Democratic Party in the 1870s and emerged as an established party with a long tradition on the Czechoslovak political scene after World War I.

It is worth mentioning that the pre-war Czech Social Democracy possessed significant political strength. It was the most prominent representative among the emerging mass parties and mobilised previously unrepresented social groups to demonstrate in favour of universal and equal suffrage in 1905. After its implementation, the Czech Social Democracy repeatedly secured a substantial share of the seats in the Reichsrat, the Austrian Parliament. Following the 1907 elections, Czech Social Democracy became the most potent political party in the Czech lands and the most successful social democratic party in Austria. Outside Scandinavia, it would be difficult to find a social democratic party that engaged to such an extent on an international scale while also gaining a significant share of votes in domestic elections (Kořalka, 1996, p. 263).

Czechoslovak Social Democracy aimed for an international approach to socialist thought, yet it was aware of Czech and Central European specificities. Paradoxically, as noted by historian Jiří Kořalka, it 'achieved the greatest international recognition in terms of the distinctiveness of Czech national society' (Kořalka, 2005, pp. 234–235).

The industrialised Czech lands offered a substantial potential electorate in the form of Czech workers. In the pre-war and interwar periods, the Czech lands undoubtedly belonged to the industrialised countries of the West. German 'unifiers' included the region in their plans for the establishment of a democratic (or even social democratic) Greater Germany (Kořalka, 1996, p .250). Through the prism of Marx's dialectics of history, the environment of the Czech lands would probably fulfil the necessary conditions for the outbreak of a proletarian revolution. Czech and Czechoslovak Social Democracy built upon the experience gained within the Habsburg monarchy through collaboration with Austrian social democrats, which must have reinforced their belief that the Central European environment would be at least specific in implementing socialism. The Czech lands were inevitably influenced by German and Austrian political culture, although the political representatives of the First Republic (not to mention the post-war period) were not always willing to admit it.

Historian Zdeněk Kárník, who specialises in Czechoslovak Social Democracy, refers to the period from 1918 to 1938 as 'its golden twenty years' (Kárník, 2006, p. 46). It cannot be denied that the party achieved a resounding victory in the first parliamentary elections, surpassing any other party's result in Czechoslovakia before World War II. after Karel Kramář, Vlastimil Tusar, a social democrat, became the prime minister, making him one of the first social democratic prime ministers in the world (Kárník, 2006, pp. 46-52).

During the republic's early years, the party had to contend with a radical faction, which later became the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (KSČ). However, the personal and programmatic discrepancies were merely reflections of more profound ideological contradictions that could not be resolved through the separation of the communists. Social Democracy could not completely relinquish revolutionary thinking, even though it was compelled to operate within the democratic institutions of the Czechoslovak state. Revolution remained a part of the party's rhetoric, as evidenced in the interwar party press.

3. State-building narrative

Czechoslovak Social Democracy underwent a dynamic development from its inception to the present day. Respected Czech historians Zdeněk Kárník and Antonín Klimek conceptualize Social Democracy within closed chronological periods. In the case of the role of Social Democracy in the history of the First Republic (1918–1938), these authors describe it as a state-building party (Klimek, 1996, pp. 152–155, Kárník, 2006, p. 46–59). Their attention is focused on high politics and on specific actions within parliament and governmental offices. Less attention is devoted to rhetoric and the analysis of narratives disseminated by Social Democratic representatives, primarily through the party press.

The role of Czechoslovak Social Democracy in modern Czechoslovak history cannot be examined within closed periods. A broader perspective is necessary. Social Democracy can be analysed in the context of the struggle for universal suffrage before the First World War, in the context of the threat of fascism in the 1930s, and subsequently in relation to its role around February 1948[1], and so forth. Such a narrow perspective would invariably lead the researcher to different conclusions in each case. It is, however, essential to also trace longer-term tendencies and trends. February 1948 was not solely the result of the activities of the Communist Party. It was the outcome of a general mood within society, shaped by many factors. On the one hand, trust in democratic institutions had been discredited by the acceptance of the results of the Munich Conference (Kokoška, 2004, p. 41–55). Communism gained popularity also due to the role of the Red Army and the Soviet Union in the liberation of Czechoslovak territory (Rychlík, 2020, p. 43). Yet one must not overlook the revolutionary culture that had been nurtured since the very emergence of the workers' movement.

According to some authors, the narrative of the exploiting bourgeoisie was disseminated exclusively by the Communist Party, which, from 1921 onward, thereby distinguished itself from Social Democracy. Such a view, however, is incomplete or even inaccurate. As I demonstrate below, revolutionary culture was also cultivated in the pages of the Social Democratic party daily. This was the case despite the genuinely state-building statements and actions of the party's top representatives. This ambivalent situation was typical of Social Democracy. Emphasizing only one dimension of the party's activity, I regard as a weakness of the state-building narrative represented by mainstream historians (see Kárník, 2000; Klimek, 1996; Kuklík, 2005).

Other authors also cast doubt on the democratic and evolutionary character of Social Democracy. Some of them take a critical stance toward the state-building narrative. In the Czechoslovak case, the historian of economic and social history Jakub Rákosník points to the ambivalent situation of Social Democracy (Rákosník & Noha, 2012, p. 241). This pilot study supports his statements with specific data.

4. Social democracy and its party press

The party press in the Czechoslovak Social Democracy already had a long tradition at the time in the interwar period. *Právo lidu*, the party's daily, was first published under this name in 1897 but followed several earlier party periodicals (Bednařík, Jirák, & Köpplová, p. 144). *Právo lidu* did not hide its support for the party; it was printed in Hybernská Street, where the *Večerník Práva lidu* (evening newspaper) was also published. The party papers included, for example, *Duch času* in Ostrava, *Nová doba* in Pilsen, *Svoboda* in Kladno, and the essential *Rovnost* in Brno (Kárník, 2000, p. 330). Authors standing for the social democratic doctrine contributed to *Naše Doba*, *Přítomnost*, and the topic of social policy received attention in the *Social Review*. Academic discussions took place in the pages of Masaryk's *Sociologická revue*, and Marxist youth discussed in *Studentská revue* (Polášek, 2011, p. 103).

The main daily newspaper, *Právo lidu*, was published daily throughout the First Republic. Josef Stivín, a leading party representative, was its editor-in-chief during this period. The publicist Jaroslav Koudelka, the deputy editor, compensated for its radical form and wrote several reflective articles. Vincenc Charvát was the editor in charge of *Večerník*. Among the regular contributors were the highest-ranking party functionaries such as Rudolf Bechyně, Antonín Němec, Antonín Srba, František Soukup, etc. Gustav Winter, for example, contributed from abroad, Theodoros Pitorius commented on economic issues, and the cultural section contains articles by Emil Vachek, A. M. Píša, F. V. Krejčí and A. M. Tilsch. Josefa Severýnová headed the women's section (Kárník, 2000, p. 330).

The split in the party in 1920 marked a turning point for the party press. Many newspapers switched to the left, conflicts over future orientation arose,

and the whole system of party journalism was irrevocably damaged. The Social Democratic periodicals lost many contributors (Bohumír Šmeral, Emanuel Škatula, Jan Skála, Josef Skalák, etc.). The Bolshevization of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia after the Fifth Congress (1929), however, marked a certain turning point, with some authors, such as Jaroslav Seifert, turning back to Social Democracy (Kárník, 2000, p. 330).

5. Methodology

Methodologically, this study is grounded in critical discourse analysis (CDA), specifically in the discourse-historical approach (DHA). The method is applied primarily in research on populism and right-wing extremism (see Wodak & Krzyżanowski, 2017; Wodak, KhosraviNik, & Mral, 2013; Krzyżanowski, 2018). At its core lies the Foucauldian concept of discourse. Discourse is regulated by its own rules and manifests itself in various sites within the public space (Foucault, 1994, pp. 7–37). Its manifestations converge in so-called nodal points (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). The approaches within CDA are united by a scholarly interest in the relationship between discourse and power or hegemony. The focus of interest is typically on subjects that construct particular narratives through so-called discursive strategies. Thus, if within revolutionary-socialist discourse the call for an egalitarian society constitutes a discursive event, the formulation of the so-called dialectics of history represents a discursive formation, while the concrete presentation of the bourgeoisie as a class enemy constitutes part of the discursive strategy.

Ruth Wodak distinguishes the following discursive strategies: nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivisation, mitigation or intensification, and legitimisation (see. Reisigl & Wodak, 2015, p. 33, Wodak, 2017). Within the strategy of nomination, the author of the utterance characterises and represents reality or directly the actor. The predication strategy evaluates the actor or reality, and typically adjectives are employed within this strategy. The represented actor is no longer merely described, but explicitly evaluated, praised, or, conversely, rejected. Argumentation constructs reasoning that supports the premises of the author's utterance or the overall perspective. Perspectivisation presents the given reality or actor within the social environment from a particular perspective chosen by the author of the utterance. Within mitigation and intensification, certain facts and contexts are downplayed or, on the contrary, accentuated (Reisigl & Wodak, 2015, p. 33). The legitimisation strategy serves the function of defending the author of the utterance or another actor. What links the individual discursive strategies is precisely the discourse itself. They are regulated and determined by a specific mode of reasoning about reality within the given discourse.

Revolutionary socialism is built on certain conceptions of reality. The system is framed as capitalist and bourgeois, and is presented as the outcome of dialectical

transformations of society through recurring revolutions from ancient times to the modern era (Marx & Engels, 1970, pp. 30–32). The confrontation of classes is characterised as class struggle, and specific attributes and evaluative markers are ascribed to the actors of this struggle. Argumentation is carried out through the selection of particular data, which, within intensification, are exaggerated, while data that contradict the stated thesis are, within mitigation, downplayed. Revolutionary socialism views society through the lens of means of production (Heywood, 2005, pp. 130–131). Revolution is conceived as the path to a classless society, and the violence it entails is legitimised by the desired outcome of an egalitarian society. This constitutes a distinct intellectual world, which may at certain points intersect with evolutionary socialism, but in its entirety stands in opposition to it. The state and trade unions, the fundamental pillars of evolutionary socialism, have no place in the dialectics of history. Any improvement in workers' living conditions within the system contradicts the thesis of the necessary intensification of class struggle leading to revolution. This set of ideas, governed by its own rules, forms the revolutionary (revolutionary socialist) discourse. Its fundamental characteristic is the division into 'us' and 'them', and a linear schema of the course of history through recurrent revolutions culminating in the final state – communism. By its very nature, it is anti-state and undemocratic. And, as it states below, it is not the exclusive domain of communists, but is also present within the social democratic movement.

Discourse analysis possesses distinctive characteristics that are most clearly articulated in contrast to content analysis. Both approaches are employed for the examination of texts, yet they rest on different epistemological premises and pursue divergent objectives. Whereas content analysis is confined to the level of *what is explicitly stated*, discourse analysis moves beyond the text in order to uncover the underlying rules and regularities that structure discursive practice.

This distinction has direct implications for the selection of material. Within content analysis, the corpus must be delineated precisely in terms of theme, temporal frame, and scope. The sample is expected to be representative and determined according to firmly established rules, steps, and procedures. Discourse analysis, by contrast, presupposes greater flexibility. The discourse itself delineates which texts or statements are analytically relevant and which are not. Moreover, the corpus remains open, allowing for the inclusion of additional material insofar as it can be situated within the discursive formation under investigation.

In the case of revolutionary discourse, for example, the relevant corpus consists of texts embedded within the intellectual framework of revolutionary socialism. Within such texts, society is discursively constructed in dichotomous terms (*us vs. them*), teleological closure is promised through the articulation of a final goal, and specific discursive strategies are deployed. Leading contributors to critical discourse analysis consistently underscore that there is no standardized procedure for data collection (Meyer & Wodak, 2015, p. 21). Rather, CDA requires

an organic and reflexive engagement with discourse. Within discourse analysis, it is not even desirable to place greater emphasis on the role of the author. It is necessary to detach from the individuality of the author and examine the text within its contexts (Foucault, 1994, pp. 41–73). Roland Barthes is even more strict and refers to this as the 'death of the author' (Schubertová, 2021, p. 17–26). In the case of newspaper articles, authorship is often unclear (see Fairclough, 1992, p. 78) and not necessary to understand the discourse practise.

6. The image of revolution in the party's daily newspaper, Právo lidu

The idea of revolution is a cornerstone of socialist rhetoric, but as we shall see, it has various meanings. There is not one kind of revolution. Clinging to the literal interpretation of a text always runs into the social constructivist objection that we only create images of reality through language, so it is impossible to substitute words for reality. Therefore, the possibility of sorting out these meanings is offered, a route that dictionary, handbook or encyclopaedia authors take when defining meanings. In case of socialism, they write primarily about political revolution (see Heywood, 2005; Miller, 1995). Sometimes, revolution is a sudden reversal, sometimes a complex process; some writers frame it in purely practical terms, while in the conception of others, revolution occurs primarily on the ideological plane (Miller, 1995, pp. 420–425). If we accept, at least in part, the ideological conception of revolution, for example, we must abandon the categorisations mentioned above, as they would probably be a challenge even for a powerful supercomputer.

So, in this study, I am not just looking for meaning. I am trying to trace the formation process of a shared image, that communication between reality, social structures and the text under study. Such a qualitative analysis will not provide us with definitions or categories. But it will give us an outline of the process by which the shared image of revolution is formed.

The question of the extent to which social democracy employed revolutionary rhetoric cannot be fully answered on the basis of a single pilot analysis. Nevertheless, such a pilot study constitutes a crucial foundation for future research on this topic. Revolutionary discourse is manifest in numerous instances within the articles published in *Právo lidu*. The procedure applied within the chosen methodological framework involves the selection of keywords derived from so-called nodal points. This set of keywords is subject to modification and, above all, expansion throughout the course of the research. All keywords are derived from the conceptual categories of revolutionary socialism, such as class struggle, capitalism, the enemy, socialism, revolution, and others.

6.1 The road to a socially just world

The understanding of revolution among socialists will always be more or less influenced by Marx's materialist dialectic from which the dialectic of history flows. The constant alternation of opposites shapes history. However, the socialists do not think in cycles. The Marxist theory that constitutes the thinking of social democrats is linear. The idea of the end of history in the form of a classless society is present in the everyday efforts to improve the worker's life and adds to its pomposity. The simple demand to cut a 'bigger slice' out of the capitalist 'pie' is typical of the American trade union movement. Still, for Central European socialists, it lacks a higher dimension. The factory owner is, therefore, not just a factory owner or 'boss'. The socialist, though democratic, lends him a historical role, that of an enemy who stands between the proletariat and a just society. The 'capitalist' (*kapitalista*) (Ejhle kapitalistickou morálku, 1930, p. 5), 'the big landlord' (*velkostatkář*) (Půda národu a lidu, 1918, p. 1), 'the bourgeois' (*buržoust*) (Buržoazie a proletariat, 1918, p. 1) and, in short, 'the owner of the means of production' (*vlastník výrobních prostředků*) (Konfiskace a expropriate, 1918, p. 1) are not seen as partners in the discussion to which social democracy subscribes within its democracy. They are still the same class enemies that Marx had in mind when he formulated his justification for violent revolution. The owner of the means of production will play his role to fulfil that 'moment of history':

> The financial means for this can only be procured by a pervasive transformation of property relations, even though the Czech Republic would not fulfil the great ideas of the age if it continued to suffer the exploitation of man by man, as is carried out today on large estates, and in large factories and enterprises. (Konfiskace a expropriate 1918, p. 1)

However, the revolution is not meant to be violent; the class enemy is not meant to be overthrown and replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the communists demand. This is the view derived from the many factors that arise from the social democratic experience of the pre-war period, but also from the environment of the new Czechoslovak state and the reaction to the radicalisation and independence of the left wing of the party, and hence of the communists. Despite this, words like 'struggle' (*boj, zápas*) are still used here. In the early days, even the idea of following the Russian way had not been wholly discarded yet: 'Should we remain on our current path, i.e., the path of democracy, or should we take up the methods of Russian Bolshevism, i.e., the dictatorship of the revolutionary proletariat?' (Bechyně, 1918, p. 1). Such questions fade with time, and the ever-militant vocabulary must do without specific formulas. Even when Rudolf Bechyně 'advises the workers to remain on the path of democracy' (Bechyně, 1918, p. 1), he still speaks of 'the struggle between capital and labour, between capitalism and socialism' (Bechyně, 1918, p. 1).

From the article's point of view, the metalworkers' (*kovodělníci*) strike is not simply a method of pushing for better treatment; the metalworkers are fighting 'together against the aggressive capitalists' (Němec, 1919, p. 2). The 'crimes of the capitalists' are to be eliminated. Revolution is at the forefront of associations with such statements, but it is not referred to directly. But how else to deal with the 'robbery and murderous capitalist culture' than to put down the system altogether? Capitalism, however, 'lost the moment it dealt a death blow to socialism' (Němec, 1919, p. 2). It is, therefore, necessary to find out how 'the capitalists are organising themselves' (Jak se kapitalisté organisují, 1919, p. 5) to be able to 'knock down the class bastions of the bourgeoisie' (Dnes všichni k volbě, 1919, p. 1), with *Právo lidu* calling out, 'To the struggle!' (Dnes všichni k volbě, 1919, p. 1). These last words are used in the context of municipal elections, not in the context of a violent coup. Even trade union activity in the form of strikes is said to have its limits. The state should intervene by expropriation because there is no hope of 'miners negotiating with coal tycoons' (Žádná naděje na vyjednávání, 1923, p. 5).

The ordinary consciousness of socialists understands the world order as capitalism, where means of production play a significant role in determining history. The idea that any area is outside this conception is not accepted even by social democrats. Capitalism is primarily about factories. Yet, based on the premise above, socialists include agriculture, where land tenure is seen either as a relic of feudalism, which constituted one of the chapters of the dialectic of history or as a 'victim of capitalism' (Zemědělství jako oběť, 1930, p. 1), where the same theories are applied to agricultural output as to factory production. People who work on farms are then not the peasantry, which does not fulfil that historical role, but 'agricultural workers' (*zemědělské dělnictvo*) (Útok agrárníků na mzdy, 1930, p. 1).

The political practice of the First Republic is already built on the clash of interests and opinions that bind the unifying element of democracy and partly of the nation. Negotiations in parliamentary circles or within the Five[2], which involve a series of compromises, are also in this spirit. Readers of one article are said to be living in 'an age of rugged individualism' (Veselý, 1930, p. 3) that is disrupting society. Yet it does not aspire, as socialism does, to 'create a higher social order' (Veselý, 1930, p. 3). The way to such an order is not through individualism but through a collective economy. The text admits that the working man, within a collectivist system, (Veselý, 1930, p. 3) 'stands at the lowest rung of the economic ladder', but 'under the educational influence of socialism and its heralds, he creates his own collective, cooperative enterprises on the broad base of democracy…', The individual is thus not ownership, but the consciousness of participation in something that transcends us.

The image of the revolution as a path to a *socially just world* is constructed in relation to embedding social democracy in the democratic structures of the state and in opposition to the alternative of communist radicalism. Revolution is

therefore not mentioned directly, but many of the statements give the impression of a revolutionary narrative in which everything fits; only the word revolution is missing. The figure of the enemy is present, and the fundamental transformation of the existing order, even the end of capitalism, is written about. The old order is based on inequality and unfriendly; its representatives are exploiters of the workers. Social democracy aspires to overthrow the old system and replace the collective way of production, life, and thinking. The word revolution is absent; the words *struggle* (*boj*), *crimes* (*zločiny*), or *victims* are frequent tools of the *Právo lidu* in the period under review.

6.2 The reactionary

As ambivalent as social democracy's relationship to revolution, its relationship with those who intend to stand in the way of progress is intensely hostile. The image of the enemy in the form of the so-called reaction, or reactionaries, arises again from the remnants of the Marxist language that social democracy would not abandon throughout the First Republic. Democracy presupposes a discussion with opponents, which the representatives of social democracy have with the representatives of other parties. However, in forums, party congresses, agitation leaflets and not least in the party press, they speak of a vile reaction which at one time wages a 'struggle against land reform' (Boj proti reformě, 1921, p. 1) and at another time attacks 'the most precious of the workers' post-war achievements' (Nový útok, 1930, p. 4) – the eight-hour working day.

The reactionary (*reakcionář*) is, first and foremost, a representative of a policy that opposes progress, often a politician from one of the major political parties. Members of the reactionary movement thus included agrarians. Before the land reform, there is even a reactionary agrarian who intends to stand 'against the expropriation of large estates' (Úklady agrárníků, 1918, p. 1) or otherwise defend landowners from the effects of land reform. At other times, the agrarian is likened to the Bolsheviks (Agrárnický 'bolševismus', 1918, p. 3), with the peasant who '… plunders the property of the Czech Republic' (Agrárnický 'bolševismus' 1918, p. 3) being substituted for the owner of the means of production. The image of the agrarian reactionary also appears in articles such as *Struggle for Land in the Czechoslovak Republic* (Boj o půdu v československé republice, 1918, p. 1) and *To All Agricultural Workers* (Veškerému dělnictvu zemědělskému, 1930, p. 7).

However, reaction (*reakce*)is also the enemy of the proletariat: the bourgeoisie, which is trying to hold on to its positions and profits. It acts primarily on behalf of one of the parties, for example, as the mouthpiece of national democracy. It opposes 'unemployment benefits' (Buržoasie proti podporám, 1921, p. 2) and defends the interests of 'unscrupulous capitalists' (Buržoasie proti podporám, 1921, p. 2). The National Socialists, who, although ironically described as 'brothers', vote with the

Czech and German 'bourgeoisie', do not escape inclusion in this category. Their activities are thus labelled, for example, as 'sabotage of the unemployment law' (Sabotáž zákona o nezaměstnaných, 1921, p. 1).

Suppose one attacks the achievements of social democracy. In that case, one is branded a reactionary who stands 'against social progress' (Fronta proti pokroku, 1935, p. 1). In such a case, a 'communist reactionary' can stand alongside the representatives of the bourgeoisie and the National Socialists:

So, a Czechoslovak National Socialist, a Bolshevik and a National Democrat (or if you prefer, a 'National Unificationist') stand and fight on the same front, with the same weapons, against the same demand, which is of great importance to the workers. And this is what strikes us – for how can the workers be saved from impoverishment, from complete enslavement, from the devastating consequences of unemployment and rationalisation, if the most critical fundament of workers' protection – the reduction of working hours – is not provided? (Fronta proti pokroku, 1935, p. 1)

But a reactionary can also be a 'patriot' (*vlastenec*) who 'most abuses the words "fatherland" and "nation"' (Pusté žvanění, 1935, p. 1). Thus, against the social progress that is linked to the democratic state there stands a nationalist front that 'copies Hitler'. 'Henlein, Hlinka, Hodáč, Stříbrný' – all of them are 'phrasemongers' who 'work with labels' (Pusté žvanění, 1935, p. 1). But condemning them is not a condemnation of patriotism as such. On the contrary:

> The socialist loves his country better and more sincerely because the working man does not abuse these great words in daily life to enrich himself using them. But the 'patriotic' Czech and German industrialists and bankers and the ushers paid by them want to prepare the working people for these insincere phrases so that the voters will also give these capitalists political power so that they can secure their capital permanently and even use it more effectively to enslave others. (Pusté žvanění, 1935, p. 1)

There is thus no use here for the contradiction between internationalism and nationalism, the emphasis of which, on a theoretical level, might be expected from the advocates of socialism. Nationalism is merely seen as a disingenuous way for the capitalist to maintain power over the means of production. The daily *Právo lidu*, on the other hand, fits the social democrat into the role of a true patriot, who is a patriot perhaps precisely because of his class consciousness, paradoxical as it may seem.

Nationalism is criticised primarily because of its fascist extreme, but the inclusion of this reaction in the continuity of class enemies is not overlooked. Hitler's policies in Germany are equated with earlier slavery, feudalism, serfdom and also wage labour in capitalism. The attack of reaction is thus not only to be repelled; the reactionaries must be 'defeated and trampled on' once and for all

(Porazíme reakci, 1935, p. 1). Social democracy, on the other hand, 'protects the poor people' and 'marches at the head of the left' as a 'pillar of democracy and freedom' (Porazíme reakci, 1935, p. 1).

The reaction, then – uncharacteristically in capitalism – is also a relic of feudalism: the old dynasties that want to seize power again, as depicted, for example, in one of the articles:

> The European monarchist reaction has a double base: one is Germany, permeated to a dangerous degree by elements which, for nationalist and capitalist reasons, are deliberately preparing the ground for the Hohenzollerns. The other is Hungary, whose gentry, officers and partly the bourgeoisie, for the same reasons, do not cease to strive for the return of the Habsburgs. (Zmařené dílo maďarské reakce, 1921, p. 1)

Such efforts are seen as strongly reactionary, with the aristocrats and royalty standing alongside the bourgeoisie as class enemies of the workers.

The image of the reactionary is regularly based on similar principles. He is not concerned with the workers; on the contrary, he is interested in maintaining the old system. Whether the reaction is feudal, bourgeois, agrarian or even, in some cases, communist, it always sides with capital, either for strategic reasons or simply to defend its interest. It thus hinders social progress and must be 'defeated and trampled on' once and for all.

7. Conclusion

The images of revolution that arise from the analysis of *Právo lidu* speak of the uncertainty of the party's value anchoring, even though the party appears confident and stable outwardly compared with other political entities of the time. A straightforward programme, firm adherence to defending democratic structures, loyalty to the republic and understandable communication with voters are undoubtedly reasons why social democracy emerges from the work of party historiographer Zdeněk Kárník as a stabilising point within the tumultuous and confusing interwar politics. However, a general view can be deceptive, and we often overlook the hidden and creeping factors that have shaped the overall picture by accentuating certain "main" variables. Although social democrats indeed opposed the Bolshevik path and its embodiment in the form of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, they retained the construct of the 'historical enemy' that should be removed by the historical dialectical process. Similarly, social democrats held onto the image of the reactionary who 'puts sticks in the wheels' of these historical processes.

Finally, it is necessary to distinguish between the position of social democracy concerning Czechoslovak democracy and the geopolitical situation. The

revolutionary discourse mentioned is primarily formulated in the context of production relations, which constitute the entire socialist doctrine. However, at certain moments, socialists found themselves in situations where purely economic disputes were pushed aside. This was especially the case when it came to defending the republic against the fascist threat. Fascism, at a certain point, forced social democracy to accept an alliance with the Soviet Union, which had previously been viewed negatively due to its incompatibility with democracy. The path of social democracy from a dialectical perception of the world to a realistic adaptation to political, economic and cultural circumstances would continue to collide with the transcendent revolutionary doctrine of the historical role of the proletariat.

Social democrats were divided between theory and practice. They were convinced that they were defending the interests of the workers against the bourgeoisie; the workers, therefore, placed their hopes in them for a tangible improvement in conditions. However, Marx and Engels never spoke about socialism this way.[3] Improving the conditions of workers is in direct contradiction to the alleged scientific prediction that class struggle will lead to revolution. In other words, to fulfil this theory, the impoverishment of workers is necessary. Anyone who would like to compromise with capitalism is to be "swept away" by the force of the production relations that define capitalism.

Social democrats must have been aware of this contradiction. However, the complete abandonment of Marxism, even if not consistently explicitly named as such, would have meant a shift towards mere trade unionism, that is, engaging in negotiations with the 'enemies of the working class'. Social democrats fully participated in a system that a communist would consider hostile, one based on capitalist economics and individualistic rights. It is, of course, a matter of debate to what extent social democrats were aware of this contradiction and merely justified it with higher goals, as well as to what extent they identified with the value of a balanced combination of socialist, democratic and 'Czechoslovak' (Czech) identities.

Social democrats framed the system as capitalism, in which worker exploitation occurs. Although such labelling presents a simplified view of an otherwise much more complex economic system, a certain level of social inequality was characteristic of the First Republic, especially in the 1930s. Jakub Rákosník and Jiří Noha provide a comprehensive view of the economic and social impact of the 1929 crisis on Czechoslovak society in their work *Capitalism on Its Knees* (Kapitalismus na kolenou) (Rákosník & Noha 2012), within which the history of the labour movement in that period must be understood.

The economic problems of the First Republic are primarily associated with high unemployment, which was not resolved even after the end of the Great Depression. According to some, it was meant to remain a permanent part of the economic life of developed economies (Rákosník & Noha, 2012, p. 147). This was accompanied by inadequate care for the unemployed, a matter criticised daily by Právo lidu (Fronta proti pokroku, 1935, p. 4).

The Great Depression, from a socialist perspective, was a symbolic failure of the capitalist world. It immediately attracted the attention of revolutionary and evolutionary leftists, who, despite their disputes, united in interpreting the crisis as a result of the 'Marxist' historical process (Rákosník & Noha, 2012, p. 241). In response to the outbreak of the crisis, social democracy presented the Action Program of 1930, which declared relatively radical positions on capitalist production. Rákosník's commentary on the Action Program highlights a significant gap between rhetoric and practice:

However, this determined rhetoric of social democracy did not align well with its parliamentary practice. Within the framework of coalition cooperation, it was forced to make various compromises with other coalition partners. In this schizophrenic oscillation of socialist left-wing parties between radical revolutionary rhetoric and moderate political practice, we can see a more general regularity in the era of crisis rather than a specific feature of Czechoslovak social democracy. (Rákosník & Noha, 2012, p. 241)

The conclusions arising from the analysis of *Právo lidu* unquestionably confirm this thesis and open up space for comparative research.

Social democracy followed a path that was genuinely democratic in terms of form and its role in high politics. On the other hand, it also contributed to a specific revolutionary culture. The path of negotiating dignified conditions for workers without the socialist label was rejected, which opened the door to revolutionary sentiments that, in my opinion, would fundamentally influence post-war conditions in Czechoslovakia, among other things.

It is not possible to measure the truthfulness of the presented thesis perfectly, and it can undoubtedly be stated that a significant portion of social democrats approached politics pragmatically as a means to defend their interests or the interests of workers. However, I am convinced that a substantial part of the social democratic movement during the interwar years still leaned towards the idea that, behind all the hardships of the working-class reality, behind the meetings of party organisations and unions, and the calls for the overthrow of bourgeois capitalism, lay a socially just world of a classless society – the kind of world described by Karl Marx.

The concept of discourse works with shared social reality across different environments. The conclusions of the discourse analysis of the revolution speak to the straddling of social democrats between the Marxist narrative and political practice. If radical rhetoric served primarily to gain votes and did not translate to a greater extent into political practice, highlighting this disjunction may seem analytically redundant. However, this 'technical' approach fails to account for the influence of the discursive practice described on the long-term formation of shared social categories.

The communists' post-war path to power tends to be framed through the events of so-called great history. The liberation by the Red Army, the discrediting

of the right-wing parties during the Second Republic, Beneš's ties to Moscow, the Eastern foreign resistance, and the constant work of the Gottwald leadership to gain power are considered causal factors. (Rupnik, 2002) But that would be an incomplete picture of reality. The victory of the Communist Party in 1946, the mass joining of the party in 1947, and the subsequent pressure of the 'street' on the democratic ministers and President Benes need to be explained. This was not a putsch led by a few people, as it was in Russia in 1917. It was a mass movement sharing the ideology of revolutionary socialism (see Fasora, 2018). These masses shared an image of the enemy that had been built up over decades. Marx and Engels sketched out its basic contours.

However, it is also being built within the social democratic movement, even before its break with the radical wings of the parties. However, the building of the image of the enemy does not end there (see Nečasová, 2020). As we have seen above, the image of the enemy to be fought against is repeatedly portrayed in the pages of the social democratic press even after the split in 1921. The social democrats did not abandon the revolutionary narrative, and in doing so helped to legitimise the position of revolutionary socialism for the next decades. After the war, the communists had a legacy to build on.

References:

Bednařík, P., Jirák, J., & Köpplová, B. (2011). *Dějiny českých médií: od počátku do současnosti*. Praha: Grada.

Bernstein, E. (1899). *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie*. Stuttgart: Verlag von J.H.W. Dietz Nachf.

Bernstein, E. (1907). *Evolutionary Socialism*. London: Independent Labour Party.

Carver, T. (2012). *Marx: Later Political Writings*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511810695

Charvát, J. (2013). *Politika volebních reforem v ČR po roce 1989*. Praha: Grada.

Dietrich, H. (2017). Past, Present and Future of World Socialism. *International Critical Thought, 8*(1), 1–27.

Engels, B. (1949). *Anti-Dühring: Pana Evžena Dühringa převrat vědy*. Praha: Svoboda.

Enyeart, J. P. (2003). Revolution or Evolution: The Socialist Party, Western Workers, and Law in the Progressive Era. *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era 2*(4), 377–402.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fasora, L. (2018). Krajina revolučních tradic (1920-1989) – kolébka nového člověka. Příklad Brněnska, Kladenska a Rosicka-Oslavanska. In L. Fasora, J. Hanuš, D. Nečasová et al. (Eds.), *Svůdnost sociálního experimentu. Nový člověk 20. století* (pp. 186–207). Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.

Foucault, M. (1994). *Diskurs, Autor, Genealogie: tři studie*. Praha: Svoboda.

Heywood, A. (2004). *Politologie*. Praha: Eurolex Bohemia.

Heywood, A. (2005). *Politické ideologie*. Praha: Victoria Publishing.

Horák, J. (2018, February 2). Stalinistka Semelová už děti neučí, škola jí nenašla místo. Postarala se o ni KSČM. *Lidovky*. Retrieved from: https://www.lidovky.cz/domov/stalinistka-semelova-uz-deti-neuci-skola-pro-ni-nemela-misto-postarala-se-o-ni-kscm.A180201_093047_ln_domov_jho

Kárník, Z. (2000). *České země v éře první republiky (1918-1938). Díl první, Vznik budování a zlatá léta republiky (1918-1929)*. Praha: Libri.

Kárník, Z. (2006). *Československá sociálněděmokratická strana dělnická v letech 1918-1938*. In M. Hrubec & M. Bárta (Eds.), *Dějiny českého a československého sociálněděmokratického hnutí* (pp. 46-59). Brno: Masarykova dělnická akademie; Doplněk.

Klimek, A. (1996). *Boj o hrad I.: Hrad a Pětka 1918-1926.* Praha: Panevropa.
Kokoška, S. (2004). Mnichov a česká společnost. In J. Němeček (Eds.), *Mnichovská dohoda: cesta k destrukci demokracie v Evropě* (pp. 41-55). Praha: Karolinum.
Kořalka, J. (1996). *Češi v Habsburské Říše a v Evropě 1815-1914.* Praha: Argo.
Kořalka, J. (2005). *Československá sociálně demokratická strana dělnická.* In J. Malíř & P. Marek (Eds.), *Politické strany: vývoj politických stran a hnutí v českých zemích a Československu 1861-2004. I. díl: Období 1861-1938* (pp. 234–235). Brno: Doplněk.
Krzyżanowski, M. (2018). Discursive Shits in Ethno-Nationalist Politics: On Politicisation and Mediatisation of the 'Refugee Crisis' in Poland. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies, 16*(1), 76–96. https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2017.1317897
KSČM. (1992). *Program KSČM. II. Sjezd KSČM.* Retrieved from: https://www.kscm.cz/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/kladensky_program_1992.pdf
Kuklík, J. (2005). Československá sociálně demokratická strana dělnická. In J. Malíř & P. Marek (Eds.), *Politické strany: vývoj politických stran a hnutí v českých zemích a Československu 1861-2004. I. díl: Období 1861-1938* (pp. 683–709). Brno: Doplněk.
Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics* (2nd ed.). London: Verso.
Lebowitz, M. A. (2015). *The Socialist Imperative: From Gotha to Now.* New York: Monthly Review Press.
Malát, Š. (2018, April 18). Favorit na šéfa KSČM Skála: Lenin byl impozantní katedrálou ducha. *Forum24.* Retrieved from: https://www.forum24.cz/favorit-na-sefa-kscm-skala-lenin-byl-impozantni-katedralou-ducha
Marx, K. (1968). *The Class Struggles in France 1848-1850.* Moscow: Progress Publishers.
Marx, K., & Engels, B. (1970). *Komunistický manifest*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
Meyer, M., & Wodak R. (2015). Critical discourse studies: history, agenda, theory and methodology. In Meyer, M. & Wodak R. (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies,* (pp. 1–22). London: Sage.
Meyer, T., & Hinchman, L. (2007). *The Theory of Social Democracy.* Cambridge: Polite Press.
Miller, D. (1995): *Blackwellova encyklopedie politického myšlení*. Brno: Proglas.
Nečasová, D. (2020). *Obrazy nepřítele v Československu 1948-1956.* Prague: NLN – Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
Newman, M. (2005). *Socialism: A Very Short Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Polášek, M. (2011). *Josef Macek a programové debaty v Československé sociálně demokratické straně dělnické (ČSDSD) v letech 1924-1938* (Doctoral Thesis). Retrieved from: https://dodo.is.cuni.cz/handle/20.500.11956/47179
Rákosník, J. (2012). Tři cesty soudobé české historiografie komunismu. In J. Kalous, & J. Kocian (eds.), *Český a slovenský komunismus (1921-2011)* (pp. 13–23). Praha: Ústav pro studium totalitních režimů.
Rákosník, J., & Noha, J. (2012). *Kapitalismus na kolenou: dopad velké hospodářské krize na evropskou společnost v letech 1929-1934*. Praha: Auditorium.
Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2015). The Discourse Historical Approach (DHA). In Meyer, M. & Wodak R. (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies,* (pp. 87–121). London: Sage.
Rychlík, J. (2020). *Československo v období socialismu: 1945-1989.* Praha: Vyšehrad.
Rupnik, J. (2002). *Dějiny Komunistické strany Československa.* Praha: Academia.
Schejbal, T. (2021). Na úsvitu dějin české sociální demokracie. Od prvopočátků hnutí k základnům moderní politické strany (1844–1893). *Dějiny – teorie – kritika* 1, 156–158.
Schubertová, A. (2021). *Stávám se řečí: smrt a návrat autora v perspektivě filozofie identity*. Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy.
SOCDEM. (n. d.). *Historie Sociální demokracie*. Retrieved from: https://socdem.cz/historie-socdem/
Stačilo!. (2025a). *Program hnutí Stačilo! pro volby v roce 2025*. Retrieved from: https://www.stacilo.cz/#program
Stačilo!. (2025b, July 21). *Žádný levicový hlas nepropadne: SOCDEM bude kandidovat za STAČILO!* [Press release]. Retrieved from: https://www.stacilo.cz/zadny-levicovy-hlas-nepropadne-socdem-bude-kandidovat-za-stacilo/
van der Linden, M. (2022). *The Cambridge History of Socialism.* Cambridge University Press.
Wodak, R. (2017). "Strangers in Europe": A Discourse-Historical Approach to the Legitimation of Immigration Control 2015/16. In S. Zhao, E. Djanov, A. Björkvall & M. Boeriis (Eds.), *Advancing Multimodal and Critical Discourse Studies: Interdisciplinary Research Inspired by Theo Van Leeuwen's Social Semiotics* (pp. 31–49). New York: Routledge.

Wodak, R., & Krzyżanowski, M. (2017). Right-wing populism in Europe and USA: Contesting politics and discourse beyond 'Orbanism' and 'Trumpism'. *Journal of Language and Politics, 16*(4), 471–484.
Wodak, R., KhosraviNik, M., & Mral, B. (2013). *Rightwing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourse*. London: Bloomsbury.

Newspaper Articles:

Večerník Práva lidu. (1935, May 15). 19. května porazíme reakci! *Večerník Práva lidu*, 1.
Večerník Práva lidu. (1918, December 18). Agrárnický 'bolševismus'. *Večerník Práva lidu*, 3.
Bechyně, R. (1918, December 10). Konec kapitalismu I u nás se neodvratně blíží. Soudruh Bechyně o bolševismu a socialismu. *Večerník Práva lidu*, 1.
Večerník Práva lidu. (1918, December 14). Boj buržoazie s proletariátem v Německu. *Večerník Práva lidu*, 1.
Večerník Práva lidu. (1918, November 30). Boj o půdu v československé republice. *Večerník Práva lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1921, April 10). Boj reakce proti pozemkové reformě. *Právo lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1921, May 10). Co chcete s revolucí? *Právo lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1921, March 9). Česká buržoasie proti podporám v nezaměstnání. *Právo lidu*, 2.
Právo lidu. (1921, March 17). Dělnickou krví zborcené Rusko. *Právo lidu*, 4.
Právo lidu. (1925, November 11). Dělníci pekařští uvažujte! *Právo lidu*, 6.
Právo lidu. (1919, June 15). Dnes všichni k volbě! Povalte třídní bašty buržoazie v obcích! Vše pro vítězství socialismu! *Právo lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1930, January 31). Ejhle kapitalistickou morálku. *Právo lidu*, 5.
Právo lidu. (1925, November 7). Hromadný odklon dělnictva od komunistů. *Právo lidu*, 7.
Právo lidu. (1919, June 5). Jak se kapitalisté organisují. *Právo lidu*, 5.
Veselý, F. (1930, May 1). Kolektivní družstevnictví, hospodářství budoucnosti. *Právo lidu*, 3.
Právo lidu. (1925, November 1). Komunistický sekretář proti komunistické straně. *Právo lidu*, 9.
Právo lidu. (1925, November 11). *Komunističtí dělníci, co říkáte vilám svých vůdců? Právo lidu*, 3.
Večerník práva lidu. (1918, December 3). Konfiskace a expropriace. Jak provedeme vyvlastnění výrobních prostředků? *Večerník Práva lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1925, November 11). Krátké nohy komunistických lží. *Právo lidu*, 2.
Právo lidu. (1921, March 4). Moskevský rozkaz. *Právo lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1921, May 10). Moskva a naše republika. *Právo lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1921, May 13). Moskevská centrála pro pučism v Československé republice. *Právo lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1935, Januray 5). Národně socialistická předvolební agitace na úkor dělnictva. *Právo lidu*, 4.
Právo lidu. (1929, February 10). Nedostali ještě úplně přesných pokynů moskevského polbyra? *Právo lidu*, 3.
Němec, A. (1919, May 2). Odstraňte zločiny kapitalistické! *Právo lidu*, 2.
Právo lidu. (1930, January 3). Nový sociálně reakční útok. *Právo lidu,* 4.
Právo lidu. (1921, March 8). Palácová revoluce v 'levici'. *Právo lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1929, January 15). Pokořující Canossa zdejšího komunistického ústředí. *Právo lidu*, 4.
Právo lidu. (1923, March 18). Pravda o sovětovém Rusku. *Právo lidu*, 3.
Večerník práva lidu. (1918, December 9). Půda národu a pracujícímu lidu. *Večerník Práva lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1925, October 28). Rozklad komunistické strany pokračuje. *Právo lidu*, 4.
Právo lidu. (1925, November 5) Rozvrat komunistů na Brněnsku. *Právo lidu*, 3.
Právo lidu. (1923, July 3). Ruská komunisticko-bolševická strana. *Právo lidu*, 6.
Právo lidu. (1925, November 8). Služebná děvčata prohlédněte demagogii komunistů! *Právo lidu*, 8.
Právo lidu. (1935, January 4) Tvoří se fronta proti sociálnímu pokroku? *Právo lidu*, 4.
Právo lidu. (1935, May 8). Tři politické strany s programem pustého žvanění. *Právo lidu*, 1.
Večerník práva lidu. (1918, November 29). Úklady agrárníků proti vyvlastnění velkostatků. *Večerník Práva lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1930, January 11). Útok agrárníků na mzdy zemědělského dělnictva odražen. *Právo lidu*, 4.
Právo lidu. (1925, November 10). Už melou z posledního..., *Právo lidu*, 7.
Právo lidu. (1930, January 9). Veškerému dělnictvu zemědělskému! *Právo lidu*, 7.
Právo lidu. (1921, April 12). Více reality, méně idealismu! *Právo lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1921, June 28). V krisi komunismu. *Právo lidu*, 3.

Právo lidu. (1921, April 15). Zdrcující úsudek nad komunisty. *Právo lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1921, April 19). Zemědělské dělnictvo Slovenska proti komunistickým štváčům. *Právo lidu*, 3.
Právo lidu. (1930, January 16). Zemědělství jako oběť kapitalistického systému. *Právo lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1921, March 31). Zmařené dílo maďarské reakce. *Právo lidu*, 1.
Právo lidu. (1923, October 4). Žádná naděje na úspěch přímého vyjednávání horníků s uhlobarony. *Právo lidu*, 5.

Endnotes:

1 In February 1948, power in Czechoslovakia was seized by the Communist Party, which ruled in a totalitarian or later authoritarian manner until 1989.
2 An authority outside the constitutional framework, composed of representatives of the five most prominent political parties of the First Republic. During the 1920s, they effectively constituted the strongest political structure in the country (Klimek, 1996, pp. 152–155).
3 With the late exception of Engels' preface to *The Class Struggles in France* (1968).